From: www.SewerWatch.blogspot.com

Published: 3/22/06

Los Osos -- You Paid for It, You Should See It

Unlike the 2001 Los Osos Community Services District Board, *SewerWatch* believes that taxpayers in Los Osos should be privy to public documents, especially since those same taxpayers shelled out damn near \$28,000 for said documents.

It took awhile, but I finally broke down and scanned in that amazing public opinion survey that the LOCSD commissioned in 2001 to gauge support for their sewer project (attached below). It's great, and very interesting.

Among many, many things, it shows a community that strongly supports a sewer system in Los Osos, and a community that was worried about fines from the Regional Water Quality Control Board. In short, a community that wanted to do the right thing.

It also shows a confused community -- a community that was still largely under the impression that the Solution Group's "better, cheaper, faster" Community Plan was still on the table, even though that project crashed and burned months before the survey was conducted. But the confusion was understandable. According to the survey, Los Osos's main source of information at the time was the *Tribune*, and that was unfortunate, because the *Trib* did not write one story on the intensely newsworthy demise of the Community Plan in 2000, even though I had just written a *New Times* cover story chronicling it (linked at *SewerWatch*). (Hey *Trib*, quick question -- why didn't you do a public information request for *this* document? Ohhhhhhh yea, that's right, because it reveals that you guys had no idea what you were talking about last year when you were popping out editorials on Los Osos, including one on election day. So, I can understand why you wouldn't want to request *this* document. In fact, it makes perfect sense.)

Throughout the survey, there are leading and misleading questions and statements everywhere. So much so, that when you read through it, it gets blurry on whether the survey was commissioned to gauge public opinion on the sewer project, or whether it was used as campaign material (funded by Los Osos taxpayers) in an effort to sway an election.

"This measure is our last chance to approve a wastewater system for Los Osos."

"It builds a treatment facility that is completely covered and equipped with odor removal equipment."

"This measure includes funds to build a large park for the citizens of Los Osos. The park would include ballfields, a picnic area, gardens, walking paths, and amphitheater, and even constructed wetlands."

Even constructed wetlands? Wow. That's one sweet sewer plant!

'coupla questions on that one:

Why did they leave out the minor details that those "funds" would amount to \$2.3 million just for the amenities, like the "constructed wetlands," and about \$3 million, at least, in operation and maintenance costs over the next 20 years?

And another thing -- why didn't they follow-up their lovely description of the park with, "Oh, and by the way, that "large park" is also going to require a large piece of expensive land, and that large piece of expensive land is going to have to be in the middle of town so people can get to the "large park," so we're also going to have to add tens of millions of dollars to the project for expensive environmental mitigation, massive odor control, land costs, and lots of expensive visual mitigation *because* of the central location to accommodate the park."?

Why didn't the early CSD Board add that to their survey? I'll take a stab at the answer -- because if they had, 100-percent of the respondents would have said, "Are you out of your freaking mind!?"

Just curious... what percentage of the 53-percent of respondents that said they would be "much more inclined" to support the measure because it creates a park, would still have supported that idea if they had been apprised of those minor details?

There are so many notable items in the survey. Things will jump out at you that I haven't even touched upon -- things like attaching "special loans" to mortgages. Huh? Did that mean if a homeowner couldn't keep up with the \$35 a month added to their mortgage by the "special loan," they would no longer be a homeowner? Just a thought.

But, without a doubt, my favorite part of the survey is where it asks:

"What is the most important issue that you would like to see local governments in the Los Osos area do something about?"

And from a list of answers, respondents said: "Open space/park protections -- 1%"

That thin number was tucked away in that dusty document at the exact same time that the LOCSD was telling the California Coastal Commission, and printing in their Final Project Report, that there was a "strongly held community value" that any sewer plant in Los Osos must also double as a centrally located "recreational asset."

Naturally, the Coastal Commission recently told *SewerWatch* that they were not aware of the survey, and that's too bad, because the Coastal Commission believed the CSD, and in 2002, reluctantly signed-off on the ESHA-filled, Tri-W site based solely on that "community value." And, of course, again, the *Tribune* did not cover any of that, even though I wrote another *New Times* cover story (linked at *SewerWatch*) chronicling all of it. (Nice job, *Trib*... you're one hell of a "watchdog.")

However, the survey does show some good news for the ladies in Los Osos. The town has 6-percent more men than women, at least that was the case in 2001.



Invoice # 01

Business ID Number: 77-0485621

600

January 31, 2001

Submitted to:

Los Osos Community Services District

Billing period:

January 15-31, 2001

Activities and Task

- Meet with Stan, Rose and Bruce re Planning
- < Follow-up with Bruce Buel
- Siscussion with David Metz re scheduling call to discuss survey
- Meeting with Associate Pat Harris re: planning.
- Pat Harris attend LOCSD agency meeting on 1/21
- < Meeting with the Taylors
- Meeting with Pandora Nash Karner
- < Attend LOCSD workshop 1/23
- Meeting with Bruce and conference call with Dave Metz and Richard Maslin
- < Staff meeting with Bruce

| Project Management 12.25 hrs @ \$100.00 ST&A Associate Fee(s) 2.5 hrs @ \$60.00 | | \$1,225.00 \$150.00 |
|--|----------|------------------------|
| Clerical | | \$ -0- |
| | Subtotal | \$1375.00 |
| Indirect Costs | | |
| FMMA SURVEY | | \$12,000.00 |
| INDIRECT COSTS - | | |
| *Phone Costs | | \$60.00 |
| *Faxing | | \$30.00 |
| *Xeroxing | | \$-0- |
| *Mileage | | \$50.00 |
| *Postage | | \$15.00 |
| *Supplies | | \$-0- |
| • | Subtotal | \$12,155.00 |
| | | |

