Regular Public Comment
- Not on the agenda -

From: [redacted]
To: CMO_BoardFeedback
Subject: public comment for item not otherwise on the meeting agenda - 5/3/2021 SMC BoS meeting
Date: Monday, May 3, 2021 2:41:55 PM

My name is Clara Jaeckel, and I live and work in Redwood City. I'm a member of Many Journeys Metropolitan Community Church in San Mateo, and of Faith in Action Bay Area. I'm writing to urge you as the Board of Supervisors to keep San Mateo County residents in stable housing by taking action to protect renters at the county level as state programs expire.

I am very concerned about a friend of mine who had a job offer rescinded in March of 2020 when the pandemic hit. She has not been able to find another job since and has gone deeper into debt with loans trying to keep up with her rent. Even so, her landlord has been telling her she will have to leave. I know she is only one of thousands of residents in the county who could be facing immediate eviction or a crushing burden of accumulated rent debt when current protections expire.

Keeping people in their homes is obviously important first and foremost because they deserve it for their own wellbeing and dignity. But if you need another reason to take action, the pandemic shelter at home orders have shown us that we need everyone in the community to have stable housing in order to achieve public health as a group. Current improvements in COVID numbers may allow loosening some of the restrictions, but that doesn't mean that people are immediately getting back the jobs and income that they lost. Allowing more people to become homeless, or to be forced to move out of the area, carries a real risk of spiking infections again. So we need to keep emergency protections in place until there is a true economic recovery for the whole community.

Consequently, I am asking you to protect residents from eviction by these actions:
- Significantly expand local efforts to assist tenants and landlords in applying to the state rent relief programs.
- Pass a resolution and send a letter to the governor about the need for continued eviction protections at the state level.
- Commit to passing an eviction moratorium at the county level, to take effect on July 1, in the event that the state fails to act.

Please take these urgent actions to keep San Mateo County residents in our homes.

Thank you,
Clara Jaeckel

Regular Public Comment
- Not on the Agenda-

May 3, 2021

Mr. Horsley, Sheriff Bolanos, Members Board of Supervisors

San Mateo County deputy sheriffs respond to locations where individuals in the community are in a state of mental health crisis.

April 26th, I attended a meeting hosted by La Honda Indivisible. During the portion where moderators asked about mobile mental health response, Mr. Bolanos, speaking both for himself and the earlier departed Mr. Horsley, showed are misinformed they remain when talking about CAHOOTS in their voices of authority. No, Mr. Bolanos, CAHOOTS are not and never were part of the Eugene Police Department, as you told residents in Mr. Horsley's district. Mr. Horsley, CAHOOTS teams consist of a mental health clinician and EMT, responding to both emergency and non-emergency calls without police. If they observe unanticipated danger, they call the CAHOOTS employee available 24/7 who had triaged the call while sitting in the call center with police dispatchers who transferred the call to him/her. No CAHOOTS employee enters reports into the police report database. White Bird Clinic, for its CAHOOTS service, has a contract with the city. I know this because I picked up the phone and interviewed a CAHOOTS clinician.

Pat Willard, Redwood City

Regular Public Comment
- Not on the Agenda-

From: [redacted]
To: Dave Pine
Cc: CMO_BoardFeedback
Subject: Aw: Say No to the underperforming Active Transportation Plan
Date: Sunday, April 25, 2021 2:35:31 PM

Happy Earthday Mr. Pine,

Let's discuss your latest article and then compare it to your own actions:
https://www.mercurynews.com/2021/04/22/opinion-california-must-accelerate-its-climate-leadership/

quote: "Traditionally, California has been a leader on climate, but now it must be said we have fallen behind others such as the European Union and the conservative government in Great Britain."

California has never been a leader on Climate Change, California has only been leading in marketing efforts. Most of our real numbers are still point upwards and also in San Mateo County.
The creation of PCE gave San Mateo an easy out on pretending to be great on climate. But essentially it's only a accounting trick, because a grid is a grid and power is needed 24/7 not only during pretend-sunshine days.
As long as San Mateo County is importing most of our power, we are polluters, basically just leeching onto the success of other counties. A few accounting tricks don't make us cleaner.
Teslas charged at night still are charged mostly by fossil fuel:
https://www.caiso.com/TodaysOutlook/Pages/supply.html

The perceived victory on the energy front also gave San Mateo and it's cities a great reason not to do anything on the transportation front.
Starting with the Board of Supervisors and the attrocious Active Transportation Plan (SMC ATP) adopted by yourselves just back in February.

