



COLAB SAN LUIS OBISPO WEEK OF JUNE 18 - 24, 2017

THIS WEEK

PROPOSED FY 2017-18 BUDGET SET FOR ADOPTION

LABOR CONTRACTS RAISE MANY QUESTIONS

**CHASTISED STAFF SEEKS DIRECTION ON
MARIJUANA ORDINANCE**

LAST WEEK

**GIBSON AND HILL'S ATTEMPT TO RALLY CITIES
AGAINST SGMA FUNDING SEEMS TO HAVE FIZZLED**

**LOW INCOME HOUSING PLOY FALLS FLAT
TOO**

**SLO COLAB IN DEPTH
(SEE PAGE 13)**

California's Economic Suicide

BY GREG WALCHER

THIS WEEKS HIGHLIGHTS

Board of Supervisors Meeting of Tuesday, June 20, 2017 (Scheduled)

Item 4 - Grand Jury Report on Expanded Juvenile Hall. The report finds that the expanded Juvenile Hall is usually about 50% occupied and recommends that the Board consider some alternative programs which have either been considered in the past or might be examined for feasibility now. The staff and Board responses are not enthusiastic about the recommendations.

Item 18 - New labor contract with District Attorney Investigators Union. This is a 2-year contract which will cost the County a new \$158,000 over the life of the contract. There are 12 subject employees. Accordingly, over 2 years they will receive an average increase of \$13,166 apiece. This does not include any scheduled annual steps for those who have not reached the top of the 5 step range.

Item 19 - New 2 year labor contract with the San Luis Obispo County Employees' Association Trades, Crafts, and Services Union. The contract will cost the County a new \$969,286 over the 2 years. There are 170 members in the union. Thus, on average, each will receive an increase of \$5,701 by the end of the 2nd year.

Key provisions include:

- A 3.5% across the board wage increase effective the pay period that includes September 1, 2016.
- A 3.0% across the board wage increase effective the pay period that includes July 1, 2017.
- An equity adjustment equating to 0.5% of SLOCEA bargaining units' payroll to be applied to classifications determined to be 7.5% or more behind market according to the County's selected comparable wage survey agencies, effective the pay period including July 1, 2017. This increase will be proportional based on market position and internal job family alignments

Apparently the negotiations with this group were difficult. According to the write-up:

On September 22, 2016, after nine (9) negotiation sessions, the County declared impasse in an effort to bring resolution to those negotiations. Pursuant to the County's Employee Relations Policy, an impasse meeting was held on October 27, 2016 during which the parties were still unable to reach agreement for a successor MOU. The parties then mutually agreed to bring the items in dispute to mediation, which was scheduled for December 19 and 20, 2016.

After two days of mediation the parties were still unable to reach agreement and proceeded to factfinding pursuant to Assembly Bill 646. A factfinder was selected from the Public Employment Relations Board (PERB), and three days of factfinding hearings were held on March 16, 17 and

27, 2017. The parties were able to reach a tentative agreement for successor MOUs on May 15, 2017, prior to the factfinder issuing a report with recommended terms of settlement.

The Budget, which ironically is being adopted on the same day as this raise, does not contain the funding. Instead the County CEO states in the Board letter:

To the extent departmental savings are not available to cover the amount, staff will recommend that your Board authorize a transfer of the deficit amount out of the General Fund Contingencies and/or reserves to the department operating budgets, as needed, as part of the third quarter report. Third quarter is when any such year-end adjustments are made.

We see this practice year in and year out. Millions of dollars in “savings” due to budget underruns are applied to the unfunded known costs of negotiated contracts. The Board should ask:

- a. If we have these underruns year after year, are we budgeting too much?
- b. Similarly, the County budgets over \$600 million dollars per year for mandated programs and, to the extent the Board has discretion, for Board priority policies. If there are millions left over in the 3rd quarter each year, are the Board policies not being carried out on time?

Relatedly, the Board has given up its power to set budget policy by allowing this process to operate. Two years ago and during the 3rd Quarter Financial report, the Board transferred \$7 million, composed of over \$6 million in department “savings” and the balance from contingency to cover the unbudgeted costs of raises. This year it was somewhere north of \$3 million.

What if the Board said, “No, we want the general fund portion (which the reports never break out) to go for Board programmatic policies.” These might include housing, homeless, SGMA planning, Nipomo parks facilities, and other priorities which various Board members have expressed. Why is the Budget underfunded, hiding the true cost of raises?

