



**AGENDA NO: A-1 thru A-4**

**MEETING DATE: November 14, 2017**

**THE FOLLOWING PUBLIC CORRESPONDENCE  
WAS RECEIVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL  
FOLLOWING POSTING OF THE AGENDA**

**Dana Swanson**

---

**From:** betty winholtz  
**Sent:** Tuesday, November 14, 2017 1:51 AM  
**To:** Jamie Irons; Marlys McPherson; John Headding; Robert Davis; Matt Makowetski  
**Cc:** Scott Collins; Dana Swanson  
**Subject:** agenda items a-1 through a-4

Dear City Council:

It is baffling to me how the Minutes for every special meeting is available for approval at tonight's meeting, but there are no up-to-date Minutes for regularly scheduled city council meetings. In fact, no Minutes have been posted on the City's website since August. This is November. Please explain priorities to me, since there is both a City Clerk and an Assistant City Clerk.

Sincerely,  
Betty Winholtz



**AGENDA NO: A-8**

**MEETING DATE: November 14, 2017**

**THE FOLLOWING PUBLIC CORRESPONDENCE  
WAS RECEIVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL  
FOLLOWING POSTING OF THE AGENDA**

## Dana Swanson

---

**From:** betty winholtz  
**Sent:** Tuesday, November 14, 2017 1:42 AM  
**To:** Jamie Irons; Marlys McPherson; John Headding; Robert Davis; Matt Makowetski  
**Cc:** Scott Collins; Dana Swanson  
**Subject:** agenda items a-8 abd c-2

Dear City Council:

There is inconsistency between the goals in A-8 and the action in C-2, as well as inconsistency between A-8 and the bid packet put out recently. In other words, you are giving the impression of being two-faced.

In the first instance, I am referring to goal #1 in A-8:

"All aspects of the WRF project shall be completed ensuring economic value with a special emphasis on **minimizing rate payer and City expense.**" (my bolding)

Yet in C-2, you are approving money for the design of a massive lift station and miles of pipes for which you have no EIR, no permit, and no money to build. Are you assuming the community will not challenge both the EIR and permit? Are you assuming you will win the 218 vote? Are you assuming that the lift station won't have to be redesigned once there is an official project description for the new plant?

In the second instance, I am referring to goal #1 (quoted above) in conjunction with goal #7 in A-8:

**Eliminate**--"Design to allow for **other possible municipal functions.**" (My bolding)

Yet in the bid package, the \$6 million office building and bay for approximately 1/5 of the City's employees is listed as part of the project. How is a \$6 million building not extravagant? How is moving 20 City positions outside of town to a plant that does not take 20 people to run not designing for other municipal functions?

Inconsistencies like these cause the community to not trust that the Council has our economic best interests at heart. At the least, if you are going to sock-it-to-us, be consistent and don't take us for dummies.

Sincerely,  
Betty Winholtz



**AGENDA NO: C-1**

**MEETING DATE: November 14, 2017**

**THE FOLLOWING PUBLIC CORRESPONDENCE  
WAS RECEIVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL  
FOLLOWING POSTING OF THE AGENDA**

## Dana Swanson

---

**From:** Bill Luffee  
**Sent:** Tuesday, November 14, 2017 9:12 AM  
**To:** Council  
**Subject:** Marijuana Ordinance

Council:

As a resident and property owner in Morro Bay

I am in favor of everything you are doing with one exception the growing of Marijuana of between 4-6 plants in residential neighborhoods NEEDS TO BE INSIDE to prevent any issues with the neighbors not after the fact. I do not want to have smell which is my biggest concern to deal with. Lets allow the community to grow for their own use but just in the privacy in the own homes. Foresee a tremendous issue with enforcement and complaints if allowed to grow outside.

Respectively

Bill Luffee



**AGENDA NO: C-2**

**MEETING DATE: November 14, 2017**

**THE FOLLOWING PUBLIC CORRESPONDENCE  
WAS RECEIVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL  
FOLLOWING POSTING OF THE AGENDA**

11/10/17

MBCC Meeting of 11/14/17, Item C-2

Agenda Correspondence

The proposed authorization to contract WRF lift station and pipeline design to an engineering firm for \$1,488,931 **should be opposed by the council** until the following questions are answered:

1. What is the current **APPROVED PROJECT BUDGET** and which budget line will these expenditures be posted against? What is the current “construction budget” for the lift station and pipeline system?
2. What is the source of funding for this design work? What will the remaining fund balance be after this design work is complete? Will debt be incurred? If so—how will the debt be financed and what will be the monthly (or annual) obligation?
3. The best economic value on a technical project like this is to use a “design/build” approach which typically incorporates contractor cost saving ideas into the final design. Hiring a firm to provide “design only services” ignores the benefit of the “design/build” approach---which the City has professed will be used on the WRF project.
4. Moving ahead with the lift station and pipeline design at this time assumes the following:
  - a. There is currently a “construction budget line” for the lift station and piping system, which will be the guideline for the design work,
  - b. The final WRF will absolutely be located at the SBB site,
  - c. The EIR under development for the SBB site will absolutely be approved,
  - d. LAFCO will absolutely approve the SBB site,
  - e. Funding will be available to build the entire WRF project, and/or rate payers will approve additional funds via a 218 protest vote is necessary,
  - f. The city will not partner with the County and Los Osos (or Cayucos) in any way that might alter the proposed lift station/pipeline design.
  - g. The CCC will approve a massive lift station west of Highway One.
5. The City takes on **potential \$1.5M design liability** by moving forward with the design of this expensive portion of the work at this time with all of the assumptions listed above. Most notable are the lack of an APPROVED PROJECT BUDGET, lack of APPROVED FINANCING in place, lack of necessary approvals by other agencies that the WRF will

definitely be built at the SBB location, and ignoring the cost saving approach of the “design/build” delivery method.