The SMC ATP only has maybe 10 miles of actual improvement, and most of that is still only on powerpoint and not really slated for construction.
Actually we don't need construction. To change the transportation world fast and cheap requires $5,000 per mile in paint for simple bike lanes.

If your public works director is roling out the concrete trucks, he is doing it wrong.
Miles of bike lanes can be built at speed and scale in almost no time ... with the necessary leadership, of course.

So, yes Mr. Pine, you are correct, we need better leadership.
Let's start with what the Board of Supervisors can do for the County, don't point your fingers to others with so many sceletons in your own closet.

best regards,
Gerd Stieler

PS.: ... and leave the Maple Street homeless shelter alone. The county doesn't need another >$20 million car bridge through a wetland area.

> **Gesendet:** Montag, 08. Februar 2021 um 22:43 Uhr
> **Von:** [redacted]
> **An:** "Warren Slocum" <wslocum@smcgov.org>, "Don Horsley" <dhorsley@smcgov.org>, "Carole Groom" <cgroom@smcgov.org>, "David Canepa" <dcanepa@smcgov.org>, "Dave Pine" <dpine@smcgov.org>

Cc: "CMO_BoardFeedback" <boardfeedback@smcgov.org>
Betreff: Say No to the underperforming Active Transportation Plan

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Let's start with a little background information:
Transportation = movement of people and goods
Active Transportation = distributes benefits and burdens most equitably
Complete Streets = transportation policy that requires streets to be planned, designed, operated, and maintained to enable safe, convenient and comfortable travel and access for users of all ages and abilities regardless of their mode of transportation.
Cost of Driving = $9,000-10,000 per year and $0.60 per mile

Transportation Equity is:

- **not about disabled people** who need to drive, but the ones that can't drive
- **not about disabled people** who don't want to walk/bike, but the ones that still want to
- **not about elderly people** who don't want to walk/bike, but the ones that still want to
- **not about low-income families** with cars. It's about low-income families without cars.
- **not about house owners**, but about cost-burdened renters
- **not about affluent households** that don't want a car, but households who can't afford one
- **not (as much) about affluent communities** unless they have kids, disabled and elderly
- **not about people riding bicycles** today, it's about the 60% "Interested but Concerned" not riding yet
- **not about recreational cycling** (technically that doesn't count as 'Transportation')
- **not about residential street parking** (also not part of transportation, plus it's also only about cars)

… and about People of Color with the added burden of biased enforcement in mind (often a typical and dangerous side-effect of 'Vision Zero').

in summary:
Low-income, zero-vehicle households, single parent households, cost-burdened renters, seniors age 75+, persons with disabilities, people relying on walking/bicycling/transit, children on their ways to schools and parks.
The goal of Transportation Equity must be to provide everybody the healthiest, safest and best transportation option possible, which is Active Transportation.

The safest option for pedestrians are sidewalks and the only safe option for cyclists are bike lanes. Bike Lanes are called Class 2 or Class 4 bike facilities.
This also fits with surveys staff was doing.
All surveys came back with check marks:
- More Bike Lanes
- More separation from vehicle traffic

Silicon Valley Bicycle Coalition also did surveys coming back with the same findings.
Separation from traffic with class 2 bike lanes are minimum requirement.

However what doesn't work are 'Sharrows' or 'bike routes'. They are neither safe, nor desirable, nor All-Ages-All-Abiliites, nor 8-80s, nor Complete Streets, nor Safe-Routes-To-School, nor Vision Zero.
In reality these "bike routes" or "bike boulevards" are currently the most dangerous thing transportation engineers can do.
They still put kids at the mercy of speeding cars and so they should really just be a few feet here or there, but not for miles.
For example in and around Redwood City, transportation engineers call Jefferson Avenue, Alameda de Las Pulgas or Whipple Avenue "Bike Routes/Boulevards".
No parents in their right mind would put a 8 year old child or their 80 year old grandma onto Whipple or Alameda de las Pulgas and yet your staff is doing exactly that.
The county calls Kings Mountain Rd. a bike route/boulevard and a 69 year old person just died there last year - so it definitely isn't all-ages-all-abilities.
County staff is proposing 102 miles of 'shared bike routes' with cars. This is not safe or modern

traffic engineering and certainly not in sync with San Mateo's 'Climate Emergency'.

During the outreach sessions, staff already made clear that most of those Class IV bike lanes require working together with other jurisdictions and are therefore highly unlikely to happen (e.g. El Camino, Woodside Rd, Bay Rd, ...)
Currently it looks like the county spent $200,000 on consulting to come up with only 16 miles of useful bike lanes.

