

| Agenda Item | Discussion/Action/Information |
|--|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supervisor Gibson’s Report | <p>the agenda comes out, you can get a sense where it fits. He thinks the Planning Commission starts at 8:30. There is a short discussion on the Library meeting conflicting in time with the LOCSD meeting.</p> <p><u>Supervisor Bruce Gibson</u> - my colleague Katcho Ashadjian always had the joke that he didn’t like to use the microphone because it made him sound like he had an accent. (Laughter) If you know Katcho, that was funny. So let me talk a little bit about the Library meeting; it is September 6, 6:00 p.m. in this room. And just found out today, just realized today that it is the same evening that the open session of the LOCSD starts at 7:00. Unfortunately we’re already well into promoting this, and so it’ll go at 6:00; we don’t think it will necessarily take quite a long time, but here’s what we want to do. As I think all of you know, it’s been many, many years that this community has understood that it needs a much bigger library. Something probably on the order of at least twice the size that the current library is. Obviously delays in the sewer project held that up. But about a year ago or a little bit more, we felt we were getting close to the threshold of being able to do something, and so we commissioned, the “we” being the Friends of the Library and the County, jointly put money into a project to commission an alternatives analysis. So the question is: if we are to have an expanded library, where should it go, and how should it be done. That alternatives analysis concluded two, three months ago, maybe a little bit longer, and they looked at a number of possibilities, one, expanding on the site where the library is right now; the second is to go to a vacant piece of parcel—a vacant parcel, or maybe there were two vacant parcels and build from scratch on those vacant parcels; and the third, was, that if it were possible to reach an agreement with a property owner, there is a current commercial building, at the corner of South Bay and Los Osos Valley Road, in the Ralphs shopping center. And out of those alternatives, it was felt that going to—again, if an agreement with the property owner can be reached, that going to the LOVR/South Bay site would make a lot of sense. As it turns out just yet, a couple of things happened; one is that the property owner’s idea of asking price is not in line with the appraisals that the County has to pay for. And the Friends of the Library have had an extensive discussion about the advisability of that. Each of these sites comes with pros and cons. And I won’t go into details because we’ll do this at the meeting, but basically the short story is, if we were to expand the library at its existing site, the building very likely would have to be demolished. It would require, obviously, closing the library. Once the project got going, the project would probably be between a year and two years duration. Getting the project going is a challenge with the ongoing lack of an updated Community Plan, a Habitat Conservation Plan, water management and all these things. So we might be looking at five years, and a fairly expensive project, to build again from scratch on that site. Alternatively, if the site at LOVR and South Bay were taken, that project could be completed within two years and perhaps completed in not much more than one year. It would not be subject to near the environmental concern and review, and could be brought in</p> |

| Agenda Item | Discussion/Action/Information |
|-------------|---|
| | <p>for considerably less money. Pros and cons. There is a lot of concern about ingress/egress out of that site where it's located, where the library has been—so the goal of the meeting on the sixth is to get the community's input on that. And personally, I don't have a strong feeling, I'm here to engage the community and see what the community wants. And I think there are good arguments on both sides of the coin and we'll look forward to hearing what people think. Once we've gathered that, the Friends will go ponder this and the Library Department will ponder that and we'll see what seems to make sense. It really is a listening session after a short presentation of what the possibilities are and we'll go from there.</p> <p>The only other couple things that I would report to you this evening, is a couple meetings ago we took up the Los Osos'—the sewer project's connection ordinance, we still have 73 properties not connected that are problematic in one way or another, largely because we haven't had much contact with the property owners, if any. So we have a graduated series of enforcement actions we can take including in the end, a nuisance abatement that would compel property owners to connect.</p> <p>A few days ago this meeting we had extensive afternoon discussion on housing policy with the board, talking about our inclusionary housing ordinance—a lot of things; secondary dwelling units, including potential for tiny homes, including potential for tiny homes on wheels, farm worker housing, agricultural worker housing, and a number of other things. We gave direction to staff to bring us back alternatives. Unfortunately we didn't solve the housing crisis in this county on that afternoon, but I think we're working on some ideas and we'll look forward to talking to this issue again in October and again in (unintelligible). That's my report, I'm happy to take questions.</p> <p><u>Questions/Comments from the Council:</u></p> <p><u>Member Korin</u> - I'm wondering in the discussions about housing if People's Self Help were present or were included. (Unintelligible) They just opened affordable housing in Nipomo (Gibson - Santa Maria) — Santa Maria. They are very anxious to do things like that.</p> <p><u>Supervisor Gibson</u> - absolutely. So the question was, whether People's Self Help Housing is involved? Absolutely, they are a wonderful organization. They participate in the Homebuilder's Association, and a coalition that includes the SLO Chamber of Commerce and our Economic Vitality Corporation. They are a key player, especially in receiving those funds that can be used and leveraged to build actually deed restricted affordable housing.</p> <p><u>Member Korin</u> - I hope when we have water to build here that they'll be able to get ahead of the (unintelligible) and build something here.</p> <p><u>Questions/Comments from the Public:</u></p> |

| Agenda Item | Discussion/Action/Information |
|-------------|--|
| | <p><u>Julie Tacker</u> - I wanted to ask about your report on the sewer hook-ups. You say there are 73 properties that are out of compliance; are the residents that were accepted through your low income assistance program, are those people all hooked up?</p> <p><u>Supervisor Gibson</u> - the short answer is no, those people aren't hooked up, but they are on the path—</p> <p><u>Julie Tacker</u> - are they part of the 73?</p> <p><u>Supervisor Gibson</u> - no, we have a path to hook-up.</p> <p><u>Julie Tacker</u> - interesting. And the reason I ask is because the Los Osos CSD is also seeking to help those disadvantaged, and they had different numbers just a month ago of a total of 121 that were not in your low income assistance program, that had not hooked up and I know that they've only helped a handful. So somewhere those numbers don't jive with yours. I'm curious that's all. My concern about the date of your library meeting; first of all, the first Thursday of every month for the last 19 years has been the Los Osos CSD meeting, I'm sorry that there would be any confusion there. Generally, there is not a whole lot happening at the Los Osos CSD, but it happens that that night there will be a discussion on the shredded tire mulch in the County park, and I think that does have lot of interest and I think people will have conflicts within the people that want to be at both meetings and they are held almost at the same time. So that's going to present a problem for some folks. Along those lines and my question to you, because it is the County's park, and yes, we've all heard Park's explanation that the life cycle of the material has not run, and that there is no budget to replace it, my question to you, is do you have some community funds that you can pitch in to help pay for it. Clearly, the community wants it gone. Whatever the justification is, for each family, each person, it's a nuisance, and I would ask that you look to your funds and see if you can contribute to expedite the removal. Additionally, an avenue that I haven't heard from the CSD, is any negotiation for when the life cycle times out, that they would be reimbursed for replacing the material ahead of schedule. I think that would be appropriate, as this is not their park, this is not their purpose, and, it's not their problem, it's yours. So I would hope that you would be willing to negotiate something like that. So that it can be removed as soon as possible, because that is the desire of the community, but then, to work out the details of the financial aspects of the project.</p> <p><u>Supervisor Gibson</u> - so the only question is whether I have community project funds, I might be able to make a small contribution to that, if the CSD chooses to move forward. I would not expect that if the CSD chooses to fund this removal project ahead of the schedule that we would normally take it on, I don't see that we would be reimbursing them at a point (unintelligible).</p> <p><u>Steve Best</u> - I brought this up with the Parks & Recreation Committee</p> |

