


February 14, 2007

Mr. Lester Snow, Director
Department of Water Resources
1416 Ninth Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

Re: Agency Requested Public Input on the Integrated
Regional Water Management(IRWM) Grant Program
(Propositions 50, 84, and 1E).

Dear Mr. Snow:

I learned about the January scoping meetings on February 5, 2007 while surfing the DWR's Website on a different water related issue. Since additional opportunities will be scheduled in the future for public input on the aforementioned subject, I am writing now to get my comments in on time. Please note that I utilized the "PROPOSAL EVALUATION Proposition 50, Chapter 8 Integrated Regional Water Management Grant Program Implementation Step 2 Proposals" form(Pages 1-4) made available for PIN: 9604(the Watersheds Coalition of Ventura County's Integrated Regional Water Management Plan Implementation Project). Please note that the major focus of my comments, questions, suggestions and recommendations is the Calleguas Creek Watershed Area; more specifically that portion that runs through the City of Simi Valley.

Mr. Snow, before I get to my points, I want to state that I am opposed to the whole aspect of integrated regional water management because many fine details and crucial locality points can be missed, or deliberately omitted from submitted grant application forms, and from approved local governments' plans. Too often, for the past 7 years, I have found that City of Simi Valley, and County of Ventura documented plans are incomplete and inaccurate. Since the IRWM system is the law, I am willing to set aside my opposition--even though I am aware that one community can benefit immensely at the expense of other areas that desperately need the grant moneys to avoid disasters but don't have the matching funds--to the process, but only for this grant program public review period. Public safety is

first and foremost in addressing issues. Making sure that I am not made a party to ill-conceived, and ill-advised decisions at all levels of government is a close second.

Mr. Snow, please note that my comments are broken down per the "Question" format. I did not include all of the categories. For some of the categories, I included:
1. point of interest statements, 2. statements relevant to issues of concern, and 3. statements that must stand out.

ADOPTED IRWMP AND PROOF OF FORMAL ADOPTION

- #1 - "The IRWMP is currently under development and scheduled for adoption prior to January 1, 2007."

DESCRIPTION OF REGION

- #1 - "...the IRWMP does not address either the future water resources of the region or the water demand for the minimum of 20-year planning horizon."

WATER MANAGEMENT STRATEGIES AND INTEGRATION

- #1 - "The applicant states that the final IRWMP will correlate the water management strategies with the objectives to assign priorities for implementation."
- #2 - "The groundwater management section could be stronger especially since a number of the projects are groundwater related."

PRIORITIES AND SCHEDULE

- #1 - "A long-term list of projects and programs will be identified for implementation and will be included in the final IRWMP."
- #2 - "The applicant does not fully address the criteria because it does not discuss how: 1) decision-making will be responsive to regional changes, 2) responses to implementation of projects will be assessed, and 3) project

sequencing may be altered based on implementation responses."

IMPLEMENTATION

- #1 - "Long-term actions are not included in the IRWMP, but are supposed to be included in the final IRWMP."
- #2 - "The applicant does not clearly describe the institutional structure that will ensure plan implementation."

IMPACTS AND REGIONAL BENEFITS

- #1 - "The primary interregional benefit of the IRWMP will be the creation of an institutional structure to bring together different water interests within the region into a single unified group with a common purpose and direction."
- #2 - "The applicant adds that another major benefit of a regional plan is the cost savings to the individual agencies."
- #3 - "The IRWMP does not address the potential negative impacts."
- #4 - "Considering that extensive use of groundwater in the region, observed land subsidence, salt water intrusion, and groundwater basin overdraft, additional discussion on the benefits and impacts of groundwater appears necessary."

TECHNICAL ANALYSIS AND PLAN PERFORMANCE

- #1 - "The applicant states that a detailed strategy for monitoring plan performance will be identified as part of the development of the final IRWMP."

DATA MANAGEMENT

- #1 - "Data will be disseminated through a website that the applicant created."
- #2 - "Originally, the main purpose was to keep coalition members on top of the latest information regarding the IRWMP."

FINANCING

- #1 - "The applicant does not fully describe financing for implementation and O&M costs."
- #2 - "The local funds by project or fund source are not explicitly identified in the IRWMP, although some general categories are listed."
- #3 - "A more detailed plan is needed."