The County also called out North Fair Oaks as their Equity Focus Area and promised to spent special attention here.
There are at least 5-10 public, charter and private schools around here and yet the team has not put any bicycle lanes around those schools.
If staff was serious about Transportation Equity, Bike Lanes around schools are a minimum expectation, leadership should have.

5-6 foot Bike Lanes are currently the best compromise to set up a fast bicycle network within a Equity Focus Area and around those schools.
Most streets around here currently feature 4 lanes for cars (2 for driving, 2 for residential parking).
When we asked the engineers why they propose expensive "bike boulevards" over cheaper and more useful bike lanes, they threw the Board of Supervisors under the bus.
They said it's for 'political reasons', they assume you - the politicians - lack the political backbone required to replace one of those 4 car lanes with 2 bike lanes.
That is the only reason: lack of political backbone. Is that true?

If the Board of Supervisors cares about health and happiness of its residents ...
If the Board of Supervisors cares about their own "Climate Crisis" ...
If the Board of Supervisors cares about Safe-Routes-To-School ...
... this is the time to show it and send this plan back to the drawing board.

Staff did a lot of outreach, they just didn't listen with Empathy and Equity.
And here is what Toole Design thinks: https://tooledesign.com/theNewEs/

best regards,
Gerd Stieler

Comments for Item No. 5

To: Clerk of the Board of Supervisors
San Mateo County
400 County Center, 1st Floor
Redwood City, CA 94063

I am writing this letter in opposition to the proposed water usage rate increase for CSA7 water users. At this time in particular, the costly increase will pose a .hardship for my family.

California Law AB685 (2012) provides that Californians have access to safe and affordable drinking water. According to the California Department of Health, affordable water means less than 1.5% of household income. The proposed increase would result in water rates of 6% of income, based on a 2016 Survey by CSA 7. This is 4x the maximum as defined by the California Department of Health.

The current proposal by DPW does not consider affordability in its analysis. There is no mention of affordability, or any analysis of the economic effects on CSA 7 customers. AB685 specifically states local governments must consider affordability when making water rate determinations. A rate proposal of 4x the recommended maximum, without consideration of affordability does not appear in compliance with AB 685. Please consider a revised proposal more in line with California Law.

Signed _____ Date April 23, 2021

From: Matthew J Pitchon

[redacted]

To: Clerk of the Board of Supervisors
San Mateo County
400 County Center, 1st Floor
Redwood City, CA 94063

I am writing this letter in opposition to the proposed water usage rate increase for CSA7 water users. At this time in particular, the costly increase will pose an extreme hardship for my family.

California Law AB685 provides that Californians have access to safe and affordable drinking water. According to the California Department of Health, affordable water means less than 1.5% of household income. Affordable water, under the proposed increase, would mean an income in excess of $173,000 per year. I do not make that much. I doubt the average household income of CSA 7 users is anywhere near $173,000.

I believe the current proposal is in violation of AB 685. Please consider a revised proposal more in line with California Law.

Signed _____ TARUNO S. VEGA Date APRIL 23, 2021

Signed Lynnette Vega Date April 23rd, 2021

From: Taruno and Lynnette Vega

[redacted]

To: Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

San Mateo County

400 County Center, 1st Floor

Redwood City, CA 94063

I am writing this letter in opposition to the proposed water usage rate increase for CSA7 water users. At this time in particular, the costly increase will pose an extreme hardship for my family.

California Law AB685 provides that Californians have access to safe and affordable drinking water. According to the California Department of Health, affordable water means less than 1.5% of household income. Affordable water, under the proposed increase, would mean an income in excess of $173,000 per year. I do not make that much. I doubt the average household income of CSA 7 users is anywhere near $173,000. In our particular case, water cost is already over that 1.5%.

Therefore, I believe the current proposal is in violation of AB 685. Please consider a revised proposal more in line with California Law.

Furthermore, I suggest seeking upgrade funds from the Federal and California governments which are awash in Billions of COVID relief and soon-to-be Infrastructure monies. This is infrastructure at the most elemental level.

Sincerely,

Signed William J. Domitilli Date 23 APRIL 2021

Jennifer S. Domitilli April 23, 2021

From: William J. and Jennifer S. Domitilli

[redacted]

To: Board of Supervisors
San Mateo County
400 County Center, 1st floor
Redwood City, California 94063

From: Terry Adams & Eva Knodt
[redacted]

April 25, 2021

Dear SMC Board of Supervisors,

This protest letter is in response to your March 15, 2021 *Proposition 218 Notice of Proposed Increases in Country Service Area No. 7 (La Honda Community Water System) Water Service Ra*tes. We object to the proposed rate increases on the following grounds:

1. The increase is excessive and raises affordability compliance issues with State Law (AB 685).
2. The increase is disproportionally affecting seniors on fixed incomes and low-income families in our small rural community. We have seen our income plummet by more than 70% over the past two years, and we are being hit at the same time with similarly steep increases in fire insurance rates and heating/energy costs.
3. The proposed water rates are out of line with what neighboring local water systems charge.
4. There is no evidence that the county has exhausted all means to obtain state funding to support equitable water service rates and long-term capital improvements for CSA7.

