



**AGENDA NO: A-6**

**MEETING DATE: April 13, 2021**

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

## Dana Swanson

---

**From:** betty winholtz [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Monday, April 12, 2021 6:51 PM  
**To:** John Headding; Robert Davis; Jeffrey Heller; Dawn Addis; Laurel Barton  
**Cc:** Dana Swanson; Rob Livick  
**Subject:** roundabout

Dear City Council:

I have 2 areas of questions regarding this project--

1. **Financial.** Omni-Means, now GHD, did reports on this intersection from 2014-2016. The cost of this work is not reported in the staff report. Were these initial reports paid for by/through the City or Caltrans? If by/through the City, it seems they should be recorded in this report. The staff report starts with a second agreement with Omni-Means that began in 2016, within months of the first one being concluded. I am wondering how much the initial study was? Why is it not include here?

Here are the references:

Intersection Control Evaluation (Step 1) Report, Omni-Means, **December 2014**, and Intersection Control Evaluation (Step 2) Report, Omni-Means, **May, 2016**.

What other money has the City expended on this intersection in the last 7 years? To whom, and how much? Where is the money coming from to pay for GHD this round? It doesn't say in the staff report. What program or project will the City forego in order to pay for this 1.5-year study and design?

2. **Process.** Where is the City in the planning process? Is the City the lead agency or is Caltrans? Has an application been made to the City? Does the City/Caltrans plan to go through the Planning Commission for a Coastal Development Permit? When will the affected businesses and residents be notified that this project is "in the works?"

The City's adopted *Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan* of 2012 identifies a Complete Streets Policy in compliance with the 2008 CA Complete Streets Act (page 25). It also identifies requirements based on the American with Disabilities Act (page 36). Are these part of the requirements that GHD will be addressing in its preliminary design, or will another consultant? Also, is GHD designing for both a signalization and a roundabout?

Much has changed at Morro Bay High School in the last 5 years, including the principal. When the roundabout was first proposed 15 years ago, the MBHS principal was against

it. This staff report says the MBHS principal in 2016 was for it. Will the brand new principal be engaged be engaged?

How does GHD's work impact the construction of the new hotel on the west side of Hwy 1, the construction of the low income housing in the east side of Hwy 1, and the sewer project? How will GHD's work impact summer traffic?

Sincerely,  
Betty Winholtz



**AGENDA NO: C-1**

**MEETING DATE: April 13, 2021**

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

## Dana Swanson

---

**From:** betty winholtz <[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** Friday, April 09, 2021 1:18 AM  
**To:** John Headding; Robert Davis; Jeffrey Heller; Dawn Addis; Laurel Barton  
**Cc:** Dana Swanson; Scott Collins  
**Subject:** agenda item c-1

Dear City Council:

I object to spending Measure Q money on personnel. Two of the 4 suggestions in the staff report ask for funding staff positions. Measure Q specifically was not to be spent on funding salaries/wages long term. Nor was it to maintain a reserve or emergency fund. It was specifically for infrastructure and equipment.

However, Measure E was worded and advertised in such a way it can be spent on anything.

I do not know the restrictions on the federal ARP money, so it may be a source for paying staff. However, since it is temporary money, i.e. one time money, is it wise to spend it on hiring people who will then have to be let go when the money runs out?

I do not like the idea of "streamlining" for the following reasons:

1. Measure Q and E money should not be in one fund because their purposes were portrayed to the voters as having different purposes, as stated above.
2. Showing expenditures from the Measures' funds should not be eliminated. A person would have to search the whole budget just to find all the items.
3. Showing personnel expenditures should not be discontinued.

How do any of these actions make for greater transparency? They do not.

The City is financially accountable to the public, not just the Citizens Finance Committee. Please don't make it more difficult for either the Committee or the Public to see how our money is spent. Are you desirous of more Public Records Act requests?

Sincerely,  
Betty Winholtz



**AGENDA NO: C-2**

**MEETING DATE: April 13, 2021**

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

**From:** [Lynda Merrill](#)  
**To:** [Council](#)  
**Subject:** C 2, Council Agenda  
**Date:** Tuesday, April 13, 2021 4:08:23 PM

---

*Dear Mayor and Councilmembers,*

*Thank you for bringing this subject to the attention of our Government and citizens.*

*There is a disturbing crisis in our Country where irresponsible people with guns can terrorize innocent people.*

*We need responsible people, only, to have firearms. We need some way to make sure people with mental challenges aren't able to have them.*

*I appreciate you discussing this issue at the Council meeting and hope you can support some regulations that will benefit the public citizens and help the situation. Responsible people will not object to regulations that will protect us all.*

*Sincerely, Lynda Merrill*

**To:** Morro Bay City Council and City Manager  
**Subject:** Council meeting 4-13-2021, Agenda Item C-2  
**Date:** April 10, 2021  
**From:** Ron Reisner, Morro Bay resident

What exactly is the problem or problems in Morro Bay relative to “Local Firearm Safety and Regulation”? The agenda item’s staff report is non-specific.

