

**From:** [noreply@getstreamline.com](mailto:noreply@getstreamline.com)  
**To:** [BoardComment](#)  
**Subject:** New form submission received: Written Public Comment  
**Date:** Wednesday, December 21, 2022 8:28:53 AM



## Written Public Comment

<b>First Name:</b>	Linda
<b>Last Name:</b>	Prentiss
<b>Address:</b>	[REDACTED]
<b>Email:</b>	[REDACTED]
<b>Written Public Comment:</b>	Please consider allowing 50 building permits for each of the next 6 years with requiring reconsideration every other year with input from the Water District a foremost consideration.
<b>Written Comment to be read at::</b>	PROS Commission
<b>Written Comment to be read at::</b>	Board Meeting
<b>Written Comment to be read at::</b>	Policy Committee Meeting
<b>Written Comment to be read at::</b>	Resources & Infrastructure Committee Meeting

Reply / Manage

Powered by [Streamline](#).

**From:** [mahala burton](#)  
**To:** [BoardComment](#)  
**Subject:** Comment for resources infrastructure meeting  
**Date:** Monday, February 13, 2023 11:13:15 AM

---

Please read this at the meeting today.

Attention Members of the Resources and Infra structure Committee  
Regarding the test pilot project for ZLD.

I request that the committee vote NO to approve this project instead refer the entire plan to the full CCSD board of directors elected to represent my interests. This project has been out of the purview of the elected CCSD board of directors and public and it is that body the Board who makes decisions not the district engineer who refers to the project as “our “ project. The community has the right and interest to see a presentation not by Zoom and have all technical and financial questions answered. CCSD committees are advisory to the CCSD board of directors they are not empowered to make decisions that the CCSD is bound by .

This project is rife with fatal flaws and to entertain using any of our staff resources and CCSD money from ratepayers is irresponsible. Permitting and lack of money to name a few fatal flaws .

The overarching issue is we are not permitted to do any such project because the Water Reclamation Facility the WRF is for emergency use only in a drought . In the past the CCSD has engaged in failed test projects all begun with good intentions but with dismal failures . Test wells at San Simeon beach , test wells at Santa Rosa natural preserve that I have been involved in. The boondoggle of the untested brine pond only used previously in hot inland areas not foggy coastal area.

After reading the test project material (difficult to acquire even with public document requests ) it is apparent there are other sites with permitted water facilities the promoter GLOBAL WATER INNOVATIONS GWI is seeking for their testing and the CCSD in the future once we have a fully permitted WRF could use that tested technology if it is a proven remedy for brine disposal.

Thank you,

Mahala Burton  
Cambria homeowner ratepayer

*M Burton*

**From:** [Crosby Swartz](#)  
**To:** [BoardComment](#); [Karen Dean](#)  
**Subject:** Public Comment on R&I 2-13-23 Agenda Item 2.C. Pilot Project  
**Date:** Monday, February 13, 2023 1:07:23 PM

---

We have the following questions about the Global Water Innovations pilot project.

- How many hours per day will the project be running?
- How many gallons will be processed during the project?
- What temperature will be used for solvent gasification?
- What is the heat source for the gasification process?
- What does "PFO" membrane stand for?
- The Osmotically Assisted SWRO Process is classified as "Trevi Proprietary". This raises questions about the availability and cost of replacement PFO membranes for a future commercial scale project. Comments?
- Please provide details of the cost calculation that WRF brine waste can be purified at a cost of \$.025 per gallon.