



**AGENDA NO: PC**

**MEETING DATE: February 23, 2021**

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

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Council](#)  
**Subject:** Public comment  
**Date:** Sunday, February 21, 2021 9:31:25 AM

---

The pandemic has been hard on everyone this last year but for seniors it has felt like a year of solitary confinement. Please start making a PLAN to reopen the senior center and the exercise classes for seniors in particular..... mid March or April 1..... maybe only allow vaccinated persons, at first, and require masks. Most of us seniors( mainly those who live alone) have really hit a wall, with this prolonged situation. If things get worse, you can abandon the plan, but if things continue in the right direction, you will be ready to move forward. I can tell you that this is CRITICAL for seniors.... the tourists have taken so much from us in the way of being able to be out and about. Please remember THIS group of citizens who are suffering. Thank you, Patti Anderson

Sent from AOL Mobile Mail  
Get the new AOL app: [mail.mobile.aol.com](mailto:mail.mobile.aol.com)

**From:** [Sean Green](#)  
**To:** [Council](#)  
**Cc:** [PlanningCommission](#); [CityClerk](#); [Scott Collins](#); [Scot Graham](#)  
**Subject:** 2/23/21 Public Comment: "World's Largest Energy Storage System" in Morro Bay?  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 23, 2021 9:35:01 AM  
**Attachments:** [Vistra Energy dwarfs Morro Rock.png](#)

---

Council, Planning Commission, and staff,

As proposed during a recent Planning Commission meeting, Vistra Energy's massive battery storage facility, though a baby step in the right direction for humankind, threatens to hold Morro Bay residents hostage to energy company ownership for another several decades, if approved. Ms. Solu's [thoughtful public comment](#) addresses both the specific and general problems with allowing MORE unsightly infrastructure than we already have, at LITTLE financial benefit relative to the parcel's potential, and NO meaningful mitigation of the mechanical graveyard we've all come to know and love- tolerate. As initially proposed, the net public benefit of adding three monstrous, lifeless facilities at the otherwise promising junction of Highway 1, Morro Rock, and the Embarcadero is less than zero, and even the thought of little Morro Bay playing host to the "[world's largest](#)" [anything](#) feels somewhat absurd. To even consider moving forward with any version of Vistra's \$450,000,000 proposal, city leadership must seek far greater public benefit than is currently being offered; the future of Morro Bay depends on it.

Respectfully submitted,

Sean Green  
Morro Bay, CA



Dear Mayor and Council,

I am writing to you with the knowledge that you are currently in negotiations with Vistra Energy concerning the construction of a battery storage facility to cover 22 acres directly next to the old PG&E powerplant which Vistra Energy now owns. It is unfortunate that the nature of real estate negotiations requires a closed session. Thus, as residents, we must make assumptions based on local news reports about the topics for negotiations. This letter assumes that the City and its leaders are negotiating regarding the proposed development of the "Morro Bay Energy Storage Project".

First, I would like to make it clear that I am all for green energy as are most of my family and friends.

As you may be aware, the community of Morro Bay has long had differing ideas about what should and should not happen to the Coastal Industrial zoned PG&E/Vistra Energy properties. What is clear is that another large scale industrial project at the coastal site would exist for at least 40 years. The Vistra report states that the three proposed buildings are "low Profile", at 40 feet total. In fact, I cannot think of another building besides the current power plant that is 40 feet or more in height in our entire community.

A KSBY news report stated that City administration estimates that the scope and scale of the project would mean approximately \$450,000 in property tax revenue to the City annually. That means that calculated out over 40 years the tax revenue would be \$18 million dollars. But the industrial project would encompass 22 acres of land within almost every resident's view. According to the VISTRA report 3 large, 40 foot high, 350 feet long and 260 feet wide buildings at 91,000 square feet per building for a total for all three buildings of 273,000 square feet are being proposed. The amount of tax revenue to the City comes out to a benefit of \$65.93 per square foot of building space over 40 years of building life or \$1.65 per square foot of estimated annual tax revenue to the City. The industrial development and subsequent use of the 22 acres would mean a monetary tax benefit to the city of \$47c per square foot of land mass annually.

