



**Fw: Board Hearing/Item 13: Economic Element Update**

Cherie Aispuro, Amy Gilman, Debbie

Frank Mecham to: Geaslen, Hannah Miller, cr\_board\_clerk Clerk 10/22/2012 08:18 AM  
Recorder

Sent by: Vicki Shelby

Cc: Amber Wilson

Frank R. Mecham  
District 1 Supervisor  
1055 Monterey St. Rm. D430  
San Luis Obispo, CA 93408  
(805) 781-5450

FMecham@co.slo.ca.us

----- Forwarded by Vicki Shelby/BOS/COSLO on 10/22/2012 08:17 AM -----

From: "Robert Rosales" <Robert@ormondeandassociates.com>  
To: <fmecham@co.slo.ca.us>, <bgibson@co.slo.ca.us>, <ahill@co.slo.ca.us>, <pteixeira@co.slo.ca.us>, <jpatterson@co.slo.ca.us>  
Cc: <dlilley@co.slo.ca.us>  
Date: 10/19/2012 04:31 PM  
Subject: Board Hearing/Item 13: Economic Element Update

---

**Gentlemen,**

**We are very encouraged to see such a cooperative effort put forth by County officials and staff with business leaders of the region on the Update of the County Economic Element. We feel it was prudent to have the Clusters of Opportunity Economic Strategy produced thru the SLO EVC included as an integral part of the updated County Economic Element. The EVC is a respected organization whose members are truly representative of the entire business community in our County. Its membership is also very representative of the different areas of the County, both the cities and the unincorporated areas. With this in mind, the Templeton Chamber of Commerce supports approval of the amended Economic Element. However, we submit the following changes and comments for your consideration:**

**- Policy EE 1.6 – The County ~~should~~ shall develop and maintain staff...**

We suggest replacing “should” with “shall” or similar stronger language to indicate County support of this effort

**- Policy EE 1.7 – We would like clarification of the term “regional significance”**

Many projects have a significant economic impact on a neighborhood, or on the community where a proposed project is located, but may not have a significant impact outside of the immediate area, or community

**- Policy EE 2.4 – The Board should state support for this policy.**

There was discussion at the PC hearing about whether to keep this as a policy - We support keeping this as a stated policy in recognition that art & cultural events can have a significant economic impact on businesses in the region knowing that such events attract significant visitor traffic into the area.

ITEM #13  
MEETING DATE: October 23, 2012  
PRESENTED BY: Rob Rosales  
RECEIVED PRIOR TO MEETING  
POSTED ON: October 22, 2012

- **Policy EE 3.2 – we cannot support a policy to “Foster development that is compact” or “Compact urban design”**

Such design as currently defined is vague and in conflict with the rural character of many unincorporated communities such as Templeton, as detailed in their community design plans. Compact urban design is only suitable in cities and communities where higher metropolitan type density is within the character of the community neighborhoods. (Per Planning staff, “On compact design/compact urban design, we are usually referring to the type of structure, the footprint, and the size of the lots, as well as some of the site design and infrastructure aspects that come with this type of design, including parking, pocket parks, narrower drives, etc.”)

- **Policy EEE 3.3 – We support the concept of County Planning working with CSD’s and other agencies concurrently/simultaneously not only on master improvement plans, but also on larger individual proposed developments as a way to expedite the permitting process.** As part of a preapplication process, we would suggest that officials from the various agencies involved meet with the applicant in a single meeting to go over the proposed project, so that there can be a dialogue between all parties simultaneously, rather than requiring the applicant to have numerous exchanges, and potential changes to a proposed project as each agency provides their input.

- **Policy EE 3.5 – the County ~~may~~ shall have a role in enabling local businesses to take advantage of it.**

Replace “may” with “shall”. The County has a unique and valuable opportunity to strengthen our economy with this resource (fiber optics). We support stronger language to indicate County recognizes the importance of this resource to our region and is willing to invest in it.

- **Policy EE 4.5 – While we agree that County should provide housing opportunities for worker households of all income groups, we would note that this is already set as policy per the Findings in the recently adopted Housing Element, wherein it was determined that County does provide sufficient land for housing opportunities.**

There has been comment that County should reconsider the current tax sharing arrangement with Cities that was agreed upon by both parties. There is no need for County to give concessions on this matter. County has taken on an enormous amount of housing and its associated costs since the agreement was reached when compared to that of Cities. For example, per the recent public draft of the City of SLO Economic Development Strategy Plan; “Over the last 20 years population in the City (SLO) has grown by around 3,000, an average rate of 0.4 percent per year...” In that same 20 year period, the nonresidential (business ) sector of the City has grown significantly, generating revenue for the City, while providing minimal housing opportunities for its workforce – a good portion of that workforce residing in the unincorporated areas of the County. On the other hand, according to data from U.S. Census, the population of the much smaller unincorporated community of Templeton was 2887 in 1990, 4687 in 2000 and 7674 in 2010, thus growing by the same number as SLO in the last 10 years, or half the time.

We would also request that you postpone discussion regarding the Olive Oil Processing matter. We feel that there was not sufficient public notice that this matter would be part of this item. The topic was not noted in the posted Agenda, and not until one goes thru the Item Documents and their Attachments do you realize that this topic will be discussed. The request is even more relevant to the matter of Roadside Stands, Field Stands, etc, which are not identified as part of the topic of Olive Oil Processing until you actually read the supporting documents

Thank you for your time and consideration,

ITEM #13  
MEETING DATE: October 23, 2012  
PRESENTED BY: Rob Rosales  
RECEIVED PRIOR TO MEETING  
POSTED ON: October 22, 2012

Rob Rosales, President  
Templeton Chamber of Commerce

ITEM #13  
MEETING DATE: October 23, 2012  
PRESENTED BY: Rob Rosales  
RECEIVED PRIOR TO MEETING  
POSTED ON: October 22, 2012

From: "Courtney Kienow" <Courtney@slochamber.org>  
To: <fmecham@co.slo.ca.us>, <jpatterson@co.slo.ca.us>, <ahill@co.slo.ca.us>,  
<pteixeira@co.slo.ca.us>, <bgibson@co.slo.ca.us>  
Cc: <jgiffen@co.slo.ca.us>, <dlilley@co.slo.ca.us>, "Ermina Karim (Ermina@slochamber.org)"  
<ermina@slochamber.org>, "Russ Levanway" <russ@tektegrity.com>  
Date: 10/22/2012 01:03 PM  
Subject: SLO Chamber letter re: Economic Element

---

Dear SLO County Board of Supervisors,

I hope you are all doing well. Attached you will find our letter regarding the County's adoption of the Economic Element. Please let me know if you have any questions. Thank you for your consideration of our views on this matter.

Sincerely,

Courtney K.

Courtney Kienow

Director of Governmental Affairs

San Luis Obispo Chamber of Commerce

ITEM #13  
MEETING DATE: October 23, 2012  
PRESENTED BY: Courtney Kienow  
RECEIVED PRIOR TO MEETING  
POSTED ON: October 22, 2012

805.786.2770

www.slochamber.org <<http://www.slochamber.org/>> :: [www.visitslo.com](http://www.visitslo.com)  
<<http://www.visitslo.com/>> :: [www.slo-business.com](http://www.slo-business.com)  
<<http://www.slo-business.com/>>

[attachment "winmail.dat" deleted by Catrina Christensen/ClerkRec/COSLO]

ITEM #13  
MEETING DATE: October 23, 2012  
PRESENTED BY: Courtney Kienow  
RECEIVED PRIOR TO MEETING  
POSTED ON: October 22, 2012