Attachment A

HOPE SCHOOL DISTRICT

3970 LA COLINA ROAD • SANTA BARBARA, CALIFORNIA 93110 • PHONE (805) 682-2564
Daniel Cooperman, Ph.D., District Superintendent FAX (805) 687-7954

September 17, 2013

County of Santa Barbara
County Executive Office—Proposition 90 Comments
105 East Anapamu Street, Suite 406
Santa Barbara, CA 93101

Proposition 90, Written Comments—Hope School District

Dear Ms. Wallar:

I am writing to express my opposition to implementation of Proposition 90 in Santa Barbara County.

The reason for my opposition is that the district would lose tax revenue if Proposition 90 were implemented. Having absorbed $2.2 million in revenue reductions over the past four years, additional Proposition 90 losses would further constrain district finances. The losses have already been substantial from our $9 million annual budget.

While some individuals would benefit from Proposition 90, the educational needs of students within our county constitute a higher priority.

Thank you for this opportunity to provide comment. Please contact me if further information is required.

Sincerely,

Dan Cooperman, Ph. D.
Superintendent
Hope School District

SANTA YNEZ COMMUNITY SERVICES DISTRICT

Mailing Address: P.O. Box 667, Santa Ynez, CA 93460-0667 • (805) 688-3008

October 3, 2013

County of Santa Barbara
County Executive Officer - Proposition 90 Comments
105 East Anapamu Street, Suite 406
Santa Barbara, CA 93101

Re: Proposition 90

Dear Ms. Wallar:

At a Special Meeting of the Board of Directors of the Santa Ynez Community Services District, your letter dated September 16, 2013 regarding implementing Proposition 90 (and attachments) was presented.

The Board discussed and considered the possible impacts to this District and also considered the possible impacts to the entire County of Santa Barbara. Because of the undetermined negative impacts to this District, the Board voted to **oppose implementing Proposition 90**.

Thank you for giving us the opportunity to comment on this very important decision.

Sincerely,

Bobbie Martin

Bobbie Martin
General Manager

CITY OF GOLETA

October 2, 2013

County of Santa Barbara
Chandra L. Wallar
County Executive Office – Proposition 90 Comments
105 East Anapamu, Street, Suite 406
Santa Barbara, CA 93101

RE: Proposition 90 Notice of Opposition

Dear Ms. Wallar:

The City of Goleta is opposed to the implementation of Proposition 90's "local-option" in Santa Barbara County which would allow the County to accept the transfer of property tax base values from other California counties when purchasing a new or existing home in Santa Barbara County. Provisions of Proposition 90 may result in substantial tax savings to homeowners since it allows the adjusted base year value of the original (sold) property to be transferred to the newly purchased or constructed home if eligibility requirements are met.

The adoption of a Proposition 90 ordinance by Santa Barbara County would negatively impact the City and hinder our ability to provide essential services. The City's property tax base is typically adjusted upwards when ownership is transferred. This is one of the very limited opportunities to adjust the City's property tax base in the right direction. The City of Goleta already endures a significant loss of property tax revenues as a result of the Revenue Neutrality Agreement which calls for a 50/50 split of the local share with the County. This Revenue Neutrality Agreement leaves, on average, only 5-cents of every property tax dollar collected to fund local services. Furthermore, the City's expenditures typically rise at a rate higher than the 2% inflationary cap associated with property taxes. As a result, each year the City falls further and further behind in matching Goleta's property tax revenues with the cost of providing essential services.

The bottom line is that the City of Goleta cannot sustain further deterioration of its revenue sources. For this reason, the City of Goleta respectfully opposes Proposition 90. Please let us know if you have any questions or need any additional information by contacting Tina Rivera at (805) 961-7527 or via email at: trivera@cityofgoleta.org.

Sincerely,

Roger S. Aceves
Mayor

cc: Michael T. Bennett, Mayor Pro Tempore
Edward Easton, Councilmember
Jim Farr, Councilmember
Paula Perotte, Councilmember
Dan Singer, City Manager
Tim Giles, City Attorney
Tina Rivera, Finance Director

Santa Ynez River
WATER CONSERVATION DISTRICT

P.O. Box 719 - 3669 Sagunto Street, Suite 108
Santa Ynez, California 93460
Telephone: (805) 693-1156

September 24, 2013

County of Santa Barbara
County Executive Office – Proposition 90 Comments
105 East Anapamu Street, Suite 406
Santa Barbara, CA 93101

Re: Proposition 90

Gentlemen:

With the revenue tax base of this District already eroded by the Education Revenue Augmentation Fund (ERAF) and with only paltry sums being returned by the demise of Redevelopment Agencies (which drained significant sums for years), the District can ill-afford another source of tax revenue loss. Therefore, this District does not support the adoption of Proposition 90 by the Board of Supervisors.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this matter.

Sincerely,

SANTA YNEZ RIVER
WATER CONSERVATION DISTRICT

Bruce A. Wales
General Manager

BAW/dsc

CARPINTERIA~SUMMERLAND
FIRE PROTECTION DISTRICT

September 24, 2013

County of Santa Barbara
County Executive Office Proposition 90 Comments
105 E Anapamu Street, Suite 406
Santa Barbara, CA 93101

On behalf of the Board of Directors for the Carpinteria-Summerland Fire Protection District, we are opposed to the County currently adopting Proposition 90 "Local Option". We are just now beginning to see some recovery in assessed valuation and a positive impact to our revenue. During the recent down turn in property values the cost of doing business continued to rise while revenues were stagnant. We believe this is not the best time to implement any legislation that would negatively impact our property tax revenue.

Thank you for allowing our comments to be considered.