Amount Due This Invoice:

\$ 13,530.00

Please submit payment to:

Singleton-Tacket & Associates

PO Box 12638

San Luis Obispo, CA 93406

All payments are due upon receipt of invoice. All balances over 30 days past due have service charges added of 1.5% per month.



Invoice # 03 April 2, 2001

Business ID Number: 77-0485621

Submitted to:

Los Osos Community Services District

Billing period:

March 1-31, 2001

Activities and Task

- Follow-up re LOCSD survey, materials
- Assist with layout and format of newsletter with graphic designer
- Follow-up on miscellaneous items with Bruce Buel
- Follow-up conversation re: preliminary survey results with FMMA
- < Follow-up re Comments on survey</p>
- < Review survey information
- Meeting with Pavo Ogren re: cost recovery information
- Follow-up on discussion with Pavo re: subcommittee
- Preparation for planning session and LOCSD Board meeting to be held 3/15/01
- < Planning session on 3/15
- Meeting with FMMA re assessment ballot
- < Follow-up with Greg Haas
- Discussion with Betsy Umhoffer re media coordination
- < Attend LOCSD meeting on 3/15
- Follow-up with Rose Bowker
- Follow-up with FMMA re materials for Washington trip
- Follow-up with FMMA re ballot language and communication series
- Conversation with Greg Haas Capp's office re coordination and media issues related to Washington
- Conversation with Bruce Buel re: communication plan
- Planning with ST&A re communication plan
- Oevelop expanded budget plan and activities for LOCSD
- < Begin designing plan
- Meeting Pat Harris and Jean DeCosta re planning and design for information workshop
- < Follow-up with Bruce re : outcomes from Washington trip</p>
- Completion of strategic communications plan
- Meeting with Bruce, Rose and Stan re : planning
- Meeting with Greg Haas/Lois Capp's office re: discussion of next steps
- Phone discussion with Sun Bulletin reporter
- Follow-up with Bruce Buel

| Project Management 38.75 h | rs @ \$100.00 | \$3875.00 |
|---|---|--------------------------|
| ST&A Associate Fee(s) (Completion of FMMA survey) | ••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••• | \$10,000.00 |
| Clerical | Subtotal | \$ 275.00 \$14,150.00 |

LOS OSOS COMMUNITY SERVICES DISTRICT WASTEWATER SURVEY 220-1093UT FINAL NOT WEIGHTED BY ASSESSMENT

| Interv | iewer | Station | |
|--|---|--|---|
| Time | Began | Time Finished | Total Time |
| (IF OV | VNER IS A PERSON, ASK 1 | THE FOLLOWING:) | |
| calling like to |) from FMA, a public opinio | on research company. I am not ites to answer a brief survey ab | ITH PROPERTY OWNER LISTED) I'm trying to sell you anything, but I would bout issues that are important to property |
| (IF OV | VNER IS A BUSINESS, LEG | AL TRUST, OR SIMILAR ENTIT | Y. ASK THE FOLLOWING:) |
| Hello, but w sos), (give the Osos | I'm calling from FMA, a pu e would like to ask a few q California. It will only take he name of the person who | ublic opinion research company questions that could be importa a few minutes to complete the | e. We are not attempting to sell anything, and to owners of property in Los Osos (OHe survey. Could you connect me with or management of your property in Los |
| 1. | First, just to confirm, do y | ou own property in Los Osos (| OH-sos)? |
| | | Yes | 100% |
| | | No | TERMINATE |
| 2. | area, would you definitely | er property. If such an election | ners ballots and ask them to vote by mail in were held in the Los Osos (OH-sos) vote in the election, are the chances 50- vould you definitely not vote? |
| | | | 69% 21% |
| | | 50-50 | 4% |
| | | | 2% |
| | | | 2% 1% |
| | | .= | 170 |

What is the most important issue that you would like to see local governments in the Los Osos (OH-sos) area do something about? (OPEN-END, DO NOT READ CHOICES)

| Air quality/air pollution/smog0% |
|--|
| Crime0% |
| Drugs0% |
| Education/public schools0% |
| Gangs/juvenile violence0% |
| Government spending/budget0% |
| Growth and development/urban sprawl3% |
| Land use/zoning1% |
| Jobs/unemployment/the economy0% |
| *Open space/park protections1 % |
| Pollution generally/the environment2% |
| Public transportation0% |
| Racial divisions0% |
| Roads/highways7% |
| Taxes2% |
| Traffic and congestion1% |
| Violence0% |
| Wastewater treatment/septic tanks64% |
| Water quality/nitrate pollution in water3% |
| Other (SPECIFY)10% |
| (DON'T KNOW/NA)5% |
| |

