

SAN LUIS OBISPO COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS

WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 5, 2026

PLEASE NOTE THE LOCATION:

**San Luis Obispo County Board of Supervisors Chambers
KATCHO ACHADJIAN GOVERNMENT CENTER SAN LUIS OBISPO COUNTY
1055 Monterey Street, San Luis Obispo, California 93401**

PLEASE NOTE THE TIME:

9:00 A.M.

The AGENDA is available/posted at: www.slocog.org

Addendum:

Supplemental Information

POWERPOINTS – August 5, 2026 (online):

<https://sanluiscog.sharepoint.com/:f:/s/SLOCOGTeamFolder/IgBHP0iA97FET56o7vSlajsrASw7HCGJM0BOQfWKRNJ11HI?e=3U0mZa>

IV. CONSENT AGENDA:

C-3 Call Box Removal Plan Sole Source Contract: *See attached PUBLIC COMMENTS regarding Item C-3 (received via email).*

E-1 Correspondence, Press Releases and News Articles: *See attached additional correspondence.*

New Item:

IX. ADJOURN SLOCOG BOARD MEETING TO JOINT SLOCOG & LOCAL TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY (LTA) BOARD MEETING:

H-1 Supplemental Funding: Measure H – Local Roads First: *See attached staff report.*

Staff Recommendation for SLOCOG Board: Consider new information.

- A) No Action – Measure H is maintained on the November 2026 Ballot.
- B) Adopt new Resolution 26-___ (to be presented) to remove Measure H from the November 2026 Ballot.

X. ADJOURNMENT

Next SLOCOG meeting: Wednesday, October 7, 2026

h:\2026-27 owpl\0400 agency admin, finance, personnel 26-27\slocog board agendas 26-27\2-august 2026\addendum - august 5, 2026\1-1 addendum_slocog board cover - august 5, 2026.docx



SLOCOG
SAN LUIS OBISPO COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS

1114 Marsh Street, San Luis Obispo, CA 93401

CONNECTING COMMUNITIES
ARROYO GRANDE | ATASCADERO | GROVER BEACH
MORRO BAY | PASO ROBLES | PISMO BEACH
SAN LUIS OBISPO | SAN LUIS OBISPO COUNTY
Phone: 805-781-4219

***** ADDENDUM – Agenda Item C-3 *****

Public Comments – August 5, 2026 - SLOCOG Board Agenda Item C-3:

From: Eric Greening [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, July 20, 2026 11:12 AM
To: Aida Nicklin [REDACTED]; Pete Rodgers [REDACTED]; Tim Gillham [REDACTED]
Subject: Eric Greening written testimony for Item C-3 on the August 5th SLOCOG Agenda

Hello!

In the face of the proposal to remove the last call boxes along our county's highways on the premise that "everyone" has a cell phone these days, and that fiscal prudence is served by their abandonment, I have put forward the question of whether such a rash action is actually fiscally IMPRUDENT as well as showing disregard for the safety of those who still need call boxes (which can include not only those without cell phones, but EVERYONE during a power failure, when cell phones fail while land lines such as those serving the call boxes remain functional). The fiscal imprudence comes into play if current rates of cell phone adoption represent a high water mark from which the tide will recede as information about the serious medical harms of this addictive technology become more widely known. Should this tide recede, it will be cell phones, not call boxes, that become obsolete, and the massive expense of rebuilding the system that never should have been destroyed will confront us.

The purpose of this correspondence is to point to some of the sources of information indicating these serious cell phone health harms; I believe we are in a period of soon-to-arrive public awareness similar to that which changed our attitudes and public policies around smoking a couple of generations ago.

I remember when doctors were shilling for specific brands of cigarette on TV, while ashtrays and smoking were everywhere: hospitals, doctors' offices, and essentially all public places. There were studies showing massive harms from smoking, but they were ignored by Congress (largely owned by Big Tobacco thanks to campaign contributions) and by the media (owned by Big Tobacco due to dependence on massive advertising revenue).

Today, it is Big Tech that owns Congress and the media; the studies showing massive harms from cell phones and the infrastructure that supports them exists--I'll point to a sampling here--but is being deliberately ignored by those compromised by economic pressure to be complicit in keeping the public in the dark about them.