| Agenda Item | Discussion/Action/Information |
|-------------|---|
| | <p>several months ago about the fact that we should be coordinating a discussion about the removal of the tire mulch in conjunction with fact that the county has discussed the fact that they are going to be removing this tire mulch at some point in the future, therefore they had it in their budget to expedite and get the rubber tire mulch removed, so they are going to be generating a fund for this, so if the CSD or the community decides to remove the material earlier than expected, it still is the County’s responsibility to, uh, liability to have that rubber tire mulch removed and replaced with something that is safe and acceptable to the community, therefore, the County should have some responsibility in funding that project, when the funding is due and when the County was scheduling to produce the new medium for that playground. So whether or not the CSD communicated and had a discussion with the County to make sure that was part of the agenda, I don’t know if that was done or not, but it should have been done and the County should also participate in making sure that the community is reimbursed for the effort of removing the rubber tire mulch because of the way the community feels about this and the concern that the community has over the rubber tire mulch. And also I want to bring up the issue of the library. Has there ever been a budget set aside for the library and have there been funds allocated for the library, and grants allocated for the library. We were talking about these three different issues here for a while and we need to start expediting some of these things. We keep talking about how we don’t have any money, we don’t have any funds, but you know, we need to solve these solutions, and not keep pushing things down the road, until we figure out—we’re not—we’re gonna— who’s going to be paying for it, and how it’s going to get paid for. So this is a County library, when is the County going to fund this library (unintelligible) building, where are the grants being put together for the construction of the library, and making a productive and efficient decision on where it’s going to go? So that we can have a new library as soon as possible and move on to bigger issues.</p> <p><u>Supervisor Gibson</u> - so Mr. Chairman, there are just a couple of questions and the rest is commentary, but let me speak to the library issue here. First, the only budget to date that’s been allocated is, I think it was \$25,000 from the County and \$25,000 from the Friends of the Library to do the alternatives analysis, and saw that most of that money has been spent. As you may know, the capital costs of expanding or building a new library in a community is by County policy right now a shared responsibility between the County and the community, usually working through its “Friends.” We’ve done that successfully in Cambria, and Atascadero most recently. So, at this point the only budget that has been allocated is the alternatives analysis. If a site, and a plan, and a desired path forward is identified, then what the County does is sign a Memorandum of Understanding with the Friends of the Library and we agree to fund this project up to a certain level in a 50/50 share. The Friends have funds on hand, and the County is then responsible to figuring out how we mobilize County resources to make the rest of it happen. In doing that, there are various charitable contributions that can</p> |

| Agenda Item | Discussion/Action/Information |
|-------------|---|
| | <p>be directed to the Friends as a 501 (c) (3) non-profit. There are various reserves and other allocations of public money through the County that we can mobilize and we really need a vision for what we want to do, and then we start putting the budget together for the capital. As to the mulch, I heard only commentary there, but I want to make sure that the Council and the community knows this: that the mulch that's on the ground right now is safe, it is not toxic, it is approved, it is actually the material that provides the best fall protection of any material that's available right now. Whereas it may be aesthetically displeasing to the community, I'll accept that, it may have it's downsides, but there is nothing unsafe about that material as it sits on the ground.</p> <p><u>Linde Owen</u> - I will have to disagree with our supervisor, that product is not safe, it just depends on whose reports you look at, so obviously the County wants to look at the long-term lifespan of the material, and because it might have another five years, even if it's all over the parking lot, it's all over the grass out there; it's everywhere. It smells bad when its a hot day. The kids are getting their clothes stained. There's a number of reasons that we want this removed; mostly it's for our children's safety. So, I hope you'll look into it a little further. I do think our park—I guess I was going as if maybe next time you come, we could have a presentation of where our tax money goes in reference to how much is put into our park maintenance. You can look out there and see about a third of our park is dead. The sprinkler systems have not been replaced. And I know this is a county that has a lot of tax revenue coming in. I would like to know what percentage of our tax revenue is going toward the maintenance of the one park we have, because we are one of the most under-parked city—community of the County. There's got to be more money coming into one park than the other communities who have multiple parks and share the money amongst them. And about the library, maybe you could give us an explanation why, at the time that Tri-W was chosen to be paid for by the Prohibition Zone, after it was considered unusable for the sewer, why the library expansion could not have been considered at that time. There's no reason in the world that you couldn't mitigate, that we couldn't mitigate it by buying another little bit property or something and we could have done this expansion long ago, by just adding another building to the back of the existing one. You're looking at expenses of buying property, of where we could zone it, where we could get the parking. We've got the perfect place right here. I don't understand what the effort to pay for studies to look at new locations when we really—I need to know why we can't build on that. And the Habitat Conservation Plan has been shimmied a few times in the past and I don't see why without your effort and assistance we couldn't look at putting an extended additional building on so that we could actually have our library expansion within budget. Thank you.</p> <p><u>Supervisor Gibson</u> - so we'll talk more about that in the meeting. The short story is, the Tri-W site is under a permit condition of the sewer, that it be maintained in the natural state that its in, which does not allow any expansion, any footprint expansion, until such time as the Local</p> |

| Agenda Item | Discussion/Action/Information |
|-------------|---|
| | <p>Coastal Program is updated. So we've got a serious constraint there, based on what constraints that property (unintelligible).</p> <p><u>Chuck Cesena</u> - I'm a member of the Community Services District Board, but I am not representing that board tonight, but I am speaking as a private citizen who is being asked at our next meeting to spend CSD money on what I consider to be a County facility, a County issue, a County problem. And that's causing me difficulty, at what (noise interference) do we start taking on these kind of requests? And one of the reasons I came tonight was because I wasn't really sure if this issue had been brought up, talked about here, (unintelligible) at our Parks & Rec Committee apparently, a little bit at our Board meetings. It's obvious it's been brought up here, it's been talked about a lot—not here? Well, Bruce is aware of it, okay, you seem pretty up on the topic, and so I just—that was one of my questions—has this been talked about with anyone besides the Parks & Rec Department? Have we gone to the Parks & Rec Commission? Doesn't one of the commissioners live out here? So, I guess that all of that was information I needed. I did hear you say that you might be willing to throw some community funds at this problem, but I didn't hear how much. So I would be interested in furthering that talk before we even have to make a decision about that. I mean personally, that's where I'm coming from. Why does the District spend money on a County issue, except that the community desperately wants it to happen.</p> <p><u>Supervisor Gibson</u> - you know Mr. Chairman, it's interesting. Over the last I don't know, couple of years, maybe three, I think we've had three casual comments directly to our office regarding the mulch in the park and then seriously until about last week or so, it is all that I have heard about. I had not heard of the discussion in front of the CSD's Parks Committee or the potential of coming to the Board until last week. You know, the County will replace that mulch with new mulch at the point at which we have budget for it. The Parks budget is seriously constrained. Parks operates with what we call Special Revenue Fund, which has gotten a flat amount of General Fund support over the years. It was again, two meetings ago or so, that we finally realized that in order to keep parks moving, to keep Parks Programs moving, we needed to do some serious injection of General Fund money simply to keep them at a status quo. We were talking, we were seeing the possibility of having to close swimming pools in the middle of the summer season if we didn't inject about \$500,000 into the Parks budget, which we did. That does not let us get ahead, that simply keeps us from falling further behind. So, the mulch again, is safe, if aesthetically unpleasing, and annoying in various ways that I don't dispute. The interesting this is that a partnership, you're talking about my Community Project Funds, or the cooperation of the Parks Department in accelerating the replacement of this mulch is a perfectly, sort of a time-honored tradition. We look at for instance, is libraries, what we were just talking about. We're not going to wait around until the County saves up enough money to build a new library branch, the community is going to participate 50% to get</p> |

