

CANDIDATE FORUM FOR MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL OCTOBER 7, 2012

OPENING STATEMENTS:

STEVE BARASCH: Thank you again for hosting this event. It's impressive and I think it shows that this particular group has a lot of concern for the neighborhoods and for the City at large. It's just great to be here and hopefully address your concerns tonight. I got in this race a little late and I don't have a formal script but my main focus for getting into this race for Mayor is very simple. It is to restore trust in our local government by instilling fiscal accountability. I've been to a number of RQN meetings over the years. I first joined RQN when my wife and I first moved here in 1989 from Pasadena which has a very strong cultural heritage tradition. Neighborhood by neighborhood there are very clear defined boundaries, very similar to San Luis Obispo. I'm an architect by training, I have an engineering background; I have an extensive post graduate degree in Management of Complex Organizations, and my specialty over the last 25 or 30 years is in finance and helping large companies and organizations that are going through turbulence. I see the opportunities to re-study the City of San Luis Obispo from a management standpoint and look at it as a very complex organization that can use its resources better. The City operates with a \$96.5 million overall budget, much like a corporation, and right now I don't see a lot of people who have the kind of business background and experience that I do. With that I'll cut my time short and be available for questions.

JAN MARX: Thank you. Hi, I'm Jan Marx, and I'm Mayor of San Luis Obispo and I'm running for re-election. I live on Albert Drive which I think was the nesting area of RQN, and I've been a member since the organization began. I've worked hard over the years to preserve the quality of neighborhoods and to make them places where working people, families, and permanent residents want to live. I really want to continue to work to preserve our housing stock and improve the sense of community safety — that's very important. That's one of the reasons I've stepped up and taken a stand on the prohibition on overnight camping in vehicles, even though it's certainly gotten me enough flack for that. But I'm very concerned about the neighborhoods — about strangers just showing up and just hanging out and destroying that sense of who really lives in the neighborhood. I'm interested in mapping and defining neighborhoods and creating a Neighborhood Council so that each neighborhood has more clout in terms of city policy. I'm very concerned about the conversion of permanent residential units into student rentals, and I'm very concerned about the fact that right now we have about 60% rentals and 40% permanent occupants. What happens when it gets to be 70 to 30; what happens when it gets to be 80 to 20 — 90 to 10? I'm not sure what we will have left in terms of the City if people are still irresponsibly

converting residential units into basically transient type of situations. I'm also the only candidate for City Council who has any experience and I am the only candidate with a positive vision for the City's future. I'm a full-time mayor, serving the City 40-50 hours a week, and I mean to get things done. So I just want you to recognize that the City is in good financial shape and we are making progress toward financial sustainability, which is very important for the strength of the neighborhoods. Thank you.

JEFF ARANGUENA: First off, my name is Jeff Aranguena and I want to thank Mike tonight and I also want to thank RQN. This is my first race. This is the first time I've been involved in a City Council race — kind of my first taste in politics. I kind of have an innocent story. I was raised in Yosemite, near Yosemite National Park. The first time I moved down here was in 2003 to attend Cal Poly. I left after a year to go back up to Turkey Tech up in Stanislaus to obtain my Bachelor's Degree. After getting done with that, I came back to San Luis Obispo for my Teaching Credential which I was able to complete at Cal Poly. I took a teaching job for a year up in Jackson, California because we all know — any teachers in the room here know — how hard it is to get a teaching job in this area. Then after a year of working with 7th graders, I decided that was not going to be the teaching position I wanted to fulfill for 35 years. So I came back down to San Luis Obispo and was lucky enough to get into the Cal Poly Masters Program for history, completed that program, and then started teaching at Pacific Beach High School where I currently now teach history and government. During that time, at the school that I'm currently at, I have been active not only just at my site as a school site rep but I'm also active in the district working on the Teacher Evaluation Committee. We just got done wrapping up a new evaluation system that's going to bring a better education to the students here in San Luis Obispo. It's that type of mentality that I will want to bring to the City Council level as well. I get things done within our school district and I now want to bring that helping hand to the city. I first attempted to do that earlier this year. I really wanted to be a part of the Parks and Rec Commission, which there was an opening for. I interviewed for that and thought I could bring some of my ideas and change that position. Sadly, I did not get that position but was urged by Councilman Carter, here tonight, and Jan to stay involved because I do think we need to have younger people getting involved in this community, and that's what I look forward to doing. I look back over the last six months in this campaign — I've knocked on over 4,000 doors, talked to a lot of people, and I think just over at that table in the corner — I think we're ready to take a road trip now — I've met a lot of great people during this time just listening. Hearing people's stories has been the fun part of this campaign and I look forward to hearing your questions tonight.

JOHN ASHBAUGH: Thank you Jeff. I'm John Ashbaugh and I have been on the City Council now for four years. I've been in the community now for 35 years. I think we actually built our house in 1988 and moved to San Luis Obispo. I have been very impressed with the work of RQN and thank them for presenting this

forum tonight. I do teach, like Jeff, but unlike Jeff, I actually like 7th graders. I do think, in fact, liking 7th graders is an important qualification for being on the City Council (laughing) – believe me. I actually had an old school teacher who once told me that teaching middle school is a lot like being in a room full of Alka Seltzer — there's a lot of energy out there. And that's a good thing. I will say that about our City Council meetings – there is a lot of energy always. We have good public engagement, we have good civility, generally speaking, among the City Council, I know I fail on that score from time to time, I lose my temper; but I do stand for certain things and one of them is, as William O. Douglas, Supreme Court Justice famously said a few years ago, protecting the blessings of quiet seclusion. That's not always available in our neighborhoods. We all know that. I knew that when we moved into a neighborhood on the very fringe of San Luis Obispo above Bishop Peak School, and learned that there were student households just a half a block away from us. And the neighbors that we had who were permanent residents immediately adjoining those houses had terrible problems — had to keep working night and day with the city — coaching the city and ultimately getting them to enforce the ordinances they had in place then. We have much better ordinances now. I've been very proud to work with this Council to put in place a number of things that we've taken a lot of heat for it. I look forward to talking about those and taking questions from you tonight about the progress we made and the progress we have yet to make on the City Council. Thank you.

DAN CARPENTER: Thank you and thank you RQN for tonight. I really appreciate having the opportunity to speak to you. My name is Dan Carpenter. I probably have the most unique perspective here because I've been a part of this community my entire life. And I place a lot of value on that and the people I talk to do also. I was a member of this community and our neighborhoods from childhood, obviously. I have lived as an adult in many neighborhoods in the community. I was part of the WOW program 40 years ago and I've seen the changes in the program from then to today. I understand those changes. My background was in business. I was part of our family business. I was fortunate to work with Arlene [Zanchuck] for many many years — it was a blessing to have her there. We still discuss those issues. But it's something that I've watched over the years — not just the business community — but actually our neighbors also and what happens, what's happened in the area you live in, and what's happened in the area that I lived in prior to my moving to that area. Anyway, I look forward to your questions tonight. I will try and give you my historic perspective on things. My two years on Council has been very rewarding to me. It has been a privilege to serve you. I feel my background, my experience in the community, and my commitment for being here for the long-term will best serve you for the next four years and I look forward to your questions.

KEVIN RICE: Good evening, my name's Kevin Rice. Sorry I didn't get around to meet everyone—hopefully I'll get a chance to before the night's over. Next to Dan, I'm a brand new resident, I've only been here about 20 years, and I really

love San Luis Obispo for the same reasons you do, for the seclusion and the beauty and the ability to walk places and enjoy the town. I attended both Cal Poly and Cuesta. Currently I'm a firefighter. I work for the County of Los Angeles — I don't have a local conflict on that which is nice. But as a firefighter, I opposed Binding Arbitration because the way it was written was bad. I want to tell you just a little about myself before we break into questions. I've got a lot of interests. I'm into computers. I like programming websites. I'd like to program what Frank's [Kassak] doing back there with his maps — that's some real cool work. What's the youngest RQN member that has ever existed — anyone know? I might be it. I moved to town like I said about 20 years ago and I joined RQN back then. That was right when I was going to Cuesta and Cal Poly. Even the younger set can take an interest in what RQN is doing, and I cared back then, and I care now. More than any answer that I'm going to say tonight, I really want to hear from you and your ideas since I really believe you're the experts in this field and the Council is going to be the mechanism to getting it done. But I think it's your diverse ideas that are going to make things keep happening in this community, to make it nice, and to improve it, and I hope all of you will get involved at the City Council level and speak to us. Thank you very much.

COMMENTATOR: *Before we get started, there are a couple of questions we would like you to answer with a yes or no—just raise your hand:*

1. *Do you consider blight a serious problem in attracting responsible property owners/renters to the city? Just raise your hand if you say yes.*

ANSWER: All candidates raised their hand for “yes.”

2. *Are you aware of students or others living in substandard living conditions within the City? Raise your hand if you say yes.*

ANSWER: All candidates raised their hand for “yes.”

COMMENTATOR: *Now starting with Kevin, the first question: Would you support a self funding Rental Inspection Program for R-1 and R-2 rental properties? Please explain why or why not.*

KEVIN RICE: Would you clarify self funding?

Commentator: *Funded by the people whose residences will be inspected.*

KEVIN RICE: Voluntary or are you talking about a city program? That's an interesting idea. Again that's a self-funded rental inspection program. You could then have people come in, I suppose, to be checking for standards of living, whether it's up to code. I do know an older gentleman who lives in a commercial unit that's not up to code — extension cords all over the place. Certainly, there's a need in the community to make sure that both our tenants and our landlords

are held responsible because I know people who have leaky roofs and broken windows — that's a landlord problem — and then the tenants who don't do the upkeep — leave their trash out — you've got a tenant problem there. There's a lot of parking problems near campus, and that's related to not only tenants but the school's attraction to parking. I think we need a vibrant bus service on that issue. But that's a good idea, I'd like to hear more on that.

DAN CARPENTER: Self-funded rental inspection program. I believe that rental inspection is absolutely necessary. Self-funded, if there's accountability to it. And that's where the city has to take responsibility for the health and safety of our residents. I believe we probably have staff already that can take care of that so anytime you self regulate there's potential for abuse so I'm really struggling whether a self-regulation would accomplish what we want to — that is the health and safety of our residents. So with some type of accountability, yes.

COMMENTATOR: *That was self-funded, not self-regulated.*

DAN CARPENTER: Well, yes, to explain that a little further — if it's self funded, there's a conflict of interest.