Nonetheless, one area in which the tide is showing a readiness to turn is in the passage and signing in California of AB 3216, removing cell phones from classrooms, and the emergence of similar legislation in close to half of the other states.

Now that harm to kids is emerging into public discussion, the notion that this addictive and harmful practice can be made ever more compulsory for adults ought to lose traction quickly, and with it, the percentage of the public needing recourse to call boxes when relevant emergencies arise.

A sampling of sources on cell phone harms--some of these link to numerous other sources:

ADDENDUM
Public Comments (received via email) on Item C-3

At Environmental Health Trust: "Published Resources on 5G, 4G, Small Cells, Wireless Radiation, and Health."

At Frontiers in Environmental Health: "Risks to Health and Well-being from Radiofrequency Emissions of Cell Phones and Other Wireless Devices."

The book "Invisible Rainbow" by Arthur Firstenberg.

This author's website: "Cellular Phone Task Force."

The website of "The EMF Safety Network," including the studies linked from its section entitled "Shortcuts to Science."

The website of "Safe Tech International."

The website of "The International Commission on the Biological Effects of Electromagnetic Fields."

National Institute of Health, by way of PubMed & the National Center for Biotechnology Information: "Wireless Technologies, Non-ionizing Electromagnetic Fields, and Children: Identifying and Reducing Health Risks;"...the "cautionary level" for radiofrequency radiation is 10,000 times lower than FCC standards.

Which speaks to: why are health-related standards being set by the FCC, which is NOT a health agency but an industry promotion? This is part of the larger pattern exemplified by the continuing unchallenged recklessness of Section 704 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996, which prohibits state and local governments from setting tighter standards than the multiple orders-of-magnitude inadequate federal ones, and prohibits every local government body from denying any application for emissive infrastructure on health and safety grounds, despite decades of accumulating evidence of the extent to which this provision constitutes a direct assault on public and environmental health.

The consequent sense of hands being tied is a factor in the lack of emergence of awareness of and lack of public policy discussion and action to address these massive and accumulating harms.

But dangerous secrets can only be hidden for so long as more and more are suffering from the harms we are not supposed to talk about. Which brings us back to your proposed action on Item C-3. While the current recommendation is based on financial prudence, it is actually financially reckless if the infrastructure being removed will need to be rebuilt from scratch if near-universal cell phone adoption goes the way of ashtrays in hospitals.

After all these grim considerations, I'll recommend one more source--fun to read--for dessert:

At "The Free Thought Project:" August 14th, 2024: "10 Teens Gave Up Smartphones for a Month. Here's what Happened."

If we want the young people around us, many suffering from cell phone addiction and the incipient or developing brain damage that can result, to live among EXAMPLES of adults who live full, happy, rewarding lives free of this addiction, we should be doing everything possible NOT to make the addiction compulsory, and threatening the safety of abstainers traveling on our highway system is just one more element of the coercion that is bearing down on all of us--coercion we should be resisting and dismantling, rather than adding to! I know you are all caring people seeking to serve the best interests of the public, and part of that service involves anticipating future needs as well as meeting present ones. The

ADDENDUM

Public Comments (received via email) on Item C-3

information above, in my mind, makes a compelling case that a robust call box network represents a future need. Please vote NO on Item C-3!

Many thanks,

Eric Greening

ADDENDUM

Public Comments (received via email) on Item C-3

**DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
DIVISION OF HOUSING POLICY DEVELOPMENT**

651 Bannan Street, 10th Floor, Suite 400
Sacramento, CA 95811
(916) 263-2911
www.hcd.ca.gov

**ADDENDUM - AGENDA ITEM E-1
*** Additional Correspondence *****

July 27, 2026

Megan Martin, Community Development Director
City of Grover Beach
154 S 8th Street
Grover Beach, CA 93433

Dear Megan Martin:

RE: Grover Beach Measure F-26 – Letter of Technical Assistance

The California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) is aware that the citizens of the City of Grover Beach (City) are considering Measure F-26 on the ballot this November. HCD understands that Measure F-26 proposes to amend the City's Development Code and Objective Design Standards by: (1) limiting building and structures in all commercial zoning districts to a maximum of three stories and 40 feet in height, including appurtenances (2) limiting buildings and structures in all industrial zoning districts to a maximum height of 33 feet in height (3) requiring that building heights be measured from average natural grade to the absolute highest point of the structure, explicitly including all architectural appurtenances (4) requiring a minimum of 33% of a mixed-use project be dedicated to commercial or retail use (5) requiring commercial space to be located on the ground floor fronting the primary street, and reducing minimum ground floor ceiling heights to 10 feet.

