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Chief Executive Officer Bulletin
Week of May 4 - 10, 2018

Board Executive Limitation Policy EL-7:
The Board Appointed Officers shall inform and support the Board in its work. Further, a BAO shall 1) inform the Board of relevant trends, anticipated adverse media coverage, or material external and internal changes, particularly changes in the assumptions upon which any Board policy has previously been established and 2) report in a timely manner an actual or anticipated noncompliance with any policy of the Board.
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<td>Report of the Public-Private Partnership (P3) Proposed Shortlist (4-24-2018) for the Request for Qualifications (RFQ) on the P3 Purified Water Program</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

District to Support Feasibility Evaluation of Pumped-Storage Hydroelectric System at Anderson and Coyote Reservoirs

The District has been approached by Silicon Valley Clean Energy (SVCE), a local community choice aggregation agency, about exploring the feasibility of a pumped-storage system between Anderson and Coyote Reservoirs. SVCE will conduct a high-level ‘fatal flaws’ feasibility study through a qualified consultant to determine if a potential pumped hydro storage project of any size or configuration could be justified financially. The district will provide the data and site information that is necessary to support the study and receive a copy of the final report.

Pumped-storage systems require two (2) nearby water reservoirs at different elevations. During periods of high electrical demand (peak hours), the water stored at the higher elevation reservoir is released and fed through power-generating turbines to help supplement electric power from the natural gas resource, carbon free resource (large hydro), and renewable resources, (solar, wind, and small hydro). Water from the lower reservoirs is pumped back to the higher reservoir during low demand (off-peak hours). This process does not result in energy savings, but helps balance the electrical load and possibly produces revenue by generating and selling energy while electricity prices are highest.

For further information, please contact Kurt Arends at (408) 630-2284.
Report of the Public-Private Partnership (P3) Proposed Shortlist (4-24-2018) for the Request for Qualifications (RFQ) on the P3 Purified Water Program

The district received three (3) Statement of Qualifications (SOQ) from respondents for the Request for Qualifications (RFQ) on the P3 Purified Water Program, which the Review Board deemed highly qualified, and therefore, recommended the three (3) proceed to the Request for Proposal (RFP) phase. This brings the total proposed shortlist to five (5) eligible respondents, including the original two (2) respondents from the prior RFQ solicitation. The shortlist has been posted at the District’s P3-Purified Water Program website (at the following link):

https://www.valleywater.org/contractors/doing-businesses-with-the-district/p3-purified-water-program

Retaining five (5) qualified respondents will increase market competition, and thereby, increases the likelihood of delivering a cost-effective Purified Water Program for the benefit of our ratepayers.

One (1) respondent appealed the proposed shortlist including all five (5) teams, and not three (3). Staff has evaluated the appeal and found it to be without merit and concluded that there are no grounds for further consideration of the appeal.

For further information, please contact Emmanuel Aryee at (408) 630-3074.
BOARD MEMBER REQUESTS & INFORMATIONAL ITEMS
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Request</th>
<th>Completed Date</th>
<th>Meeting Date</th>
<th>Director</th>
<th>GM / AGM</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>20 Days Due Date</th>
<th>Expected Completion Date</th>
<th>Disposition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R-18-0009</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>05/08/18</td>
<td>Hsueh</td>
<td>Hawk</td>
<td>Staff to look into the water conservation program currently being used by Mr. William Sherman of WRATES (Water Rates Advocacy for Transparency, Equity and Sustainability) and provide information to Water Conservation and Demand Management Committee for discussion.</td>
<td>05/28/18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-18-0006</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>04/24/18</td>
<td>Keegan</td>
<td>Richardson</td>
<td>Director Keegan requested that staff provide the Board with a report on the Conservation Corps Trail Security Plan.</td>
<td>05/16/18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-18-0010</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>05/02/18</td>
<td>Keegan</td>
<td>Hawk</td>
<td>Staff to respond to Ms. Deirdre Des Jardins’ letter presented to the Board during Public Comments on the California WaterFix for Item 2.1 at the May 2, 2018 Special Board Meeting.</td>
<td>05/22/18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-18-0007</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>04/10/18</td>
<td>Santos</td>
<td>Callender</td>
<td>Test - this BMR is being assigned to test whether the system will automatically send Rachael an email at 4:30 p.m. on 4/12/18.</td>
<td>05/02/18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request</td>
<td>Completed Date</td>
<td>Request Date</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>GM / AGM</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>20 Days Due Date</td>
<td>Expected Completion Date</td>
<td>Disposition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-18-0006</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>04/24/18</td>
<td>Hsueh</td>
<td>Richardson</td>
<td>Director Hsueh requests staff prepare a draft response to the October 21, 2016 Saratoga Creek petitioners for the May 22, 2018, Board Meeting.</td>
<td>05/14/18</td>
<td>04/25/18 Information Only.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-18-0005</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>04/10/18</td>
<td>Kremen</td>
<td>Hawk</td>
<td>Director Kremen requests staff to provide more detailed information regarding the San Jose Population Projections discussed at the Recycled Water Policy Advisory Committee Meeting.</td>
<td>05/09/18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-18-0007</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>05/08/18</td>
<td>Kremen</td>
<td>Hawk</td>
<td>Provide Director Kremen with the Draft P3 Term Sheet in WORD format.</td>
<td>05/29/18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-18-0004</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>03/27/18</td>
<td>Santos</td>
<td>Hawk</td>
<td>Staff is to provide information on whether brackish groundwater can supplement waste water supplies at the SVAWPC.</td>
<td>04/29/18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TO: Board of Directors

FROM: Michele L. King, CMC
      Clerk/Board of Directors

SUBJECT: Additional Comments on California WaterFix

DATE: 05/10/18

The following phone calls and comments on Agenda Item 2.1 – California WaterFix, were received after the handout printing cut off for the May 8, 2018 Board Meeting.
Phone Calls Received in the Clerk of the Board’s Office regarding the 5/8/18 Special Board Meeting on the California WaterFix.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date/Time of Call</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>City of Residence</th>
<th>Position (Opposed/Support)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5/8/18 8:45 a.m.</td>
<td>Karen Campbell</td>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>Opposed (called after cut off)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>408-307-8373</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/08/18 3:17 p.m.</td>
<td>John Miller</td>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>Opposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/08/18 4:20 P.M.</td>
<td>Christine Pepin</td>
<td>Sunnyvale</td>
<td>Opposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/9/18 12:46 pm</td>
<td>Celia Becker</td>
<td>District 3</td>
<td>Opposed – She will not vote for any more bonds the District has on the ballot.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/9/18 12:46 pm</td>
<td>Ms. Cannuli</td>
<td>District 2</td>
<td>Opposed - She will do “as much as she can” to ensure those who voted in favor are not re-elected.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
May 8, 2018

The Honorable Richard Santos, Chair
Santa Clara Valley Water District Board of Directors
5750 Almaden Expressway
San Jose, CA 95118

Re: California WaterFix Tunnel Project

Honorable Board Chair Santos and SCVWD Board of Directors:

On behalf of The Silicon Valley Organization (The SVO), I am writing to applaud the Santa Clara Valley Water District’s (SCVWD) latest proposal to commit up to $650 million to support the California WaterFix Tunnel Project. We encourage you to support this proposal with your affirmative vote at your special Board meeting on May 2nd. By way of background, we are the Silicon Valley’s premier business advocacy organization representing 1,400+ companies that employ nearly 300,000 workers and we represent our membership as the region’s largest Chamber of Commerce.

The SVO believes that a reliable water supply is essential to California’s economy and to support businesses in Silicon Valley. Currently, the statewide water system that supports California’s water infrastructure is in dire need of restoration and our aging water system is in urgent need of repair. The California WaterFix project will deliver vital water resources through modern pipes and provide precious drinking water throughout the state. In addition, the WaterFix project is one of the most affordable options to support a reliable and regional water supply that will also power Silicon Valley’s long-term economic engine.

Furthermore, SCVWD staff have taken special effort to consider the guiding principles adopted by the SCVWD Board back in October 2017 regarding the California WaterFix project. We understand that this latest proposal to support the WaterFix project is not inconsistent with these guiding principles. Thus, the Santa Clara Valley Water District should be a partner in this effort and take leadership in securing California’s water supply for the future. We urge you to support this important and vital project. Should you or your staff have any questions about our position, please contact Eddie Truong, Director of Public Policy, at 408-291-5267.

Sincerely,

Matthew R. Mahood
President & CEO

cc: Santa Clara Valley Water District Board of Directors
Dear Directors Linda LeZotte, John Varela, and Richard Santos,

I wanted to write to personally thank each of you for your courageous no votes on the funding issue for the WaterFix project. It appears that there was a lot of pressure and not much time to review materials, and Baykeeper sincerely appreciates your dedication to your constituents, to rational discourse, and to the principles of good governance that prevented you from leaping before you knew what the real costs and impacts of the twin tunnels would be.

Sincerely,
Ben Eichenberg

M. Benjamin Eichenberg
Staff Attorney
San Francisco Baykeeper
1736 Franklin Street, Suite 800
Oakland, CA 94612
Office: 510-735-9700 x105
Fax: 510-735-9160

Protecting San Francisco Bay from pollution since 1989
www.baykeeper.org
@sfbaykeeper

CONFIDENTIAL/Attorney-Client Privileged. Intended ONLY for receipt by Addressee(s). If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, any review, use, disclosure, distribution, or copying of this e-mail (and any attachments) is prohibited. Please contact the sender by reply e-mail and destroy the message and all copies of the original message (and any attachments).
Can you please forward this to director Lezotte, chair Santos and director Varela
Thanks and best regards

Subject: Water Fix decision, thank you

Thank you for standing up with our rate payers by not supporting the Water Fix project.

It is a project that does not provide any cost benefits to our service area. Of all the comments sent to the board and testimonies at the hearing, the majority of them, almost 99%, expressed opposition to the project. If this project were to proceed, all of our rate payers for the next generations have to bear the cost.

Our share estimated to be $65 million will be much higher, given the history of overrun and we will have no control as we will be the minority member in the JPA. This $65 million could have been spent on those much needed local projects such as flood control, water recycling and potable water reuse. I am troubled by the board action and I am sure that rate payers will take this into consideration in future if the Water District is asking voters approval for another Clean Safe Water bond.
Begin forwarded message:

From: "Swanee Edwards" <swanee@garlic.com>
Date: May 9, 2018 at 4:37:23 PM PDT
To: "John Varela" <john.varela@yahoo.com>
Subject: Water Fix vote

Vice Chair Linda Lazotte, and Chair Santos,

I have asked John to pass our letter to you regarding yesterday’s District vote on the “Water Fix”.

We wish to thank you both for your NO vote on the District’s participation in the Delta Tunnel proposal. You both have our gratitude for listening to all of us that spent time to be there at these meetings! This has been a very controversial decision from the beginning, and you both showed us that you are listening to our concerns. This was a long, and confusing at times, issue that bears your careful consideration. We understand that this was not an easy decision, but you both did the right thing!

Thank you both again, and know that you have garnered our support and admiration!

Ever Onward,

Swanee
This email is directed specifically to Nai Hsueh. As a resident of your district, specifically Tracel Drive in San Jose, I would like to understand your reasoning in full for voting for the Twin Tunnel Delta project. I am a Ph.D. in Resource Economics, work in the federal government as manager of 8 economists, 3 with Ph.D.s who value intangible assets of all types. I also teach at Menlo College. I wrote the Governor a letter asking for feedback on overall water policies in California, noting about 27 new projects to reclaim underground brackish water, and only recent work of the state to access its groundwater resources that seemed to be generated finally by the great drought of 2012-2017. I think water quality, reliability, and its contribution to economic security is essential to Silicon Valley businesses and residents, so I would like to understand how this project with all of its costs, controversies, and likely contribution to less than reliable environmental stability in the delta will contribute to the three attributes I view as essential to Silicon Valley well being. I can be reached at cradelberg@me.com, by phone at 408-892-3687. Looking forward to a thoughtful reply to my inquiry.
Begin forwarded message:

From: HD MCD <altobass@sbcglobal.net>
Subject: State Twin Tunnels Vote
Date: May 9, 2018 at 1:52:55 PM PDT
To: "gkremen@valleywater.org" <gkremen@valleywater.org>
Reply-To: HD MCD <altobass@sbcglobal.net>

Dear Mr. Kremen,

I am a resident of the south Almaden Valley, and I want you to know that I am utterly dismayed by yesterday's vote reversing last fall's decision regarding funding of the state twin tunnels water project. The justification about providing a more reliable water supply for Santa Clara county goes against all of the environmental and economic analysis of this project. Our water bills have sky-rocketed in the past several years, and the thought of paying another $100-150 dollars/year to fund this project makes absolutely no sense. Please know that if this decision is not reversed, I will be voting against your re-election this year.

Hugh McDevitt
Begin forwarded message:

From: tim mccabe <patronpole12@gmail.com>
Date: May 9, 2018 at 7:25:32 PM PDT
To: <gkremen@valleywater.org>
Subject: Dum ass Watewrfix

Gary  Who paid you off?  I hope you get caught!!  You vote just sealed the DEATH of the CA DELTA ,  The end of the San Francisco Bay and turned the Sacramento River into the Sacramento Creek..  You need to leave town now and go to L.A.
Begin forwarded message:

From: <davemer@comcast.net>
Subject: Delta Tunnels - No Vote
Date: May 8, 2018 at 8:30:13 AM PDT
To: <gkremen@valleywater.org>
Reply-To: <davemer@comcast.net>

Director Kreman,

I again strongly urge you to vote NO on this project. A minority seat on the "Tunnels Board" accomplishes nothing. Not only is the Tunnels project a major environmental threat to the Delta it is also a significant financial threat to the customers of the SCC Water District. State agencies have a long history of mismanagement of major projects resulting in considerable cost overruns.

