

COLAB SAN LUIS OBISPO COUNTY

WEEK OF JANUARY 31- February 4, 2012

INSIDE THIS UPDATE:

SAVE THURSDAY, MARCH 22, 2012 FOR COLAB SLO'S ANNUAL
DINNER AND AUCTION

SUPERVISOR MECHAM TO HILL: APOLOGIZE!!
PUBLIC TO THE BOARD: CENSURE HILL

ALERT

SLOCOG TO APPROVE GRANTS: MORE CLIMATE ACTION
RESTRICTIONS AND REGULATIONS

SURFING MARGARITA: SLOCOG TO PLAN FOR SEA LEVEL RISE

Board of Supervisors Meeting of January 24, 2012 (Completed)

Supervisor Mecham Requested an Apology: During Public Comment Supervisor Mecham requested Supervisor Hill to apologize for impersonating Pismo City Councilman Waage/Third District Supervisor Candidate Ed Waage in a phone call to a citizen involved in an annexation question. You can see the video tape at www.FreeSLO.com (a new site called Defending Liberty on the Central Coast) put up by Josh Friedman. Supervisor Mecham requested that Supervisor Hill apologize to Mr. Waage, the Board, and the public. Supervisor Hill said he was sorry if he offended anyone but it was an “innocent joke on a friend” and was “blown out of proportion.” He said his “friend was in the audience.” She did not speak. Four citizens did speak, suggesting that Hill was immature, deranged, and violated his oath of office. One suggested he step aside. Gibson stated that Mecham “...is elevating this out of proportion” and that too much time had already been spent on it. Patterson also stated “it had been blown out proportion and is a trivial matter.”

Future Backfire: If the Board ignores the Hill situation and does nothing, it will come back to haunt them and cost them when action is taken against employees for violation of the County Organizational Values Rules. The Board is on notice that Hill has continued to carry out abusive acts. Citizens, COLAB, and the media have asked Hill to stop. At some point the libel and slander, abuse of power, and intimidation will cost the County financially. What if the recipient of the impersonation call believed that it was Ed Waage?

What does it tell us about Hill's state of mind? Should the Board have someone conduct an independent investigation to determine the facts? What if it is a malicious attempt to discredit Waage, damage his reputation, and thereby defeat him in the County Supervisorial election? By defeating Waage, Hill retains substantial personal material economic benefits, including a salary, health insurance, travel and entertainment reimbursements, an office and staff, communications services, and a larger County pension when he retires. If the call was a deliberate and malicious act calculated to discredit Waage, does it violate Section 528.5 of the Penal Code? (See below). Why would the Board not ask County Counsel for an analysis and opinion? After all, the County Counsel and staff lawyers are on the payroll every day and have the prime duty to advise the Board.

Do the other Supervisors think that Hill's actions violate the County's recently adopted Organizational Values (See below), which apply to both elected officials and employees? What if a Department Head or other executive "played a joke" by telephoning a citizen, and told her that he was Adam Hill and threatened her? What if a line employee, such as a field worker, Deputy Sheriff, or other staffer, was found to have played such a joke? Would some Board members say it was "blown out of proportion" and "too trivial to examine"? Should the Board fail to take action, they effectively undermine the concepts of integrity and accountability and render themselves impotent in front of their employees. What happens in the future when an employee violates the Organizational Values Code and is disciplined?

Background:

1. SECTION 528 OF THE CALIFORNIA PENAL CODE:

528.5. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any person who knowingly and without consent credibly impersonates another actual person through or on an internet web site or by other electronic means for purposes of harming, intimidating, threatening, or defrauding another person is guilty of a public offence punishable pursuant to subdivision.

(b) For Purposes of this section, an impersonation is credible if another person would reasonably believe, or did reasonably believe, that the defendant was or is the person who was impersonated.

(c) For purposes of this subdivision "electronic means" shall include opening an email account or an account on a social networking Internet Web site in another person's name.

(d) A violation of this subdivision is (a) punishable by a fine not exceeding one thousand dollars (\$1,000) , or by imprisonment in a county jail not exceeding one year, or by both that fine and imprisonment.

