



COLAB SAN LUIS OBISPO COUNTY

WEEK OF MAY 29 - JUNE 4, 2016

**DID HILL'S WIFE CRY OUT FOR HELP AND
PLEAD FOR HIS DEFEAT?**

THIS WEEK

NO SUPERVISORS MEETING THIS WEEK

LAST WEEK

**BOARD APPROVED PROCESS TO COMPLY
WITH PHASE I OF STATE GROUNDWATER
MANAGEMENT ACT**

**PLANNING COMMISSION CONTINUES
WORKFORCE HOUSING ISSUE & GETS
PREVIEW OF ANTI PHILLIPS 66 ACTIVISM**

SLO COLAB IN DEPTH

(SEE PAGE 9)

AFFORDABLE HOUSING MAY BE LIMITED BY NEW STATE ENVIRONMENTAL RULES

By Matt Flemming

THE STATE'S BIG HOUSING DILEMMA

BY DAN WALTERS

HOW LONG WILL SAN LUIS OBISPO COUNTY IGNORE ITS HOUSING CRISIS

By Suzanne Smith

THIS WEEKS HIGHLIGHTS

There are no meetings of the key County agencies this week.

Hill's Wife Makes Plea For His Election Defeat – Will Voters Honor Her Request?

Once again the *CaLCoastNews* scooped the rest of the central coast media and broke a bizarre story about Supervisor Adam Hill's wife's (Dee Torres Hill) outburst during a local charitable fundraising event. One import of the story is that it reveals the stress being experienced in the Hill household as a result of SLO City Councilman Dan Carpenter's challenge to unseat Hill and take over his 3rd District Supervisorial seat.

More significantly, an attendee (Bev Aho), who was a target of Dee Torre's wrath, quotes Mrs. Hill's alleged statement:

Torres-Hill responded saying she wished her husband would lose the race and that she was tired of his "f---ing job,"

You would think Mr. Hill would honor his recent bride's plea and spare her and everyone else more trauma and drama by resigning immediately for the sake of his marriage, tenderness towards his wife, and long term domestic felicity. Otherwise the voters should honor Mrs. Hill's request and rescue her from the obvious stress that is taking place.

For whatever reason, San Luis Obispo County government seems plagued by episodes of domestic turpitude, unprofessional behavior, and conflicts of interest.

The article, which was posted on May 24, 2016 by the *CalCoastNews*, is printed below:

Dee Torres-Hill rips nonprofit volunteer at fundraiser

By CCN STAFF

Tempers flared Saturday night when Dee Torres-Hill, wife of San Luis Obispo County Supervisor Adam Hill, allegedly confronted a woman and a political opponent of Hill's during a fundraising dinner for the Senior Nutrition Program. Torres-Hill took issue with one of Hill's former supporters sitting next to San Luis Obispo City Councilman Dan Carpenter and his wife, Sandy.

During the live auction, multiple sources confirmed that Torres-Hill walked across the banquet room at the Cliff's Resort and asked Bev Aho of Avila Beach why she was sitting next to Carpenter. Aho, a volunteer with the nonprofit, said her seating assignment for the event, attended by about 200 people, was random.

"I was in shock," Aho said. "We were in the middle of an auction, and Dee comes over and wants to take me outside and talk to me. She shamed me."

Aho said she tried unsuccessfully to get Torres-Hill to calm down.

Several people at Aho's table participating in the auction also took umbrage with Torres-Hill's actions.

Bev Aho



"It was not appropriate to call anyone out of a live auction," said Alana Reynolds, another attendee who witnessed the exchange. "It was disruptive to those of us who were sitting at the table."

The next day, Reynolds said she called Hill to discuss the incident. "Hill's assistant then called me to apologize for (the supervisor's) wife's behavior," Reynolds said.

In the hotel's foyer, Torres-Hill told Aho she was angry that Aho was sitting next to Carpenter because Carpenter and others were trying to "harm her children."

Carpenter is in a tight race to unseat Hill, who seeks a third term as District 3 supervisor in the upcoming June 7 primary. Hill frequently claims that members of the media who report on his actions, as well as his political opponents, are harassing his wife's three children.



Torres-Hill then reportedly went back to the Aho table and asked Dan Carpenter to follow her to the foyer. Dan and Sandy Carpenter and Aho complied. Then, said Aho, Torres-Hill allegedly began cursing and screaming that Carpenter, CalCoastNews, and radio hosts Dave Congalton and Dick Mason were after her children.

