

---

**From:** Don Davies <dondavies100@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, June 05, 2020 7:32 PM  
**To:** BOSComments  
**Subject:** 6/9/20. Item # 35.

I would like to postpone the vote because the cost seems outrageous!!!! Thanks Don Davies.

Sent from my iPhone

---

**From:** Michelle Higginbotham <shelhigg@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Saturday, June 06, 2020 4:36 PM  
**To:** BOSComments  
**Subject:** Meeting Date 6/9/2020 Item #35

Please see comments below for 6/9/2020 Board of Supervisors Meeting Item #35

Honorable Board,

Thank you for taking my comments. I am a homeowner in the CSA-1 Tamarack district. We are facing the necessity of raising our contributions to the sewer and water systems which serve us. To achieve this we first had to pay for an engineers report. This was required as our rates could no longer be catagorized as fees and must be classified as an assessment. Next we are responsible to fund a Prop 218 vote which I am told is in excess of \$10,000. Is this an arbitrary charge or an adopted fee in your fee schedule? We pay \$2460.22 yearly, labeled as Fresno Countywide Tax. We would respectfully request that the costs for the Engineers report OR the Prop 218 vote be paid from that source of funds. We are a small CSA-1.

Additionally, I would like to recognize Jennifer Cavalla, the analyst assigned to our CSA on her patience and professionalism in handling our areas needs.

Respectfully,

Shelly Higginbotham

55578 Cordwood  
Lakeshore

Pismo Beach

---

**From:** John Bianco <johnbianco815@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, June 07, 2020 6:05 PM  
**To:** BOSComments  
**Subject:** Board of Supervisor's Meeting 6/9/2020 - Item #35

The overall assessment being proposed is an increase of 280 percent over the current assessment. (\$137,188.39 in 2024/25 compared to total assessments of \$49,000 in 2019-20. No new services or improvements are being proposed.

The biggest problem with the proposed increase is that it is based on claimed expenses over the past three years, for which there has never been a detailed accounting provided. More than 75% of the claimed expenses are simply described as "Professional and Specialized Services". There is no attempt to itemize or describe the Professional and Specialized Services portion of the costs. We've repeatedly requested that County staff provide the details for this item - So far, only coded entry accounting has been provided, with no backup documentation for any of these charges. From what has been provided, it appears these charges may be made up to a large degree by general county administrative expense allocation, which are not appropriate to be charged to enterprise accounts such as this - only specific expenses for services provided specifically and directly to CSA1 are appropriate to be recouped from property based tax charges such as this.

The proposed fee is based on 3% inflation of the projected 2019-20 costs, which itself is a projection that is nearly 50 percent higher than actual recent year budgets. There is no justification or explanation for why the 2019-20 projected budget (\$144,108) is 44% higher than the average budget for the preceding three years (\$100,792).

There is no accounting for the revenues - just a total number for assessments collected is stated in the narrative. It is noted that Ad valorem tax revenues have been available to pay a portion of prior year costs. What allows for this, and why was this not assumed to continue to some degree in future years? Are there other sources of revenue that should be considered that would reduce the burden on the fee payers (such as grant funding from the tree removal program - grant writing costs were charged to this fund, so it follows that grant income should be available to offset the costs of the fund).

As noted in the report, County staff has not conferred with anyone with the CSA between October 2019 and the public meeting held May 29, 2020. No advance description of the conclusions of the Engineer's report were provided, and the report itself was not provided at the May meeting, and we have only had the opportunity to review it after the agenda for the Board of Supervisors meeting was posted. This process is anything but transparent.

These issues make the Engineer's Report defective, which will give grounds for invalidating the election even if the fee increase is approved. It also raises the need for a complete audit of this fund for the past three years.

The 218 election should not proceed until all of these questions are answered. If the 218 election proceeds, and fails, county staff has threatened to cut off services to the CSA1 service area. If this were to occur, based on the faulty accounting that has been provided to date, then the County will be subject to liability to the landowners for causing damage to their property.

I request that the Board reject the resolution and not proceed with the 218 vote until the above objections have been answered.

With kind regards,  
John P. Bianco

**From:** Anthony Stetson <AnthonyS@dulcich.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, June 08, 2020 1:35 PM  
**To:** BOSComments  
**Subject:** Board of Supervisors meeting 6/9/20, Item # 35 - SCA 44

I am a property owner in the Tamarack Estates subdivision, CSA 44, and I am opposed to the 218 being voted on tomorrow at this meeting. It is an unnecessary expense and before it is approved it needs to be clearly defined what the procedure moving forward will be to help us get out of the current financial situation we are in, instead of incurring a 218 at a cost of \$10,000.00 for no apparent reason. We know we have water issues and we need to address them without incurring this additional cost.

