



**AGENDA NO: B-2**

**MEETING DATE: May 18, 2021**

**AGENDA CORRESPONDENCE  
RECEIVED BY THE CITIZENS  
OVERSIGHT/FINANCE ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
FOR PUBLIC REVIEW PRIOR TO THE MEETING**

## Dana Swanson

---

**From:** betty winholtz [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Monday, May 17, 2021 1:27 AM  
**To:** Barbara Spagnola; John Martin; Bart Beckman; Tina Wener; Homer Alexander; Steve Peck; Lois Johnson  
**Cc:** Katie Lichtig; Dana Swanson  
**Subject:** agenda item b-2

Dear Committee:

There is much to comment on in this staff report.

1. Under **BACKGROUND**: It would be great if staff could let go of the perpetuated myth that the City's financial problems stem from "lost revenues associated with the closure of the Morro Bay Power Plant." Rather the City's financial problems are related to "increased costs" perpetuated by all city councils over the last 7-10 years. Only one expense has been "outside the City's direct control": CALPERS. (page 5 of 122)
2. If "Measure E is a general-purpose revenue source and revenues are deposited in the general fund," then funds going into the Harbor Enterprise Fund are questionable. (page 5 of 122)
3. As I stated to the Committee in a previous email, of the 4 principles passed by the City Council on April 13, 2021 only #3 qualifies for Measure Q funding. To use Measure Q funds for the other three principles violates the public trust in the passage of Measure Q. (page 6 of 122) In my opinion, the Committee is bound to enforce the will of the people, not what a city council decides is legitimate.
4. Under **DISCUSSION**: Staffing should come from Measure E, as should "sidewalk replacement and trash disposal on the waterfront" and restoring the "General Fund Reserves." (page 6 and 7 of 122)
5. Under **Proposals**:
  - a.) Page 20 of 122, looks like the wrong map is attached to this description.
  - b.) Please explain why some Storm Drain projects are broken into sections with the same descriptions, i.e. "west of Main along Hwy 1." All the storm drain projects are unfunded except for the first one, so I don't think it is related to money.
  - c.) This is confusing--"Along Main Street, between Preston Lane and Azure Street"--because Preston and Azure are on opposite sides of Hwy 1, the former south of Hwy 41 and the latter in the Beach Tract. Maybe Radcliffe should be substituted for Azure? This happens three times; why the repetition in locations?
  - d.) "Along Marina Street, between Piney Way and Shasta Avenue" may well need improvement, but it can't be because of "storm conditions near the roundabout at Morro Bay Boulevard and Quintana Road" because Piney and Shasta are both west and downhill from the roundabout. The same is true for Marina between Shasta and Monterey.
6. It would be great if the money going toward the intersection of 41/1/Main was diverted to more paving of surface streets or the many unfunded storm drains.

Sincerely,  
Betty Winholtz



**AGENDA NO: B-4**

**MEETING DATE: May 18, 2021**

**AGENDA CORRESPONDENCE  
RECEIVED BY THE CITIZENS  
OVERSIGHT/FINANCE ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
FOR PUBLIC REVIEW PRIOR TO THE MEETING**

## Dana Swanson

---

**From:** betty winholtz <[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, May 18, 2021 1:11 AM  
**To:** Barbara Spagnola; John Martin; Bart Beckman; Tina Wener; Homer Alexander; Lois Johnson; Steve Peck  
**Cc:** Katie Lichtig; Dana Swanson  
**Subject:** agenda item b-4

Dear Committee Members:

Please solicit the answers to my questions--

- 1) In section 1.1.2.2. on **page 78**, it states that 27 trees were removed. Only 25 trees were suppose to be removed; who pays the penalty for the 2 trees? If one were to count the stumps of trees cut, one would count more than 40 stumps. This includes the stumps that have been grounded down below grass level along Morro Creek in Lila Kaiser Park. Who pays the penalty for the 15 trees cut without permit?
  - 2) The trees along the bike path behind the power plant are numbered. Is this for a "head count" or are they numbered for removal? Table 1 on **page 79** under "Conveyance Facilities" declares more trees will be cut; has there been an amendment to the Coastal Development Permit (CDP) from the CA Coastal Commission (CCC) to agree? I thought the trees were suppose to be protected.
  - 3) Also in Table 1 on **page 79**, under WRF, the landslide continues. Who will pay for the remediation?
  - 4) In Table 2 on **page 81**, we can see that the bid on the Conveyance Facilities came in \$6M over budget or had a 29% increase out the door. On top of that, in 2 years, the cost has increase another \$10M or 37%. That is an overall 80% increase from \$21M to \$37.5M. Why? Is the cultural investigation mentioned in Table 1 part of the cost? How much is left in contingency?
  - 5) In table 3 on **page 83**, it states zero piping has been laid. Yet, lower Quintana has been closed to through traffic for two months. I assume this is part of the cost increase. Will the ratepayers be charged for this?
- Since the new increased cost of the project, approximately \$45M, is known now, it's a bit misleading to not include that new cost in Tables 3, 2, and other tables.
- 6) Table 5 on **page 85** shows no money has been spent on advertising (to the public?) or notices and publications (to the public?). Is it not a requirement of the CDP that public outreach be made? Only this week the sign on Quintana went up. This is reminiscent of the delay in getting the sign up at the WRF site.

7) Table 20 on **page 95** shows that the injection wells will be ready 20 months behind the conveyance facilities even though both projects are being worked simultaneously. Why is that? Does this mean that the purified water will go directly into the ocean for 20 months?

8) The top of **page 98** encourages the public to reach out to the WRF people via the website. Why aren't the WRF people encouraged to reach out to the public, as directed the CCC CDP? The items listed on the next page are mostly computer related; is there other means to get the word out? A multi-media approach would be helpful.

9) **Page 99-100** references the Division of Drinking Water because the City is asking for exceptions to the rules. This does not make me comfortable if the project cannot follow standard safety rules. This should have been a fatal flaw for building on the west side of Hwy 1.

10) **Page 100**, still no CA Fish and Game permit; another fatal flaw. Is it time to cut our losses and go to a non-controversial site like the concrete plant, or upgrade the current site?

Sincerely,  
Betty Winholtz