



**AGENDA NO: CS-2**

**MEETING DATE: April 10, 2018**

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

## Dana Swanson

---

**From:** Sean Green [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Saturday, April 07, 2018 3:16 PM  
**To:** Council; Scott Collins; Eric Endersby; Dana Swanson  
**Subject:** 4/10/18 Council Closed Meeting Agenda Item CS-2

Council and Staff,

Please consider adding language to all waterfront leases that provides minor punitive damages to master leaseholders (out of pocket) for long-term vacancies. No amount of tourism marketing can overcome the damage caused by voids in the continuity of Morro Bay's waterfront (such as that left by Off the Hook in recent years). If a minor damages clause were to be inserted into all master leases moving forward, lame duck leaseholders (or all leaseholders, for that matter) may be appropriately incentivized to reduce turnover, speed up transitional projects, and proactively seek out new tenants in an expedient manner.

Sincerely,

Sean Green



**AGENDA NO: A-8**

**MEETING DATE: April 10, 2018**

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

## Dana Swanson

---

**From:** betty winholtz [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Monday, April 09, 2018 2:00 AM  
**To:** Dana Swanson  
**Subject:** Fw: agenda item a-8

Dana,  
I forgot to cc you for inclusion in Agenda Correspondence.  
Betty

----- Forwarded Message -----

**From:** betty winholtz <[REDACTED]>  
**To:** Jamie Irons <jirons@morrobayca.gov>; Marlys McPherson <mmcpherson@morrobayca.gov>; John Headding <jheadding@morrobayca.gov>; Robert Davis <rdavis@morrobayca.gov>; Matt Makowetski <mmakowetski@morrobayca.gov>  
**Cc:** Scott Collins <scollins@morrobayca.gov>  
**Sent:** Monday, April 9, 2018 12:04 AM  
**Subject:** agenda item a-8

Dear City Council:

I support the City having GIS service. I wonder if there is a benefit to doing it differently.

If you do the math, the City is paying for permanent ("It is Staff's intent to continue to contract GIS services into next fiscal year") 1/2 time services (4 hours a day, 5 days a week) at \$60/hour which is \$62,400 annually. When compared to City employee wages, it appears that the City is paying full time money for a 1/2 time job.

Can it be demonstrated, by including employee benefits, that it is cheaper to stay with a consultant rather than hire a part-time employee? Or, is there money to be saved by going with a 1/2-time city employee? Staff has stated their intent to raise the money to cover this service ("staff has developed an Information Technology Fee") which can pay for a City employee as easily as a consultant.

Secondarily, if this position is performing 2/3 time for Public Works, why is it being supervised by Community Development?

Sincerely,  
Betty Winholtz



**AGENDA NO: B-1**

**MEETING DATE: April 10, 2018**

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

## Dana Swanson

---

**From:** betty winholtz <[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** Monday, April 09, 2018 5:09 AM  
**To:** Jamie Irons; Marlys McPherson; John Headding; Robert Davis; Matt Makowetski  
**Cc:** Scott Collins; Dana Swanson  
**Subject:** agenda item b-1

Dear City Council:

**Of paramount importance** in the Master Fee Schedule changes is the increase of two categories of appeal fees, which together are slated to increase by an average of 213%. Appeal fees are unlike any other charge the City makes. Please consider the following:

1. Appeals are the door through which the public directly says to the City, "We disagree, and let us tell you why."
2. It's not a fee for a service; it is a quasi-judicial hearing, and should not be treated like a fee for renting a picnic area.
3. This is not a fee to cover costs; it can only supplement the time spent on your duty.
4. To charge \$820, for that which the Coastal Commission charges \$0 is contrary.
5. It is difficult to believe that the attention given to a tree appeal is the same spent on a Coastal Development Permit.\*
6. The proposed fee is even higher than the fees charged for an Embarcadero lease agreement \$265 adm. and \$700 city council.\*\*
7. The current \$250/270 fee already requires neighbors to pool their money to make an appeal.
8. \$822 will have a chilling effect, exclude participation, in one's own government.
9. This is not a "user friendly" change as stated why some fees aren't changed in this Schedule.