#### **273,000 Square Feet of Building Tax Benefit**

$$40\text{Yrs.} \times \$450,000 = \$18,000,000$$

$$\$18,000,000 / 273,000 = \$65.93 \text{ in tax revenue per square foot over 40 years}$$

$$\$450,000 \text{ annual tax revenue} / 273,000\text{sq ft.} = \underline{\$1.65 \text{ per square foot of annual tax revenue}}$$

#### **22 Acre Land Mass Tax Benefit**

$$40\text{Yrs.} \times \$450,000 = \$18,000,000$$

$$43,560 \text{ sq. feet per acre} \times 22 \text{ acres} = \mathbf{958,320 \text{ Square feet of coastal land}}$$

$$\$450,000 \text{ annual tax revenue} / 958,320 \text{ Square feet of coastal land} = \underline{\$0.47\text{c per square foot of annual tax revenue to the City per square foot of land}}$$

If the buildings exist for 40 years my middle son who is 20 and a Cuesta student would be 60 years old. That is older than I am currently. My concern is not for you or myself as in 40 years many of us would be lucky to be here. But, some 60 years ago City leaders were faced with a similar industrial decision. The lure of revenue for the County and later the City upon incorporation was palpable. That decision good and bad shaped the history of Morro Bay and continues to loom as a primary identifier for our community, only dwarfed by Morro Rock.

Those leaders have been heralded by some for providing Californian's cheap and clean natural gas based electricity and cursed by others for the industrial development of pristine California Coastal Lands. As a community we have lived both good and bad with their decisions. Now we are being asked for another industrial development to provide "Clean Energy" keeping costs "LOW" for

Californian's. What is clean in Sacramento once again looks like a large scale industrial project in the center of our tiny community along our pristine coast for at least 40 years. The location is poorly thought out.

Our community is a passionate one. Most residents including the children, county residents and visitors have an opinion about the three stacks and the power plant. Most have ideas about what the area could be and what the community may need for community benefit. What most do not know is that the entire site has significant deed restrictions that were put onto it by PG&E upon its sale to Vistra Energy and by The California State Department of Toxic Substances Control.

These restrictions include the following taken from the DTSC report summary:

In 2011, PG&E submitted a number of documents to DTSC, beginning the process for acquiring sufficient data for site characterization to determine if a remedy was needed for the Site. Through multiple documents and iterations, DTSC approved the risk assessments in late 2018. These risk assessments identified that no additional remedial actions are needed at the Site for PG&E beyond those recorded in the existing deed restriction recorded by Dynegy in 1998. DTSC will be recording a Land Use Covenant (LUC) with Dynegy as the signatory, which will require annual inspection and reporting to evaluate if the remedy continues to be effective, and to require notification to DTSC if significant activities occur that could expose humans or ecological receptors to site contamination. This LUC will prohibit sensitive and residential uses as already contained within the Deed Restriction but will require DTSC consent if Dynegy or future Site owners wish to change the potential uses of the property. PG&E will still have remaining environmental liability with certain areas of concern at the Site that cannot be investigated appropriately until the buildings above them are removed.

The full report may be found

here: [https://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/profile\\_report?global\\_id=80001832](https://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/profile_report?global_id=80001832)

Further, the Vistra Energy presentation titled "Morro Bay Energy Storage Project" spells out the deed restrictions put onto the property by PG&E:

### 3.1 Restrictions on Development

3.1.1 Declarant will not develop the Property or any portion thereof for permanent or temporary lodging (including hotels, motels, and the like), hospital or other health-care facility, school, day-care center for children, park, playground, or other recreational use. If the Property is already being used for such purposes, Declarant may permit existing use of the Property to continue, but Declarant will not permit any new or expanded use of the Property (including expanding the portion of the Property so used) for such purposes.

What I am asking you for is a deep insightful consideration of the impact of ANY contract that you will enter into with VISTRA Energy. Not the monetary impact but the impact of living every day for the next 40 years with a large scale industrial project located next to a mothballed large scale industrial project that is quickly turning to blight. Ask yourself if \$65.93 in tax revenue per square foot of building space or .47c per square foot of raw land and the benefit of the creation of a cut through road from Main Street to the Embarcadero are enough to win you over and earn your consent to double the industrial footprint in the middle of our small coastal community. Consider if the sum of \$65.93 per square foot in tax revenue annually is enough to win your vote, not in terms of revenue and roads but rather, is it enough in terms of the 40 year timeline and generations of current and future Morro Bay residents living with the City's decision for the of doubling industrial expansion in the center of our Morro Bay.

