

From: noreply@getstreamline.com
To: [Haley Dodson](#)
Subject: New form submission assigned to you: Written Public Comment
Date: Monday, February 20, 2023 8:46:47 AM



Written Public Comment

First Name:	Linda
Last Name:	Prentiss
Address:	[REDACTED]
Email:	[REDACTED]
Written Public Comment:	Please consider allowing 50 Water Meter holders to build each year for two years to test the effect on the water supplies. THANK YOU
Written Comment to be read at::	PROS Commission
Written Comment to be read at::	Board Meeting
Written Comment to be read at::	Finance Committee Meeting
Written Comment to be read at::	Policy Committee Meeting
Written Comment to be read at::	Resources & Infrastructure Committee Meeting

[Reply / Manage](#)

From: [Holly Ludwigson](#)
To: [BoardComment](#)
Subject: Public Comment CSD Board meeting March 9, 2023
Date: Monday, March 6, 2023 6:34:29 PM

Please read this during public comment on topics NOT on the March 9, CSD meeting agenda. Thank you.

>>

>>> I would like to request that the acting general manager of CCSD annually review the existing social media policy (policy 2415 approved by CCSD on 9/16/2021) with members of all standing committees. The social media policy outlines approved guidelines regarding commenting and posting on social media sites about CCSD business by “District employees and District officials, as well as consultants and contractors performing work on behalf of the District” as stated in the policy’s Purpose.

>>>

>>> I feel a formal and annual review of the existing social media policy with members of standing committees is warranted based on posts and comments containing mis-information and unsupported allegations that show up on Next Door and local Facebook sites by some standing committee members

>>>

>>> Two examples come to mind: Mis-information by a Finance Committee member about components of the most recent Prop 218, and the recent accusation by a policy committee member that CCSD is influencing community members’ trash bin choices in order for CCSD to benefit financially.

>>>

>>> In the interest of CCSD board transparency and greater community involvement, I cannot understand how standing committee members’ incorrect social media posts/comments could be anything but harmful to community members’ understanding of current CCSD concerns and projects, besides being in violation of the CCSD policy on Social Media communications.

>>>

>>> I recognize how tantalizing it is to speak from an “official” position having “insider” information, but sharing misunderstood/prejudiced, and incorrect information on social media sites is dangerous.

>>>

>>> Since the current and approved CCSD Social Media Policy policy appears to be consistently observed by Board Members, but not by all committee members, an annual review of the policy with standing committee members could be beneficial.

>>>

>>> Thank you.

>>>

>>> Holly Ludwigson

>>> Homeowner, small business owner and full-time resident of Cambria

Sent from my iPad

From: [JAMES TOWNSEND](#)
To: [BoardComment](#)
Subject: March 9th Agenda Item 5C
Date: Thursday, March 9, 2023 9:15:01 AM

President Dean and Members of the Board:

I am writing to encourage the board to adopt the draft Code of Ethics policy contained in agenda item 5C on the March 9th, 2023 agenda. The Policy Committee, of which I am a member, reviewed and considered a number of "Codes" adopted by a wide variety of California Special Districts. We found the model CSDA code identified as Policy 1030 to be clear, comprehensive, and non-threatening to any honest elected or appointed official.

I appreciate the board's consideration of this issue, and support its adoption.

Thank your your service and the opportunity to provide this comment.

Jim Townsend

From: [Crosby Swartz](#)
To: [BoardComment](#)
Cc: [Karen Dean](#); [Tom Gray](#); [Debra Scott](#); [Harry Farmer](#); [Michael Thomas](#); [Ray Dienzo](#)
Subject: Public Comment 3-9-23 Agenda Item 5.B Water Meters
Date: Thursday, March 9, 2023 11:54:49 AM

We have several questions and comments about the information in the agenda package for this item.

What is the expected service life of the Neptune water meters?

Will the meters use internal or external antennas?

Will the external antennas be visible or accessible to the customer?

What is the radio frequency transmitter power of the meters?

How long will it take to install the new meters? Residential vs commercial.