A yes vote places district customers at risk by based on a vaguely worded document that provides significant risk and guarantees nothing.

David Burnham

District 7 Resident
Dear Santa Clara Valley water board:

I live in Discovery Bay, but mine and my wife's family and friends live in San Jose and the immediate area. They visit us most weekends to enjoy the water and are very upset over what is about to happen with Delta. If the water bill is passed by Santa Clara County, they plan on sharing their displeasure by email, to all their friends and will ask that those friends pass the information on.

On a personal note, there is so much to lose with the Delta and its environment and so little to gain, especially for northern California. The water "package" will definitely have a short term benefit for few "large central valley farming interests" (especially those who are politically connected) and the L.A. area. But, past history has taught us that it has a very good chance of ending up like so many past southern California water "projects" that simply ruined the origin water source -- dried it up or set its environment back ages.

Thank you for your consideration in voting no.

Regards,

Colin Brodie

5631 Starboard Drive

Discovery Bay
Begin forwarded message:

From: Anne Harrington - earthlink <anneharrington@earthlink.net>
Subject: Tomorrow's vote on the Twin Tunnels
Date: May 7, 2018 at 8:52:45 AM PDT
To: <gkremen@valleywater.org>

Dear Mr. Kremen,

As a resident of your district, I strongly urge you to vote “no” on the so-called “Water Fix” project. I value the health of the Delta and the entire Bay Area eco-system, which would be placed at risk by the proposed project with little benefit to the state either economically or environmentally.

Again, please vote “No.”

Anne Harrington
4343 Cesano Ct.
Palo Alto, Ca
Begin forwarded message:

From: Dale Breen <dalerbreen@comcast.net>
Subject: Water Fix
Date: May 7, 2018 at 9:19:12 AM PDT
To: <gkremen@valleywater.org>

Dear Honorable Mr. Kremen:

I know you are considering the Water Fix issue. I understand how important the water issue is to all of us. I know there are alternatives out there that have been shared to avoid the destruction and irreparable damage this will do to this treasure we have here in the bay area.

This plan will cause the collapse of our way of life on the Delta. We will not only lose much of the fish and wildlife but the recreation and communities will be devastated. The noise of the pile driving will be 91 decibels 24 hours a day. Noise travels long distances over the water. Also the millions of dump trucks traveling our already dangerous two land roads will cause massive traffic delays. The barges going back and forth will caused traffic as well as the draw bridges will have to be raised eight times a day. This plan allows the dumping of muck on the islands out here. This will cause a terrible stench and other damage. Our home values will plummet and businesses will fail. They expect a substantial number of the marinas to fold if this goes forward. This is just the tip of the iceberg.

Should the Delta and all the residents sacrifice their lives and livelihoods for this water grab? We want to share the water but please, I beg you, not this way.

Please stand up and do the right thing for the entire state and say no to water fix but yes to alternatives.

Sincerely,
Tami Breen
1947 Discovery Bay, CA 94505
Begin forwarded message:

From: tim mccabe <patronpole12@gmail.com>
Date: May 6, 2018 at 4:26:34 PM PDT
To: <gkremen@valleywater.org>
Subject: Dum ass tunnels

You and the MWD are raping the delta. MWD lives 600 miles away and are trying to control, Rape, and destroy our delta. We live here and we give 1/2 of our water now. the San Joaquin river flows backwards now because of the pumps. The delta is in pearl and now they and you want to turn the Sacramento river into the Sacramento creek.
Stop this insane ides of gov Brown. If you think this will cost 17billion. you are a fool. some estimates are over 100, billion.
Begin forwarded message:

From: Mark Simpson <simpson-mark@sbcglobal.net>
Date: May 6, 2018 at 10:43:32 AM PDT
To: <gkremen@valleywater.org>
Subject: Vote No on the tunnels

We live in Cupertino, vote in Santa Clara and have a weekend home on the Delta in Discovery Bay. I urge you to vote against the tunnels. A yes vote will result in raise higher water rates and destruction of our home and recreation area along with the severe environmental impact. You are being fed lies by Jerry Brown’s cronies.

Mark Simpson
10491 Stokes Avenue
Cupertino CA 95014

5652 Drakes Drive
Discovery Bay CA 94505
Begin forwarded message:

From: Jimmy Jenkins <jimjenkins444@yahoo.com>
Date: May 4, 2018 at 4:29:57 PM PDT
To: "gkremen@valleywater.org" <gkremen@valleywater.org>
Subject: Delta Tunnel Vote

interests
Hello Ms Hsueh,

I am terribly disappointed to learn that you got seduced into voting for the twin tunnels. It is a terrible idea. The Mercury News editorials and letter to the editor have presented all the reasons why it should have been voted down. Wish you had read them.

Regards,

Betty Gerlack
Cupertino
Dear Board members

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo and Sierra Club urging you a NO vote.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board’s prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school’s Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District’s board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen “Even if we leave it we’re still going to have to pay for it. And we’d have no control”

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision how is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plan upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan.

In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources.

Sri Narasimhan
20218 Blauer Dr
Saratoga
CA 95070
Dear Board members

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo and Sierra Club urging you a NO vote.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board’s prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school’s Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District’s board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen “Even if we leave it we’re still going to have to pay for it. And we’d have no control”

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision
How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plan upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan.

In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources.

voter of Santa Clara county,
Jamie Tsai
Dear Board members

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo urging you a NO vote.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board's prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school's Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District's board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn't outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen "Even if we leave it we're still going to have to pay for it. And we'd have no control"

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn't listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision
How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plan upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan.

In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources.
Find it difficult to believe the desired reservoir is worth being sucked into the funding intakes of the tunnels.

Rick Jones
Sunnyvale

Sent from my iPhone
Hi,

My family and I (owners of multiple houses within the Santa Clara Valley Water District) vehemently oppose this water tunnels project and the financial commitment 4 members of the board just signed us up for. What can we do to protest this outcome, and hopefully, reverse it?

I did not sign up to be blank check for SoCal water needs, and I have no faith in the numbers provided to date, nor in the lawyer’s comments that we can walk away at a future date with minimal financial risk for the full $650 million. (Like the other partners on the project would ever let that happen!) At the very least, this should be voted on by all of us ratepayers. The only reason it hasn’t been put to a vote is because they know it will lose.

Please let me know ASAP what we can do to reverse the decision and commitment of OUR hard earned dollars, opt out to make sure our funds are not being used for such a foolish, dangerous, unproven project, or, at the very least, get concrete, legally enforceable guarantees that we will not be liable for any cost overruns, etc.

Sincerely,
Meena Nathan
Subject: CALIFORNIA WATER FIX: Please do NOT support

Dear Board members

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo and Sierra Club urging you a NO vote.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board’s prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school’s Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District’s board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen “Even if we leave it we’re still going to have to pay for it. And we’d have no control”

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision. How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plan upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan.

In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources.

Trudi Burney
Saratoga, CA
Dear Board members

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo urging you a NO vote.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board’s prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school’s Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District’s board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen "Even if we leave it we’re still going to have to pay for it. And we’d have no control"

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision

How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plan upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan.

In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources.

Yuri Levashov,
Santa Clara County Resident
Dennis Caldwell <bigd4444@icloud.com>

Wednesday, May 09, 2018 12:15 PM

Board of Directors

California WaterFix project

What the hell were you thinking when you voted in favor of California WaterFix project? Do you honestly think that your one seat on the board will give you ANY say so with the Southern California members? So now we have to destroy the Delta eco system so we can send more water to Central and Southern California. Southern California has the worst record in the state for conserving water! Now we have to pay in higher rates so big agriculture can continue to grow the worst choice of water hogging crops and Southern Californians can continue to fill their swimming pools with no concern with conservation. Shame on you people. I hope this gets tied up in courts until we get people in your position with brains.

Dennis Caldwell
Dear Board members

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo and Sierra Club urging you a NO vote.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board’s prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school’s Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District’s board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen “Even if we leave it we’re still going to have to pay for it. And we’d have no control”

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plan upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan.

In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources.

Best regards,

Jack
Dear Board members

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo urging you a NO vote.

It is my belief that trusting the leadership of the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be a huge mistake for the water customers of San Jose and all of the peoples of Northern California. There is no reason to believe they are competent to handle a project as large as this. Consider that they haven't even been able to maintain existing infrastructure despite having some of the highest water rate in the country, let alone the state.

Additionally, we in San Jose already pay too much for the water we use; and on top of that they want more; and at a many time higher rate of increase than local inflation. It is out-of-control groups like this that drive the high cost of living in our area where not only is the cost of home ownership high to begin with, but ever increasing property taxes and the cost of running a home with something as fundamental as water is set to soar; making the situation even worse. Think about it. This is not going to solve even one of our more pressing issues.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board's prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school's Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District's board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them. Southern California should have to find their own water, not steal it from the North and disrupt the sensitive delta. The uncontrolled expansion of new water hook-ups without increasing the actual water supplies (not further tapping what we already have) should be an obvious miscarriage of responsibilities of both local and state water authorities. They are all in over their heads! We can not continue to spread a very finite amount of water over an ever-growing number to water users. Anyone with half a wit should be able to see that is not going to work. If there is not enough water to go around, and the isn’t, we should stop allowing new hook-ups; both commercial and residential.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per
board member Gary Kremen "Even if we leave it we're still going to have to pay for it. And we'd have no control". This is not the sort of deal our representatives should allow. These open ended projects only serve to make the contractors and lawyers rich.

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind? No one should be allowed to write such an open ended check on behalf of the citizens of Santa Clara County rate payers / tax payers.

Assuming they will move ahead on this program despite the objections of the local public I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Any agreement should be written to state that at any time the citizens of Santa Clara County and / or it's constituent cities, towns and villages decide to leave the program they can do so freely, without restriction and without further financial obligation.

I think the Santa Clara Valley Water District and the San Jose Water Company should be made to get their current house in order before being allowed to take on such a giant new project. They have yet to prove competence with their current challenges. How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plan upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan. (Oh, that's right, they want to raise our fees and taxes. Imagine that!)

In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) we should not participate in this project due to a lack of trustworthy competence at the district level, and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might over-commit ratepayers and District staff resources.

Sincerely;

John Miller
Subject: CALIFORNIA WATER FIX: Please do NOT support

Dear Board members

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo and Sierra Club urging you a NO vote.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board’s prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school’s Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District’s board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen "Even if we leave it we’re still going to have to pay for it. And we’d have no control"

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision

How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plan upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan.

In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources.

Trudi Burney
Saratoga
Dear Board members

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo urging you a NO vote.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board’s prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school’s Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District’s board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen "Even if we leave it we’re still going to have to pay for it. And we’d have no control"

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision
How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plan upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan.

In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources.

Best Regards,

Yan Zhang

yanzhang@hotmail.com
Dear Board members,

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo and Sierra Club urging you a NO vote.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board’s prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school’s Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District’s board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen “Even if we leave it we’re still going to have to pay for it. And we’d have no control”

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plan upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan.

In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources.

Sincerely,

Jitendra Patel

Saratoga, CA
Dear Board members

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo urging you a NO vote.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board’s prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school’s Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District’s board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen “Even if we leave it we’re still going to have to pay for it. And we’d have no control”

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision

How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plant upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan.

In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources.

Thanks,

Amit
Dear Board members

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo urging you a NO vote.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board’s prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school’s Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District’s board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen "Even if we leave it we’re still going to have to pay for it. And we’d have no control"

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision. How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plan upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan.

In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources.

-Thanks,
Charanjeet Saini
Melissa Stone

From: Peter <sognar@aol.com>
Sent: Tuesday, May 08, 2018 2:00 PM
To: Clerk of the Board
Subject: Water proposals

I vote Noooo on any water
Projects that increase our water rates. Enough is enough ...
A disgruntled home owner !!!

Sent from my iPhone
Dear Board members I am with Sierra Club and Congresswoman Anna Eshoo urging you a NO vote. As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board’s prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school’s Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District’s board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen “Even if we leave it we’re still going to have to pay for it. And we’d have no control”

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plan upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan.

In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources.

Thankyou, Jean Dilley

Sent from my iPad
Dear Board members

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo urging you a NO vote.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board's prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school's Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District's board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn't outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen "Even if we leave it we're still going to have to pay for it. And we'd have no control"

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn't listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision

How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plan upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan.

In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources.

Sincerely,

Vinod Ramakrishnan
Dear Board members

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo urging you a NO vote.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board’s prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school’s Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District’s board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen "Even if we leave it we’re still going to have to pay for it. And we’d have no control”

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision

How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plan upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan.

In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources.

Dean Sakauye
Dear Board members

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo urging you a NO vote.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board’s prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school’s Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District’s board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen "Even if we leave it we’re still going to have to pay for it. And we’d have no control"

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision
How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plan upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan.

In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources. Patricia Sweeney
On Water increases!!
Connie Hamrah

Sent from my iPhone
Hello

I am totally against any more rate increase on our water bill. Please reconsider and not raise rates on water bill. I support our elected officials who are also against this.

Thank you
Susan Roldan
Melissa Stone

From: JTakatsuji <jtakatsuji@shibatec.com>
Sent: Tuesday, May 08, 2018 9:11 AM
To: Clerk of the Board
Subject: CALIFORNIA WATER FIX: Please do NOT support

Dear Board members

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo urging you a NO vote.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board’s prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school’s Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District’s board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen "Even if we leave it we’re still going to have to pay for it. And we’d have no control"

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision
How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plan upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan.

In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources.

Jonie Takatsuji
Dear Board members

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo and Sierra Club urging you a NO vote.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board’s prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school’s Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District’s board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen “Even if we leave it we’re still going to have to pay for it. And we’d have no control”

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision

How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plan upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan.