Finally, please consider that you are uniquely positioned to bring PG&E, Vistra Energy and the DTSC together to negotiate for a plan to mitigate and/or reduce/repurpose the industrial footprint of the defunct plant and towers and mitigate/restore the land, lift the deed restrictions as seen above and get the benefits from the property that our entire community, now and in the future deserve. The industrialization of our community and our coastline for the next 40 years depends on you.

I am happy to discuss the issue with you and am open to hearing that there are justifiable benefits to our community.

Respectfully,  
Joan Solu



**AGENDA NO: A2**

**MEETING DATE: February 23, 2021**

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

## Dana Swanson

---

**From:** betty winholtz [REDACTED] >  
**Sent:** Tuesday, February 23, 2021 8:42 AM  
**To:** John Headding; Robert Davis; Jeffrey Heller; Dawn Addis; Laurel Barton; Eric Endersby  
**Cc:** Dana Swanson; Scott Collins  
**Subject:** Re: city council agenda item a-2

Eric,

Thank you for explaining the flow of this year's meetings. It sounds like you and other participants may report back at a future city council meeting with what transpires during the month of March or later.

Betty

On Monday, February 22, 2021, 10:54:12 PM PST, Eric Endersby <eendersby@morrobayca.gov> wrote:

Hi Betty,

As you might imagine, being a virtual CMANC conference this year, and with a new administration, things are quite fluid and we've only recently received a draft agenda. And it will likely be a work in progress right up to the days of. I only included last year's agenda in the staff report, as we do every year, to illustrate the types of meetings we have. Even on "normal" CMANC DC years, we don't have an agenda to share with the Council and community until after DC is over.

As to our meetings to be held outside CMANC, which we usually do while in DC with CMANC, this year these meetings are being arranged from now through March. And like the CMANC agenda, this agenda is a work in progress as well. In fact, no meetings are set in stone yet so I have no agenda to present. As to the white paper "leave behinds," we have not yet developed those, but to answer your question, yes, of course we will be sharing those with the community.

Hope that helps.

Eric

---

**From:** betty winholtz <[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** Monday, February 22, 2021 10:38 PM  
**To:** John Headding <jheadding@morrobayca.gov>; Robert Davis <rdavis@morrobayca.gov>; Jeffrey Heller <jheller@morrobayca.gov>; Dawn Addis <daddis@morrobayca.gov>; Laurel Barton <lbarton@morrobayca.gov>  
**Cc:** Dana Swanson <dswanson@morrobayca.gov>; Eric Endersby <eendersby@morrobayca.gov>; Scott Collins <scollins@morrobayca.gov>  
**Subject:** city council agenda item a-2

Dear City Council:

I am wondering why there is not a current agenda for the CMANC meetings that are only 3 days away. Rather, staff offers the agenda for last year.

In addition, other than a general statement, there is no agenda for what meetings will held with other government officials. Again, only last year's agenda. Will you be sharing your while papers with the community, and when?

Finally, I notice there is no comment about WIFIA. Will you or will you not be discussing with WIFIA the loan for the sewer plant related projects?

Sincerely,

Betty Winholtz



**AGENDA NO: B-1**

**MEETING DATE: February 23, 2021**

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



February 22, 2021

To: Mayor and City Council of Morro Bay  
595 Harbor St  
Morro Bay, CA 93442

From: The Healthy Communities Work Group

RE: Agenda Item B-1, Tax Exempt Bonds for HASLO

COALITION PARTNERS:

Bike SLO County  
Cal Poly State University  
Community Action Partnership of SLO County  
First 5 San Luis Obispo County  
Independent Living Resource Center, Inc.  
Rideshare – Safe Routes to School  
Smart Share Housing Solutions  
SLO Council of Governments  
SLO County Departments:  
Air Pollution Control District  
Board of Supervisors  
Health Commission  
Public Health  
Environmental Health  
SLO County YIMBY

Dear Council Members,

The Healthy Communities Work Group is a collaboration between public health officials, local planning and transportation officials, community-based organizations, academia, and community members, working to improve health through community design. We provide research and evidence-based recommendations from a health perspective on proposed land use projects, ordinance and general plan amendments, and special projects.