We are asking the Board of Supervisors to go back to the drawing board to find a fairer and more equitable solution to the rising cost of water in Service Area 7 . Specifically we ask the Board to:

- Remove long-standing barriers to obtaining state funding for system infrastructure upgrades, drought relief etc. By this we mean that the highest priority should be to find an alternate raw water source and bring the system in compliance with the State Water Resources Control Board's *San Gregorio Creek Adjudication Order of Determination.*
- Establish a fund for financial assistance to qualifying low-income families.
- Redo the income survey and revisit income-based funding sources. There is evidence that CSA incomes have dropped significantly since the last survey was done in 2016 due to aging of the community and pandemic-related income losses.

We believe that the skyrocketing service costs in or water system are a direct result of decades of deferred maintenance that could have been avoided had CSA7 been able to apply for state finding at the same level as neighboring communities.

Sincerely,

Terry Adams — April 25, 2021
Date

Eva Knodt — April 25, 2021
Date

parcel # 083-204-060

To: Clerk of the Board of Supervisors
San Mateo County
400 County Center, 1st Floor
Redwood City, CA 94063
April 26, 2021

CSA 7 Proposed Rate Increase

Please consider the following when making your determination of the proposed rate increase:

1. California Law AB685 (2012) Provides that all Californians have the right to safe affordable drinking water. This legislation was a first in the nation. Either safe and not affordable, or affordable and not safe, is no longer acceptable. AB 685 charges local governments and water systems with meeting the mandate.

1. The California Department of Health has determined affordable means 1.5% of household income. The EPA guideline is about 2.5%. The UN guideline for all nations is about 3%.
2. The DPW rate proposal (letter dated March 15, 2021) makes no mention of affordability. Thus, the proposal is deficient and not in compliance with AB685. It also asks the Board to make a decision without important information.
3. CSA 7 did a survey of customer household income in 2016. Although the results of that survey have not been made public, it has been reported the median household income for CSA 7 customers is about $50,000 per year.
4. The DPW rate proposal would cost the average CSA 7 customer $3,900 per year in 5 years, or nearly 8% of household income, more than 4x the recommended maximum.
5. The DPW proposal specifically excludes capital improvements. The DPW Public Information Rate Increase Disclosure discusses Capital Improvements and estimates those costs would add another $830 per month per or $10,000 per year per customer. The total cost per customer would then be $13,900 per year, or nearly 28% of household income. The guideline is 1.5%.

The Law requires local governments to provide safe affordable water. This DPW proposal does not meet the standard for Affordable water as set forth by AB685, and the California Department of Health.

Thank you

Matthew Pitchon

[redacted]

April 26, 2021

To: Clerk of the Board of Supervisors
San Mateo County
400 County Center, 1st Floor
Redwood City, CA 94063

I am writing this letter in opposition to the proposed water usage rate increase for CSA7 water users. At this time in particular, the costly increase will pose an extreme hardship for my family and our community.

California Law AB685 provides that Californians have access to safe and affordable drinking water. According to the California Department of Health, affordable water means less than 1.5% of household income. Affordable water, under the proposed increase, would mean an income in excess of $173,000 per year, which we do not meet, especially after my husband lost his job during the COVID-19 crisis.

Our family has been impacted financially by COVID-19, with the loss of my husband's job. We have a daughter and another baby on the way, and we are running a bare bones budget in our home until our economy stabilizes. While I agree that our water system is in need of improvements, increasing our water bill by close to 50% year-over-year is not only astronomical, but heartless to put onto a community of only 65 residents, many whom (myself included) were impacted financially by the pandemic.

I believe the current proposal is in violation of AB 685, unethical, and unreasonable. I strongly ask that you consider a revised proposal more in line with California Law and the financial constraints our community is facing.

Signed _____ Date 4/26/21

From: Amanda King

[redacted]

April 26, 2021

From:
eileen maisen
[redacted]

To:
Clerk of the Board of Supervisors
San Mateo County
400 County Center, 1st Floor
Redwood City, California 94063

Re: Proposition 218 Notice of Proposed Increase in County Service Area No. 7
(La Honda Community Water System) Water Service Rates

I am writing this letter in opposition to the proposed water usage rate increase for CSA7 water users. At this time in particular, the costly increase will pose an extreme hardship for me.