| Agenda Item | Discussion/Action/Information |
|-----------------------|--|
| <p>• LOCSD Report</p> | <p>it done. You look at Cayucos, at two significant projects. We have a beach access that's been closed for many years. And early this year, we had a good conversation with our Visitor Alliance, which is basically the tourism marketing board's local to Cayucos, and they forwarded \$25,000 to help us accelerate the design of the new beach access, get it through its permitting, get its environmental work done. That cut about nine months, maybe a year off the County's timetable of getting that access rehabilitated. So the community made its contribution to that. The Cayucos pier, you may have heard, that the community raised \$700,000 to contribute part of that money to the \$4 million project to rebuild the Cayucos pier, which happened faster because of their input. The idea that the CSD, that the community working through its CSD, which seems to be the venue where this has been discussed, wants to make a local community contribution, to help accelerate the replacement of this mulch product, that's great. And my Community Project Funds are committed in a lot of different directions, not the least of which, in fact the most important one for Los Osos is the library. So I'm not ready to specify a number. I'm happy to talk to the CSD, and see what the CSD does, in terms of allocating money when it becomes before them. But I want to support communities doing things that communities want to do. What's being teed up in front of the CSD is perfectly in line with a lot of different things that we have done previously in other communities. So, happy to continue the conversation Mr. Cesena with you and the CSD staff and we can talk about how we can move forward with that.</p> <p><u>LOCSD Director Lou Tornatzky</u> - I'm going to try to summarize what has been happening at the Los Osos board meetings and other activities within the organization. At the Board meeting of August 2, the following issues were presented, discussed, and decisions made: Battalion Chief Alex reported District/CAL FIRE activities within the last several weeks, noting 138 calls, with the majority being medical aids. So, they do a lot of stuff but its not necessarily putting down fires in this location, they may lend to other things going on. In addition, the Chief reported notable progress in acquiring a new Command vehicle, and well as a likely sale of the Medic Rescue truck, which has over 63,000 miles. Chief Alex also reported file code violations in 116 lots around the community. The owners were given two weeks to correct violations. Jose Acosta, is the Utility Systems Manager, he reported on June water production, which noted a 9.57% decrease from last year. General Manager Renee Osborne summarized activity involved in the forthcoming 2017/2018 Audit, with preliminary work scheduled for late August and the balance executed hopefully in the fall, probably in October. Going to the thing that has occupied a lot of discussion, the Parks and Recreation Committee is working on options to remove rubber chips from Los Osos public parks, to be replaced by alternative wood-based materials. It was felt by the committee members that rubber chips tend to produce noxious smells, as well as provide a chewable play material for younger children. The Board approved the motion presented by General Manager Osborne for the distribution of</p> |

| Agenda Item | Discussion/Action/Information |
|-------------|--|
| | <p>monies to ten applicants to the Los Osos Low Income Assistance Fund. Questions that go beyond the questions that have already been going back and forth?</p> <p>No questions/comments from council members.</p> <p><u>Questions/Comments from the Public:</u></p> <p><u>Paul Hershfield</u> - do you know how much the replacement cost is to change it to playground chips?</p> <p><u>Director Tornatzky</u> - I don't have a good picture of that, I have no numbers in front of me.</p> <p><u>LOCSD President Vicki Milledge</u> - the agenda is coming out tomorrow.</p> <p>(A mic is requested.)</p> <p>Audience Comment - \$15,000.</p> <p><u>President Milledge</u> - we'll be having a full discussion of all of this at the next CSD meeting. And, as I tried to say, but wasn't loud enough, the agenda comes out tomorrow with the whole agenda packet, so you can see all the materials.</p> <p><u>Julie Tacker</u> - so for a little background, the Change.org petition to remove the mulch was established in December of 2016. On May 27, 2017, I sent a letter to the Board of Supervisors, this was just before you were considering your budget, alerting you to that petition. At that time there was on the order of 250 signatures, today there's nearly 500 when last I checked. Because I wasn't getting any response from the County, any traction—(Chairperson Bender says this is for questions for the CSD)—so I was going to help with the history, of the very subject that Mr. Tornatzky was talking about, and the number is just over \$14 thousand some dollars. A lot of contribution is coming by way of donation according to the staff report that was before the Parks & Rec Committee. John Madonna Construction is donating their equipment, Mission County Disposal is donating their equipment, there is a small charge associated with their labor, for both of those private companies, and the material itself to replace, and the rest is all blood, sweat, and tears of the community members to actually shovel the crap out of the park. And Parks told all of us if anyone was ever asked, that it is on the order of \$20,000 out of their budget to replace it, and they refused to do so, they say now it's twenty three (2023) before they would, and clearly that's not sufficient, that's too late. So, what is before the Board on Thursday next week is this possibility that they would fund \$15,000, that's the number that Renee's gotten it down to, from what was the pool fund. And I think that people who have an affinity for the pool fund want that money to stay there. People who want that tire mulch removed immediately look at that as a source to have the situation rectified, and clearly, it's very unfortunate that you haven't</p> |

| Agenda Item | Discussion/Action/Information |
|-------------------------------|--|
| <p>• LO/BP Chamber Report</p> | <p>been brought into the conversation. I had heard that you had been, and that people had been complaining to you. And clearly a year and a half ago, I had sent you an email telling you there was a petition.</p> <p><u>Chairperson Bender</u> - do you have a question to the CSD regarding the chips?</p> <p><u>Steve Best</u> - had the CSD interacted with the County to find out if there is a way to be compensated, reimbursed in a timely manner with the schedule the Parks Department was going to replace the product in the playground. And, has there been an investigation as to the value of the chips, could they be used to other purposes, say for example, horse arenas or other things to offset the cost of this project, and, I personally have been looking at, in my campaign in 2016, I looked for a project to remove the rubber tire mulch, the process to develop the CSD's Parks & Recreation Committee, and that was part of the plan, and I discussed it with Supervisor Gibson and other members such a Nick Franco and so forth. So this is not an issue that is just recent.</p> <p><u>Director Tornatzky</u> - I'll answer that. A few months back, myself, Vicki, Renee, had a wonderful tête-à-tête with County officials. They were sympathetic to what we were trying to do with Parks & Recreation, particularly things like the kind of stuff (background noise) that kids have to run around in, the stuff that stinks and is pretty awful. And they said we also have no money. And then we also learned that County officials are stacked up trying to figure out a million questions, many of them are (unintelligible). So we can just say they are going so slow, as a human being it offends me. And I'm probably speaking not out of turn what I was supposed to report on it. I'm not running again for the CSD, and has anyone whose known me, or has known me for the last 25 years, I get stuff done, and the most notable thing I've learned about working in this kind of context, yeah it (unintelligible) it may, with righteous people trying to push it. So, I don't know.</p> <p><u>Steve Vinson</u> - this Sunday is the annual Bayfest. It's going to be held behind the Back Bay Inn, with the musical talents of Craig Nuttycomb, Back Bay Betty, and The Zongo All-Stars. That's from 1:00 to 7:00. I don't know if you get cable; I've talked about the community meetings for authorized overnight parking - have you guys talked about that? OK, good. Our next mixer is going to be on September 5 at the Villages of San Luis Obispo. It will be held at The Palms, at the outdoor pool patio area, complimentary appetizers by on-the-site (unintelligible) chefs will be available with beverages. Tours will be offered to anyone wishing to see independent and assisted living communities on their campus. This is going to be held in conjunction with the Morro Bay Chamber as well. So Bear Festival is in full swing, and come September 9th, the bears are going to be moved to the South Bay Community Center for Grandparent's Day. It'll be judged by a panel and the community. The categories are Chamber Business, Residential Organizations, Youth Under 18. A map of the bears will be available at the Los Osos/</p> |