JOHN ASHBAUGH: This is an issue that has been raised at the City Council in the past and frankly I think we have also received — as I've said — we have taken a lot of heat for the City Ordinances we have proposed. Where I would expect opposition to this to come from is particularly the real estate community — land owners in general — and Business and Property Owners Association, in particular, which, by the way, one of the candidates for Mayor has been President of for awhile — it will be real interesting to hear his answer to this one. I think we have to be a little bit careful as we approach this. We have to study it thoroughly. We do have now a high occupancy residential inspection program for homes that are five or fewer sorry, unrelated adults in a home—we do—no?--oh well, okay--we'll talk later. But what we do have isn't apparently adequate and that's where we can start. As I have gone door to door, there are easily evidence in many many neighborhoods of conditions of, as we call it, blight, and those do need to be addressed for the safety of the residents.

JEFF ARANGUENA: This is a really good question, and I think Dan kind of nailed it on the head here — you have to look a little bit more into it. The first part of it, yes, I think the way the city is moving, as Jan mentioned in her introduction, we have 60% of our residences here in SLO are in fact, individuals who are renters, and let's face it, a majority of them are individuals who are, in fact, college students. If we don't do something about the ability of people to come in here to buy homes and have that opportunity and create more head-of-household jobs, we are in fact going to have to do something in this direction where we are, in fact, regulating this, because it could turn into 65 which turns into 70 which turns into 80% rentals and the next thing you know we have some of the current situations we have now which is you do have blight taking place. So I would

definitely be in favor of looking more into this to see how we could move forward with this.

JAN MARX: Thank you. Yes, I would support this kind of program and I actually did before and got voted down sometime between 1998 and 2002. What I would propose is that we link it to the Rental Business License. You have to have a business license in order to have a rental business in the City of San Luis Obispo. There's no reason why we couldn't look at it and study it, and it would have to be done very carefully because there are a lot of competing interests involved but you know, if you want to have a business license to do rentals, then you would be in some way required to kick into the, something like the TBID, like we have 2% from the hotels going into marketing. We could also have a fund that would basically protect the housing stock and also keep the people who are living in these units – looking at their welfare and especially at the welfare of the neighborhoods also.

STEVE BARASCH: I actually strongly support this concept. I want to correct some inadequacies that I heard earlier. I own a number of multi-family rentals and get that fee get tacked onto our assessor's tax roll. If you own three or more units in the City of San Luis, you are charged under the multi-family rental inspection ordinance. What this would do, if it were self funded? It would take the onus away from the City inspectors to some degree because they would be better funded. They would also not miss these inspections like they do now for the multi-family. I get charged whether they come out or not, which is ridiculous. But if we had additional resources, then we would be able to attack the problems faster with more resources, particularly the rental units. Where it may be a little onerous is on the owner occupants because that is based on a complaint driven approach that the city also respects right now. So if you have a neighbor who sees a complaint, they usually file it.

COMMENTATOR: *Please tell us what you have done to preserve, protect, or improve the quality of life in our residential neighborhoods?*

STEVE BARASCH: That's not only a good question but it goes to the heart of what I do. In San Luis Obispo, people have accused me of being a neighborhood gentrification specialist. I will repeat that: neighborhood gentrification specialist. We bought a number of properties, we fixed up every one that we bought, and it's amazing how many properties around us have tried to keep up with my wife because she bakes cookies and brownies and gives them to our tenants who continue to keep those properties up to a very very high standard. My tenants often get very upset with me because we adhere to the noise ordinances because we get the fines as a result of the actions of our tenants. But we have come into probably fifteen different neighborhoods. Property values have gone up, our lawns are green, they're not brown, even though our water rates have continued to rise incrementally, and the neighborhoods around where we have bought properties have been gentrified significantly better than when we bought them.

JAN MARX: Thank you. Well, since I've been on City Council, which is six years on City Council, two years as Mayor, I have worked consistently to try to improve the quality of life in our neighborhoods. I voted for making Neighborhood Services a Budget Goal, and actually it is now happening out there in the City. Again, we get a lot of flack from various people who feel that it's kind of like being a nanny city. However, this group and the residents, people who live in the neighborhoods who are owner occupiers or are permanent residents, definitely appreciate it. I also voted in favor of new ordinances such as the Unruly Gathering and the Social Host and other sets of ordinances. I will say I've never owned a rental that has been declared uninhabitable by the City, as opposed to my opponent here.

JEFF ARANGUANA: Preserve and improve. One of the things when I first got here five years ago, the school where I teach, Pacific Beach High School, is in a residential neighborhood. We were getting complaint after complaint after complaint about students – not just our students, but also the school around us. There was trash, fights, there was violence, I mean, you name it. That area was consumed by this every day from about 12:30 to 1:00 pm. So one of the things I did when I first got to the school was, instead of reacting to the police officers, who would show up and say, “Hey, listen, there are kids getting in trouble here.” We did two things. First off, we would show them there was a pathway for the kids to go another way, not through the neighborhoods; but we also installed a weekly cleanup crew. So these kids go out now and aren't part of the problem anymore. They get out there, they're knocking on doors, they're building a relationship with these neighbors near our school, they're cleaning up the properties, they're cleaning up trash; and lastly, I've been part of the SLO Pre-Cleanup Day as well — we've gone out there — rolled up our sleeves and taken out tons and tons of trash.

JOHN ASHBAUGH: Yea, all of those things seem like good ideas. Frankly, I have consistently advocated your interests and your positions as well on the Council. There have been times, as I said, when we have taken a lot of heat. One example was just last April when the *Tribune* took us to task for the fines that we were attempting to associate with various violations. We adopted an alternative fee schedule which reduced the fines substantially. But I think, so far, we'll see, every one of these steps we have taken has a sunset clause — not a sunset but just an annual monitoring and review. We're taking a good look at the Social Host Ordinance which seems to be working and the Unruly Gathering Ordinance — we haven't really had any – maybe one or two that's all – that have received this citation. There may have been some Unruly Gatherings that we've missed but that's where you folks need to make sure we know about those and nip them in the bud. The fact is that partying now takes place on a much more regulated basis, and that's a good thing but we also, I think, have tried to toughen our noise enforcement overall and, to me, it's been well worth it for the neighborhoods.

DAN CARPENTER: During my time on Council, I also supported the Unruly Gathering Ordinance and also the noise ordinance. However, when you go back to our budget process when we talked about the Neighborhood Services Specialists, I fought really hard, without the support of the majority of the Council, to have those specialists be able to write citations for noise. The police chief fought against it and said she only wanted sworn officers doing that. I still feel that they don't have the ability they need to go out and take care of those issues that are important to the neighbors. And now I'm finding out recently that our two Neighborhood Specialists are only really spending 50% of their time out in the field. The rest of their time is spent in the office doing paperwork and other things — that disappoints me too.

KEVIN RICE: Well one of the things for your neighborhood, and I'm sure that you do, is to take care of your neighborhood first. And over the years, I've noticed the parked cars that are abandoned all summer long while the kids go home and they have cob webs growing and the plates are expired. I recently had a problem with a big RV that said "Beer Pongs for World Peace" on the side. I brought that to the attention of this Council and their staff, and it eventually got taken care of. But I'm dissatisfied with a couple of other issues. For instance, my neighborhood has parking signs that look like this [holds up blank piece of paper]. I don't know if any of your neighborhoods have that. That doesn't do any good — you can't enforce that, and I was disappointed the Council spent \$120,000.00 to replace signs downtown, but they're not taking care of the signs in the neighborhoods where the parking districts are and where we need these signs to keep these parkers out of the neighborhoods. So I want to continue to enhance our neighborhoods and look forward to your vote.

COMMENTATOR: *What do you think is the main reason that our owner-occupied housing stock has fallen to about 36% during the past 10 years? What would you do to keep this number from falling further in the next 10 years?*

DAN CARPENTER: Well, I think it's a combination. Obviously the economy has driven away the home ownership. But, the bigger issue is the neighborhoods, and their deterioration, especially around campus. There's no question that people are leaving those neighborhoods and either moving to less impacted neighborhoods by students or they're leaving town. The cost of living in San Luis is higher than in many other areas in our County and it's attractive to move out into those more rural areas when you're having to deal with that all the time. I'm not sure what the answer is to it, but I believe part of it is taking a more proactive approach and we just saw that recently with WOW week and either bringing that to an end or putting in some very specific controls. As far as property values, as long as we have the quality of life that we do in San Luis, we're always going to attract people but I'm concerned about the area that is impacted by excessive student issues.

JOHN ASHBAUGH: We're certainly all concerned about that. I think one of the ways we're going to be addressing this is through our update of our Land Use and Circulation Element we helped initiate with the help from Grant funds from the Institute for Local Government just a couple of years ago. It's underway, been underway for a few months now, and I think the very process of defining neighborhoods, engaging the neighborhoods in helping to build their identity will enable the kind of improvements that will get long-term, permanent, owner-occupied housing back into San Luis Obispo. It's a very complex problem. I've given a lot of thought to it and frankly there are a variety of different solutions. One is building the kind of housing that will, in fact, be sold rather than merely rented. An example of that would be the project at California, Taft and Kentucky actually, right off California. I would like to see that project sold as condominiums rather than merely rented out. Also, in the neighborhoods where we're planning the Margarita area, the Orcutt area specific plan, all those new neighborhoods ought to be planned so they attract and hold permanent owner-occupied housing.

JEFF ARANGUENA: That's a good question. First off, the economy, of course, has always been a big part of this. But, you know, when I first moved down here ten years ago, it was cheaper for five people to live in a house and pay rent than the actual owner to live there himself. So, until we do something about making people incentivized to stay here – what you're having is people are buying homes here and moving to Atascadero and Paso Robles and just renting them because they get so much money for them. I think head-of-household jobs is one way we can go ahead and create more people to stay here. I know, I teach here, and there's just no way, at this moment, that I could afford a house. So we need to get more higher paying jobs here. I think also we have to attract more housing, as with what Dan said earlier. One of my friends who has a really great job here in the City — he just built his first home up in Atascadero because it's cheaper. I think also the change in mentality regarding student abuse is something we really need to look forward to because, as with a conversation I was having earlier, there are people not wanting to buy around the area around Cal Poly.

