



AGENDA NO: II

MEETING DATE: September 26, 2023

**AGENDA CORRESPONDENCE
RECEIVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL AND
PLANNING COMMISSION FOR PUBLIC
REVIEW PRIOR TO THE MEETING**

Heather Goodwin

From: Rigmor Samuelsen [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, September 25, 2023 6:39 PM
To: Council
Subject: BESS

CAUTION: This is an external email. Please take care when clicking links or opening attachments.

Want to ditto Jeff Heller on 1,2 and 3. No use for me to say anything, he said it. Rigmor

Heather Goodwin

From: patticake801 [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, September 25, 2023 2:24 PM
To: Council
Subject: BESS questions

CAUTION: This is an external email. Please take care when clicking links or opening attachments.

IF the Bess project is somehow approved, how soon can it start to be built? Same with the wind farms? How soon will construction begin? Also can Morro Bay city please help us get back into the Chumash Heritage Marine Sanctuary? It's ridiculous that we are excluded. Last item, if Dawn Addis has a "field representative" here.... How is it that she does Not know why the group, Citizens for Estero Bay preservation, do Not want the Bess Project..... per her remarks at the Moss Landing town hall recently (she said something like, maybe they don't like the way it will look!!!) Are you kidding me? Thank you, Patti Anderson

[Sent from the all new AOL app for iOS](#)

Heather Goodwin

From: Jeffrey Heller [REDACTED]
Sent: Sunday, September 24, 2023 9:31 PM
To: Council; Planning Commission
Subject: Questions for Staff - Joint Council and Planning Commission Mtg 9/26/23

CAUTION: This is an external email. Please take care when clicking links or opening attachments.

I am out of town and not able to attend this important meeting. I hope the following questions will be issued as "agenda correspondence) and will be published for the public's benefit.

BESS:

1. Which agency (local, state, federal) has the final authority re: approval or disapproval of this project? If our general plan as well as a possible citizen's initiative prohibit a BESS at the proposed location along our coast, is it possible these documents can be overruled by another agency(s)?
2. The Coastal Commission has a mandate to move "all critical infrastructure off the coast". This is in response to the impacts of climate change, including sea level rise as well as flooding. We moved our sewer plant 3.5 miles inland and uphill at great expense to our ratepayers. How can the BESS plant or the existing PG&E substation be any different? Aren't they both parts of our "critical infrastructure"? If so--shouldn't they be relocated as well?
3. Is a BESS facility a "coastal dependent" industrial use? Or can BESS' be located anywhere a grid connection is available?
4. The United States generates more greenhouse gases (GHG's) per capita than any country in the world. Yes. Number 1. While generating more power from renewable sources is an admirable goal--are the mining, manufacturing, transportation and maintenance processes necessary to develop a grid scale BESS being evaluated from a "net carbon" perspective? Or will the planned development of a future MB BESS follow the traditional and current processes which generate substantial amounts of GHG's? If so---we are "chasing our tail". If BESS' (or Windfarms) cannot be developed using existing, "Net-Zero" sustainability metrics---our efforts to increase generation of power from "renewable" sources will be in vain.

Thank you all for dealing with these important questions!

Jeff Heller
Member of MB City Council-2018-2022
[REDACTED]

Heather Goodwin

From: Eric Meyer
Sent: Saturday, September 23, 2023 8:42 AM
To: Scot Graham
Cc: Heather Goodwin
Subject: Joint City Council Planning Commission Meeting
Attachments: original-B0750717-F749-4696-A492-C855CAF84643.jpeg; processed-7450E66A-2844-4B8D-9F02-BAF1222C6A4F-4F79453D-EC9A-4E54-8F0F-81556A094D58.jpeg

Scot
Can you please have the two images (attached) available when we ask questions about the power plant master plan/BESS project at the joint meeting.
Prior to the Navy's creation of the Embarcadero, the original natural route of Morro Creek was a lot more southerly. Originally Morro Creek entered the bay at approximately where the power plant is now. This is backed up by early aerial photos of the project site area then known as "the willows".

I will be asking you to show these two images and during that I will describe the original route of Morro Creek... and then I'll be asking the following two questions:

1. Given the original routing of Morro Creek and its tendency to want to return to that route, as evidenced by the two recent floods, is flooding from an atmospheric river rain event, during a king tide, taken into account by the EIR for the BESS project?
2. What measure of 100 year estimated sea level rise is being used and who decides what measure of sea level rise is used?

I don't expect you or any consultants to be able to fully answer the questions... as the EIR does not exist yet. I just want the subject raised and on public record for the sake of the EIR and design of the project, should it be approved.

Thank you.

Eric Meyer

Get [Outlook for iOS](#)

T.28S., R.10E.

T.28S., R.11E.

PLAT
of the
RANCHO MORO Y CAYUCOS
finally conferred to
James M. Kinley
Surveyed under instructions from the
U.S. SURVEYOR GENERAL
by
J. E. Terrell, Dep. Sur.
January 1861
Containing $8845 \frac{49}{100}$ Acres
Scale 40 chs to inch
Variation $16^{\circ} 30' E$

Boundaries

N ^o	Course	Dist.	N ^o	Course	Dist.
1	N 70 1/2 W	33.00	18	S 48 W	17.00
2	N 12 W	25.00	19	S 37 1/2 W	13.00
3	N 9 W	134.00	20	S 63 1/2 W	12.50
4	N 33 1/2 W	36.00	21	S 76 1/2 W	7.00
5	N 16 1/2 W	30.00	22	S 57 1/2 W	12.70
6	N 28 1/2 W	140.00	23	S 68 1/2 W	5.30
7	N 48 1/2 W	115.00	24	S 44 1/2 W	7.75
8	N 10 E	14.00	25	S 22 1/2 W	4.72
9	N 25 1/2 W	6.00	26	S 12 1/2 W	6.00
10	S 81 5/4 E	376.31	27	S 18 1/2 W	7.30
11	S 11 1/4 E	214.82	28	S 38 W	7.35
12	S 38 W	18.00	29	S 54 1/2 W	4.90
13	S 76 1/2 W	29.00	30	S 24 1/2 W	10.00
14	S 65 1/2 W	10.00	31	S 23 1/2 E	6.30
15	S 8 1/4 W	15.00	32	S 12 1/2 W	15.00
16	S 66 W	40.00	33	S 10 1/2 W	5.30
17	S 21 1/4 W	25.00	34	West	6.30
		1261.73			142.65
					1261.13

Aggregate of Exterior Boundaries 1403.81
= 17 miles 48 chs. 81 lks.



Note Notice of the approval of this plat and its retention in office for four weeks subject to inspection, was published from 2nd of May to 1st of June 1861, in pursuance of the Act of Congress of June 14th 1860.

J. W. Mandeville
U.S. Surv. Gen^l Cal^a

The field notes of the Rancho Moro y Cayucos and from which this Plat has been made out have been examined and approved and are on file in this office
U.S. Surveyor General's Office
San Francisco California
May 2nd 1861

J. W. Mandeville
U.S. Surv. Gen^l Cal^a

This plat of the Rancho Moro y Cayucos is a full true and correct copy of the original on file in this office
U.S. Surveyor General's Office
San Francisco California
March 12th 1877

J. E. Terrell

