

From: [Barbara Buikema](#)
To: [Domine Barringer](#)
Subject: FW: Ribera sewer replacement project
Date: Wednesday, June 28, 2023 3:45:25 PM
Attachments: [june 27 letter to cawd.docx](#)

More public comment – sorry I did not see this earlier

From: Gail Dryden <gddryden@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 27, 2023 7:58 PM
To: angeloP@co.monterey.ca.us; Barbara Buikema <Buikema@cawd.org>; Ken White <White@cawd.org>; Michael Rachel <rachel@cawd.org>; Robert Siegfried <Siegfried@cawd.org>; urquhart@cawd.org; Greg D'Ambrosio <DAmbrosio@cawd.org>; mooreS@comomoterrey.ca.us
Subject: Ribera sewer replacement project

This email originated from outside the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Please find attached a memo regarding the concerns of my husband and me as to the Ribera Sewer Replacement Project. Thank you. Gail Dryden



Virus-free. www.avast.com

TO: Phil Angelo and members of the CAWD Board

FROM: Gail Dryden

DATE: June 26, 2023

RE: CAWD Proposed Sewer Replacement Project on Ribera Road

As a Carmel Meadows neighbor and homeowner affected by the proposed grinder pumps, my husband and I want to go on record once again in strong opposition to the proposed plan. We are feeling totally confused by the seemingly changing parameters of the wastewater district's proposal. In April of 2022, we were told it was a done deal and would be installed by the summer of 2023. At that time it didn't even seem that onerous, but the more we know and the more we read and the more the District seems to veer to appease some owners, it becomes more and more muddy. Clearly, the timing has changed. We were told we would be responsible for the cost of maintenance and upkeep after a period of time; in the latest iteration being presented on June 29 the attachments seem to now indicate that the district will pay monetary costs in perpetuity. We were told we could talk to others in the district who had grinder pumps and a list would be given us.; we have never received such a list although we've asked for it more than once. This lack of clarity on so many issues related to the project makes us more and more leery of its veracity. Why is the District so unclear and unhelpful?

Additionally, it seems from a cursory reading of some of the attachments that two very different projects are being spoken of here—the Ribera sewer replacement project and a separate need at some future time to place the current piping across the lagoon underground. Statements about heavy equipment were never mentioned in earlier proposals. Why is this suddenly being stated for the replacement project?. It may be that it isn't even the same project and is more closely related to the undergrounding of the lagoon pipe. It is not clear and needs to be explained and codified.

Although I am sure that regulatory requirements do change over time the documents do not convince me that such requirements preclude replacement in kind. Getting clear on the differentiation of the projects (Ribera sewer replacement versus undergrounding of the lagoon pipe) or why they seem to be connected by some district personnel is important to know, as are the regulatory requirements that make the earlier study problematic (if, in fact, it truly is problematic). Can these issues be clarified?

This, and much more shows that the District has changed its collective mind about several things. Several studies have been done which we have (eventually) been made privy to. One indicates that it is feasible, especially with upgrades to engineering capabilities over the past ten years, to replace the sewer in its current configuration negating the need for grinder pumps and a lift station. Having attended the LUAC meeting several months ago we know of their support for this alternative. It is certainly what my husband and I feel would be best due to issues of power outages and the health and safety issues posed by outages, possible overflows, noise and more. Yet, we've only received statement about regulations and coastal issues with no clear reasons why the replacement in kind cannot occur.

My husband and I are getting older and may be wanting to sell our home. A grinder pump would need to be disclosed and we are unclear as to the financial negative impact this could have on us personally. Yet, this is not at all the main issue for us for we are more concerned about the overall impact the proposed plan would have on the entire neighborhood, making this a less desirable place to live.

At the last meeting of the CAWD Board one board member spoke about being open and transparent. I applaud his seeming desire for that in the work of the District. However, when receiving volumes of material just a day or two before a meeting and having little to no time to read nor respond to it, this seems a bit specious. To send the packet for the June 29th meeting and not point out the changes the District is now proposing makes a mockery of the intent of open meeting laws. In addition to my concerns about the project itself, I am angered at the District's methods in regard to being open and transparent. It seems like the District is hiding its true motives. Why?

It feels like the District is throwing crumbs at a few neighbors. Certainly, not having to pay at any time for expenses associated with grinder pumps is a plus. However, what is needed is a fresh look at the possibilities in an open, truthful and clear manner rather than what is seeming like a piecemeal approach

In that gravity flow has worked for so long and will always work (as opposed to electricity) and knowing that a replacement in kind project truly is feasible, that should be the starting point of any proposed project in this neighborhood. Health of the neighbors, noise concerns, odors, loss of electricity, and the general welfare of the Carmel Meadows Community should take highest priority rather than being sublimated to what appears to just be making it easier for the District to maintain in the future. The CAWD proposed project unduly burdens some citizens for the benefit of the District; and that is not acceptable nor necessary. What issues make the District's plan so superior as to negate the needs of our neighborhood?

My husband and I ask that the Planning Commission deny this application and direct the CAWD District to submit a plan that will replace the existing sewer line, knowing that regulatory and environmental constraints CAN be met. Although one of the four homeowners clearly affected by the current choice of CAWD, our entire Carmel Meadows neighborhood is opposed to their choice as shown by the support of over 100 resident signatures.