In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources.

Kristin Gragnola
Dear Board members

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo urging you a NO vote.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board’s prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school’s Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District’s board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen "Even if we leave it we’re still going to have to pay for it. And we'd have no control"

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision
How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plan upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan.

In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources.

Norman Harrison
Please do not raise the rates.

Thank you

Chabrant Way, San Jose

---

If any of your friends or family express an interest in buying or selling a home, I'd be honored to work with them.

Daniel Goni
Serenogroup - Saratoga
408-832-9121
The Faylor Real Estate Team
www.JFTeam.com
BRE # 01888053
Email: Board@valleywater.org, clerkoftheboard@valleywater.org,
Subject: CALIFORNIA WATER FIX: Please do NOT support

Dear Board members

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo and Sierra Club urging you a NO vote.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board’s prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school’s Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District’s board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen “Even if we leave it were still going to have to pay for it. And we’d have no control”

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision

How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plan upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan.

In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources.

Vladimir Aleksic
Melissa Stone

From: Gina Adriano on behalf of Communications Unit
Sent: Wednesday, May 09, 2018 8:36 AM
To: Board of Directors
Subject: FW: WaterFix

Good morning,

I will be forwarding various emails addressed to the board on WaterFix.

Thanks,
Gina

From: Freda Hofland [mailto:twildwood@aol.com]
Sent: Tuesday, May 8, 2018 1:42 PM
To: Communications Unit <CRU@valleywater.org>
Subject: WaterFix

Dear Members of the Board:

I wish to express my opposition to the Santa Clara Valley Water District committing more money to the so-called Water Fix Delta Tunnels project. My objections are threefold:

1. Foremost is the environmental harm this project would cause to the Delta area

2. Locking us into a very undetermined, but probably huge, monetary commitment

3. Putting the water district in a position where it is paying but doesn't have any clout with the project due to the funding/voting structure

Please stay the course and vote "no" to the twin tunnels project.

Sincerely,

Freda Hofland, ratepayer

27070 Sherlock Rd.
Los Altos Hills, CA 94022
Melissa Stone

From: steve <steve_zientek@msn.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 09, 2018 8:07 AM
To: Board of Directors
Subject: The Tunnels

Dear Gary Kreman,

Disappointed to read in this morning’s paper that you were one of 4 Directors to support the diversion of yet more northern California water via new, expensive tunnels to southern California. You must have had your reasons; please share.

In the view of this voter and tax payer, the project is simply Jerry Brown’s swan song for Southern California.

Steve/Elizabeth Zientek
College Av
Los Gatos
Dear Board members

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo urging you a NO vote.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board’s prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school’s Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District’s board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen “Even if we leave it we’re still going to have to pay for it. And we’d have no control”

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision

How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plan upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan.

In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources.

<Your Name>
560 million at risk for a project that will never be built. How stupid can you be? Be aware your vote will be remembered. Charles Shoemaker

Sent from my iPad
I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo urging you a NO vote.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board’s prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school’s Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District’s board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen "Even if we leave it we’re still going to have to pay for it. And we’d have no control"

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision

How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plan upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan.

In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources.

******* VOTE NO!!!!
Dear Board members

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo and Sierra Club urging you a NO vote.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board’s prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school’s Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District’s board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen “Even if we leave it we’re still going to have to pay for it. And we’d have no control”

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision.

How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plan upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan.

In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources.
PLEASE TAKE THE TIME TO TRULY REVIEW THIS PLAN. OUR WATER RATES THRU SAN JOSE WATER ARE VERY VERY HIGH AND PROMISE ONLY TO GET HIGHER WITH THIS PLAN AND AS LONG AS SAN JOSE WATER COMPANY IS ALLOWED TO BE A MONOPOLY. CALIFORNIA HAS CONTINUALLY MISMANAGED FUNDS AND AS A RESULT PLACED OUR STATE AT THE TOP OF STATES IN DEBT. PLEASE DO NOT BURDEN THE TAXPAYERS MORE. PLEASE VOTE NO ON THIS ISSUE.

Nancy and David Lietzke
21847 Villa Oaks Lane
Saratoga, CA
Dear Board members

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo and Sierra Club urging you a NO vote.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board’s prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school’s Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District’s board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen “Even if we leave it we’re still going to have to pay for it. And we’d have no control”

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision. How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plan upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan.

In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources.

Best,
Asher Mathew
Dear Board members

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo and Sierra Club urging you a NO vote.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board’s prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school’s Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District’s board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen “Even if we leave it we’re still going to have to pay for it. And we’d have no control”

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision

How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plan upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan.

In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources.

Nitin Chandra
Cell # 408-472-4297
Dear Board members,

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo and Sierra Club urging you a NO vote.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board’s prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school’s Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District’s board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen "Even if we leave it we're still going to have to pay for it. And we'd have no control"

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision
How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plan upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan.

In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources.

Regards,

Lori Stafford
Saratoga, CA
Dear Board members

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo and Sierra Club urging you a NO vote.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board’s prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school’s Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District’s board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen "Even if we leave it we’re still going to have to pay for it. And we’d have no control”

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision

How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plan upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan.

In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources.

Suchitra Vaidya
From: jLL <lijanel@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, May 08, 2018 7:29 PM
To: Board of Directors; Clerk of the Board
Cc: JLL
Subject: CALIFORNIA WATER FIX: Please do NOT support

Dear Board members

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo and Sierra Club urging you a NO vote.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board's prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school's Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District's board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn't outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen "Even if we leave it we're still going to have to pay for it. And we'd have no control"

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn't listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision.

How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plan upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan.

In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources.

Jane & Chuang Li
Dear Board members

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo and Sierra Club urging you a NO vote.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board’s prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school’s Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District’s board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen "Even if we leave it we’re still going to have to pay for it. And we’d have no control”

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision

How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plan upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan.

In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources.

Sincerely,
Sylvia L. Tsang
From: Dan Rhoads <dr.hoadsg@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, May 08, 2018 4:44 PM
To: Board of Directors; Clerk of the Board
Subject: CALIFORNIA WATER FIX: Please do NOT support

Subject:
Dear Board members
We are with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo and Sierra Club urging you a NO vote.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board’s prior rejection of this project.

We support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school’s Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District’s board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

We agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

We are VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen “Even if we leave it we’re still going to have to pay for it. And we’d have no control”

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind?

We fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

Suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision. How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plan upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan.

In summary We suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources.

Daniel and Carolyn Rhoads

--

Dan,
Dr.HoadsGr@GMAIL.COM
Dear Board members

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo and Sierra Club urging you a NO vote.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board’s prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school’s Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District’s board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen “Even if we leave it we’re still going to have to pay for it. And we’d have no control”

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision

How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plan upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan.

In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources.

Sincerely,
Marianna and Wil Samson
homeowners in Saratoge, CA
Dear Board members

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo and Sierra Club urging you a NO vote.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board’s prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school’s Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District’s board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen “Even if we leave it we’re still going to have to pay for it. And we’d have no control”

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision. How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plan upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan.

In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources.

Best Regards,
Atul Bhandari
Dear Board members of the SCVWD:

I strongly urge you to OPPOSE the Delta Tunnels. Not only will it severely impact (decrease) water quality in the Sacramento Delta and the Bay, but it does not solve the water problems of either Northern or Southern California. I strongly urge you to spend the money to address local water availability and quality issues, including ground water use and recharge, that will directly impact water users in Santa Clara County.

Further, the risk of cost overruns threatens our property tax here in Santa Clara county, as we are on the hook for any cost overruns. It is significant that the Metropolitan Water District (LA County) has upped it’s participation - it wants more of our precious Northern California water and is willing to pay - as it has in the past - to sop up every drop from anywhere in the State, rather than impose restrictions on use and promote conservation. In the last drought, we saw lawns being watered in S. California when ours turned brown because they had water rights to Delta water.

Sincerely,

Glenn Fisher
3854 Corina Way
Palo Alto CA 94303
Santa Clara County
Dear Board members,

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo and Sierra Club urging you a NO vote.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board’s prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school’s Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District’s board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen "Even if we leave it we're still going to have to pay for it. And we'd have no control".

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision. How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plan upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan.

In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might oversell ratepayers and District staff resources.

Nahid & Dennis King
I see that you voted to approve. I strongly object and will register my opinion at the ballot box. This is a bad decision.

John Tobias

On May 8, 2018, at 8:37 AM, Board of Directors <board@valleywater.org> wrote:

Thank you for contacting the Board of Directors of the Santa Clara Valley Water District!

Please be assured that any and all emails addressed to the Board are distributed promptly. If your email necessitates a response, the Board will make every effort to do so within 14 calendar days. The Board appreciates hearing from their constituents, and thanks you for your time.

Sincerely,

Board of Directors
Santa Clara Valley Water District
Hello Water District,
I am vehemently against raising water rates to build tunnels in the delta.

No on raising rates, you are killing fish in the delta by taking even more water out.

Let LA get their own water supply.

NO ON TUNNELS
Thank you

Shelly Froehlich
Dear Board members,

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo and Sierra Club urging you a NO vote.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board’s prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school’s Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District’s board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen “Even if we leave it we’re still going to have to pay for it. And we’d have no control”

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision
How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plan upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan.

In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources.

Rajan Mehra
Saratoga, CA
Dear Board members

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo and Sierra Club urging you a NO vote.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board’s prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school’s Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District’s board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen “Even if we leave it we’re still going to have to pay for it. And we’d have no control”

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision

How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plan upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan.

In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources.

Thanks & Regards,
Inderjit.
Dear Board members

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo urging you a NO vote.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board’s prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school’s Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District’s board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen "Even if we leave it we’re still going to have to pay for it. And we’d have no control”

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision
How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plan upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan.

In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources.

Many Thanks,
Patricia Juarez
San Jose CA 95126
Dear Board members,

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo and Sierra Club urging you a NO vote.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board’s prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school’s Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District’s board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen "Even if we leave it we’re still going to have to pay for it. And we’d have no control"

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision. How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plan upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan.

In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources.

David Young  
Sonoko Sakakibara  
Saratoga residents
Dear Board members,

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo and Sierra Club urging a NO vote.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board’s prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school’s Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District’s board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen “Even if we leave it we’re still going to have to pay for it. And we’d have no control”

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision. How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plan upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan.

In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources.

Sincerely,
Virginia Spicer
Please do not vote for the Twin Tunnels project. It is environmentally unsound, politically sketchy, and probably going to cost much more than projected. The plans are sketchy at best. It appears that Northern California will have a minority vote on the project, giving more power to Southern California. You were correct in not passing this previously; please consider all of the negative ramifications of a positive vote and VOTE NO.

Thank you,

Stella Hearn
650 Fairmede Ave.
Palo Alto, CA 94306
From: JT Li <JT.Li@synopsys.com>
Sent: Tuesday, May 08, 2018 2:04 PM
To: Board of Directors; Clerk of the Board
Subject: CALIFORNIA WATER FIX: Please do NOT support

Dear Board members

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo and Sierra Club urging you a NO vote.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board’s prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school’s Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District’s board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen "Even if we leave it we’re still going to have to pay for it. And we’d have no control”

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision
How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plan upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan.

In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources.

Jeong-Tyng Li
650-584-4861
886-3-623-0736
jt.li@synopsys.com
Dear Board members

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo and Sierra Club urging you a NO vote.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board’s prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school’s Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District’s board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen "Even if we leave it we’re still going to have to pay for it. And we'd have no control"

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision.

How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plan upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan.

In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources.

Rudy & Ping Juang
Dear Board members

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo and Sierra Club urging you a NO vote on joining the Water Fix project.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month (current prediction, may be more). I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, Water Fix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board’s prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school’s Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District’s board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen "Even if we leave it we’re still going to have to pay for it. And we’d have no control"

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision

How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plan upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan.

In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources.

Finally, if in spite of the above, you feel that the District must participate, then the board should alter the agreement to assure that the District’s financial obligations are capped at no more than $650 million. Further, these obligations should be less than the $650 million if the District leaves the plan
early. That is, the funds expended as of the district's departure are the only funds owed with NO financial obligation for funds expended after the district departs the project.

Myron Cagan
Saratoga, CA
I am with Sierra Club and Congresswoman Anna Eshoo urging you a NO vote. As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board’s prior rejection of this project. I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school’s Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District’s board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns. I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them. I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen "Even if we leave it we’re still going to have to pay for it. And we’d have no control" Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind? I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides. I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plan upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan. In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources.

Sincerely,
Joy Tani
Saratoga resident
The Delta Tunnels will take water from the Sacramento River, depriving the San Francisco Bay Delta of needed freshwater flows, harming water quality in the Delta and the Bay.

The project will cost at least $17 billion dollars, and independent estimates run as high as $64 billion, but even the Water District Board admits that it will not increase local water supply.

I am writing to urge you to NOT commit local taxpayer dollars to this misguided project. That money should instead be use for local projects, providing local jobs, developing local sustainable water supplies.

If this project goes through it will harm San Francisco Bay and Sacramento Delta, local water independence and conservation, and local jobs.

Thank you for your attention.

Patty Linder
839 Bend Avenue
San Jose CA  95136-1804
Dear Board members

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo and Sierra Club urging you a NO vote.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board’s prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school’s Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District’s board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen “Even if we leave it we’re still going to have to pay for it. And we’d have no control”

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision.
How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plan upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan.

In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources.

Thanks
Ramya
Dear Board members

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo and Sierra Club urging you a NO vote.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board’s prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school’s Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District’s board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen "Even if we leave it we’re still going to have to pay for it. And we’d have no control"

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision

How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plan upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan.

In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources.

