

Public Comments for Tuesday March 25th Board meeting received by April 25, 2023, at 1500

Received 04/24/2023 at 0309 From Marilyn Tyler

Public Comment for 4/25/2023 CVWD Board Mtg: Action Item 2 Property Roll Tax --- Intentional Omission? Intentional Misstatement? Request to the Board

[1] [INTENTIONAL OMISSION?]

At the previous CVWD Board Meeting on 4/11/2023, during discussion of the Prop. 218 Notice for the proposed property-related tax, I was relieved to hear several Board members express concern about the large amount (minimum \$400) being proposed. Director Erikson wanted to know the community's reaction to this proposal, so he directed Staff to provide a summary of the remarks made by the public at the two CVWD public outreach sessions which were held on 4/4/2023.

Yet in the Agenda Packet for the upcoming CVWD Board Meeting on 4/25/2023, for Action Item 2 "Proposition 218 Notice," no such summary of public remarks made at the two outreach sessions is provided. Instead, all that is provided is a repeat of the public emails received by CVWD prior to the 4/11/2023 CVWD Board Mtg. Did Staff conveniently forget to include the public remarks from the two public outreach sessions on 4/4/2023, to downplay the strong reactions from the community? To encourage the Board to approve the Prop. 218 Notice as is?

[2] [INTENTIONAL MISSTATEMENT?]

In the Agenda Packet for the 4/25/2023 CVWD Board Meeting, for Action Item 2 "Proposition 218 Notice," James Lee, Director of Finance and Administration, states the following: "As part of its ongoing "Roadmap" discussion, the District **implemented** annual rate increases of 8% in 2022, 2023, and 2024, 7% in 2025, 2026, and 2027, and 6% in 2028 and 2029." (From "Subject: Supplemental Study for Determining a Capital Charge for the District's Long-Term Pipeline Replacement Program," April 18, 2023, emphasis added by me.) I believe this statement is incorrect, or at the least misleading to Board members who were not around when this was proposed. The sequence of 10 years of rate increases was NOT IMPLEMENTED---only the 3 year rate increase of 8% per year for 2022-24 was sent to the community in a Prop. 218 Notice. (In fact, the community as a whole is unaware of this 10-year schedule of proposed rate increases.) I believe Mr. Lee used the word "implemented" rather than "proposed" in describing this 10-year schedule to get the Board used to the idea of future large rate increases and more amenable to approving them.

[3] REQUEST TO THE BOARD

Please take a cold, hard look at how much funding for pipeline replacement is actually needed each year. The massive funding efforts which have been (i.e., bonds, 10-year schedule of rate increases) and are being (i.e., property-based fee) proposed are based on an attempt to fund the "Pyramid Pipeline Replacement Schedule" developed by Director of Engineering David Gould in 2021. (See Engineering Committee Agenda Packet for 4/20/2021 Agenda Item 1 "Discussion of Long-Term Pipeline Replacement Schedule" by David Gould.)

But when Director of Engineering David Gould was directed to come up with his "Pyramid Pipeline Replacement Schedule" in 2021, he was NOT asked if the resulting schedule was feasible. Based on

David Gould's previous comments, I believe he would say the "Pyramid Pipeline Replacement Schedule" was physically do-able but NOT FEASIBLE. For example, the "Pyramid Pipeline Replacement Schedule" ramps up to a pipeline replacement rate of 2.5-3 miles per fiscal year, yet David Gould has previously stated that the public is seriously disturbed if more than 2 miles of pipe is replaced per year. The "Pyramid Pipeline Replacement Schedule" proposes replacing over 2 miles of pipe per year for TWELVE of it's twenty-year schedule.

Historically, I believe that even with increased funding (e.g., bonds) CVWD has yet to replace more than 1.3 miles of pipe per year. **Please consider a more realistic schedule of pipeline replacement and a more realistic level of funding.** (For example, see the "80-Year Replacement Cycle" proposed by my husband Scott Tyler, an aerospace engineer, and myself, as described in two Public Comments for the CVWD Board Meeting on 4/27/2021: "Public Comments mt" and "Public Comments Replacement Schedule (Scott's analysis of David Gould's pipeline data)". Note that our "80-Year Replacement Cycle" can be achieved by gradually ramping up to 1.7mi and remaining at that rate thereafter. Just a suggestion! 😊)

Received 04/24/2023 at 0357 from Marilyn Tyler

Addendum To My Public Comment for 4/25/2023 CVWD Board Meeting

I want to clarify some comments I made in "[3] Request To The Board":

The objective of David Gould's "Pyramid Pipeline Replacement Schedule" is to ensure that pipes originally laid in 1947-1967 are replaced at or before their 75th anniversary (i.e., "75-year replacement cycle").

The "80-year replacement cycle" proposed by my husband and me would relax the 75-year requirement and replace pipes at or before their 80th anniversary.

But in any case, [to the Board]: **Please consider a more realistic schedule of pipeline replacement and a more realistic level of funding!**

Received 4/24/23 at 0430 From Marilyn Tyler:

More Addendum (Addenda?) To My Public Comment for the 4/25/2023 CVWD Board Mtg:

As stated in "Public Comment mt" for the CVWD Board Mtg on 4/27/2021:

"(My husband) Scott's analysis (which covered ALL pipe put into the ground from 1947 to 2021 and spanned the fiscal years from FY2022-FY2062 to make sure there was no build-up of aging pipe) showed the following:

- An 80-year replacement cycle can be achieved by replacing 1.70mi/year from FY2026 onward
- An 82-year replacement cycle can be achieved by replacing 1.55mi/year from FY2026 onward
- An 85-year replacement cycle can be achieve by replacing 1.40mi/year from FY2026 onward
- A 78-year replacement cycle can be achieved by replacing 1.9mi/year from FY2026 onward

These results show the Board it has viable options besides an aggressive 75-year replacement cycle."