\*General Fees

The Non-refundable appeal fee for non-land use administrative decisions is proposed to increase from \$250 to \$822 to align with the cost of the Community Development Appeal fee" (page 50 of packet)

"Planning Division Miscellaneous Fees

The Appeal of City Decision, excluding Coastal Permits in the appeal jurisdiction—refundable if applicant prevails fee is proposed to increase from \$277 to \$820" (page 51 of packet)

\*\*Harbor Department--Lease Administration Fees

Actions requiring city council approval \$700

Actions requiring administrative approval \$265" (page 123 of packet)

**On a secondary topic**, please know this history:

In 2015, the City switched from using the LA-Riverside-Orange County Consumer Price Index (CPI) to SF-Oakland-San Jose CPI. The former is traditionally lower and the latter is higher. Changing to the SF CPI, the City gave itself permission to increase our fees by a greater percentage. I would like to see the City go back to the LA CPI.

**Other comments/questions** are listed by page number:

page 61, "physical posting of shut-off notice", is in essence a late fee, or fine for not paying your bill on time. \$62.27 is more than 50% of a base water/sewer bill which is around \$108 now. Not even my internet company charges that percentage for a late payment. This should be reduced.

page 101, Across the board, Development Impact Fees are consistently not being raised for Storm Drains. Are our storm drains perfect, don't need cleaning, new stamping, replacement? Those who do this work, their wages/benefits haven't gone up?

page 101, Development impact fees for non-residential industrial: why do they not have to pay an increase for fire, police, government? Particularly in the areas of fire and government, how are they not on par with other businesses?

page 103, Crediting "conceptual review" to future permitting is not "covering costs".

page 104, How is it a person/developer rather than the City would make Text Amendments and Annexations? Can you give an example of when this has happened?

page 108, Special - private encroachment, landscaping exempt. Is this saying that a person can pay to take away public parking on their street? And if they do it with plants, they don't have to pay to eliminate public parking? What if they landscape with rocks like on Ridgeway?

page 108, Why would sidewalk deferral be allowed? Hasn't the City been footing the bill for sidewalks?

page 114-118, Why are there no increases in the Fire Department charges? To some extent, this is covered by referring to the cost of personnel, but there are other charges not subject to personnel only.

page 134, "...identifying and recommending new fees and revenue sources." This is not the phrase residents wants to hear. Updating current fees is one thing, but intentionally figuring out ways to squeeze more money from residents: this is not the time.

Regarding the **3 Request For Proposal (RFP)** studies:

"Staff recommends that the City Council authorize the issuance of an RFP for a Comprehensive Fee Study and Cost Allocation Plan."

Quoting as many sources as one can to make it seem like a must do now, does not mean there is the money to do the studies now.

Being cognizant of limited available funding to complete all three studies, if one felt obligated to do one, the Development Impact Fee Study is the least recent of the three, and therefore in most need of updating.

Sincerely,  
Betty Winholtz

---



Virus-free. [www.avast.com](http://www.avast.com)



## Dana Swanson

---

**From:** debbie highfil <[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** Monday, April 09, 2018 9:00 AM  
**To:** Council  
**Subject:** I ask that you do not raise the appeal fee

Dear council members,

I think, upon reflection, it is easy to see how such a steep raise in fees would quell the public's ability to exercise their voice in the management of our city. Please do the right thing and keep the fee no higher than \$270 to file an appeal to the city. This keeps it at a reasonable rate and not out of reach for lower income residents. After all, our primary commitment should be to the democratic process and giving voice to citizens as opposed to simply facilitating the pathway for the agendas that we want.

Doesn't this appear to be a blatant attempt to achieve the latter? Please give this careful consideration because it is important to our democratic process.

Sincerely,

Debbie Highfill

## Dana Swanson

---

**From:** Penny Harrington <[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** Monday, April 09, 2018 4:34 PM  
**To:** Council  
**Subject:** appeal fee

The proposed appeal fee is outrageous!!!! It is not based on any actual costs that the city incurs. Anytime a fee quadruples, there has to be a good reason. The reason cannot be that the city is in financial trouble because of mismanagement. Citizens have the right to question the city about the actions the city takes. I think that even the \$270 fee is way too high.