Now I would like to read you a list of issues some people say may be problems in the Los Osos (OH-sos) area. After I read each one, please tell me whether you think it is a problem in the Los Osos (OH-sos) area or not. (IF PROBLEM, ASK: "Is that a serious problem or just somewhat of a problem?") (ROTATE)

| | , | SERIOUS | s.w. | NOT A | (DK/ |
|-------|---|---------|-------|-------|-------|
| | | PROB. | PROB. | PROB. | NA) |
| | | | | | 14747 |
| []a. | Unemployment | 5% | 14% | 57% | 23% |
| [lb. | Crime | 20/ | 240/ | 070 | 2370 |
| []0 | The evelter of least 15 at | 2 % | 24% | 6/% | -8% |
| I IC. | The quality of local drinking water | 16% | 31% | 46% | -6% |
| []d. | Traffic and congestion | 9% | 24% | 64% | -3% |
| []e. | The quality of public education | 5% | 12% | 59% | 25% |
| []f. | The amount of money people have to pay in property taxes | 20% | 30% | 44% | -6% |
| []g. | The lack of a safe and efficient system to dispose | | | | 0 70 |
| | of wastewater | 63% | 17% | 14% | -6% |
| []h. | Government waste and inefficiency | 27% | 24% | 36% | 13% |
| []i. | The rate of growth and development | 20% | 23% | 54% | -4% |
| []j. | The amount of park space and recreational areas in Los Osos | 22% | 27% | 45% | -5% |
| | | | * | | |

Now let me mention a few local government agencies that are active in the Los Osos (OH-sos) area. After I mention each one, please tell me if you have a favorable or unfavorable opinion of that agency. If you have never heard of the agency I ask you about, or don't know enough about it to have an opinion, you can tell me that too. (IF FAVORABLE/UNFAVORABLE, ASK: "Is that very or just somewhat?") (ROTATE)

| | | VERY FAV. | S.W. FAV. | S.W. UNFAV. | VERY UNFAV. | NEVER HEARD OF | |
|-------|--|------------------------|----------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------|--------|
| []a. | The Los Osos (OH-sos) Community Services District | -40% | 30% | 7.0/ | 4.0/ | | |
| []b. | The County of San Luis (LEWIS) Obispo | 1/10/ | 270/ | 7% | 4% | 6% | 14% |
| []c. | The California Regional Water Quality | - 14 70 | - 3/% | 20% | 17% | 1% | 12% |
| | Control Board | 7% | - 23% | 23% | 17% | 3% | 28% |
| 6. | Do you recall seeing or hearing anything rec treatment system in the Los Osos (OH-sos) just a little?) | ently abo area? (IF | out plans YES, AS | to build a r SK: Have y | new waster ou heard a | water great de | eal or |
| | Yes, a gr | eat deal- | | IASK O | 7.00\ 650 | , | |

Yes, a great deal-----(ASK Q7-Q8)--65% Yes, a little-----(ASK Q7-Q8)--26% No, haven't heard anything --- (SKIP TO Q8)--8% (DK/REFUSED/NA) ------ (SKIP TO Q8)--1%

(IF YES IN Q6, ASK Q7-Q8)

1

 In a few words of your own, can you tell me what you saw or heard? (OPEN END, RECORD VERBATIM RESPONSE BELOW)

| New system proposed/Trying to find alternative plan 26% |
|---|
| How to fund the project/costs too much14% |
| Location14% |
| *Proposal to build underground with park over it8% |
| Community growing, needs new sewer system5% |
| Putting in sediment ponds/Holding tanks5% |
| Local advertising/Pamphlets/Brochures4% |
| Cost each household \$100/using our money4% |
| Citizens don't want it built near them/Middle of town4% |
| Length of time to completion4% |
| Have seen the plans |
| Have seen the plans |
| Some of the plans & permits have been approved3% |
| Need more information1% |
| No answer2% |
| Misc2% |
| Don't know/Refused2% |

| treatment system? | 3. | From what you have heard, treatment system? | would your property fall into the area served by the new was | tewater |
|-------------------|----|---|--|---------|
|-------------------|----|---|--|---------|

| Yes91% |
|-------------------|
| No4 % |
| (DK/REFUSED/NA)5% |

(RESUME ASKING ALL RESPONDENTS)

NOW I AM GOING TO ASK YOU ABOUT SOME OTHER ISSUES.

9. Would you support or oppose the construction of a new wastewater treatment system that would remove and treat wastewater from all homes and businesses in the Los Osos (OH-sos) area? (IF SUPPORT/ OPPOSE, ASK: "Is that strongly SUPPORT/OPPOSE or just somewhat?")

There will be a special election in a few months that will give property owners the opportunity to vote by mail on a wastewater treatment project for Los Osos (OH-sos). Let me explain a little bit more about it:

The project would replace septic tanks in Los Osos (OH-sos) with a sewer system and wastewater treatment facility. The treatment facility, located at next to the library on Palisades Avenue, will be completely covered and equipped with odor-removal equipment. It will be surrounded by a new community park complete with trails, gardens, a dog park, ballfields, and an amphitheater. Treated wastewater will be recycled for use in irrigation, and sludge will be removed to a site outside of Los Osos (OH-sos). Once the system is complete, it will protect drinking water supplies from contamination and prevent Los Osos (OH-sos) property owners from being fined by the Regional Water Quality Control Board.

