

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [BoardComment](#)  
**Subject:** Comments for April 8 2021 CSD Board meeting  
**Date:** Thursday, April 8, 2021 11:53:47 AM

---

Comments for today's CSD Board meeting. Please include in the public record. Thanks, Osssana.

#### 5A. Discussion and Consideration of Rescheduling the Dates for the Six Month Strategic Plan Review with Marilyn Snider

Rescheduling to when? How about Never? The board has already torpedoed Goal 1, to Increase and Improve Communication with the Public, by reducing opportunities for the public to comment at meetings. It's not as if a crowd of people attend and comment. But fewer opportunities mean fewer critical comments, insulating the board from scrutiny. An example of how this can stifle public comment was the discussion of changing the name of the Emergency Water Supply Project. By allowing public comment only before the board discussed the new name, all the Cambrians who had something to say focused on names that, in the event, weren't even under consideration. The board chose a different name entirely, one that wasn't mentioned in the agenda. It's exactly the kind of misleading sleight of hand that convinces the public that they can't trust the board. What about the goals of Achieve and Sustain Adequate Financial Resources to Fulfill the Mission and Develop and Implement a Long-Term Infrastructure and Resources Plan. Changing the name of the Emergency Water Supply Project won't reduce the continuing financial drain of that project. Instead of a new name for an old mess, take the advice of last year's strategic advisor, to whom the district paid about \$100,000 of the district's financial resources, and rewrite the EWS Coastal Development Permit project description to serve existing users only during drought. As he noted, that's a bar the district might be able to meet, rather than the current description for growth. The district's application remains only 13 percent complete, seven years after the plant was built and eight months after a sketchy permit application was filed. The goal of Achieve a Balanced Policy for Growth and Resources is defeated when the board allows staff to approve new construction permits, against the Local Coastal Plan and the Building Moratorium. The permits then go through the county on their way to eventual denial by the Coastal Commission. Which is so frustrated with the district that one Coastal Commissioner suggested putting up a billboard saying, "Don't believe these people." Unless Ms. Snider can connect the board to the serious problems the district faces, and convince the board to act, you may as well save the money. Apply it to improving forest health with a forest manager, helping Cambrians' protect their homes against wildfire, and the constant expense of fixing broken rusty water pipes.

#### 5B. Discussion and Consideration Regarding the Implementation Report Relating to the Renaming of the Facility Formerly Known as the Sustainable Water Facility (SWF) to the Water Reclamation Facility (WRF)

#### COMMENTS

I thank the staff for enumerating the many places in which the name will need to be changed, and the board for doing this in a public meeting, unlike the previous name

change, which was done by staff without public discussion. This table illustrates the complexity and confusion changing the name of the Emergency Water Supply Project will cause. Please, as Dr. Bettenhausen suggests, table this item. Thank you.

6A. Public Comment: The President will be asking for Public Comment before the Reports

Please provide the reports and their dates in the agenda so that the public can make informed comments on their substance. Again, I support Dr. Bettenhausen's suggestions. Departmental reports are usually given in the second meeting of the month. Are these reports deferred because the board was unable to complete its agenda at a previous meeting? Providing the information would assist the district in meeting its Strategic Plan goal to Increase and Improve Communication with the Public, as mentioned earlier. Thank you.

--

Christine Heinrichs

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Ossana Terterian](#)  
**Subject:** Board Meeting 4/08/2021  
**Date:** Wednesday, April 7, 2021 7:49:51 AM

---

Please read at public comment

Hello Board

Time to reopen CCSD and standing committees meetings in a public setting at the Vets Hall this item needs to be put on your agenda. California

will demolish the color tier so business can resume prior to June per our Governor. All restrictions will be lifted

thank you

Cheryl McDowell

MEMO

DATE: 7 April 2021

TO: CCSD Board of Directors; Ossana Terterian; John Weigold

FROM: Elizabeth Bettenhausen

SUBJECT: Agenda Item 5.A., 5.B., and 6.A. on 8 April 2021

Here's the context for my public comments on the next page.

**Mauna Loa: Carbon Dioxide Levels 1974-2021**

Year	CO2 PPM
2020	418.56 (June 1)
2015	404.84 (April 14)
2010	394.23 (April 17)
2005	383.99 (May 1)
2000	373.51 (April 20)
1995	365.18 (June 2)
1990	358.15 (May 6)
1985	350.08 (May 18)
1980	342.38 (May 17)
1975	334.63 (May 14)

9:42 AM · Apr 5, 2021

144 19 Copy link to Tweet

The doubling of atmospheric CO2 is [expected](#) to increase Earth's temperature by 2.6 to 4.1°C above preindustrial averages, a level of planetary heating that would "rul[e] out more modest warming scenarios," as the *Post* noted.

[https://www.commondreams.org/news/2021/04/06/we-have-act-atmospheric-co2-passes-420-ppm-first-time-ever?cd-origin=rss&utm\\_term=AO&utm\\_campaign=Daily%20Newsletter&utm\\_content=email&utm\\_source=Daily%20Newsletter&utm\\_medium=Email](https://www.commondreams.org/news/2021/04/06/we-have-act-atmospheric-co2-passes-420-ppm-first-time-ever?cd-origin=rss&utm_term=AO&utm_campaign=Daily%20Newsletter&utm_content=email&utm_source=Daily%20Newsletter&utm_medium=Email)

**1. Item 5.A. Discussion and Consideration of Rescheduling the Dates for the Six Month Strategic Plan Review with Marilyn Snider**

- Why is this review necessary? What is its purpose?
- Why would scheduled monthly updates and discussion be insufficient to meet that purpose?
- What makes a 6 month review worth the stated minimum of \$5,150 plus staff time?

