

Additional Correspondence

Agenda Item F10a

A-3-MRB-11-001

City of Morro Bay-Cayucos CSD

F10a

Dear Commissioners:

I am an appellant of a Friday agenda item, Appeal No. A-3-MRB-11-001
(Morro Bay-Cayucos CSD, San Luis Obispo Co.).

I am unable to attend the Substantial Hearing, while other appellants will be present.

I encourage you to note the many reasons outlined in the CCC staff report, the numerous appeals, and the State Water Board's comments to the DEIR why there is substantial reason to hear this appeal. An incomplete application, for a project of this magnitude, proposed to be sited literally across the street from dunes and beach, must be sent back to the City for completion to receive an accurate evaluation.

Please vote that substantial issue exists.

Sincerely,
Betty Winholtz
former City Council Member

RECEIVED

MAR 07 2011

CALIFORNIA
COASTAL COMMISSION
CENTRAL COAST AREA

F10a

I'm a new resident of Morro Bay, but I did attend one meeting of the joint Morro Bay/Cayucos planning commission for the new water treatment plant. I don't know much about it or about the various people involved, but I can tell you that the commission was not listening to the citizens when they voiced their concerns about the treatment plans. They all but rolled their eyes when citizens got up to speak against the current plans. My impression was that they were going to approve the plans come hell or high water and regardless of what anybody had to say.

It scared me.

Linda Fidell
280 Andros Street
Morro Bay, CA 93442

818 921-0765

RECEIVED

MAR 07 2011

CALIFORNIA
COASTAL COMMISSION
CENTRAL COAST AREA

For health reasons, I am unable to attend your meeting this week, and request that you accept my comments presented in this email in lieu of verbal comments at the meeting (should you decide to allow them).

I ask that you deny the Coastal Development permit for the City of Morro Bay's wastewater treatment plant (WWTP) and require the City of Morro Bay to adhere to Coastal Act policies and the policies of its own LCP. The arrogant disregard of these policies that has been shown by the Council majority and by City staff cannot be tolerated.

An ongoing pattern of disrespect and disregard for these policies, for the environment, for recommendations and decisions of the CCC and other environmental protection agencies, and for concerned residents, has led to serious pollution of the groundwater and ocean, and to significant damage to environmentally sensitive habitat. The WWTP is just one example of the problem. Here are some others:

1. In 2006, just three months after the CCC Commissioners voted to deny the City's request to widen the Embarcadero Road extension, and limited the road width to 22 feet, the City widened it to 42 feet, paved it with "red rock", and built an unpermitted storage yard at the end of the road, destroying a great deal of environmentally sensitive habitat.
2. In 2007, several residents, including a CWEA Grade 4 collections system management expert, reviewed video inspections of the City's sewers. Their documented study indicated that the system was clearly in a serious state of disrepair, and was exfiltrating large amounts of raw sewage into the ground. The study's authors were vilified by City staff member Dylan Wade who, in a written response, claimed the study authors were unqualified, and insulted them personally.
3. In 2007, and later in 2009, boatyard projects initiated by the City had to be scrapped when City staff failed to consult the CCC before the design process began, and were later informed by CCC staff that the target locations were in environmentally sensitive habitat.
4. In August, 2009, a City-hired consultant performed an alleged "stream interference study" with stated plans to show the SWRCB that use of the City's Chorro Valley well field did not impact the surface flow of the stream. The ultimate goal was to obtain a waiver from a prior SWRCB ruling, Decision 1633. Nearby residents noted that something was seriously wrong with the "test" because the stream in the area was completely dry, meaning there was no surface flow to be interfered with. They complained and the "test" was immediately stopped, but not before over 2 million gallons of water was wasted – pumped from the already-stressed aquifer and dumped on the ground in a nearby field.
5. In 2010, the City issued Morro Bay Mutual Water, a PG&E affiliate, a permit for a new well to be drilled on Morro Bay power plant property. The City granted the permit in blatant violation of the City's own LCP, which clearly forbids private water wells

within City limits. Recognizing the violation, Commissioner Wan appealed the permit, and the application was withdrawn.

Please do not let the City of Morro Bay continue to get away with ignoring laws designed to protect the environment, and the agencies responsible for enforcing those laws. Please show them that you mean business, and insist that this project be done right. If it is at all possible, please take over control of this project, so that the end result is a plant that meets the needs of the City AND respects the environment.

Linda Stedjee

RECEIVED

MAR 07 2011

CALIFORNIA
COASTAL COMMISSION
CENTRAL COAST AREA

F10a

FR: David Nelson, 2180 Juniper Avenue, Morro Bay, CA 93442
RE: Comments on Coastal Commission Appeal Staff Report, Prepared on 2/16/11,
Appeal A-3-MRB-01-001, Morro Bay-Cayucos Wastewater Treatment Plant
DT: 3/6/11

These are my comment to the Commission on the staff report on the Morro Bay Waste Water Treatment Plant. I am in total agreement with the staff and thank them for a great job. Please put my comments in the record and forward them to the commission. I am a resident of Morro Bay, and have been following this issue for many years.

Staff Report:

Although the LCP requires that new development such as this be sited and designed to avoid coastal hazards and explicitly prohibits all development in 100-year flood plains, the City-approved project site is located in a 100-year floodplain and tsunami inundation zone directly adjacent to an eroding shoreline where the sea level is rising and in an area subject to known seismic hazards. In conflict with LCP requirements, the approved WWTP would locate new, major public works infrastructure in a highly hazardous area where it is not allowed per the LCP.