How much time does it take to handle a simple appeal? Not counting the time that the city council spends on deliberation in council meetings. What do neighboring cities charge? This appears to be an example of staff being told to recommend increases in fees to balance the budget and for no other reason.

Penny Harrington  
[REDACTED]

**Dana Swanson**

---

**From:** Tina Granados [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Monday, April 09, 2018 10:54 AM  
**To:** Council  
**Subject:** Raising Fees

To the City Council

The proposed raising of the appeal fee from \$250/270 to \$820/822 is an obvious effort to stifle any questioning of council decisions and an effort to make the residents of this city unable to formally disagree with you. This is not in keeping with your job, which is to serve the public and work in conjunction with the public when running the city. From what I understand, there is no great cost to the city in most of the situations in which this fee would apply, and therefore, there is no reason for such an exorbitant fee. This city is full of retired people and we do not have the kind of incomes that can easily absorb \$820 dollars. I can only assume that you are trying to stop decent and perhaps if you are afraid of descent by your constituents, you should be in some other line of work. Decent is part of any democracy and it should never be priced out of reach of the people.

Christine Granados

[REDACTED]  
Morro Bay

**Dana Swanson**

---

**From:** Colby <[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** Monday, April 09, 2018 11:36 AM  
**To:** Council  
**Subject:** Appeal fee increase

I oppose the Appeal fee increase proposed for your approval at your Tuesday council meeting. As our elected representatives it is your primary responsibility to include the public interest in your decisions. This proposed increase would send a chilling effect, and send a message of exclusion to your constituency neighborhoods.

Colby C. Crotzer  
Two term Council Member

Sent from my iPhone

**Dana Swanson**

---

**From:** Marla Jo Bruton [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 10, 2018 11:59 AM  
**To:** Dana Swanson  
**Cc:** Jamie Irons; Matt Makowetski; John Headding; Marlys McPherson; Robert Davis; Scott Collins  
**Subject:** 4-10-18 MBCC meeting Public comment correspondence--Proposed adjustment to the city fee schedule for raising appeal filing fee(\$270 ro \$800+)

Dear Dana, Please include my comments below into the 4-10-18 MBCC public comment correspondences. The comment relates to the Proposed adjustments to the fee schedule. Thank you, marla jo sadowski

-----

RE: Agenda Item on the 4-10-18 MBCC meeting --Adjustments to the City Fee Schedule--

Morro Bay City Council:

I'm asking you to vote no on the exorbitant raise in the appeal filing fee. It looks like (and will be) a sneaky way to prohibit the right of the public to bring forth grievances before their local government decision makers.

Of significant concern in our community is the proposed change in the City appeals fee.

The proposed fee change would take the cost for the public to file an appeal to the MBCC from \$270 to \$800 plus.

Community members feel that the MBCC is pricing them out of being able to appeal decisions to the MBCC.

This is significant because there has been a systematic trend going on with the current MBCC to discourage public participation in our local government process.

This fee increase is not a "user friendly" raise nor is it fair to raise a fee by over 200%!

It is clearly an attempt to out price the citizenry from filing grievances when they feel there is a problem with a decision.

The right to redress a decision is a right the public holds; but skirting around that right by imposing exorbitant fees for exercising that right, is a calculated step the MBCC is poised to make tonight.

Raising the appeal filing fee from \$270 to \$800+ becomes an unfair prohibitive factor for many community members. And I think you all know that.

If the MBCC approves a 200% + appeal filing fee increase tonight, it will be playing fast and loose with the spirit of open government transparency and accessibility.

