



**COLAB SAN LUIS OBISPO COUNTY**



**WEEK OF JULY 27-August 2, 2014**



THE COALITION OF LABOR,  
AGRICULTURE, AND BUSINESS

**COLAB**  
San Luis Obispo County

**SOUTH COUNTY  
MIXER 2014**



**LOCK AND LOAD  
FOR FALL.**

**KEEPING YOU INFORMED.**

**Thursday, August 14, 2014**

**5:30-7:30 p.m.**

**Arroyo Grande Hall  
707 Huasna Rd.**

**(At the intersection of Hwy 227,  
E. Branch St. and Huasna Rd.)**

**Appetizers and Beverages  
will be served.**

**Guest Speaker**

**Supervisor  
Debbie Arnold**



Join us and hear Fifth District Supervisor Debbie Arnold's front line insights about her efforts to stop the Board of Supervisors majority's reenergized assault on business and private property. A key element of this plan is to prohibit development of single family freestanding homes with a yard, garage, and privacy. A companion policy is to force all development into the core of Nipomo, Oceano Templeton, and San Miguel. Other Current initiatives include manipulation of the housing market; imposing centralized one size fits all control over neighborhood and agricultural water resources, more consolidated power for Board Chairman Gibson, more fees at the Planning Department and APCD, and more job killing permitting delays and costs.

**RSVPs appreciated by Monday, August 11th.**

**Email: [colabslo@gmail.com](mailto:colabslo@gmail.com) or call (805) 548-0340**

# NO BOARD MEETING TUESDAY JULY 29, 2014

## PLANNING COMMISSION CONTINUES ACTION ON SEVERE NEW DEVELOPMENT RESTRICTIONS TO SEPTEMBER 11, 2014 (2:1 WATER OFFSET NOW RECOMMENDED FOR ALL SEVERITY III BASINS)

### Board of Supervisors Meeting of Tuesday, July 22, 2014 (Completed)

**Item 9 - Award of a \$4.2 Million Mental Health Services Contract to Transitions-Mental Health.** The Board awarded the contract but only after COLAB provoked a fairly protracted discussion of the inadequacy of the various performance measures which were included in the Board letter. In the end the Board directed the CAO and Health Agency Director to bring a presentation on the metrics used to measure the services back on the Board meeting of August 12, 2014. It is positive that the Board members are taking an interest in this subject and we hope it will extend beyond this one contract and the Behavioral Health Program. As we indicated back at budget adoption time, we think the Board should review and comment on the measures for all departments as part of its assessment of the adequacy of the programs and their relative efficiency.

Supervisor Hill stated, "I'm not comfortable with the performance measures we have here...." He went on to state that he was interested in outcomes.

Later outside in the hall, Health Services director Jeff Hamm seemed quite irritated that COLAB might have something to offer. He stated that excellent performance measures are in the contract, which was not posted with the on line agenda. We will see.

In general a performance measure should meet the standards outlined below:



## Statement...

### ❖ Ideally, performance measure statements contain five elements:

- ◆ The Action
- ◆ The Problem statement
- ◆ The Current State of the problem
- ◆ The Proposed State or solution
- ◆ The Time Interval during which the solution will occur

A hypothetical measure:

### ❖ **“Contract with and provide supportive services to 19% more family members by year-end under the Family Self-Sufficiency Program, increasing the number for family members served from 63 to 75.”**

- ◆ Action: “Contract with and provide supportive services.”
- ◆ Problem: Inferred that families in program are not self-sufficient.
- ◆ Current State: Number of families served at beginning of the year (63).
- ◆ Proposed State: Target number of families (75).
- ◆ Timeline: Fiscal year assumed.