Comment:

With all of the evidence of global warming, the 100-year flood plains are more relevant than ever and restrictions should be strictly enforced. The City has known for years that the location would need to be changed, but did nothing to secure a better site for the plant. Please don't make it easy to put this new plant somewhere we may all regret.

Staff Report:

Although the LCP requires the scenic and visual qualities of the coast to be protected and requires development to be sited and designed to protect views to and along the ocean and other coastal areas, and although the WWTP site is located in an LCP-designated sensitive view area between Highway One and Morro Rock, the City-approved project would obstruct and degrade important public views, including through increased structural height for the new WWTP as compared to the old, inconsistent with the LCP.

Comment:

If the new plant is put in the same place, it would need fill to raise it to conform to the 100-year flood plan. This would make a plant much higher and more visible, thus degrading important public views of the coast.

Staff Report:

Although the LCP requires that significant archaeological and historic resources be preserved to the greatest extent possible, including requiring avoidance of significant archaeological sites if possible, the City-approved project is located in close proximity to numerous documented archaeological sites and is located on top of a significant burial ground of the Salinan Tribe inconsistent with the LCP.

Comment:

As the CEC studies show in the expansion plan for the power plant, this plant is in a very important archaeological area.

Staff Report:

Although the LCP and the Coastal Act require public recreational access opportunities to be

maximized and oceanfront land to be protected for recreational use, the City-approved project would reduce the availability of scarce oceanfront land for potential public recreational purposes, and it could cause adverse impacts to nearby existing public recreational access opportunities due to both construction activities and operation of the new WWTP (e.g., through additional truck traffic and objectionable odors), inconsistent with LCP and Coastal Act public recreational access requirements.

Comment:

This location has huge potential for public recreational purposes.

Staff Report:

□ Although the LCP requires the City to pursue water reclamation as part of this WWTP project, requires water supply to be protected for priority uses, and requires enhancement of Morro and Chorro groundwater basins where feasible, the City-approved project only includes a small amount of recycled water output (e.g., available for agricultural irrigation, urban landscaping, groundwater replenishment, etc.), and continues to propose to discharge (both tertiary and secondary treated effluent) via an ocean outfall when the LCP requires a more meaningful water reclamation program.

Comment:

On this point, I can't agree more. This plant has been discharging into our ocean for years on a waiver from the Water Board, and I believe it is time this stops. Water reclamation was an issue in the last election. We are dependent on State water and the leaders seem to think there is endless water to be had. The mayor elect unfortunately thought there was no need for anymore water, so water reclamation was a waste of money. So we really need some voice of logic -- which I hope will come from the Commission -- to make my city do the right thing for the future.

RECEIVED

MAR 07 2011

CALIFORNIA
COASTAL COMMISSION
CENTRAL COAST AREA

RECEIVED

F10a

MAR 03 2011

CALIFORNIA
COASTAL COMMISSION
CENTRAL COAST AREA

February 24, 2011

California Coastal Commission

Central Coast District Office

Attn: Sara Wan, Board Chair

Madeline Cavaliere, staff

Subject: Commission Appeal No. A-3-MRB-11-001

City of Morro Bay; Cayucos Sanitary District Waste Water
Treatment Plant

Upon careful consideration of your Commission's staff report and recommendations I completely support your findings and urge the commission to stand fast on the issues of only considering one site - the site hazards (refer to City's Safety Element), lack of adequate plan for reclamation and recycling of treated water and the issues of visitor services.

Is this the highest and best use of the area? As a Morro Bay resident for 46 years I hope we can do better than this -

Norma Dwyler

P.O. Box 391

Morro Bay, CA 93443

F10a

Hi Sara,

There is a huge issue on the Coastal Commission agenda on March 11 that I would like your perspective on. The City of Morro Bay and Cayucos Sanitary District have submitted applications for acceptance of the EIR and approval of an LUP and LCP for a new wastewater treatment plant that they are seeking to develop under their Joint Powers Agreement.

The agenda contains the Commission staff's report, which found numerous instances of substantial issues that show the proposed project conflicts with the city's LCP and the Coastal Act, and the report has recommended that the city submit additional information on a range of issues before the project is allowed to proceed to de novo hearing. A large number of residents opposed the project as designed for the same reasons the Commission staff does and more than a dozen filed appeals.

Staff informed me that public comment will not be in order by anyone, including the applicant, and the Commission will concur with findings and recommendations of the staff with regard to substantial issues unless a minimum of three commissioners request a hearing to contest the staff's findings at the meeting. I would appreciate your opinion--on or off the record--of the likelihood of three members requesting that public comment be allowed. In addition, I would like your opinion on whether letters from residents on this matter to the Commission urging support of the staff's recommendations are advisable and might have a positive effect.

As you may recall, I am a retired Los Angeles Times reporter and now write for a member of the "new media" online instead of in print, which is called the Slo Coast Journal (www.slocoastjournal.com), covering the San Luis Obispo County area from Los Osos to Cambria. I have written a detailed article about the staff report finding substantial issues with the proposed project and the upcoming Commission meeting, which is due for posting and public viewing on March 1, and would like to include the information requested above about whether a public hearing may be held.

A number of us plan to attend the meeting regardless, but as a reporter, I would like to include as much information as possible about the March 11 meeting.

Thanks,
Jack

RECEIVED

FEB 28 2011

CALIFORNIA
COASTAL COMMISSION
CENTRAL COAST AREA