The Healthy Communities Work Group strongly supports the issuance of tax-exempt bonds for HASLO's development of 35 affordable housing units.

Lack of housing availability and affordability negatively impacts physical and mental health. In light of the critical connection between health and housing, San Luis Obispo's [Community Health Improvement Plan](#) has identified this issue as a key priority, and set a community goal to "improve access to affordable, attainable, safe and supportive housing"<sup>1</sup>.

These 35 affordable housing units will help address a critical need for housing, ultimately supporting community health.

Thank you for this opportunity to provide comment,

*Chuck Stevenson*

Chuck Stevenson, AICP  
Co-Chair, Healthy Communities Group

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'Kealoha Ghiglia'.

Kealoha Ghiglia, REHS  
Co-Chair, Healthy Communities Work Group

---

<sup>1</sup>SLO County Community Health Improvement Plan,  
<http://www.slohealthcounts.org/tiles/index/display?alias=CHIP>

**Dana Swanson**

---

**From:** betty winholtz <[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** Monday, February 22, 2021 10:44 PM  
**To:** John Headding; Robert Davis; Jeffrey Heller; Dawn Addis; Laurel Barton  
**Cc:** Dana Swanson; Scot Graham; Scott Collins  
**Subject:** city council agenda b-1

Dear City Council:

I would like some clarification regarding some confusing language.

1. Under the BACKGROUND section of the staff report, it states, " All of the rental units in the housing facilities will be rented to persons and families of low or very low income." Yet, under the 4th WHEREAS it states, "a portion of the housing units in the Housing Facility will be rented to persons and families of low or very low income." **Which is it? If it is the latter, what is the "portion?"**

2. Is the 7th WHEREAS referring to this hearing or the previous hearing? **If this hearing, may the public make comment on more than the financing?**

2. Under the THEREFORE #5, "The adoption of this Resolution shall not obligate the City or any department thereof to (a) provide any financing to acquire or construct the Housing Facility;" **Hasn't the City already given grant money or other monies to this project? Is this clause speaking futuristically?**

THEREFORE #5 continues, "(b) approve any application or request for or take any other action in connection with any planning approval, permit or other action necessary for the acquisition, construction or operation of the Housing Facility;" **Does this mean the City is hands-off in terms of building permits and inspections to make sure the project is following conditions put on it by the planning commission and city council?**

Sincerely,  
Betty Winholtz



**AGENDA NO: C-1**

**MEETING DATE: February 23, 2021**

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

## Dana Swanson

---

**From:** betty winholtz [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, February 23, 2021 12:14 AM  
**To:** John Heading; Robert Davis; Jeffrey Heller; Dawn Addis; Laurel Barton  
**Cc:** Dana Swanson; Katie Lichtig; Scott Collins  
**Subject:** city council agenda item c-1

Dear City Council:

Under the BACKGROUND section, it states, "The attached draft Mid-Year Budget Report (Attachment 1) covers the first six months of the fiscal year beginning July 1, 2020 and ending December 31, 2020....including Measure Q and other major funds." Therefore, I assume the figure \$142,000 for Measure Q is for 6 months. However, then I see the same \$142,000 figure under the Second Quarter Budget Adjustments. If it's the former (6 months) then Measure E funds have been erroneously doubled. If it is the latter (3 months), then Measure E is in alignment. **Which is it?**

It appears as though \$125,000 of the \$142,000 for paving from Measure Q is being taken away from street paving and given to a particular Storm water Drain project; location not identified. **Am I misunderstanding this transfer?** One of Measure Q's targets was storm drains, so the money should come straight from Measure Q and not impact paving.

Regard the WRF table,

--In 4 categories, there are overruns: Supplies and Equipment, Water, Consultation Services, and Licenses and Permits. **Please explain why. Which of these categories will continue to rise during this fiscal year?**

--In addition, there is an extra expense of \$66,224 in legal fees that are claimed to be unanticipated. It is difficult to believe legal services would not be anticipated when all easements and properties had not been purchased first as permit conditions dictate. **I anticipate this amount will continue to rise since the city is still in litigation; is that true? No money has been budgeted for potential suits with contractors?**

**--In which line items are change orders reported?** Specifically I am referring to the extra charge for the landslide(s).