Adam
Subject: CALIFORNIA WATER FIX: Please do NOT support

Dear Board members

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo and Sierra Club urging you a NO vote.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board’s prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school’s Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District’s board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen "Even if we leave it we’re still going to have to pay for it. And we’d have no control"

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision. How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plan upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan.

In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources.

Warren Shimada
Dear Board members

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo and Sierra Club urging you a NO vote.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board’s prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school’s Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District’s board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen "Even if we leave it we’re still going to have to pay for it. And we’d have no control”

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision
How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plan upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan.

In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources.

Thanks,
Deepti Mangal
(Saratoga resident frustrated with water company rate hikes)
Dear Board members

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo urging you a NO vote.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board’s prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school’s Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District’s board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmental groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen "Even if we leave it we’re still going to have to pay for it. And we’d have no control”

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision

How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plan upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan.

In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources.

Thanks and regards,
Amarnath Kolla
Please see message on WaterFix to board.

-----Original Message-----
From: Leslie Foster [mailto:leslie.foster@sjsu.edu]
Sent: Tuesday, May 8, 2018 7:36 AM
To: Communications Unit <CRU@valleywater.org>
Cc: Leslie Foster <leslie.foster@sjsu.edu>
Subject: Vote no on twin tunnels

I am a San Jose resident. I ask you to vote no on the twin towers water project.

If you vote yes on the project, at the next election opportunity I will vote against Barbara Keegan, Gary Keenan, Tony Estremera, and Nai Hsueh.

I will also ask that friends and family vote against these water board members and I will campaign against these water board members.

Leslie Foster
3351 Nestor Dr.
San Jose, CA, 95118
Dear Board members

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo urging you a NO vote.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board’s prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school’s Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District’s board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen "Even if we leave it we’re still going to have to pay for it. And we’d have no control"

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision
How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plan upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan.

In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources.

Vivek Rao
Melissa Stone

From: Celia Fabos-Becker <celia.lfsbecker@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, May 08, 2018 12:36 PM
To: Board of Directors
Subject: Today’s vote: Do NOT vote to join that latest rape of Northern California waterways and foul up the delta any more than it is. You will have NO Say but be part of a unproductive mess.

Mrs. Cecilia L. Fabos-Becker
32738 Rocky Water Lane
San Jose, CA 95148
Tel./fax: 408-223-6102
Email: celia.lfsbecker@gmail.com

8 May, 2018

Dear Board of Directors;

You have an important vote today. The board was wise to postpone it for a few days to allow you all to really think this over. You should NOT vote to join this pipeline project which does not add to the fresh water availability for southern California, as the more water it sucks up, especially in drought years, the more likely it is to be brackish and it will allow a greater inflow of water from the bay and ocean making the entire delta region more saline. How great would that be for the agriculture in the delta and adjacent areas? It is not a solution that increases fresh water. It is a vain hope that still relies on enough rain enough months to keep enough fresh water in the Delta for that huge irresponsible, wasteful area down south to suck it dry and leave nothing for anyone else—another Owens Valley. The South needs to have all its agriculture be drip irrigated, recycle and clean all its water, including from the oil industry’s usage and for the huge coastal cities, needs close-by desalination plants of brackish and saline water, and shorter east west pipelines to carry excess from the cities recycling processes and desalination eastward to agriculture instead of preying on the north.

You will have NO say in this project. Your pathetic $650 million is not even one-tenth of the amount that the Southern California district is pledging (assuming it can even deliver on its own pledge), and is not the extra 30% the project needs—as it is, before the inevitable unanticipated problems, legal bills from lawsuits—and repayments of any damaged parties, like the rice growers in the north when the Delta becomes saline, and cost overruns.

Think about it this way: how much say does any small shareholder with less than a 6% share have in any company, influence with its board, etc.? Do you really think you’re measly few percent donation will be treated with any more respect than tiny shareholders at companies?

Next: you have already promised a rebuild of the Anderson Dam. You’ve been promising that for more than a DECADE. You have a decent potential with a new, enlarged Pacheco Dam for water storage. There’s an easy way around the threatened lawsuit there: make the Native Americans prove they are (a) Native Americans (DNA testing), (b) that their direct ancestors actually had a sacred space, e.g. temple, even a few deliberately moved and placed stones, or a burial ground, etc., there. Otherwise, if all they did was live there and grind acorns, and it is nothing more than an old village site, the way thousands have existed for tens of thousands of years in every nation of men and been built over as nothing that great. You need to challenge these groups on the reality of their being definable Native Americans and a solid definition of sacred besides “it was once our land”—especially since almost NO Native Americans in North America ever believed they ever OWNED the land. You should be suing the state to get your water recycling in use throughout the county and getting the cities to put grates on all the storm drains to keep large pieces of trash, etc. out of the drains and make it easier to reclaim waste water, especially during the rainy season and, once cleaned, put it back into the various water storage systems. If you don’t have the money to rebuild Anderson Dam, enlarge Pacheco and get the recycling system in full use, then you don’t have the money to contribute to the tunnels project that will do nothing but harm and which NO credible candidate for governor supports (one of the few bits of wisdom they all seem to be demonstrating). Get real here and quit deluding yourselves! This is a project that will only do harm to this entire area, if it ever gets built (not likely—and then you tie up the
money for nothing and probably have to sue to reclaim it) and you will have as much say about it, as a less than 5% shareholder in any company.

Cecilia Fabos-Becker

Virus-free. www.avg.com
Dear Board members

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo and Sierra Club urging you a NO vote.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board's prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school's Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District's board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn't outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen "Even if we leave it we're still going to have to pay for it. And we'd have no control!"

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn't listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision.

How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plan upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan.

In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might over commit ratepayers and District staff resources.

Robert Goedjen
Dear Board Members,

I am with Anna Eshoo, the Sierra Club, and voices of fiscal responsibility urging you to vote NO on this project.

As a customer of San Jose Water I already pay water rates at least several hundred percent in excess of rates of neighboring communities like Sunnyvale. My bill for a single family home in Sunnyvale was routinely less than $30 per month, now I pay more than that with San Jose Water JUST FOR THE METER!

A $10.26 per month increase is unacceptable, full stop. That is the price only assuming we don't have cost overruns on this project. Can you really accept responsibility for burdening water customers with these excessive additional costs for essential services?

Don't write a blank check against our future. Don't approve this plan without significant legal clarification and caps on our participation. Don't increase our water rates!

Thank you,
David
Dear Board members

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo and Sierra Club urging you a NO vote.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board’s prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school’s Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District’s board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen "Even if we leave it we’re still going to have to pay for it. And we’d have no control”

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plan upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan.

In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources.

Meir Levi
Saratoga CA
Dear Board members

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo and Sierra Club urging you a NO vote.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board’s prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school’s Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District’s board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen “Even if we leave it we’re still going to have to pay for it. And we’d have no control”

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision.

How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plan upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan.

In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources.

Regards
Varun
Dear Board members;

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo and Sierra Club urging you a NO vote.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board’s prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school’s Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District’s board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen "Even if we leave it we’re still going to have to pay for it. And we’d have no control"

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision. How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plan upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan.

In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources.

Best regards,

Gregory Green
President | COAST RESIDENTIAL FUNDING, INC.
Managing Broker | CRF PROPERTIES
Dear Board members

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo and Sierra Club urging you a NO vote.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board’s prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school’s Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District’s board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen “Even if we leave it we’re still going to have to pay for it. And we’d have no control”

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision. How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plan upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan.

In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources.

Sathiyan Kuty
650-520-3282

Sathiyan (Seth) Kuty
From: Allen Hulme <allen.hulme@32shine.com>
Sent: Tuesday, May 08, 2018 11:33 AM
To: Board of Directors; Clerk of the Board
Subject: California Water Fix: PLEASE DO NOT SUPPORT!!

Dear Board members

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo and Sierra Club urging you a NO vote.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board’s prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school’s Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District’s board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen “Even if we leave it we’re still going to have to pay for it. And we’d have no control”

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision.

How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plan upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan.

In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources.

Allen Hulme
Saratoga Resident
Dear Board members

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo and Sierra Club urging you a NO vote.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board’s prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school’s Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District’s board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blanket check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen "Even if we leave it we’re still going to have to pay for it. And we’d have no control”

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision
How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plan upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan.

In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources.

Thank you.

Anand J
Melissa Stone

From: David Carkeek <dcarkeek@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, May 08, 2018 11:30 AM
To: Board of Directors
Subject: CALIFORNIA WATER FIX: Please do NOT support

Dear Board members

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo and Sierra Club urging you to vote NO on the California Water Fix project.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board’s prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school’s Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District’s board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially being vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab. They oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen, "Even if we leave it we’re still going to have to pay for it. And we’d have no control."

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents show that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project.

How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plan upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan?

In summary, I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources.

Best regards,
David Carkeek
Saratoga, CA
Dear Board members

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo urging you a NO vote.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board’s prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school’s Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District’s board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen "Even if we leave it we're still going to have to pay for it. And we'd have no control"

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn't listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision

How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plant upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan.

In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources.

Kiran
Dear Board members

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo urging you a NO vote.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board’s prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school’s Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District’s board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen “Even if we leave it we’re still going to have to pay for it. And we’d have no control”

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision

How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plan upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan.

In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources.

Dongmei Tang
Dear Board members

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo and Sierra Club urging you a NO vote.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board’s prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school’s Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District’s board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen "Even if we leave it we’re still going to have to pay for it. And we’d have no control”

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision

How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plan upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan.

In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources.

Shankari
Dear Board members

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo urging you a NO vote.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board’s prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school’s Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District’s board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen "Even if we leave it we’re still going to have to pay for it. And we’d have no control"

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision

How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plan upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan.

In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources.

Lufan Chen
Dear Board members,

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo and Sierra Club urging you a NO vote.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board’s prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school’s Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District’s board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen “Even if we leave it we’re still going to have to pay for it. And we’d have no control”

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision. How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plan upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan.

In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources.

Regards, Rahul
Dear Board members

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo and Sierra Club urging you a NO vote.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board’s prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school’s Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District’s board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen "Even if we leave it we’re still going to have to pay for it. And we’d have no control"

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision
How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plan upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan.

In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources.

<Your Name>

Suzanne Zazzi
From: Suzanne Zazzi <szazzi5@comcast.net>
Sent: Tuesday, May 08, 2018 11:15 AM
To: Board of Directors; Clerk of the Board
Subject: Subject: CALIFORNIA WATER FIX: Please do NOT support
Dear Board members,

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo urging you a NO vote.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board’s prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school’s Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District’s board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen "Even if we leave it we're still going to have to pay for it. And we'd have no control"

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision

How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plan upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan.

In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources.

Emma Bolich
Dear Board members

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo and Sierra Club urging you a NO vote.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board’s prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school’s Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District’s board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen "Even if we leave it we’re still going to have to pay for it. And we’d have no control”

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision
How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plan upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan.

In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources.
Paul Bonaso
Sent from my iPhone
Dear Board members

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo urging you to vote NO on Waterfix.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Congresswoman Eshoo, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board’s prior rejection of this project.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen "Even if we leave it we're still going to have to pay for it. And we'd have no control"

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision.

How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plan upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan.

In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources.

I would rather see SCVWD look at purchasing SJWC instead of spending money on tunnel. There is not enough information for a yes vote and Southern California should be paying substantially more.

Sincerely,

Michael Blomquist
408-399-0590
Dear Board members

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo and Sierra Club urging you a NO vote.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board’s prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school’s Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District’s board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen "Even if we leave it we’re still going to have to pay for it. And we’d have no control"

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plan upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan.

In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources.

Regards,
Anitha
Melissa Stone

From: Ted Bancroft <ted_bancroft@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, May 08, 2018 10:46 AM
To: Board of Directors; Clerk of the Board
Subject: CALIFORNIA WATER FIX: Pleas do NOT Support

Dear Board members

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo urging you a NO vote.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board’s prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school’s Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District’s board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen "Even if we leave it we’re still going to have to pay for it. And we’d have no control”

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision

How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plan upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan.

In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources.

Sincerely yours,

Edward S. Bancroft
17288 Eaton Lane
Monte Sereno, CA 95030
Do not approve the currently pending rate increase. It is unjust and abusive to the citizens who demand responsible management of essential services.
Ronald Schoengold
Saratoga CA

Get Outlook for Android
Dear Board members

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo and Sierra Club urging you a NO vote.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up anymore. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board’s prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school’s Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District’s board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that has called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen "Even if we leave it we're still going to have to pay for it. And we'd have no control"

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision

How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plant upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan.

In summary, I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed, and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources.

Jagruti Bhikha
Dear Board members

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo and Sierra Club urging you a NO vote.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board’s prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school’s Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District’s board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen "Even if we leave it we’re still going to have to pay for it. And we’d have no control"

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision

How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plan upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan.

In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might over commit ratepayers and District staff resources.

Vijay Israni, Nisha Israni, Divya Israni, Richa Israni
Saratoga Residents
Melissa Stone

From: Sachin Walia <leowalia@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, May 08, 2018 10:37 AM
To: Board of Directors; Clerk of the Board
Subject: CALIFORNIA WATER FIX: Please do NOT support

Dear Board members

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo and Sierra Club urging you a NO vote.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board's prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school's Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District's board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn't outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen "Even if we leave it we’re still going to have to pay for it. And we’d have no control"

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision

How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plan upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan.

In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources.

Thanks,
Sachin Walia
Dear Board members

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo and Sierra Club urging you a NO vote.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board’s prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school’s Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District’s board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen "Even if we leave it we're still going to have to pay for it. And we'd have no control"

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision. How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plan upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan.

In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources.

CHARU ROY
Dear Board members

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo and Sierra Club urging you a NO vote.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board’s prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school’s Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District’s board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen "Even if we leave it we’re still going to have to pay for it. And we’d have no control"

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision. How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plan upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan.