Dan and Sandy Carpenter picture to the left.

"Dan was very calm and he kept asking Dee to calm down," Aho said.

Dan Carpenter said he has never even discussed Torres-Hill's children, Aho said.

Torres-Hill responded saying she wished her husband would lose the race and that she was tired of his "f---ing job," Aho said.

Torres-Hill then said that Carpenter had posted a [video of Dick Mason](#) on his campaign website that was causing one of her children emotional angst.

Sandy Carpenter reminded Torres-Hill that her husband's affiliates had posted photos of her adult daughter with devil horns along with a claim that she was the spawn of Satan. Torres-Hill said Carpenter's daughter deserved the attack because she had "thumbed up" a Facebook post critical of Hill, several witnesses said.

Torres-Hill then began screaming "f---ing pig" and at one point lunged at Dan Carpenter in an attempt to slap him, witnesses said.

Dan Carpenter told Torres-Hill the conversation was over and returned to his table. Torres-Hill then walked in front of the auctioneer to retrieve her purse and departed, Aho said. Hill had left the banquet area shortly before Torres-Hill confronted Aho.



Supervisor Adam Hill

"This was Dee trying to bully me, and then bully Dan," Aho said. "It really messed up my bidding. I volunteer for senior nutrition and I know how much they need the money."

CalCoastNews asked Torres-Hill for examples of the alleged harassment of her children, and for a comment on the incident at the Senior Nutrition Program fundraiser. In response, Torres-Hill sent the following email, reprinted verbatim:

"Yes, you got me, I tried to jump Dan Carpenter at the senior nutrition event right after I sent threatening e-mails to some obscure radio guy's daughter(?????), before I went and stole some more children for CWS, which was all – well after Adam and I plotted the death of a few unnamed journalists (or is it sanitation guys)? Wait, was I in that murder plot story, I can't remember? I know it's me who's funneling money from SLO Housing to Adam, right? Hard to keep all of my very treacherous deeds straight. I guess this means a new wanted poster is going up."

No Board of Supervisors Meeting on Tuesday, May31, 2016 (Not Scheduled)

There will be no Board of Supervisors Meeting on May 31, 2016, as it is the day after a holiday. The Board typically does not meet on a Tuesday following a Monday holiday.

LAST WEEK'S HIGHLIGHTS

Board of Supervisors Meeting of Tuesday, May 24, 2016 (Completed)

Item 21 - Implementation of the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA)

Strategy. The Board approved Phase I of the plan to achieve compliance with SGMA.

Essentially Phase I is a process where the County staff assists each of the subject water basin's residents, agriculturalists, and local government agencies develop a Groundwater Sustainability Agency (GSA). The GSAs will develop groundwater sustainability plans (GSPs) over the next 4 years (Phase II) and then will be responsible for funding and managing the implementation of those plans over the subsequent 20 years (Phase III). The cost of Phase I is covered in the proposed FY 2016-17 Water Agency Budget (a division of the County Public Works Department).

Initial Annual Cost Estimate of SGMA Compliance & Implementation for Five (5) Priority Basins

Revised on 5/9/2016

Phase 1 – Partners Negotiate Governance/ Funding Agreement; Form GSA						
Calendar Year	High/ Medium Priority Groundwater Basins					Total Phase 1 Cost Estimate per Year (for all basins)
	San Luis Obispo (Edna) Valley Basin	Cuyama Valley Basin	Santa Maria Valley Basin	Los Osos Valley Basin (County's Cost Share Allocation for 2016 is 20%)	Paso Basin	
2016	\$ 165,000	\$ 140,000	\$ 140,000	\$ 62,920	\$ 140,000	\$ 647,920
2017	\$ 165,000	\$ 140,000	\$ 140,000	TBD by BMC	\$ 165,000	\$ 610,000
Total Phase 1 Cost Estimate by Basin	\$ 330,000	\$ 280,000	\$ 280,000	\$ 62,920	\$ 305,000	

Hill and Gibson continued their ploy to induce State takeover of the Paso Basin. They kept pointing out that since the basin voters had rejected the proposed AB 2453 water district, there was no funding available for Phase II (costs illustrated below on the next page). Hill asked, "When are we going to have a meaningful discussion about funding?" Gibson inferred that the south county should not have to pay for funding north county issues, such as the Paso Basin. Arnold was quick to point out that during the prior week's Board meeting, Gibson was seeking general fund dollars to pay off the debt for the dying County owned and operated Dairy Creek Golf Course in his district. Gibson put on his prosecutorial guise and demanded that Mecham and Arnold explain how they would pay for the Phase II costs. Mecham became irritated at

Gibson's tone. Hill chimed in that "we are parking the fundamental question." Chair Compton called for the vote, which in the end approved the first phase unanimously.