JAN MARX: Thank you. Well, I live in the middle of it all. I've got five guys living on one side of me and five guys living on the other side of me and they each have great big trucks so I am well aware of this. I think that one of the reasons is the economy. I see this with estate planning. If a mom or dad dies and the house then goes to the heirs, in this market, they're not going to sell it — the prices are really low. They're renting it out. They're getting \$3,000.00, maybe \$4,000.00, a month for renting these houses out. So this is a market driven thing. What I would do to prevent this is I would urge Cal Poly to build more on-campus housing. I'd like to see a Greek Row on campus. I'd like to see the fraternities and sororities move on-campus like a lot of colleges have Greek Rows. And also I'm meeting next week, along with Councilmember Carter, with the University Administration, and WOW week is going to be a huge item on that agenda. Having 2,000 students pour into your block is not an acceptable way of living.

STEVE BARASCH: I think the question was why has the owner occupancy rate decreased so significantly here in San Luis Obispo and what can we do about it? Couple factors: First, the enrollment at Cal Poly has gone up to in excess of 19,500, and the amount of on-campus housing has not kept up with that full-time enrollment increase at all. If you remember, it was twenty years before they built the last series of dorms, before this recent series got built on campus. So the enrollment has way out-paced the housing. Secondly, San Luis Obispo has all the amenities. As the price of gas goes up, college kids and younger kids don't want to commute to some of the amenities here, the restaurants, the bars. Lastly, it's the job center of the County. The vacancy rate in San Luis is just about zero. And I would like to just ask my opponent to give me a list of all my non-standard rentals that are uninhabitable because I have permitted everything and my permit files are up to date. So if you would kindly provide me with that list, it would be very helpful. Thank you.

KEVIN RICE: Well, owner occupied, that's simple. It's student rentals. And the issue is Cal Poly. Kids don't want to live on campus for two reasons — it's not economical to them because the university has built higher end housing where the students can live cheaper off campus, closer to their friends, closer to the downtown fun, and we need to look at the balance there as to how Cal Poly can entice the kids to move back onto the college campus and keep them out of the neighborhoods — that's just bottom line, plain and simple.

COMMENTATOR: *If in the future budget cuts are necessary, would you support retaining the Neighborhood Services Specialists to continue to address blight issues?*

JOHN ASHBAUGH: Well, Mike, we actually added those positions during the time when we were cutting virtually everything in the budget. So I think you can be fairly well assured that their position within our City is safe. I'm a little concerned about something I just learned from Councilman Carpenter, that only half of their time is actually spent out in the field. But that may be due to the fact, that frankly the ordinance and controls that we have in place, appeals process, requires extensive documentation and appeals process and so forth. So I guess, while I'm surprised about that, I would like to see us take a look at that when the ordinance comes back to us for renewal because it certainly seems to me, that, at least a good part of it, is better spent in actual pursuit of those complaints derived from people out in the neighborhoods and also just getting proactive. That was the whole point of this — to be proactive. So I think they will be a permanent part of our City.

JEFF ARANGUENA: Yes, if I was on the Council starting with the new term, I would definitely like to retain that. I think as you see sales tax up, TOT tax up, our reserve is strong, our bond ratings are good, five contracts just got negotiated, I don't foresee anything in the future to put me in a position to vote against, or cutting this position.

JAN MARX: Thank you. Well, we are going to be back, that ordinance and that decision to create those Neighborhood Specialists is going to be coming back to City Council. I want to do a thorough review. I would like to look at their job functions and how they spend their time, and question whether they address the noise problems or not. It is an important issue, and I certainly want to hear from RQN about how it's actually working out there in the neighborhoods. So far, I have heard good comments. I also want to say that I think it's a plus that the violations are no longer complaint driven so neighbors are not having to "rat" on their neighbors in order to bring a situation to the City's attention. I think it's also good that we have a place on the City's website, which needs to be improved, where you can put complaints in that way. It's really something that I support and will fight for.

STEVE BARASCH: Thank you. I went to the last RQN Board Meeting, and one of the biggest concerns of the Board was how the Measure Y money was used. There was some misrepresentations made — there would be more neighborhood services coordinators, more neighborhood inspectors. And I keep asking the Council, "What did we ever do before Measure Y?" And I don't ever get a really clear answer where the potholes were fixed, the trees were trimmed. The other question is, How many of you have been to a City Council meeting in the last year? Seen it on TV? How many of you have seen it on TV? You see me there asking if the City is a good neighbor. I keep asking, is the City a good neighbor? I have derelict properties all around me. I've noticed four separate properties with lead based paint, debris, and collapsing fences — it's a mess. And I asked the City, are you a good neighbor? And, as a result of my going public, they have actually gone in and fixed up several properties they own. The City owns over 250 different properties. And at this point, I don't consider them a good neighbor under the current Council stewardship.

KEVIN RICE: Yes, I'll support those positions. But I want a few things out of the City on that. I want to see some numbers on the website, or somewhere available, so that we can see if they are performing and what they're doing. I want to know how many trash cans or whatever they're citing so that we know that we're getting our money and our value out of that. I agree with the Mayor that we should have a way to put complaints on the City website. We are getting a new website soon and I want to see a lot more things on that City website to make access to you and everybody else what the rules are and how to get in touch with the right people when the rules aren't being followed.

DAN CARPENTER: My simple answer is, yes. The amount of time spent in the field was just brought up last week at our monthly Neighborhood Services meeting at the Ludwick Center. It was a shock to me that we don't have more field time out of our two employees. I definitely would continue to support them and add to it, if we needed to, because I don't believe our positions have enough teeth in them. I still feel they need to address noise issues, we have other code-

enforcement issues that they could take care of that we don't need a sworn officer taking care of, so I would support it with additional responsibilities.

COMMENTATOR: *Switching gears just a little — we often mention the financial and intellectual benefits to the community of having two colleges nearby. Can you think of any costs to the community related to those colleges?*

JEFF ARANGUENA: That is a good question. Who here was at the City Council meeting two Tuesdays ago? I know some people here were there —our time keeper was there — I harassed her earlier and said I see you everywhere. The cost — hearing people testify about what happened in their neighborhood during WOW week was, there was no financial cost, but there was definitely some type of integrity costs there. So, we love having our education center. Cuesta and Cal Poly do great things. They generate students that come work in our City, work in our County. It's one of the best schools in California and in the country. But we have to build better relationships with them. And there are some ideas that have been brought up tonight, but if we don't put our foot down and if we don't get out there and start building a better, more active relationship with them, we will continue to see the costs continue to rise. and I would like to see some numbers from what happened after cleanup from WOW week, etc. There are definitely financial figures — I just don't have them in front of me, and I don't know where I could find them. But there definitely is a cost of having those two colleges here.

JAN MARX: Thank you. Well, about half of our city residents are between the ages 18 and 25. Whether or not they're students — that's another question. There are definitely costs that come with police service, firefighters, and Public Works in terms of dealing with parties and the aftermath in the downtown after the bars close and that kind of thing. But I also want to say that the students also contribute to the vitality of the community, and I think it's important to provide them with recreational opportunities and other things to do. I've always encouraged Cal Poly to have more on-campus events, have concerts and things like that, that draw the students into the campus at night. The other thing is providing more bike paths, more open space. I think there's going to be improvements at Laguna Lake Park. In general, we need to also remember that they are half of the residents of the City, and we need to provide them with alternatives. If all they have to do for fun is sit around and get plastered and cause problems for the neighbors, that's no good. We need to have more positive alternatives.

STEVE BARASCH: I think we all have to recognize in San Luis that we have a genuine jobs/housing imbalance. We have a lot of jobs here but we don't have the kind of housing that will support the many low to moderate type income jobs. Many of them are not even head-of-household jobs. There is clearly an additional cost inherent in a city with this kind of jobs/housing imbalance because we take on a lot of the municipal services for both the students who go to the two major universities as well as the commuters who come into town and leave town causing

the immense traffic on 101 and other arterial roads. I must say one of the things we could do better is assess the landlords, particularly in large complexes for any debris or any mess and make them responsible for cleaning it up because our city seems to be very—our resources are stretched too thin and we can't seem to keep up—even with 135 people in our Public Works Department—with the ongoing delivery of services in our community. Thank you.

KEVIN RICE: Well, there certainly are costs to the schools. Who gets woken up five times per night? As a firefighter, I've been in that spot — getting woken up five times after midnight to go out on some band-aid call and go back. Well that is a big cost to our local fire services to be going on those kinds of calls. You can imagine if that's fire, how many police runs there are, and I was talking to some of you tonight that in fact there's 100 pages in the police log every weekend on the big weekends. That's big bucks. We need to lean on the university and the college to make sure that there's some level of parity. Yea, we're reaping a lot of economic benefit from those schools, but we've got to make a little bit of parity. I think we're getting \$25,000.00 a year from Cal Poly for the use of our 100 foot ladder truck — that's not parity in my opinion. Also, the busing service. Providing busing is so important, and we need to make sure that Cal Poly pays for that bus because that's not the kids that are driving and parking on your street to go to school.

DAN CARPENTER: It's definitely something we struggle with all the time. The benefits to the community of having two colleges in our vicinity, and the costs. The benefit, the obvious financial benefit, is we receive extra tax dollars and we get to turn around and spend the tax dollars on our residents and remainder of the community. The cost is significant, obviously. The cost is to the individual property owners. They're experiencing the costs. But costs to our own staffing and resources where we have extra public safety on hand during those weekends that we expect things to get out of control. Many times they're working overtime, and that's costing extra. They'll be taking time off later, but their time in spending that overtime is a big cost.

JOHN ASHBAUGH: Having the colleges in our community are a great benefit — a great asset, in fact, that's part of the identity of Cal Poly. It's part of what gives us our vitality as a community. The costs are there, absolutely, and we experienced some of that last month after WOW week. I actually had occasion to speak with the President of Cal Poly last evening, and I know that he's probably not looking forward to the conversation that Jan and Andrew are going to have with him at the University Quarterly Luncheon Wednesday, whenever that is. I believe the university has good leadership now and it is paying attention and it is going to make some changes. It's made some already but not enough. We need to keep working on that, but the fact is Cal Poly does pay for water, for sewer service at least, for the fire service, and for a number of things that we actually benefit from a great deal. The transit system is as robust as it is because we have a contract with Cal Poly. So it works both ways and I think any changes to

that has to be in partnership with Cal Poly. And I want to keep that partnership solid.