This Board item and its two accompanying items are deficient in that there is no overall aggregate picture of what raises are due (for all units) in FY 2017-18, how much of the amount is actually budgeted, and how much will have to be made up from transfers next May. At that point the Board’s back will be against the wall and it will have no choice and be compelled to approve the transfers.

- c. What accounts for the underruns? Inaccurate budgeting, inefficient and slow hiring, absenteeism, lack of a sense of urgency, or what?

Item 20 - Submittal of a resolution approving the July 1, 2016 – June 30, 2018 Memoranda of Understanding between the County of San Luis Obispo and the San Luis Obispo County Employees’ Association, Public Services Unit, Bargaining Unit 01, Supervisory Unit, Bargaining Unit 05, and Clerical Unit, Bargaining Unit. This one is even worse. First of all it is partially a retroactive contract slated to cover the 2-year period of June 1, 2016-June 30, 2018. Jurisdictions should never agree to retroactivity. Once unions understand that they can obtain

retroactivity they have much less incentive to settle timely. They then prolong negotiations, invoke mediation and fact finding, and end up getting more money.

The result is described in the County write-up:

On September 22, 2016, after ten (10) negotiation sessions, the County declared impasse in an effort to bring resolution to those negotiations. Pursuant to the County's Employee Relations Policy, an impasse meeting was held on October 27, 2016 during which the parties were still unable to reach agreement for successor MOUs. The parties then mutually agreed to bring the items in dispute to mediation, which was scheduled for December 19 and 20, 2016.

After two days of mediation the parties were still unable to reach agreement and proceeded to factfinding pursuant to Assembly Bill 646. A factfinder was selected from the Public Employment Relations Board (PERB), and three days of factfinding hearings were held on March 16, 17 and 27, 2017. The parties were able to reach a tentative agreement for successor MOUs on May 15, 2017, prior to the factfinder issuing a report with recommended terms of settlement.

The contract covers 1,546 employees as displayed in the table below:

Bargaining Unit and Description	Number of Employees
Public Services Unit, BU01	967
Supervisory Unit, BU05	208
Clerical Unit, BU13	371
Total	1,546

Given the \$9.2 million total, the average raise for each of the 1,546 employees will be \$5,950 for the 2-year period (of which one portion is a lump sum retroactive payment – Have a Happy 4th of July. Depending on job classification, rank, and time in service some will receive more and some less. It would be interesting to know how much of the \$9.2 million will go to the 208 employees in the Supervisory Unit?

The cost of the onetime lump sum retroactive payment, which will cover ten months, will be \$3.8 million. This is base building and when annualized adds a new \$4.5 million per year.

The FY 2017-18 cost is \$4.7 million. The 2-year cost is \$9.2 million base building and recurring essentially forever.

Again, and as pointed out in the item above, the costs are not fully funded in the proposed budget, which ironically, is being adopted on the same day as these raises are being approved. The write-up again states:

Departmental savings and/or unanticipated revenue will be the primary source of funding for these unbudgeted expenditures associated with these compensation increases. To the extent departmental savings are not available to cover the amount, staff will recommend that your Board authorize a transfer of the deficit amount out of the General Fund Contingencies and/or

reserves to the department operating budgets, as needed. Third quarter is when any such year-end adjustments are made.

- a. What portion of these raises is included in the Budget to be adopted?
- b. How much is true local discretionary general fund?
- c. Will the necessary savings be achieved by stalling board approved service programs or running them at slower velocity than intended?
- d. Is the County vacancy rate so high that this is a safe bet each year?

It turns out that not all the issues were settled and there are still disputes about the employees paying for a small portion of the attributable increase in pension costs. In fact the item does not say how much of the increase is in pension costs and how much is in salaries. **Caution: are the attributable pension costs to the County even included?**

How much of the aggregate salary and pension increases for all employee groups are included in the proposed budget? How much will have to come in the 3rd quarter from “salary savings”?

All this demonstrates that the Board’s true top strategic policy is making sure the unions are happy. After debt service, Public Safety and all the other policies are just rhetoric. Given the endless growth of taxes and fees, it is clear that in California, the public works for the “public servants.” And you thought feudal times were long gone.