In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources.

Sarah Lee, MD
Maternal-Fetal Medicine, Obstetric Medical Group
Medical Director Women’s Services, Good Samaritan Hospital - San Jose
Dear Board members

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo urging you a NO vote.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board’s prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school’s Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District’s board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen "Even if we leave it we’re still going to have to pay for it. And we’d have no control”

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision

How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plan upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan.

In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources.

Jim and Melissa Shank
4038 Jarvis Ave
San Jose, CA 95118
I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo urging you a NO vote.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board’s prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school’s Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District’s board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen "Even if we leave it we’re still going to have to pay for it. And we’d have no control"

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision. How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plan upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan.

In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources.

The rates I currently pay to San Jose Water Company are already astronomical with their yearly rate increase requests to the PUC on superficial and phantom cost excuses for infrastructure improvement, conservation efforts and rates charged to them by Santa Clara Valley Water Board. This delta channel boondoggle will add to our rate woes that we ultimately pay as water consumers! Help.
Melissa Stone

From: Kim Hutsepiller <khutsepiller1@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, May 08, 2018 10:27 AM
To: Board of Directors; Clerk of the Board
Subject: CALIFORNIA WATER FIX: Please do NOT support

Dear Board members,

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo and Sierra Club urging you a NO vote.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board’s prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school’s Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District’s board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen “Even if we leave it we’re still going to have to pay for it. And we’d have no control”

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision.

How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plan upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan.

In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources.

Sincerely,

M.Kim Hutsepiller
Resident of San Jose, 50 years
From: Madhulima Pandey <mpandey@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, May 08, 2018 10:25 AM
To: Board of Directors; Clerk of the Board
Subject: CALIFORNIA WATER FIX: Please do NOT support

Dear Board members

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo and Sierra Club urging you a NO vote.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board’s prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school's Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District’s board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen “Even if we leave it we’re still going to have to pay for it. And we’d have no control”

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision. How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plan upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan.

In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources.

Madhulima Pandey
Saratoga, CA Resident
Dear Board members

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo and Sierra Club urging you a NO vote.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board’s prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school’s Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District’s board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen “Even if we leave it we’re still going to have to pay for it. And we’d have no control”

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision
How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plan upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan.

In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might over-commit ratepayers and District staff resources.

Maggie
Dear Board members

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo and Sierra Club urging you a NO vote.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board’s prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school’s Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District’s board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am very concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen “Even if we leave it we’re still going to have to pay for it. And we’d have no control”

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision.

How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plant upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan.

In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources.

Thank you,

Jamie Abhari
Dear Board members

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo and Sierra Club urging you a NO vote.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board’s prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school's Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District’s board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen "Even if we leave it we’re still going to have to pay for it. And we’d have no control”

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plant upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan.

In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources.

Jin K Kim, Ihn Hee Kim
21194 Bank Mill Rd.
Saratoga, CA 95070
Dear Board members

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo and Sierra Club urging you a NO vote.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board’s prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school’s Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District’s board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen “Even if we leave it we’re still going to have to pay for it. And we’d have no control”

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plan upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan.

In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources.

Sanmeet Dhillon
Board Members and other concerned parties:

I agree with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo and urge you to vote NO to San Jose Water Company (SJWC) rate hikes..

According to Congresswoman Eshoo, our rates will go up by $10.26/month if you vote to approve rate increases. I do not want my water rates to further increase. I am tired of SJWC’s price gouging. I further agree with Congresswoman Eshoo that WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified this Board’s prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school’s Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District’s board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen stated, "Even if we leave it, we’re still going to have to pay for it. And we’d have no control."

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, stated that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Where is the transparency?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a several upsides, but large downsides, as well.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision. How are Santa Clara Valley Water District and the people of Santa Clara County going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plan upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan.

In summary, please consider doing the following: (1) analyze alternative levels of participation; and (2) consider the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources.

Best regards,

Michael L. Rossi
19255 Bountiful Acres Way
Dear Board members

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo urging you a NO vote.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board’s prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school’s Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District’s board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen “Even if we leave it we’re still going to have to pay for it. And we’d have no control”

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision

How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plan upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan.

In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources.

<Your Name>
Dear Board members

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo and Sierra Club urging you a NO vote.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board's prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school's Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District's board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn't outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen "Even if we leave it we're still going to have to pay for it. And we'd have no control"

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn't listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision.

How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plant upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan.

In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources.

Regards,
Sam Hou
Saratoga resident

415.828.6381 (cell)
Melissa Stone

From: Suresh Balasubramanian <heysb@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, May 08, 2018 10:16 AM
To: Board of Directors; Clerk of the Board
Subject: CALIFORNIA WATER FIX: Please do NOT support

Dear Board members

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo and Sierra Club urging you a NO vote.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board’s prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school’s Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District’s board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen "Even if we leave it we’re still going to have to pay for it. And we’d have no control"

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision

How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plan upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan.

In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources.

Suresh and Vandana Balasubramanian

+-+
Dear Board members

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo and Sierra Club urging you a NO vote.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board’s prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school’s Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District’s board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen "Even if we leave it we’re still going to have to pay for it. And we’d have no control"

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision. How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plan upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan.

In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources.

Thank you
Pravin Madhani
Saratoga, CA
From: Marc Cooper <malacoop@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, May 08, 2018 10:15 AM
To: Board of Directors; Clerk of the Board
Subject: PLEASE VOTE NO: Valley Water Fix

Dear Board members,

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo and Sierra Club urging you a NO vote.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board’s prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school’s Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District’s board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen “Even if we leave it we’re still going to have to pay for it. And we’d have no control”

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision.

How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plant upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan?

In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources.

Respectfully,

Marc Cooper
Saratoga, CA
Dear Board members

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo and Sierra Club urging you a NO vote.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board’s prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school’s Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District’s board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen “Even if we leave it we’re still going to have to pay for it. And we’d have no control”

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision. How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plan upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan.

In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources.

Naren Agrawal
19200 Portos Drive
Saratoga, CA 95070

*********************************************************************************************

Dr. Naren Agrawal
Benjamin and Mae Swig Professor
Department of Operations Management & Information Systems
Leavey School of Business
Santa Clara University
Santa Clara, CA 95053

Tel: (408) 554 4165
email: naren.agrawal@gmail.com

Link to my book Retail Supply Chain Management
Link to our MS-SCMA Program
*********************************************************************************************
Dear Board members

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo and Sierra Club urging you a NO vote.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board’s prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school’s Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District’s board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen "Even if we leave it we’re still going to have to pay for it. And we'd have no control"

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision.

How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plan upgrade, dam repair and the water system master plan.

In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources.

Cecilia C.
From: Barbara DeZur <barbara.dezur@att.net>
Sent: Tuesday, May 08, 2018 10:04 AM
To: Board of Directors; Clerk of the Board
Subject: CALIFORNIA WATER FIX: Please do NOT support

Dear Board members:

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo and Sierra Club urging you cast a NO vote.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board's prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school's Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District's board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn't outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen "Even if we leave it we're still going to have to pay for it. And we'd have no control"

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn't listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision
How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plan upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan.

In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources.

Sincerely,
Barbara DeZur
Saratoga, CA
Dear Board members

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo urging you a NO vote.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board’s prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school's Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District’s board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen "Even if we leave it we’re still going to have to pay for it. And we’d have no control”

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision. How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plan upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan.

In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources.
Dear Board members:

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo and Sierra Club urging you a NO vote.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board’s prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school’s Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District’s board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen "Even if we leave it we’re still going to have to pay for it. And we’d have no control"

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision
How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plan upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan.

In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources.

Thank you.

Vipin Jain
20755 Seaton Ave
Saratoga, CA 95070
Board members

I agree with Anna Eshoo. Vote NO on the fix, for SO many reasons.

Mike Lanahan
Dear Board members

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo urging you a NO vote.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board’s prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school’s Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District’s board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen “Even if we leave it we’re still going to have to pay for it. And we’d have no control”

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision

How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plan upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan.

In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources.

Thanks,
Praveen Gonugunta
Address: 764 Harriet Ave, Campbell, CA 95008
Phone : 425-829-8648
Email: praveen@gonugunta.com
Dear Board members,

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo and Sierra Club urging you to vote NO.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board’s prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school’s Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District’s board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen "Even if we leave it we’re still going to have to pay for it. And we’d have no control"

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision

How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plan upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan.

In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources.

Herb Klaas
Dear Board members

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo and Sierra Club urging you a NO vote.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board’s prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school’s Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District’s board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen "Even if we leave it we’re still going to have to pay for it. And we’d have no control"

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision
How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plan upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan.

In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources.

Regards,

Partha Srinivasan
Dear Board members

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo and Sierra Club urging you a NO vote.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board’s prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school’s Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District’s board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen "Even if we leave it we’re still going to have to pay for it. And we’d have no control"

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plant upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan.

In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources.

Putappaiah Muni
408-981-2915
Dear Board members

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo and Sierra Club urging you a NO vote.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board's prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school's Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District's board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen "Even if we leave it we’re still going to have to pay for it. And we’d have no control"

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision.

How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plan upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan.

In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources.

Lei Huang
Dear Board members

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo urging you a NO vote.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board’s prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school’s Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District’s board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen “Even if we leave it we’re still going to have to pay for it. And we’d have no control”

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision. How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plan upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan.

In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources.

Vikram Modak
Saratoga, CA
Dear Board members

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo and The Sierra Club urging you a NO vote.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. Our rates are the smog the highest in the nation while neighboring water districts have lower rates. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water and this Board should not be party to it. As per Congresswoman Eshoo, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board’s prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school’s Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District’s board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen "Even if we leave it we’re still going to have to pay for it. And we’d have no control"

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision

How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plan upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan.

In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources.

Uday Nagendran
Melissa Stone

From: Bill Wang <y2wang@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, May 08, 2018 9:52 AM
To: Board of Directors; Clerk of the Board
Subject: CALIFORNIA WATER FIX: Please do NOT support

Dear Board members

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo and Sierra Club urging you a NO vote.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board’s prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school’s Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District’s board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen “Even if we leave it we’re still going to have to pay for it. And we’d have no control”

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision
How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plant upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan.

In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources.

Sincerely,

Bill Wang
Dear Board members

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo urging you a NO vote.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board’s prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school’s Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District’s board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen "Even if we leave it we’re still going to have to pay for it. And we’d have no control”

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plan upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan.

In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources.

Ramesh Sivakolundu
13542 Myren Dr
Saratoga, CA 95070
Dear Board members

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo and Sierra Club urging you a NO vote.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board’s prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school’s Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District’s board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen “Even if we leave it we’re still going to have to pay for it. And we’d have no control”

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision

How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plan upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan.

In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources.

Lakshmi Vanitha
Dear Board members

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo and Sierra Club urging you a NO vote.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board’s prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school’s Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District’s board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen "Even if we leave it we’re still going to have to pay for it. And we’d have no control"

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision

How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plan upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan.

In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources.

Michael Story
Los Gatos, Ca
Subject: CALIFORNIA WATER FIX: Please do NOT support

Dear Board members

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo urging you a NO vote.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board's prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school's Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District's board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn't outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen "Even if we leave it we're still going to have to pay for it. And we'd have no control"

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn't listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision. How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plan upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan.

In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources.

Martin Harding
Melissa Stone

From: John McDonald <jmcdo99@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, May 08, 2018 9:49 AM
To: Board of Directors; Clerk of the Board
Subject: CALIFORNIA WATER FIX: Please do NOT support

Dear Board Members

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo and Sierra Club urging you a NO vote.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board’s prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school’s Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District’s board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen "Even if we leave it we’re still going to have to pay for it. And we’d have no control”

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision. How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plan upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan.

In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources.

John L. McDonald
1072 Ridgeley Drive
Campbell, CA 94008
Dear Board members

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo and Sierra Club urging you a NO vote.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board’s prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school’s Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District’s board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen “Even if we leave it we’re still going to have to pay for it. And we’d have no control.”

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision

How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plan upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan.

In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources.

Regards,

Anil Saboo

Sent from my iPad
Dear Board members,

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo and Sierra Club urging you a NO vote.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board’s prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school’s Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District’s board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen "Even if we leave it we’re still going to have to pay for it. And we’d have no control”

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision. How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plan upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan.

In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources.

BV Jagadeesh

Regards,
/Jagadeesh
www.KAAJventures.com
"Entrepreneur’s Trusted Partner"
Dear Board Members,

You are causing quite a stir with me and my neighbors.

High water bills, whether we use water or not, and unprecedented increases lampoon your credibility as public servants. They give rise to suspicion of corruption. There is even talk of some sort of revolt to seize or replace your organization.

This is no time for you to vote to increase rates yet again. If history is a guide, we will receive yet another glossy brochure about the great job you are doing.

How about a plain, low budget letter that details your efforts to improve efficiency and reduce costs? If the facts so dictate, you may explain thoroughly why such efforts have failed and must fail in the future.

Sincerely,
Joseph E. Doll
19145 Brookview Dr., Saratoga

---

Dear neighbors,

Please send an email to our water agency board members as they make a decision today that will **likely increase our water rates and more**

You can read SJ Mercury News coverage of this topic [here](#)

Email: Board@valleywater.org,
clerkoftheboard@valleywater.org,
Subject: CALIFORNIA WATER FIX: Please do NOT support

Dear Board members

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo and Sierra Club urging you a NO vote.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board’s prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school’s Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the
Subject: CALIFORNIA WATER FIX: Please do NOT support

Dear Board members,

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo and Sierra Club urging you a NO vote.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board’s prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school’s Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District’s board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blanket check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen "Even if we leave it we’re still going to have to pay for it. And we’d have no control”

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision. How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plan upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan.