California Law AB685 provides that Californians have access to safe and affordable drinking water. According to the California Department of Health, affordable water means less than 1.5% of household income. Affordable water, under the proposed increase, would mean an income in excess of $173,000 per year. My income is much less than half that amount. I doubt the average household income of CSA7 users is anywhere near $173,000.

I believe the current proposal is in violation of AB685. Please consider a revised proposal more in line with California Law.

Signed by Tenant and Account Holder: eileen maisen
Property owner: Fran Davidson
[redacted]

April 23, 2021

TO: Clerk of the Board of Supervisors
San Mateo County
400 County Center, 1st Floor
Redwood City, CA 94063

I am writing this letter in opposition to the proposed water usage rate increase for CSA-7 residents. This proposed costly increase will pose an extreme financial burden for my small income, well below $75,000 annually.

California Law AB685 provides that Californians have access to SAFE and AFFORDABLE Drinking WATER. According to the CA Dept. of Health, affordable water means less than 1.5% of household income. Affordable water under the proposed increase would mean an income in excess of $173,000 per year. I do not make anywhere near that much income and I highly doubt the average household income of CSA-7 residents comes close to that.

I believe the current proposal is in violation of AB 685.

Please consider a revised proposal more in line with CA State Law.

Signed:

Kim Beneto

[redacted]

4/25/21

RECEIVED
IN THE OFFICE OF
APR 29 2021
CLERK OF THE
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

CLERK OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
400 COUNTY CENTER
REDWOOD CITY CA 94063

DEAR FOLKS

THIS LETTER IS MY OPPOSITION TO THE PROPOSED WATER RATE HIKE FOR CSA 7 USERS.

THE PROPOSED INCREASE WILL PUT AN IMPOSSIBLE STRAIN ON MY FAMILY. I AM A 69 YEAR OLD WRITER MAKING AROUND $15,000 PER YEAR AND AM ONLY SQUEAKING BY NOW

CALIFORNIA LAW AB685 STIPULATES THAT CALIFORNIANS HAVE ACCESS TO SAFE AND AFFORDABLE DRINKING WATER. THE CA DEPT OF HEALTH SAYS "AFFORDABLE" IS LESS THAN 1.5% HOUSEHOLD INCOME. THIS MEANS I AM ALREADY PAYING MORE THAN I CAN AFFORD WITHOUT AN INCREASE. THERE IS NO WAY THE AVERAGE CSA 7 USER MAKES $173,000 ANNUALLY. I DOUBT ANY CSA 7 USER DOES.

I KNOW THE PIPES BREAK, I KNOW MY WATER COMES OUT IN A DRIBBLE. I'M USED TO THAT.

THE CURRENT PROPOSAL IS IN VIOLATION OF AB 685. PLEASE CONSIDER THE COUNTY'S RESPONSIBILITY TO THOSE WITH THE VERY LEAST.

THANK YOU.

DAVID STROHM

PO BOX M
[redacted]

RECEIVED
IN THE OFFICE OF
APR 29 2021
CLERK OF THE
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Board of Supervisors

San Mateo County

400 County Center, 1st Floor

Redwood City, CA 94063

I am writing this letter in opposition to the proposed water usage rate increase for CSA7 water users. This is a formal protest of that measure. The costly increase will pose an extreme hardship for my family now and for years to come.

California Law AB685 provides that Californians have access to safe and affordable drinking water. According to the California Department of Health, affordable water means less than 1.5% of household income. Affordable water, under the proposed increase, would mean an income in excess of $173,000 per year. I do not make that much. I doubt the average household income of CSA 7 users is anywhere near $173,000.

Additionally, alternative plans for maintaining the csa-7 water system need to be drawn up with an eye towards the financial impact and the equity in spreading that to the various users - both the operational costs and the capital costs. The proposed impact is far too great in the short term.

I believe the current proposal is in violation of AB 685. Please consider a revised proposal more in line with California Law.

Signed Paul Witort PAUL WITORT Date 4-28-2021

Signed Sharon Witort Sharon Witort Date 4/28/2021

From: Name: PAUL & SHARON WITORT

[redacted]

To: Clerk of the Board of Supervisors
San Mateo County
400 County Center, 1st Floor
Redwood City, CA 94063

I am writing this letter in opposition to the proposed water usage rate increase for CSA7 water users. At this time in particular, the costly increase will pose an extreme hardship for my family.

