



**AGENDA NO: C-1**

**MEETING DATE: July 10, 2018**

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

## Dana Swanson

---

**From:** betty winholtz  
**Sent:** Monday, July 09, 2018 12:50 AM  
**To:** Jamie Irons; Marlys McPherson; John Headding; Matt Makowetski; Robert Davis  
**Cc:** Scott Collins; Dana Swanson  
**Subject:** agenda item c-1

Dear City Council:

Three types of references are made here: questions for clarification, identifying misleading statements, and typos. My words are in italics.

Sincerely,  
Betty Winholtz

1. On page 105 of the full agenda, the staff report states, "Recycled water provides the City with a relatively drought-proof local supply that improves water supply security and reliability." *This is true IF water can be recovered from injection. That's not been proven.*
2. Which makes this statement on the same page (105) beg the question, *Why not drop the injection wells for a savings, or a wash, of \$35 million?* (page 112) "Financial analysis indicates that the impact of the added costs of the recycled water facilities would be largely offset by the financial benefits of subsidized financing available with recycling."
3. page 105, *While "Water recycling was identified as a community goal for the new WRF," it was not meant as a goal at any cost: to put people out of their homes due to its prohibitive nature.*
4. *It is important to make clear to the the public that the WIFIA loan interest rate is not only not set, it is going up.* (page 114)
5. page 117, **typo:** *2021/11 should be 2021/22?*
6. page 139, **typo,** *in first line: should "and" be "an"?*
7. page 139, *Table 21, Please confirm or correct that while the surcharges are dedicated to paying for the new WRF, base rates are also contributing to building the new WRF via debt service and cash contribution.*
8. *same table, wastewater treatment O&M is going up 78% at the new plant. The footnote accounts for Cayucos' current 25% share, but what accounts for the balance, i.e. is the new plant that much more expensive to run?*
9. page 175, first paragraph, *the upgrade in the 1980s was left out of the history, making the plant sound more ancient than it is.*

10. page 175, first paragraph, *the phrase, "the City's new, more stringent, permit requirements" does not reflect the fact that the current sewer plant is meeting the "more stringent" requirements now as often as not, if by stringent you are referring to meeting secondary treatment.*
11. page 175, second paragraph, *who is suggesting to "rebuilt at its current location"?*
12. page 175, second paragraph, *the site referred to as "near the existing site" is not the same location as what is now being proposed, the Hanson site.*
13. page 175, second paragraph, *please cite the inconsistencies with the Coastal Act and Morro Bay's Local Coastal Program.*
14. page 175, third paragraph, *the proposed out-of-town site is normally referred to as 3 miles from the current sewer plant because that is how far the pumping and piping will have to go to get to the new facility. To say it is "roughly one mile east of downtown" is true but irrelevant.*
15. page 175, third paragraph, *while "input from a number of professional and community-advisory groups", was received, their advice was not necessarily accepted.*
16. page 176, second paragraph, *"The previously adopted rates...do not provide adequate funding to support each utility's share of costs for the WRF Project"; however the "previously adopted rates" would provide enough funding for a different sewer project in a different location. This point is avoided.*
17. page 176, third paragraph, *The surcharges are being adopted a year early, before the previous 5-year rate cycle is up.*
18. page 176, Low Income Discount *not identified as only 10%.*
19. page 177, "billed per residential dwelling unit" *This is different language from customer of record and parcel owner For example, will an apartment building have one surcharge because it has one meter, or one surcharge for each unit in the building?*
20. page 178, "a) identify the affected property or properties," *this is confusing since there is room for only one parcel number/address on the form. Please clarify if multiple listings are allowed on the same piece of paper.*
21. page 178, *the closing statement in italics may be appropriate for a poll, but not a ballot.*
22. page 180 #5 **typo:** *word missing, sentence not clear.*
23. page 183, section 9, **typo,** *sentence not clear.*

24. page 183, section 10, *Are City properties part of the baseline number of parcels being counted in the total to meet the 50% plus one criteria?*

25. page 183, *Using this phrase creates confusion: "without opening the envelopes." It's confusing because protests can be submitted without an envelope when dropped off at City Hall. This statement does not consider this possibility. Or, is it being implied that envelopes are a must and will not be counted if there is no envelope?*

## Dana Swanson

---

**From:** Kathy Quigley  
**Sent:** Monday, July 09, 2018 8:58 AM  
**To:** Dana Swanson  
**Subject:** For inclusion in July 10 meeting correspondence

Please include in agenda July 10 meeting correspondence

Dear Mayor and Council,

A new, revised sample protest ballot is included in the July 10, city council agenda packet. The word surcharge has been substituted for rate. Surcharge has just recently been added to the vocabulary of increased sewer and water costs.

In Resolution No. 44-18, the word **rate** is used 25 times, the word **charges** 2 times and the word **fees** 3 times. Surcharge is not included in this resolution.

The most recent Important Water and Sewer Update flier mailed out by the city uses **rate** and **flat rate** to describe what citizens will see appear on their bills if this goes through. No mention of surcharges.

The city attorney clarified at the June 28, special city council meeting (hour 2:04:25) that a surcharge is a **flat rate**.

HOWEVER, the draft Notice of a Public Hearing that you are considering at the July 10 council meeting uses surcharge and rate surcharge almost exclusively. This is confusing! Please use the terms you have made familiar to the community over the past year. Change the usage of **surcharge** to **rate** on your sample ballot and in the notice you will be sending out for the 218.

Respectfully,  
Kathy Quigley  
Morro Bay

## Dana Swanson

---

**From:** Kathy Quigley  
**Sent:** Monday, July 09, 2018 1:08 PM  
**To:** Dana Swanson  
**Subject:** One more thing for correspondence

Hi Dana,  
Is there any chance this could still be attached to the agenda correspondence?  
Thanks, Kathy

Dear Mayor and Council,  
Your draft Notice of a Public Hearing should include clear information in Spanish regarding the nature of this important process. The draft has a short statement in Spanish that can be found on the LAST page of the notice. This statement informs us if we would like to receive this news in Spanish to call or visit the city web site. But the news itself – that rates are increasing and you have a right to protest and how to do so are NOT in Spanish.

I urge you to have the title of your notice – Notice of a Public Hearing on Proposed Water and Sewer Rates to Support a New Water Reclamation Facility be in Spanish directly below or next to the one in English. The statement that is on the last page should also be moved to the front page so that it is clear why this notice is coming out and how to obtain a copy in Spanish.

I appreciate that Mayor Irons clarified at the last meeting that this notice should be in Spanish. If it is not being mailed out with both languages, please include the suggested changes so that it invites all citizens to be informed.

Respectfully,  
Kathy Quigley

Date: July 9, 2018

To: Dana Swanson  
City Clerk

From: Don Headland  
Morro Bay Resident

**Subject : Correspondents for the City Council Meeting on July 10, 2018  
Item C. BUSINESS ITEMS, C-1 REVIEW PRELIMINARY  
RECOMMENDATIONS FOR WATER AND SEWER RATES**

Hello,

I have some question about the security of the 218 Protest Votes that are turned in by citizens to the City of Morro Bay.

My concerns are:

1. What is the City procedure for securing the 218 Protest Vote that are hand carried into the City Hall?
2. Where will the 218 Protest Votes be secured after business hours during the 45-day period?
3. Will there be a locked box for citizens to deposit their 218 Protest Vote?
4. Where will the designated box be location?
5. What is the procedure to prevent anyone from tampering with the 218 Protest Votes?
6. Who will transport the **218 Protest Votes** to the Veteran's Building on August 28, 2018 for the Public Hearing?

Thank You,