In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources.

--

Lori Ellingboe
Saratoga Resident
Dear Board Members

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo and Sierra Club urging you a NO vote.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board’s prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school’s Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District’s board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen “Even if we leave it we’re still going to have to pay for it. And we’d have no control”

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision. How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plan upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan.

In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources.

Robert L. LoPresto
14659 Fieldstone Drive
Saratoga, CA 95008
Dear Board members,

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo urging you to vote NO on the current WaterFix plan.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board's prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school's Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District's board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn't outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab, and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen "Even if we leave it we're still going to have to pay for it. And we'd have no control"

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn't listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision.

How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plant upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan?

In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources.

Sincerely,
Bill Bradley
San Jose, CA 95129
Dear Board members

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo and Sierra Club urging you a NO vote.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board’s prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school’s Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District’s board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen “Even if we leave it we’re still going to have to pay for it. And we’d have no control”

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision

How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plan upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan.

In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources.

Richard Thompson
Saratoga, CA
Melissa Stone

From: Rick Waits <rwaits1@icloud.com>
Sent: Tuesday, May 08, 2018 9:43 AM
To: Board of Directors, Clerk of the Board
Subject: CALIFORNIA WATER FIX: Please do NOT support

Dear Board members

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo urging you a NO vote.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board’s prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school’s Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District’s board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen "Even if we leave it we’re still going to have to pay for it. And we’d have no control”

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision

How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plant upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan.

In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources.

Regards,
Richard Waits
Dear members of the Board,

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo and Sierra Club urging you to vote NO!

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board’s prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school’s Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District’s board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen "Even if we leave it we’re still going to have to pay for it. And we’d have no control”

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision
How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plan upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan.

In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources.

Sincerely,
Lee See Loh
Saratoga, CA
Dear Board members

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo and Sierra Club urging you a NO vote on California Water Fix. I do not want my water rates to go up any more.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board’s prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school’s Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District’s board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen "Even if we leave it we’re still going to have to pay for it. And we’d have no control"

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision.

How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plan upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan.

In summary I suggest that you consider the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources.

I do not want to participate in this vague, expensive plan. I vote for NO more rate increases.

Lydia Franzese
Santa Clara County Voter

Sent from Lyd's iPhone
Dear Board members

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo urging you a NO vote.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. My most recent water bill is $70.19 for 2 CCF, that's for $8.87 for actual water usage and $61.32 for their service charge and a whole litany of other charges. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board’s prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school's Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District's board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen "Even if we leave it we’re still going to have to pay for it. And we’d have no control”

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision
How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plant upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan.

In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources.

Please stop this blatant price gouging and poorly thought out plan. Thank you for your consideration.

Kathy DePippo
Dear Board members,

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo urging you a NO vote. As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board’s prior rejection of this project. I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school’s Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District’s board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns. I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them. I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen "Even if we leave it we’re still going to have to pay for it. And we’d have no control" Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind? I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides. I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision. How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plan upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan. In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might over-commit ratepayers and District staff resources.

Respectfully,

Sanjay Agrawal
From: Adele Salle <absalle@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, May 08, 2018 9:39 AM
To: Board of Directors; Clerk of the Board
Subject: CALIFORNIA WATER FIX: Please do NOT support

Dear Board members

I am urging you a NO vote.

As per Anna Eshoo, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board’s prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school’s Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District’s board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen "Even if we leave it we’re still going to have to pay for it. And we’d have no control"

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision
How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plan upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan.

In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources.

Adele Salle
Dear Board members

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo and Sierra Club urging you a NO vote.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board’s prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school’s Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District’s board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen "Even if we leave it we’re still going to have to pay for it. And we’d have no control”

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision

How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plan upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan.

In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources.

Regards
Dhawal Tyagi
Saratoga, CA
Dear Board members,

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo urging you a NO vote.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more! I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board’s prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school’s Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District’s board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen "Even if we leave it we’re still going to have to pay for it. And we’d have no control"

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision. How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plan upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan?

In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit rate-payers and District staff resources.

Kia Baratzadeh
Dear Board members

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo and Sierra Club urging you a NO vote.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board’s prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school’s Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District’s board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen “Even if we leave it we’re still going to have to pay for it. And we’d have no control”

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision. How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plan upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan.

In summary I suggest that you consider the following:
1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and
2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources.

Regards
Jagane and Shankari Sundar
15070 Sperry Lane
Saratoga, CA 95070
Phone: 408-255-8924
Dear Board members

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo and Sierra Club urging you a NO vote.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board’s prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school’s Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District’s board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen "Even if we leave it we’re still going to have to pay for it. And we’d have no control"

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision

How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plan upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan.

In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources.

Sincerely,

David & Wendy Liu
From: Satya Simha <satya_simha@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, May 08, 2018 9:34 AM
To: Board of Directors: Clerk of the Board
Cc: rishi@rishikumar.com
Subject: CALIFORNIA WATER FIX: Please do NOT support

Dear Board members

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo and Sierra Club urging you a NO vote.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board’s prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school’s Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District’s board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen "Even if we leave it we're still going to have to pay for it. And we'd have no control"

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision
How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plan upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan.

In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources.

Sincerely Yours

Satyanarayana Simha
12371 Saratoga Creek Dr, Saratoga, CA 95070
Dear Board members

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo urging you a NO vote.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board’s prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school’s Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District’s board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen "Even if we leave it we’re still going to have to pay for it. And we’d have no control"

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision

How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plan upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan.

In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources.

--

Best wishes

Feng
Melissa Stone

From: Steve Machado <smachado@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, May 08, 2018 9:32 AM
To: Board of Directors; Clerk of the Board
Subject: CALIFORNIA WATER FIX: Please do NOT support

Dear Board members

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo urging you a NO vote.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board’s prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school’s Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District’s board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen "Even if we leave it we’re still going to have to pay for it. And we’d have no control"

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision.

How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plan upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan.

In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources.

Steve Machado
Dear Board members

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo urging you a NO vote.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board’s prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school’s Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District’s board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen “Even if we leave it we’re still going to have to pay for it. And we’d have no control”

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision.

How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plan upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan.

In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources.

Manju Banerje
From: Bob Hartley <bob_hartley@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Tuesday, May 08, 2018 9:31 AM
To: Board of Directors
Subject: Fw: [The Saratoga Update 96] URGENT: Please send an email now (by 10AM)

Email: Board@valleywater.org, clerkoftheboard@valleywater.org,
Subject: CALIFORNIA WATER FIX: Please do NOT support

Dear Board members

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo and Sierra Club urging you a NO vote.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board’s prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school’s Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District’s board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen "Even if we leave it we’re still going to have to pay for it. And we’d have no control”

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision
How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plan upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan.

In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources.
Dear Board members

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo urging you a NO vote.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board’s prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school’s Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District’s board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Club and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen "Even if we leave it we’re still going to have to pay for it. And we’d have no control"

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision

How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plan upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan.

In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources.

Robert Lee
Dear Board members

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo urging you a NO vote.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board’s prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school’s Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District’s board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen "Even if we leave it we’re still going to have to pay for it. And we’d have no control"

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plan upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan.

In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources.

Best regards,

Brandi Muniz
Director of Finance

1175 Saratoga Ave, Ste. 14, San Jose, CA 95129
Phone: (408) 996-7950
Dear Board members

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo urging you a NO vote.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board’s prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school’s Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District’s board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen "Even if we leave it we’re still going to have to pay for it. And we’d have no control"

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision
How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plan upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan.

In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources.

Dean Sakauye
Dear Board members

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo and Sierra Club urging you a NO vote.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board’s prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school’s Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District’s board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen "Even if we leave it we’re still going to have to pay for it. And we’d have no control”

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision

How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plan upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan.

In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources.

Sujatha Bodapati
From: Mumuksha Shah <mumuksha@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, May 08, 2018 9:30 AM
To: Board of Directors
Subject: CALIFORNIA WATER FIX: Please do NOT support

Dear Board members

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo and Sierra Club urging you a NO vote.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board’s prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school’s Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District’s board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen "Even if we leave it we’re still going to have to pay for it. And we’d have no control"

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision
How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plan upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan.

In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources.

Thanks,
M
Dear Board members

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo urging you a NO vote.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board’s prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school’s Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District’s board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen "Even if we leave it we’re still going to have to pay for it. And we’d have no control"

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision
How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plan upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan.

In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources.

Sue Hamilton
SJH Development
collegeandcareercoaching.com
408-568-1030
Email: Board@valleywater.org, clerkoftheboard@valleywater.org,
Subject: CALIFORNIA WATER FIX: Please do NOT support

Dear Board members

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo urging you a NO vote.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board’s prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school’s Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District’s board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen "Even if we leave it we’re still going to have to pay for it. And we’d have no control"

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision
How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plan upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan.

In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed;
and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources.

Rich Woolman
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The information in this message is copyright protected and confidential information that is legally privileged and is intended only for the use of the individuals or entities named above. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination or copy of this message is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please immediately notify us by telephone.

You received this message because you are subscribed to the Google Groups "SJWC Water Oversight Committee" group.
To unsubscribe from this group and stop receiving emails from it, send an email to WaterOversight+unsubscribe@googlegroups.com.
To post to this group, send email to WaterOversight@googlegroups.com.
To view this discussion on the web visit https://groups.google.com/d/msgid/WaterOversight/04BBF750-0CB6-452C-BA77-DC85520FDD41%40gmail.com.
For more options, visit https://groups.google.com/d/optout.
Dear Board members

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo urging you a NO vote.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board's prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school's Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District's board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn't outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen "Even if we leave it we're still going to have to pay for it. And we'd have no control"

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn't listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision
How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plan upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan.

In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources.

Jody McAvoy,
Saratoga Resident
Dear Board members

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo and Sierra Club urging you a NO vote.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board’s prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school’s Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District’s board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen "Even if we leave it we’re still going to have to pay for it. And we’d have no control”

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision

How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plan upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan.

In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources.

Thanks.

Always a pleasure working with you.
Gurdeep Kaur Chawla
408 476 3564
Dear Board Members,

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo and Sierra Club urging you a NO vote.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board’s prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school’s Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District’s board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen "Even if we leave it we’re still going to have to pay for it. And we’d have no control”

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision.

How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plan upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan.

In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources.

Anna Sheng
Saratoga resident
I urge you to not support this huge expense and water theft project

Michael A Shields
Saratoga, CA
Dear Board members

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo and Sierra Club urging you a NO vote.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board’s prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school’s Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District’s board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen “Even if we leave it we’re still going to have to pay for it. And we’d have no control”

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision

How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plan upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan.

In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources.

Respectfully,
Pamela D. Roper-Kaiser
Dear Board members,

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo urging you a NO vote.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board’s prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school’s Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District’s board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen "Even if we leave it we’re still going to have to pay for it. And we’d have no control"

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision

How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plan upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan.

In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources.

Sincerely,
Natalia Vassilieva
Dear Board members

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo and Sierra Club urging you a NO vote.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board’s prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school’s Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District’s board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen "Even if we leave it we’re still going to have to pay for it. And we’d have no control"

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision. How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plan upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan.

In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources.

Jennifer Zhuang
Dear Board members

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo and Sierra Club urging you a NO vote.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board’s prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school’s Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District’s board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen “Even if we leave it we’re still going to have to pay for it. And we’d have no control”

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision
How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plan upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan.

In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources.

Carolyn Cummings
Dear Board members,

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo urging you a NO vote.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board's prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school's Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District's board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn't outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen "Even if we leave it we’re still going to have to pay for it. And we’d have no control"

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision. How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plan upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan.

In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources.

Best wishes,
Yuanjing Wang
Dear Board members

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo urging you a NO vote.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board’s prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school’s Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District’s board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen "Even if we leave it we’re still going to have to pay for it. And we’d have no control"

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision

How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plan upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan.

In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources. Patricia Sweeney
I DISAGREE the new rate and want to vote NO.
Thank you.

Saratoga resident
Wen and Sue Tang

----- Forwarded Message -----
From: Rishi Kumar <rishi1@gmail.com>
To: IncredibleSaratoga@googlegroups.com
Sent: Tuesday, May 8, 2018 8:53 AM
Subject: [The Saratoga Update 96] URGENT: Please send an email now (by 10AM)

Dear neighbors,
Please send an email to our water agency board members as they make a decision today that will likely increase our water rates and more
You can read SJ Mercury News coverage of this topic here

Email: Board@valleywater.org,
clerkoftheboard@valleywater.org,
Subject: CALIFORNIA WATER FIX: Please do NOT support

Dear Board members

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo and Sierra Club urging you a NO vote.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board’s prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school’s Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District’s board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen “Even if we leave it we’re still going to have to pay for it. And we’d have no control.”
Email  Board@valleywater.org

clerkoftheboard@valleywater.org,
Subject: CALIFORNIA WATER FIX: Please do NOT support

Dear Board members

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo and Sierra Club urging you a NO vote.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board’s prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school’s Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District’s board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen "Even if we leave it we’re still going to have to pay for it. And we’d have no control"

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision

How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plant upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan.

In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources.

Jeannie Nguyen
Dear Board Members,

I urge you to vote no on the Delta tunnels. It would be the height of fiscal irresponsibility to vote in favor of this project. The rate payers of the Santa Clara Valley are not protected by the proposal and it is not in our best interests. The proposal is not well written and not adequately drafted to protect us. If you approve this, you will pay the price at the ballot box. People are angry about this.

Please to the right thing. Ignore the will of your constituents at your peril.