California Law AB685 provides that Californians have access to safe and affordable drinking water. According to the California Department of Health, affordable water means less than 1.5% of household income. Affordable water, under the proposed increase, would mean an income in excess of $173,000 per year. I do not make that much. I doubt the average household income of CSA 7 users is anywhere near $173,000.

I believe the current proposal is in violation of AB 685. Please consider a revised proposal more in line with California Law.

Signed Carolyn R Danforth Date 4/27/21

Signed [illegible] Date 4/27/21

From: Name:

[redacted]

To: Clerk of the Board of Supervisors
San Mateo County
400 County Center, 1st Floor
Redwood City, CA 94063

I am writing this letter in opposition to the proposed water usage rate increase for CSA7 water users. At this time in particular, the costly increase will pose an extreme hardship for my family. We are about to have a baby and just barely making ends meet as it is. This increase in such a short amount of time is simply unjust.

Signed [redacted] Date 4.21.21

Signed [redacted] Date 4-21-21

[redacted]

To: Clerk of the Board of Supervisors
San Mateo County
400 County Center, 1st Floor
Redwood City, CA 94063

I am writing this letter in opposition to the proposed water usage rate increase for CSA7 water users. The almost doubling of the water rate will create financial hardships for many of the CSA7 users, myself included.

California Law AB685 provides that Californians have access to safe and affordable drinking water. According to the California Department of Health, affordable water means less than 1.5% of household income. Affordable water, under the proposed increase, would mean an income in excess of $173,000 per year. I doubt the average household income of CSA 7 users is anywhere near $173,000.

Nor are many of us using water for landscaping, so there isn't much to cut. Most of us are only using water for the essential needs of everyday life.

I believe the current proposal is in violation of AB 685. Please consider a revised proposal more in line with California Law.

Thank you for your attention to this vital matter.

Signed E McMillan Date 4-28-2021

Evelyn McMillan

[redacted]

To: Clerk of the Board of Supervisors
San Mateo County
400 County Center, 1st Floor
Redwood City, CA 94063

I am writing this letter in opposition to the proposed water usage rate increase for CSA7 water users. At this time in particular, the costly increase will pose an extreme hardship for my family.

California Law AB685 provides that Californians have access to safe and affordable drinking water. According to the California Department of Health, affordable water means less than 1.5% of household income. Affordable water, under the proposed increase, would mean an income in excess of $173,000 per year. I do not make that much. I doubt the average household income of CSA 7 users is anywhere near $173,000.

I believe the current proposal is in violation of AB 685. Please consider a revised proposal more in line with California Law.

Signed _____ Date 04.28.21

Signed _____ Date 04/28/21

From: Name: Dylan Haase

[redacted]

4/28/2021

To whom it may concern!

I feel the rate increase may be needed, but the tiered increase is too large too fast! Smaller increments should be considered.

So I am writing this protest to the proposed water rate increase as proposed by San Mateo County!

Thank you

Dante Razzini

Dante Razzini

[redacted]

April 30, 2021

RECEIVED
MAY 3 2021
COUNTY MANAGER

San Mateo County Board of Supervisors
400 County Center, 1st Floor
Redwood City, CA 94063

Dear Members of the Board,

I am writing to protest the rate increases of the CSA7 Water system as proposed by the SM County Department of Public Works.

Armin T. Borick

[redacted]

Armin T. Borick

April 28, 2021

San Mateo County Board of Supervisors
400 County Center, 1st Floor
Redwood City, CA 94063

Dear Members of the Board,

I am writing to protest the rate increases in the CSA7 Water System as presented by the SM Co. DPW in the notification to property owners in March 2021.

The "Information Packet" assembled by SM Co DPW and made available to owners in March 2021 was somewhat confusing in presenting both O&M AND Capital Improvement information when these proposed rate increases (and the suggested incremental scale) actually refer ONLY to the O&M budget. Rather than providing comprehensive budgetary data reflecting actual costs and revenue since the last rate increase in 2013 (as well as outlining anticipated expenses by year) we were given ONE example of costs vs. revenue labeled not by fiscal year but only as "current":

Current annual O&M expenses are $103,712 (with a fund reserve of $47,685)
Current "average" annual revenue $ 95,784

From this scant information we are left to surmise there is "currently" a budget shortfall of $7928 – for ease in discussion, let's round that up to $8000 in the red. Dividing that $8000 by 67 owners in CSA7 amounts to $119.40 or $9.95/month, no-where near the immediate 45% rate increase requested by the DPW in the first year.