**2. Item 5.B. The attachment, List of Impacts, on p. 5, describes a considerable expenditure of time and money that accomplishes pervasive change of wording for no clear and compelling purpose. Please **table this agenda item or take no action.****

**3. Item 6.A. "6. BOARD MEMBER, COMMITTEE AND LIAISON REPORTS**

**"A. Public Comment: The President will be asking for Public Comment before the Reports"**

- Does this mean before any of the reports is given or before each report is given?
- Where are the written reports? The Agenda packet does not include them. Thus I am not able to make a comment on any of these reports.
- Why not ask for public comment after each report is given and before discussion of that report by the Board begins? Members of the public would have read the reports in the Agenda packet (if they are published) and listened to corrections, changes, explanation in the oral presentation by the member of the staff. This would make public comment more well-informed.

**Please insert this memorandum into the public, written record of the meeting. Thank you.**

**Elizabeth Bettenhausen**

**Full-time resident of Cambria since 22 March 2002**

**[REDACTED]**

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [BoardComment](#)  
**Subject:** comment for today's meeting 3/8/20121  
**Date:** Thursday, April 8, 2021 11:14:25 AM

---

I had sent in a comment before, but it did not seem that it went through. I am resubmitting. I apologize if you received multiple emails.

Below is a final edited version to be submitted for the meeting today, which reflects today's agenda.

Thank you.

### What's in a Name?

Comments for April 8, 2021 board meeting, Agenda Item 5B

#### Name Change

At the March 11, board meeting, the directors discussed a proposed name change for the facility originally known as the Emergency Water Supply (EWS), subsequently called the Sustainable Water Facility (SWF). They proposed and voted unanimously to rename the facility the Water Reclamation Facility (WRF). They directed the staff to prepare a report about the feasibility and costs associated with the name change.

Board members said they proposed the name change because:

- The current name, the SWF, is a politically loaded term
- The community pushed back when the EWS name was changed to the SWF due to lack of input from the community on the name change
- The name of the facility should reflect what the facility does, not what we want to use the water for.

It is puzzling why, if board members know that there is pushback from the community on the name SWF because the community was not involved in that decision, the board would propose another name change with no community involvement. Also puzzling is why they

would choose the name Water Reclamation Facility as less politically loaded than Sustainable Water Facility. One could just look to other communities using that name, such as Morro Bay, and see it is equally controversial. In fact some board members discussed that one may not want to use the words “reuse” or “reclaim” as one might not want to focus on that aspect of the facility.

I do agree that the name should reflect what the facility does. And what it does right now, is sit and wait for a level three emergency, only being activated periodically to maintain it. Therefore the name Emergency Water Supply does describe both what the facility does and what the water is used for. “Function” and “use” are synonyms, so I do not understand why the board is making a distinction. Therefore I, like some of the commenters at the March 11 board meeting, think we should use the original name, Emergency Water Supply (EWS) to refer to the facility. That is what is permitted, what the facility is used for and what it currently “does.”

The Sustainable Water Facility (SWF) is the name on the Coastal Development Permit (CDP) application. It is premature to even call the facility that other than when referring to the facility as outlined on the CDP application. That application is to run the facility during the dry season so that we will not have to wait for a stage three emergency, to *sustain* us through a drought. That name was given to differentiate the facility from its current emergency permitted use to the proposed use in the CDP application. As that application process is only 13 percent complete, even the use of SWF to refer to our current system is premature and causing confusion.

For example, our bill originally had surcharges for the EWS, then it was referred to as the EWS/SWF, now it is referred to as the SWF. We have a charge that appears as “SWF water base charge” and another that appears as the “SWF water usage charge.” When the EWS/SWF is operated, we will be charged a SWF water operational charge. The SWF base rate is a fixed fee, while the usage and operation charges are based on each customer’s overall water consumption since it is not possible to tell how much water we are each using from the system. Therefore, currently it appears we are being charged for water we are not using as the system only is used when we are in an emergency level 3. The money actually goes to the repayment of the loan, any capital expenditures and maintaining the system. It would be more transparent and less confusing to simply call the charges Emergency Water Supply surcharges or assessments to pay for an Emergency Water

Supply.

If it is premature to call the facility the SWF, it is definitely premature to call it the WRF or anything else. I propose that the district and board go back to using the term EWS and change the billing to reflect that we are paying for an Emergency Water Supply. Two of the board members expressed an immediate urgency to change the name and did not even want to give staff time or opportunity for input. No mention was given at all of gathering community input. The staff report includes 15 areas that will be impacted by the name change but yet to outline any fiscal effects. It seems that the name change was decided arbitrarily and I hope the board will consider the staff report and public comment and not change the name at this time.

In short, the facility should be called what its permit reflects, the Emergency Water Supply, EWS, internally, externally and on our bill. The SWF should refer to the facility as outlined on the CDP application. Any other name changes should be discussed after the CDP and with public and staff input.

Thank you,

Susan Mackey

Cambria Community Member, Constituent and Ratepayer

Get 

What's in a Name?

Comments for April 8, 2021 board meeting, Agenda Item TBA; RE: Agenda Item 4. C at the  
March 11, 2021 Meeting - Name Change