



AGENDA NO: A-4

MEETING DATE: January 28, 2020

**AGENDA CORRESPONDENCE
RECEIVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL
FOLLOWING POSTING OF THE AGENDA IS ATTACHED
FOR PUBLIC REVIEW PRIOR TO THE MEETING**

Dana Swanson

From: betty winholtz [REDACTED]
Sent: Sunday, January 26, 2020 9:50 AM
To: John Heading; Marlys McPherson; Robert Davis; Jeffrey Heller; Dawn Addis
Cc: Dana Swanson; Jennifer Callaway; Scott Collins
Subject: agenda item a-4

Dear City Council:

It would be help to see a table of critical dates included in this policy and as a handout to customers. It was difficult for me, a math person to picture the procedure. A lot of people are not math-inclined. In addition, the language can be confusing to understand because of the closeness of spelling and meaning, i.e. delinquency, discontinuation, etc. Were you able to figure this out? A list as simple as the following would be helpful. If my dates are wrong, you know it's super confusing. Please be customer friendly.

- Day 0--Issuance Date (date of bill)
- Day 31--Delinquency Date
- Day 45--First Delinquency Notice mailed (approximately)
- Day 60--Appeal deadline
- Day 77--Second Delinquency and impending discontinuation of service; also, master-meter service termination notice
- Day 90--Final Notice of Termination; also, final date for City's response to an appeal
- Day 91--Reasonable attempt to contact by phone
- Day 92--Water Shutoff Date (or next regular business day)

In addition, I suggest the phone call be made earlier than 24 hours before shutoff.

Also, I suggest the penalty and tag fees forgiven once every 12-month cycle rather than a 24-month cycle.

The term "tag" is nowhere defined. This should be added to "Definitions." It has a specific definition in this context.

"Master-meter" service is not defined. This should be added to "Definitions." It was a specific definition in this context.

This policy should be an ordinance, part of the Morro Bay Municipal Code.

There is a typo in your "Council Policy" under the section "Policy:" page 2, line e, the second "a" should be an "as."

Sincerely,
Betty Winholtz



AGENDA NO: A-7

MEETING DATE: January 28, 2020

**AGENDA CORRESPONDENCE
RECEIVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL
FOLLOWING POSTING OF THE AGENDA IS ATTACHED
FOR PUBLIC REVIEW PRIOR TO THE MEETING**

Dana Swanson

From: betty winholtz [REDACTED]
Sent: Sunday, January 26, 2020 9:32 PM
To: John Heading; Marlys McPherson; Robert Davis; Jeffrey Heller; Dawn Addis
Cc: Dana Swanson; Scot Graham; Scott Collins
Subject: agenda item a-7

Dear City Council:

I continue to be concerned that the City is purchasing lot 6SW (part of dog beach) from Cayucos via the Trust for Public Land. Ownership by Cayucos, Chevron, or Morro Bay is irrelevant due to historical use known as prescriptive rights. Historical use is acknowledged in Recital A of the MOU. For the City Council to purchase this lot is purposeless.

At the last city council meeting I inquired as to the 5 lot sizes identified in Recital E of the MOU. The director of Community Development said he could not state the size of the 5 lots. If the attached map is accurate, the acreage will more than double the size of North Morro Bay. Please have lot sizes available for this city council meeting. Also, please be able to identify what the zoning will be and whether the lots will be allowed to have accessory dwelling units (ADU); or, if they will be restricted from building a second unit. If ADUs are allowed, what is the maximum size they can be, considering the size of the properties?

I am unclear why "Chevron ultimately desires to have its lots" annexed into the City? Is it for marketability because they will have City services? While the City Manager stated that they will preserve a nature backdrop for the north end of the City, it is my understanding that the acres are unstable enough to not allow building regardless of whether the lots are annexed or not, so it is a moot point about viewshed protection. Certainly, the City did not preserve ridgeline viewshed protection as directed in the City's General Plan on Nutmeg Avenue.

The public's initiative that annexation must go to a vote of the people is not acknowledged anywhere in this document or staff report. Is it the city council's intent to circumvent this vote in some way, i.e. via a public benefit? If not, what is the city council's strategy to gain public approval for annexing?