The staff report goes to length listing incidents of mass shootings in the U.S. from 2014 to 2021 – a total of thirteen noted over a seven year period, in ten different states ranging from New Jersey to California. Significantly, however, the staff report does not provide gun incident statistics for Morro Bay for the same year range, or for that matter any calendar year.

As stated in the staff report, “. . . the State of California arguably has the most robust firearms regulations in the United States” – regulations that are the law of the land in California. Furthermore, the Morro Bay Police Department has its own robust policies regarding firearms.

Is the Morro Bay City Council asserting that California gun laws and the City’s firearm policies are inadequate? If so, specifically how are those laws and policies inadequate for the City of Morro Bay?

Section IV. A. of the staff report, which is entitled “Safety Regulations and Programs”, cites seven examples of “gun safety regulations”. Addressing each in turn:

1. Safe Storage Laws: Clearly this is a complex and controversial issue. Is the City of Morro Bay, with its very strained budget (as often cited by Council) prepared to adopt a local law that will be challenged and will require expensive defense on the part of the City? If so, specifically to what end - without regard to rhetoric?
2. Firearm Owners Liability Insurance: If the City were to require firearm owners to carry liability insurance – what would be the specific definition of a firearm; what would be the specific requirements of such insurance; which specific insurance underwriters provide such insurance; how much would such insurance cost the insured; and how exactly would the City enforce such a requirement?
3. Firearms and Public Property: Citizen holders of a California concealed weapons carry permit (CCW) must participate in and satisfy extensive gun

safety training, as well as thorough training in applicable firearms law, and undergo a Federal background check. In the absence of available law enforcement, who better to respond to an armed threat that might occur in a public place or on public property?

4. Firearms Businesses:

- a) Local Firearms Dealer Permit: In the State of California, a gun dealer must hold a valid federal firearms license (FFL) from the U.S. Dept. of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms, and must have a business license from the City, and must have a valid seller's permit from the State Board of Equalization. In order to obtain an FFL, the dealer must pass a thorough background check conducted by Federal authorities, then pass a formal interview process which focuses on the FFL applicant's knowledge and understanding of applicable Federal, State and local requirements.
- b) Videotaping of Firearm Sales: Reasonable – provided you can get past the privacy issues, and the potential cost to Morro Bay taxpayers from defending such a measure.
- c) Regular Inventory Reports: Such intrusion into a duly licensed and permitted business is unnecessary. A firearm dealer must, under law and per their permit, report each and every firearm sale. Additionally, California requires firearms dealers to report the theft or loss of any firearm or ammunition to the local law enforcement agency where the dealer is located within 48 hours. Further, Federal law requires licensed firearms dealers to maintain records of gun sales for at least 20 years, including information about the firearm(s) being purchased, as well as the purchaser.
- d) No Residential Sales: There are any number of FFL permit holders that operate out of a residence or in a residential area, and as previously noted, must in Morro Bay maintain a valid business license from the City. The notion of no legitimate residential firearm sales (illegitimate sales are thoroughly addressed by both Federal and State law) is intentional interference in contractual relations, and may be tortious.

5. Public Firearms Safety Education Program: Perfectly reasonable and prudent - provided such training is in no way politicized.

6. Annual Gun "Buy-Back" Program: Reasonable, provided it is in no way mandatory.

7. Supplemental MBPD Officer Mass/Active Shooter Trainer: Surely determining the need for such training is the province of the Morro Bay Chief of Police, not the City Council. Leave it in the hands of the Chief to make such a determination - on a non-politicized basis.

Staff report item B.: Once again Morro Bay City government contemplates involving itself and our taxpayer funds in politicized matters beyond Morro Bay. If staff and Council believe it imperative by virtue of Morro Bay's specific needs that Morro Bay taxpayers fund City government involvement in matters outside the City, then Council is obligated to prove the local imperative to the citizens.

Staff report item C.: Duly noted – California's 2016 "red flag" law is a matter of public record. If City government feels the need to make the local citizenry more aware, post a notice on the City website.

Staff report item D: Yet again Morro Bay City government contemplates involving itself and our taxpayer funds in politicized matters beyond Morro Bay. First, City government is obligated to effectively address each and every one of the many practical and economic needs pertaining directly to the citizens of Morro. Then, and only then, City government can formally poll the citizenry regarding how else they would like their tax dollars spent.

Morro Bay City government is obligated to make clear - with factual detail - the "local firearm safety and regulation" issues that directly affect the citizens of Morro Bay – without regard to progressive ideology and its attendant politics. As is always the case with City government initiatives, Council and staff are obligated to the citizens they represent to justify the expenditure of each and every taxpayer dollar they contemplate spending - for any purpose.