



AGENDA NO: B-1

MEETING DATE: May 21, 2025

**AGENDA CORRESPONDENCE
RECEIVED BY THE PUBLIC WORKS ADVISORY BOARD
FOR PUBLIC REVIEW**

From: [Betsy Gaudette-Cross](#)
To: [Public Works Advisory Board](#)
Subject: PWAB comment
Date: Wednesday, May 21, 2025 12:49:26 PM

Sorry, I sent it from my home email by accident originally.

Dear Fellow PWAB Members,

I have read a portion of the staff report and attachments for agenda item B-1. I make these comments as my officially submitted public comments to be responded to as part of the Second Addendum.

1. On page 1 of the staff report, the description of Cannon's responsibilities are no different than what they have been. Nothing seems accomplished. Options have been worked on for years; why is there no conclusion yet?
2. It seems like Addendum #2 is expanding the scope of work rather than narrowing it. I believe the city was going to do 1-3 injection wells. Now, it seems like the recommendation is up to 5, maybe even 8. This is the wrong direction. And these new wells may not even be permanent or chosen.
3. It is not surprising that one location has different rates or travel times as reported in the tracer study. The same is true of an above ground creek or stream depending on the time of year/weather. It is known that the Morro aquifer is not a real basin, but a shallow flow area.
4. Why do you continue to drill so close to the ocean? Isn't such drilling facilitating salt water intrusion?
5. In the staff report it says that non-potable water to Lila Kaiser Park and the high school should be "removed." Yet in the *Conceptual Design Report* they are included. Please explain.
6. Incremental movement as the new recommendation is driving the cost up. I am not in favor of spending more money on consultants who are not producing a product. For example, in the "Summary Recycled Water Program Implementation Schedule," the first 2 lines: why is there a 2-year gap between drilling a well and performing the tracer study for 2 years?
7. If Confluence Engineering is the oversight for this project, and we are no closer to an answer than 2 years ago, do we need a new oversight?
8. Like Cannon, GSI has brought us no closer to a solution.
9. Why is the demolition of the old sewer plant connected to the IPR? Are

the same companies working on both?

10. Katz has not done its PR job in a timely fashion, particularly in regard to the website.

Thank you for entertaining my questions and comments.

Sincerely,
Betsy Gaudette-Cross
PWAB Member

Get [Outlook for iOS](#)