COMMENTATOR: *Students tend to party late at night thru the early morning hours, often roaming residential streets, drunk and disorderly, looking for the next party. What actions will you take to help those neighborhoods see improvement in their quality of life?*

JAN MARX: Well, I do live on one of those streets so outside of getting up in the middle of the night and going out on my deck in my flannel nightgown and yelling at them, which is pretty effective, I do think that we need to keep looking at what we're doing in terms of regulating. And another thing is working with the university in this regards. Specifically with Cal Poly in my neighborhood, but I know north of Foothill. We're talking about Cuesta too. I have had conversations with Gil Stork about getting more contact with his students, and I think he's willing to do it, but right now he's focusing on accreditation. But after that, he's definitely willing to work with the City. And in terms of Cal Poly, they've now adopted "The Mustang Way." One of the tenants of that is – kind of a Code of Conduct – getting along with your neighbors and having respect for your neighbors. So I want to keep working with the university on that and if we need more ordinances we'll just make them.

STEVE BARASCH: I don't look as good in a flannel nightgown as my opponent but I can imagine the impact she has in her neighborhood now. How many of you live in neighborhoods that have clearly defined boundaries? Do you know the boundaries of your neighborhood pretty well – I mean you know there are mountains, and creeks and whatever? Most of us live in neighborhoods that are well defined. From my standpoint, I would like to see more neighborhood control and policing. We have a very strong neighborhood where I live, upper Johnson area, and people actually have signs that look out for their neighbors when they're away traveling. They house watch, and I would like to see perhaps better organized neighborhood associations. The police can only do so much, and their response time is rather slow sometimes, particularly on holiday weekends and big weekends. The SNAP are also very effective but they aren't sworn officers – they can't really effectively stop things. So if we could do more policing, have more neighborhood definition to monitor each others' homes, I think it would be really productive.

KEVIN RICE: Certainly policing is the big factor and the SNAP teams that we have had going. You know it's really a delicate balance. It's a balance between the students or the tenants and the landlords and the police and then you've got Cal Poly and what they don't provide on their campus, forcing the kids to do more fun things off campus, and what we have downtown and elsewhere. So some of the ideas that Mayor Marx talked about was that we need to provide more opportunities. How many people look downtown and all you see is more bars? I know I've heard that, okay? Well when I drive around close to campus on a

Friday night, all I see is bars, except there's no regulation, no control other than the police walking by. But the police aren't welcome to walk in and check on those bars. So I think there's a careful balance we need to make about downsizing Downtown Brew versus saying hey, that's a managed place and we need to really look at what the police are saying in that maybe it's not a good idea to make sure Downtown Brew is too small because they're under police control when they're there.

DAN CARPENTER: I definitely think we have to have more of our public safety out there on these weekends. And I say we should expect that Cal Poly will provide those resources. There's no way I'd be in agreement to us spending our resources for an environment they're creating. And once you have those officers out on the street and you start writing a bunch of tickets for drunk in public, disorderly conduct, word will get out and it will stop; but we have to get the resources to provide that, and not at our cost.

JOHN ASHBAUGH: I'm a little confused Dan. If you're not in support of having City public safety people patrolling these neighborhoods but you expect university police, you're going to be waiting for a very long time for them to take any action. From my understanding, they don't have any jurisdiction off-campus. Have I misunderstood? Well, that half mile may not be enough as the problems spread farther. I support all the measures we have taken since April of 2010 when we passed the Unruly Gathering Ordinance — that's one. The Social Host Ordinance was another. Enhancing the fines for noisy parties is another. We still have far too many complaints, and Frank [Kassak] has been tracking these very carefully over the years, but you have seen a positive trend – not enough by any means yet – but we're always working on ways to improve that. This Council has been very receptive to the input from your organization and others in the community about how best to continue to, as I said, maintain the blessings of quiet seclusion.

JEFF ARANGUENA: I think there has to be a balanced approach. I think the right answer is somewhere between what Dan was talking about – some sort of preventative maintenance. When I see some of the problems taking place, and I never thought I'd be the one yelling outside my door at the age of 30 – I am. They're jumping in the pool making noises in the complex where I live, and I have to teach in the morning so I've become the angry old 30 year old who yells out at Cal Poly and Cuesta kids. I think one of the biggest things when you're talking about preventative maintenance in a sense, and this is what we're talking about, is outreach. We gotta get out there, we gotta talk to them, we gotta let them know, and as Dan said, hey listen, if we're gonna ticket them, we're gonna ticket them. If they know that's coming and they still do it, then that's their fault. But I think if we have a better outreach program with Cal Poly, with Cuesta, and with the university police as well, if we do that, we can also not only help to solve that problem but we can do what a lot of people do currently right now, and I would definitely advise everyone to do this. You can talk to those kids. One of the teachers that I work with had words in that area, and they just have an open

communication and they'll say, listen, Terry, we're having a party this weekend and as long as there's that understanding, they can sometimes narrow that down and narrow the complaint down as well and they're both happy.

COMMENTATOR: *What do you think is the single most important reason for the exodus of permanent residents and how would you reverse that trend?*

STEVE BARASCH: I've been waiting for that question all night. From an economic standpoint, as said earlier, to some degree it's more prudent for landlords and owners to rent houses in San Luis Obispo. They're worth more as a rental, and I think the only thing we can really do is cap the enrollment at the universities which is not controlled locally, it's controlled at the State Chancellor's Office. Due to public education pressures, San Luis is really getting the brunt of what is happening with state education, and we feel the pressure in the neighborhoods, and we feel the pressure in and around the more urbanized portions of town because we are basically the recipient of the large public education programs in the city. I think we're not going to change the market forces, as long as the university keeps increasing its enrollment. The only thing we can do is really put the clamps on the enrollment increases and make sure the administration understands the neighborhood problems and addresses them head on. Thank you.

JAN MARX: In just talking about my neighborhood. Part of what's happening is that people who own those houses get old and move on and then either they or their children want to rent them out, as I said earlier, because the price of housing is so low they want to wait for the market to go back up. So there's an economic factor. But the other thing is that it is really hard, once a house has been converted over to a student rental, to ever get it to go back to an owner occupier or a permanent renter who is a working person. It's really hard. I have been working with the realtors when I address them. I always bring this up, please don't advertise a house as Poly Parents or investors. Please open up the market when you go to show it. Show it and don't talk down the neighborhoods that have students in them. I think that part of what we need to do is to continue to work with the students so that just being in a mixed neighborhood isn't necessarily a detriment. Basically, we've lived there almost 25 years and we enjoy it. Communication is the key.

JEFF ARANGUENA: I think Steve has mentioned a lot of great things here. It's a problem that doesn't have an easy fix. I think the cost of living in this area is extremely high. I would imagine most of you have lived here for quite some time, but being somebody who's been here, like I said the first time I moved down here was ten years ago, the cost of living was high then. We haven't seen any change. We live in an area that's 70 degrees usually everyday. The expense of that is that you're going to have high property values. The other areas around us have become more attractive. I know, as I have gone through the Teaching Credential Program and Grad School and all that good stuff and become a young professional

in the community, a lot of people who haven't had the ability to get the higher income job – I guess I shouldn't say a teaching job is a higher income job, but more of a stable job – they have moved to places like Atascadero and Grover Beach and what not, because it just is cheaper. I think if you're going to find a long-term answer, it's going to be head-of-household jobs. So if we can work on that – I know people have discussed stream-lining the permit process. If we can do that, attract more businesses and bring in higher income potential to this community, then we might be able to start that conversation.

JOHN ASHBAUGH: The question again was the single most important reason for the exodus of permanent owner-occupied owners from San Luis Obispo. I think the reason for it frankly is simply market forces. As Jeff said, these houses, when they go on the market, unfortunately there just isn't enough demand from those who do hold or are getting head-of-household jobs or are returning to San Luis Obispo in that supply aspect of it — I'm sorry the demand for that type of housing. The single most important thing we can do, in my opinion, is support what Cal Poly is apparently proposing, which is the addition of another several thousand units on their campus so that part of the demand can be met by on-campus housing. That again frees up the housing in the City. I think then we have to work on the things that Jan was talking about as far as encouraging investors, realtors, and buyers of these homes to move into them to have them ready for owner-occupancy again. And it can be done.

DAN CARPENTER: I think the major reason is pretty obvious for the exodus of our permanent residents. It has to do with the deterioration of the neighborhoods. I can't tell you how many people I talk to who have just had it. If they can't find a place in another area of San Luis (and there are other areas too that are just as bad as next to campus, the neighborhoods directly adjacent to downtown suffer all the night issues, the fallout of the late night drinkers who are walking home at night) then they move out of the city. It happens as much as a half mile or a mile away too. So I'm certain that's the cause of people leaving. They're leaving, they're moving to other areas, and keeping their house, as has been mentioned before, as a rental because the rental rates are high. I think we have to continue to encourage Cal Poly to provide more housing on campus and mandate that they live on campus to a certain year.

KEVIN RICE: Well, it's simply economics. You can rent (out) a room for \$700 bucks in a four bedroom house — it doesn't pay to live there — it pays not to live there. Absolutely, Cal Poly needs to build some more housing on campus, or they're going to be living in our rental houses. And the only way to change the market dynamic is to change the demand for the houses. Because the students are willing to pack five or six into a house, and most families aren't. So it makes it more valuable as a student rental than it is for a family rental or owner occupied. So, if Cal Poly doesn't build them, then maybe we should build them out on Hwy 1 somewhere, but we need to address that demand for housing. Then second of all, the students compete for our jobs. So we don't have people making

the money they can afford to pay more than the students are willing to pay when there's basically five kids living in one house. So, we're getting it on both ends. And the answer is to work with the university to provide more for the students, and you know, I hate to say it in this crowd, but maybe Cal Poly needs to provide some alcohol and bars on-campus to deal with their own problems, instead of them all coming into SLO.

COMMENTATOR: *This next one is another show of hands. The question is: SLO is the second densest city in the county; Grover Beach is the first. Do you think SLO should continue to increase its density? If you say yes, just raise your hand please. If you say yes, there's a chance for you to make a comment.*

JOHN ASHBAUGH: The fact is that I think San Luis Obispo will be decreasing its density because of the plans we've made in certain areas like the Margarita, like the Orcutt area specific plan, where there is a mix of density. But overall I think that the outcome and the hope and realization of those projects overall will generally decrease the density that we have now. That's my prediction and I'm sticking to it.

JAN MARX: I just want to say I think the R-1 neighborhoods should definitely be protected, but I do think there is a need for multi-family housing and for more student housing. And that's very dense housing. That's my qualification.