If Measure F-26 passes, the amendments to the City's Objective Design Standards and Development Code (Article IX of the City's Municipal Code) will likely result in a reduction in residential density or intensity. The purpose of this letter is to provide technical assistance related to the Housing Crisis Act (HCA)¹ and Housing Element Law.² This letter provides technical assistance to the City regarding the requirements of the HCA with respect to No Net Loss.³ This letter also provides technical assistance regarding the requirements and process to amend the City's sixth cycle Housing Element.

Housing Crisis Act (HCA) – Reductions in Intensity

The HCA limits the ability of a local agency to reduce residential densities without

¹ Gov. Code, § 66300.

² Gov. Code, §§ 65580-65589.11.

³ Gov. Code, § 65863.

concurrently increasing (i.e., upzoning) residential densities elsewhere. The HCA specifies that an “affected city” specifically “includes the electorate of an affected county or city exercising its local initiative or referendum power”.⁴ The HCA prohibits changing the land use designation or zoning of a parcel to a less intensive use or reducing the intensity of land use below what was allowed by the land use designation or zoning that was in effect on January 1, 2018.⁵ Specifically, the law prohibits an affected county or city from enacting “a development policy, standard, or condition” that would have the following effect:

Changing the general plan land use designation, specific plan land use designation, or zoning of a parcel or parcels of property to a less intensive use or reducing the intensity of land use within an existing general plan land use designation, specific plan land use designation, or zoning district in effect at the time of the proposed change, below what was allowed under the land use designation or zoning ordinances of the affected county or affected city, as applicable, as in effect on January 1, 2018, except as otherwise provided in clause (ii) of subparagraph (B) or subdivision (i). For purposes of this subparagraph, “reducing the intensity of land use” includes, but is not limited to, reductions to height, density, or floor area ratio, new or increased open space or lot size requirements, new or increased setback requirements, minimum frontage requirements, or maximum lot coverage limitations, or any other action that would individually or cumulatively reduce the site’s residential development capacity.⁶

However, the City is exempt from this prohibition if it “concurrently changes the development standards, policies, and conditions applicable to other parcels within the jurisdiction to ensure that there is no net loss in residential capacity”.⁷ In the case of an initiative measure, “concurrently” means the action is included in the initiative in a manner that ensures the added residential capacity is effective at the same time as the reduction in residential capacity.⁸

Furthermore, per the HCA, “any development policy, standard, or condition enacted on or after the effective date of this section that does not comply with this section shall be deemed void.”⁹ Therefore, should Measure F-26 pass without the required compensatory zoning action to accommodate potential reduction in residential capacity in violation of the HCA, the action shall be deemed void.

⁴ Gov. Code, § 66300, subd. (a)(3).

⁵ Gov. Code, § 66300, subd. (b)(1)(A).

⁶ Gov. Code, § 66300, subd. (b)(1)(A).

⁷ Gov. Code, § 66300, subd. (h)(1).

⁸ Gov. Code, § 66300, subd. (h)(2)(C).

⁹ Gov. Code, § 66300, subd. (b)(2).

Housing Element Background

As you are aware, HCD found the City's housing element in full compliance on March 2, 2021. It is the responsibility of the City to "review its housing element as frequently as appropriate to evaluate... the appropriateness of the housing goals, objectives, and policies, the effectiveness of the housing element in attainment of the community's housing goals and objectives, the progress of the city in implementation of the housing element, and the effectiveness of the housing element goals, policies, and related actions to meet the community's needs, pursuant to paragraph (7) of subdivision (a) of Section 65583."¹⁰

There are several goals, policies, and programs within the housing element that could be impacted by passing Measure F-26. The following Housing Element goals, policies, and programs would need to be reevaluated should Measure F-26 pass:

Goal #5 - Reduce development constraints, where appropriate, encourage creativity, and provide incentives for the development of affordable housing.

