From: [redacted]
To: BoardComment
Subject: March 17th CCSD Board meeting, Agenda Item 8B
Date: Wednesday, March 16, 2022 5:56:41 PM

Dear President Howell and Members of the Board:

I am writing today to suggest that the Cambria Community Services District refrain from initiating a Prop. 218 rate increase on the good people of Cambria until and unless it can deliver on the commitments made to ratepayers during the 2014 Prop 218 process, which significantly raised rates to support the development of the then-called Emergency Water System, currently known as the Water Reclamation Facility.

Since 2014, CCSD has spent millions of ratepayer dollars on the WRF project, and in seven years, has been unable to complete even a *permit application* to operate the facility, other than in a declared drought emergency. It is becoming painfully clear to the residents of Cambria that the CCSD is not currently capable of managing a complex capital project such as the WRF. We don't really know what it cost to build, we don't know what it will cost to operate, both in dollars and environmental impacts (assuming it ever gets permitted) and we don't know how much water it might actually produce. All we have are "studies" and "computer models," like the ones that gave us the failed brine ponds.

I understand the need for improvements to both the wastewater treatment plant and our water delivery infrastructure, and that those improvements will be expensive. But the CCSD should not burden ratepayers with significantly higher water and sewer rates until it can justify, via actual results, the money spent on the still-unpermitted WRF.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

Jim Townsend
Cambria, CA

From: [redacted]
To: BoardComment; Donn Howell; Karen Dean; Cindy Steidel; Harry Farmer; Tom Gray; John F. Weigold IV; Ray Dienzo
Subject: Public Comment on 3-17-22 Agenda Item 8.A. WRF AMP Report
Date: Thursday, March 17, 2022 12:31:53 PM

- We have reviewed the Adaptive Management Report and the Todd Groundwater Modeling Technical Memorandum and we have the following questions and comments.
- On page 4 of the Todd Report (Agenda page108) it states "Annual CCSD water demand in normal years is 700 AFY". This water demand, adjusted for conservation measures, is used for all model runs. We recommend adding additional model runs to simulate the effects of existing water demand by existing customers compared to projected future demand by projected future customers. This information is necessary to evaluate the impact of future pumping on the aquifer.
- On page 5 (Agenda page 109) it states "60 percent of water injected at RIW1 is available for extraction by municipal wells SS-1 and SS-2 (per CDM Smith, 2014)". The referenced CDM Smith report states "If the emergency alternative is operated for only a period of 3 months, all of the water produced by wells SS-1 and SS-2 would originate from the basin, since the reinjected water water would still be intransit from the recharge well ... ; between 160 and 200 days half the water would originate from the treated water recharged to the basin ...; the percentage of recovery would increase for longer durations." Please clarify how much water will be recovered by the municipal wells and when it will be available.
- On page 13 (Agenda page 117) it states "The amount of SWF injection can be adjusted to exactly meet the target minimum SS-4 / 9P7 (9P2) gradient." The operation or non-operation of the SWF (WRF) should not be determined by the SS-4 / 9P2 gradient. As in the past, this gradient is controlled by operating the 9P7 Gradient Control Well to lower the water level at the percolation pond.
- On page 13 (Agenda page 117) it states "groundwater flow in deep model layers became landward in the summer of year 1 and remained landward until December of year 2. The gradients were small, but the condition persisted for 16 months. That condition could potentially cause seawater intrusion." Please verify that the water salinity at wells 9P4 and 9P7 are not adversely affected by seawater intrusion during dry months. The report's use of annual flow averages does not identify shorter term seawater intrusion problems, which can affect WRF operation and Warren Ranch irrigation water.
- Thank you for your consideration of my comments. Crosby Swartz

From: [redacted]
To: BoardComment
Subject: Re: Item 8A on March 17th Agenda, Adaptive Management Plan Annual Report
Date: Thursday, March 17, 2022 12:55:30 PM

Dear President Howell,
The Biological Report by Cindy Cleveland in regards to the impact on protected species (Steelhead trout, Tidewater Goby and Red-Legged Frog) is very limited in scope. The period of the study was short (less than a year), based on qualitative observations, and concluding that "the baseline data shows stable habitats for sensitive species."

The Biological report siting the presence of all life stages of Steelhead trout and California Red-Legged Frog is just that - the presence. It does not take into account the actual populations present, nor their fluctuation over the years. The populations of these protected species in and around San Simeon Creek have drastically declined over the years, and my concern is that this report is a snapshot of a short period of time, with no regard to the long term effect on these species from all the water demands (agricultural, human and environmental) put upon San Simeon Creek and its watershed. Stating that the baseline data shows stable habitats for the sensitive species disregards the limited time range of baseline data and ignores the long term impact and decline on these species populations over the decades.

My hope is that the California Department of Fish and Wildlife, as well as U.S. Fish & Wildlife agencies will not just focus on this short study to determine impact on the AWP, but look at the long term impact on these species that are struggling to survive in and around San Simeon Creek amid all the demands on the watershed.

Respectfully,
Bob Fountain
Cambria resident