On behalf of the Board,

Michael D. Mingee
Fire Chief

The City of SOLVANG
Danish Capital of America

September 25, 2013

County of Santa Barbara
County Executive Office – Proposition 90 Comments
105 East Anapamu Street, Room 406
Santa Barbara, Ca. 93101

Dear Board of Supervisors:

On behalf of the Solvang City Council, I wish to advise the Board of Supervisors of the opposition for the proposed implementation of Proposition 90 for the County of Santa Barbara.

While the Council's discussion included recognizing the benefits to individuals over the age of 55 it was felt that the repercussions from the loss of property tax revenue would adversely affect the City of Solvang and its residents.

Sincerely,

Jim Richardson
Mayor

1644 Oak Street , Solvang, Ca. 93463 Telephone (805) 688-5575 Fax (805) 686-2046

CITY OF SANTA MARIA
OFFICE OF THE MAYOR
AND CITY COUNCIL

110 EAST COOK STREET, ROOM #1 • SANTA MARIA, CA 93454-5190 • 805-925-0951 • FAX 805-349-0657 • www.ci.santa-maria.ca.us

September 25, 2013

Honorable Board of Supervisors
Santa Barbara County
c/o Clerk of the Board
105 E. Anapamu St., Rm. 407
Santa Barbara, CA 93101

SUBJECT: IMPLEMENTATION OF PROPOSITION 90

On behalf of the City of Santa Maria, I wish to advise the Board of Supervisors of the City's opposition to the proposed implementation of Proposition 90 in Santa Barbara County.

Although the City recognizes the benefits to individuals over age 55 who move within the City of Santa Maria (City), we realize that implementation of Proposition 90 will only further erode the tax base of the City; thereby, reducing the City's ability to provide public services.

For example, if a person living in some other area of the State, where their housing is assessed at $170,000, decides to relocate to the City and purchases a house valued at $275,000, the house would reduce to an assessed value of $170,000 for tax purposes. By staff's estimate, this would result in a loss of tax revenue of approximately $106. While that amount alone may not be a great reduction in tax revenue, if this scenario occurred 50 times, the reduction would be approximately $5,300 which becomes significant. The City's position is that the potential, particularly in the City where many people would like to retire, could be disastrous and seriously impair the City's ability to provide public services.

Consequently, I urge the Board of Supervisors to reject the proposed implementation of Proposition 90 in Santa Barbara County as it's not in the City's best interest for this to go forward.

Alice M. Patino

ALICE M. PATINO
Mayor

Van Wingerden, Cam

From: Kamil Azoury <kazoury@goletasanitary.org>
Sent: Wednesday, October 02, 2013 10:07 AM
To: Van Wingerden, Cam; Bozanich, Dennis
Cc: 'jerry smith'; 'John Carter (E-mail)'; 'John Fox (E-mail)'; 'George Emerson (E-mail)'; 'Sharon Rose'; 'R Battles'; 'Robert Mangus - Goleta Sanitary District'
Subject: RE: Proposition 90

Dear Chandra:

Thank you for advising of the County's interest in SB 90 and for soliciting feedback from the Goleta Sanitary District relative to this issue. Our District does not receive a significant amount of property tax revenue to fund our operations. We are primarily dependent on our own user charge revenue source. As such we believe that implementing SB 90 "local option" would be of insignificant impact on us. Therefore, the Goleta Sanitary District is neutral on this matter.

Please call me if you have any questions.

Best regards,

Kamil S. Azoury, PE, BCEE
General Manager / District Engineer
Goleta Sanitary District
One William Moffett Place
Goleta, Ca 93117
805-967-4519
kazoury@goletasanitary.org

From: Van Wingerden, Cam [mailto:cvanwingerden@co.santa-barbara.ca.us]
Sent: Monday, September 16, 2013 2:42 PM
To: 'kazoury@goletasanitary.org'
Subject: Proposition 90

Chandra L. Wallar
County Executive Officer

105 East Anapamu Street, Room 406
Santa Barbara, California 93101
805-568-3400 • Fax 805-568-3414
www.countyofsb.org

Executive Office

September 16, 2013

Kamil Azoury
Goleta Sanitary

Van Wingerden, Cam

From: Bozanich, Dennis
Sent: Thursday, October 10, 2013 4:38 PM
To: Van Wingerden, Cam
Subject: FW: Prop. 90 Local Option

Please add this email to the Prop 90 file.

d

From: Andrew Carter [mailto:ACarter@ci.guadalupe.ca.us]
Sent: Thursday, October 10, 2013 4:31 PM
To: Bozanich, Dennis
Cc: Wallar, Chandra
Subject: Prop. 90 Local Option

Mr. Bozanich,

I am writing this e-mail at the request of my City Council which formally considered the issue of supporting or opposing the Prop. 90 local option at our Council meeting Tuesday night.

By a 4-0 vote (one member was absent), the City Council of Guadalupe opposes the implementation of the Prop. 90 local option in Santa Barbara County.

Guadalupe is a poor community and City government in Guadalupe is revenue-starved. We have no Transient Occupancy Tax since there are no motels in the City. We have very little Sales Tax since there are few shopping opportunities here. Most of our residents do the bulk of their shopping in Santa Maria. As such, we are probably the most Property Tax dependent municipality in Santa Barbara County. That's true even though the majority of each resident's property tax supports our schools, the community college district, the state, and the County. Given that, allowing new residents to purchase homes in Guadalupe and transfer their reduced Prop. 13 assessments on their old homes in other communities to Guadalupe would represent a real hardship to us.

Thank you in advance for forwarding this e-mail to the Board of Supervisors.

Andrew Carter
City Administrator

City of Guadalupe/ 918 Obispo Street/ Guadalupe, CA 93434/ 805-356-3892

BCC, City Council