Policy 1.1 - The City shall ensure there is an adequate supply of vacant or underutilized land for development or redevelopment at specific densities to meet the housing objectives for affordable housing. This will include meeting or exceeding the RHNA.

Policy 6.1 - The City shall review site development standards, development review procedures, and development fees and shall modify them, if necessary, to ensure they do not unreasonably constrain the development, conservation, and rehabilitation of housing.

Program 1.5: No Net Loss - The City will evaluate residential development proposals for consistency with goals and policies of the General Plan and the 2020-2028 Housing Element sites inventory and make written findings that the density reduction is consistent with the General Plan and that the remaining sites identified in the Housing Element are adequate to accommodate the RHNA by income level. If a proposed reduction of residential density will result in the residential sites inventory failing to accommodate the RHNA by income level, the City will identify and make available additional adequate sites to accommodate its share of housing need by income level within 180 days of approving the reduced density project.¹¹

Within the existing and compliant Housing Element, the Vacant Land Inventory identifies 26 sites that would be impacted by Measure F-26. These sites have a realistic unit

¹⁰ Gov. Code, § 65588.

¹¹ City of Grover Beach Housing Element

capacity of 38 Above-Moderate units and 37 Moderate units. Additionally, the City's Opportunity Sites will be impacted by Measure F-26.¹² The realistic capacity would need to be evaluated in light of the more restrictive standards. Depending on the results of that analysis, the City may need to identify additional site capacity to continue to accommodate the City's Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA). As a reminder the RHNA for Grover Beach includes 91 Very Low-Income units and 66 Moderate Income units for the Sixth Cycle Housing Element cycle. Of these, there is an unmet need of 31 Very-Low Income units and 49 Moderate Income units. Additionally, the modified development standards outlined in Measure F-26 would need to be identified as a potential governmental constraint in the housing element. For example, the current element would require revisions to demonstrate the modified standards would allow for housing at the allowed zoning densities. This would require additional revisions to the currently approved housing element. HCD commends the City for the progress made thus far in fulfilling their sixth cycle RHNA obligations and reminds the City that compliance throughout the entire planning period is required.

Process for Amending the Adopted, Substantially Compliant Housing Element

Pursuant to Government Code section 65585, prior to making any amendments to the housing element (including amending the sites inventory, or amending program commitments), the City must submit a draft of those changes to HCD at least 60 days prior to adoption.¹³ HCD must then review those amendments to ensure substantial compliance with housing element requirements and report its findings to the City.¹⁴

As a reminder, per Housing Element Law, HCD "shall review any action or failure to act by [the City] that it determines is inconsistent with an adopted housing element..., including any failure to implement any program actions included in the housing element..."¹⁵ If HCD "finds that the action or failure to act by [the City] does not substantially comply with this article," HCD may revoke its finding that the City's housing element is in compliance with Housing Element Law until it determines that the City has come into compliance with state law.¹⁶ The City must then consider those findings prior to adoption. If HCD finds that the amendments do not substantially comply with housing element requirements, the City can either (1) change the draft amendments to substantially comply or (2) adopt the amendments without changes but also include in the adopting resolution "written findings that explain the reasons [the City] believes that the ... amendment[s]" substantially comply with housing element requirements despite HCD's findings.¹⁷

¹² City of Grover Beach Housing Element

¹³ Gov. Code, § 65585, subd. (b)(1).

¹⁴ Gov. Code, § 65585, subds. (b)(3), (d).

¹⁵ Gov. Code, § 65585, subd. (i)(1)(A).

¹⁶ Gov. Code, § 65585, subd. (i)(1)(B).

¹⁷ Gov. Code, § 65585, subd. (f).