It's too bad Mecham didn't get irritated with Gibson about 3 years ago.

We think that before the Board gets too deep into the discussion of funding the Phase II costs (see the table below), the numbers need to be proved out in a line item budget that relate to the actual work tasks to be undertaken. As we pointed out in last week's Update and during the Board hearing:

Phase 2 costs total \$23,735,500. This one needs some clarification work at the proverbial blackboard. For example just what tasks costing \$1,905,000 would be undertaken in 2018 to begin to develop the GSP for the Paso Basin? The staff should show the project detail for each of these numbers in terms of the actual work and projects to be undertaken.

The staff breaks the costs down into 3 categories for each year by basin. Thus for the Paso Basin staff projects costs of \$1,350,000 for governance, administration, and coordination; \$ 80,000 for monitoring, data improvements, and reporting; and \$475,000 for technical studies, GSP Development and Refinements. All this adds up to the 2018 projection of \$1,905,000. What is the line item detail underneath these numbers? What are the cost components of governance, administration, and coordination which cost \$1,359,000? This basin has been studied to death. There is a basin model. If that model is true (which not everyone believes), the only question is how do the principle water users - the city of Paso, City of Atascadero, the Templeton Community Service District, and large vineyards - reduce their water usage to bring the basin back into balance?

Phase 2 – GSA Develops Basin Sustainability Goals & Actions/ GSP							
		High/ Medium Priority Groundwater Basins					
		San Luis Obispo (Edna) Valley Basin	Cuyama Valley Basin	Santa Maria Valley Basin	Los Osos Valley Basin (County's Cost Share Allocation for 2016 is 20%)	Paso Basin	Total Phase 2 Cost Estimate per Year (for all basins)
Calendar Year	2018	\$ 1,655,000	\$ 1,905,000	\$ 1,805,000	TBD by BMC	\$ 1,905,000	\$ 7,270,000
	2019	\$ 1,270,000	\$ 2,095,000	\$ 1,420,000	TBD by BMC	\$ 1,645,000	\$ 6,430,000
	2020	\$ 1,470,000	\$ 1,045,000	\$ 1,620,000	TBD by BMC	\$ 1,120,000	\$ 5,255,000
	2021	\$ 1,320,000	Assume GSP complete by 1/31/2020 deadline.	\$ 1,470,000	TBD by BMC	Assume GSP complete by 1/31/2020 deadline.	\$ 2,790,000
	2022	\$ 920,000	Move to Phase 3	\$ 1,070,000	TBD by BMC	Move to Phase 3	\$ 1,990,000
	Total Phase 2 Cost Estimate by Basin	\$ 6,635,000	\$ 5,045,000	\$ 7,385,000	TBD by BMC	\$ 4,670,000	

The chart below provides a little more detail in regard to the Paso Basin and is illustrative of the general work tasks to be performed.

**SGMA Compliance: Conceptual Basin Governance & Cost Estimate
PASO ROBLES AREA (Basin No. 3-4.06)**

Deadline to Establish GSA: 6/30/2017

Deadline to Adopt GSP: 1/31/2020

CONCEPTUAL COST ESTIMATES FOR BASIN-WIDE COMPLIANCE:

Category	Phase 1 – Partners Negotiate Governance/ Funding Agreement; Form GSA		Locality cost sharing / GSP development funding	Phase 2 – GSA Develops Basin Sustainability Goals & Actions/ GSP			Locality cost sharing / GSP development funding	Phase 3 – GSA Funds Actions, Monitors, Reports and Adapts		
	2016	2017		2018	2019	2020		2021	2022	... 2040
Governance, Administration, and Coordination	\$ 140,000	\$ 140,000		\$ 1,350,000	\$ 1,025,000	\$ 950,000				
Monitoring, Data Improvements, and Reporting	\$ -	\$ -		\$ 80,000	\$ 170,000	\$ 170,000				
Technical Studies, GSP Development, and Refinements	\$ -	\$ 25,000		\$ 475,000	\$ 450,000	\$ -				
TOTALS	\$ 140,000	\$ 165,000		\$ 1,905,000	\$ 1,645,000	\$ 1,120,000				

(Note 1) Estimates do not reflect potential cost sharing amongst the entities that comprise a GSA or GSA(s), but rather reflects basin-wide compliance.