Item 21 - Women’s Jail Expansion Project Cost Overruns: The project is now \$2,840,000 over budget. Staff requests a transfer. The table below to the right details the numbers.

According to the write up, the County is blaming the contractor for delays and will seek to recover costs through arbitration or other legal recourse. The contractor blames the County for design errors. The original budget contained a \$2.8 million contingency, which has already been exhausted

Table #2

Sources of Funding			
Funding			
	State Funding	County Funding	Proposed Authorized Funding
State - AB 900	\$25,125,630		\$25,125,630
County - Detention Facilities Reserve		\$7,000,000	\$7,000,000
County - Criminal Justice Facility Const. Reserve		\$4,421,504	\$4,421,504
County - Facility Planning Reserve		\$3,656,652	\$3,656,652
County - General Fund		\$694,000	\$694,000
County - General Building Replacement Fund		\$50,000	\$50,000
County - Capital Project Savings		\$897,000	\$897,000
Subtotal Board Approved Funding	\$25,125,630	\$16,719,156	\$41,844,786
County - Capital Project Savings		\$300,000	\$300,000
Prop 172 Solar Designation		\$2,540,000	\$2,540,000
Budget Adjustment Request		\$2,840,000	\$2,840,000
Total Project Funding	\$25,125,630	\$19,559,156	\$44,684,786

through 31 change orders. There are similar problems with the Juvenile Hall expansion, and there is a \$10 million-plus contractor's claim on the Los Osos Sewer Plan relating to the installation of the sewer mains and street pipes. That contractor asserts improper design specifications by the County, which led it to underbid the project. These matters are discussed in closed session, so we have no idea what the legal bets are on the outcomes.

Item 41 - Formal Budget Adoption. This item consists of a hearing and the actual vote on adopting the Budget. It is not known if Hill and Gibson's objections to proposed appropriations for SGMA planning, road maintenance, and Nipomo parks facilities will result in further discussion or public participation. Also and during the budget review hearing, Gibson and Hill launched a sudden attack, sugarcoated as a housing and homeless measure. The public, cities, and most of the not-for-profits saw it for what it was: a red Herring cheap shot political ploy. Even the New Times Shredder column opined:

Opinion - Shredder

THE HOUSING TRAP

Anybody have a refrigerator box under a plastic tarp in their backyard I can rent? My pet marmot, Carl, and I are very quiet. Bathroom privileges would be nice, but yes, I know better than to ask for kitchen privileges. It's fine. It's not like I can afford food anyway ... or pay for utilities. I mean, it would be nice to be able to afford to *buy* a house where I work, but this is **San Luis Obispo**, after all. I know better.

Who to blame? First **Oprah** told everyone we're the "**Happiest City in America**" (Take that, **Disneyland!**) and then the website **College Rank** named us "**Best College Town in America**" (Suck it, **Berkeley!**), and now **Outside** magazine has named SLO one of its "**25 Best Towns Ever: Where to Live Now**" (Way to lose, **San Francisco!**), so I guess I'm never going to be able to afford a house. Maybe if I work hard I can find a shared room for 1,200 bucks, but your refrigerator box is looking pretty good right about now. You *do* accept small squirrel-like pets, yes?

Between **rich parents** buying houses as investment properties while their children attend **Cal Poly**, **wealthy retirees** buying up houses to get in on this "happy" thing we've supposedly got going, and **predatory slumlords** and their "passive income," I don't stand a chance on a shredder's salary. Let's see: The calculation is 30 percent of your income, so \$30K x .3 is \$9,000 a year, carry the one, divide by 12, plus the square root of 11 ... OK, I should be able to pay for a median-priced \$540,000 home in exactly 60 years provided I'm charged zero interest and I live that long. Any banks out there interested in my loan parameters? Anyone? Hello?

I think SLO County Supervisors **Bruce Gibson** (District 2) and **Adam Hill** (District 3) had a point in their **Tribune** commentary ("SLO County has a housing crisis. Two supervisors have

a \$5 million plan to help," June 8). In the run-up to the **SLO County Board of Supervisors'** annual budget meeting on June 12, Gibson and Hill explained in their commentary how the conservative majority on the board—**John Peschong** (District 1), **Lynn Compton** (District 4), and **Debbie Arnold** (District 5)—has rejected the need for low-cost housing.

"The most pressing issue, of the greatest moral urgency, is housing," Gibson and Hill wrote. "The playing field for this discussion has been tilted by the board majority."