COMMENT: Numbers 1-3, these observations were right on the money so to speak. The reason that: 1. the financing for the implementation and O&M costs were not fully described, 2. the local funds by project or fund source were not explicitly identified with some generalities, and 3. a more detailed plan is needed is due to the fact that Countywide NPDES related flood control/watershed protection district assessment fees were levied without public hearings. These fees cannot be increased without a vote of the people, and County consultants have advised against pursuing increases--the truth would be revealed.

The property-related fees that the County and its cities placed their hopes on to help cover NPDES related projects have been put on the back burner temporarily because the way that the State legislation(Nava) was pursued to get this authorization was rushed, and not all i's were dotted, and t's crossed. The original Nava bill was vetoed by Governor Schwarzenegger. The authorization to levy these fees was eventually signed by the

Governor, but only because the language was included in another legislator's bill at the last minute. But, the signed bill is flawed.

FEMA Hazard Mitigation Grant Program funds for NPDES related County and City of Simi Valley projects are under investigation by the U.S. Department of Homeland Security's Office of Inspector General(OIG Complaint Number: 0403210).

RELATION TO LOCAL PLANNING & SUSTAINABILITY

- #1 - "The applicant will serve as the coordinating body to identify and resolve policy terms and practices between the local plans and the IRWMP."
- #2 - "In addition to extensive coordination with State and federal agencies, over 120 local agencies are represented."
- #3 - "Providing the relationship of specific actions in the IRWMP to specific sections in local planning documents would have resulted in a higher score."

COMMENT: Number 3, by not providing the relationship of specific actions in the IRWMP to specific sections in local planning documents allows the local governments and special districts to control and manipulate water management projects and programs since there is not a lot of public involvement in such matters.

STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT & COORDINATION

- #1 - "More discussion on the stakeholder process related to EJ and DAC concerns would have resulted in a full score."
- #2 - "The applicant provides the forum for conflict resolution and has identified areas of potential conflict with wetlands and within the context of statewide priorities."

COMMENT: Numbers 1 and 2, limiting the discussion on the stakeholder process related to EJ and DAC concerns benefits the applicant and shortchanges the public. Please refer to my comment under RELATIONSHIP TO LOCAL PLANNING & SUSTAINABILITY.

Since my understanding is that the public is also a stakeholder, please note that while the applicant is providing the forum for conflict resolution, I have no confidence in the Watersheds Coalition of Ventura County. Back on January 2005, I submitted a letter to the County Flood Mitigation Plan Coordinator on the Draft Flood Mitigation Plan. I never received a reply. Also in January 2005 I submitted a letter to Anna Davis, URS Corporation, on the County's Draft Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan. I never received a reply. I have notified the Board of Supervisors of this situation on several occasions when addressing other County and Watershed Protection District for the past 2 years to rectify the matter. Instead the County prefers to continue violating the public participation process. These plans were approved by the Board in an incomplete and inaccurate form.

Also, in 2006, I addressed the FEMA/County of Ventura/Nolte current Draft Preliminary Flood Insurance Study(FIS), and Preliminary Flood Insurance Rate Maps(FIRMs). To date, I have not heard from FEMA or the County. The Study was terribly flawed--inaccurate and incomplete. Some of the FIRMs had errors. For example: One FIRM had a major reservoir/dam mislabeled.

For 7+ years, I have addressed the City of Simi Valley Preliminary Base Budgets. For most of that time, I have been the only person present at the Budget staff/public meeting. Two such meetings used to be held. Then, it was dwindled down to one meeting. The citizenry had at least 7 days to review the Preliminary Base Budget between the time

the documents(3 or 4) were release and the meeting was held. For the 2006 Budget staff/public meeting, the days were dwindled to less than a week. Not enough time to review all of the information, nor cross-reference the Budget with other pertinent documents. Per City staff request, my comments have been submitted in writing. In 2006, even though I missed the Budget staff/public meeting, I still submitted my written comments. To date I have not received a reply. Without answers to my questions, I am in the dark about local, state and federal funding, projects, and programs. Many times, due to the close scrutiny, I have saved City staff's faces, and my City money with my suggestions and recommendations. Sadly, those who run the City of Simi Valley prefer to violate the public participation process. In 2005, I was asked by the Budget staff at the meeting to defer from finishing reading the rest of my FY 2005-2006 Preliminary Base Budget letter.

If I'm not mistaken the City of Simi Valley (WWD#8), and the County(Watershed Protection District) are members of the Watersheds Coalition of Ventura County.