(Note 2) Estimates reflect assumptions made for governance and coordination needs, as shown in the graphic below.

(Note 3) Estimates reflect basin's existing condition and varying stages of technical studies, models, monitoring and management plan development.

It seems so strange that the Board members do not require staff to prove their numbers. What are the actual line item costs in the 2018 Paso basin costs of \$1,350,000 for “Governance, Administration, and Coordination related to preparing a groundwater sustainability plan”? The \$1.3 million seems intuitively large for the stated purpose. We also wonder how this stuff gets through the agenda vetting process. Does anyone in the CEO’s office independently analyze this stuff or do they just accept whatever the Department heads request?

Planning Commission Meeting of Thursday, May 26, 2016 (Completed)

Item 1 - General Public Comment for Matters Not on the Agenda - Phillips 66. A large group of residents from the neighborhoods in the vicinity of the Phillips 66 refinery, as well as some residents from Arroyo Grande, spoke against the recent decision of the Commission to tentatively approve the rail spur project. The group of approximately 30 had selected 10 of its members to be speakers. Those who spoke rehashed the arguments which have been made opposing the permit.

Their key new point was that the Commission should reschedule the item for its next meeting and reverse its 3/2 decision to conceptually approve the project, subject to refined conditions. Commissioner Campbell was absent.

Acting Chair Meyer started to wander into a Brown Act violation by asking the Commission if it wanted to consider (voting) to re-agendize the item. Topping correctly pointed out that the “vote” at the prior meeting was really not a vote but a straw poll. Topping regards the action as a request for staff to develop information necessary for potential future action. In the end no action was taken. Finally County Counsel intervened and pointed out that it would be inappropriate for the Commission to have a substantive discussion of a matter that had not been agendized.

Separately staff projected that when the matter comes back for action in September, 3 days may be required (When every radical, Revolutionary Communist Youth Brigade (RCYB)

provocateur, and enviro socialist from Berkeley to Bakersfield, shows up to intimidate SLO County).



Items 3 & 4 - Approval of Minutes - Good Catch of the Day. Commissioner Eric Meyer noted a correction. A reference to the Vacation Rental Ordinance had been spelled Vacation “Renal” Ordinance. Did the staffer who prepared the minutes actually have an intuitive subconscious insight? Do vacation renters tend to pee more than others?

Item 10 - Workforce Housing. The Planning Commission ran out of time and continued consideration of amendments to the Inland Zoning Ordinance that would add a permitted land use category called workforce housing subdivisions. The matter will come back on July 14, 2016.

Background: The idea is to encourage development of housing affordable to “working professionals within the County, such as teachers, firefighters, and other public employees, as well as much of the working private sector,” by permitting flexibility including smaller lots, mixed uses (commercial and residential in the same project), design flexibility, and partial relaxation of some affordable housing requirements.

The workforce housing provision is designed as a tool and is not mandatory. The tool is restricted to areas inside Urban Reserve and Village Reserve lines, essentially San Miguel, Templeton, Shandon, Santa Margarita, inland Oceano, and Nipomo Village. The tool may be used in the Residential Single-Family, Residential Multi-Family, Office Professional, and Commercial Retail zones. On the broader strategic level the ordinance is in line with the County’s overarching so called “smart growth” stack-and-pack plan.

Please see the articles which follow and which describe the real causes of out of control housing costs, homelessness, and the drag on economic development.

SLO 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.

AFFORDABLE HOUSING MAY BE LIMITED BY NEW STATE ENVIRONMENTAL RULES

By Matt Flemming

A new rule designed to promote urban development and curb both car usage and greenhouse gas emissions may end up making cities less affordable and more congested, critics say.



Photo Credit: HUD.gov

The rule would modify how traffic is evaluated during a critical phase for planning for building developments, shifting the focus from traffic congestion to the increase in miles traveled. New building projects would be viewed as adversely affecting the environment if they increase vehicle miles traveled by more than a regional average without offsets.

The Brown administration — which was tasked with creating the new rule by the Legislature — believes this shift will encourage the development of urban housing, bringing people into the cities and giving them more transportation options beyond the car.

“This proposal will actually help affordable housing projects, especially near transit,” said Christopher Calfee, General Counsel for California’s state Office of Planning and Research.