In essence each of you who vote to approve the increase will be participating in stifling public participation in the appeal process and excluding the citizens who will no longer be able to afford to participate in the open government process that is legally afforded to them.

respectfully,

Marla jo Sadowski  
No. Morro Bay



**AGENDA NO: C-1**

**MEETING DATE: April 10, 2018**

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

## **Dana Swanson**

---

**From:** Jeffery Heller  
**Sent:** Friday, April 06, 2018 3:15 AM  
**To:** Council  
**Cc:** Dana Swanson  
**Subject:** Agenda Correspondence for Item C-1, MBCC Meeting of 4/1/18

4/5/18

Agenda Correspondence for MBCC meeting of 4/10/18

From Jeff Heller

Item C-1 – Award of WRF Program Management Contract to Carollo Engineer

**Carollo is to WRF  
As  
Fox is to Chicken Coop.**

Immensely disappointing



## Dana Swanson

---

**From:** Linda Stedjee <[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 05, 2018 7:21 PM  
**To:** Dana Swanson  
**Subject:** Fwd: Request to include document in the agenda correspondence for the next Council meeting  
**Attachments:** WRF Cost Concerns1.pdf

Hi Dana,

On March 26, I asked that a document be included in the correspondence for the next Council meeting. You said it could not be included because the agenda did not contain any items pertaining to the WRF project. I see that the latest agenda does contain a WRF item. So, I am resubmitting my document, I ask that you include the document following this message in the correspondence for the agenda 4/10/2018 Council meeting. In case the table did not come through correctly in email, I have attached a pdf version

Thanks,

Linda Stedjee  
-----

There have been many questions raised regarding the drastic increases in the estimated Morro Bay sewer plant cost. Between 2013 and 2016, the estimated cost more than tripled. What could explain this huge increase?

The differences cannot be explained by land acquisition costs that the City would incur for building the plant at a distant location. According to City of Morro Bay documents, the estimated costs for the infrastructure alone were as follows: 2013: \$34,300,000; 2014: \$66,789,000; 2016: \$118,617,575

Could the differences be explained by the fact that the 2014 and 2016 estimates include infrastructure to move sewage to locations that are distant from the current plant, while the 2013 estimate does not? Adjusting the 2014 and 2016 figures to remove the costs for conveyance infrastructure, we have:

2013: **\$34,300,000**

2014: \$66,789,000 - \$1,769,000 - \$5,313,000 = **\$59,707,000**

2016: \$118,617,575 - \$9,239,930 = **\$109,377,645**

After these adjustments, there are still huge differences. Could inflation be the explanation?

It is a well-documented fact that construction costs are rising faster than the costs of consumer goods. For example, the online article, "Using an Index to Help Project Capital Costs Into the Future", provides basic construction cost inflation data for several years up to and including 2016.

The article says that "Construction costs rose on average 2.6%/ year in the last five years", and that meanwhile, Consumer goods rose 1.3% on average.

If we take a simplistic approach and apply the 2.6% per year average inflation rate to the original 2013 estimate, and compare the results to the adjusted estimates for 2014 and 2016, we have the following:

Year	Estimated cost, construction only, using 2.6% per year inflation rate	Actual Project Cost Estimates without land conveyance costs ; None of the figures include water reclamation infrastructure.
2013	-----	<b><u>\$34,300,000</u></b> * (sized to include Cayucos, to be built next to existing plant)
2014	\$34,300,000 + \$891,800 = <b><u>\$35,191,800.</u></b>	<b><u>\$59,707,000</u></b> ** (without Cayucos, to be built at Rancho Colina)
2015	\$35,191,800 + 914,986.80 = <b><u>\$36,106,786.80</u></b>	-----
2016	\$36,106,786.80 + \$938,776.46 = <b><u>\$37,045,563.26</u></b>	<b><u>\$109,377,645</u></b> *** (without Cayucos, to be built at South Bay Boulevard)

\* Source: "Wastewater Treatment Plant Project" - Updated April 29, 2013 <http://ca-morrobay.civicplus.com/352/WWTP-Upgrade-Project>

\*\* Source: Comparative Site Analysis: Regional CMC Facility vs. Rancho Colina December, 2014 attachment b <http://www.morro-bay.ca.us/DocumentCenter/View/7844>

\*\*\* Source: Water Reclamation Facility Master Plan, November, 2016, Section 12.1

Clearly, an average of 2.6% inflation in construction costs does not explain these increases. Was this inflation figure too low?

According to another article, “Soaring Construction Costs Threaten Infrastructure Push”, *“The numbers are astounding. Since 2000, the cost of construction has doubled, as measured by the Bureau of Economic Analysis”*.