The assessment to fund the wastewater treatment system would be calculated individually for every property based on the proportionate amount of wastewater produced by that property. The average single-family residential property would pay a monthly assessment of nineteen dollars to help pay back the cost of municipal bonds that will fund part of the construction.

If the vote on this measure were held today, would you vote <u>yes</u> to support the construction of the wastewater treatment system or <u>no</u> to oppose it? (IF YES/NO, ASK: "Is that definitely or just probably?")

| Definitely Yes to support52 | 2% |
|--|----|
| Probably Yes to support20 |)% |
| Probably No to oppose3 | 1% |
| Definitely No to oppose8 | 1% |
| (DON'T READ) Need more info(SKIP TO Q12)15 | % |

(DON'T READ) Don't know----- (SKIP TO Q12)--3%

(IF YES/NO IN Q10, ASK Q11)

 In a few words of your own, why would you vote YES/NO on this measure? (OPEN END, RECORD VERBATIM RESPONSE BELOW)

| Yes |
|--|
| We need a sewer system in the worst way31% |
| Whole package sounds good/good for the community18% |
| we need to protect the water resources |
| It seems very affordable at \$19 a month |
| Being forced to or will have to pay fines8% |
| This should've happened when the city reached a certain size8% |
| It's a matter of public health6% |
| It will allow people to start building again5% |
| If it were less than \$100/concerned about the cost3% |
| fired of them not using money the way they should |
| VIISC |
| Don't know1% |
| 1 /0 |
| <u>No</u> |
| It's too costly42% |
| It's not needed |
| Because of its location |
| Should find another alternative |
| Don't know/NA/Misc0% |
| 0 / 0 |

(RESUME ASKING ALL RESPONDENTS)

In addition to the nineteen-dollar monthly assessment I just mentioned, the wastewater treatment project would have some other costs that would be billed to area property owners. These include the cost of paying back a loan from the state that will help finance the project, and the cost of the ongoing operation and maintenance of the system.

The total amount of these costs has not yet been finalized. I'm going to read a range of possible total average monthly costs for single-family homeowners; after I read each one, please tell me whether you would vote yes or no on the project at that monthly cost.

Remember, I am asking about the <u>total</u> cost. Would you vote yes or no on this measure if you knew the total average monthly cost for you would be... (READ FIRST NUMBER) What if it were...? (READ NEXT NUMBER IN ORDER AND CONTINUE THROUGH THE LIST) (IF YES/NO, ASK: "Is that definitely or just probably?")

(SPLIT SAMPLE A: READ IN LISTED ORDER)

(SPLIT SAMPLE B: READ IN REVERSE OF LISTED ORDER)

| | C | DEFINITELY YES | PROBABLY YES | PROBABLY <u>NO</u> | DEFINITELY NO | (NEED MORE INFO) | (DK/ NA) |
|----|---|-------------------|-----------------|-----------------------|------------------|------------------------|-------------|
| υ. | Eighty dollars Ninety dollars One hundred dollars | 21% | 18% | 11% | 30% | 70/ | 20/ |

FAIRBANK, MASLIN, MAULLIN & ASSOC.

220-1093-UT

PAGE 7

| []d. | One hundred and ten dollars11% | 10% | 18% | 52% 6% 3% |
|-------|------------------------------------|-----|-----|-----------|
| []e. | One hundred and twenty dollars 10% | 10% | 16% | 55% 6% 3% |

13. In order to take advantage of the new wastewater treatment system, property owners will have to pay to have their property connected to the main sewer lines that will take wastewater away for treatment. The cost of these connections will vary widely, depending on the location and type of buildings on each property. The average single-family residential property owner will have to pay a one-time fee of roughly seventeen hundred dollars to connect to the wastewater treatment system.

Having heard this, if the vote on this measure were held today, would you vote \underline{yes} to support the construction of the wastewater treatment system or \underline{no} to oppose it? (IF YES/NO, ASK: "Is that definitely or just probably?")

| Definitely Yes to support37% |
|--------------------------------|
| Probably Yes to support19% |
| Probably No to oppose8% |
| Definitely No to oppose18% |
| (DON'T READ) Need more info12% |
| (DON'T READ) Don't know6% |

14. Local banks have already agreed to make low-cost loans available to help people pay the costs of the connection charge I just described. The loans can be arranged by adding onto existing mortgages, or through a new special loan program. By taking these loans, property owners would not have to pay an up-front connection charge, but would pay an average of between ten and 35 dollars per month, depending upon the length of the loan or mortgage. If you knew that these loans were available, would you vote <u>yes</u> to support the construction of the wastewater treatment system or <u>no</u> to oppose it? (IF YES/NO, ASK: "Is that definitely or just probably?")

| Definitely Yes to support40% |
|---------------------------------|
| Probably Yes to support28% |
| Probably No to oppose4% |
| Definitely No to oppose12% |
| (DON'T READ) Need more info 11% |
| (DON'T READ) Don't know5% |