The aforementioned plans, study and maps are crucial to the Integrated Regional Water Management Program. Without complete and accurate documentation and records, the data is flawed, and thus its management is negatively impacted--mismanaged.

The State of CA legislators, and members of Congress that I have written to also don't ca much care about what I tell them.

With the escalation of natural disasters, and biblical catastrophic proportion ones impacting the Nation more often, FEMA does not have the capital, the personnel, nor the expertise it once used to in order to help out the local, tribal, county, state, and federal governments.

Some insurance companies, for policies issued in the U.S. coastal areas, are substantially increasing home and business coverage rates.

Some insurance companies are refusing to issue policies in some of the coastal areas.

Only time will tell if insurance companies substantially increase rates for policies in inland areas that continuously flood from levee and dam breaks, and poorly maintained and built drainage projects. Or that policy holders will no longer be covered because they didn't prepare or prevent damage to property, or loss of life.

Already the U.S. DHS Secretary has placed the blame on the citizenry, to counter federal government incompetence, or blame is placed on the apocalyptic catastrophe.

WORK PLAN

#1 - "The proposed projects are summarized and overall the application addresses the criterion well."

#2 - "Each of the eleven projects is discussed including the goals and objectives, tabulated overview, maps, synergies and linkages, budget, permitting and CEQA, project status, and what is to be built or performed."

#3 - "Plans and specifications were submitted for four of the proposed projects."

COMMENT: In future PROPOSAL EVALUATION forms, provide the project(Example: C-11) breakdown for all categories instead of just giving the number.

#4 - "Seven projects are still in conceptual stages, preliminary design stages, or pilot project phase."

COMMENT: In future PROPOSAL EVALUATION forms, provide the project(Example: SC-3) breakdown for all categories instead of just giving the number.

Also, breakdown the projects per stage and/or phase.

- #5 - "Tasks are clearly described with expected outcomes, but there is not much discussion on how the individual projects will accomplish overall goals of the IRWMP."

COMMENT: By limiting the discussion on how the individual projects will accomplish the IRWMP's overall goals the applicant benefits, and the public is shortchanged. It shows why proposed projects can be picked in order to just generate additional revenue. Limited discussion leads to someone else, like members of the public, to do the cross-referencing of documents in order to connect the dots and determine if proposed projects are vital, and feasible.

- #6 - "More detail on how the work, including construction, will be performed is needed in the work plan."

COMMENT: Limited detail on how the work will be performed benefits only the applicant, and shortchanges the public's input since too often it is difficult for citizens at the fringes to visit the Public Works Agency to review records, records' copying costs can be prohibitive, and work plans are not posted with Board of Supervisors' Agenda Items staff reports.

Unless a proposed project requires a 4/5ths vote, cities city councils and the county Board of Supervisors agendas don't have to list them under public hearings. Thus, no public notice in the newspapers.

Sometimes it is difficult to access the City of Simi Valley City Council, and Ventura County Board of Supervisors agendized items on their websites because the information cannot be displayed for circumstances beyond local governments'

control, and circumstances that can be under their control.

Close scrutiny by the public is imperative to make sure that contracts are not just awarded to a particular business, or individual, and that contingency fees are not unreasonable, or awarded too often.

BUDGET

- #1 - "The budget items generally agree with the work plan and schedule."
- #2 - "The budgets for all of the proposed projects have cost information by task and the costs are considered reasonable."
- #3 - "...it is difficult to review the detailed budgets without more narrative explanation."
- #4 - "The construction contingencies for Projects C-1, C-3, and C-7 need more explanation."
- #5 - "O&M costs are included for some projects."

COMMENT: Numbers 1-5, for years I have found it extremely difficult to understand and cross-reference the County of Ventura, and special districts' budgets because of the very statement under #3. When there is more narrative explanation for Board agendas items' staff reports, the pertinent detailing is lacking. Unless the reader is aware of, and well versed about, the subject in question, the limited information is a detriment to public participation, and to the scrutiny by the State and federal government agencies.

While the statements under numbers 1 and 2 are welcome, because of the statement under #3, numbers 1 and 2 seem to be in conflict to this reader with the overall conclusions since numbers 3, 4, and 5 outweigh

"generally agree" and "budgets for all of the proposed projects have cost information by task and the costs are considered reasonable."

