

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Haley Dodson](#)  
**Subject:** please have this read at todays meeting public comment  
**Date:** Monday, November 9, 2020 7:33:37 AM

---

Hello Board

Friday November 06,2020 the California Coastal Commission made a ruling on an applicant that the CCSD issued an intent to serve.

All Commissioners voted denial

.....

We have no new water and it appears that this commission will continue to deny any and all intent to serve No permits to build will be issued.

CCSD General Manager and Legal Counsel need to adhere to these rulings and follow protocol of the LCP. CCSD is inviting litigation by

applicants on the water wait list by issuing Intent to Serve notices.

I hereby ask the CCSD Board to resend the CDP as written it is not for growth.

Thank you very much.

Cheryl McDowell

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [BoardComment](#)  
**Subject:** November 9 Special Meeting comments  
**Date:** Sunday, November 8, 2020 5:45:53 PM

---

Good morning, Haley --

I won't be able to attend this morning's meeting, so please read my comments into the record for me. Thank you.

9 November 2020

I ask the board not to approve acceptance of this grant. While the APCD grant of \$8,977 is welcome, the district must pay over \$13,000 to have it installed. The district is strapped for funds for critical infrastructure. Spending this money at this time cannot be justified.

In the future, if the district acquires electric vehicles and needs a charging station for them, it would be appropriate to install a charging station. The CSD is a water, sewer, fire district. It is not in the business of providing power to vehicles.

I support the goal of reducing carbon emissions. The district is in an excellent position to be a leader in that area. However, electric vehicle charging stations to serve the public are a step outside the district's purview.

This grant application came before the board in July, when two grants were in the offing, and the district's commitment was \$10,000. Now, there's one grant, and the district's commitment is up to \$13,000. The GM claims those costs can be recovered, but I'm not assured that the numbers he presents are accurate or realistic.

The grant offer letter is dated November 2, asking for a response within ten days. This item could have been added to the regular meeting agenda for November 12, avoiding the costs to the district for an extra meeting, payment to the directors and AGP Video.

At the July 16 meeting, not either of the June meetings, this grant application was narrowly approved by a 3-2 vote. One of those three votes in favor was Director Steidel, who before the vote asked that the grant applications be withdrawn, saying "Let's just kill this," suggesting her support is less than enthusiastic. This project lacks public support and has only the minimum of board support. Stop it now.

This is another example of the general manager reaching beyond his authority to push the edges of what he can do. When he presented the board with a project description for the Sustainable Water project for growth, after being directed to describe the project for existing users only, the board failed to act to require that to be revised. Now this project. He explained at the July 16 meeting that the board would have an opportunity to decide whether to fund it later. This is later. The answer should be No.

--

Christine Heinrichs