15. Next, I am going to read you a list of specific features of the proposed wastewater treatment project. After I read each one, please tell me whether including that feature makes you more likely or less likely to vote for the measure approving the project. (IF MORE/LESS LIKELY, ASK: Is that much MORE/LESS likely or just somewhat?) (ROTATE)

| | • | MUCH MORE LIKELY | S.W. MORE LIKELY | S.W. LESS LIKELY | MUCH LESS LIKELY | (DK/ NA) |
|--------|---|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|-------------|
| []a. | It limits further contamination of | | | | | |
| f 16 | Los Osos (OH-sos) drinking water supplies | 55% | 22% | 3% | 7% | 12% |
| []b. | It eliminates the use of septic tanks | 48% | 20% | 9% | 13% | 11% |
| []c. | It reduces the rate at which Los | | | | | |
| | Osos (OH-sos) will use up its groundwater | 50% | 26% | 3% | 9% | 11% |
| []d. | It builds a sewer system to remove | | | | | |
| | wastewater from all properties in Los Osos | | | | | |
| f 1- | (OH-sos) | 52% | 26% | 4% | 8% | 9% |
| []e. | It prevents Los Osos (OH-sos) property owners | | | | | |
| | from being liable for fines of ten thousand | | | | | |
| | dollars per day due to the community's lack of | | | | | |
| . 16 | a wastewater treatment system | 54% | 17% | 6% | 11% | 13% |
| []f. | It does <u>not</u> use ponds as a way of | | | | | |
| | removing treated wastewater | 34% | 17% | 8% | 12% | 29% |
| Jg. | It creates a new park for the use of | | | | | |
| | schoolchildren and local community members, | | | | | |
| | complete with trails, gardens, a dog park, ball | | | | | |
| | fields, and an amphitheater | 53% | 23% | 4% | 9% | 11% |
| []h. | It provides recycled water for use in irrigation | 56% | 27% | 3% | 6% | 8% |
| []i. | It maintains local control of the community's | | | | | |
| | water resources | 60% | 23% | 2% | 6% | 9% |
| []j. | It eliminates the need to import expensive | | | | | |
| | water | 59% | 19% | 4% | 8% | 10% |
| []k. | It prevents sea water from further | | | | | |
| | draining into the community's drinking | | | | | |
| | water supplies | 58% | 18% | 3% | 7% | 13% |
| []]. | It builds a treatment facility that is completely | | | - / - | , , , | , . |
| | covered and equipped with odor-removal | | | | | |
| | equipment | 60% | 20% | 3% | 7% | 9% |
| []m. | It protects Morro Bay and the Estuary from | | | 0 /0 | , ,, | 0 70 |
| | contamination with nitrates and bacteria | | 18% | 3% | 6% | - 10% |
| []n. | It removes all collected sludge to a site outside | | . 0 , 0 | 0 70 | 0 70 | 1070 |
| | of Los Osos (OH-sos) | 51% | 22% | 4% | 8% | - 15% |
| []o. | It offsets costs with grants and loans from the | 0.70 | 22 /0 | 7,0 | 0 /0 | - 1370 |
| | state and federal governments | 64% | 20% | 1 % | 5% | - 10% |
| | | / 4 | 20 /0 | 1 /0 | | 10/0 |
| (SPLIT | SAMPLE A ONLY) | | | | | |
| βp. | It eliminates the current ban on new | | | | | |
| | development in Los Osos (OH-sos) | 40% | 20% | 11% | 20% | - 10% |
| , | | / 0 | 20 /0 | - 1 1 70 | 20 /0 | 10/0 |

| SPLIT SAMPLE B ONLY | SPL | ΙT | SA | MP | LE | В | ON | IL. | Υ |
|---------------------|-----|----|----|----|----|---|----|-----|---|
|---------------------|-----|----|----|----|----|---|----|-----|---|

[]q. It returns control over local growth and land-use decisions to local officials ------ 50% ----- 19% ------ 5% ------ 8% ------ 19%

(RESUME ASKING ALL RESPONDENTS)

16. The election on this wastewater treatment measure will be held through the mail. In addition to a ballot, all affected property owners will be sent some information about the wastewater treatment projects that will be funded, the amount of their assessment, and the way that the assessment was calculated. Property owners will have 45 days to fill out their ballots and mail them back.

Based on what I have said, do you think definitely vote in the election, probably vote in the election, are the chances 50-50 that you will vote, will you probably not vote, or will you definitely not vote?

| Definitely vote87% |
|-----------------------|
| Probably vote8% |
| 50-503% |
| Probably not vote0% |
| Definitely not vote2% |
| (DON'T KNOW/NA)1 % |

17. Let me read you some statements we have heard from various people about the wastewater treatment measure on which you will be asked to vote. After hearing each statement, please tell me if it makes you more inclined to vote <u>yes to support</u> the measure. If you do not believe the statement, or if it has no effect on your thinking one way or the other, please tell me that too. (IF MORE INCLINED, ASK: "Is that much more or just somewhat?")

MUCH SMWHT

MORE MORE (LESS DON'T NO (NO INCL. INCL.) BELIEVE EFFECT OPIN.)