| Agenda Item | Discussion/Action/Information |
|---|---|
| <p>CONSENT AGENDA</p> <p>Recommend Approval:</p> <p>DRC2018-00095 Collins: Proposed Minor Use Permit for a single family residence with a garage located at 1187 8th St. in Los Osos.</p> <p>DRC2018-00112 Hirsig: Proposed Minor Use Permit for a 761 SF additional to a single family residence at 425 Woodland Drive in Los Osos</p> <p>Recommend Denial:</p> <p>DRC2018-00092 McDonald: Proposed Minor Use Permit for a three-unit vacation rental located at 1901 Nevada Ct, 1905 Nevada Ct, 199 Nevada Ct in Los Osos.</p> | <p>Baywood Park Chamber of Commerce. For more information for signing up for a booth at Grandparent’s Day/Bear Festival, contact Michelle Feldman of the Rotary Club at 591-0563. The Rotary Club of Los Osos presents the 11th Annual Fun Fair on Grandparent’s Day, on Sunday, September 9, here at the Community Center from 12 to 4. Entertainment by Morro Bay Dance Fusion, the Coastal Performing Arts Foundation cast of “Shrek Junior” and the classic rock ‘n roll of Route 66. There’s a barbecue lunch with complete hamburger, hot dog and chicken meals at just \$6.00, kid’s meal for \$3.00. Celebrate the generations with activities including a bounce house, face painting, bubbles, games, crafts, the San Luis Obispo Symphony Petting Zoo and much more. Admission is free. All proceeds go to charitable projects of the Rotary, and local not-for-profits. And the last thing we have is that trip to Spain, March 20, 2019. There’s a presentation coming up and that’s September 6, from 4:00 to 5:00 p.m., across the street at the Chamber office, and that’s all I have.</p> <p>No council or public questions/comments.</p> <p><u>Chairperson Bender</u> - changes the schedule to reverse LOCAC Businesses and Process with Public Comment. He asks Vice Chairperson and Chairperson of the Land Use Committee Margaret Mayfield if she wants to make comments on the Consent Agenda Items.</p> <p>A motion is made to approve the Consent Agenda.</p> <p><u>Member Tornatzky</u> - asks to pull an item, McDonald, and to have a short discussion on it. I’m sort of thinking maybe it shouldn’t have been on Consent because it is such a strange item, that’s not one we’ve encountered before, maybe the County has. I don’t know if there is any public comment on that item, but I’d like to hear it if there is. I watched the Enerle Homestay on video, I wasn’t there at the hearing. And that was an anomaly that we passed on too. Homestays are usually inside of the home. This was a detached building, and we passed it with no problem. So this project before us, McDonald is also kind of an anomaly. The County was quite interesting in how they conditioned the Enerle project, the Homestay project. And I would assume that they might look at this and say no, maybe it should just be a hotel project, as they even suggested during the Enerle conversation. So, I would like to know if anybody else would like to make some comments on this. I would be more interested to see what the neighbors say, we didn’t have any neighbors at the LUC meeting, and I don’t see the applicant, or any neighbors, I don’t think they’re here. So rather than just voting on a consent thing, I would like to suggest that maybe we could come up with a couple of conditions on that, but I’d like to hear public comment first.</p> <p><u>Member Stanfill</u> - just agree to take that off of the Consent Calendar, (Chairperson Bender - yes) and then we just vote on the Consent Calendar.</p> <p><u>Chairperson Bender</u> - so we’ll be pulling item McDonald.</p> |

| Agenda Item | Discussion/Action/Information |
|-------------|--|
| | <p><u>Audience member</u> - Public Comment, do you take Public Comment on your Consent?</p> <p>Comments that we should.</p> <p>There is a motion and a second to approve the Consent Agenda Items.</p> <p><u>Chairperson Bender</u> - asks if there are any questions from Council members (none) and the public.</p> <p><u>Chuck Cesena</u> - I couldn't tell from what I saw on your agenda much detail about these items. One was for a new home, looked like the address, was it 8th Street; there's a home there, maybe a tear down, a replacement. But I didn't see a lot of detail, how many bedrooms are going down and how many are going back. The other one is a 760 square foot addition, but no detail about what kind of room. Is it a bedroom, a den, what is it intended to be? You know, I think most everybody knows that we're under a permit condition for the wastewater project that says you cannot add new water connections to the plant until you can demonstrate that you have adequate water for your community. So they're trying to limit water use until we know what's going on here. For every bedroom that's approved, you add three bedrooms, you've added a new home. Coastal Commission says you can't do that. So I guess I want to know more detail about whose tracking how many of these permits come through, how many bedrooms we're adding, how many equivalent new homes have we added this way? These don't come to the CSD because they don't need new water connections. So we don't have any idea what's going on. Is the County tracking this thing? Is there dialogue with the Coastal Commission about the appropriateness of adding how many bedrooms until you have added the equivalent of how many residences?</p> <p><u>Chairperson Bender</u> - I'd like to answer that real quick - the assumption we're going on, Kerry Brown's not here, it would be up to her, that if a property already has a water connection, and it is connected with the sewer, the County is accepting additions to the built structure. That's my general understanding, again, if Kerry was here, she could clarify for you better. But both of the additions, are being accepted, the County is accepting them. Most of them, the same people are living in the house, they're just finally expanding it. When the house gets sold, we know more people are going to live, we know that—the increase is not going to be substantial. The County is going on the acceptance of the Coastal (unintelligible). All we are doing is going on what County informs us.</p> <p><u>Land Use Committee Chairperson Margaret Mayfield</u> - the details are at the Land Use Committee, that's where we review the project and that's where it's being discussed. So if nobody found any significant issues, and no significant issues were brought up during the meeting, either by members of the Land Use Committee or the public attendees, then it goes on the Consent Agenda, if it meets all the full County ordinances.</p> |

