

SUMMARY OF PUBLIC COMMENTS PROVIDED  
DURING THE DECEMBER 7, 2021  
PLAN FOR WATER WORKSHOP #2

00:12:47

*Q: Jeff Litton* - Asked if the Hydroelectric presentation was better suited for a regular Board meeting since most people showed up for the Plan for Water.

*R: Jennifer Hanson* - The Plan for Water is a time-certain item that begins at 4:00 p.m. She apologized that the "time-certain" was not listed on the agenda and noted that the Plan for Water workshops would usually be paired with a Department Update or Project Update.

01:03:07

*C: Jeff Litton* - Suggested NID begin doing land acknowledgments at public meetings. He acknowledged that this meeting is taking place across traditional, unseated lands of the greater Nisenan Nation, who lived on the lands of the Yuba, Bear, and American River watersheds and continue to live in and celebrate these watersheds today.

01:09:18

*C: Resa Huck and Laura Beeman* - Agreed with Director Hull's comments regarding a master calendar for meetings, outreach, and public communications.

01:36:01

*Q: Harvey Ross* - Asked how NID views current required in-stream flows, near-term changes to in-stream flows due to new FERC requirements, and actual Watershed functional flows that an attentive Watershed Steward would maintain even if there were no regulatory requirement?

*R: Jennifer Hanson* - We need to make sure that we're accounting for all flows to ensure that we're meeting regulatory requirements. We're trying to implement our future ramping requirements early. We are cognizant of our watershed, and we want to be good stewards. We also have a very high obligation to ensure we're accounting for everything.

*R: Chip Close* - During the FERC negotiation process, NID made a conscientious effort to increase our contributions to the watershed, which is why you see the FERC flow rates going up in almost every area. It is important to measure accurately, not only from a regulatory perspective but also from a water rights accounting perspective.

*R: Jennifer Hanson* - We need to ensure enough water for customers and health and safety. We have a significant revenue component associated with hydropower that allows us to have lower rates. We have water rights obligations we are required to

report on and obligations to the watershed we live in. We take our stewardship very seriously.

01:55:23

*C: Harvey Ross* – Commented on the District's definitions of recoverable and irrecoverable flows in context to District diversions, water rights, and functional watershed flows for stewardship. He stated that, from the watershed context, all flows are recoverable that are not diverted out of it, in general.

*R: Chip Close/Jennifer Hanson* - The words we use may be offensive from a watershed perspective. It is not meant to be. We track every drop of water to ensure we're moving water for our customers, for hydropower purposes, and our water rights. Our terminology used in this accounting exercise doesn't speak to the value of the watershed. It's just our technical aspect of accounting for and reporting the water.

02:03:28

*Q: Harvey Ross* - Asked how much water is annually conveyed in The South Yuba and Chalk Bluff Canal?

*R: Chip Close* – It varies from year to year based on hydrology. We get close to maximizing the facility in the high 70's cfs flow range during the summer. We don't need the flows for consumptive uses in the winter months, and PG&E runs the facility much lower during winter operations, reducing the flow to approximately 30 cfs.

02:20:26

*Q: Diana Suarez* - When will NID initiate the new minimum in-stream flows in Bear River since there is a commitment to watershed stewardship?

*R: Chip Close/Jennifer Hanson* – The Plan for Water Process that we're going through right now will help guide us and how much water we have for the future and how much the in-stream flows affect our operations. This process gives us a better picture of NID and its supply and demand and will better inform those in-stream flows.

02:21:40

*Q: Harvey Ross* - Drum Canal design and operational capacity flows are not shown. What are those? What is the flow that is typically conveyed?

*R: Chip Close* – It is a PG&E facility, and we do not have all the design specs.

02:34:08

*Q: Bob Branstrom* – Would you repeat where the water for Grass Valley comes from?

*R: Chip Close* – The water for the City of Grass Valley is supplied through the District's BS canal, which comes out of Scott's Flat reservoir. It's supplied by the Deer Creek and the South Yuba canal.

02:38:08

Q: *Harvey Ross* - Is Grass Valley in the District or out of the District?

R: *Jennifer Hanson* - Technically, it is out of the District. There is a very old agreement by which we wholesale water to Grass Valley, and they treat the water. The difference between in-District and out-of-District for NID is from a fiscal financial perspective. Out-of-District does not pay property taxes, but they do pay a higher municipal rate. It is not likely that we would ever not be serving water to Grass Valley.

02:39:27

Q: *Bruce Herring* - Was the Combie Reservoir recreation originally intended for private use only?

R: *Jennifer Hanson* - We will have to research to respond to the question.

02:40:14

Q: *Diana Suarez* - Where does the water from the Combie powerhouse go after generating power?

R: *Chip Close* - The Combie North powerhouse is utilizing the water that's being put into our Combie Phase One canal, so it's our consumptive demands that are spinning up that generator. When there is excess flow, run of river flow, we'll put those flows into our canal, but we're also dumping out of the canal and putting it back into the Bear River.

02:41:48

C: *Harvey Ross* - Commented that in addition to a fiscal perspective from Grass Valley and Nevada City, not being in the District, they also don't participate in our elections. In order for a new area to be included in the District, they have to go through an annexation process, which requires a number of items, but one of the most important is the tax sharing agreement with the city in which the territory they're annexing out of and into, as well as approval by LAFCO.

Mr. Ross also commented that redistricting should address Grass Valley.

R: *Jennifer Hanson* - Unfortunately, until they are annexed in, redistricting couldn't address Grass Valley, but that is certainly a point of consideration if they were ever to annex in because it would sway the population balance.

02:44:59

C: *Otis Wollan* - Stated it would be helpful if NID did an equal presentation on PG&E's Drum Spaulding system because the waters are co-mingled everywhere, and the District purchases water from the Drum system. It would be useful as you look at the next 50 years, in coordination with PCWA, at managing the Drum system and its south fork watershed waters.

*R: Director Hull* - That could be brought up as one of the investment opportunities that the District needs to consider as part of the future instead of going through it as a presentation.

*R: Chip Close* - This is something we had thought of way back when we redid the coordinated operating agreement in 2013. That agreement spells out what would happen if there is a transfer of the facility, and that NID is protected.

02:48:00

*Q: Mr. Feldman* - Asked when it would be appropriate to ask a question about structural and maintenance adequacy, how the planning for maintenance or deferred maintenance, and how you assess risk for earthquake, fire, and storm damage?

*R: Jennifer Hanson* - We do have some significantly high-risk facilities from a damage perspective that need to be planned for. We could use a full meeting on risk to our facilities. This is something that is warranted to have a deeper conversation about, especially in consideration of the South Yuba Canal.