Calfee said the new proposed guidelines will streamline the process as it removes other factors, like aesthetics and parking — from being considered to be negative for the environment. But critics say applying this standard in instances outside of specific urban areas near major transportation spots — areas called Transit Priority Areas — will hurt the development of housing in suburban and rural areas where property values are lower, and hurt local economies by thwarting new development.

“We’d prefer to see approaches that continue to incentivize transit, incentivize (re-purposing old buildings),” said Richard Lambros, the managing director of the Southern California Leadership Council. Lambros was critical of the new rule, saying while it benefits areas near mass transit, it could limit the development in lower cost, suburban and rural areas.

Greenhouse gasses

When the Legislature tasked Brown’s administration with writing the new rules in 2013, it asked that the new rule “promote the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions, the development of multi-modal transportation networks, and a diversity of land uses.” This coincided with a statewide goal to reduce greenhouse gas emissions by 40 percent by 2030.

In addition to promoting alternative means of travel, the new regulations impose a “road diet,” meaning limiting the amount of new road lanes built — a 4 percent cap statewide between now and 2030.

“We respect that we’re trying to achieve important (greenhouse gas) reduction goals in California, but we can’t develop the policy to do that in a way that doesn’t account for unintended consequences,” said Lambros.

But the Brown administration contends that this doesn’t put a cap on roads (although road diet is OPR’s term), providing instead a threshold for when the mileage standard is considered significant.

“Some new roads will actually decrease (the new standard called Vehicle Miles Traveled),” said Calfee. “Others will increase it. Even if that increase is significant, lead agencies may override the impact and still approve the project.”

Lawsuits

The 46-year-old California Environmental Quality Act requires developers to obtain an Environmental Impact Report during the planning period, which evaluates a project’s impact on the local environment. This public document advises local governments when they are deciding to approve or deny a project, and it’s in this report that the new guidelines will be applied.

Local governments are not actually required to deny a project based on a negative report. However, many proposed developments end up being fought in court — by environmentalists, opposing developers and so on — so cities and counties can overlook these guidelines at their own peril. In other words, overlooking the environmental impact report makes a project less defensible.

“It gives more ammunition to people who want to stop capacity projects for whatever reason,” said Hasan Ikhata, executive director of the Southern California Association of Governments,

whose group is concerned that the new rule will subject hundreds of projects in their six counties to new standards midstream, which they say are largely un-achievable.

History

Under CEQA (pronounced see-qua), many factors were considered in an environmental impact report — a requirement for new development. Some of the factors were transportation, aesthetics and parking.

The 2013 bill said that parking and aesthetics in certain instances in the Transit Priority Areas were no longer considered significant impacts on the environment. These areas were created by the Legislature to encourage high-density development in areas where there is existing or proposed public transportation — like areas near metro stops.

The bill also tasked the Brown administration to come up with new guidelines on determining the transportation impact, as the old guidelines were based on traffic congestion — making congestion worse was considered an adverse impact

The proposed modification shifts the focus from congestion to vehicle miles traveled, as compared to the regional average. So, increasing the average amount of miles that vehicles travel compared to the regional average is considered adverse if it's without plans to offset the mileage.

Affordable Housing

So with the new standard, close proximity to proposed or existing mass transit is certainly helpful, and critics say it's an unofficial requirement. Because there are existing roads and generally adequate access to public transportation, high density projects near urban centers will fare better in the CEQA/environmental review process.

But areas further away from the urban center would likely be more affected. Critics say this could affect the access to affordable housing, since property values and rents usually fall the further away development gets from the city. Many critics aren't against the new standard, just its widespread application.

“We’re ok with (the new standard),” said Ikhrata. “But what we’re saying is you shouldn’t subject every project to this test. This should be done on an overall system, and be able to mitigate in other places. No project is going to pass that test.”

This article first appeared in the February 24, 2016 edition of Cal Watch Dog.Com

THE STATE’S BIG HOUSING DILEMMA

BY DAN WALTERS

It’s time once again for some fun with numbers, in this case the data on California’s serious – and worsening – housing crisis.

Since 2010, the state's population has risen by 1.8 million to 39 million human beings who live – most of them, anyway – in 14 million units of housing of all types.

That translates into an average of 2.78 persons per dwelling, implying that since 2010, we've needed about 650,000 new units to keep pace with population growth, or about 130,000 a year.