Gibson and Hill are certainly correct that SLO County suffers from a dearth of affordable housing, but is this how local government works? Is it standard operating procedure to try to shame your colleagues in the press before a budget meeting?

"Already, they have signaled that their spending priorities ignore our most critical issue—the dire unaffordability of housing for wage earners and young families, and the explosion of homelessness—and instead their choices bestow benefits on those who already have homes and property," Gibson and Hill wrote.

So what's their solution? According to the dynamic Democratic duo, they see \$5 million in the proposed budget that Peschong, Compton, and Arnold have earmarked to benefit their Richie Rich friends that could instead be given to nonprofit builders such as **Peoples' Self-Help Housing** or **Habitat for Humanity**, which could then be leveraged to "secure state and federal funds" to build "as many desperately needed apartment units, small houses, and co-housing complexes as possible—as quickly as possible," and to "assure county residents the ability to not just rent, but buy these low-cost homes."

That sounds like a fantastic plan! Did you run it by staff? Did you pitch it to your colleagues in a public meeting? Did you do any of the normal things politicians do to move their agenda forward, or did you set up a disingenuous "gotcha" ploy where you wrote a public commentary for a plan you knew would be rejected at the annual budget meeting so you could cry foul and accuse your political opponents of not caring about the poor and homeless? Um, yeah, ya gone and done that last one.

"What I see is an at-the-last-minute, hail mary attempt," Compton said during the budget meeting. "Now to say you want to take \$5 million from things we've already voted on to me is crazy."

Crazy like a fox? Hey, Gibson and Hill, isn't this the kind of stunt you accused Compton of when she got her discussion of proposed Nipomo-area parks on the agenda? Remember how Hill went apoplectic, accusing Compton of lying and agitating the public with said lies, leading to a gaggle of Nipomoites showing up at the meeting to decry the lack of spending for public amenities? Or remember that time y'all were pissed when it appeared the conservative supes got together in violation of the Brown Act to trot out their revised

version of the **Sustainable Groundwater Management Act** plan? I guess when liberals pull these shenanigans it's coolio, but when the conservative cabal does it it's high treason.

Look, entire board of SLO County supervisors, we need affordable housing. Tarp-covered refrigerator boxes are nice and all, but at some point you five need to *work together to actually solve the problem* instead of pointing fingers and playing gotcha politics. Yes, it's very entertaining, but I can't sleep under it.

This column first appeared in the June 15, SLO New Times.

It's possible that Hill and Gibson might vote against the Budget. This would actually present an opportunity for the Board Majority. If one of them would vote against it too, they could back up and make some major changes and reforms. Although it is bad practice to adopt a budget after the start of the fiscal year, counties have some leeway under the law to delay budget adoption to September. In this case the Board could hold some rigorous review sessions and really get into it.

As noted in some of the union raise items above, they could have staff parse out the real accumulative costs. If there are over 240 vacancies at any time, why not cut it by 100? The world didn't end this year with all the unfilled funded positions.

Item 42 - Amendments to the Woodlands Specific Plan. This item has been before the Board previously and is back for final consideration. The applicant seeks to trade out 4 acres of commercial retail zoning for a residential and planned care facility. The project is part of a much more extensive and largely built out planned residential golf community in Nipomo.

The project recognizes, as we pointed out last week, that families are more and more priced out of San Luis Obispo County by land use policies which arbitrarily restrict the amount of land available and create rationing price escalation. Except for the presence of Cal Poly students, the County is becoming a granny glen – perhaps wealthier grannies.

Matters After 1:30 PM

Item 48 - Check In on the Proposed Recreational Marijuana Regulatory Ordinance.

Things will get out of control. In this case the Board had assigned Planning Department staff to take a skeleton draft ordinance out to the community, receive community/industry input, and report back. Instead the staff went out and developed a new full version of an ordinance and was about to submit it to the Planning Commission without checking back with the Board. The Planning staff never came back to Deputy County Administrator Guy Savage, who is in charge of the policy and ordinance development project.

When some Board members found out, the fur flew, staffing assignments were changed, and now the issue is back to receive revised instructions from the Board. It appears that there are several interest groups or factions in the marijuana industry that are not in agreement. For

example the small traditional mom and pop growers are at loggerheads with the larger well capitalized corporate type interests.

The hearing is likely to be extensive and may provoke disagreement.