Please postpone this vote until a clear course of action can be determined. We are not financially capable of incurring increasing taxes each year without any kind of clear solution.

**Anthony Stetson**

55522 Flintridge  
Lakeshore, CA

---

**From:** Josh Gmail <josh.madsen1@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, June 08, 2020 7:19 PM  
**To:** BOSComments  
**Subject:** Concerned about the cost of vote for 218

I'm concerned about the cost of item 218 for the increase of water and sewer costs for Tamarack CSA. I oppose the 218 measure and cost increase of utilities.

Thank you,  
Josh Madsen  
55531 Cordwood Road  
josh.madsen1@gmail.com

Sent from JSM phone

---

**From:** Stoker Noel G. <noelgstoker@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 09, 2020 8:12 AM  
**To:** BOSComments  
**Subject:** 218 vote cost

I have concern about the administrative cost of the 218 Vote. It is seems disproportionate in view of the small area it represents.

Noel G Stoker  
55587 Cordwood Rd

**From:** STEVE & DIANNE PINHEIRO <dpinh4@comcast.net>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 09, 2020 8:45 AM  
**To:** BOSComments  
**Subject:** BOS meeting 06/09/2020, 9:00 a.m., ITEM 35

We are members of CSA 1-Tamarack. Our district needs to make rate adjustments to fund our sewer and water systems. We are concerned by the high costs being charged to our small district. We had to pay for an engineer's report when our water and sewer rates could no longer be designated as fees rather than assessments. Now we are charged with the cost of an expensive Prop 218 vote. We are unclear if the charge for the 218 vote is established in your fee schedule or is arbitrary. We are assessed \$2,460.00 for a Countywide tax. Why can't these fees be taken from the tax and not our CSA funds?

**From:** richard turner <rs\_turner@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 09, 2020 2:38 PM  
**To:** BOSComments; Cavalla, Jennifer  
**Subject:** Objections to CSA 1 - Tamarack Rate Adjustment Proposal

I am the owner of the home at 55511 Cordwood Road (#7 on the Tamarack tract) and I am responding to the proposal set forth in the May 21st communication regarding adjusting/increasing the Water & Sewer rates. While this discussion has been going on for the past year, the county has not provided sufficient data to establish the basis for the increase. We have repeatedly asked for more details and they have not been provided.

The overall assessment being proposed is an increase of 280 percent over the current assessment. (\$137,188.39 in 2024/25 compared to total assessments of \$49,000 in 2019-20. No new services or improvements are being proposed.

The biggest problem with the proposed increase is that it is based on claimed expenses over the past three years, for which there has never been a detailed accounting provided. More than 75% of the claimed expenses are simply described as "Professional and Specialized Services". There is no attempt to itemize or describe the Professional and Specialized Services portion of the costs. We've repeatedly requested that County staff provide the details for this item - So far, only coded entry accounting has been provided, with no backup documentation for any of these charges. From what has been provided, it appears these charges may be made up to a large degree by general county administrative expense allocation, which are not appropriate to be charged to enterprise accounts such as this - only specific expenses for services provided specifically and directly to CSA1 are appropriate to be recouped from property based tax charges such as this.

The proposed fee is based on 3% inflation of the projected 2019-20 costs, which itself is a projection that is nearly 50 percent higher than actual recent year budgets. There is no justification or explanation for why the 2019-20 projected budget (\$144,108) is 44% higher than the average budget for the preceding three years (\$100,792).

There is no accounting for the revenues - just a total number for assessments collected is stated in the narrative. It is noted that Ad valorem tax revenues have been available to pay a portion of prior year costs. What allows for this, and why was this not assumed to continue to some degree in future years? Are there other sources of revenue that should be considered that would reduce the burden on the fee payers (such as grant funding from the tree removal program - grant writing costs were charged to this fund, so it follows that grant income should be available to offset the costs of the fund).

As noted in the report, County staff has not conferred with anyone with the CSA between October 2019 and the public meeting held May 29, 2020. No advance description of the conclusions of the Engineer's report were provided, and the report itself was not provided at the May meeting, and we have only had the opportunity to review it after the agenda for the Board of Supervisors meeting was posted. This process is anything but transparent.



These issues make the Engineer's Report defective, which will give grounds for invalidating the election even if the fee increase is approved. It also raises the need for a complete audit of this fund for the past three years.

The 218 election should not proceed until all of these questions are answered. If the 218 election proceeds, and fails, county staff has threatened to cut off services to the CSA1 service area. If this were to occur, based on the faulty accounting that has been provided to date, then the County will be subject to liability to the landowners for causing damage to their property.

I request that the Board reject the resolution and not proceed with the 218 vote until the above objections have been answered.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Richard Turner

55511 Cordwood Road  
(#7 on the Tamarack tract)