See last week’s Weekly Update for an analysis of the problem at the link:

[http://www.colabslo.org/prior\\_actions/WEEKLY\\_UPDATE\\_JULY\\_20-26\\_2014.pdf](http://www.colabslo.org/prior_actions/WEEKLY_UPDATE_JULY_20-26_2014.pdf)

### **Public Comment on the Resource Management System (RMS) (See the Planning Commission Discussion Below For an Explanation of the Expansive Regulatory Proposal).**

COLAB requested that the Board schedule a hearing on the burdensome and outlandish proposals being served up to the Planning Commission by the staff. The Board ultimately determined to wait until the Planning commission is finished and submits its recommendations to the Board. A question is, if the Commission substantially recommends the new provisions, will the Board overturn its own appointments? The public will be forced to mobilize and attempt to convince the Board to reject or dial back a fully completed proposal. The staff write-up stated that the assignment that generated the proposal was given back in 2009. Since the Board has several new members who were not here at that time, we think it would be prudent for the Board to do a sanity check.

COLAB pointed out as many of the problematical provisions as could be covered in 3 minutes.

Supervisor Gibson stated that “the only sensible approach is to let the Planning Commission act.” Not surprisingly, Supervisor Arnold was the only one who raised questions about the issue. Strangely, Supervisor Ray remained fairly aloof on the issue. Supporting a request to have the Board review its 5-year-old direction on a major controversial issue would seem to have been a prudent step for her, especially after Gibson’s one-sided declaration.

County Administrative Officer Buckshi and County Counsel Neal were quick to jump in and state that an assignment, once given, is valid until a successor Board either terminates or modifies it. As several commentators noted, what if the staff dredges something up from 1879? It would be interesting to have their substantive professional recommendation as opposed to their procedural duck and cover.

**Assignment Not a Blank Check:** It turns out that the assignment was approved on the Board meeting of **April 21, 2009**. The vote is significant. Gibson, Hill, and Patterson voted in favor. Mecham and former Supervisor Achadjian voted no! Patterson has been replaced, largely on the grounds of his forceful and proactive support for this policy and its companions. Supervisor Caren Ray is now sitting in Achadjian’s seat. It will be interesting to see how she reacts to the item when it reaches the Board. It is noteworthy that she did not support Arnold’s request to pull the matter up to the Board now for a sanity and policy check. Her district is very unlikely to support the extensive regulatory, fee, and social engineering components implicit in the reinforced RMS.

A review of the extensive hearing that took place on April 21, 2009 shows that Mecham and Achadjian had significant questions and reservations. Achadjian was particularly critical of the concept that the RMS would require the board to take mandatory actions restricting development based on its automatic severity scales (actually generated by the planning staff). He went on to ask a pointed question, which resonates today: “What right do we have to interfere with water rates” (as a growth limiting tool)? How ironic. He also asked if the County could legally get into regulating water use. He asked if adjudication was the legal tool. Back in 2009 Planner Caruso said he was not sure.

Mecham noted that the staff was seeking ways to avoid subjecting the proposal to CEQA. He talked about the double standard. The County forces nearly all applicants through CEQA but takes steps to avoid the requirement itself. We wonder what he will say now (when the RMS reaches the board) since the staff has declared it categorically exempt.

**No Board of Supervisors Meeting Scheduled for July 29, 2014**

No Board meetings are scheduled for the next 2 weeks.

**Planning Commission Meeting of Thursday, July 24, 2014 (Completed)**

**Item 5 - Resource Management System Intensification**

1. Commissioner Irving was away on a previously scheduled vacation. It is suspicious that staff would schedule this major policy item when they had known for months that Irving would be away. It is likely that Irving would have many questions.

2. The staff attempted to lull the Commission into believing that the RMS is simply a benign analytical tool to assist the board of Supervisors in its decision-making. As several of the commissioners pointed out, it has more weight and power because it is incorporated into the Land Use and Circulation Elements of the General Plan. If it is simply an analytical tool, why is it incorporated into a legally and binding policy Plan document which governs subordinate land use ordinances and regulations?

The quote from the actual Commission Agenda item below confirms this fact.

