

To: Tom Luster and the members of the California Coastal Commission

Re: Proposed geotechnical project at the mouth of Santa Rosa Creek, Cambria

Dear Tom Luster:

Well, here we go again.

Last time this project of the Army Corp/Cambria Community Services District (oh, who are we kidding? It's a CCSD project) came up for a consistency determination, I drove all the way up to Santa Cruz to attend your meeting, and to ask you not to approve it.

Instead, the commission placed many restrictions on the project, such as requiring the ACE to test for mercury first thing. Director Mirkarimi even joked about taking bets on how quickly they'd hit mercury (its presence had already been proved by independent tests). They pulled core samples, all right. In fact, I (and several other Cambrians) have photos of those samples sitting unattended in the back of a pickup truck near the children's playground. And when we asked the results of these mercury tests? Well, when I last checked, no information was forthcoming. The ACE said there were no results.

Then they went out onto the County Beach (after working hard to find a map that gave a broader definition of the County Beach than any other) and hit bedrock at only 24 feet, about a third of the depth predicted by their earlier studies. So, the question in my mind is, which is more of a waste? That version of the project? Or this one?

This year I am too busy with work to attend in person, but I still oppose the project and want my thoughts to be heard. I realize this letter, these thoughts, are far less technical and perhaps not as well expressed as other you will receive. But I am a Cambrian, a constituent, and these are my concerns.

Many months ago, an article appeared in The Cambrian Newspaper regarding the state of the geotech project. Nick Franco of State Parks offered a quote that pretty much said it all. I'm paraphrasing, but the intent will remain clear. He said State Parks could probably work something out with the geotesting, but that it was not legal to site a desalination plant intake at that location. As I'm sure you know, above the mean high tide line is a protected natural preserve. Below it is our new marine park. So what on earth is the point of drilling up that delicate and endangered ecosystem *if they can't put their darned desal intake there?* It has become a project without a purpose. I can't imagine what the CCSD or the ACE hope to gain by going forward with it. I won't even speculate. But it will not result in a desal plant at that location. So *why let them do it?*

I still have a video clip of Esther Sanchez speaking eloquently on her objections to this project the first time it came before the commission. You can feel her frustration that none of her colleagues seemed to want to listen. Staff recommended the consistency determination be given. I have no idea why. Maybe you do. But, frankly, Mr. Luster, a great disservice was done to our

community, and all who visit it. Director Sanchez said she felt like she was “getting on a train.” Ecologically concerned Cambrians felt as though we were being run over by one.

Now the commission has another chance to protect our beautiful beach and lagoon from a project which has come completely unmoored from any earthly purpose. Please do protect it.

I'd appreciate having this letter of objection entered into the meeting record.

Thank you,

Catherine Ryan Hyde

287 Weymouth St

Cambria, CA 93428

(805) 927-1783

ryanhde@cryanhyde.com