6.

**I urge the council to NOT APPROVE ITEM C-2 until all of the issues addressed in this correspondence have been answered. The financial exposure for these design services is unnecessary.**

Regards

Jeff Heller

---

**From:** Kenneth Green < >  
**Sent:** Monday, November 13, 2017 10:07 AM  
**To:** Council  
**Subject:** Agenda Item C-2 for the November 14, 2017 Meeting

Dear Mayor Irons and City Council Members,

Please excuse the group post.

I object to assigning nearly \$1.5 M to consultants for lift station and pipeline design for the Water Reclamation facility.

My reasons:

- the money should be part of a larger, design/build contract and not a plan that may or may not be followed by a contractor
- the money should go to a project manager who would prioritize the City's interests in high quality work and astute control over expenses
- the money amounts to salary and fringes of nearly \$300,000 for five years; a project manager would find the salary attractive and the time period would likely see the WRF to completion
- my citizen's view is that consultants for the WRF project have not provided value for money; I see no advantage to spending this amount of money on more consultation.

Please do not approve the proposal to hire consultants to do designs. Please choose an alternative that is more cost effective.

Sincerely,  
Ken Green

Morro Bay

## Dana Swanson

---

**From:** Tom Rost  
**Sent:** Monday, November 13, 2017 2:55 PM  
**To:** Jamie Irons; Marlys McPherson; Matt Makowetski; John Headding; Robert Davis  
**Cc:** Dana Swanson  
**Subject:** Design of Lift Station and Piping to South Bay Blvd Site for WRF

Dana, please distribute to the Mayor and all the Council Members and have it filed as part of the Official Record.

RE: MBCC Meeting of 11/14/17, Item C-2

You are respectfully advised that you are putting the cart before the horse to authorize expenditure for design of lift station and piping to the South Bay Blvd site for the WRF Project.

Surely by now as a body you would understand that a “design/build” approach is by far the most cost efficient for the taxpayer. This approach for authorization of \$1,488,931 would be part of the “design/build”. Your piece meal approach could certainly be construed as malfeasance in office.

Anyone who is providing you with consulting advice would never suggest designing a transmission system of liquid without first knowing the size of the receiving processor relating to its capacity and flow processing.

Once the decision has been made to select a particular plant, the lift station and piping may have to be redesigned which would cost unnecessary expenditure of tax dollars.

As I publicly have said at your meeting, you are not as a body being well-served with your selective consultants.

My suggestion to you would be that you as individuals consult the Civil Engineering Department at Cal Poly for I believe that the Department Chair or Professors would indicate misgivings of approving your proposed expenditure in this piece meal approach and would not be recommended as taxpayer efficient. I would believe that they would advise that you may encounter re-expending tax dollars for a redesign of the lift station and piping.

There are many other questions that should be answered relating to administration, some of which are raised in Jeff Heller’s letter, aside from the logical approach to design and construction of a sanitary system. You are attempting to go in the back door which most often is the road map to disaster.

Tom Rost

## Dana Swanson

---

**From:** Robert Settje  
**Sent:** Monday, November 13, 2017 4:50 PM  
**To:** Council  
**Subject:** Lift Station vote

How can you build a lift station west of Hwy 1 and you can not build a sewer west of Hwy 1 ? What is the difference between a lift station and a sewer? They both move the waste to other locations. All the bad things that might happen that will never happen to the sewer would happen to a lift station. The Sewer should be west of Hwy 1 for cost reasons and you have already wasted 2 years so what is another 2 years to get the new sewer west of Hwy 1. Think about it if the ocean really rose to the current sewer level. Florida would be flooded south of Orlando. Now that is a big problem. 50 years from now people will be wondering why those crazy people pumped all that waste over the hill when they did not have to. Stop and think. Would the population of Morro Bay like to pay \$150 or \$240 water and sewer bills. I and everyone I know is voting for \$150 and so will the entire city.

## Dana Swanson

---

**From:** betty winholtz  
**Sent:** Tuesday, November 14, 2017 1:42 AM  
**To:** Jamie Irons; Marlys McPherson; John Headding; Robert Davis; Matt Makowetski  
**Cc:** Scott Collins; Dana Swanson  
**Subject:** agenda items a-8 abd c-2

Dear City Council:

There is inconsistency between the goals in A-8 and the action in C-2, as well as inconsistency between A-8 and the bid packet put out recently. In other words, you are giving the impression of being two-faced.

In the first instance, I am referring to goal #1 in A-8:

"All aspects of the WRF project shall be completed ensuring economic value with a special emphasis on **minimizing rate payer and City expense.**" (my bolding)

Yet in C-2, you are approving money for the design of a massive lift station and miles of pipes for which you have no EIR, no permit, and no money to build. Are you assuming the community will not challenge both the EIR and permit? Are you assuming you will win the 218 vote? Are you assuming that the lift station won't have to be redesigned once there is an official project description for the new plant?

In the second instance, I am referring to goal #1 (quoted above) in conjunction with goal #7 in A-8:

**Eliminate--**"Design to allow for **other possible municipal functions.**" (My bolding)

Yet in the bid package, the \$6 million office building and bay for approximately 1/5 of the City's employees is listed as part of the project. How is a \$6 million building not extravagant? How is moving 20 City positions outside of town to a plant that does not take 20 people to run not designing for other municipal functions?

Inconsistencies like these cause the community to not trust that the Council has our economic best interests at heart. At the least, if you are going to sock-it-to-us, be consistent and don't take us for dummies.

Sincerely,  
Betty Winholtz