



**Fw: Letter to BOS**

**Cytasha Campa** to: BOS\_Legislative Assistants,  
cr\_board\_clerk Clerk Recorder

05/19/2014 01:39 PM

Kindest regards,

**Cytasha Campa**

Board Secretary

Board of Supervisors

San Luis Obispo County

805-781-4335

----- Forwarded by Cytasha Campa/BOS/COSLO on 05/19/2014 01:39 PM -----

From: "Mary" <mary@slofarmbureau.org>  
To: <ccampa@co.slo.ca.us>  
Cc: "Lynn Diehl" <lynn@slofarmbureau.org>, "Joy Fitzhugh" <fitzhughhillranch1@gmail.com>, "Joy Fitzhugh" <joy@slofarmbureau.org>  
Date: 05/19/2014 01:36 PM  
Subject: Letter to BOS

---

Cytasha,

Please forward the attached letter to the Supervisors regarding items on the Tuesday, May 20<sup>th</sup> Agenda.

If you have questions please contact me.

Mary

Mary Silveira  
Office Manager  
San Luis Obispo County Farm Bureau

San Luis Obispo, CA 93401

[mary@slofarmbureau.org](mailto:mary@slofarmbureau.org)



5 20 14 Hearing Item 24.pdf



# SAN LUIS OBISPO COUNTY FARM BUREAU

---

May 20, 2014

Supervisors  
San Luis Obispo County Board of Supervisors  
County Government Center  
San Luis Obispo, CA 93498

Re: Hearing Item Number 24

Dear Supervisors:

Thank you for receiving comments for this hearing. The San Luis Obispo County Farm Bureau is very concerned with the current water issues and believe that there is a real need to continue to look at the four proposals before you at this time.

**Growth Management Ordinance:**

**Countywide –One-Size- Fits-All Doesn’t Work:** First, I agree with the advisory groups that one size does not fit all, especially when considering countywide water supplies and water conservation. As stated at the bottom of page 3 of Mr. Caruso’s report, the county has varied water supplies. Each area is hydrologically, geographically and climatically different. Each area must be considered based upon the types of water sources, level of growth as well as many other factors unique to each area. We ask that you look at each area separately.

**Effectiveness of Amending the GMO Questionable:** I tend to agree with the statement on page 6 of Mr. Caruso’s report regarding that the GMO does not in itself decrease water use. Again, as each area is different (and there are even water availability and quality differences within individual basins and watersheds) an overall growth rate limit only lengthens the time within which the new development is completed, it does not limit the overall development.

**Water Neutral Development Has Potential For Residential Development:** Although it may not be easy to achieve, having development that is water neutral appears to be more effective in protecting the water supply. There are a number of means of effecting water neutral conditions beyond retrofitting which has limited effectiveness. There are many conservation practices such as rain harvesting/catchments, recycling certain water uses, requiring high water efficiency appliances, limiting outdoor water use, etc, that could go far in making new development water neutral

**Larger Minimum Parcel Sizes:**

**Larger Parcel Requirements Don’t Appear to Solve the Problem:** As stated under “effectiveness” on page 8 of Mr. Caruso’s report, the water savings don’t appear to be substantial.

**Land Division Prohibition Does Not Consider Non-buildable Lots:** As opposed to a prohibition on all land divisions, there are times when a non-buildable lot is an acceptable alternative. These lots might be used for grazing or dry land crops. If a landowner needs the funds from dividing his/her land and selling a lot, then it could be restricted to being a non-buildable lot. Should not this alternative be available?

**Merger of Substandard Parcels:**

**Mergers Don't Seem Effective:** As stated on page 9 of Mr. Caruso's report the water savings does not appear substantial. There appear to be far more effective ways of saving water than a lengthy and costly involuntary merger ordinance.

**Alternative ii and Water Saving Activities:** Alternative ii of the Potential Applications and Alternatives appears to be far more on target for water savings. Rain harvesting/catchments, circulating pumps on hot water systems, water recycling/gray water use or requiring water efficient appliances including washing machines (front loaders usually use 20 gallons as opposed to many top loaders which use 40 gallons of water). These and other water saving measures can lead to water neutral homes and is much more effective than merging of substandard parcels.

**Transfer of Development Rights:**

**TDCs Have Not Been Readily Accepted:** Unfortunately with the TDC program there are possible sellers, but few buyers. Although a good concept, it does not seem to be accepted on the receiving end as the urban/village areas don't want the increased density whether for water issues or otherwise.

**TDCs and Recharge Areas:** This does appear to be a possible solution if the identified areas and landowners for the recharge have some incentive to not develop but rather have the area designated for recharge.

I hope you will consider these comments in the process of reviewing the authorization for processing of the four amendments.

Sincerely,

---

JOY FITZHUGH  
Legislative Analyst