After readopting the housing element, the City is required to resubmit it to HCD.¹⁸ HCD is then required to review the amended housing element and determine if the amended element continues to substantially comply with Housing Element Law.¹⁹ Additionally, the City is also responsible for providing adequate opportunity for public participation and review, no less than seven days prior to submitting a draft to HCD.²⁰

As part of this review, HCD will review any changes to the housing element to ensure that sites are suitable and available for housing development within the planning period and meet all the requirements of Government Code sections 65583, subdivision (c) and 65583.2. In addition, the element must demonstrate that any new development standards do not pose a constraint to the development of housing.²¹ Additionally, the housing element must ensure that the new development standards do not inhibit compliance with other state housing laws, including, but not limited to, State Density Bonus Law²² and No Net Loss Zoning Law.²³

Consequences for Housing Element Noncompliance

HCD will continue to monitor the City's progress towards meeting all requirements and ensure the City meets its RHNA obligations in accordance with the housing element that was approved on March 2, 2021. Various consequences may apply when a city does not have a housing element in compliance with Housing Element Law, including ineligibility or delay in receiving certain state funds, referral to the California Office of the Attorney General (AGO), court imposed financial penalties, the loss of local land use authority to a court-appointed agent, and the application of the "builder's remedy."²⁴ In addition, further penalties such as a minimum of \$10,000 per month and associated attorney costs are authorized for any action brought by the AGO or HCD to enforce the adoption of housing element revisions, among other statutes.²⁵

Conclusion

If Measure F-26 passes and results in a reduction in capacity relative to what existed January 1, 2018, and does not include a commensurate increase in capacity, then the measure is void pursuant to Government Code section 66300, subdivision (b)(2). In addition, the resulting modifications to the objective development standard may trigger

¹⁸ Gov. Code, § 65585, subd. (g).

¹⁹ Gov. Code, § 65585, subd. (h).

²⁰ Gov. Code, § 65585, subd. (b)(1).

²¹ Gov. Code, § 65583, subd. (a)(5).

²² Gov. Code, § 65915.

²³ Gov. Code, § 65863.

²⁴ Gov. Code, § 65585, subds. (j), (l).

²⁵ Gov. Code, § 65009.1, subds. (a)(1), (a)(2) (effective January 1, 2025).

the need for amendments to existing housing element.

HCD reminds the City that HCD has enforcement authority over the HCA and Housing Element Law.²⁶ As such, HCD may review local government actions and inactions to determine consistency with these laws. If HCD finds that a city's actions do not comply with state law, HCD may notify the California Office of the Attorney General that the local government is in violation of state law.

HCD appreciates the opportunity to provide technical assistance to implement the provisions of Housing Element Law and ensure compliance with the Housing Crisis Act. We look forward to continued cooperation with City staff as the City continues to implement its housing element and ensure compliance with state housing laws.

If you have any questions regarding the content of this letter or need additional technical assistance, please contact Clancy Taylor at clancy.taylor@hcd.ca.gov.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Melinda Coy', with a long, sweeping horizontal stroke extending to the right.

Melinda Coy

Housing Accountability Unit Chief

²⁶ Gov. Code, § 65585, subd. (j).

SAN LUIS OBISPO COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS

STAFF REPORT

MEETING DATE: AUGUST 5, 2026	***ADDENDUM***	ITEM H-1
SUBJECT: Supplemental Funding: Measure H – Local Roads First		
STAFF CONTACT: James Worthley		

SUMMARY

The purpose of this item is to consider recent information with regard to Measure H: Local Roads First.

SLOCOG BOARD RECOMMENDATION

Staff: Consider new information.

- A)** No Action – Measure H is maintained on the November 2026 Ballot
- B)** Adopt new Resolution 26-__ (to be presented) to remove Measure H from the November 2026 Ballot

DISCUSSION

On June 3, 2026, SLOCOG (designated by the County Board of Supervisors [BOS] to act as Local Transportation Authority [LTA]) passed a resolution adopting Ordinance No. 26-01 *the San Luis Obispo County Local Pothole Repair, Traffic Relief, Road Safety Measure*, adopting the retail transactions and use tax ordinance, and requesting that the Board of Supervisors call a special election to place the ordinance on the ballot. On June 16, 2026, the Board of Supervisors passed a resolution placing the measure on the ballot (Measure H), which has been deemed a ministerial function.

Since that action, the supporters of Measure H have late breaking information to share at the SLOCOG meeting.

In order to withdraw Measure H, the following actions must occur on or before August 12, 2026 (not later than the 83rd day prior to the election):

- SLOCOG, acting as the LTA, must pass a resolution by majority vote requesting the County Board of Supervisors to withdraw the order of special election to place Ordinance No. 2026-01 on the ballot; and
- The Board of Supervisors must pass a resolution withdrawing the order of election and file that resolution with the elections official.