STEVE BARASCH: When you surround yourself with green belt and you become the central job center of the county — I mean there's 85,000 people that are in San Luis during the day and only 45,000 residents, you inherently encourage higher density. As an architect, and a builder, and as a property manager, there's always going to be a need for a secondary dwelling, there's always going to be a need for a guest house, even in an R-1 area, doesn't mean it's appropriate, but the zoning does allow for it. So I want to say that if we encourage higher density in the appropriate locations, then we can preserve the R-1 and R-2 neighborhoods a lot better.

JEFF ARANGUENA: And I'm a fan in appropriate areas — the live/work situation that you've seen take place — I know right down the road from me off of Johnson and Monterey, there's a nice little Sushi place that has opened up but on top of that are residences there as well. So for re-development for some of these areas — if we're doing projects like that — I'm definitely in favor of them.

DAN CARPENTER: I'll just stick to your question, no.

KEVIN RICE: Everybody flip-flopped once they got to expand. I'm saying no because you build this stuff and then there's cars that come along with it. There's five bodies that go in that room that was meant for three. You increase the density and it impacts and it spills out — there's more people, more trash, and everything else.

COMMENTATOR: *Do you agree with the locations city staff identified as areas for increased housing density and specified in paragraph 6.12 of the 2010 Housing Element update? If yes or don't know, do you think it was okay for staff to include those areas without notifying nearby residents or obtaining their comments?*

DAN CARPENTER: From what I remember from it, and I don't have it in front of me, I do agree with it. But the part I don't agree with is a lack of public input on it. And that bothers me because we didn't hear from the community about what they thought, if the location was proper. And that is part of an ongoing problem — is proper notification. We do public outreach, we hold these public workshops — we're doing it now with our Land Use — but people don't show up, and they don't show up until the end. So I am curious to see why we didn't have public input at that time. If it was rammed through to get it that way, I have no idea why it happened. I would encourage more public input.

JOHN ASHBAUGH: Staff often makes proposals that then get aired at the community level; then turn to the neighborhood outreach and then long before they reach the Council, they should have been heard at the neighborhood level. But if not, if there's a problem with that, then we should take steps to correct it. If there is a problem with the process by which the last Housing Element emerged, then we will make sure that doesn't occur with the next one. And also with our Land Use and Circulation Element with much more public involvement right now in terms our decision making.

JEFF ARANGUENA: I think a big part of this campaign for me over the past six months has been getting out there, getting to know people, knocking on doors, and just listening to the people. I mean that's been a big part of why I got into this race — because I think I am an individual who can actually get out there and take the issues to the people, get their feedback, and take that back to the Council. So in this case, with anything like this, there definitely needs to be more public input on this process. I'm running for City Council because I want to be the individual who goes to the people and actually hears what they have to say, not just a form that they get in the mail. I would like to go knock on doors and believe I have the energy and the time and the desire to do that to get the input from the people, because ultimately, at the end of the day, what a representative democracy is about is you're that chain link between what the people needs and desires are and what actually gets done. So I want to see a new level of input, a new level of outreach from the City Council to get out there and ask the people and get input from the people for projects like this.

JAN MARX: Well, I'm a believer in early and meaningful input from the neighborhoods as to any decision that is undertaken which involves the neighborhoods. And I'm not sure about the exact section 6.12, but it is my understanding that what has been designated as infill right now are the areas of the city where there are no structures, so it's a matter of filling in. I'm not sure

exactly what that provision provides for. However, I do think the nearby residents should have been notified, and it's something that I really want to see happen with the Land Use and Circulation Element. That's one of the reasons why I want to have mapped neighborhoods strongly defined neighborhoods and neighborhood councils so that the neighborhoods are empowered so that if there are decisions coming up, it's really easy for city staff and council members to say, I'm going to talk to the neighborhood coordinator over here because something is happening over there that will impact their neighborhood. Right now we're not organized enough.

STEVE BARASCH: To address this question head on, in 2004, Andrew Carter and I served on the then Housing Element Update. This was a historic document because it changed the way we looked at market-rate low- to moderate-housing. The state mandates that we have to deliver a certain amount of low- to moderate-income housing — something called affordable by design — and the state actually checks with the city to see if it's meeting its fair share quota. I think the 2010 document was a reflection on the update from the 2004-2005 Housing Element. It really didn't change much. All it did was identify higher potential receiver zones where you could add density. Whether you like it or not, the city is bound to its Housing Element which does mandate we have to deliver housing in each economic sphere. Public input is absolutely essential to the process, but sometimes the current staff and the council don't listen very well. They have their mind made up because they have agendas that are sometimes more important than listening to the public at large.

KEVIN RICE: Well, who filled out their Measure Y survey way back when – six years ago – and you could check whether you wanted a better Senior Center, fix pot holes or more police? Remember that survey? We've seen more than one survey over the years and we each check our box and think that's what we're getting. How many got what they thought they were getting from Measure Y? I don't feel like the city came through. And the Land Use and Circulation Element Task Force — who's been to one of those meetings so far? Well, you're on the committee, of course. I've been to several of those, and I'm really concerned because I don't think the survey is really getting the community's broader input. When the whole plan is done and bound, it's going to say, "Oh, we had all this community input," and I bet maybe five of you filled out a survey in the end. So there is a real problem when the city says we're going to do something — did we actually do the outreach or did we just get some of the in-crowd to fill out the survey. Maybe the bike people were all over the LUCE Survey and that was all 400 of the respondents because they want to get their bike lanes. Did they get everybody? That is my concern with this issue and with Measure Y and with other issues.

COMMENTATOR: *Current City policy is to provide notice to residents within 300 feet of a pending project. Do you think, because of the proliferation of rental*

properties, that this distance should be expanded? (Y/N) If yes, to what distance?

JOHN ASHBAUGH: Well, 300 feet is the statutory distance under State Planning law. It's certainly not impossible for us to extend that but whether that's a good idea, it would have to be considered in the light of the additional costs associated with that and how these additional costs, if any, would be funded. So, I'd be willing to look at that question. I don't want to commit myself at this point but, frankly, the 300 feet distance is pretty standard, and I would point out — I would note that in fact that it's kind of interesting that as elected officials, we have to declare a property that we own, in fact in my case my wife's downtown leased property, her office, is (unintelligible) I believe around that we have to declare any conflicts of interest in that we have to avoid, in fact we have to leave the room when any decision is being discussed. So maybe 500 feet could be done — I'd be willing to look at it.

JEFF ARANGUENA: This is a prime example of wanting to get more input from the actual individuals that this will impact. I think when you're looking at a city which has 60% people who rent versus 40% who own, one of the things I'd like to hear is the voice of the people. As John said earlier, that is State law so it would be one of the things that I'd like to hear the pros and cons of it and actually listen to the people who, in fact, have a high opinion of this.

JAN MARX: As John Ashbaugh said as city council members or candidates, you have to list all of the real properties that you own as a requirement of the Fair Political Practices Committee because there is an inherent conflict if you own property within 500 feet of a proposed project. I think 500 feet would be better than 300 feet — I don't know whether 300 feet is a statutory requirement or not, but I do want to say that relying on post cards is not the way to go. I think that we need to move into the electronic age, and this is another reason why I want to have Neighborhood Councils and have them organized so we can actually have e-mail chains with maps and with URL's to the City website and actually get the information out there and be more transparent. Let the people out there know what's happening. Often they get these postcards and they think, "Oh, somebody's putting on a deck." They don't understand that it could be something that really seriously affects the value of their property and their quality of life. So we need to really make the whole process more alive.

STEVE BARASCH: I would support a 500 foot radius. I know that the state does require a 300 foot radius now for any subdivision, that is indeed a state requirement, and I also support tenants, as well as landlords, getting noticed because right now only the property owners get the post cards. The post cards are very understated in terms of the issues. We have a process in San Luis that really encourages public participation but only when the public pays attention. So we can't rent airplanes or biplanes and we can't put up neon signs — oh John could, he has the budget — but if we had tenants also getting the list, they would

inform their landlords, and I think the landlord will be much more sensitive to new development or infill development in and around their properties.

KEVIN RICE: It's funny where I work there's a lot of filming going on. And we get postcards all the time at the fire station that says there's going to be filming at this location tomorrow and there's going to be vulgar dialogue and a man smoking and maybe some simulated gun fire or something like that. So you'd think if they could notify you for a film permit right on your doorstep that they could do that for a big project. And the bigger the project, go out to 1,000 feet. If they're going to build a 200 unit condo. Or something like that, yea, I support the more notice the better, and please provide more than adequate parking on these projects since that's the major impact because they're willing to walk and park their cars three blocks down.

DAN CARPENTER: I would definitely support greater than 300 feet. I think that's totally inadequate. 500 or even 1,000 because the more community input we get in the beginning the more buy-in you have from the community and the less we have to face issues later on where we did not get that input. A couple of examples — the Johnson Avenue underpass. They sent notices to 300 feet. It impacted people a mile away who never got noticed. And the 80 plus units they're going to build as infill at that same intersection of San Luis Drive and Johnson, they're noticing people 300 feet away. It impacts people all the way down to Monterey Street and all the way up to Laurel Lane. Those are the kinds of issues we need to get more public input in. So 300 feet to me definitely seems inadequate.

COMMENTATOR: *This is a change of pace, but it is something the Council is currently looking at. The current Council has directed staff to look into expanding the Safe Parking Program throughout the City into business and/or church parking lots. Many of these lots are likely to be in or adjacent to residential neighborhoods. Does shifting the transient population from a commercial area to business or residential areas solve the problem or does it create another level of stress on already over-burdened residential neighborhoods? How would you propose addressing the issue—including dealing with those who do not want help?*

JEFF ARANGUENA: That's a great question. First of all, in order to solve a problem, you have to understand the problem and with regard to the homeless issue, you have about 40% of those individuals who are transient, 40% of those individuals who have mental health issues, and the remainder are actual individuals who have been deemed individuals who want help. If you look at what they're doing in Santa Barbara, which I'm a big fan of, they have expanded the Safe Parking Program to about 50 actual places. They've had a lot of success there. And I think one of the reasons they've had that success is because they've been able to do it in areas that, in fact, have been agreed upon. In this case, what we have going on with our City, I would like to see the city work with the county to produce some kind of voucher program where city parks and county

parks could be used as parking spaces instead of areas, like the question addressed, concerns in residential areas. If we could build that relationship with the county and see if we can't open up those parking spaces, we could potentially expand the parking program and expand it in a way that it might not impact the residential areas as much.