Staff has prepared several tables explicating some of the choices:

TABLE 1: Board Direction from July 2016

Topic	Recommendation	Sections in Ordinance
Land Use Designation	Specialty Crop – allowed where other commercial AG is allowed	No provision (commercial AG allowed everywhere)
Maximum # of licensed cannabis cultivation permits allowed	100 (excludes personal and caregiver cultivations)	22.40.040.B.1 23.08.423.a.(1)
Licensees per site	One	Seeking Board direction
Property setback measured from	Adjacent property line	22.40.040.D 23.08.423.c
Setbacks – Cultivation	300 feet 1,000 feet from any pre-school, youth facility, public park, etc.	22.40.040.D 22.40.040.C 23.08.423.c 23.08.423.b
Setbacks – Outdoor personal and caregiver cultivation	Front: 50' or behind main structure Sides: 30' Rear: 30'	22.40.020.A.1 23.08.421.a
Grandfathering	No provision	No provision
Volatile Manufacturing	Ban or limit to industrial areas, separate from cultivation	22.40.060.B 23.08.425.a
Signage	Prohibited – Display of cannabis products or graphics depicting cannabis on the exterior of the property	Sign plan review - 22.40.030.B.2.c (Reed v. Town of Gilbert)
Security	Security plan and measures required at time of license (individualized based on the business and activities)	22.40.030.B.2.a 22.40.030.C.2.c 22.40.030.4.a 22.40.100.B 23.08.422.a.(2)(i) 23.08.422.b.(2)(iii) 23.08.422.b.(4)(i) 23.08.429.a
Pesticides and Fertilizers	Stored in conformance with applicable Federal, State, and Local laws and regulations	22.40.040.E.5 22.40.100.C.2 22.40.130.D

TABLE 2: Additional Items Needing Direction

Topic	Issue	Possible Options
Cap on cultivation permits	Should the cap on cultivation permits be changed?	A) Keep current limit of 100 B) Increase or decrease limit C) Eliminate limit
Cap on cultivation permits	Should cultivation cap include cannabis nurseries?	A) Cultivation sites only B) Cultivation and nursery sites
Selection of permit holders	How should staff allocate limited permits?	A) Competitive, using a "points-based" system* B) Lottery C) First come, first served
Distribution of cultivation permits	How should the limited permits be distributed?	A) Based on selection of limited permits B) Based on land use category C) Based on planning area D) Based on district E) Based on some other method
Selection and distribution of cultivation permits	Assuming the Coastal Zone Land Use Ordinance is not approved very shortly after Inland Zone, how should selection and distribution be handled?	A) Wait to open application period until Coastal Zone Land Use Ordinance is adopted B) Set aside some number of permits to be allocated to Coastal Zone C) Allocate all permits and wait for future allocations before approving anything in

		the Coastal Zone
Mixed-Light Cultivation	Should mixed light grows be separately addressed and regulated by the ordinance or regulated the same as indoor cultivation?	A) Define under indoors and use indoors standards B) Create separate definitions for indoors, outdoors, and mixed-light cultivation
Storefront dispensaries	Should dispensary activities continue to be limited to medical only?	A) Continue to limit to medical only B) Allow both medical and non-medical
Storefront dispensaries	Should dispensaries be allowed in the Coastal Zone?	A) Continue limitations to Inland areas only B) Allow in both Inland and Coastal Zone
Delivery services	Should delivery services be allowed, or be allowed with limitations or restrictions?	A) Allow delivery services B) Allow, but limit to permitted storefront dispensaries C) Allow, but limit to permitted storefront dispensaries in SLO County D) Allow, but do not require a local storefront dispensary (tied to one outside our jurisdiction) but require proof of other jurisdiction business license E) Allow, but do not require a local storefront dispensary (tied to one outside our jurisdiction) but require a local business license F) Prohibit all delivery services
Caregiver registration	Should caregivers be required to provide a declaration from their qualified patient(s) designating them as the primary caregiver?	A) Require caregiver to present patient declaration form(s) B) Do not require
Caregiver restriction	Should caregivers be allowed to grow for up to five patients (30 plants) or just one patient (6 plants)	A) Allow up to 5 patients per caregiver B) Allow 1 patient per caregiver
Limitations on permits or licenses per site	Should there be a limit on the number of land use permits, business licenses, or state licenses per site?	A) Limit cultivation to one land use permit per site B) Limit to one land use permit per site C) Limit to one business license per site D) Limit to one state license per site E) Do not limit licenses or permits by site F) Specify additional standards

Note: Will UBER AND LYFT BE ALLOWED TO DELIVER? THEY DELIVER PIZZA.