Terry Johnson

12153 Candy Lane
Saratoga, CA 95070
Dear Board members

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo and Sierra Club urging you a NO vote.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board’s prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school’s Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District’s board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen “Even if we leave it we’re still going to have to pay for it. And we’d have no control”

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision
How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plan upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan.

In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources.

Michael Ziegel
Dear Board members

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo and Sierra Club urging you a NO vote.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board’s prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school’s Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District’s board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen “Even if we leave it we’re still going to have to pay for it. And we’d have no control”

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision
How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plan upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan.

In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources.
Dear Board members

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo urging you a NO vote.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board’s prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school’s Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District’s board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen “Even if we leave it we’re still going to have to pay for it. And we’d have no control”

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision.

How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plant upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan.

In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources.
Dear Board members

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo urging you to vote NO. My reasons follow and I want you to clearly understand this is my position. It was well written and there is no point in my changing the wording.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board’s prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school’s Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District’s board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen "Even if we leave it we’re still going to have to pay for it. And we’d have no control"

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision
How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plan upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan.

In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources.

Sharon Andres

Sent from my iPad
Dear Board members

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo and Sierra Club urging you a NO vote.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board’s prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school’s Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District’s board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen “Even if we leave it we’re still going to have to pay for it. And we’d have no control”

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision

How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plan upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan.

In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources.

Virginia King
Dear Board members,

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo and Sierra Club urging you a NO vote.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board’s prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school’s Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District’s board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen “Even if we leave it we’re still going to have to pay for it. And we’d have no control”

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision
How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plan upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan.

In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources.

Best,
Grace
Dear Board members

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo and Sierra Club urging you a NO vote.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board’s prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school’s Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District’s board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen "Even if we leave it we’re still going to have to pay for it. And we’d have no control"

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision
How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plan upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan.

In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources.

Elango R
20290, Orchard Road
Saratoga
CA-95070
Dear Board members,

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo and Sierra Club urging you a NO vote.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board’s prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school’s Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District’s board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen “Even if we leave it we’re still going to have to pay for it. And we’d have no control”

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plan upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan?

In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources.

Subha & Sharma Podila
Melissa Stone

From: Subrata Chatterji <subrata_123@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, May 08, 2018 9:16 AM
To: Board of Directors; Clerk of the Board
Subject: CALIFORNIA WATER FIX: Please do NOT support

Dear Board members

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo and Sierra Club urging you a NO vote.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board’s prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school’s Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District’s board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project --- like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen “Even if we leave it we’re still going to have to pay for it. And we’d have no control”

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision

How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plan upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan.

In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources.

Sincerely,

Subrata Chatterji
14646 Fieldstone Drive
Saratoga, CA 95070
Dear Board members

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo and Sierra Club urging you a NO vote.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board’s prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school’s Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District’s board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen "Even if we leave it we’re still going to have to pay for it. And we’d have no control”

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision

How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plan upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan.

In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources.

Saratoga resident,
Kevin Chen
Melissa Stone

From: Eddie Truong <eddyet@thesvo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, May 08, 2018 9:15 AM
To: Eddie Truong
Subject: Vote Today to support Water District staff proposal RE California WaterFix Project

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Santa Clara Valley Water District Board of Directors,

Today is a critical opportunity to vote in support of Water District staff proposal to partner and engage with the California WaterFix Tunnel Project. With your affirmative vote, you will allow the Water District to have appropriate representation and governance of the WaterFix project. By not taking action, we will lose all leverage to advance the interests of residents and businesses of the Santa Clara Valley Water District.

Please take action today and vote in favor of staff's proposal.

Regards,
Eddie

EDDIE TRUONG
Director of Public Policy & Advocacy
The Silicon Valley Organization
Leaders in organizing business for 132 years
408-291-5267 | Thesvo.com
Connect with me on LinkedIn
Email: Board@valleywater.org, clerkoftheboard@valleywater.org, Subject: CALIFORNIA WATER FIX: Please do NOT support

Dear Board members

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo and Sierra Club urging you a NO vote.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board’s prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school’s Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District’s board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen "Even if we leave it we’re still going to have to pay for it. And we’d have no control!"

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision. How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plan upgrade, dam repair and the recycle plan master plan.
In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources.

<Your Name>

Thanks
Rishi Kumar

Re-elect Rishi to Saratoga City Council 2018 - FPPC ID #1364592
• Endorse Rishi: rishikumar.com/endorsements
• Contribute to the campaign: rishikumar.com/contribute
• Join the campaign leadership: rishikumar.com/endorsements

Saratoga City Council member
• Water Page www.RishKumar.com/water
• Safety Tips www.RishKumar.com/tips
• Neighborhood Watch program launched www.RishKumar.com/nsw
• City Council update http://www.rishikumar.com/newsletter
• Email: rkumar@saratoga.ca.us || Phone 408 805 5993 || Facebook.com/VoteRishi || @rishikumar1

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTE
The information in this message is copyright protected and confidential information that is legally privileged and is intended only for the use of the individuals or entities named above. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination or copy of this message is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please immediately notify us by telephone

--

Keep up with Saratoga related updates, subscribe to,
INcredible SARATOGA http://groups.google.com/group/IncredibleSaratoga
Direct city related emails to rkumar@saratoga.ca.us
PHONE 408 805 5993 || Facebook.com/VoteRishi || Twitter rishikumar1
Office hours: Saturdays, Please refer to social media broadcast for the location and time slots

You received this message because you are subscribed to the Google Groups "Incredible Saratoga" group.
To unsubscribe from this group and stop receiving emails from it, send an email to IncredibleSaratoga+unsubscribe@googlegroups.com.
To post to this group, send email to IncredibleSaratoga@googlegroups.com.
Visit this group at https://groups.google.com/group/IncredibleSaratoga.
To view this discussion on the web visit https://groups.google.com/d/msgid/IncredibleSaratoga/0B9CA3CEF-8430-45F2-9316-E937EDB86377%40gmail.com.
For more options, visit https://groups.google.com/d/optout.
Dear Board members

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo and Sierra Club urging you a NO vote.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board’s prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school’s Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District’s board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen "Even if we leave it we’re still going to have to pay for it. And we’d have no control”

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision

How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plan upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan.

In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcome ratepayers and District staff resources.

Anthony Chan
Dear Board members

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo and Sierra Club urging you a NO vote.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board’s prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school’s Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District’s board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen "Even if we leave it we’re still going to have to pay for it. And we’d have no control"

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision.

How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plan upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan.

In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources.

In addition, please consider that increasing the fixed service charge, and lowering a little bit the quantity charge, decreases incentives for water conservation. Perpetual increases in the service charge have resulted in customer payments that have virtually no relation at all to the amount of water we use.
I see no reason for our local water company to charge us for massive water projects imposed on us by the state.

Eric Meece, San Jose
Dear Board members

As a resident and hapless ratepayer, I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo urging you a NO vote.

As per Anna, our rates will now go up further by $10.26/month. I do NOT want my water rates to go up any more! I am sick and tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already for the past several years. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board’s prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school’s Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District’s board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

We need you to hold the line and look out for the interests of Santa Clara Valley customers!

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen “Even if we leave it we’re still going to have to pay for it. And we’d have no control”

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please do not sign up for this. This is a very big project with a lot of downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision.

How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plan upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan.

In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources.

Sundari Josyula,
San Jose Water customer
Dear Board members,

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo urging you a NO vote.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board’s prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school’s Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District’s board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen "Even if we leave it we’re still going to have to pay for it. And we’d have no control"

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision

How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plan upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan.

In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources.

Thomas McAvoy,
Saratoga Resident
Dear Board members

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo urging you a NO vote.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board’s prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school’s Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District’s board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen “Even if we leave it we’re still going to have to pay for it. And we’d have no control”

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision

How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plan upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan.

In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources.

Jonie Takatsuji
Dear Board members

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo urging you a NO vote.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board’s prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school’s Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District’s board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen " Even if we leave it we’re still going to have to pay for it. And we’d have no control "

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plan upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan.

In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources.

Sincerely,
Nancy Leasia
knrheidi@earthlink.net
Dear Board members

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo urging you a NO vote.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.28/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board’s prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school’s Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District’s board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen “Even if we leave it we’re still going to have to pay for it. And we’d have no control”

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision.

How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plan upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan.

In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources.

Regards,
Daniel Chan
Dear Board members

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo and Sierra Club urging you a NO vote.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board’s prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school’s Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District’s board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen “Even if we leave it we’re still going to have to pay for it. And we’d have no control”

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision
How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plan upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan.

In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources.

+andy gong
Dear Board members

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo urging you a NO vote.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board’s prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school’s Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District’s board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen "Even if we leave it we’re still going to have to pay for it. And we’d have no control”

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this.

This is a very big project. Based on my understanding of the project the upside is only for the folks in southern California and the agriculture business in central valley and the risks over costs overruns are very high.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plan upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan.

In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources.

Avinash Patro.
@P
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[NSW Captains Group 141] Please send an email now (by 10AM today)
Rishi Kumar
Tosafetycaptains@googlegroups.com
May 8 at 8:53 AM
Friends,

Please send an email to our water agency board members as they make a decision that will likely increase our water rates and more
You can read SJ Mercury News coverage of this topic here

Email: Board@valleywater.org,
clerkoftheboard@valleywater.org,
Subject: CALIFORNIA WATER FIX: Please do NOT support

Dear Board members

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo urging you a NO vote.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board’s prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school’s Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District’s board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Coritra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to
a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen "Even if we leave it we’re still going to have to pay for it. And we’d have no control"

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision

How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plan upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan.

In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources.

Daniel Charles and Ann Malmuth-Onn
13770 Beaumont Ave.
Saratoga CA 95070

From: Rishi Kumar <rishi1@gmail.com>
Subject: CALIFORNIA WATER FIX: Please do NOT support
Date: May 8, 2018 at 8:45:38 AM PDT
To: Board@valleywater.org, clerkoftheboard@valleywater.org

Dear Board members

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo urging you a NO vote.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board’s prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school’s Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District’s board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to
a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen "Even if we leave it we're still going to have to pay for it. And we'd have no control"

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn't listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is
Dear Board members

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo urging you a NO vote.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board’s prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school’s Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District’s board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen ”Even if we leave it we’re still going to have to pay for it. And we’d have no control”

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision
How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plan upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan.

In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources.

--- Alexander Clemm
Dear Board members

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo and Sierra Club urging you a NO vote.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board’s prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school’s Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District’s board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen “Even if we leave it we’re still going to have to pay for it. And we’d have no control”

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision.

How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plan upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan.

In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources.

Kristin Gragnola
Dear Board members

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo and Sierra Club urging you a NO vote.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board’s prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school’s Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District’s board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen “Even if we leave it we’re still going to have to pay for it. And we’d have no control”

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision

How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plan upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan.

In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources.

Thank you!

Fan
Dear Board members

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo and Sierra Club urging you a NO vote.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board’s prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school’s Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District’s board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen "Even if we leave it we’re still going to have to pay for it. And we’d have no control”

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision. How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plan upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan.

In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources.

Rosemary and Fiachre O’Neill
19943 Via Escuela Drive
Saratoga
Dear Board members

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo and Sierra Club urging you a NO vote.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board’s prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school’s Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District’s board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen "Even if we leave it we’re still going to have to pay for it. And we’d have no control”

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision.
How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plan upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan.

In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources.

Best regards,
Lakshmi Sathyanarayana
Realtor and Loan Originator
CalBRE: 01472095
NMLS: 238706
MaxReal/Googain Inc.
Dear Board members

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo and Sierra Club urging you a NO vote.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board's prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school's Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District's board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen "Even if we leave it we’re still going to have to pay for it. And we’d have no control"

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision. How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plant upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan.

In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources.

Kanaka Sriram and Sriram Chakravarthy
Melissa Stone

From: carole roth <caroleroth410@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, May 08, 2018 9:06 AM
To: Board of Directors; Clerk of the Board
Subject: CALIFORNIA WATER FIX: Please do NOT support

Dear Board members

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo urging you a NO vote.

Per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board’s prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school’s Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District’s board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen "Even if we leave it we’re still going to have to pay for it. And we’d have no control"

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision. How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plan upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan.

In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources.

Carole Roth
Saratoga
Dear Board members I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo urging you a NO vote. As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board’s prior rejection of this project. I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school’s Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District’s board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns. I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them. I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen “Even if we leave it we’re still going to have to pay for it. And we’d have no control” Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind? I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides. I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plant upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan. In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might oversubscribe ratepayers and District staff resources. Sincerely,

Keith Duffy

Resident of Saratoga, CA
Dear Board members

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo and Sierra Club urging you a NO vote.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board’s prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school’s Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District’s board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen "Even if we leave it we’re still going to have to pay for it. And we’d have no control"

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision
How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plan upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan.

In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources.

Carolyn Armstrong
Dear Board members

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo and Sierra Club urging you a NO vote.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board’s prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school’s Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District’s board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen “Even if we leave it we’re still going to have to pay for it. And we’d have no control”

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision
How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plan upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan.

In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources.

Mike Hulme
Dear Board members,

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo urging you a NO vote.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board’s prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school’s Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District’s board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen "Even if we leave it we’re still going to have to pay for it. And we’d have no control"

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision

How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plan upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan.

In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources.

Thank you.

Chakra Srivatsa
13241 Via Blanc Court
Saratoga CA 95070
Dear Board members

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo and Sierra Club urging you a NO vote.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board’s prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school’s Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District’s board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen "Even if we leave it we’re still going to have to pay for it. And we’d have no control"

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plan upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan.

In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources.