Just for the sake of argument, consider a hypothetical scenario in which inflation was so high that cost of construction doubled just between 2013 and 2016. That would mean the current estimated cost for building the plant should be \$68,600,000.

Is it? No. Even using the silly assumption that construction costs had doubled in three years does not explain the difference in cost estimates. The 2016 figure, adjusted for comparison to the 2013 figure by removing land and conveyance costs, is \$109,377, 645. That’s a lot more than \$68,600,000.

So, what DOES explain the jump from \$34,300,000 in 2013 to \$109,377,695 in 2016? It isn’t land costs. They are not included in the figures used here. It isn’t the cost of conveying the sewage to a distant location. Figures were adjusted for that.

How about differences in technology? Could water reclamation costs explain the differences? No, water reclamation infrastructure is not included in the figures cited here.

Could other technology-related differences provide the explanation for the cost jumps? It seems highly unlikely. If the City could save tens of millions now by building the plant using the technology that was recommended in 2013, wouldn’t the people who did the 2014 and 2016 estimates mention that, and recommend that original technology?

What else could explain the huge estimated cost increases? Could the 2013 estimate, done by Montgomery Watson Harza (MWH) be totally wrong? This is an experienced engineering firm in business to make money, so that seems highly unlikely.

Something very strange seems to be going on here, and the project should be brought to a screeching halt until a satisfactory explanation can be found.

References:

1. Using an Index to Help Project Capital Costs Into the Future  
<http://efc.web.unc.edu/2012/09/26/using-an-index-to-help-project-capital-costs-into-the-future/>  
(article and graph updated March, 2017 to show figures through 2016)
2. “Soaring Construction Costs Threaten Infrastructure Push”,  
[http://www.progressivepolicy.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/10/PPI\\_Construction\\_2017.pdf](http://www.progressivepolicy.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/10/PPI_Construction_2017.pdf)

## Dana Swanson

---

**From:** Linda Stedjee [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 05, 2018 7:49 PM  
**To:** Dana Swanson  
**Subject:** A second document that I request be included in correspondence for the April 4 City Council meeting  
**Attachments:** councilletterapril4.pdf

Hi Dana,

I ask that you include the document following this message in correspondence for the April 4 Council meeting. This is in addition to the document already submitted. In case it is easier for you, a pdf of the document is attached.

Thanks,

Linda Stedjee

-----  
In its efforts to justify its outrageously-expensive, mismanaged WRF project, the City continues to claim that the project must proceed as quickly as possible to avoid trouble with the California Coastal Commission (CCC) and the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB).

In fact, the City could easily and reasonably remain at the current sewer plant for the foreseeable future, until a more sensible, reasonably-priced project can be established and completed.

Here are the pertinent facts:

**1. The CCC's authority related to the project lies only in its ability to approve or deny development permits. Contrary to misinformation spread by the City, the CCC cannot order the City to move the plant.** Should the City decide to reconstruct any of the existing plant's facilities, the CCC would have a say, but they have no authority to approve or disapprove normal maintenance. Hence, the City can stay in the current plant with no CCC interference.

The CCC's biggest issue with the existing plant appears to be its location in a flood plain, and near the ocean. However, the proposed new plant, as designed, would have the same risk of damage from environmental hazards as the existing facility. This is because the design includes an enormous lift station on the site of the current plant. If the lift station fails, the whole system fails.

Regardless of its concerns with plant location, the CCC cannot stop the City from remaining in the current facility for as long as the City needs to do so.

**2. The RWQCB's authority lies in its charter to enforce clean water standards. It can establish requirements for conformance to specific standards, and can levy fines for nonconformance. However, in the existing sewage treatment plant's performance, there is little basis for financial penalties.** Violations of standards are few and minor, their impacts are somewhere between negligible and non-existent, and they are temporary.

In 2014, the RWQCB clearly demonstrated that it saw no reason for the City to rush to build a new plant. At the November 11, 2014 Morro Bay City Council meeting, RWQCB Executive Director Ken Harris told the City Council that there was no hurry in getting the project completed. Regarding a target date for choosing a site for the plant, Harris told the Council, *“That 5-year deadline is a self-imposed deadline. There are no regulatory triggers. We’re not going to show up with our ticket book in 5 years and start writing tickets, so we don’t want you to feel rushed.”* and, *“There is the potential, and if it takes another year to do it...”* Also present at the meeting was RWQCB president Jean-Pierre Wolff. He did not contradict Harris’ comments.