(ROTATE)

| Unless we pass this measure, our | |
|--|--|
| drinking water is at risk of biological | |
| contamination. Our septic systems | |
| have contaminated | |
| our water supplies with dangerously | |
| high levels of nitrates. We need to pass | |
| this measure now to ensure that we | |
| have safe, clean drinking water for the | |
| future, | 37%11%6% |
| This measure is the result of years | 0270 1070 |
| of careful planning and research by | |
| | |
| in our area. We will not be able to | |
| come up with a wastewater treatment | |
| | |
| | |
| | drinking water is at risk of biological contamination. Our septic systems have contaminated our water supplies with dangerously high levels of nitrates. We need to pass this measure now to ensure that we have safe, clean drinking water for the future. This measure is the result of years of careful planning and research by some of the best engineers and planners in our area. We will not be able to |

and affordability.-----19%-----10%-----8%

[]c. This measure is our last chance to approve a wastewater system for Los Osos (OH-sos). The Regional Water Quality Control Board has set a firm deadline by which we have to approve a new system; unless this measure passes, property owners could be subject to fines of as much as ten thousand dollars per day.

much as ten thousand dollars per day. -----7%-----7%-----25%-----10% -----7%

MUCH SMWHT MORE MORE (LESS DON'T NO (NO INCL. INCL. BELIEVE EFFECT OPIN.) INCL.) []d. Building in Los Osos (OH-sos) is prohibited until a wastewater treatment system is put in place. People who bought land to retire here have been unable to improve their property. By approving this measure, we can allow this kind of reasonable, managed growth in Los Osos (OH-sos).-----33%----- 21% -----15%------11%----- 15% ------5% []e. This measure includes funds to - \$2-3 million worth of funds? build a large park for the citizens of Los Osos (OH-sos). The park would include ballfields, a picnic an amphitheater, and even where did that word come from? constructed wetlands. ----- 16% ----- 16% ----- 16% ----- 16% []f. This measure was developed with extensive public input: last year alone, the Los Osos (OH-sos) Community Services District Board had 39 public meetings to gather public comments; the District's wastewater committee held an additional 24 public meetings. Using that public input measure was developed to meet the needs and concerns of Los Osos (OH-sos) property owners. ------6%-----15% -----9%

18. No matter which way you might be leaning on the wastewater treatment vote, of the statements I just read which one stands out as the best reason why someone should vote <u>FOR</u> this measure? (DO NOT RE-READ RESPONSES)

| | a. Drinking water contamination 32% |
|----|-------------------------------------|
| | b. Engineers' best plan/balanced |
| | approach6% |
| | c. Last chance/fines from govt 17% |
| | d. Remove building restrictions9% |
| ۱* | e. Will create park7% |
| 4 | f. Plan from public input6% |
| | (DON'T READ) All of these5% |
| | (DON'T READ) None of these12% |
| | (DON'T READ) DK/NA6% |

| 19. | Now that you have heard more about it, let me ask you one more time: if you had to vote today, |
|-----|--|
| | would you vote 155 to support the wastewater treatment measure, or would you vote NO to |
| | oppose it? (IF YES/NO, ASK: "Is that definitely or just probably?") |

| Definitely Yes to support48% |
|---------------------------------|
| Probably Yes to support23% |
| Probably No to oppose4% |
| Definitely No to oppose8% |
| (DON'T READ) Need more info 12% |
| (DON'T READ) Don't know5% |

20. Here are some more statements we have heard from various people about the wastewater treatment measure on which you will be asked to vote. After hearing each statement, please tell me if it makes you more inclined to vote no to oppose the measure. If you do not believe the statement, or if it has no effect on your thinking one way or the other, please tell me that too. (IF MORE INCLINED, ASK: "Is that much more or just somewhat?")

| (ROTA | ATF) | MUCH MORE INCL. | SMWHT MORE INCL. | (LESS INCL.) | DON'T BELIEVE | NO EFFECT | (NO OPIN.) |
|-------|---|-----------------------|------------------------|-----------------|------------------|--------------|---------------|
| []a. | People just can't afford to pay any more taxes, no matter what the government says about | | | | | | |
| í]b. | groundwater contamination. The ban on development in Los Osos (OH-sos) has allowed our community to retain its small-town feel. If we vote for this measure, the ban will be lifted and rapid development will destroy the | | | | | | |
| []c. | character of Los Osos (OH-sos) | | | | | | |
| []d. | natural sources, not septic tanks | 8% 1 | 11% | 6% | 35% 1 | 7% 1: | 3% |
| | and over 100 dollars per month. There must be a way to treat our wastewater that does not cost so much.———————————————————————————————————— | 5% 1 | 7% | 8%1 | 12%2 | 2%6 | 6% |
|) | problems1 | 8% 1 | 1% | 6%2 | 28% 2 | 5% 12 | 2% |

21. Sometimes over the course of a survey like this, people change their minds. Let me ask you one more time: if you had to vote today, would you vote YES to support the wastewater treatment measure, or would you vote NO to oppose it? (IF YES/NO, ASK: "Is that definitely or just probably?")

| Definitely Yes to support47% |
|---------------------------------|
| Probably Yes to support24% |
| Probably No to oppose6% |
| Definitely No to oppose9% |
| (DON'T READ) Need more info 10% |
| (DON'T READ) Don't know4% |

