From: [redacted]
To: BoardComment
Subject: August 20 meeting
Date: Thursday, August 20, 2020 1:56:46 PM

Here's my comments for today. I'll be at the meeting to read them.

August 20 meeting comments

Item 4B

I ask the board to remove Consent Agenda Item 4B Consideration to Adopt the July 16, 2020 Regular Meeting Minutes and June 25, 2020 and July 20, 2020 Special Meeting Minutes for separate consideration.

Please review the video of the June 25 meeting. The process itself was too confused to support any action, certainly not advancing a controversial project description and CDP application for the expensive EWS/SWF. Even board members did not understand the process: at first, they were assured by counsel that they would not take a vote on advancing the application, because the public had not been adequately notified. Then, they were informed that they could take exactly that action simply by doing nothing! Certainly a violation of the spirit of the Brown Act, informing the public about the public's business.

And the No Action option is not adequate for this important document, with the changes that have never been adequately discussed. The change from an Emergency Facility to a project for growth is important, because allowing new connections based on the imaginary increase in available water will start Cambria on the road to more water shortages. The reason for an Emergency facility was lack of adequate water. Adding new users changes the numbers, but leads Cambria to that same situation: not enough water for residents. Allowing the permit application to go through to the county for approval without vetting this issue is not acceptable.

The Minutes of that meeting are not adequate in reporting what happened. A future reader would not know what to make of the long list of Cambrians and others who commented, followed by the conclusion:

> The Board of Directors held an extensive discussion regarding this item. The Board of Directors received the report from staff and reached concurrence to direct staff to proceed with the permit process.

This argues again for the board to have its own secretary who would be responsible for reporting complicated issues such as this one. Perhaps Director Rice, an experienced writer, would be willing to summarize that part of that meeting.

Of the 40 people who commented, twenty-two mentioned water security. This revised description, for growth, does the opposite. It assures that Cambria will face water emergencies again. Seven mentioned fire protection. This project costs so much that Cambria doesn't have money for the water tanks and reservoirs that would actually provide fire fighting water. This plant does not. It provides treated wastewater available over a six-month timeline. You can't plug in a hose and start fighting a fire.

I ask the board to review that meeting, revise the Minutes, and withdraw the Project Application, now under Information Hold at the County, until the issues can be discussed, the Project Description revised to an Emergency Project and the required studies have been done to support it.

Item 7C

The EWS/SWF Project Description for the CDP application is now under Information Hold, awaiting nine pages of items that are missing from the application. One that has often been discussed, which I do not understand well, is the requirement for In-Stream Flow studies. My understanding is that this is required to establish how much water is flowing in the streams. That would require measuring the flow year-round, since the flow varies substantially depending on the time of year. The amount of flow is especially significant to allow steelhead to migrate up and down the stream, to and from the ocean. I have heard that it can be done in a month, that it will be done in August, that it will take a year, that the plant needs to be operating, that the plant should not be operating. It appears to me that baseline data of how much is flowing normally is needed before operating the plant, in order to determine what effect the plant has on the stream flow. Please provide full information on what is involved in the In-Stream Flow Studies and when they will be conducted. Thank you.

--
Christine Heinrichs

From: [redacted]
To: BoardComment
Subject: conservation
Date: Wednesday, August 19, 2020 9:56:35 AM

The time to take conservation measures is BEFORE our water reserves get low. The CCSD has my permission to direct our water usage NOW, not later. Also, are there grants given to water districts to help homeowners pay to re-plumb our degraded pipe
systems in the older homes and businesses? That would insure less water leakage. Charging us more for water is not the only way
to encourage conservation. Give us a specific plan — it's worked before!

Lauren Younger

From:	[redacted]
To:	Harry Farmer; Cindy Steidel; Amanda Rice; Donn Howell; David Pierson
Cc:	John F. Weigold IV; Haley Dodson
Subject:	Revised Minutes for 25 June 2020
Date:	Saturday, August 15, 2020 6:48:09 PM
Attachments:	sunset21 July2019 _20190721_201349Park Hillsunset21 July2019 .JPG

CCSD Directors:

The revision of the Minutes for the meeting on 25 June 2020 Item 4.B. sets a new standard for contra-transparency.

"The Board of Directors received the report from staff and reached concurrence to direct staff to proceed with the permit process."

To derive concurrence from chaos evidences creativity of the most imaginative sort.

Elizabeth Bettenhausen
Cambria, CA
[redacted]

sunset21 July2019 _20190721_201349Park Hillsunset21 July2019 .JPG