SCHEDULE

- #1 - "Six of the 11 projects are scheduled to be implemented before December 1, 2007."
- #2 - "The schedules are consistent and generally reasonable."
- #3 - "...some schedules appear overly optimistic. For example, Projects C-11 and SC-3 have construction start dates in October/November 2006, yet design and permitting are not complete."

SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL MERIT

- #1 - "The applicant has documented each project thoroughly with the associated studies or plans that support the technical and scientific merits of the proposal." ***(County/Flood/FEMA plans)
- #2 - "Included in the supporting documents are plans, design alternatives and studies, and required CEQA documents or permits." ***(C/F/F plans)
- #3 - "...more explanation in the application how the references were applied to a specific proposed project would have provided assurance of the projects technical feasibility."

MONITORING, ASSESSMENT and PERFORMANCE MEASURES

- #1 - "The Monitoring, Assessment, and Performance Measures tables provide a concise description of reasonable means to achieve or contribute to the project goals and targets for each goal of the individual projects."

#2 - For most of the other projects procedural assurance protocols are to be included in the funded activities."

COMMENT: No! Assurances must be stated in the IRWMP.

When the City of Simi Valley submitted its application to the FEMA for Hazard Mitigation Grant Program for the Regional Stormwater Detention Basins Project, their urgency in stemming flooding was highlighted. Out of the six basins (the application may have been for 11 dams but due to City staff not making past documents available--employees see no benefit in revisiting history--I cannot say for sure; the number of basins was discussed in the 1990 City of Simi Valley Master Plan of Drainage. Not all development projects were guided by this document. For Example: The Wood Ranch development--within the area of inundation from the Bard Reservoir/Wood Ranch Dam--'s drainage planning was undertaken with each proposed project. Thus, significant negative cumulative impacts are not well documented, nor reasonable.

Around the middle of the 1990's, then Mayor Greg Stratton wrote that City staff would not be answering my City's Preliminary Base Budget questions because the information would be forthcoming at the time projects were undertaken. Such has not been the case.

Even though the Joint Water Well project between the City of Simi Valley and the Calleguas Municipal Water District has been mentioned at City Council meetings, and the project information has been included in the CMWD's Urban Water Management Plan, to date there have no public hearings on the issue.

ECONOMIC ANALYSIS

#1 - "The quality of the economic analysis and supporting documentation is good."

#2 - "WWD recycling project(250 AF) are not included."

#3 - "Benefits claimed are less than costs, but a variety of benefits claims are conservative."

COMMENT: Please clarify this evaluation statement.

#4 - "For example, reduced salinity for households and Calleguas/Camarillo feeder avoided costs are not included and the use of fines as a proxy for water quality benefits probably understates the benefits."

COMMENT: Please clarify "the use of fines as a proxy for water quality benefits probably understates the benefits."

#5 - "The economics of the two most costly projects depend on a larger planned project that includes a brine line and six groundwater desalters."

COMMENT: This reminds me of a City of Simi Valley City Council meeting for HUD Community Development Grant Program funding allocations when one social services provider's application was contingent upon another social services provider's application being funded, and questionable practices by this provider--that jeopardized its non-profit status--would have been funded if the questionable information had not been disclosed in time.

This is also so reminiscent of the City of Simi Valley's Municipal NPDES Permit mitigation measures(construction of detention basin 1-11 joint project with the County).

PROGRAM PREFERENCES

#1 - "Overall, the projects implemented should provide multiple benefits, improve regional water supply reliability, contribute to attaining water quality standards, address impaired water bodies, and improve groundwater water quality in a DAC."

COMMENT: The evaluation statement is only true as long as the projects are undertaken, and undertaken as the applicant's IRWMP states, and that the applicant has been above board throughout the entire proposal(s) process.

#2 - "The Calleguas Creek projects integrate salt management, riparian habitat improvements, water reuse facilities, and water treatment plant improvements."

COMMENT: Please note that I opposed the Current FEMA/ County of Ventura/Nolte Preliminary Flood Insurance Study(FIS), Preliminary Flood Insurance Rate Maps(FIRMs) did not cover the entire City of Simi Valley. It only undertook the Calleguas Creek Watershed up to the City's westernmost boundary. The Federal Emergency Management Agency relied on the City's previous FIS and FIRMs, but there were also problems with them. Thus, my written opposition to them in 1996. One of the main points of contention was the FIRM that did not correctly name the Las Llajas Creek; it was labeled as a canyon.

#3 - "The purpose of some activities is to meet regulatory requirements, such as salt and nutrient loadings, TMDLs, and address impaired water bodies on the 303(d) list."