JAN MARX: Thank you. I think there are inherent problems in locating safe parking pods, as they're called, approximately five or six cars, in residential neighborhoods. So, what Council has directed staff to do is to come back to us with a proposal, and I think it has to be extremely carefully fine-tuned so that we don't end up creating problems in the neighborhoods. That's one of the reasons that I stood up for the prohibition of overnight camping. It's because I have gotten all kinds of calls from people in neighborhoods of people just showing up, camping in their cars, and people do not feel safe in their own homes, and that's not acceptable. On the other hand, I think the Safe Parking Program really needs to be linked to some kind of case management, someone with some kind of professional training, so that you have people in those programs who are actually a point of contact for services so that people who need help and are willing to accept help can be helped. Eventually, we want all those people housed.

STEVE BARASCH: How many of you have had problems with the homeless in San Luis, in your neighborhood so far — just raise your hand? I don't see too many hands but a few of you have. I think what the city's done is woefully inadequate by allowing a major parking area of five spaces next to the homeless shelter. Today I went around and looked for RV's. I have an office on Prado Road which is ground zero for the homeless problem. And I saw 125 RV's parked to the south of the Elks Club Lodge. We have defacto safe parking zones in San Luis Obispo right now, and five spaces isn't going to change much in the course of our conflicts between the homeless and the neighborhoods. What I would suggest is the city start thinking outside the box and start working with private and public organizations because, in business, we take the path of least resistance. And if you're living in an RV, you're going to take the path of least resistance. And you're going to locate yourself where you get harassed the least. So it's already working in a defacto way. I don't think we have really begun to explore the problem fully.

KEVIN RICE: I agree the current program is incredibly, woefully short of dealing with the problem. We are providing five parking spaces when there are several hundred homeless living out in multiple streets. We could do two things: We could hammer them, like the current Council has been doing and then they go into the creeks, trash the creeks, and then we get a fire behind Lincoln Street — maybe burn a house down, or we can try to work with the people who want help. We have responsible churches and organization. Would you be opposed to them taking on one or two of the people that they find responsible and honorable enough to live on their property? Do you think the churches want a guy creating problems who's living on their property? That's going to de-centralize the crowd.

There's problems when they're centralized in groups. So, yes, I think we should get them out into a few church lots, try it out, maybe a few in parks. But getting sued, spending \$500,000 on a lawsuit, and getting nowhere is not the solution.

DAN CARPENTER: I think we have to remember the Safe Parking Program is a pilot program. We've had it less than six months to try to see if that kind of process works for the organization that's running it, CAPSLO. They're telling us that it works for them. That doesn't mean that it works for all the homeless people who don't want to live in housing or are not able to live in housing. I would not be in favor of putting these pods all over town. I think you take the problem and you spread it around like that – putting it into neighborhoods and environments where people never bought into that when they bought their property or they moved there – they did not have that expectation. So I think we find a location, somewhere on the peripheral of the city where we can park 40 to 50 vehicles, it's easier to manage, you only need one type of security, you have water, sewer, all the services they need. There has to be some accountability for it and certainly security is a big issue. But I would not spread it out all over town.

JOHN ASHBAUGH: No, not Laguna Lake Park, sorry. In fact, I'm not sure if I'm ready to endorse any site in the peripheral. Look what happened with Sunny Acres, for example, the Dan De Vul Sunny Acres, and I want to come back to Sunny Acres in just a minute and that would be the other Sunny Acres. I'm going to disagree with my colleague, Jeff, on singing the praises of the Santa Barbara program. There are a lot of problems with that safe parking program, and I'm not sure this is the model we want to emulate, frankly. I think the model we're going to want to emulate is our own model. We are creating it, we're evolving it as we learn more about the dimension of this problem and as we develop the resources to address it. Frankly, as the City's representative with the Community Action Partnership, I have been heavily involved and been rolling up my sleeves in working on the development of a new Homeless Services Center to replace the Maxine Lewis Homeless Center which, frankly, is falling apart. While we also talked about the problems with students, there are far more problems – actually we spend 70% of our police calls, night calls, are with the transient and homeless population. Today's *Tribune* had a very serious objection to the proposed Homeless Services Center site by one our prominent members of the business community so the answer to part of the question is that, are we just shifting the problem to commercial and industrial areas? Yes, we are and frankly, yes, that is going to be the Homeless Services Center site and, if I have anything to say about it, we are going to proceed with that site. We're going to solve the problems associated with that site. I wish I had more time to talk about homeless issues.

COMMENTATOR: *This next question is from the audience, and it is a yes or no question. Are you aware that there are over fourteen sober living homes in San Luis Obispo, that they are unlicensed, and that they don't have to follow the City's zoning rules? Just raise your hands.*

ANSWER: Steve, John, Jan, and Kevin raise their hands.

COMMENTATOR: *Do you think that Measure Y funds have been spent in the neighborhoods as was promised to the voters? If elected, what would you do to ensure neighborhood streets, sidewalks, etc. are not forgotten or ignored?*

JAN MARX: Well, the expectations that were raised in terms of the wording on the ballots were not specific promises because it was a general purpose kind of measure and that meant that we only had to have 50%. If it had been specific, we would have had to have two-thirds to have passed it. I was disappointed that we didn't get the two patrol agents that we hoped for in that, and I have ideas for Measure Y, if it's reenacted. One thing I'd like to do is make sure there are advisory questions put on the ballot at the same time as Measure Y, so that we have real clear input from the community about what they want. And the other thing is to make it part of the General Fund but have each expenditure voted on separately by the City Council so we can have public hearings on each expenditure and definitely want more input from the neighborhoods, more infrastructure, and more patrols.

STEVE BARASCH: The answer to your question is absolutely not. I want to be really clear on that. I can't support the renewal of Measure Y in its present form. I think we have among us someone who wrote the opposition paper to Measure Y when it was first proposed. Ms. Pinard was then on the County Board of Supervisors. She and I have had long discussions on this issue. I believe that we have to act (as local citizens, homeowners, and concerned neighbors) as watch dogs. We have to have clear guarantees that the Measure Y funds will be spent as promised. I went through probably ten workshops where we were told, by the then finance director and the then CEO of the City, that Measure Y funds were going to be earmarked predominately for public and civic improvements — sidewalks, curbs, gutters, creek clean-out (which we don't do as routinely). So I keep asking the question to the Council, "What did we ever do before Measure Y when everything was a lot better?"

KEVIN RICE: No, I certainly don't feel like we got our money's worth out of Measure Y. And of course that got hit pretty hard by Binding Arbitration which I opposed in 2000 in Measure S. Remember it was Measure S back in 2000. We heard the Mayor just say, well it was a general thing, it wasn't specific because otherwise it would have required a two-thirds vote. Well, that's true, but the Council isn't spending it on specific things, and they have the ability to do that, and they're using it as a general thing. They need to make some promises and be transparent as to how they're spending and take the input from, say, the original surveys. Certainly it is general, but you have the latitude to spend it on something specific. We have been neglecting CIP's (Capital Improvement Projects), and we need to get back on our streets and our no parking signs — they're blank because the sun has bleached them — so that it protects our neighborhoods.

DAN CARPENTER: Measure Y definitely did not meet the promises that it was given to the neighborhoods in 2006, and the reason why is that 2008 Binding Arbitration Decision where that money was used to back-fill salaries and pensions. And that brings to light what happens with a general purpose sales tax. Every two years you have the possibility of a new Council who will, through the budget cycle, appropriate those funds to whatever their priorities are, the priorities the community comes up with. So there is value in having a specific use tax. It does require a two-thirds, and what's wrong with that? It provides a super majority of the community wanting money spent specifically on particular items, and why not. That forces your elected officials to follow what your expectations are of your tax funds.

JOHN ASHBAUGH: Well I'm sorry, Dan, but I can't think of a better prescription for channeling a source of five million dollars available to our City right now which is what you're suggesting. If we are to itemize every dollar where Measure Y monies are going to go, we are going to have to get a two-thirds vote. I'm afraid that's a bridge too far. Now I have with me, the actual original Measure Y promotional flier. There are an awful lot of names in this community on this, and I hope every single one of them would support my assessment that maybe we haven't spent the money exactly as our own individual priorities would have spent it, but we have spent it in the matter consistent with the process in the spirit of Measure Y. I have here for example, Measure Y, 2009-2011 Financial Plan with me and I have a similar one for 2012-13 that we're spending right now. So we know where every dime of Measure Y money has gone. And we've done our best, as a city, to communicate the value to this City as we have done during the goal setting process. I have one good example for you: Measure Y called for more money to be spent on the Senior Center. We did spend it. We remodeled the kitchen, we built the Mitchell Park parking lot and they're happy with that, I hope.

JEFF ARANGUENA: Being kind of a newcomer to this, I look at how government works and how government impacts people's lives, and this is a prime example of how my being a fresh face on the Council could actually be a benefit. And with that being said regarding Measure Y — I would support the renewal — yes, we do need capital improvement, yes we do want to explore open space — but only if we can bring a new level of transparency. Now John talked about these fliers here, but when I go out and I talk to people, they haven't seen this. They're there to support Measure Y, they signed onto something that they thought was going to be something fantastic and they're OK with continuing to support it, but they want to see a new level of transparency, a new level of promotion with this project — with this sales tax. I mean they want to see where these funds are being spent. Yes, it's on the website, but they want to see more promotion when they're driving through downtown, when they're seeing these areas that are supposed to be improved by the tax itself. So we can bring a new level of promotion, kind of like I said before, I'm kind of a New Deal government kind of nerd where during the New Deal they promoted some of these general taxes. If we can do some of that at the city level, and if I got full support from the rest of Council, I would hope

that my being on the Council can help to come up with some ideas for these promotional possibilities.

COMMENTATOR: *OK, the night is growing long so we've got some questions here that will be simply raise your hands for yes and raise our hands for no and then we'll go back to some questions. The first one is very short. Will you vigorously support and encourage enforcement of the City's High Occupancy Ordinance? Yes, please raise your hands.*

ANSWER: All candidates raised their hands, supported--yes.

COMMENTATOR: *The next question's also a yes or no and it's a long question so bear with me. It is long-time City policy that new development pays its own way – except when Council publicly votes to waive part or all of the fees for a community-wide benefit. When developer fees do not cover the costs of new development, the costs do not go away – they are shifted to city residents through new charges, lowered levels of service, or as a new debt to the city budget. Although there has been tremendous input from development and commercial interests to lower developers' fees, there has been little to no input from residents who will be affected for years to come. Will you vote to maintain the policy that new development "pays its own way" – with of course the current exemption? Yes, please raise your hands.*

ANSWER: Steve, Jan, Jeff, and John voting yes. Dan and Kevin voting no.