--On page 28 of the report, the the term Water Resource Facility is used; **is this a typo?** On page 30, WRF is referred to as a Relocation & Treatment Alternative; **is the Water Reclamation Facility being rebranded?**

It would have been helpful if the initial tables in the staff report had been titled at the top rather than at the bottom, including time period covered. Also, it would have been helpful if the Attachments to the staff report had been labeled Attachment A, Attachment B, etc.

I strongly object to creating an ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES DIRECTOR–ASSISTANT CITY MANAGER position. Being a population of 10,000 and during a time of tightening belts to

address foreseen shortfalls, it appears impudent to add to an administrative position and increased salary when you have released frontline workers.

Sincerely,  
Betty Winholtz



**AGENDA NO: C-2**

**MEETING DATE: February 23, 2021**

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

**From:** [Barry Branin](#)  
**To:** [Council](#)  
**Subject:** GSI Report Analysis.pdf  
**Date:** Saturday, February 20, 2021 7:39:53 AM  
**Attachments:** [GSI Report Analysis.pdf](#)

---

This is comment for the discussion of the WRF at the next Council meeting.  
Barry Branin

Sent from my iPad

Analysis of the  
GSI Technical Memorandum Dated April 19, 2019  
To Eric Casares from Dave O'Rourke and Tim Thompson

Executive Summary

The series of water quality scenarios reported by GSI in 2017 and recently updated (April 2019) by GSI to further delineate water recovery details from the Lower Morro Valley by injecting 800 acre feet per year of reclaimed water from the proposed South Bay Blvd sewage treatment plant are released. The Morro Bay wells west of the narrows would be used for the water recovery. The consequences of using this small, unconfined aquifer are discussed below:

1. The basic limitations from the 2017 study have not been addressed in the latest 2019 report so they are still valid. Thus the modeling has not been strengthened. It has only been expanded to disclose what is hoped to be done via using the Lower Morro Valley' small, unconfined aquifer to effect recovery. For a summary of these significant limitations see page 24 of the 2017 GSI report regarding groundwater levels, aquifer properties, streambed percolation rates, nature of the aquifer geometry and ocean interface, aquifer geometry, and underflow issues. Unfortunately they are all key limitations needed to get good predictions from the modeling studies. The study is not proof that water can be injected and recovered without significant losses and change in water quality. It is only suggestive and the quality is dependent on the accuracy of the assumptions used to build the model.
2. The sea water levels used in the study are historical using the average mean sea level numbers from the past 38 years. The study indicates that 25% of the injected tertiary-treated water will be necessary to stop saltwater intrusion into the aquifer. This study does not take into account that 31 years hence, by year 2050, sea level is conservatively estimated to be 1-2 feet higher than in 2017. This is well within the lifespan of the WRF, the proposed "forever" plant. The consequences of this are completely ignored and yet that *is* the environment that *needs* to be modeled by GSI!

Does this mean, that in the "real world", to protect the lower Morro Valley aquifer for fresh water recovery, it will be necessary for the City to utilize more than 25% of their expensive, tertiary treated water, possibly in the range of 35-50%, to have a viable recycling process? What is the ultimate cost of this recovered fresh water? At what sea level rise will it become economically impractical to utilize the wells? The economics for a viable recycling process and the justification for an expensive WRF is heavily dependent on *amount* and *cost* of the potable water recovered from the ground. This is necessary to determine the merits of the approach for providing for the future of Morro Bay. Furthermore, the current recycling plan would lose between 250 and 400 acre-feet of the 800 acre-feet of reclaimed water. If losses like this are tolerable, an efficient method of recycle of this lower amount of water would only require a WRF that is 35-

50% smaller. Such a WRF facility would still be larger than the current sewage treatment plant, which handles both Cayucos and Morro Bay, and would provide significant construction savings.