1'm going to read the names of some people and organizations that might speak out about the wastewater treatment measure I have been asking about. After you hear each name, please tell me if you would consider that person or organization to be a reliable source of information or not about this measure. If you have never heard of the person or organization, or have no opinion about it, please tell me that too. (IF RELIABLE/NOT RELIABLE, ASK): "Is that very or somewhat/not too or not at all?") (READ LIST AND ROTATE NAMES)

| []a. Congresswoman Lois Capps |
|--|
| []b. State Senator Jack O'Connell7%7%37%3%6%6%6%6% |
| Lic. The Los Osos (OH-sos) Community |
| |
| |
| []d. Los Osos (OH-sos) Community Services |
| District Board Member Rosemary |
| |
| Bowker (BOW [as in "wow"]-ker)20% 34% 13% 2% 2% 29% []e. Los Osos (OH-sos) Community Services |
| District Board Member Frank Freiler |
| (FRY-ler)3%30% |
| [If. The National Estuary Program14%14%17%3%3%29% |
| []g. Mary Ellen Simkins29% |
| []h. Homeowners who have recently bought |
| or sold homes in Los Osos (OH-sos)6%13%20%12%39% |
| li. Gary Karner |
| []j. The Morro Coast Audubon Society11%29%5%7%7% |
| []k. The Howard Jarvis Taxpayers |
| Association 17% 29% |
| 1 + 75 20 76 1 7 76 1 7 76 29 % |
| (SPLIT SAMPLE B ONLY) |
| []I. State Assemblyman Abel Maldonado2% 19% 5% 13% 30% |
| []m. County Supervisor Shirley Bianchi |
| (bee-ON-kee)14%28% |
| []n. The League of Women Voters4%4%4%4%4%4%4% |
| []o. Pandora Nash-Karner |
| []p. Your local neighborhood association13% 18% 22% 4% 4% 40% |
| []q. Los Osos (OH-sos) Community Services |
| District Board Member Stan Gustafson12%23%5%5%4%30% |
| []r. Los Osos (OH-sos) Community Services |
| District Board Member Gordon Hensley 17% 19% 3% 4% 35% |
| []s. Los Osos (OH-sos) Community Services |
| District Board Member Sylvia Smith14% 28% 18% 4% 2% 34% |
| I.t. Ray Bracken 294 3294 996 1196 294 294 |
| []u. Tom Neve (NEEV) |
| Liv. The Morro Estuary Greenbelt Alliance. |
| or MEGA 10% 18% 16% 20% 4% 10% 34% |

(RESUME ASKING ALL RESPONDENTS)

NOW I WOULD LIKE TO ASK YOU A FEW QUESTIONS ABOUT THE PLACES YOU TURN FOR NEWS AND INFORMATION.

23. I'm going to read you a list of sources from which people get information about community issues in Los Osos. For each, I'd like you to tell me how often you use it to get information about community issues: frequently, occasionally, rarely, or never. (ROTATE)

| | community issues. Trequently, occasionally, falely, (| | | | | (DV) |
|----------------|---|---|---------------------------------------|--|---|--|
| | • | FREQ. | OCCAS. | RARELY | NEVER | (DK/ NA) |
| []a. | Local television news programs | - 50% | | | | 0% |
| []b. | Cable television news programs | 30% | 18% | 12% | 38% | 1% |
| []c. | Radio | 28% | 21% | 16% | 35% | 1% |
| []d. | The Sun-Bulletin newspaper | | | | | |
| []e. | The Tribune newspaper | | | | | |
| []f. | The Los Angeles Times | | | | | |
| []g. | The San Francisco Chronicle | 3% | 5% | 12% | 79% | 1% |
| []h. | The Gazette newspaper | | | | | |
| []i. | E-mail | - 13% | 12% | 11% | 64% | 1% |
| []j. | Mail you receive from organizations of | | | , . | , . | . , . |
| | which you are a member | - 20% | 22% | 14% | 43% | 1% |
| []k. | The Los Osos (OH-sos) Community | | | | , . | . , , |
| | Services District website | 6% | 8% | 9% | 75% | 2% |
| | | | | | | |
| 24. | I'm going to read you a list of television stations that me how often you use it to get information about co rarely, or never. (ROTATE) | t serve L mmunity | os Osos. F rissues: fre | or each, I'd quently, od | d like you casionally | · . |
| | | | | | | IDVI |
| | | EBEO | 00040 | DADELY | NEVED | (DK/ |
| | | FREQ. | OCCAS. | RARELY | NEVER | NA) |
| []a. | KSBY-TV, the local NBC station | | | | | NA) |
| []a. []b. | KSBY-TV, the local NBC stationKCOY-TV, the local CBS station | - 56% | 15% | 7% | 22% | NA) |
| []a. []b. | KSBY-TV, the local NBC stationKCOY-TV, the local CBS station | - 56% | 15% | 7% | 22% | NA) |
| | | - 56% - 20% ve Los O | 15% 17% | 7% 15% | 22% 47% | NA) 1% 1% Il me rely, |
| []b. | I'm going to read you a list of radio stations that ser how often you use it to get information about comm | - 56% - 20% ve Los O | 15% 17% | 7% 15% | 22% 47% | 1% 1% |
| []b. | I'm going to read you a list of radio stations that ser how often you use it to get information about commor never. (ROTATE) | - 56% - 20% ve Los O nunity iss | 15%sos. For eaues: freque | 7% 15% ach, I'd like ntly, occas | 22% 47% you to te ionally, ra | NA) 1% 1% II me rely, (DK/ NA) |
| []b. 25. | I'm going to read you a list of radio stations that ser how often you use it to get information about commor never. (ROTATE) KVEC, FM 92 point zero | - 56% 20% ve Los O nunity iss FREQ. | 15%sos. For eaues: freque | 7% ach, I'd likently, occas | 22% | NA) 1% 1% II me rely, (DK/ NA) |
| []b. 25. | I'm going to read you a list of radio stations that ser how often you use it to get information about commor never. (ROTATE) KVEC, FM 92 point zeroKGLO, AM 1340 | - 56% 20% ve Los O nunity iss FREQ 13% | 15%sos. For eaues: freque | 7% 15% ach, I'd like ntly, occas RARELY 11% | 22% 47% you to te ionally, ra NEVER -64% | NA) 1% 1% II me rely, (DK/ NA) 1% |
| []b. 25. | I'm going to read you a list of radio stations that ser how often you use it to get information about commor never. (ROTATE) KVEC, FM 92 point zero | - 56% 20% ve Los O nunity iss FREQ 13% | 15%sos. For eaues: freque | 7% 15% ach, I'd like ntly, occas RARELY 11% | 22% 47% you to te ionally, ra NEVER -64% | NA) 1% 1% II me rely, (DK/ NA) 1% |
| []b. 25. | I'm going to read you a list of radio stations that ser how often you use it to get information about commor never. (ROTATE) KVEC, FM 92 point zero | - 56% 20% ve Los O nunity iss FREQ 13% 17% 17% | 15%sos. For eaues: freque OCCAS10%9% | 7% ach, I'd like ntly, occas RARELY 11% 6% watch the ess Channe | 22% | NA) 1% 1% II me rely, (DK/ NA) 1% 1% 1% |