Hearing to consider a request by the COUNTY OF SAN LUIS OBISPO to amend Chapter 3, Resource Management System, in the Inland and Coastal Framework for Planning documents, Part I of the Land Use and Circulation Elements of the San Luis Obispo County General Plan. The Coastal Zone Framework for Planning document is also part of the Local Coastal Program. The amendment includes: 1) recalculating lead times for responding to Levels of Severity for certain resources, 2) adding highway interchanges as a monitored resource, 3) revising or establishing criteria and recommended actions for Levels of Severity for water supply and systems, wastewater treatment, schools, roads, air quality, and parks, 4) reorganizing text and tables, and 5) updating and clarifying processes, references and other language. This amendment also includes minor clean-up revisions to Chapters 1 and 8 of the Inland and Coastal Framework for Planning to remove outdated references to the Master Water and Sewer Plan and to change reporting of information by agencies to the County from "annually" to "biennially." This project is exempt under CEQA. County File Number: LRP2008-00013 Assessor Parcel Numbers: Countywide Supervisorial Districts: All Date Authorized for Processing: April 21, 2009 Brain Pedrotti, Project Manager Recommend to the Board of Supervisors Approval

3. Staff has already decided to drive this through the process. When Commissioners asked about making changes, the staff basically said you can try but we think this is what we were directed to do back in 2009. Planner Caruso made it fast with:

**“We can’t preclude what the Board is going to do”**

In other words, we know what the Board majority (and we ourselves) want, and you’re wasting your time if you try and change it.

The full text can be accessed at the link below.

[http://slocounty.granicus.com/MetaViewer.php?view\\_id=3&event\\_id=770&meta\\_id=284692](http://slocounty.granicus.com/MetaViewer.php?view_id=3&event_id=770&meta_id=284692)

**Background:** Like a stealthy festering and hidden virus, a long forgotten project to make the RMS more severe and burdensome is now making its appearance at the Planning Commission as a first step toward ultimate adoption by the Board of Supervisors. According to the Planning Department write-up, the Board authorized the Department to begin working on amendments to

the RMS back in 2009. For whatever reason the now completed recommendation is being brought forward at this time. Perhaps the recent electoral victory of Supervisor Gibson combined with tenuous prospects for the continued reign of the current Board majority has created a sense of urgency.

Our readers will recall that the RMS is a scheme whereby the County staff determines whether there is sufficient water capacity, sewer capacity, road capacity, parks capacity, public school classroom capacity, and air quality to allow further development. Problems are rated in terms of levels of “severity” on a scale of from I to III, with III being bad. In the updated version a new category is added: freeway interchange capacity. When the planners determine that there is a problem, they go to the Planning Commission and then to the Board of Supervisors and request the Supervisors to “certify” the recommended level of severity. The Paso Robles Basin was set at a level III severity back in 2011 for water.

This is a highly dishonest system because it is premised on the false and obsolete Malthusian idea that mankind is doomed, in part by the “natural” carrying capacity of the earth’s biosphere and in part by the current technological and capital investment level of human society. The Planners and Board majority have simply imposed this ideological view on the County in an effort to fulfill their part in the broader scheme of the enviro-socialist left to cripple the economy and beckon the ensuing societal crises, which will in turn eradicate private property, free market capitalism, and human rights.

This underlying and outrageous premise is stated openly at the beginning of the revised RMS document. (Words and sentences in blue are new).

As the county enters the 21st century, the public and decision makers have become more aware of the limits of our natural resources, the cost of expanded infrastructure and its maintenance and the difficulties in finding solutions to these problems. ~~Growing public awareness and more accurate information about the limits of natural resources and the accelerating costs of many public services have highlighted the need to better coordinate the rate of growth with the availability of both natural and man-made resources. Limitations affecting~~ Deficiencies in many man-made resources such as sewers, schools, police and fire protection can be overcome by upgrading or expanding such facilities. Although augmentation of man-made resources may be costly, the solutions are tangible and easily identified. This is often not the case with natural resource limitations. Solutions are not always obvious and technical data may be confusing or lacking altogether. There may also be significant, even prohibitive, costs involved in determining resource capacity and availability.



**Local Agency Formation Commission Meeting Not Scheduled in July 2014.**

**No Air Pollution Control District Meeting Scheduled in July 2014**