We recognize additional costs have come with growing regulations, monitoring and compliance in the last decade and the need for fiscal responsibility in day-to-day operations. It is somewhat surprising that rate increases have not been proposed since 2013. However the County DPW has not presented a compelling argument for the 45% increase in the first year with the following 4 years at 3% increase other than implying that it is "long overdue." We ask that you direct the County DPW to modify the proposed increment schedule and spread out these increases more equally over the five years. In a year when a world-wide pandemic has wreaked havoc on personal & mental health, income and our economy these increases as proposed are not demonstrated as critical and are unjust to the owners.

In addition, it has been frustrating to go to the County CSA7 website seeking more information about our system's fiscal history and proposed capital costs etc. to discover the website has not been updated in 6 or 7 years (with exception to the info packet distributed in March.) At the public meetings held for the 2013 rate increases we were told that documents and information relevant to our system was going to be made available on a website under development as well as the Quarterly CSA7 meeting schedule so that owners could attend, remain up to date and become better acquainted with the issues facing our system. That never happened. Now that

COVID has forced these meetings online we ask that CSA7 website posts the ongoing Quarterly meeting schedule with links or instructions for interested owners to attend. As owners in the system we believe it is our right to be able to access these meetings.

Thank you for your deliberation and consideration of this protest.

Kim Borick Kim Borick

[redacted]

To: Clerk of the Board of Supervisors
San Mateo County
400 County Center, 1st Floor
Redwood City, CA 94063

I am writing this letter in opposition to the proposed water usage rate increase for CSA7 water users. At this time in particular, the costly increase will pose an extreme hardship for my family.

California Law AB685 provides that Californians have access to safe and affordable drinking water. According to the California Department of Health, affordable water means less than 1.5% of household income. Affordable water, under the proposed increase, would mean an income in excess of $173,000 per year. I do not make that much. I doubt the average household income of CSA 7 users is anywhere near $173,000.

I believe the current proposal is in violation of AB 685. Please consider a revised proposal more in line with California Law.

Signed _____ Date April 27 2021

Signed _____ Date _____

From: Name:_____

[redacted]

Water rate increase

To: Clerk of the Board of Supervisors
San Mateo County
400 County Center, 1st Floor
Redwood City, CA 94063

I am writing this letter in opposition to the proposed water usage rate increase for CSA7 water users. At this time in particular, the costly increase will pose an extreme hardship for my family.

California Law AB685 provides that Californians have access to safe and affordable drinking water. According to the California Department of Health, affordable water means less than 1.5% of household income. Affordable water, under the proposed increase, would mean an income in excess of $173,000 per year. We have two small children and my husband has been out of work due to Covid. I also doubt the average household income of CSA 7 users is anywhere near $173,000.

I believe the current proposal is in violation of AB 685. Please consider a revised proposal more in line with California Law.

Signed [redacted] Date 4/29/21

From: Anastasia and Sascha Matzke

[redacted]

To: Clerk of the Board of Supervisors
San Mateo County
400 County Center, 1st Floor
Redwood City, CA 94063

I am writing this letter in opposition to the proposed water usage rate increase for CSA7 water users. At this time in particular, the costly increase will pose an extreme hardship for myself and my community.

California Law AB685 provides that Californians have access to safe and affordable drinking water. According to the California Department of Health, affordable water means less than 1.5% of household income. Affordable water, under the proposed increase, would mean an income in excess of $173,000 per year. I believe the current proposal is in violation of AB 685. I wish to stop the clock and pause for a moment so that more information can be gathered and additional factors considered before moving forward.

Signed _____ Date 4-29-21

From: Name (s)

Jeffrey Magni

[redacted]

Greg and Linda McCartney
[redacted]

Clerk of the Board of Supervisors
San Mateo County
400 County Center, 1st Floor
Redwood City, CA 94063

Re: Proposition 218 – Notice of Proposed Increase in CSA 7 Area Water Rates

We are opposed to the proposed excessive rate increase for CSA 7. Section 106.3 added to the water code pursuant to State Assembly Bill No. 685 (September 2012).

The bill and the code section mandates "affordable and accessible water for human consumption". CSA 7 rates are barely affordable at existing rates. The proposed rates are beyond what is affordable for the majority of users.

Please drop the current proposal and come up with something reasonable.

Greg McCartney

Clerk of the Board of Supervisors
San Mateo County
400 County Center, 1st Floor
Redwood City, CA 94063

I am writing this letter in opposition to the proposed water usage rate increase for CSA7 water users. At this time in particular, the costly increase will pose an extreme hardship for this community.

California Law AB685 provides that Californians have access to safe and affordable drinking water. According to the California Department of Health, affordable water means less than 1.5% of household income. Affordable water, under the proposed increase would equate to an income in excess of $173,000 per year. I am certain that the average household income of CSA 7 users is nowhere near $173,000/year.

