

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: noreply@getstreamline.com
To: [BoardComment](#)
Subject: New form submission received: Written Public Comment
Date: Thursday, February 16, 2023 10:54:33 AM



Written Public Comment

First Name:	Lauren
Last Name:	Younger
Address:	██████████
Email:	██████████
Written Public Comment:	<p>When I was on the policy committee, we were told to consider only what the board of directors wanted us to consider. We had community members attend the meetings, but they were told to give their comments to the Board of Directors, not us, since we were there for the board only. As the policy committee discusses things, the community members should be able to comment (some have useful perspectives). Also, it might be reasonable for the policy committee members to be able to inform community members of the pros and cons regarding their suggestions so their suggestions can be altered appropriately for board consideration. This may already be the case. If so, disregard my comments. Thank you.</p>
Written Comment to be read at::	Policy Committee Meeting

[Reply / Manage](#)

From: [Holly Ludwigson](#)
To: [BoardComment](#); [Ray Dienzo](#); [Karen Dean](#); [Tom Gray](#); [Harry Farmer](#); [Michael Thomas](#); [Debra Scott](#)
Subject: Policy Committee non-agenda item public comment for Feb 23, 2023
Date: Wednesday, February 22, 2023 2:02:45 PM

Please read this during public comment on topics NOT on the Feb 23, 2023 Policy Committee meeting agenda.
Thank you.

> I would like to request that the acting general manager of CCSD remind the Policy Committee members about the existing social media policy (policy 2415 approved by CCSD on 9/16/2021) that 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 that show up on Next Door and local Facebook sites by standing committee members with mis-information and unsupported allegations.

>

> Two examples come to mind: Mis-information by a Finance Committee member about components of the most recent Prop 218, 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 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 committee members could be beneficial.

>

> Thank you.

>

> Holly Ludwigson

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

From: noreply@getstreamline.com
To: [Haley Dodson](#)
Subject: New form submission assigned to you: Written Public Comment
Date: Thursday, February 23, 2023 2:40:59 PM



Written Public Comment

First Name:	Jeff
Last Name:	Wilson
Address:	[REDACTED]
Email:	[REDACTED]
Written Public Comment:	<p>Thank you President Dean and Board members for taking my comments. As I've become more informed and engaged with various aspects of CCSD governance the past 6 months, including regular Board Meetings and PROS, I have observed several themes that I believe indicate the need for policy and process improvement. First theme is a general lack of trust and transparency of CCSD in the community. My observation is this is not subject to debate, it's simply a fact and needs to be overcome. It's unacceptable and unsustainable to have such a level of angst, animosity and apathy in our community towards our governing body. Second theme, related to #1, is there is significant confusion about policy and process within the Board and its advisory committees, in all manner of business. I observed this with the Mission Country Waste rate subject. Again with more recent processes and discussions related to fire department equipment purchases of roughly \$150,000 for the protective equipment and command vehicle, and in particular the \$500,000 for the Type 5 fire engine. For expenditures of that level, which should be specified clearly in procurement policy, the Board should be presented with at least 2 options, ideally 3; a clear financial analysis of those options with acquisition options (cash, financing, or other); the overall pros and cons of</p>

each option; and a preferred option recommended and why. This is basic governance and due diligence, and should be clearly spelled out in CCSD Policy. I see this coming as well in the current debate about ZLD with GWI. You simply can't decide on this, even a pilot, without looking at other ZLD providers and other solutions, preferably driven by an RFI and RFP. process. Lastly, in looking at the checklist of Policies included in the agenda packet, many areas lack policy or are in major need of updating, so I applaud and support an exhaustive review.. I'm no expert on this, but I'm not convinced an internal review is appropriate and will yield the improvements in trust and transparency I know you all want. I believe it would be appropriate to at least consider a LAFCO Municipal Service Review to accomplish your objectives. This is the organization that formed CCSD originally and last conducted an MSR in 2014. I realize there's a lot of history in all this going back decades, but it's time to clean the slate with a third party review and recommendations to update and tighten CCSD Policies to the current realities for CSD governance. Thank you!

**Written
Comment
to be read
at::**

Policy Committee Meeting

[Reply / Manage](#)