(e) In addition to any other civil remedy available, a person who suffers damage or loss by reason of subdivision (a) may bring an action against the violator for compensatory damages and injunctive or other relief, etc., etc.

2. COUNTY ORGANIZATIONAL VALUES

Organizational Values: The employees and *elected officials* of San Luis Obispo County are guided by the following values. Our decisions and actions demonstrate these values. Putting our values into practice creates long-term benefits for stakeholders, customers, employees, communities and the public we serve.

Integrity

- We are dedicated to high ethical and moral standards and uncompromising honesty in our dealings with the public and each other.
- We behave in a consistent manner with open, truthful communication, respecting commitments and being true to our word.

Collaboration

- We celebrate teamwork by relying on the participation and initiative of every employee.
- We work cooperatively within and between departments and the public to address issues and achieve results.

Professionalism

- We are each personally accountable for the performance of our jobs in a manner which bestows credibility upon ourselves and our community.
- We consistently treat customers, each other, the County, and the resources entrusted to us with respect and honesty.

Accountability

- We assume personal responsibility for our conduct and actions and follow through on our commitments.
- We are responsible managers of available fiscal and natural resources.

Responsiveness

- We provide timely, accurate and complete information to each other and those we serve.
- We solicit feedback from customers on improving programs and services as part of a continuous improvement process.

Board Meeting of Tuesday January 31, 2012 (No Board Meeting)

There will be no meeting as January 31, 2012 is the 5th Tuesday of the month. The Board's Rules provide that it will meet on the first 4 Tuesdays of the month.

San Luis Obispo Council of Governments (SLOCOG)

CITIZEN ALERT (Oppose the Sustainable Communities Grants)

SLOCOG Board Meeting of February 1, 2012 (8:30 AM at 1055 Monterey)

Sustainable Communities Planning Grants: The SLOCOG Board, which is made up of the five County Supervisors and a city council member from each of the cities, will consider a staff recommendation to apply for Sustainable Communities Grants. SLOCOG ostensibly exists to help coordinate transportation planning throughout the County. In State and Federal law it is referred to as a metropolitan planning organization (MPO). MPO is an important term to remember because much of the environmental smart growth assault is to be imposed through MPO's.

In addition to the Board of Supervisors, the Air Pollution Control District (APCD), Integrated Waste Management Board (IWMA), County Planning Commission, Central Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board (CCRWQCB), and California Coastal Commission, the SLOCOG is a key maneuver unit in the war on private property, jobs, the economy, and liberty. Of course the war is being carried out in the name of climate control and smart growth.

The danger posed by the "Sustainable Communities Grants" is that they will provide from \$100,000 to \$1 million per grant to help meet regional (greenhouse gas) targets established by the California Air Resources Board (CARB), one of the key puppet masters in the whole scheme. In other words, the grants will further empower local enviro-socialists in their quest to implement SB 375 and AB 32 and restrict your housing, transportation, job (if any are left), and consumption choices in the name of reducing greenhouse gas emissions consistent with the California Global Warming Solutions Act. The agenda item (E-3) report can be found at the convoluted link below.

http://library.slocog.org/PDFs/Agency_Mtgs_Agendas/SLOCOGBoard/2012/February%202012/E-3%20California%20Strategic%20Growth%20Council%20Sustainable%20Communities%20Planning%20Grant%20Application.pdf

The grants will be used to further the plan to force future development into urban areas and restrict the rights of property owners in the rural/urban fringe areas and agricultural areas. They will also be used to try to force county residents out of their personal vehicles and into expensive government run mass transit.

Surfing Margarita-Your Tax Dollars and Adapting to Sea Level Rise: Ridiculously, the grants will also be used to plan for "adaptation" to the impacts of sea level rise caused by "global warming." Remember these are State funds, which come from your personal income tax, sales taxes, and fees. They can't fix the roads. They are raising tuition at the colleges and universities. They are closing the State parks. They are shifting prisoners from the state penitentiaries to the County Jail because they don't have enough money. They have hundreds of billions of unfunded public pension debt. In spite of all these problems, there is grant money that your local officials would actually accept to plan for sea level rise. What a travesty. Tell your Supervisors to reject these grants and throw the proverbial tea into Boston Harbor.

