

QUESTION #4: *Cal Poly has released plans to grow its enrollment over the next several years. This growth will inevitably impact the City's own land use and circulation and house elements. Would you ever consider litigation as a serious option against Cal Poly for its significant negative impacts on the City and its neighborhoods? Why/why not?*

DONALD HEDRICK: We should encourage Poly to play a bigger role in housing its students to take the pressure off the property managers that see the dollars per room formula for the students instead of the rental for our working people that want to put down their roots in our town and have to resort to commuting to have a job in our town. Head of family jobs need more access to living in our town. This plan to house on campus is countered by families from far reaching areas being able to afford putting their student spawn into the town's neighborhoods for their various reasons. However, the key to getting more students onto campus is having those on campus places available.

JAN MARX: Prior to litigating, the parties should try everything to resolve disputes, including mediation. The City initiates litigation very rarely, but frequently must spend significant amounts of money defending itself. I would not favor litigation against Cal Poly in the abstract, but also not rule it completely.

Cal Poly needs to become more productive, not increase enrollment. It should institute a robust Summer School program, allow students to earn degrees in four years, and become more efficient. There are many alternatives to be explored. Furthermore, if the University decides to increase enrollment, it should increase on campus housing to accommodate the increase accordingly.

JEFFERY SPECHT: I think it's horrible that Cal Poly is wanting to build their new housing right next to an established neighborhood. Because of the relationship between Cal Poly and San Luis Obispo, I would like to see a more passive approach. I don't think that there needs to be a lawsuit. I would like our City manager to do her job and step up to bat and facilitate an agreement between Cal Poly and San Luis Obispo. I think it is her fiduciary responsibility to act for the City and she's not doing that.

DANIEL CANO: All options should be considered when addressing serious concerns that negatively impact our community. Litigation is a strategic option that plays a role in negotiating partnerships. It wouldn't be prudent to levy legal threats that create deep divisions, however. A respectful relationship should be our goal with Cal-poly.

CARLYN CHRISTIANSON: Cal Poly's President Armstrong has expressly and specifically, in writing, pulled back from goals related to increasing enrollment at the university unless and until the associated impacts and challenges, including housing for students and increased staff and faculty, are addressed. I believe it was the very clear communication from the city and its residents regarding the dorms project that educated our new university President, and convinced him that these concerns are very obviously

real and significant. Cal Poly (and Cuesta) are now taking a much more active role in working to find real solutions to current problems than they ever have in the past. That being said, I would always consider litigation to protect essential city interests – but whether to actually bring suit is determined by a host of factors that must be considered, such as the very high expenditure of city resources of time and money, the chances of prevailing on any substantive issue, and the interests of the city as a whole, and for the long term. Litigation is unfortunately often a bottomless pit of endless acrimony, wasted money and very little gain.

MICHAEL CLARK: Cal Poly has not been respectful of the housing needs of San Luis Obispo residents for decades. As I pointed out in response to a question about workforce housing at the Chamber of Commerce's recent Candidates Forum, Cal Poly's failure to provide on-campus housing inevitably leads to students seeking housing within SLO. Housing that students occupy here would be considered workforce housing in most other cities. Thus, Cal Poly has put us in the position of trying to provide additional housing for our own residents and workforce while Cal Poly simply avoids that capital expense and shifts the burden to a small city ill-equipped to house thousands of students in addition to its own workforce.

Cal Poly's lack of cooperation in this serious matter is not that of a good neighbor. As reluctant as I am to ever enter into litigation, if that is the only option that Cal Poly leaves us, then I would seriously consider taking legal action.

GORDON MULLIN: Litigation should be a hammer in our tool box. One that is hopefully, lightly used but necessary for the driving of stubborn nails.

DAN RIVOIRE: This is a complex question. I agree that with its core values. Protecting neighborhood wellness is extremely important.

Cal Poly has expressed a commitment to addressing community impacts before any future increases in enrollment. It is the City's responsibility to hold Cal Poly accountable to this commitment and help them understand that we can work together in a way that will sufficiently mitigate its impacts. I am open to considering all potential solutions to solving problems facing the City. Nevertheless, I believe litigation against a superior agency such as Cal Poly should only be considered when the cost, consequences, and potential success of doing so is evaluated in every possible way.