Sincerely,
Betty Winholtz



AGENDA NO: C-3

MEETING DATE: January 28, 2020

**AGENDA CORRESPONDENCE
RECEIVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL
FOLLOWING POSTING OF THE AGENDA IS ATTACHED
FOR PUBLIC REVIEW PRIOR TO THE MEETING**

Dana Swanson

From: Sean Green [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, January 24, 2020 10:56 AM
To: Council; Scott Collins
Cc: Dana Swanson
Subject: 1/28/20 Agenda Item C-3: Visitor Center Relocation

Council and Staff,

The opportunity to relocate the MB Visitor Center to 575 Embarcadero is a no brainer. Space in the new 550sf unit should be allocated to Visitor Center first, Tourism staff second, if available, and Chamber staff third (simply because providing information and guidance to Morro Bay's visitors far outranks the need to house staff on the waterfront). Rather than spend significant City time and energy "exploring" this opportunity, I'd support the immediate signing of this low-stakes lease as proposed, a lease start date of March 2020 to facilitate Memorial Day opening, and a request for Tourism and Chamber staff to return to Council in February 2020 with three planned layouts and basic assumptions: (A) Visitor Center + Tourism + Chamber, (B) Visitor Center + Tourism, (C) Visitor Center only. I'm excited by this unique opportunity for Morro Bay's new visitor center to not only serve our vacationers with local tips, but also to serve as an example for other Embarcadero businesses in the providing (and maintaining) of public bathrooms, coastal access, and complimentary Wi-Fi.

All systems go,

Sean Green
Morro Bay, CA



AGENDA NO: C-4

MEETING DATE: January 28, 2020

**AGENDA CORRESPONDENCE
RECEIVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL
FOLLOWING POSTING OF THE AGENDA IS ATTACHED
FOR PUBLIC REVIEW PRIOR TO THE MEETING**

Dana Swanson

From: Sean Green [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, January 28, 2020 9:40 AM
To: Dana Swanson
Subject: 1/28/20 Agenda Item C-4: EV charging stations
Attachments: EV stations (1).jpg; EV stations (2).jpg; EV stations.jpg

Council and staff,

While I support most opportunities to advance Morro Bay's energy infrastructure and tourism amenities, and while I somewhat support the time and energy expense required for this particular grant application, I must voice my opposition to the proposed locations of EV charging stations in item C-4. Given that waterfront parking consistently ranks high on Council's priority list, it seems a huge mistake to further your recent, unfortunate trend of gifting away (or otherwise reallocating) public parking along the waterfront. Over the past three years, and to the detriment of both citizens and visitors, each of the following City-approved projects reduced general public parking along Embarcadero:

- Triangle lot reduction - expansion of private trash enclosures for Harbor Hut, GAFCO, Frankie & Lola's, and Bayfront Bistro (2018)
- Dynergy dirt lot reduction - now private boat storage (2019)
- Rose's Landing hotel development - several public parking spaces reassigned to private hotel parking (2021)
- Coast Guard building expansion - loss of public parking spaces (2021)

Add those to the potential closure of one traffic lane for Embarcadero sidewalk expansion (which I happen to agree with), and the designating of additional spaces to 20-minute parking (apparently to serve the needs of private, takeout eateries), and we're looking at even fewer parking opportunities for the general public moving forward.

Certainly, it can be said that EV spots remain general public parking, but we've all seen such charging stations go vacant for long stretches in even higher demand areas like San Luis Obispo, so I would argue this project does more to hurt general public parking than it does help it, again, if allowed in the proposed locations.

So, in determining alternative location(s) for EV stations, the three main questions I would ask are:

- Should EV stations really be given the same priority locations immediately adjacent to businesses just as ADA spaces are?
- Should EV stations that would only sometimes be occupied really be prioritized over general public parking that is almost always occupied?
- Might there be mutually beneficial EV locations away from the waterfront that not only satisfy EV driver needs and maintain high demand general parking along the waterfront, but also more publicly advertise Morro Bay's EV offerings?

Assuming you'd agree that EV drivers are just as capable of walking as your average users of general parking, and assuming EV stations would occasionally remain vacant even at times of peak parking demand, why not relocate the proposed EV stations to areas of lower parking demand yet higher visibility? Doing so would have little negative impact, as EV stations users would likely be happy simply to have their EV demands met, yet could have greater positive impact in terms of marketing Morro Bay as an EV-friendly city. Additionally, locating EV stations right along the waterfront would likely cause traffic jams during times of peak demand, as each and every incoming vehicle would see from afar what appears to be an empty parking space only to be deceived by EV designation, thus requiring another traffic-jamming loop around the lot. For these reasons and more, I urge you to consider more strategic locations such as those highlighted in the attached satellite photos.

A 2-2-2 or 3-3 grouping at two or three of the locations below seems to make sense, if in fact we are lucky enough to receive enough grant funding to make this project happen. Thank you in advance for seriously considering the practical and permanent implications of allocating away one of Morro Bay's scarcest resources.

Sincerely,

Sean Green
Morro Bay, CA



Library lot or Vet's Hall