| Agenda Item | Discussion/Action/Information |
|-------------|--|
| | <p><u>Julie Tacker</u> - I think really what Chuck's asking for with your Consent Agenda is that you have a small project description with each agenda item, that seems like an easy fix going forward. (Chairperson Bender agrees.) The larger question that he's raised, my conversation with Daniel Robinson at Coastal Commission is it doesn't necessarily mean there'll be more water use. What a flimflam answer. Clearly, when you add a bedroom, you add the ability to add more people to the house. I think the County, and maybe this is something for a future agenda item, where we have this larger discussion. Just like people wanting to add a secondary dwelling unit, or adding a bedroom, we are looking at a housing crisis and the County is trying to flex as much as they can to allow people to be homes—housed. And so there are going to be impacts to the water. The Condition Number Five in the Coastal Development Permit says no intensification of use of water, but clearly, that has the potential to an intensification of the use of water. But they are blowing it off, they are relaxing. And some of it's politics, a lot of it's politics.</p> <p><u>Chairperson Bender</u> - it looks like it's going to be a big issue in the future, and yes, we need to keep discussing it more, especially here in Los Osos.</p> <p><u>Julie Tacker</u> - take a position.</p> <p><u>Steve Best</u> - one of the things I'm kind of confused about is, we're making decisions here and we're setting precedent. It's making decisions on who lives and who dies, whereas my understanding, the purpose of this organization is to advise and consent, but not to set rules and change them. And it seems that it has gone beyond its charter. So whether or not we use, or allow people to use more or less water, whether or not we allow construction to happen, whether or not we allow people to live in their homes as they desire. I'm wondering what is truly the responsibility of this committee to rule and set precedent, and agenda and standards of the community and who is really responsible for that.</p> <p>Chairperson asks Sue Morganthaler is asked to save her comment for later in the agenda.</p> <p><u>Richard Margetson</u> - referring to what Chuck talked about, what we are allowing now is creep, one project at a time, we are allowing the possibility in the future for increased water consumption. And the argument I put out, Mr. Gibson's heard it, I've said it at the Utilities Committee, I've said in front of the CSD, and nobody has rebutted this statement, if every home in Los Osos was one bedroom, one bath, and they all in the future become two bedrooms, two baths, there is no one, there's no statistical information, there's no studies that show there won't be increased water consumption. And this body should be taking a more serious look at every one of these projects that are coming before you, because we are experiencing creep. 761 square foot addition on Woodland? You don't think that's going to lead to a potential down</p> |

| Agenda Item | Discussion/Action/Information |
|-------------|---|
| | <p>the road for more occupancy, more water usage. When this argument comes before the Coastal Commission, there is plenty of evidence to convince them that this is still part of the conditions of the wastewater project that need to be adhered to. And this body should be taking these very seriously. Because it's a project here, it's a project there. Ten years from now how many more bedrooms, how many more bathrooms do we have because of the County's stance. Kerry Brown has actually cited at one of these meetings that they don't believe that an increase in the size of a house by adding a bedroom or adding a bathroom necessarily adds to an increase in consumption. But nobody can rebut my statement about the one bedroom, one bath, compared to two bedroom, two bath. And that's the direction we are going.</p> <p><u>Paul Hershfield</u> - this talk about creep, kind of concerns me. The difference between all the houses being one bedroom, one bath and all the houses being two bedroom, two bath, is really not a reasonable comparison because that's not what we're talking about. We're talking about all of a sudden we're going to double the water usage. The 760 foot addition does not include a bathroom, it's not a bedroom, my recollection, it's a garage, a (unintelligible) workspace, a studio space. The house that is being torn down and replaced, I don't remember the details, if there is any increase in bedrooms or not, but I don't see that a house here and a house there is a cause for panic, that ten years from now we're going to be completely overrun. And I don't think—as a member of the Land Use Committee, a public member, I think that everybody on the committee works very hard to consider all of those factors and with the information they have, make the best recommendation. Of course that recommendation is not binding, the person still has to go through the County permit process, the Coastal Commission will probably weigh in, and they'll find out whether they'll be able to proceed further down the line. This is just a volunteer committee doing the best they can with the information they have to make what they think are reasonable recommendations to support members of the community where appropriate.</p> <p><u>Linde Owen</u> - I think the other issue that we aren't getting—we aren't aware of, is the Basin Management Plan. And the County is able to put in all the houses they want on wells. There's a new well that was put in on Los Osos Valley Road, there'll be a house there in another six months if all goes well. And some people believe that retrofit goes forever. I believe that we have kind of reached a certain retrofit. I also believe that retrofit kind of stops the use of water when you keep filling up, it's like giving credits for pollution, you know you're going to get to point where you've got more pollution than you expected. But that's my opinion. I would like to ask Kerry Brown maybe as a council, is to get us a list of every single permit that is issued in our incorporated area, whether it is ministerial, and they just looked at it and approved it, or what it is, because if we aren't watching the procedure of the creeping, which is definitely going on outside the Prohibition Zone, houses are being built, retrofitted, but they are being built. And unless somebody is in—looking</p> |

| Agenda Item | Discussion/Action/Information |
|-------------|---|
| | <p>to see if all those credits are correct, we don't have a way of auditing or really knowing where this is going. And, the Basin Management Program, acts very—you know, like they are going to manage this, but apparently they have no plans on doing that yet because Golden State can issue a permit, somebody can put a well in, inside the Prohibition Zone, you can do an expansion, or you can't, depending—it is a little bit political. So I have always thought that it is to our advantage to know what permits are going through the process, and Kerry has said that that is not something that they do, but I think that it would be a healthy way for us to see every permit, that's going through and being looked at, whether it's approved by the county and lets it go forward. But that's—if we're going to be a community council, that gives us a lot more knowledge about what is going on in our basin.</p> <p><u>Chairperson Bender</u> - let's have a vote now on the two items that are on the Consent Agenda.</p> <p>(Crosstalk.)</p> <p><u>Member Harper</u> - if you really, really, really want to be informed, you have to go to the Land Use. You have to read the stuff that Margaret sends out. It's difficult to come here not informed and then go to irritation. And, like has been said by Paul, we're all volunteers. Margaret does an excellent job with Land Use. She tries to keep people informed. And everybody has an opinion, and there's not a lot of people here out of our community, so this isn't a big concern for the community. If it's a big concern, much like the rubber chips, or this or that, you have to get people involved, you have to get people to buy in with what you are saying, and the Land Use is where it starts.</p> <p><u>Member Korin</u> - and I am quite sure when we discussed the new house, we were concerned about how many bedrooms. I can't tell you for sure one hundred percent, but we were looking at rooms versus how many now, and I think it was probably the same, but you can check it and I can check it to verify. And I think it's a good point, if somebody is tearing down a home to not add bedrooms, as far as—as much as we can prevent that.</p> <p>A motion was made and seconded to recommend approval on the Consent Agenda. LOCAC voted in favor - 9, opposed - 0, no abstentions. (9-0-0), two members absent.</p> <p>Chairperson Bender asks Land Use to send a note to the County that these items were accepted. He opens discussion on the McDonald project.</p> <p><u>Vice Chairperson Mayfield</u> - I'll introduce the project. It's a proposed vacation rental property in a multi-family residential zone. It would be three, separate vacation rental units in one building. So the committee members pointed out to the applicant that the proposed vacation rental</p> |