COMMENT: For years, at least as far as the City of Simi Valley is concerned, Municipal NPDES Permit requirements were not met due to various excuses--equipment not functioning correctly, anyone could access the refrigerators where samples were kept because they were not combination or padlocked, and to aid the Rockedyne for its Santa Susana Field Laboratory's surface, ground and drinking water impacts--and waiting for the Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board rules decisions.

Then, the fear factor relative to the costs associated to deal with the TMDLs was touted

by City Council members to the constituents in order to avoid complying with the LARWQC Board approved rules.

The City of Simi Valley City Council approves the use of its special districts' and special fund accounts to pay for all sorts of things. Since redevelopment projects generate huge revenue for City government, Municipal NPDES Permit projects have taken a back seat since 1992--the year that the City Council approved the request of the County to allow detention basin fees under the then Flood Control District(now Watershed Protection District)'s Benefit Assessment Program; a few years later, the City's Director of the Public Works Department(now the Director of the County's Public Works Agency) informed the City Council that the District had no such funding mechanism in place. Yet, these are those illegal assessment fees because no public hearings took place at the County and cities levels. Yet, the City of Simi Valley City Council approved the use of special districts' funds to purchase property for its regional mall.

Also, the City did not hold public hearings on the regional stormwater detention basins project. The North Simi Drain Regional Stormwater Detention Basin, and the Dry Canyon Regional Stormwater Detention Basin were instead listed under the Agenda's Consent items section. The residents adjacent to the Dry Canyon Regional Storm Water Detention Basin were not notified about the meeting by the County or City. I went around the neighborhood notifying them.

- #4 - "Removing septic systems and installing lines to a WWTP will help to meet RWQCB requirements and improve the local water resource, including those of a groundwater dependent DAC(El Rio)."

STATEWIDE PRIORITIES

#1 - "Documentation is comprehensive and thorough."

COMMENT: Some of the evaluation counters this.

#2 - "The certainty of meeting Statewide Priorities will depend on obtaining required permits and completion of unfinished project design and subsequent work plans."

COMMENT: It must also depend on the truthfulness, and thoroughness of the applicant.

#3 - "Some conflicts between water users will likely be reduced from those projects that increase water supply, particularly the C-1, C-11, and V-1 projects."

COMMENT: Likelihood is no insurance.

#4 - "The Calleguas Watershed projects demonstrate, at a minimum, a moderate degree success in meeting floodplain management, desalination of groundwater, or recycling priorities."

COMMENT: Compliance with the NFIP is not guaranteed because the degree of success that the projects will bring is "moderate" even when they are the "minimum".

#5 - "Benefits to Delta and the CALFED Bay-Delta Program are claimed but are not expected to be significant or certain."

#6 - "Surface water right conflicts are only marginally addressed."

COMMENT: Simi Valley resident Ginn Doose has been kept from being heard in State and Federal court in order to record the Writ of Possession for over a decade. She was defrauded of her home through a intricate web of corruption and conspiracy by the governments and corporate America because her property is tied to water rights.

JORDAN QUESTIONS

1. Does each "Question" have a different scoring range? If so, how many points can be awarded under each "Question"--I notice that some scores range in single digits, and others are in the teens and twenties?
2. Does the DWR review final IRWMPs to monitor that applicants have followed through on what was stated in the PROPOSAL EVALUATION form?
3. With regards to "decision-making will be responsive to regional changes", and "project sequencing may be altered based on implementation responses"--points 1 and 3 under Priorities and Schedule--are these responses related to answers to submitted public review period comments on projects?
4. Who fills out the "PROPOSAL EVALUATION" form--DWR staff members, or the staff of a contractor?
5. Is the Website created by the applicant to disseminate the data included under the County and its cities' Websites "Links" section? Will the cities have this link on their Websites?
6. Is an applicant required to set up a data disseminating website by law? If so, is this website supposed to be perpetual? Will there be an "Archives" section?
7. Will an applicant's "coordinating body" status impact negatively the public hearings process at the cities and county levels? Is such a body legally authorized to resolve policy terms and practices between the local plans and the IRWMP?
8. Is the "City/County Planning Association"--that meets monthly--associated with the Calleguas Creek Watershed Management effort land use subcommittee? Is this related to the Calleguas Creek Watershed Management Plan Group?
9. Are applicants allowed to delete, defer, and/or modify their projects for which funds were applied and allocated?