However, the Great Recession clobbered housing construction, which fell to as low as 44,000 units in 2010 and has averaged only 70,000 a year during the decade so far, half the demand.

Housing production has since climbed to 100,000 a year, but even at that level, it's just three-quarters of what's needed – not counting the backlog shortage of 300,000-plus units just since 2010.

The result is a severe squeeze, particularly acute in major metropolitan areas, that has pushed housing costs sky-high, especially rents and especially in the Los Angeles and San Francisco Bay Area metropolitan regions.

Zumper's national rent survey in December found four of the nation's 10 highest rental markets in California, topped by San Francisco's average of \$3,500 for a one-bedroom apartment.

Housing costs are, according to the Census Bureau and the Public Policy Institute of California, the major factor in the state having the nation's highest level of functional poverty.

Nearly a quarter of Californians – 9 million people – are living in poverty by the Census Bureau's alternative measure. PPIC studies have found high poverty rates even in high-income communities because of astronomical housing costs.

Politicians profess to be concerned about California's housing squeeze, but their proposals tend to be symbolic at best, adding perhaps a few thousand units to deal with a problem that's exponentially more severe.

The market is evidently there, and private developers, it would seem, are ready to fill it, at least for those in the moderate-to-high income brackets. The impediments are largely political.

NIMBYism – not-in-my-backyard – is rampant in California, sometimes erupting extemporaneously in response to development proposals, sometimes driven by misguided environmentalism. It affects even high-density “infill” projects that environmentalists support in principle, but often oppose in practice.

An example is the Neighborhood Integrity Initiative in Los Angeles that, if enacted, would make it almost impossible to build large-scale housing projects in a huge city already experiencing mass homelessness and immensely burdensome housing costs, as Mayor Eric Garcetti points out in his criticism of the measure.

The pivot point for many housing clashes is the California Environmental Quality Act, which project opponents often invoke. The state Supreme Court has been busy lately interpreting CEQA's effect on specific housing cases – which implies its central role in the issue.

Were politicians willing to seriously address California's housing crisis, rather than make token gestures, they'd reform CEQA and take other steps to encourage supply.

Gov. Jerry Brown once declared CEQA reform to be “the Lord's work,” but he and the Legislature have done almost nothing on the issue

This article was widely distributed by the Sacramento Bee on January 16 2016

RECENT LETTER TO THE EDITOR BRINGS IT HOME

How long will San Luis Obispo County ignore its housing crisis?

I recently lost my long-term rental of 24 years in Los Osos. I *immediately* began the search for housing and soon realized that there is none in this area.

I am one of hundreds of people in this area who work hard every day and love living in Los Osos. One month ago, I began staying in my 8-foot travel trailer in a friend's driveway. It is illegal, but it was my only choice while searching for housing. I received a 72-hour notice to vacate.

Where am I supposed to go? I guess the county would rather I sleep in my car on the side of the road.

The recent [sewer completion in Los Osos](#) has caused a flood of people in my position. I just met three people who have joined the ranks.

The greed and glut of San Luis Obispo County astounds me. Where are the working poor supposed to live? California Valley? We are not riff raff; we are the people who mow your lawns, paint your houses and sit next to you in church on Sunday.

How long will San Luis Obispo County turn a blind eye to this problem?

SUZANNE SMITH, LOS OSOS



AND THEIR ANSWER IS THE SYMBOLIC HOUSING IN LIEU TAX!

MEMORIAL DAY 2016



SUPPORT OUR TROOPS AND VETERANS

REMEMBER THOSE WHO SERVED AND SACRIFICED



PLEASE SEE IMPORTANT ANNOUNCEMENTS ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES.



COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS IN THE BALANCE

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

AM1440
KUHL • the information station

AM 1290
Santa Barbara News-Press Radio

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

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

MEMBERSHIP APPLICATION

MEMBERSHIP OPTIONS:

Platinum Member: \$ _____ **Gold Member:** \$5,000 - \$9,999 ☐

Silver Member: \$2,500 - \$4,999 ☐ **Bronze Member:** \$1,000 - \$2,499 ☐

Executive Member: \$250 - \$999 ☐ **General Member:** \$100 - \$249 ☐

General members will receive all COLAB updates and newsletters. Voting privileges are limited to Executive Level and above 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: _____ Expiration Date: _____

TODAY'S DATE: _____

All applications are subject to review and approval by the COLAB Membership Committee and Board of Directors.
Applications that are not accepted will have the dues or donations promptly refunded.