* Possible selection criteria can be found in the attachment - Possible Selection Criteria.

Are there not some Constitutional equal protection issues involved in the some of the choices above? This is especially a question since there are already 432 grows registered legally with the County, which evinces its knowledge of the existing businesses. If the County were to adopt some of the restrictions, many existing businesses could be put out of business. Would this be an illegal taking and subject the County to potential costs?

Of course one unanswered question is: What if President Trump orders Attorney General Sessions to enforce the Federal Narcotics Act under which marijuana is listed as a Class I illegal

narcotic? Would the Board of Supervisors members be prosecutable for conspiring to enable the illegal possession for the purpose of sale? (a felony)

Planning Commission Meeting of Thursday, June 22, 2017 (Scheduled)

Item 4 - A request by the Cayucos Sanitary District for a Conditional Use Permit and Development Plan / Coastal Development Permit, DRC2016-00063, for the Cayucos Sustainable Water Facility (CSWP). The proposed CSWP consists of: 1) a Water Resource Recovery Facility (WRRF), solar array, and landscaping in an approximately 8-acre development area; and 2) related pipelines and conveyance infrastructure. The project is complex and would generate upgraded tertiary treated sewer water, which can be legally discharged into the ocean or for irrigation. It will correct issues that have been pending before the Regional Water Quality Board and Coastal Commission for years. There does not seem to be any opposition, at least as evidenced by the fact that there are no formal filings or letters in the agenda attachments at this point.

The so-called Northern Chumash Tribe is hanging around and did not bless or oppose the project. Perhaps they will use their expertise to consult during construction and receive a fee.

LAST WEEK'S HIGHLIGHTS

Board of Supervisors Meeting of Monday, June 12, 2017 (Completed)

Item 4 - Budget Hearings for the Fiscal Year 2017-18 Recommended Budget. For the first time recent memory the Budget review took a full day. As predicted, some of the elapsed time involved the conflict over the funding of SGMA groundwater management planning.

In past years Board review has been perfunctory and brief. Last year the whole budget, except for the Wednesday nonprofit request session, took about 1.5 hours. Had it not been for the disagreement over the SGMA funding and a separate proposal by Supervisor Compton to direct some community facilities fees to Nipomo, the session may have been equally short. There were presentations by Department Heads, which also contributed.

As we have been reporting for several weeks, Gibson and Hill launched a strike on the Board majority of Arnold, Compton, and Peschong. The issue flared into the open as Gibson and Hill severely criticized the 3-Board majority. Arnold and Compton responded with a factual historical review of the situation, including information about much larger water planning expenditures

supported by Hill and Gibson in the past. In the end the Board voted 3/2 to fund the SGMA planning with a mixture of County Water District funds and general budget funds.

It is expected that the Budget will be formally adopted on Tuesday, June 20th. It is not known if any other changes are expected to be proposed or if Gibson and Hill will engage in further argument. It is also not known if they will vote against the Budget. A minimum 3/2 vote is required to pass it.

[The County's Recommended and Supplemental Budget documents can be viewed at the following link: http://www.slocounty.ca.gov/admin/Budget.htm.](http://www.slocounty.ca.gov/admin/Budget.htm)

**Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO) Meeting of Wednesday, June 15, 2017
(Completed)**

Item A-1: Estrella-El Pomar-Creston Water District. This item contained a pro forma legal requirement that the County Election Official determine if there were protest votes against formation of the district sufficient to stop it. As an all-voluntary district there were only 2 negative votes, representing a tiny portion of the acreage. The proposed district now moves to a full all-mail vote by its prospective members.

B- 3: Study Session - County Service Areas Sphere of Influence Update/Municipal Service Review. LAFCO's are required to conduct what are called Municipal Service Reviews (MSRs) every 5 years to determine if jurisdictions are living within their resources. These reviews are used to determine if expansions of their spheres of influence (areas where they might expand in future years) are feasible. Over the cycle of years LAFCO reviews cities, community service districts, and independent special districts. Additionally it reviews County-run community service areas (CSA's), which are the subject of this report. There are no big policy issues here, but the reports on each of the CSA's are quite extensive. These can be seen at the web link below.