Why were these senior RWQCB officials not worried about an extra year’s delay in building the plant? Their attitude was likely caused by the documented evidence that the existing plant is working well and causing no harm to the environment. The legally-required 2017 annual Morro Bay plant monitoring report specifically refers to the *“benign environmental character of the effluent”* and the *“... low toxicity of the effluent stream, and absence of impacts to the marine environment”*. Those statements are not surprising given the minor nature and small scope of secondary treatment violations.

The current Morro Bay sewer plant’s National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit sets secondary treatment requirements for 88 constituents of sewage. The plant consistently achieves secondary treatment for all but 2 of those 88 constituents, settleable solids (SS) and biochemical oxygen demand (BOD). The plant comes very close to achieving consistent secondary treatment for those 2 constituents as well.

- BOD: It would be difficult for anyone to claim that this violation is significant. According to the current legally-required 2017 annual Morro Bay plant monitoring report, *“Technology-based requirements for BOD are generally unimportant for open-ocean discharges because they are unlikely to result in oxygen depletion (page 6 in National Academy of Sciences 1993)”*. Even so, the plant’s performance in removing BOD has, according to the 2017 report, been good. In 2017, the plant removed 83.8% of BOD. The secondary treatment standard is 85%. The effluent contained 52 mg/l, while the standard is 30 mg/l.
- SS: This violation is very minor. Secondary treatment standards require that treated effluent contain no more than 30 mg/l of settleable solids and that the plant remove at least 85% of the solids. In 2017, the plant’s annual averages were 38 mg/l and 88.1% removal. Thus, the mg/l standard was missed by a few mg, but the removal percentage not only met, but surpassed the secondary treatment standard.

**3. Future adherence to all secondary standards at the current plant is assured.** Once Cayucos leaves the Morro Bay plant, all secondary treatment standards can be met without difficulty. As stated in the Environmental Impact Report for the Cayucos sewer plant project, *“By reducing the flows to the WWTF, the CSWP project would make the existing WWTF compliant with the Clean Water Act and the Regional Water Control Board settlement agreement, resulting in the possibility of the City staying at that location for the foreseeable future. Given these uncertainties and the preliminary nature of City plans at the time of the CSWP NOP, the CSD believes it was correct in not including the decommissioning as part of the Proposed Project.”*

**4. Any fines that the RWQCB might levy would pale beside the tens of millions that the City intends to waste on its current project.** Given the minor and temporary nature of secondary treatment standard violations, it appears that it would be difficult for the RWQCB to justify levying any fines at all. Even if there were fines, they would be measured in thousands, not millions of dollars.

Monitoring reports referred to above are available at: <https://www.morro-bay.ca.us/355/Monitoring-Reports>.

The City's National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit is available at: <https://www.morro-bay.ca.us/DocumentCenter/View/459>

## Dana Swanson

---

**From:** betty winholtz <[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** Monday, April 09, 2018 3:15 AM  
**To:** Jamie Irons; Marlys McPherson; John Headding; Robert Davis; Matt Makowetski  
**Cc:** Scott Collins; Dana Swanson  
**Subject:** agenda item c-1

Dear City Council:

For two reasons: (1) choosing Carollo Engineers, a national corporation, (2) at a price tag of \$7,640,000 for 5 years defeats the point of having an owner's agent to "mind the City's pocketbook" on the proposed sewer plant. This proposal adds cost to the project, not controls cost. In my naivete, I pictured the hiring of an individual for \$100,000/year until completion.

Staff is once again promoting the expensive way? Will you protect the public by directing staff to come back with a less expensive option?