| Agenda Item | Discussion/Action/Information |
|-------------|---|
| | <p>goes against more than one of our new guidelines on which we base our review of vacation rentals. It does not meet the zoning guidelines because it is located in a multi-family residential zone, and we created that guideline to help with the availability of long term and lower income housing in Los Osos. The owner also owns already vacation rental property in Los Osos, so it does not meet the minimum one per owner in our guidelines. It proposes three separate vacation rentals in one building, so it does not meet the required distance between vacation rentals, per the guidelines. Now, speaking on behalf of the applicant, she understands the community has concerns with vacation rentals, but she maintains that this particular property is well suited for a vacation rental being located near the bay, and she feels it's in her rights to develop it that way. The vacation rental guidelines that we passed had not been forwarded to the County at the time that she applied for her permit, and she said that the planner actually encouraged her to consider all three units as vacation rentals. Let's see if there are any other issues—the other issues that were discussed, that each of the units being a two bedroom unit, it was possible that there could be a total of eighteen persons staying in the building and nine cars, and there is insufficient parking for that number of cars on site, and so someone said that if the permit is approved, it should be limited to a maximum number of renters based upon the parking capacity of the site. The applicant's son lives in one unit currently, and the others are rented month-to-month at this time. The committee members asked why not keep the units as a month-to-month, and she replied that she just wants to have all options available to her. So initially a motion was made to recommend denial of the permit request due to the fact that it does not meet our guidelines, and the preliminary vote was four to four, and so it failed. But a member of the public asked why those who voted against the motion, why they did so when it went contrary to the LOCAC Vacation Rental Guidelines. And Linde Owen, I hope you don't mind I am pointing it out, stated she did so because she though we were caught in this in between place where the guidelines have not been approved by the County, and so our review should be based on the current Vacation Rental Ordinance. However, I explained that that is not the case, one of the primary reasons the guidelines were developed was so that the Land Use Committee would have some objective criteria of which to base the recommendations for approval or denial. And that this is stated in the Vacation Rental Guidelines document that was passed by LOCAC and forwarded to the County, so the County knows, and has been told that we intend to use these guidelines to base our decisions upon, and we have the right to do so and they agree we have the right to do so. So Linde Owen stated that she was not aware that that was the case so changed her vote so that the motion passed five to three. So that's a summary, if anyone has any questions?</p> <p>Member Stanfill wants to know what Member Tornatzky has to say. Member Tornatzky said she wanted to hear what the public has to say before she and the rest of the council opines. No questions from the council.</p> |

| Agenda Item | Discussion/Action/Information |
|-------------|--|
| | <p><u>Questions/Comments from the Public:</u></p> <p><u>Julie Tacker</u> - the parking capacity recommendation came from me, and I would recommend, that you recommend, that on any approval for the project, which the County has the authority to do, that you are on record conditioning the project to meet the parking capacity versus the bed count, it that makes sense, if you are all following along. The other things about this property, is that it has the on-site management, which I think is a huge plus, and it is almost like a Homestay because somebody is there, 24/7. The other thing about the residential multi-family, my understanding for the zoning requirement to be in your guidelines, that you are somehow holding on to affordable housing. This particular property is quasi-bayfront, and residential multi-family or not, the tri-plex nature of it, or not, is not affordable housing. This is highly desirable real estate, and that holding on to it or denying it based on the zoning, is not necessarily applicable here. The beauty of the minor use permit is that you have the ability to take each project on a case-by-case basis. And the three things that I mentioned to you, on site management, parking capacity, and that it is not affordable housing, that we're talking about here, this particular parcel, I think are all reasons that you could recommend approval of the project in some fashion—(interruption to announce Ms. Tacker has 30 seconds left) you can recommend approval of the project in some form, condition it the way you like, but I don't think a flat out denial is appropriate in this. Thank you.</p> <p><u>Paul Hershfield</u> - my understanding of way the guidelines were written in terms of multi-family, was not necessarily the broadest definition of affordable, but those spaces are not super fancy, there are people who could afford to live there permanently who will not have that opportunity, so I don't think it's just about affordable. The other issue is, and we keep going over this, there was a process, the community was involved, ultimately guidelines were created, by the Land Use Committee members, the vote was in favor. And the idea was therefore we were going to be using those guidelines. Now if somebody wants to, let's take you know, sort of federal government, if someone wants to say that goes against the law, and show that it goes against the law, great. But they can't say (unintelligible) that the law is wrong. We voted on it, we decided that's what we're doing, and having to revisit it every time. I don't feel is a fair use of people's time and energy. The guidelines are very clear, it's nothing that's in question about whether or not something meets the guidelines. As I pointed out at that meeting, multiple times, we understand that it's not binding, it's guidelines that community members that were involved helped to create, the person, and I communicated this to them, they still go to the County and plead their case. And they county may just give them what they want anyway. But again, to have to revisit it every time, I think is really unfortunate use of people's time. Thanks.</p> <p><u>Member Stanfill</u> - as I understand it, there are two places where this application did not meet the guidelines. One was parking, one was the three-in-one location, what was the third? (Comments - multi-parking,</p> |

| Agenda Item | Discussion/Action/Information |
|-------------|---|
| | <p>distance requirement.) So, if in fact that’s true, then I would move that we deny this application.</p> <p>(Crosstalk.)</p> <p><u>Chairperson Bender</u> - Jim, thank you for that, we’ll have some more public comment, and then we’ll put it to....</p> <p><u>Trish Bartel</u> - so, just to state a few things, it is still more affordable to live in a multi-use unit than it is in a single-family home, so we are losing renters that could actually rent all three of those units. Her son does have a trailer in front, he camps a lot and that was even brought up at the meeting—at the Land Use Committee. He is gone weeks at a time, so the thought that he is there 24/7 is not a reality. Parking? I think that is very strict, we have to make sure that there is always parking. We have gone through a process with Land Use Committee, we have gone through the guidelines, they were approved by LOCAC. They did not qualify. Land Use Committee voted to deny this, and it’s still going to the County, so I really would appreciate it if everyone looked at the guidelines, obeyed the guidelines, and that is why we’re here tonight. Thank you.</p> <p><u>Steve Best</u> - these guidelines weren’t voted on by the entire community, but that’s not the point. I just looked at the map to see where the property was, and yeah, this property is an optimal vacation application. And whether or not you put together your guidelines appropriately or not, would allow this project to fit or not fit. And yes, it is a vacation site, to take a walk, to go golfing, to do whatever. If the neighbors have no objection to it, if there are other conditions in terms of maybe limitations, maybe in terms of numbers of units, or available parking, that is all done through the process of reservations, and having those limitations posted within the dwelling, then those issues are mitigated. So, if you write your guidelines inappropriately, and you are going to have problems continually every time something like this comes up.</p> <p><u>Sue Morgenthaler</u> - I think I share the frustration. A lot of people worked really hard on these guidelines, the Land Use Committee passed the guidelines, you guys passed the guidelines, and Jim, just to clarify, besides the parking problems, and that it doesn’t actually qualify for a homestay, whatever you said. We have a density requirement, you can’t have three places next to each other, and there is only one allowed per owner in Los Osos and you guys already gave her one just a couple of months ago and she just said, she just (unintelligible) where they are, she can’t say they are in Los Osos for sure. And the other one is that we chose for very important reasons why not to put them in multi-family dwellings. I just want to read the words that you guys voted on that Margaret wrote so eloquently. It says to form the basis of the review of Los Osos vacation rental permit applications, the vacation rental guidelines that LOCAC submits</p> |