<http://nebula.wsimg.com/628652d72df22ca6306e39e89bf46f02?AccessKeyId=242F22EFFF FDE4B18755&disposition=0&alloworigin=1>

Continued on the next page:

CSA/District Area Served	Anticipated Growth
Nipomo Lighting Nipomo	CSA 1, the zones of benefit and Lighting District are recommended for dissolution. The Nipomo CSD is the more appropriate agency to provide these services. No future connections or increases in the provision of service are anticipated for this area.
CSA 1 and Zones A, B, C, D, E, F Nipomo	
CSA 7 and Zones A, B, C Oak Shores	CSA 7 should be reduced in size to cover only the area in the Village Reserve boundary for the community of Oak Shores and those properties that need an emergency access road. Limited water supplies and access to sewer constrain build out of Oak Shores.
CSA 10 and Zone 10A Cayucos	Significant increases in population are not anticipated to occur in this area over the next 20 years.
CSA 9 Los Osos	Significant increases in population are not anticipated to occur in this area over the next 20 years.
CSA 9 and Zone I Los Osos	
CSA 12 Lopez Water Sales	Significant increases in population are not anticipated to occur in this area over the next 20 years.
CSA 16 Shandon	Shandon may experience a significant increase in population depending on the buildout of the Shandon Community Plan.
CSA 18 San Luis Obispo Country Club	Significant increases in population are not anticipated to occur in this area over the next 20 years. Although, Tract 2429 would increase services.
CSA 21 Countywide Road Maintenance	CSA 21 will continue to meet the needs of the unincorporated areas with regard to roads based on County's CIP.
CSA 22 San Luis Obispo Airport Area	The City of San Luis Obispo is anticipated to serve this area. It is recommended that CSA 22 be dissolved at the appropriate time.
CSA 23 Santa Margarita	The Santa Margarita Ranch may develop over the next 20 years causing an increase in the population; however the ranch is outside of CSA 23.

COLAB IN DEPTH

IN FIGHTING THE TROUBLESOME, LOCAL DAY-TO-DAY ASSAULTS ON OUR FREEDOM AND PROPERTY, IT IS ALSO IMPORTANT TO KEEP IN MIND THE LARGER UNDERLYING IDEOLOGICAL, POLITICAL, AND ECONOMIC CAUSES AND FORCES

California's Economic Suicide

BY GREG WALCHER

Last fall, California Gov. Jerry Brown signed a law requiring his state to reduce its greenhouse gas emissions 40 percent below 1990 levels. That ratchets the state's already severe limits down even tighter, now requiring a reduction to levels not seen since the 1950s or earlier. Some are

beginning to understand that it cannot be done in the modern era without extreme new regulations, which could quite literally give the state power to control nearly every detail of life.

James Sweeney, director of Stanford University's Precourt Energy Efficiency Center, warned that the requirement will result in a much more fragile economy. "Meeting the requirement will require severe restrictions, far beyond those seen to date," he said. A cabinet-level official agreed that "it is the biggest thing we have done yet in sheer volume. It requires a level of coordination between different agencies that we haven't seen before."

One Los Angeles Times writer says officials are discussing rules to determine the kind of houses and businesses that might be allowed, as well as automobiles. They may need to require people to limit miles driven, to use public transportation, and to walk or bicycle to work. The state is poised to dictate how much and what kind of energy people can use, and even what kind of food can be grown on the state's farms.

The legislature cited "evidence" that the new requirement will help limit global temperature increases to 2 degrees. That's hard to believe, since California only produces about 1 percent of the world's total carbon emissions, so a 0.4 percent reduction is virtually meaningless environmentally. In response, "Governor Moonbeam" Brown — never to be denied his optimism — claims other countries will follow California's lead, though there is absolutely no evidence to support that hope.

In fact, China's global economic strategy is based on building new coal-fired power plants; it has been involved in 240 coal power projects in 65 countries since 2001. Similarly, India is building dozens of new coal-burning power plants, despite its voluntary emission reduction targets under the Paris agreement. In both countries, several billion people are finally getting off bicycles and into cars, obviously not following California's example. California has a much more energy-efficient economy than most of the world, yet China and India are apparently not envious enough to follow.