Sincerely,  
Betty Winholtz



Virus-free. [www.avast.com](http://www.avast.com)

## Dana Swanson

---

**From:** Bart Beckmann <b[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** Sunday, April 08, 2018 3:50 PM  
**To:** Dana Swanson; Council  
**Cc:** Jeffrey Heller; Barry Branin; Scott Collins  
**Subject:** Item C1 April 10, 2018 City Council Agenda

Dear Council,

I was truly heartened by your previous decision to seek new leadership and guidance for moving ahead and allowing more creativity in addressing the sewage and water issues for Morro Bay.

And yes there is a "but" in this thought after perusing the proposal you will be considering for approval this Tuesday.

You have already "split" the Project, which may or may not be legal. And you will soon have the opportunity to select an engineering/construction team (who have never partnered before).

Both of these bids have "built-in" Project Management control systems. And you already have under contract a Rate consultant.

Scott needs someone to oversee these contracts, someone to follow through on the necessary permits and vet issues as they arise - most significantly the water reclamation options. But then, that is already part of the primary bid.

You are considering issuing an \$8 million bid to help Scott oversee this Project. While I may be slightly over-simplifying this task, keep in mind that Cayucos is completing their ENTIRE Project for \$25 million.

I had assumed you would actually get to the bottom of why Cayucos can construct a plant for \$25M and Los Osos for \$50M.

You also requested that cost incentives be included. This wording is unbelievably weak.

The incentive for Carollo is to justify the MKN estimate and your apparent desire to NOT seek cost effective solutions.

To say I am disappointed (particularly with one of you), is an understatement.

But not surprising as you pick citizen advisory members who orally say they are ignorant of issues and who is not a resident and reject someone with knowledge and wisdom in this area.

But then you cancel meetings to squash or limit citizen input - IF they might want to offer an opinion other than the one you want to hear.

I urge you to not issue this contract and to reject any bid that is not in line with what Cayucos management is working with.

Respectively

Bart Beckman



## Dana Swanson

---

**From:** Marla Jo Bruton [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Monday, April 09, 2018 6:49 PM  
**To:** Dana Swanson  
**Cc:** Jamie Irons; Matt Makowetski; John Headding; Marlys McPherson; Robert Davis; Scott Collins  
**Subject:** Public Comment for the Carollo Engineering contract consideration on the 4-10-18 MBCC agenda -

Dear Dana, Please include this letter in the public comment correspondence for the 4-10-18 MBCC meeting

-----

Morro Bay City Council,

Please do not go approve the Carollo contract that is on the agenda for the 4-10-18 MBCC meeting.

While you may have half listened to the public request to hire a Project Manager to oversee the current proposed So. Bay Blvd project, the action you are about to take tonight flies in the face of the reason for the request in the first place.

The request for the Project Manager is based on the need to have more oversight on the consultant and contractor fees as the project moves forward. The idea is to have a more independent set of eyes on the finance expenditures as they relate to the value the city is receiving.

The wisdom of hiring another firm that has worked a long side the very consultants and experts they will be hired to monitor shows us that you either don't get what your fiduciary oversight duties are or you lack the insight needed to protect the citizenry from runaway spending.

We are asking for a Project Manager who is not part of the system they are supposed to oversee. The firm you are considering hiring does not meet that criteria.

If it sounds like the citizens have lost all confidence in your ability to provide sound guidance on a project of this magnitude, it's because it is true. Yet you are choosing to be tone deaf. And if you approve the Carollo contract for \$7 million tonight you are once again proving you are tone deaf.

Stop throwing more money down the drain. What we are asking you to do doesn't line up with what you are being asked to approve.

Once again the public has been shut out of this process.

And this time its to the tune of: "We are MBCC.... And we... know how to spend the C's"!

You are tone deaf and we can hear it when you sing tunes like that! It's not a pretty sound!

Your community is singing the blues right now why can't you hear them?

Please do not approve the Carollo contract; it will be counter productive and an oxymoron. The purpose of the request was to help the city stop wasting money!

Marla jo Bruton Sdowski

No. Morro Bay

There is an urgent need to reduce spending on the So. Bay Blvd WRF project. The estimated costs have become prohibitive for a community our size and income brackets.

Everyone of you should know that by now if you are listening. The public outcry is calling for a more sensible and affordable project for our community. But still you are demonstrating a profound lack of understanding about the consequences of your decisions on our hometown population.