



AGENDA NO: C-1

MEETING DATE: May 14, 2019

**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: Tuesday, May 14, 2019 2:15 AM
To: John Headding; Robert Davis; Marlys McPherson; Jeff Heller; Dawn Addis
Cc: Scott Collins; Dana Swanson
Subject: agenda item c-1

Dear City Council:

Your approval of the 3 recommendations in this report clearly outline how and why City Council and City Staff have broken the Public Trust.

1. When stated during the campaign for the 218 vote--there is a fixed price or lid on the price of the sewer plant, and that lid is \$67,234,512. Now the price has a caveat: unless we want to add another \$2,000,000 now, another \$2,000,000 during the second stage, and another \$2,000,000 during the third stage--up to a total of \$6,240,000. In other words, the cost was always \$73,474,512, but we [the City] are not stating that.
2. The promise was that the price would only go down, now it's going up.
3. Authorizing the City Manager to continue to make potential change orders reaffirms that the guaranteed price of \$667,000,000 was insincere.
4. In increments of \$125,000, the City Manager can spend another \$500,000 to even \$1,000,000 without prior Council or Public input.
5. It seems to me you are violating the design/build delivery system.
6. While the staff report declares, "The Final PCO is brought to WRFCAC for review and comment," WRFCAC members complained about too little time to go through the material. The Committee did not feel it could give an adequate or appropriate review and comment.
7. Which city council members have read the document and checked for accuracy? For example, do you know that the equalization tank was included in the first draft and is being asked for again, so it will be paid for twice, to the benefit of the construction company, double billing the Public?
8. Where is the owner's representative who is suppose to be watching out for the taxpayers' money?

A better move would be to refer this back to WRFCAC and give them adequate time to give city council a recommendation, since an objective review is coming from nowhere else.

If all there is is still 30% after months of work, how will the other 70% be complete in 6 weeks or less to go before the Coastal Commission in July?

Sincerely,
Betty Winholtz

Dana Swanson

From: betty winholtz [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, May 14, 2019 2:39 AM
To: John Heading; Robert Davis; Marlys McPherson; Jeffrey Heller; Dawn Addis
Cc: Scott Collins; Dana Swanson
Subject: agenda item c-1

Dear City Council:

Obviously I made a typo in #3: \$677,000,000 should be \$67,000,000.

Sincerely,
Betty Winholtz

Dana Swanson

From: Mark Low [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, May 13, 2019 4:17 PM
To: Dana Swanson; John Headding; ecasares
Cc: citizensforaffordableliving; Rob Livick; Council; Barbara Spagnola
Subject: "As much time as feasible" / A hurry up to wait, critical path of putting off the test wells and borings to find out what's really down there. . .

CMB 03 26 19 City Council Meeting

@2:05:06 **"The WRF Package" discussion begins;**

Pmgr Casares states first WRFAC meeting in April,

PWD Livick then states that "he doesn't think that will happen and that a special WRFAC meeting would likely be needed."

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=zxdjUODPV4A>

Why did it take more than a month to secure the data that the "design build team" feels it needs to support its desire for more money, for the WRFAC's and concerned citizen residents consideration?

As I understand it, the "tome" that was produced for the WRFAC's review on Thursday May 2nd, 2019, begs the question, why "the work" supporting the "Proposed Change Orders" wasn't ready when the PTO's were requested?

If "Speed is of the Essence" why the delay in getting the necessary hydrology work accomplished required for "potable reuse permit?" A permit that seems to be the only permit on Pmgr Casares' agenda?

Also, why is Pmgr Casares *putting off the test wells and borings to find out what's really down there and finding out how long it takes the water injected into the ground to get to extraction wells*, if speed is so necessary to, how "this proposed project" works?

05.09.19 CMB WRFAC Special Meeting

@ 2:08:23 **"I've seen this before."**

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=pAtGarUDyBs>

The 'speed' at which the proposed PTO's were first declared, juxtaposed with the short time given to WRFAC and the residents of Morro Bay, makes it seem to me as though the more than one month delay was intentional and is causing another reason for *distrust* regarding the People's business.

Richard Sadowski was concerned that a short period of time was given to review a copy of the Draft Final Environmental Report. He felt it was not enough time for this caliber of a project. Barbara Spagnola mentioned that speaker slips should be filled out and bring to staff. PUBLIC COMMENT <https://youtu.be/Cbx1CUul9Wk?t=1m25s> The public comment period was opened, seeing none, the public comment period was closed. 1. Review of Draft Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) for the Morro Bay Water Reclamation Facility (WRF) <https://youtu.be/Cbx1CUul9Wk?t=3m34s> Scot Graham introduced Jennifer Jacobus, with ESA who made a brief presentation. Discussion, comments and questions continued amongst Committee members, staff, and consultants. PUBLIC COMMENT <https://youtu.be/Cbx1CUul9Wk?t=33m15s> The public comment period was opened. Jeff

Heller thanked the committees for their time. He expressed concern about why the South Bay Blvd location is the preferred sight and the impact it will have on businesses on Quintana Road during construction. He feels there is not a preferred pipeline route or a preferred lift station location yet. His last concern questioned the preferred location of the wells and the impacts for each of those locations.

<http://www.morrobayca.gov/ArchiveCenter/ViewFile/Item/5022>