Some of this meter replacement project should be on a pay-as-you-go basis. If the purchase and installation of the meters can be scheduled over more than one fiscal year budget, less financing and interest costs will be needed.

Thank you for your consideration and response to my comments.

From: [Michael Calderwood](#)
To: [BoardComment](#)
Subject: Code of Ethics
Date: Thursday, March 9, 2023 8:30:20 PM

While it describes a lengthy list of behaviors and desired behaviors it lacks any detail on who/what/how each member will be judged. Who determines if the member is acting as described? What is "due process" in real terms as it applies to this code? The document is very nice, aspirational, and thoughtful. But it has no real meaning beyond that without detailed, clear and enforceable oversight. If this is adopted, what changes?

1030.14 Enforcement:

Any Official found to be in violation of this Code may be subject to Censure by the District Board, subject to any required due process. Any member of any advisory Committee found in violation may be subject to dismissal from the Committee. In the case of an employee, appropriate action shall be taken by the General Manager or by an authorized designee.

Michael Calderwood



From: [Christine Heinrichs](#)
To: [BoardComment](#)
Subject: March 9 2023 Written Comment
Date: Friday, March 10, 2023 9:15:40 AM

Hi, Haley --

Here's my comment from yesterday. Thanks!

Item 5A: PUBLIC COMMENT:

I'm most curious about the progress of the Coastal Development Permit for the EWS/SWF/WRF.

By the way, I've been asked not to refer to it that way, but I will continue to use all three, because the public is confused by them. Most Cambrians don't follow district activities very closely. They elect directors and expect them to lead local government responsibly. That's not unreasonable, and I look forward to joining them some day.

However, many Cambrians do not understand that all three names refer to exactly the same project. Confusing the public may not have been intentional, but it has been one result of the name changes. Including all three names is my effort to make clear that it's the same project.

The board may want to scrutinize the progress of the EWS/SWF/WRF Coastal Development Permit application. Does the board want to move this permit application forward? The past three years suggest not. That's the effect of the efforts thus far.

Mr. Dienzo's reports to the December Resources & Infrastructure Committee and to the board at its regular December meeting were so confusing that even Vice President Gray, who in the past was employed by the district as Public Information Officer to explain the plant to the public, was uncertain of what the report meant. He acknowledged that it is understandable that the public would be confused. He and three other board members and several members of the public asked for clarification. The January Utilities Report included two diagrams in response. Neither includes deadlines or specifies who is responsible for each step.

The update also pushes completing the CDP application into the second quarter of 2023, with a revision of the project description. What changes are anticipated to the project description? Is the board considering revising the project description back to its original goal, providing service for existing users only, instead of for growth?

The update refers to the Instream Flow Study data, which is now posted to the district's website, although confusingly labeled Draft – As of 2/21/2022, but the actual document is the Final dated January 2023. The public could again be pardoned for being confused. When can the board and the public expect Mr. Yates to give a report in person and explain the findings?

Last year, the board hired Merk Associates to complete the biological surveys, by

September. Mr. Dienzo acknowledged the importance of that work at the December 12 meeting. Six months after the deadline, he has not explained why the work is not done, or when the board can expect it to be done. The biological reports posted are the ones that were inadequate, and the reason Merk Associates was hired, for \$83,000.

Two directors have pressured me to stop asking for answers to why this work has not been done. I ask the board why they accept these delays.

It's been three years, the acting general manager promised the application would be completed by the end of 2022, and the board has no clear explanation for why it isn't done. Mr. Dienzo has been promoted to Acting General Manager. Observers could reasonably conclude that the board is satisfied with delay rather than progress. That's where it stands now.

Funding for the Vets Hall gets two entries, one about a grant denied and another about other possibilities.

The \$12 million Wastewater Treatment Plant improvements now have their own Financing Oversight committee, consisting of two board members and two staff members, no members of the public, as on the Finance Standing Committee. I hope we are not back here in a couple of years with money spent but projects left undone.

--

Christine Heinrichs