COMMENTATOR: *The next questions is an answer yes or no. Our General Plan requires early and meaningful notification of residents about projects that may affect them—including requiring meetings in neighborhoods. Not following these requirements has caused issues to "blow up" and resulted in additional costs in time and manpower. We've talked a little about this already. Will you support more vigorous adherence to this requirement? Raise your hands if you say yes.*

ANSWER: All candidates said yes. Thank you, you just saved a page of questions.

COMMENTATOR: *What actions are you, personally, willing to take to encourage Cal Poly to take responsibility for the off-campus actions of their students?*

STEVE BARASCH: Well, recently I got probably the world's highest notice of noise violation fines, and I think if the students also were monitored by the university and got fines for misbehavior on and around the campus, like the landlords get fined for the actions of their tenants, I think patrolling would be a lot more rigorous. I think they would be much more sensitive to the needs of the neighborhoods surrounding than they are currently. I just don't think the SNAPs and our City police have the resources to be there to break up thirty parties an hour which occur after our curfew of 10:00 p.m. So, really strongly believe that

Cal Poly could do a lot more self-policing and I think, as I said earlier, if we have stronger Neighborhood Watch programs, we could turn people in for egregious behavior faster than the responses by the local police.

KEVIN RICE: Well certainly sitting down is the most responsible thing to do – you've got to negotiate with them. But I don't think paying \$25,000 for the use of our ladder truck is parity, like I said earlier. We don't have to provide a lot of things that we do provide to them, and we need to work harder to put the screws on them to provide more and to keep the problems on campus. And that's just going to come through creativity through your ideas. I mean you're looking for my ideas but you guys are the experts and it's your job, as much as mine, to bring good ideas to the Council so that we can think these things out together and go sit down with Cal Poly and come up with something that works. All of these questions tonight – they don't have simple solutions.

DAN CARPENTER: I think it's important that Cal Poly take responsibility for their students, and I've said that, and I'll continue to say that. After this last WOW week, I sat down with our City Manager, and I told her exactly what I would do. I would put it to Cal Poly that they are going to have to provide the financial resources for us to provide extra policing during those specific times when we know the problems are going to occur. What we have nowhere near covers what we need to have in our neighborhoods. So, if it takes 200 extra officers for a WOW weekend, then they need to foot the bill for that. And I expressed that very clearly to our City Manager that when she meets with them, and our Council does too, I would hope they would ensure that.

JOHN ASHBAUGH: I took an action last evening when I spoke to President Armstrong at the reception after the Symphony, and I too told him that there was a lot of concern – and he is aware of that already – as to what happened over the WOW week. Merely confining the official activities of WOW week on campus will not address the problem. What we need is a better partnership with Cal Poly and I'm going to work to establish that. I have my concerns. I've just learned recently – I'm not sure this is the case and I may just be spouting a false rumor here – that Cal Poly's police department has been cut back significantly. If that's the case, it doesn't matter how much of a radius they can enforce around Cal Poly – they're not going to have the resources to do it. Good luck in getting any financial resources out of this institution, especially if Proposition 30 is not passed. Cal Poly might be seeing a 40 million dollar cut-back, and a lot of that is going to come out of any kind of extra resources, including payments they're now obligated to make to us for city services that they now pay for. So, I hope we have a better partnership with them – I'm going to work for that in every way I can. I'm going to see that we can establish better responsibilities on their part.

JEFF ARANGUENA: Well, this is an area where I think I can shine. As Kevin mentioned, this is about sitting down and meeting with people. Almost 45% of the population in this city is individuals between the ages of 18 to 25. Being the

younger, fresher face on the Council, if I can get in there, get into Cal Poly and speak with these kids, speak with these students, bring students to the table, bring a new outlook and say hey listen, you're here for an education, not necessarily here just to party, and here are the concerns of the individuals who are going to be here after your graduate. My hope is that if I can do that and if I do allocate the time, which I will 'cause it is a top priority, working with Cal Poly, which is what we've all said up here — that it's a major priority that needs to be taken up by this Council, encouraging that relationship to work with individuals to ensure that we can move forward so that these students who are coming here for four or five years and then leaving, have a common understanding of the impact that they're having, not just on themselves, but on the greater community as a whole.

JAN MARX: Thank you. Well I have met with President Armstrong and, as I mentioned earlier, this Wednesday Council Member Carter and I are meeting with the university at these quarterly meetings that we have, and we are definitely going to be talking about WOW week. There is a culture of trashing the neighborhoods that is perpetuated at Cal Poly. It's quite clear, it emanates from Hathaway Street and I would propose writing letters to the property owners — the landlords — I think it has been very effective working with the landlords and telling them you're also responsible for what goes on on your premises. We got Mardi Gras under control, we got Poly Royal under control, WOW week is next as far as I'm concerned. These freshmen would not behave that way in Rancho Cucamonga or wherever they're from. But when they get here, the first thing they get is a signal that, "Hey let's all go trash the neighborhoods — that's what we do at Cal Poly." That has to change.

COMMENTATOR: *This is another question from the audience, and it kind of dove-tails with what we're speaking about here and it's consolidating two questions. Many problems are caused by student drinking — under age drinking is of special concern. Can the City review its policies and regulations to crack down on under-age drinking? For instance: arrest under-age drinkers, pull use permits if parties are out of control and under-age drinkers are at the party?*

JAN MARX: This is not a yes or no question? But I'll say yes, I think the City can. This is a real problem. As someone who has raised two teenagers in San Luis Obispo, I have to say that it's a problem for the residents of kids that age. They sneak out and they go to these parties (not all of them, but mine did), and it's a real problem. I think the City has gone a long way in this regard but we need to make sure that we have the staffing to do it. And that's one of the reasons why I want to beef up the patrols in the neighborhoods. I think it's really important, and part of that has to do with making sure that the bar scene in the downtown is kept under control too. Because what happens is that all of our police end up going to the downtown to deal with what is happening there, and then what's happening in the neighborhoods is only secondary, and it needs to be primary as far as I'm concerned.

JEFF ARANGUENA: Well, I bring a unique perspective to this question because I do teach high school and I work with sixteen to eighteen year olds at an "at risk" high school. So it's not just the college students, it is actual high school students as well. So I want to applaud the majority of the Council who earlier (I believe sometime last year) passed the Curfew Ordinance because I think for people who are good parents and understand that they do keep a tight wrap on their children, there are those who don't. I work with those kids who have parents who don't know where they're at. That's a real problem. I think this is a major priority for the next Council. I think you've seen it here tonight how important it is for this next Council to start off with WOW week but also instill a new mentality when it comes to solving these problems. My hope is that I can bring the kind of understanding and empathy with what it's like to work with teenagers who do go out and have this type of fun and get themselves in these types of situations and hope that I can bring it to the next Council as a priority. We need to be able to deal with these individuals on the basis that we're going to start focusing on cleaning up this problem.

JOHN ASHBAUGH: Thank you, Jeff, for your compliment because it means a lot to me. I'll tell you, the Curfew Ordinance, when we passed it, was one of the more difficult issues any of us have had to deal with, and it provoked a lot of arguments between me and my wife and my daughter. They think I'm too much of a nanny. The fact is that we did modify the terms of the Curfew so it was a little less onerous than it would have been as originally proposed. But we've made a lot of progress on that, as well as all the other issues. But again, it's a continual process. We're learning a lot, we don't have it under control yet, but we're getting there. I applaud your organization again for the role you have taken in giving us — you've got our back when it comes to issues like that and I want to thank you for that because it helps a lot.

DAN CARPENTER: Of course I believe there's a lot more we can do to take care of under-age drinking. It's going to take more resources but it also takes, from the top down, a message that it's not going to be tolerated, because each police officer out in the field has discretion. And if the Chief, as our previous Chief was giving a message of more tolerance, then of course they aren't going to cite as many. I have given a clear direction to this Police Chief when he signed on, that if we're going to have laws on the books, then let's enforce them. And let's not take that discretion and let it slide because it's a bad message the first time and the second time that you talk to them, they're obviously under-age and drinking and if they get a pass, they're going to do it again. If we have laws, enforce them.

KEVIN RICE: Anybody can get alcohol, anybody can get marijuana, anybody can get whatever they want in this town. And the only way to stop that is when you catch them, you don't just cite them. You throw them in jail, you take the nearest responsible adult with them, keep them overnight as well and that will send a message.

STEVE BARASCH: This question is very interesting to me. I have a son who had a fake driver's license who lost his driver's privilege for six months, and we had to hire an attorney because he was an under-age drinker. I blame my wife for pushing him so hard [laughter]. But we're dealing with a social problem on a local level, the way I see it. And I think the best way to deal with under-age drinking is a sanction — like taking away their driver's license for six months. I mean, it's that simple. If you took an 18 year old driver's license away or you gave him a sanction that is socially taboo, he would learn a lesson for life. That's all I have to say.

COMMENTATOR: *This will be the last question, and I really appreciate the speed in which the candidates have been responding—staying within the time limits. We were shooting for wrapping things up by 9:00 p.m. and we're a minute after, so one more question and we won't be too far off base. And this is a total change of topic. Would you support a city-wide program—similar to the Home Occupation Program—wherein property owners of R-1 and R-2 rentals, through their Rental Business License/permit, would be obligated to meet certain standards – for example, sufficient off-street parking, health and safety standards, and common standards of appearance? Please explain your answer.*

STEVE BARASCH: The answer from my standpoint is absolutely, because my wife and I, for example, are held to a higher standard than most landlords because we have a number of properties and some of our tenants call us some of the worse landlords because we strictly enforce the noise and party ordinances of the City to the letter. I'm tired of getting \$3,000 party tickets or administrative citations. We really are very strict with our tenants. We're some of the landlords who have the greenest lawns in town, even though the water and sewer rates seem to double every four years, because we require that they keep their irrigation timers on. We paint our houses every five years or less because we want the exterior of our houses to integrate with the neighborhoods. My wife is looking at me for something — do you want to say something dear? [Wife — “Community service.”] Jeanine, my wife, started the community services program in town where we give the option, after the first notice, to do twenty hours of community service or they can pay a \$200 fine to us and our fines are much higher than the City's for the first, second, and third offenses. They get the message.