Sridhar Teklur
From: Bette <dbloomis@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Tuesday, May 08, 2018 9:05 AM
To: Board of Directors
Subject: Vote NO

Please don't vote for rate increase!
Thank you,
Dave and Bette Loomis

Sent from my iPad
Dear Board members

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo and Sierra Club urging you a NO vote.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board’s prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school’s Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District’s board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen "Even if we leave it we’re still going to have to pay for it. And we’d have no control"

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision.

How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plan upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan.

In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources.

Regards,
Manisha
Dear Board members

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo urging you a NO vote.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board’s prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school’s Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District’s board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen “Even if we leave it we’re still going to have to pay for it. And we’d have no control”

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision. How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plan upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan.

In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources.

Shivaram Mysore
Dear Board members,

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo urging you a NO vote.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board’s prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school’s Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District’s board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen "Even if we leave it we’re still going to have to pay for it. And we’d have no control”

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision
How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plan upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan.

In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources.

Theodore Wu
4494 Norwich Way
San Jose, CA 95130
Dear Board members

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo and Sierra Club urging you a NO vote.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board’s prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school’s Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District’s board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen "Even if we leave it we’re still going to have to pay for it. And we’d have no control".

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision.

How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plan upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan.

In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources.

Thanks,
Prashanth
Dear Board members

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo and Sierra Club urging you a NO vote.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board’s prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school’s Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District’s board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen “Even if we leave it we’re still going to have to pay for it. And we’d have no control”

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision

How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plan upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan.

In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources.

--

Regards,

Narayan
Voting "NO" for the project.
Thank you

Regards,
Jane Chan
Dear Board members

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo urging you a NO vote.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board’s prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school’s Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District’s board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen “Even if we leave it we’re still going to have to pay for it. And we’d have no control”

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision

How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plan upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan.

In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources.

Regards,

Sarmila Dasgupta
1569 Rebel Way
San Jose CA 95118
Hello Board,

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo and Sierra Club urging you a NO vote.

As per Representative Eshoo, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Representative Eshoo, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board’s prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school’s Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District’s board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen "Even if we leave it we’re still going to have to pay for it. And we’d have no control"

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision
How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plan upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan.

In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources.

Thank you.

Iyer Venkatesan
Saratoga, CA
Dear Board members

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo urging you a NO vote.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board’s prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school’s Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District’s board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen "Even if we leave it we're still going to have to pay for it. And we'd have no control"

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision

How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plant upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan.

In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might over commit ratepayers and District staff resources.

Paramjit Kaur
Dear Board members

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo and Sierra Club urging you a NO vote.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board’s prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school’s Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District’s board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen "Even if we leave it we're still going to have to pay for it. And we'd have no control"

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision.

How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plan upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan.

In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources.

Sincerely,
Cathie Watson-Short
Saratoga, CA

--
Cathie Watson-Short
Dear Board members

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo and Sierra Club urging you a NO vote.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board’s prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school’s Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District’s board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen "Even if we leave it we’re still going to have to pay for it. And we’d have no control"

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision
How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plan upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan.

In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources.

Regards
Vinu Krishnamurthy
Dear Board members

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo urging you a NO vote.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board’s prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school’s Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District’s board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen "Even if we leave it we’re still going to have to pay for it. And we’d have no control"

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision
How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plan upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan.

In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources.

Regards,

Pranab Dhar
1569 Rebel Way
San Jose CA 95118
From: Marianne O’Connor <marianne@sterlingpr.com>
Sent: Tuesday, May 08, 2018 8:57 AM
To: Board of Directors; Clerk of the Board
Subject: CALIFORNIA WATER FIX: Please do NOT support

Dear Board members,

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo and Sierra Club in urging you to vote NO.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water. WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board’s prior rejection of this project.

I support Jay Lund, UC Davis professor and director of the school’s Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District’s board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and become potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County, that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am very concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen, “Even if we leave it, we’re still going to have to pay for it. And we’d have no control.”

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and some very large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision
How will the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plan upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan?

In summary, I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources.

Sincerely,

Marianne O’Connor
13810 Ravenwood Drive
Saratoga, CA 95070
Dear Board members

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo and Sierra Club urging you a NO vote.

Thanks,
Jitendra Maheshwari
Dear Board members

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo and Sierra Club urging you a NO vote.

As per Ms. Eshoo, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board’s prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school’s Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District’s board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen ”Even if we leave it we’re still going to have to pay for it. And we'd have no control”

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision
How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plan upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan.

In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources.

Thank you,

Anand Rajagopalan
Please vote no on the Water Fix boondoggle.

I support the governor on most things, but he has a blind spot on water for LA. The smell of a secret deal in return for the recent state funding for SCVWD is hard to miss.

Don’t commit our district to this mess.

Ken Poulton
Palo Alto

(Sent from Ken's iPhone)
Dear Board members

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo and Sierra Club urging you a NO vote.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board’s prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school’s Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District’s board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen “Even if we leave it we’re still going to have to pay for it. And we’d have no control”

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision.
How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plan upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan.

In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources.

Regards,
Laura Leafstrand
12762 Lantana Avenue
Saratoga, CA 95070
Dear Board members,

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo and Sierra Club urging you a NO vote.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board’s prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school’s Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District’s board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn't outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen “Even if we leave it we’re still going to have to pay for it. And we’d have no control.”

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision. How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plan upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan?!

In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources.

Thanks,

Dinesh Betadapur
Saratoga, CA
CALIFORNIA WATER FIX: Please do NOT support

Dear Board members,

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo urging you a NO vote.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board’s prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school’s Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District’s board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen “Even if we leave it we’re still going to have to pay for it. And we’d have no control”

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision

How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plan upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan.

In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources.
From: Rishi Kumar <rishi1@gmail.com>
Subject: CALIFORNIA WATER FIX: Please do NOT support
Date: May 8, 2018 at 8:45:38 AM PDT
To: Board@valleywater.org, clerkoftheboard@valleywater.org

Dear Board members

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo urging you a NO vote.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board’s prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school’s Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District’s board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen “Even if we leave it we’re still going to have to pay for it. And we’d have no control”

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision
How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plan upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan.

In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources.

-Frank Seto
Dear Board members

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo and Sierra Club urging you a NO vote.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up anymore. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board’s prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school’s Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District’s board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen “Even if we leave it we’re still going to have to pay for it. And we’d have no control”

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision

How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plant upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan.

In summary, I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed, and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources.

Best!

Shashank Shekhar
From: Kamal Anand <kamalanand@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, May 08, 2018 8:57 AM
To: Board of Directors; Clerk of the Board
Subject: CALIFORNIA WATER FIX: Please do NOT support

Dear Board members

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo and Sierra Club urging you a NO vote.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board’s prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school’s Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District’s board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen “Even if we leave it we’re still going to have to pay for it. And we’d have no control”

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision

How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plan upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan.

In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources.

Kamaljit Anand
Saratoga Resident
Dear Board members

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo and Sierra Club urging you a NO vote.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board’s prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school’s Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District’s board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen "Even if we leave it we’re still going to have to pay for it. And we’d have no control"

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision

How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plan upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan.

In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources.

Angela Haskell
Please read this comment into the record at the May 8th, 9:30 am meeting of the Santa Clara Water Board.

Dear Santa Clara County Water District Board

My name is Kathryn Barnard and I reside in Silicon Valley (94061). I've been a 21 year resident of Santa Clara County and a 17 year resident of San Mateo County.

Please vote NO on the tunnels for the following reasons:

1. The State of California is required by law to maintain the quality of the water in the North Delta for the North Delta farmers and for the Delta wildlife. Building tunnels and stealing the river north of the Delta would be illegal, and would destroy family farms in the Delta as well as wildlife. These 2 entities have a higher right to the water. By bumping off 2 entities that have a higher right to the water, you and other water districts are trying to "jump" the water line-up, and it's the wrong thing to do.

My great-grandfather served in the Union Navy in the Civil War and then purchased land in the Delta to start a farm. He planted pear trees. He toiled on the farm for the rest of his life. He had one son, my grandfather, who survived the depression and toiled on the farm his entire life. My grandfather had four children, including two sons. My uncles have toiled on the farm their entire lives and are still farming. One of my uncles did take time off farming to serve in the Korean war. Pear trees cannot grow in salt water. By stealing the river north of the Delta, you would be killing the wildlife and taking the family farms.

2. These 40 foot high, 35 mile long tunnels are MONSTROUS and would be a disaster for the environment and for the taxpayers of Santa Clara County. You will burden all the people of California with a huge load of debt. Did you calculate how many truckloads of dirt it will take to dig these huge chunnels and the carbon emissions alone? Did you calculate how much you will need to pay for all the family farms that you take? You'd not only be taking the family farms and killing the wildlife, but you'd also be leaving the Delta with more pollution and mountains of dirt. The cost is expected to far exceed the estimated $17 billion.

We count on our government officials to do the right thing. Vote NO on the tunnels.
As a rate payer, living in Almaden Valley, I am adamantly opposed to the twin tunnels water project. It does nothing to mandate that all water districts and their residents make every effort possible to conserve water—by using recycled water, metering every house in the state, especially those in Southern California,—nor does it produce more water or help the environment.

I urge you to vote no on this project, as was done previously by this board.

Thank you for your consideration.
Kimberly Chortek
Dear Santa Clara water board,

Please read this into your record. Please also ask yourself why you are being so short sighted as to limit the future growth of Santa Clara, if you vote for funding of proposed Waterfix tunnels. You would be committing all Santa Clara residents, businesses and land owners to limits on water supplies for 50 or more years. You would be limiting the groundwater recharge for your area, as the tunnels project if operational would begin to degrade the groundwater of the Delta and then the entire San Francisco Bay area. Will the more expensive tunnel surface water you receive make up for the groundwater you help to destroy? You would joining in with California Dept of Water Resources, an agency that has clearly shown its loyalties lie with SoCal, not NorCal. Please take a stand against the proposed Waterfix tunnels and for your own future water resources and that of your neighbors. The proposed WaterFix is a water heist in reality. Also take the time to learn the facts. Did you know DWR and USBR are already taking too much water and the drinking water aquifer of the Sacramento San Joaquin Delta is already being negatively impacted? The impacts to the Bay area will be next. Do the research for yourself before you vote.

Reject to WaterFix tunnel project once and for all, and save the Santa Clara drinking water aquifer.

Nicky Suard, Esq. Managing Member, Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC
As a resident in District 2 I would like to register my strong opposition to the Delta Tunnels project. Please reject this boondoggle.

Andy Wood
461 Northlake Dr. #51
San Jose, CA 95117
andy@davcoroof.com
Dear Board,

Read the Mercury’s editorial!!! Vote for Water Fix and you will be voted out. The reasons cited are bogus and to quote Feinstein, “it doesn’t pencil out.”

Why should Santa Clara ratepayers be charged to send water to SoCal? The seat you desire on the board will be rendered mute by the 3 other members.

VOTE NO ON WATER FIX!!!

Mary Cannuli
2039 Mardel Lane
San Jose, CA 95128

Sent from Mail for Windows 10
Dear Board Members

Please do not approve the water fix as it is presently constructed. I am strongly opposed to the process. I would support one tunnel but not two. Los Angeles and San Diego voted against the project.

I will remember your votes on Election Day.

John Tobias
Dear Board members

I am with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo urging you a NO vote.

As per Anna, our rates will go up by $10.26/month. I do not want my water rates to go up any more. I am tired of the price gouging by San Jose Water already. As per Anna, WaterFix remains plagued by high costs and mismanagement that justified the board’s prior rejection of this project.

I support Professor Jay Lund, UC Davis and director of the school’s Center for Watershed Sciences, that given the cost overruns that often occur on large projects, Santa Clara Valley Water District’s board should clearly impose a cap on how much it will contribute, so that it isn’t outvoted by Southern California interests and potentially vulnerable to being hit with cost overruns.

I agree with environmentalist groups such as Sierra Clubs and Delta counties, including Contra Costa County that have called the massive tunnels — each 35 miles long and 40 feet high — a water grab and oppose them.

I am VERY concerned. Cost overruns on the massive project — like the multi-billion-dollar price jumps that affected the Bay Bridge and high-speed rail plans — could expose Santa Clara County residents to a blank check of liability in the form of higher water rates or property taxes. As per board member Gary Kremen “Even if we leave it we’re still going to have to pay for it. And we’d have no control”

Professor Buzz Thompson, a Stanford law professor who specializes in water issues, said that the draft documents spell out that the Santa Clara Valley Water District would be allowed to purchase water from the project, but the price isn’t listed. Are we walking into something blind?

I fear we may not be able to leave the partnership without being on the hook for the $650 million. Please be careful before you sign up for this. This is a very big project. It has a lot of upsides, and large downsides.

I suggest you consider 2.5%, 5% and 7.5% participation in a public meeting evaluating the pros and cons before making a decision
How is the water agency (and the people of Santa Clara County) going to pay for this project when we already have costly water supply projects such as the water treatment plan upgrade, dam repair and the recycle water master plan.

In summary I suggest that you consider the following: 1) alternative levels of participation to be analyzed; and 2) consideration of the number of water supply projects and the associated costs, and how this might overcommit ratepayers and District staff resources.
Thanks
Rishi Kumar

Re-elect Rishi to Saratoga City Council 2018 - FPPC ID #1364692
• Endorse Rishi: rishikumar.com/endorsements
• Contribute to the campaign: rishikumar.com/contribute
• Join the campaign leadership: rishikumar.com/endorsements

Saratoga City Councilmember
• Water Page www.RishiKumar.com/water
• Safety Tips www.RishiKumar.com/tips
• Neighborhood Watch program launched www.RishiKumar.com/nsw
• City Council update http://www.rishikumar.com/newsletter
• Email: rkumar@saratoga.ca.us || Phone 408 805 5993 || Facebook.com/VoteRishi || @rishikumar1
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