

**QUESTION #2:** *In the relationship between Cal Poly and the City of SLO, do you feel the City is doing enough to protect permanent residents or do you feel the majority of the emphasis is being laced on other interests such as downtown, Cal Poly, tourism? Why/Why not?*

**DONALD HEDRICK:** I am an Alumni that built his life here. There is a long time marriage between our town and the college and as such occasions attitudes need some adjustment. The current sore point is the bully way inflicts on its Slack Street neighborhood to the South. It is a city street and no need to accommodate any college traffic. Taking the lead from that first Mixed-use development that had to build in an industrial zone with a twelve foot tall wall to join it to the surrounding neighborhood, Why not require a twelve foot tall on the north side of Slack Street and then Poly can do as it pleases. There would be a risk that the residents would feel like they were on the East side of the Berlin Wall. Yet to consider which way the barbed wire would lean. Poly really needs to get even more students to live on campus. That would free up more housing for the town's work force. That would be a good impact on the commute problem too. The downtown does get favored which is good for tourism but the stack and pack of our downtown is a detriment.

**JAN MARX:** Even if the dorm location does not ultimately change, the City should protect the residential neighborhoods by urging the University establish incentive programs to make it financially possible for faculty and staff to move back into the neighborhood. I feel the City Council must balance the interests of the various stakeholder groups, be fiscally responsible and always respect the priorities of residents.

**JEFFERY SPECHT:** I do not think the City is doing enough to protect permanent residents. I think they are doing more to protect the interests of the university and the students' families. They hired two extra police officers to protect people from the problems downtown, but they are not dealing with the problems students create all over the city. They need to enforce the ordinances. I have observed the police officers doing nothing while students are obviously drunk in public, but then they target the homeless and ticket them.

**DANIEL CANO:** I believe the City has tended to focus its attention on economic interests relating to development and tourism. As a Director of a social services organization, I see the direct negative impact on communities with high percentages of short term renters who have less investment in their community. If elected, I would work to ensure codes are enforced and resident's concerns are addressed. I would also work with neighborhood leaders to develop a plan to engage students who move into our communities in way that can prevent activities and behaviors that negatively impact our neighborhoods.

**CARLYN CHRISTIANSON:** The city is doing a lot for permanent residents but can always use new ideas. Meanwhile, I am not sure that the city's efforts can be divided into different factions – aren't we all in this together? Cal Poly, downtown, tourism – they are not adversaries of permanent residents, they are important partners with and aspects of our great city – so attention to issues in those areas is attention to the interests of permanent residents in keeping our city functioning as a whole. As I always keep in mind – many of our beloved city features and amenities are here because of Cal Poly and Cuesta. In fact, many of our oldest permanent residents came here first as students, faculty and staff at our educational institutions, or first drove through as tourists. I do think that right now, partly because of the relative dormancy of the recession, our city seems to be changing quickly – and things might feel unbalanced. I have trust in our citizens to help the city and university leadership find that balance again, and meet our challenges, and I'm working hard to listen to all and think creatively.

**MICHAEL CLARK:** In recent years the interests of residents have seemed to receive reduced attention while Cal Poly and the tourist industry have moved to the forefront. This is understandable to a degree as both bring dollars to city coffers, and for the past several years, the City has seemed to have a near single-minded focus on raising funds.

Some years ago (*New Times*, Feb 4, 2009), former Mayor Dave Romero was quoted as saying, "Of course the vision I have [for downtown SLO] is somewhat like Main Street Disneyland." His vision comes closer to reality with each passing year as more dining and drinking establishments spring up to appeal to the ever increasing numbers of tourists being lured here as our downtown comes closer to the fantasy of Main Street Disneyland and a place for students and tourists to "enjoy the SLO life."

As Cal Poly adds students without adding on-campus housing, it forces its students to seek housing in residential neighborhoods, and this in turn, consumes what in other cities would commonly be termed workforce housing. The city then gets caught in a seemingly endless loop of trying to encourage the construction of additional work force housing – much of which gets converted to student rentals.

The quality of life of our permanent residents is an afterthought in too many instances.

**GORDON MULLIN:** To answer the first part of your question- No. Hell no. Cal Poly should be housing more, far more, students in campus dorms and away from city boundaries. It is unfortunate that we have a council that has refused, three times, to even bring this topic to its agenda. (Council members Carpenter and Smith supported bringing this to council. Council members Christianson and Ashbaugh voted against.) As long as this city council chooses to stand back from the problem, folds its arms and refuse to demand that Poly enter into these discussions, Poly has little incentive to fix the problem. Changing this is my number one priority, above all others.

Allow me to elaborate. In the state of CA, 10% of the population is between the ages of 18 to 24. In SLO, that number is 37%. When my family came to SLO in the early

50's roughly two-thirds of the homes were owner occupied, a third were rentals. Today that has reversed. If asked, I don't think that our neighbors would ever agree that this is a good situation nor what we would like to see happen- if we were given the choice. My point here is- we were not and are not being given the choice nor even a voice. That must change.

**DAN RIVOIRE:** City leadership needs to continue to strengthen its negotiating position with Cal Poly in order to help them become better community partners. The university must learn to understand that greater investment in community infrastructure will dramatically enhance the student experience while reducing negative impacts on permanent residents.

Meanwhile, promoting long-term neighborhood residency by renting to young professionals, families, and increasing the number of owner occupied homes is the best way to create significant quality of life improvements. The City's improved police presence, increased code enforcement and the delivery of additional neighborhood services are also helping address resident concerns. I believe we need to continue these efforts while evaluating their efficacy every year.