3. The 2012 DUDEK report on Recycled Water Feasibility, prepared for the Morro Bay and Cayucos Sanitary Districts, documents that recycled water is in the range of 40% more expensive than desalination. This will naturally be further exasperated by the need to utilize 35-50% of the initial reclaimed water to prevent saltwater intrusion into the well field. Considering the touted purpose of recovering wastewater is to provide a buffer for Morro Bay during times of drought. If so, a truly independent cost analysis of using the recycled wastewater from the proposed WRF versus desalination water needs to be done before breaking ground on the facility. This analysis needs to include the capital costs of building the tertiary treatment facility, the infrastructure to pump it into the Lower Morro Valley and its operating costs compared to the costs of refurbishing the current desalination plant and its routine operating costs. Which *is* the more economical solution? After all, the Pacific Ocean is a non-depletable source of potable water while the Lower Morro Valley wells have a limited time before salt-water intrusion destroys their value and the value of the WRF.

In wet years the need to have a water buffer is significantly lower than in dry years. What can we then do with the very expensive recycled water in other than pump it into the ocean. If there is an alternative use for this “excess” water, which there will certainly be plenty (800 acre feet per year), what is the capital costs of implementing it? There is no such thing as an 800-acre foot tank and what if the wet years come back to back? The only solution for this amount of water is a reservoir and if used, it would be the option of choice rather than pumping the water into the Lower Morro Valley Aquifer! Unfortunately, no reservoir exists in Morro Bay.

4. The Lower Morro Valley wells are contaminated with unacceptable levels of nitrates. The GSI report rationalizes their presence due to farming in the Lower Morro Valley basin, but the source claims fall far short of proof. Their speculation would be a reasonable expectation if it were not for the analysis of nitrates in the well water using a nitrogen and oxygen isotope analysis technique. This is a significant study since the methodology used is a well established forensic method to distinguish human waste contamination from manufactured nitrate sources. The difference between the isotope ratios for the two potential sources is heavily on the side of human waste. Also another analysis from the wells has found sucralose in the water. This sweetener could only come from human waste! It is not a result of farming since it has no value for raising crops or animals. This conclusion is important for a variety of reasons.

So what is the concern about nitrates, a mild carcinogen that is present in all sausages (technically a mix of nitrates and nitrites) as a preservative? Basically, nitrates are a manageable waste-stream product. They can be easily removed by ion exchange chromatography and possibly other affordable methods. However, in this case the nitrates are the proverbial

“canary in the mine”. The concern is that if they are from human waste as suggested above, the well *water also contains everything else* that is in human waste, including sucralose. For it to get into the Morro wells, it has to come from the sewage lines approaching the narrows from Cayucos and North Morro Bay. Those lines have not been properly maintained for at least a decade or two and the leakage from them must have heavily contaminated the soil that drains into the well field. The GSI study is compatible with primarily a nitrate sewage source with possibly a small additional amount from farming to achieve the isotopic ratios observed in the tests. It is not solely from fertilizer since the isotopic analysis does not support such a conclusion. The GSI modeling study does not recognize a flow path from North Morro Bay that would enable sewage to enter the well field indicating an important design weakness in their model.

What no one to date has analyzed for is the many other materials in the water that are present in human waste. Of primary concern are drugs, both ethical drugs and their metabolites, as well as unethical drugs and their metabolites. These are difficult, biologically active substances to remove from water. Chlorination does not generally remove them. In fact it might modify some of them to make so-called “designer” drugs of unknown properties.

So what spectrums of substances are likely to be contaminating the water supply? They will be drug types such as painkillers including oxycodone, Lyrica and fentanyl, anti-inflammatories such as steroids, CBD2 and ibuprofen, anti-depressants such as Paxil and Cymbalta, anti-anxiety drugs such as Valium, Midazolam and Librium, birth control substances, erectile dysfunction drugs, etc., etc. Basically any drug available from your neighborhood pharmacy is likely there. Also included would be psychoactive drugs such as marijuana (THC), cocaine, heroin, methamphetamine and a number of “designer” drugs, all of which are not available in the drug store.

The body tries to detoxify itself via the liver and kidneys by excreting metabolites and unmodified drugs. These substances are biologically active materials that should not be in the body unless it has a condition that warrants a prescription for treatment. No one knows what routinely taking a cocktail of such substances at low concentrations does to individuals, particularly infants and the elderly, but it is a main reason recycled wastewater is not considered to be potable. It should be emphasized that chlorination does not remove these substances.