10. Does the State have a monitoring program in place for the projects that receive funding?
11. Can applicants submit future applications to cover the costs of projects already submitted and grant funds approved for?
12. Are unused approved grant funds supposed to be returned to the State, or is an applicant allowed to use the moneys toward other water management projects that are not part of the application?
13. Is providing the relationship of specific actions in the IRWMP to specific sections in local planning documents a State code requirement?
14. Are submittals of plans and specifications for all proposed projects a State code requirement?
15. Is the PROPOSAL EVALUATION's "Total Proposal Score" the only determining factor as to which applicant is chosen for funding in each grant program round? Or, does the amount of matching funds also enter into the picture? Do red flag statements--such as not enough detail or discussion--carry any weight in choosing which applicants are funded?
16. How are schedules determined to be "consistent"?
17. How are schedules determined to be "reasonable"?
18. How are proposed projects related costs determined to be "reasonable"?
19. How is the "quality of the economic analysis and supporting documentation" determined to be "good"?
20. Should "WWD recycling project(250 AF)" have been included? Were they not included because recycling projects costs being shouldered by the development community(for water fountains, open space), or existing and new businesses(such as golf courses), park districts(duck, or fishing ponds, aesthetic streams) to benefit from recycled water use?

21. Should it not matter that benefits to "Delta and the CALFED Bay-Delta Program" are not expected to be significant or certain"?
22. Why were groundwater rights not included along with "surface water right conflicts" under the Statewide Priorities" Question?
23. Are grant program applicants supposed to certify the information in their applications--as is the case for HUD CDBG Program applicants?
24. How are the applicants and the DWR reaching out to the legally blind community to inform them about the IRWMP at the local and state levels?

JORDAN SUGGESTIONS

- #1 - Include on the "PROPOSAL EVALUATION" form the date that it is filled out.
- #2 - Include on the "PROPOSAL EVALUATION" form the name of the individual(s) that filled it out. If Agency staff, if name is not feasible, then give the name of the Department. If an employee of a contractor did the evaluation, then give the individual's name, or the contractor's name.
- #3 - Include a number with each "Question" instead of just listing the subject.
- #4 - Include the name of the proposed project(s) instead of just giving the number.

Mr. Snow, under the "Objectives" Question evaluation, the statement is made that the "applicant defines success as when individual projects meet their goals and cumulatively contribute to IRWMP objectives." Success must also be measured by accurate and complete documentation, and compliance with the public participation process. Not only is success important, but so is the protection of the bond funds in light of the SEC's changes to limit shareholder--in IRWMP case "stakeholder"--litigation, and compensation awards. Then, too, the SEC has no authority to take on municipal bond fraud.

For example: Back in 1991, the City of Simi Valley fraudulently levied the Royal Corto Assessment District fees on 63 homeowners at the cost of about \$20,000 for a period of 20 years in the Griffin Homes "Greenbriar" housing tract project. State law required a City Council 4/5ths vote, and the vote was 3-0. Homes in this area that have not paid off the assessment, and are resold carry that illegal assessment. The Ventura County Grand Jury first questioned my bringing the issue forward because I was not one of the homeowners, but agreed to look into the matter when I mentioned that a family member was among the 63 homeowners. The Grand Jury found no problem.

Mr. Snow, who ever made the proposal evaluation for the Watersheds Coalition of Ventura County did an exceptional job (agency staff, or contractor employee), even though I have noted shortcomings in my letter. It is not an easy task cross-referencing documents in order to see whether or not applicants comply with set laws, and guidelines.

Mr. Snow, due to the length of this letter, I am not including copies of my January 20, 2005 letter to the Ventura County Flood Mitigation Plan Coordinator, nor my January 26, 2005 letter to Anna Davis, URS Corporation. That information is available through the County of Ventura Website's Board of Supervisors Agenda section for March 1, 2005. If you prefer, I can forward that documentation along with a copy of my letter on the FEMA/County of Ventura/Nolte current Preliminary Flood Insurance Study (FIS), and Preliminary Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRMs).

Sincerely,

Mrs. Teresa Jordan

Enclosures:

March 1, 2005, Ventura County Board of Supervisors
Meeting Agenda, Correspondence Agenda Items 3 & 6.

February 1, 2007, Letter to Mr. David Todd, Chief
DWR Financial and Technical Assistance Branch.
(5 Pages)