

SANTA BARBARA COUNTY BOARD AGENDA LETTER



Clerk of the Board of Supervisors
105 E. Anapamu Street, Suite 407
Santa Barbara, CA 93101
(805) 568-2240

Agenda Number:
Prepared on: 09/17/02
Department Name: County Administrator
Department No.: 012
Agenda Date: 09/24/02
Placement: Departmental
Estimate Time: 30 min
Continued Item: NO
If Yes, date from:

TO: Board of Supervisors

FROM: Michael F. Brown, County Administrator

STAFF CONTACT: Jim Laponis, Deputy County Administrator
Lori Norton, Analyst 568-3421

SUBJECT: Legislative Program Committee Recommendations

Recommendation(s):

That the Board of Supervisors consider taking the following actions relative to Statewide Ballot Initiatives Qualified for the November 5, 2002 Ballot:

- A. Support Proposition 46, the Housing and Emergency Shelter Trust Fund Act of 2002
- B. Take no position on Propositions 47, 48, and 49
- C. Consider, without a recommendation from the Legislative Program Committee, Proposition 51, Transportation. Allocation of Sales and Use Taxes Raised from Sale or Lease of Motor Vehicles
- D. Support Proposition 52, Election Day Voter Registration.

Alignment with Board Strategic Plan:

The recommendations are primarily aligned with Goal No. 1. An Efficient Government Able to Respond Effectively to the Needs of the Community.

Executive Summary and Discussion:

On September 17th, the Legislative Program Committee ("Committee") met, considered, and voted to forward the above recommendations to the Board of Supervisors. The 2002 Committee is comprised of the following members: First District Supervisor Naomi Schwartz, Second District Supervisor Susan Rose, County Administrator Michael F. Brown, Auditor-Controller Robert Geis, and County Counsel Stephen Shane Stark. Where pertinent, additional information regarding the recommended actions is included in the following paragraphs.

Statewide Ballot Initiatives

A brief summary of the Statewide Initiatives that will appear on the November 5th Ballot is included in Attachment A. Attachment A also includes a copy of the State voters guide for the November 5th ballot.

The voters guide provides an analysis by the Legislative Analyst and the full text of each of the Propositions.

Proposition 46

The Committee voted to recommend that the Board of Supervisors support Proposition 46, which, if approved by voters, will allow the State to sell \$2.1 billion of general obligation bonds to fund various housing programs primarily for low-and moderate-income homebuyers. This recommendation is consistent with the Board's action of 4/16/02, when the Board supported SB 1277, the bill that resulted in placement of Proposition 46 on the November 5th ballot. County Administrator Michael Brown raised concerns regarding increasing the State's debt, through the passage of additional general obligations bonds and noted that the November 5th ballot contains three bond measures totaling approximately \$19 billion. Concern about the impact of adding to the State's debt during the existing State budget crisis was expressed. Mr. Brown and Mr. Geis abstained from the vote to recommend the Board support Proposition 46.

Propositions 47, 48, and 49

The Legislative Program Committee voted to recommend the Board of Supervisors take no position on Propositions 47, 48, and 49.

Proposition 50

On August 6, 2002, the Board of Supervisors adopted a Resolution of Support for Proposition 50, and appointed Supervisor Joni Gray to serve as a representative of the County in the Northern and Coastal Water Bond Initiative Coalition.

Proposition 51

The Committee voted to send Proposition 51 to the Board for consideration, without a recommendation. Proposition 51 would redirect from the State General Fund, to transportation purposes, 30% of the sales and use tax revenue from the sale of new and used motor vehicles. The Legislative Analyst estimates that approximately \$420 million would be diverted in FY 02-03, increasing to \$910 million in FY 03-04, and continuing to increase annually depending on the increase in the sale and leasing of motor vehicles. These funds would be allocated to 17 specific funding categories.

Proposition 51 would be additive to Proposition 42, approved by the voters in March 2002, which permanently dedicates sales tax paid on gasoline to transportation-related programs. Proposition 42 allocates approximately \$1.3 billion annually to transportation beginning in FY 03-04. If Proposition 51 passes, approximately 4.5% of the States sales tax revenue will be dedicated to transportation.

Proponents of Proposition 51, argue that the State's transportation infrastructure needs are grossly underfunded and that a dedicated revenue stream, is necessary to rebuild the State's transportation infrastructure. Opponents argue that Proposition 51 further reduces the State's flexibility to determine how to spend its General Fund dollars by earmarking funds for transportation related purposes. Additionally, in the current State budget crisis, opponents fear that passage of Proposition 51 will require additional reductions in State General Fund program areas including education, health care and social services. Finally, opponents of Proposition 51 claim that many of the projects specifically identified to be funded by Proposition 51 were selected to obtain contributions to support the passage of the Proposition, and did not go through any process to insure funding is directed to either State or local transportation priorities.

Please note: one of the projects identified for funding in Proposition (Project 102, Pg 90-91 of the attached voter guide) is identified as Route 101 access: State Street smart corridor Advanced Traffic Corridor System (ATSC) technology in Santa Barbara County. One million three hundred thousand dollars (\$1,300,000) is identified for the project and the City of Santa Barbara is identified as the lead applicant. According to the Proposition proponents, Santa Barbara County would also be eligible to apply for funding in a number of the funding categories.

Even with these potential direct benefits to the County, staff recommends the Board oppose Proposition 51. CSAC is also on record in opposition to Proposition 51.

Attachment B includes two analysis of Proposition 51, one prepared by the California Budget Project and the second by the California Transportation Commission. It also includes an endorsement list for Proposition 51. (Vote No on Proposition 51 does not have a list of opponents.) Finally, Attachment B includes a list of potential programmatic benefits (categories of funding for which Santa Barbara County transportation agencies may apply) as prepared by Vote Yes on Proposition 51, and a recent article from the Los Angeles Times (September 9) titled: *Clearing the Road for Pet Projects*.

Proposition 52

The Committee voted to recommend the Board support Proposition 52, the Election Day Voter Registration Initiative. Proposition 52 would allow eligible citizens, upon presenting proof of residency, to register up to and including election day. The County Clerk Recorder Assessor, Ken Pettit, supports Proposition 52, and urged the Committee to recommend support to the Board. After discussing the potential benefits of increased voter participation and the concern of increased voter fraud, the Committee unanimously voted to recommend support.

Federal Priorities

The Legislative Committee received an oral report, from Waterman and Associates, on the status of the County's Federal Legislative Program. Of interest, Ron Waterman conveyed that the County was awarded \$450 thousand under the USFA Fire Grant Program. The County applied for but did not succeed in obtaining funding last year through this grant process. In the current year, Waterman and Associates assisted the County in preparing and submitting our application for grant funding.

Ron Waterman also reported that they are continuing to pursue an amendment to obtain CDBG entitlement status for the County of Santa Barbara. If successful, this would allow the County to access approximately \$3.5 million annually in housing funds. Waterman and Associates are working to include a Floor Amendment in the VA-HUD Appropriations bill, which may be considered in the current Federal Legislative Session.

State Legislative Update

Cliff Berg, Governmental Advocates, provided a very brief update on the State Budget and the status of State legislation. Mr. Berg will present the end of the year legislative review to the Board at its meeting of October 8th.

Mandates and Service Levels:

The Legislative Program is not mandated and its service levels are discretionary.

Fiscal and Facility Impacts:

There are no facility impacts; the fiscal impacts, if known, are noted in the discussion of each issue.

C: (E-mail) Cliff Berg, Governmental Advocates
 Ron Waterman, Waterman and Associates
 Phil Demery, Public Works