It is clear that if the source of nitrates is human waste, as the analytical data strongly indicates, the Morro wells should be considered contaminated and require full tertiary purification to approach potability. Dilution is not the solution as proposed in the GSI report. It is internationally recognized as unethical (and possibly illegal in many nations) to use dilution to reduce the concentration of contaminants because ultimately dilution does not eliminate dosing of the entire quantity of contaminant to the public. Purification to eliminate the contaminant is the only ethical solution.

Likewise, using contaminated wells for the recycle of purified wastewater is not likely a goal of the Federal and State governments. To meet WIFIA requirements, a different process *needs* to be implemented. Using a contaminated aquifer does not solve any problems and would likely require a second, full RO treatment at the WRF. This would likely be prohibitively expensive.

### Conclusions

- The latest GSI modeling study contains the same limitations as the 2017 report. No significant improvements have been implemented, particularly with regards to pathways for sub-surface flows to enter the Morro Bay well field ground water.
- The modeling utilized mean sea level from the last 38 years. Today's sea level and most importantly the expected sea level in 2050 need to be studied to validate the robustness of the water reclamation strategy over the life span of the WRF which will likely be over 50 years, since the City call it their "forever" plant.
- The 2012 DUDEK Recycled Water Feasibility Study done for Cayucos and Morro Bay Sanitary Districts estimates that desalination of seawater is at least 60% less expensive than treated, and recycled wastewater. Since there have been no breakthroughs in water purification since 2012, an independent comparative cost analysis of the proposed WRF water recycling approach, taking into account correctly done modeling by GSI and projected capital costs and operating costs, compared to refurbishing the existing desal plant is warranted before contracts are let and groundbreaking begins. That is the only financially responsible path to take.
- Alternative plans are likely needed to address recycling the treated water for potable use. The inherent cost of the recycled water far exceeds any recoverable agricultural use. With a large percentage of the expensive, recycled water being necessary to retard saltwater intrusion into the unconfined aquifer in Morro Bay. This just makes the finally recovered water even more expensive.
- Since the wells are contaminated with human sewage, the treatment of the recovered ground water needs to remove all pharmaceutical residues before human consumption. In fact, any water taken from the Morro Bay well field needs to be similarly treated before distribution to the public.

### References



**AGENDA NO: C-4**

**MEETING DATE: February 23, 2021**

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

**From:** [Sean Green](#)  
**To:** [Council](#)  
**Cc:** [CityClerk](#); [Scott Collins](#)  
**Subject:** 2/23/21 Agenda Item C-4: Sale of city properties  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 23, 2021 8:26:58 AM

---

Council and staff,

If the city currently did not own the lot pairing of [985 Shasta and 570 Dunes](#) but had \$900k in available cash, would you choose to purchase them? Absolutely not. Selling these two city lots would generate \$900k that could be used for any of the following:

- Embarcadero sidewalk widening from Tidelands to Rose's
- Embarcadero sidewalk widening from Hofbrau to Dockside
- Surf Street Stairs replacement with scenic overlook per the [Beach Street Specific Plan](#)
- Public bathrooms overhaul throughout town
- Annual payment to Harbor of \$100k/yr for 9 years in lieu of an unpopular camping program

Choosing to seek rental tenants now, after leaving 570 Dunes vacant for years, would seem to acknowledge that Council left \$60k in missed rent revenue on the table with no sales plan in mind. That's equivalent to one full-time employee we could've kept on staff. Still, if you do choose to rent out the home, please don't further our city's historical trend of subsidizing private leases at the expense of public funds. Nowhere in town does a newly available 2-bedroom single family residence rent for \$1700, even in that condition. \$2000 minimum, or please put these properties up for sale once and for all.

Thank you for your consideration,

Sean Green  
Morro Bay, CA

**Dana Swanson**

---

**From:** betty winholtz <[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, February 23, 2021 12:31 AM  
**To:** John Headding; Robert Davis; Jeffrey Heller; Dawn Addis; Laurel Barton  
**Cc:** Dana Swanson; Scott Collins  
**Subject:** city council agenda item c-4

Dear City Council:

If indeed you choose to sell the Bolton Drive lot, "entities that provide affordable housing" should definitely be allowed to negotiate for it. Otherwise, you are being inconsistent with one of council's stated goals.

Sincerely,  
Betty Winholtz