JAN MARX: Yes, I would definitely support that kind of a program. I think again it would have to be carefully fine-tuned, and it would be something that I'd want to get some input from all of the neighbors in the neighborhoods and the Neighborhood Specialists as well because it would have to be funded. It goes along with the idea I mentioned earlier about having some kind of funding connected with the Business License that we charge for the rentals. I think we are addressing the whole question of appearance of the yards and like that and this has made this Council the object of ridicule by various newspapers and blogs. But actually it makes a huge difference in terms of the quality of life. So this is a

good idea, and this is something I'd like to see brought forward during the Goal Setting process — you know when we do the Goal Setting in January. So I hope RQN gets us some really cool goals together and shows up for that.

JEFF ARANGUENA: I'd also just say yes. I think one of the things we have to focus on is, and Kevin mentioned this earlier, was parking. Parking would be the big question. But more input from individuals would be the key to this. My mom was a business owner. She ran a Board and Care. She was able to do that in a residential neighborhood, and she kept that Board and Care with high standards in that residential area and did an excellent job in doing so. So, I think it can be done, but I would also like to see the City outreach more to the public to hear what they have to say and more ideas that they might have regarding this issue.

JOHN ASHBAUGH: The answer is yes. I think we should deal with this through the Business License program that we are now enforcing during just these last few years, during my term on the Council. I believe if I'm not mistaken, we're collecting about \$250,000 a year in revenue that we did not collect in the past because we just overlooked the requirement for so many residential property owners who are renting their properties now. We still have some that are missing, but we are looking to cleaning those up, but as we now have that inventory of landlords, we want them all to be like Steve, frankly. But we need to enforce the ordinances that we have toward that end.

DAN CARPENTER: I'm generally in favor of a program that goes along that line, but I'd certainly want to see the details of it. I think I need to throw a little bit of caution out there. I think the more we step on individual property owner's rights that they have on their property, it throws up a red flag to me. However, having input from the neighbors on what types of issues are a problem in the neighborhood is obviously good information to have in helping to structure this program. But I would really draw some caution in overstepping our governance on people's personal property.

KEVIN RICE: I think one of the ways to do that is that you just make everybody running a rental put their name and address of who owns the place on a website so that if we have trouble with it, we can just call them. So instead of putting dots on papers and trying to figure out who rents, the City should just publish a list of here's the landlords in town – basically saying, if you have a problem call me. If not, then we call the City and we pursue something worse. Being responsible.

COMMENTATOR: *Well, we still have some questions, but we've been able to consolidate some of them and the time is growing late. We did promise that each candidate will have two minutes to wrap up so let's go ahead and start that with Kevin please. Your timed wrap up.*

KEVIN RICE: Two minute wrap up—OK. Like I said I moved to this town and one of the first things I did was join RQN, because I wanted to find out what the concerns of my community were. I served on the City's Mass Transportation Advisory Committee — OK, who cares? Well, that's the committee that provides the bus service. If the kids are on the bus, then their cars aren't parked on Kentucky. It's important that the City continues to work with the colleges to make sure our buses operate smoothly. We need to look at the areas where we put future houses. We need to encourage Cal Poly to put housing on campus and maybe some bars and entertainment on campus so they can keep it to themselves. If not, maybe we can build some high density housing closer to them and keep it out of our neighborhoods so we have more people wanting to owner occupy. It's the demand on our single-family homes that's creating the drop in owner-occupied. Again, I've been here for about twenty years. I'm a firefighter. I understand the way government works. I've been attending Council meetings, not just in SLO, but Pismo, Morro Bay, Grover Beach. I have relationships all around this county and tonight we've been speaking on a lot around one little issue but the job of Council, especially in the County Seat, is understanding the relationship of the City with the other cities, with the Board of Supervisors, with the Air Pollution Control District, SLOCOG. I've studied these issues — in fact I gave a presentation to 300 people on this issue — was it in March now. If you guys want to go to "integrityslo.org" you can see my presentation where I explain county government and how it works. So if you want an idea of my knowledge in that area, check out that video on that website. I'd really appreciate your vote.

DAN CARPENTER: Thank you very much for letting me take up some of your time tonight to give you my views. It's been a real privilege to serve you these past two years and it's my sincere hope that I can continue to serve you. We've talked about a lot of issues but there are a lot of issues important to this City that we have not talked about tonight. I would encourage you to go to my website, "Dancarpenterslo.org" There's a lot of information in there. One thing I brought tonight – they're in the packets that are out on the table and I hope you take it with you, and I think what is significant is my endorsement sheet. There are a few hundred on there. There are important ones on there. It shows the broad base of support that I have. Both our State Legislators, who are local, endorse me. Both Council members who are not running for re-election have endorsed me, three of our County Supervisors, and three of our past Mayors all endorse me and hundreds of other people. What it doesn't have on there is a political party endorsement. What it doesn't have on there is a special interest endorsement because I'm here to represent the people of San Luis Obispo — not any special interest. So I would hope you will agree with these people that are on here. I hope you will look back on my record of the past two years, and will give me that support on November 6th. Thank you for your time tonight.

JOHN ASHBAUGH: I want to thank you too for your time tonight. I will take up a lot less than my two minutes and simply just ask you for your support once again in 2012. And make sure if you haven't got one, if you want one, I've got

these reusable bags for you. I also have literature outside and yard signs, please take one if you haven't already. And if you have any concerns, and absolutely you do, because I've had disagreements with some of you individually, and frankly with RQN. But if you do, let's talk. I am, as I advertised in 2008, a leader who listens — I don't always listen — but I do my best and would love to listen to you as long as you've got tonight, I'm here.

JEFF ARANGUENA: Once again Mike, thank you so much for tonight — you did a great job. Excellent job in the timing, very good. You didn't even look at us all night long — you just waived signs at us. Once again, my name is Jeff Aranguena, and I am running for San Luis Obispo City Council. I want to thank you for your time tonight. The entire six months of this process has been a learning lesson for me — getting out there. I'm a newcomer to this, I'm a fresh face to this, but I think it's a fresh face that this City Council does need and desires. When I started even thinking about getting involved in local politics, I first started off at the educational level — of course being a teacher — doing one of those things where I get to make a difference every day. The school that I work at, I invite you to stop by at any time. It's a great group of kids. I've been working very hard on changing the perception of the kids that I actually work with. I took my ability, my ability to articulate people's ideas, as I have the skill set to listen to people and articulate those ideas to the next level. I'm looking to bring that to the City Council. I've done that at the educational level in the past five years here with the school district to not only improve the resources that each class has but also to improve the education that each child will get in the coming years here in San Luis Obispo. My hope is that we can move forward to work on creating more head-of-household jobs. We can definitely come together. I think tonight we talked about the homeless issue, which is a major problem for any group that has concerns here in San Luis Obispo. But also I want to be there to restore the trust factor with our City employees. I think over the last couple of years we've seen some of our employees not being treated in the right way. That definitely could be worked at in a way that you say, "Listen, you can come to the table to be part of the problem or part of the solution." So I think a fresh face might do that for them. Lastly, in closing, I have a strong endorsement sheet myself for somebody who is new on the list. I've got three school board members here in the district who support me. I've got soon to be re-elected California State Assemblyman, Bill Monning, supporting me as well. So I think over the last six months, for somebody that's new in this, to get that type of support from some of these people in this community who have been here a long time means a lot, and my hope is that after I have gone out and knocked on three or four thousand doors, this is a whole new era of listening. That's the way I look at it, and my hope is that I can continue to bring that ability here to the City level.

JAN MARX: Thank you. Well, RQN, I just want to encourage you to keep up the good work. For a small group of dedicated individuals, you've been incredibly effective, and I just hope that you will continue that, and I'm proud to be part of that movement. I want you to know that I'm a full-time Mayor — I've been

working forty to fifty hours a week for the City and this is quite a feat when you're also running for office. So I've been pretty busy lately. For those of you who know me well know I'm the only candidate for Mayor who has experience. I've had five years on the Parks and Recreation Commission, two years on the Planning Commission, six years on the Council as a council member, and now two years as Mayor. I think that is really important, just like if you were going to have surgery done, you would want to go to a surgeon who had done that before. I don't see the value of putting people on the City Council who have no experience at all and with people who have not volunteered for the City. In the six years I was not on Council, I was volunteering for the City. I was raising money for the bike paths, I was doing everything I could do improve the City to keep it the wonderful place that it is and even improve it. I have been on regional boards for the past four years and have done a very effective job in getting a lot of state and federal programs for the City of San Luis Obispo, including fifteen million dollars for the LOVR interchange which is going to be very important in terms of traffic congestion. I've been endorsed by County Sheriff Ian Parkinson, three County Supervisors, and over a hundred individuals, as well as Bill Monning. The Tribune gave me a very nice tribute saying "she's smart, she does her homework, and shown herself to be a good ambassador for the City in dealing with the private sector as well as governmental agencies." And I would hope that I could also list dealing with the neighborhoods with that. So please vote for me. Thank you.

STEVE BARASCH: Thank you, Jan. That's the first time I've heard that presentation. I think in these changing times, you need a different kind of leadership in the City. You need someone who understands financial affairs. You need someone who understands principles of organization. You need someone who thinks outside the box. But most importantly, you need someone who will ask the really really tough questions, like what did we ever do before Measure Y? And are you a good neighbor, City of San Luis, because to date, the City hasn't been a very good neighbor in maintaining its properties. My whole reason for getting into this race, again, is to restore trust in our local government by instilling fiscal accountability. And that would allow more money to go back into the community, back into the places the City originally promised that money would go. The Measure Y thing to me has just been a real debacle. And I differ from many of the people who have been on the Council because it really isn't going to where it was promised. We can see that the City is just not building anything anymore. I have asked the City for lists of what we have built during the last three years. I've asked for a list of what we are going to build in the next five years. Those lists don't exist. Yes, we put in a kitchen in the Senior Center. That money was allocated some years ago. The bottom line is that the community is being cheated. It's not getting what it was promised to get. Being someone who is very strong in the area of corporate consulting, management consulting, and fiscal consulting, I know how to look at the City to make more funds available to the community, to the neighborhoods, and to build things again to benefit the citizens. I'm not going to give you all my endorsements because I think it's superfluous. I think what is really important is the potential to change

things in the City and bring back fiscal accountability to the City as quickly as possible. And I will stop 'cause I love that sign.

COMMENTATOR: *Well, running for office and ultimately serving, for those who are successful in being elected, is certainly not simple and not for the faint of heart. I would like to thank all of you for your candor tonight and for your concern for our City. I wish you all well in the coming election.*