| Agenda Item | Discussion/Action/Information |
|-------------|---|
| | <p>to the county will provide the basis for the Land Use Committee’s recommendations for support or denial of the vacation rental permit application. County Planning may make the determination to recognize the new standards as the voice of the community on vacation rentals in Los Osos and reference those standards when they make a decision on any new vacation rental permit application for Los Osos. I agree with everybody, it was done, you voted. Why are we keep raking this over the coals? This doesn’t qualify on many, many ways in the (unintelligible) that you voted on. I appreciate it, thank you.</p> <p><u>Chairperson Bender</u> - does anyone want to make a motion on this? (Crosstalk.)</p> <p><u>Member Tornatzky</u> - how about comments from us? After hearing, I heard everybody and I asked to hear people, and now I’d like to make my comments having heard what people said. Well, for one thing, I guess slightly off topic, is, we voted on these guidelines, however, since I feel like, since the County hasn’t authorized these guidelines that we voted on, that we still need to give the community, the neighbors to say what their ideas are on this because we have a very small sampling of people, considering the number of people that live in this town, that approved the guidelines, that cut out maybe 90% of the people that live in this town. So I think it is a little arrogant of us to not include the community to be able to step up and talk about these things. So that would be the first part I would say. Second of all, this is an oddball case, much like the Enerle case was. Homestays are supposed to be in a home, but we didn’t have any problem with allowing a separated little cottage to be considered part of that home. So this is another oddball case, the three houses that are there, I think it would be wise of us, rather than to just vote no, we can still vote no, but to put some conditions on it for the future, for instance the parking. There can’t be any more parking than the spaces that that land allows, we could condition it that way. We can also say that if the son is going to be gone, she is not allowed to have anybody stay there, we could say that. And I just feel like, if the neighbors really hate it, they’re going to show up at that hearing, and they’re going to complain. So we can do our part here, and they will do their part there, but I would just say, we could make a motion to deny it, but if we don’t and we sat we would pass it, I’d say we would put conditions on it. Thanks.</p> <p><u>Member Korin</u> - can I make a motion? Oh, we’re still discussing—?</p> <p><u>Chairperson Bender</u> - before we make a motion, I’d just like to say we worked really hard on coming up with some guidelines, we are also here because we are concerned with the public and that’s why if someone wants to pull an item, and discuss it, we encourage that. You know we are not gestapo rules, that said, and so people do have that right, and I’d like to keep that right. We might have to repeat this, I will guarantee we will have to repeat this, over and over and over again because more people will probably try and get vacation rental permits in or future, you</p> |

| Agenda Item | Discussion/Action/Information |
|-------------|--|
| | <p>know. But that’s why we’re here and this is what we do, you know. We discuss it, and we talk about it, and then we make a decision, you know. And again, still—we’re trying to represent our community as best we can. We’re all in it, everyone here is involved with the community otherwise we wouldn’t be here, you know, that’s why we’re here. So it is a good representation, I don’t want to say we have 90%, but we are the people who care about our community, and that’s why we’re here. So now—a motion.</p> <p><u>Member Stanfill</u> - I think there’s one on the floor, and I think we had a second—I would say as the maker of the motion, I would welcome to identify the problems with this particular application, and that would identify for the applicant what the problems are. And if they choose to address those problems, and correct them.</p> <p><u>Chairperson Bender</u> - if they’re correctable, some of them are not.</p> <p><u>Member Harper</u> - I’d like to second, but I’d like the minutes from tonight’s meeting and Land Use to go with the recommendation so they understand, and that’s what we used to do previously.</p> <p><u>Member Korin</u> - I’d like to speak, not to the motion. (Crosstalk.) I appreciate your concern with parking and I think that the County, if they do not take our recommendation to deny, will look into that, they’ll find it, because they have it on their demand, or their requirements, so we don’t have to worry about the parking right now because we have three to four reasons to deny before we even get to the parking. So I’m not concerned with parking. It’s not a Homestay because nobody lives there, being on the property on a trailer does not make you a resident. It is an illegal staying there—(crosstalk)—affordable, overnight—</p> <p><u>Chairperson Bender</u> - there is no question about a Homestay.</p> <p><u>Member Korin</u> - so it’s not a Homestay, it’s—it doesn’t even, it doesn’t even answer the 250 feet requirement of the County, one to the other, so the denial was completely justified. The prob—the reasoning of bringing up here (crosstalk), We are following our guidelines, I will suggest a motion to keep the denial as it is appropriate, and to let people that care about it so much, go to the County and fight for that, for that lady there, and try to justify, rather than going against our guidelines and then expect people to go there and justify. This is the way roundabout against exactly what we spent about eight months coming up with those guidelines.</p> <p><u>Member Tornatzky</u> - the lady—there are three units that are up, it’s a total of four units (crosstalk)—three units, but the guy, the son lives in one of the units, so that leaves two left (crosstalk) she applied for three, so I recommend two, I recommend two. And as long as he is on the premises, I would like to condition it that way.</p> |

| Agenda Item | Discussion/Action/Information |
|--|--|
| <p>PUBLIC COMMENT ON ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA</p> | <p><u>Chairperson Bender</u> - okay, the motion that's before us right now is Jim's motion to deny the application, with the information from the meeting tonight and the Land Use meeting to be included to the County. So do we have—I'd like to have a vote on that motion (crosstalk).</p> <p>LOCAC voted to recommend denial - 8, opposed - 1, no abstentions. (8-1-0), two members absent.</p> <p><u>Chairperson Bender</u> - so the (unintelligible) is denied with minutes and notes with circles and arrows and inscriptions.</p> <p><u>Vice Chairperson Mayfield</u> - so I do write the project referral letters and I will attach minutes. Do members want me to send those out to all of you so that you can read them?</p> <p><u>Member Korin</u> - are they available on the website?</p> <p><u>Vice Chairperson Mayfield</u> - no, I just email them, so I can include LOCAC members if you want.</p> <p><u>Member Korin</u> - sure.</p> <p><u>Chairperson Bender</u> - if anyone wants them, we will have it electronically and we can email it to you. (Unidentified speakers - Isn't it on the website? It's in the County staff report, you'll see it there.) Yeah, yeah, at the County level, we don't post it generally here. And so that takes care of that, the next thing would be Public Comment on items not on the agenda.</p> <p><u>Julie Tacker</u> - I'm just going to shoot off some random thoughts. I've asked twice already, this will be the third time that I've asked your council to consider the dry land farm contracts that the County is wasting water on, and money. The fire meeting that was Monday, I missed a lot of you, my take away from it was there was no action plan or next steps, and I'm sorry about that. Everything seems to be waiting for the Habitat Conservation Plan. In the meantime, we just wait. The agendas and the ability for the public to follow along—when the agenda goes out it's not going to have—it used to have, I think when Vicki was Chair, it had a link to the referral, a live link, you could click on it. If that is at all possible, I think that would be helpful so the public doesn't have to go searching back for that referral, it could be part of the agenda. The comments earlier about the creep, and the bedroom, bathroom additions Linde was right, LOCAC doesn't see every room addition. Not every project requires a Minor Use Permit, there's a certain threshold. So bedrooms and bathrooms are being added without your knowledge. So we are not able to track that. And it would be interesting, because like Chuck said, every three bedrooms that are added, you might as well put in a brand new home. There are a lot of vacant properties out there and those people are denied access to water and wastewater. But somebody that's already got a house has some priority and that's never been discussed why they</p> |