Based on the above, I believe the current proposal is in violation of AB 685. Please consider a revised proposal more in line with California Law.

Date April 29, 2021

Dan Dillett

[redacted]

To:
Clerk of the Board of Supervisors
San Mateo County
400 County Center, 1st Floor
Redwood City, CA 94063

We are writing this letter in opposition to the proposed water usage rate increase for CSA7 water users.

California Law AB685 provides that California residents have access to safe and affordable drinking water. According the California Department of Health, affordable water means less than 1.5 percent of household income. Affordable water, under the proposed increase would mean that an income in excess of $173,000 per year.

Please consider a revised proposal in line with the California Law outlined above.

Regards.

Lindsay and Brett Hull

[redacted]

From: **David Falkenberg & Miriam Anne Frank**

[redacted]

To: Clerk of the Board of Supervisors
San Mateo County
400 County Center, 1st Floor
Redwood City, CA 94063

We are writing this letter in opposition to the proposed water usage rate increase for CSA7 water users. At this time in particular, the costly increase will pose an extreme hardship for my family and many of our fellow CSA7 neighbors. Moreover, the proposed rate hikes would mean that our water costs would shatter the record for the most expensive water in the Nation!

California Law AB685 provides that Californians have access to safe and affordable drinking water. According to the California Department of Health, affordable water means less than 1.5% of household income. Affordable water, under the proposed increase, would mean an income in excess of $173,000 per year which we do not make. We therefore believe that the current proposal is in violation of AB685.

Please consider a revised proposal that both is more in line with California Law and is reflective of an understanding of the economic impacts of COVID (Miriam lost her permanent job last March).

Signed _____
David Falkenberg

Date 04/23/2021

Signed _____
Miriam Anne Frank

Date April 23, 2021

To: Clerk of the Board of Supervisors
San Mateo County
400 County Center, 1st
Floor
Redwood City, CA 94063

I am writing this letter in opposition to the proposed water usage rate increase for CSA7 water users. At this time in particular, the costly increase will pose an extreme hardship for my family. I am a school teacher, and finances have been especially hard this year due to teaching from home. Having utility prices increase would be detrimental to my family. Please consider the impact this huge increase would have on our community.

Signed _____ Date 4/21/21

From: Katie Rosas and Theo Healey

[redacted]

Pam LoCoco Fiduciary Services
[redacted]

April 28, 2021

To: Clerk of the Board of Supervisors
San Mateo County
400 County Center, 1st Floor
Redwood City, CA 94063

I am the trustee of the Klingele Family Trust, which owns and operates La Honda Park, 8181 La Honda Rd., La Honda, CA 94070. The park is part of the CSA7 Water System

I am writing this letter in opposition to the proposed water usage rate increase for CSA7 water users. At this time in particular, the costly increase will pose an extreme hardship for the residents of La Honda Park, who have individual sub meters off the two main meters.

California Law AB685 provides that Californians have access to safe and affordable drinking water. According to the California Department of Health, affordable water means less than 1.5% of household income. Affordable water, under the proposed increase, would mean an income in excess of $173,000 per year. Most of the residents of the park are low income households. I am relatively certain the average household income of these CSA 7 users at the park is nowhere near $173,000.

I believe the current proposal is in violation of AB 685. Please consider a revised proposal more in line with California Law.

Signed Pamela LoCoco, Trustee Date 4/28/2021

From: Pam LoCoco, CLPF #40, Trustee
[redacted]

cc: West Coast Mobile Home Parks

THOMAS AND MELISSA SABERI
[redacted]

April 30, 2021

Clerk of the Board of Supervisors
San Mateo County
400 County Center, 1st Floor
Redwood City, CA 94063

Re: Proposition 218 – Notice of Proposed Increase in CSA 7 Area Water Rates

May 4, 2021 – Board of Supervisors Hearing, Agenda Item # 5

We are opposed to the proposed excessive rate increase for CSA 7. Section 106.3 added to the water code pursuant to State Assembly Bill No. 685 (September 2012).

The bill and the code section mandates "affordable and accessible water for human consumption". CSA 7 rates are barely affordable at existing rates. The proposed rates are beyond what is affordable for the majority of users.

Regarding the future capital improvements to the system, it appears as though the County is not sharing in the costs as a customer of any of the required or proposed upgrades. The water system services Camp Glenwood and Sam McDonald Park and the County should pay their share as a customer of this water system.

Please do not approve the current water rate increase and/or the capital improvement schedule.

Sincerely

/S/ Tom Saberi

TOM SABERI