



AGENDA NO: C-1

MEETING DATE: September 10, 2019

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

Dana Swanson

From: betty winholtz [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, September 09, 2019 1:46 AM
To: John Headding; Robert Davis; Marlys McPherson; Jeffrey Heller; Dawn Addis
Cc: Dana Swanson
Subject: agenda item c-1

Dear City Council:

Before you approve this change in contract Tuesday evening, please answer these questions for the record:

1. This is the second time this year you have changed the "not to exceed" limit for companies working on the WRF. I have come to believe that "not to exceed" is just a term and not a serious commitment. How much money is left in the the contingency fund for the WRF after this item is approved?
2. What happens if the contingency fund is exhausted before construction begins, and subsequently there are more change orders? Where does the money come from?
3. This item was before the WRFCAC on Sept. 3. Yet, there is no comment in the staff report regarding their dialogue and/or recommendation. What did the WRFCAC members have to say?
4. When this WWE Amendment was before the WRFCAC last week, it was heard in conjunction with a Corollo Amendment? Where is the Corollo Amendment? Why is it not part of the staff report or its own separate item tonight?
5. Property owners along the pipeline route have been listed up to, but not including, along S. Bay Blvd, Teresa Drive, and the underpass of Hwy One. Are they not part of the offsite pipeline portion of the project? If not, why not? If they are, why are they not talked about in the report?

Sincerely,
Betty Winholtz



AGENDA NO: C-2

MEETING DATE: September 10, 2019

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

Dana Swanson

From: betty winholtz [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, September 09, 2019 10:19 AM
To: John Headding; Robert Davis; Marlys McPherson; Jeffrey Heller; Dawn Addis
Cc: Dana Swanson
Subject: agenda item c-2

Dear City Council:

I encourage you to *not* receive and file this report. For an addendum to be legitimately used, NONE of the circumstances laid out in Public Resources Code 15162 as calling for a Subsequent EIR must apply. These circumstances include substantial changes in the project or its circumstances since the previous EIR was completed, the emergence of significant impacts not previously discussed in the original EIR, information indicating that impacts previously analyzed would be significantly more severe than was understood at the time the original EIR was completed, etc.

There are significant environmental changes due to rerouting that have been made. Staff saying it's not so does not make it true. Two examples are the significant impact to the mile of Quintana businesses and the revealing impact to the blue line stream running by the proposed plant location. In the last paragraph before the Conclusion on page 239 of 289, it states:

"Per discussions with State Board staff, they require that any environmental analysis for a project being funded by CWSRF, even an addendum, must be circulated for public review for two weeks with the State Clearinghouse and locally with the County of San Luis Obispo Clerk. On August 14, 2019, the FEIR Addendum was received by the County Clerk and State Clearinghouse. The FEIR Addendum was also placed on the WRF website on August 28, 2019."

Actions by your staff and consultants to make this document available on a technicality not per the intent of the State Water Board is revealing as to Council's intent to *not* be transparent. The document was sent to the two government agencies required by law, but not posted on the City's website as other documents have been. It was published August 14. It was posted on the City's website two weeks later, August 28; I believe because I raised the question the night before at the City Council meeting. Searching on the City Website before August 28 revealed nothing. Once it was posted it has difficult to locate; one has to know the special website address morrobaywrf.com.

Sincerely,
Betty Winholtz



AGENDA NO: C-3

MEETING DATE: September 10, 2019

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

Dana Swanson

From: betty winholtz [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, September 09, 2019 4:02 AM
To: John Headding; Robert Davis; Marlys McPherson; Jeffrey Heller; Dawn Addis
Cc: Dana Swanson
Subject: agenda item c-3

Dear City Council:

The history of vacation rentals in Morro Bay should begin in 2006, when residents came before the City Council and asked for an ordinance; none existed. The Council passed the current ordinance. In 2016, residents returned to Council because the ordinance was weak and more and more vacation rentals were being established in neighborhoods. Two years later, a limit was added to the ordinance in 2018 but in residential zones only.

It is important to note the 250-limit did not cover other zones; there are many apartments in the commercial area of downtown. As recently as a couple of weeks ago, 3 more long term renters were given notice to leave because their apartments are being converted to vacation rentals.

The staff report does not reflect the 2019 action City Council took last month to include vacation rentals in TBID.

Morro Bay is experiencing a housing crisis because of vacation rental conversions. Residents are trying to get your attention.

It is unnecessary to either divert staff time or hire another consultant to address the community's concern. Los Osos residents wrote their own. Morro Bay can do the same. As with the writing of the Mobile Home Rental Control Ordinance, all that is required is a neutral mediator because you will want residents and managers on the committee that proposes our ordinance. There are many models to choose from: there is no sense in re-inventing the wheel. There are qualified people in our community who can moderate. Act now.

Sincerely,
Betty Winholtz

Heather Goodwin

From: Jamie Irons [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, September 10, 2019 12:21 AM
To: Council
Subject: Vacation Rentals

Dear Council,

Thank you for continuing the work on Vacation Rentals in Morro Bay. Vacation Rentals (VR) have been a discussion with residents, visitors, and VR operators for years. The moratorium and limit on VR's may have been both appropriate and effective for the time, but do we have anymore data to support a way forward. I have spoken with property owners who live in and on their property while they rent it out on a short term basis as a VR, and some that have a cottage on their property in addition to the main residence that choose to rent it as a VR to allow their children and grandchildren the opportunity to stay with them throughout the year. This practice of a host VR allows members of our community to enhance their lives with extra revenue and in some cases allows for a greater family experience. There have been reports of visitors disrupting neighborhoods on weekends with loud parties though it has been hard to differentiate a party in a second home versus a party in a VR. We have had personal experience as a host VR operator and found it to be a good experience, allowing for greater visits from family members, and allowing many of our neighbors family members to stay as well. It is hard to quantify the number of second homes that are not VR's versus investment property for the specific use of VR. Housing and full time rentals are a challenge on the coast, this adds to the difficulty of a VR ordinance moving forward. Our Housing Element update will provide some data but not all. Looking at VR websites there are in excess of 300 VR's listed for Morro Bay. Some are in Los Osos but it is difficult to attain accurate data. There are companies that provide services for city's in monitoring websites to identify licensed and unlicensed VR's but this comes at a cost.

With all that in mind I have a proposal for council to consider. Currently our VR's are assessed at 10% with an additional new 3% to the TBID. At 10% TOT for FY18/19 the City collected approximately \$5.5 million in VR receipts which equates to about \$550,000 in TOT Tax collected. Would Council consider a trial period for three years with the following? A 20% TOT assessment for VR's. Thats an additional 7% TOT or about \$385,000. A \$500/year fee for non hosted VR's. Remove the limit on VR's, because we haven't been able to enforce the ones that are not permitted by the City anyway. We know that more than 250 VR's are listed on VR websites, and this way we could get a clear number over a three year period.

The \$500/year fee for non hosted VR's based on a 100 non hosted VR's could net \$50,000 which could be used for social assistance programs, be it a utility assistance program or a grant program for rental housing repair and improvement. The \$385,000 would be utilized for an additional half time code enforcement officer, for VR enforcement and data collection, contracting with a VR service that monitors VR websites to assist in data collection and reporting non permitted VR's and any additional funds required for additional legal and staff time. The remainder of the unallocated funds could go to the General Fund.

The program would require more details such as an annual application, an enforcement policy that included fines etc. This may seem like a lot but it could be an opportunity to really analyze the impacts of VR's with funds to do it and perhaps a little extra to the General Fund and a social needs program.

If you have any questions please feel free to call.

Respectfully,
Jamie Irons
805-550-6595