Occasionally ------20% Rarely ------14% Never -----27%

27.

28.

29.

30.

31.

| ANK, MASLIN, MAULLIN & ASSOC. | 220-1093-UT | PAGE 17 |
|---|--|--|
| | Do not subscribe to cable TV(DON'T READ) Don't know | |
| | E. I'M ONLY GOING TO ASK YOU A F FOR CLASSIFICATION PURPOSES. | EW |
| Do you drink the tap water at your pro | perty in Los Osos (OH-sos)? | THE RELEASE OF THE PROPERTY OF |
| | Yes | 62% |
| | No | 38% |
| | (DK/REFUSED/NA) | 0% |
| How long have you owned property in APPROPRIATE CATEGORY) | the Los Osos (OH-sos) area? (OPEN-E | ND-CODE IN |
| | Five years or less | 25% |
| | 6-10 years | 16% |
| | 11-15 years | 22% |
| | 16-20 years | 9% |
| | 21-25 years | 11% |
| | 26 years or more | 18% |
| | (DK/REFUSED/NA) | 0% |
| Are you registered to vote? (IF YES, A member of some other party, or do yo | ASK: Are you registered as a Democrat u decline to state a party affiliation?) | , a Republican, a |
| | Yes, Democrat | 39% |
| | Yes, Republican | |
| | Yes, other party | |
| | Yes, decline to state | |
| 1 | No, not registered to vote | |
| | (DON'T KNOW/NA) | |
| Which of the following best describes house, or a mobile home? | your place of residence: an apartment, | a condominium, a |
| | Apartment | 1% |
| | Condominium | |
| | House | 95% |
| | Mobile home | 1% |
| | (DK/REFUSED/NA) | 0% |
| In what year were you born? | | |
| | 1983-1977 (18-24) | 1% |
| | 1976-1972 (25-29) | |
| | 1971-1967 (30-34) | |
| | | - / U |

1966-1962 (35-39) -----5% 1961-1957 (40-44) ----- 10% 1956-1952 (45-49) -----11% 1951-1947 (50-54) -----14% 1946-1942 (55-59) -----13%

| FAIRBANK, MASLIN | MAULLIN | & | ASSOC |
|------------------|---------|---|-------|
|------------------|---------|---|-------|

RMF ------91% RSF ------91% Blank -----1%

| 220-1 | 1093 | III- |
|-------|------|------|
| -20 | | |

PAGE 18

| _ | | 1941-1937 (60-64)6% |
|---------------|---|---|
| | | 1936 or earlier (65 +)31% |
| | | (REFUSED)6% |
| 32. | With which racial or ethnic group | do you identify yourself: White or European, Black or African- |
| | American, Hispanic or Latino, Fili | ipino, Asian, or some other ethnic or racial background? |
| | | NA/Lin- |
| | | White91% |
| | | Black0% |
| | | Hispanic/Latino2% |
| | | Filipino0% |
| | | Asian1 % |
| | | OTHER(SPECIFY) 2% |
| | | (DON'T READ) DK/NA/REFUSED4% |
| 33. | income. Would you please stop income for all the people in your | mount, but I'm going to read you some categories for household me when I have read the category indicating the total combined household before taxes in 2000? \$10,000 and under |
| | | |
| | | THANK AND TERMINATE |
| GEND | ER (By Observation): | |
| Constitution, | | Male53% |
| | | Female47% |
| ZONIN | G CODE: | |
| CB | 0% | |
| | 0% 1% | |
| | | |
| OP | 1 % | |