| Agenda Item | Discussion/Action/Information |
|-------------|---|
| | <p>have a priority over someone who has waited twenty-five or thirty years to build. It's a conversation our community needs to have. And my last topic that I will just touch on, my comments on this last vacation rental were specific to some ways that you could have approved the project. I wasn't rehashing guidelines, I wasn't scolding you for what I didn't like about them, but that's what I heard, in the comments behind me, is that you didn't want to hear about it—what's that? (thirty seconds, three zero), okay, I don't need that, I speak in three minute intervals, ask Jeff. Anyway, it looks like you're flipping me off, so I don't appreciate it (unintelligible from timekeeper) well, don't do it to me. My point on the vacation rental guidelines; you might as well make them over-the-counter permits. If your project meets these guidelines, you get a permit, you don't have to go to LOCAC. Why waste people's time? If it doesn't meet the guidelines, then they don't get a permit. That's what you're recommending. So I don't quite understand why we would take \$2,700 dollars from people to hope to get a permit through the County, if you are going to quash it at every opportunity that it comes to you. It doesn't make sense to me to have a Minor Use Permit, and all these guidelines. It's one or the other. You have the flexibility through the Minor Use Permit to have discretion to shape the project to how you want it to be.</p> <p><u>Member Stanfill</u> - I want to make a motion to adjourn. (Laughter.)</p> <p><u>Steve Best</u> - just to revisit the (unintelligible) we are setting precedent here in this small group that does not represent the full community, and you can make these recommendations to the County but they need to be defined and detailed and provide exigencies for other things so that it is not a giant line that is cruel and unrelenting for people that should have a right to be able to do what they—do with their lives. We also should be thinking with what's going on with our water, the fact that we are putting polluted water back into our aquifer. And we should be thinking, four, five, eight years down the road here about what we're doing for this community. We need to start thinking about how we're going to have our Community Plan make sense, and be able to survive. So we need to start thinking about potable water rather than treated water going back into our aquifer, so that we're not poisoning our aquifer and then having to provide (noise blocked statement) for our entire aquifer many years from now. We need to be humane and moral with the way we're treating our homeless community and find ways with working with that. So that we can provide a safe environment for our families and our children to be able to be within the wooded areas of our community, but at the same time, we're not rousting people and telling them that they are not wanted here. And we also need to be working with the County and doing—making this our town, with parks and multi-purpose trails and making it contingent so we have a real plan and not something that 20 years goes by and we still don't have shit. We need to get out of the small minutiae that we're stuck in and start looking at the big plan for the future.</p> <p><u>Richard Margetson</u> - I guess my previous comment got completely</p> |

| Agenda Item | Discussion/Action/Information |
|--------------------------------------|--|
| <p>LOCAC BUSINESS AND PROCESSES:</p> | <p>misunderstood. The reason I gave the one bedroom, one bath comparison to two bedroom, two bath is because I was rebutting the County's position when Kerry Brown was taking about a project that was increasing a bedroom and a bath and they stated in their belief there is no increase, there would be no increase in water consumption. And I came back with a rebuttal, and they had no rebuttal to mine. I never said that in 10 years it's going to be a double in number. But I will go back to the 80s, and the County staff, our District Engineer from the CSD have stated numerous times that they believe, that if the 1100 homes had not been built in the 80s here, based on a promise of a sewer project, that the seawater intrusion issue in Los Osos might not have happened. And that's what I'm talking about the creep issue. I'm hoping that everybody on this body has read the Coastal Development Permit and the conditions, I think it would be a good read, I'm sure Lynette's read it, for sure, but I think it would be a good read for all of the people that sit on the Land Use Committee and the board as a whole. If we have another drought, we're going to be right back where to we were a few years ago, a couple years ago. And I will just tell you as a member of the committee that developed the rates that were structured for the CSD, the rate structure with Rob Miller, the District Engineer, and Ron Munds who works for the County of San Luis Obispo in the Water Department, we were anticipating a reduction in water consumption. Water consumption for the CSD this year is up 10,000,000 gallons. 10,000,000 gallons. Significant increase in a community that's supposed to be conserving. Water rate increases didn't cause the anticipated reduction in consumption. That coupled with this creep that's happening, like Julie said, some of the permits never come before you. Yes, maybe the public isn't aware and when I come into these meetings but you're the body that's supposed to be representing these issues. We talked about the dry land farmers, oh my god, that issue is huge. The CSD wrote a letter, there's back-up from the Coastal Commission from years ago that that shouldn't have happened, and now, trying to get that done, through the CSD and Public Comment, sure could use some backing from LOCAC. You're the representatives. Yes, you're volunteers but eight of you were elected. For me that takes it out of the volunteer group. Four of you were appointed by Mr. Gibson, and you can quit or whatever, but eight of you were elected. You have an additional responsibility to this community whether one person shows up or nobody shows up. Be up on the issues, understand the past, and let's try to not make those same mistakes in the future, because what happened in the 80s severely impacted this community for 40 years.</p> <p><u>Chairperson Bender</u> - for the public, the meeting is adjourned. We do have some business we have to do ourselves, it doesn't involve the public and sounds pretty boring. We want to talk about rearranging the tables and chairs. You are welcome to stay if you want, it's (noise interrupts). (8:42 p.m.)</p> <p>Chairperson Bender explains that we had our Outreach meeting. He reports that Member Sarrouf is doing MailChimp, but that she isn't here</p> |

| Agenda Item | Discussion/Action/Information |
|-------------|---|
| | <p>to present anything. Member Harris relates that it is a program that helps collect names. She will send it out to all of us and we in turn will send it to our mailing lists. Chairperson Bender says we are trying to do outreach to get more people involved/more people informed on the projects we have and what comes before us. Member Harris says once we get our Facebook going, it will collect emails from there too. Chairperson Bender explains how when meetings are more crowded, the room setting that worked well tonight, then puts people onto chairs at the back. He would like to see more tables for audience comfort. Member Womack asks about a more oblong configuration. Vice Chairperson Mayfield suggests a more conference-like setting with tables and rows. Member Korin likes the round set up as everyone can see everyone else. Various members voice opinions. Sometimes we have a lot of people, and other times not so much. Former Chairperson Vicki Milledge describes a room configuration that fit a large group of 100 people, a large rectangle. We need a place to put the microphone. We intend to use the mic more to facilitate everyone hearing and the minutes. The three minute time limit on speaking was addressed, how to do it so people feel comfortable in realizing that their three minutes is approaching the end. Various suggestions were made. Former Chairperson Milledge can donate a timer. A short discussion was had on the pros and cons of the three minute speaking time limit. The placement of the reports on the agenda was discussed. (There were no reports from Tree & Landscape, Traffic & Circulation, or Outreach Committees. Land Use Committee minutes were posted on the board. There was no approval of minutes. There was no Treasurer's Report.) Chairperson need some help with the templates. Member Harper explains that we are not under the Brown act but that we try to follow it with agenda timing and says we can help with agendas.</p> <p>Chairperson Bender resigns as Chair and Member Harris will take over. We will have to vote on it at the next meeting. Thank yous to Dave, and help is offered. Former Chairperson Milledge offers to help.</p> <p>The room arrangement will be evolving.</p> <p>Meeting adjourned 8:56 p.m..</p> <p>The next meeting is September 27, 2018.</p> <p>Respectfully submitted.</p>  <p>Lynette Tornatzky LOCAC Secretary</p> |