

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Ossana Terterian](#)
Subject: Comment January 14 meeting
Date: Thursday, January 14, 2021 2:02:36 PM

Hi, Ossana --

I will have comments in Public Comment and Item 5A:

Public Comment:

The district plays a significant role in the county process of granting new construction permits. The important point is for Cambria to assure the county that there's enough water to serve new customers. There isn't.

The district has allowed staff to approve two more permit applications, Hadian and Bookout. They will be heard at SLO County Planning public hearings on January 22. I urge board members and the public to attend and oppose these permits.

The Hadian permit is essentially identical to one that has already been denied by the Coastal Commission, as have many others approved by the district such as Orellana and Settini. This continuing flow of approved permit applications has frustrated the commission. I hope you all have watched the video of the November 6 Coastal Commission meeting, at which one commissioner, so frustrated with the district for requiring commission staff time and effort on these bogus permits, suggested getting a Cease & Desist Order against the district or posting a billboard in Cambria saying Don't Believe These People.

Incidentally, that meeting also provided another perspective on the district staff's claims that the district has a good relationship with the commission. Not to hear the commission tell it!

The Coastal Commission has already told the district and the county that these permits are likely to be denied by the Coastal Commission, should they get that far. I ask the board members, as individuals, and any Cambrians so inclined, to attend these public hearings and recommend that the department deny them.

5A Discussion and Consideration to Reconstitute the Ad Hoc Committee Working on the Coastal Development Permit and Expand Its Scope

This is certainly an important issue. Director Farmer has asked that the board review the CDP application and change the name, from the Sustainable Water Facility back to its original, Emergency Water Supply Project. That would also involve revising the project description, from addressing "a buildout of approximately 4,650 residential units, including both existing connections and CCSD-approved wait list customers)" back to the original emergency permit condition, which specified "existing authorized water connections only to abate the emergency, not to serve new development."

The district is struggling to meet the requirements of the CDP permit application. As the district was notified on August 14, the application is incomplete and requires many documents before it can be processed at the county level. Your staff has told you that this is normal and the application is not incomplete, but according to the county, it is.

Despite claims to have the required information and documentation, the district has submitted nothing in response to the August 2020 Information Hold except a request for another six months delay.

Among the issues the district has no response for are:

Inadequacies in the Adaptive Management Plan

Lack of clarity as to mitigation for impacts to Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Area

Letters of concurrence from state Fish & Wildlife, US Fish & Wildlife, State Water Resource Control Board and other relevant agencies.

The diversion amount from San Simeon Creek

Noise levels when operating

Feasibility study of impacts on ESHA that includes constraints analysis, and analyze alternative locations.

And more in the nine pages of requirements. Utilities Manager Dienzo has proposed studies to evaluate Instream Flow, but the Coastal Commission has raised questions regarding his proposal to perform Tasks 1 and 2 concurrently. Senior Environmental Scientist Tom Luster said without completing Task 1, which would identify whether there is water available for the SWF, and if so, how much, it doesn't seem likely that Task 2 would have a valid basis for proposing how the SWF would operate, what timing and volume restrictions it might have, and so forth. Completing the instream flow study appears to be a necessary step before successfully accomplishing Task 2.

I strongly ask the board to appoint a committee that would allow the public to attend meetings and be fully informed of the progress of this important permit. How do you propose expanding this ad hoc committee's responsibilities? It appears that the CDP application, already stalled for nearly six months, should be the sole focus of their attention.

--

Christine Heinrichs

From: [REDACTED]
To: [BoardComment](#)
Subject: Public Comment for the Board Meeting 14th January 2021
Date: Wednesday, January 13, 2021 2:44:26 PM

To the Board Secretary,

PUBLIC COMMENT

I am submitting the information below for the CCSD Board meeting on Thursday the 14th January 2021.

Good Afternoon Directors,

I would like to know the status relating to the blowers that were previously installed at the brine pond. Is there an active plan to dispose of these blowers and if so what steps have been taken? It seems to me that at this time of year there should be a potential demand from ski areas? I have noticed that having been removed these blowers are being stored at the waste water treatment plant out in the open where they continue to rust away. Would it not be wise to at least cover these with a tarpaulin which would be a cheap way to protect the investment?

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Tony Church,

[REDACTED] Cambria, CA 93428

[REDACTED]

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows 10