Indeed, the only really measurable result of the regulatory nightmare about to begin in California will be the slow and painful death of economic prosperity. The state's Air Resources Board (in charge of producing the new regulations) says it will cost the economy up to \$14 billion and perhaps 102,000 jobs. It will likely be much worse. The construction sector alone says it may lose 75,000 jobs in the short-term, and the Farm Bureau openly wonders whether agriculture has any place in the state's future.

The truth is that nobody can really estimate the long-term impact. That's because most economic models are based on an assumption that the emission targets can be met, and that new technologies will be implemented efficiently. It is more likely, though, that businesses and jobs will simply move away. Consider what high taxes and oppressive regulations, along with stiff competition from elsewhere, did to Detroit, Buffalo, and Dayton.

Leaders from elsewhere in the West are salivating over the prospect of attracting California companies looking for a friendlier business climate. Many have already moved. In 2000, that state produced 5.6 percent of all U.S. manufacturing investment, but today it's only 1.8 percent, according to the California Manufacturing and Technology Association. That organization predicts that "over the long term, manufacturers will be choosing to put their money elsewhere."

Why would the people of California allow their leaders to commit such economic suicide? The likely answer is that most people simply take for granted the conveniences of modern life, without thinking much about their source. We live in comfortable homes with heating and air conditioning, change dark to light with the flip of a switch, enjoy hot and cold running water, brew our own coffee, drive ourselves wherever we want to go, and buy products from all over the world at local stores.

All of that is made possible by oil, gas, and coal — supplying about 90 percent of America's energy. We are so accustomed to a comfortable lifestyle that we don't even associate these conveniences with energy, much less any specific source. Many people just imagine they can live without it. In California, they may be sacrificing their way of life on the altar of political correctness.

Greg Walcher is president of the Natural Resources Group and author of "Smoking Them Out: The Theft of the Environment and How to Take it Back." He is a Western Slope native. This article was first Published in the June 16, 2017 Hoover Institution of Stanford University Daily Report. Greg Walcher is National Conservation Policy Leader



ANNOUNCEMENTS

**THE
ANDY CALDWELL
SHOW**

The only local talk show to cover the entire Central Coast!




Central Coast Government watchdog, taxpayer, business and traditional values advocate Andy Caldwell interviews leaders and scholars on a variety of local, state and national issues.

Andy is Live Monday Thru Friday 3:00 PM to 5:00 PM

Call in 1-888-625-1440

Visit www.theandycaldwellshow.com for more information

Streaming Live on www.am1440.com and www.newspress.com



SUPPORT COLAB!
PLEASE COMPLETE THE
MEMBERSHIP/DONATION FORM
ON THE NEXT PAGE

Coalition of Labor, Agriculture and Business
San Luis Obispo County
"Your Property – Your Taxes – Our Future"
PO Box 13601 – San Luis Obispo, CA 93406 / Phone: 805.548-0340
Email: colabslo@gmail.com / Website: colabslo.org

MEMBERSHIP APPLICATION

MEMBERSHIP OPTIONS:

General Member: \$100 – \$249 \$ _____ Voting Member: \$250 - \$5,000 \$ _____

Sustaining Member: \$5,000 + \$ _____

(Sustaining Membership includes a table of 10 at the Annual Fundraiser Dinner)

General members will receive all COLAB updates and newsletters. Voting privileges are limited to Voting Members and Sustainable Members with one vote per membership.

MEMBER INFORMATION:

Name: _____

Company: _____

Address: _____

City: _____ State: _____ Zip: _____

Phone: _____ Fax: _____ Email: _____

How Did You Hear About COLAB?

Radio Internet Public Hearing Friend

COLAB Member(s) / Sponsor(s): _____

NON MEMBER DONATION/CONTRIBUTION OPTION:

For those who choose not to join as a member but would like to support COLAB via a contribution/donation.

I would like to contribute \$ _____ to COLAB and my check or credit card information is enclosed/provided.

Donations/Contributions do not require membership though it is encouraged in order to provide updates and information.

Memberships and donation will be kept confidential if that is your preference.

Confidential Donation/Contribution/Membership

PAYMENT METHOD:

Check Visa MasterCard Discover Amex NOT accepted.

Cardholder Name: _____ Signature: _____

Card Number: _____ Exp Date: ___/___ Billing Zip Code: _____ CVV: _____

TODAY'S DATE: _____

(Revised 2/2017)