

**PLUMAS COUNTY FLOOD CONTROL & CONSERVATION DISTRICT**

1834 East Main Street, Quincy, CA 95971

Telephone: (530) 283-6268

May 8, 2014

Carl Torgersen, Deputy Director, State Water Project and  
Lead DWR Negotiator for the Contract Extension Project  
Department of Water Resources  
PO Box 942836  
Sacramento, CA 94236

Subject: Objective 4 – Contract Extension Project – State Water Project

Dear Mr. Torgersen:

This letter responds to your letter, same subject, of April 2, 2014.

It is also noted that the AIP and Legal Review Teams have apparently completed their work in the preparation of the Final Draft Agreement in Principle (AIP), dated 5/6/2014.

The AIP drafting team has essentially reinforced the segregation of Objective 4 from the process that is the subject of the AIP by stating that the “Objective [ 4 ] will not be a part of the SWP contract amendment based on this AIP.” As previously stated, Plumas County officials oppose the segregation of Objective 4 from the process embodied in the AIP now being drafted.

Furthermore, as stated at Public Negotiation Meeting No. 22, Plumas County would not object to the current drafting of the AIP drafting if DWR quickly selected a new facilitator, thus enabling the vetting of Objective 4 before the environmental review process is completed.

The implementation schedule set forth in your April 2<sup>nd</sup> letter is excessively drawn out. It is capable of being accomplished in a more expedited fashion. This is demonstrated by the fact that the process for Objectives 1 – 3 proceeded much more quickly than the time ranges that are projected for Objective 4. To date, DWR has not even demonstrated a good faith effort toward initiating the proposed additional process. With regard to Objective 4, the North of Delta aspect certainly does not require the length of time indicated in the proposed timeline.

The time consuming process set forth in your April 2<sup>nd</sup> letter likely thwarts the ability of any State Water Contractor that has desired, since April 2013, to have Objective 4 considered and vetted and included in the environmental review process that is about to commence. This is most troubling, since every previous attempt to discuss options to address Objective 4 during the negotiation process were dismissed.

Carl Torgersen, Deputy Director, State Water Project and  
Lead DWR Negotiator for the Contract Extension Project  
May 8, 2014  
Page 2

Plumas County officials re-assert that the de facto deletion of Objective 4 at this time requires discussion and action at a new Public Negotiation Meeting.

Plumas County officials note that Butte County officials have also made assertive statements that oppose the present course of action. Unfortunately, DWR and the AIP drafting team leave Plumas County no alternative other than refusal to sign the AIP document in its present form.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Robert A. Perreault, Jr." with a stylized flourish at the end.

Robert A. Perreault, Jr.  
Plumas County Lead Negotiator,  
Contract Extension Project

cc: David B. Okita, State Water Contractors, Inc.  
Paul Gosselin, Butte County