

Ramirez, Angelica

Public Comment - Group 2

#1

From: Stephen Pepe <steve@clospepe.com>
Sent: Monday, March 23, 2020 9:31 AM
To: sbcob
Cc: Bantilan, Cory; 'Bob Nelson'
Subject: March 24th BOS Meeting - Item D1 Covid 19 -Deferral of property taxes without penalties or interest.



Caution: This email originated from a source outside of the County of Santa Barbara. Do not click links or open attachments unless you verify the sender and know the content is safe.

Chair and Supervisors,

Property taxes are due April 10th. With hotels, restaurants, nightclubs, bars, theaters, wine and beer tasting rooms shut down and non-essential other business closed, does the county really need 100% of the property taxes due on April 10th? Tens of thousands of our fellow citizens are unemployed. Even with essential businesses like grocery stores open, some of those employees hours are reduced due to reduced store hours.

Both the federal and state have deferred tax payments from April 15th to July 15th without penalties or interest. We all understand that the county can't print money or borrow the way the Federal Government can and the county does not have the states \$15B tax surplus. But and it is a big but, does the county need 100% of the property taxes due on April 10th? If not, then the county should follow the federal and state governments and defer some or all of the April 10th property taxes without penalties or interest to later in the year. Hopefully by then our fellow citizens and businesses will be back at work and have the cash to pay their taxes.

Thank you for your consideration.

Stephen Pepe
Clos Pepe Vineyards LLC
4777 E. Hwy 246
Lompoc, CA 93436
805 735 7867

Ramirez, Angelica

From: Bobbi McGinnis <c21bobbi@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, March 23, 2020 9:06 AM
To: sbcob
Subject: Delay property Taxes by 90 days like Fed Government Income Taxes

Caution: This email originated from a source outside of the County of Santa Barbara. Do not click links or open attachments unless you verify the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Board of Supervisors and Treasurer Harry Hagen,

Dear County Supervisors and Treasuer Harry Hagan,

Recently, Governor Newsom declared "shelter in place" for all people living in California. This order, while well intended, has decimated many local small business. Commercial and residential tenants have been told by local officials to simply not pay rent. This greatly impacts landlords and property owners. Please follow the President Trump's lead and extend property tax due date to July 15th, 2020 without penalty to give property owners a chance to catch up with cash flow from rental income. This helps everyone in the County. I have already contacted the State Legislature and they have said it is up to the individual Counties.

In this time of crisis, please help your hard working landlords and home owners.

Respectfully,

Bobbi McGinnis
Chairwoman
SBGOP
805 680 6921

--
R.Bobbi McGinnis
Century 21 Butler Realty, Inc.
1635 State St.
Santa Barbara, Ca. 93101
DRE Lic.00628934
Ph.805 680-6921
Fx.805 569-0591

Ramirez, Angelica

From: Andy Caldwell <andy@colabsbc.org>
Sent: Monday, March 23, 2020 10:25 AM
To: sbcob
Subject: confirm receipt please...Read into Record 3.24.2020
Importance: High

Caution: This email originated from a source outside of the County of Santa Barbara. Do not click links or open attachments unless you verify the sender and know the content is safe.

3/24/2020 to be read into the record

Dear Chairman Hart,

I am Andy Caldwell representing COLAB

Please consider this a public records act request since my previous questions during public comment have been ignored.

Other jurisdictions are reporting factual information that happens to be relevant to this crisis.

SB County on the other hand keeps reporting the number of people infected along with crisis-level infection prediction rates going forward.

They say we need to “flatten the curve”.

Well, just how do you measure our progress or lack thereof?

How do we know if the predictions for catastrophic infection rates are actually happening or not?

SB County needs to report:

The number of people in the hospital

The number of people in ICU

The number of people who test positive but are told to go home

The number of people who test negative.

They then need to put all these numbers in the context of how many people live in this county and, finally, how many county residents fall into the category of senior citizens with serious underlying conditions, as these last two numbers truly measure probable versus potential risk.

Only then will decision makers have the right information to determine whether killing our economy was the right thing to do, as it is a well known fact that a recession with high unemployment numbers seriously impacts public health (heart attacks, suicide, drug and alcohol, domestic violence, etc.)

I would appreciate it if your staff could present this data at their hearing tomorrow.

Thanks.

Andy Caldwell

COLAB

Ramirez, Angelica

From: Scott Cooper <scooper@lifesci.ucsb.edu>
Sent: Monday, March 23, 2020 11:20 AM
To: sbcob
Subject: COVID message



Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Caution: This email originated from a source outside of the County of Santa Barbara. Do not click links or open attachments unless you verify the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Clerk of the Board,

I hope you are well. Could you please share the following message with the Director of Public Health? My name is Scott Cooper and I am a research professor and professor emeritus at UCSB. I have worked at UCSB for 40 years and one of my areas of research is network studies, which deals with nodes and linkages of interaction in ecosystems. I live in Goleta.

I appreciate the time, effort, and thought that DPH has devoted to pre-emptive, rather than purely reactive, measures to stem the spread and prevalence of SARS CoV 2. Experience in other countries has shown that it is critical that all possible measures to flatten the curve should be instituted as soon as possible. Towards this end, I offer the following correction, addition, and concern.

Last week, Dr. Ansorg stated that the SARSCOV2 virus could be passed to other hosts only if the infected person is symptomatic. A growing literature and information, however, strongly indicates that presymptomatic and asymptomatic hosts can pass the virus to other people. Please see this link, which contains a video by one of Dr. Ansorg's Cottage colleagues: <https://youtu.be/IF0xkXHp7SI> This information, of course, adds weight to the criticality of stay-at-home and social distancing orders.

Secondly, Dr. Ansorg rightly emphasized that young people could catch and carry the virus, in some cases eventually showing moderate to severe symptoms. I think that it is critical that PDH emphasize that all age groups abide by the stay-at-home and social distancing provisions. As a consequence, I think PDH could additionally emphasize that, as carriers, young people can put other people in the community at risk if they do not abide by stay-at-home and social distancing restrictions.

Thirdly, Santa Barbara airport continues to be a possible node for transmission, because of the difficulty of avoiding aggregations, practicing social distancing, and reducing contact with people coming from other geographic areas during air travel. Other countries have closed nonessential air travel and Hawaii now requires a 2-week quarantine for any new arrivals. Many cases in the US are reported to be travel-related and China, while reporting no new domestic cases, still records a constant flow of travel-related cases. Of particular concern for Santa Barbara are people arriving from COVID hotspots, like the Bay area. Certainly, I agree that flights should continue to accommodate essential passengers and cargo, as well as people trying to get home or care for a loved one, but it is unlikely some of the current flights are essential. Although it could be argued that the current statewide stay-at-home order would cover this practice, the fact that the airlines keep running suggests that some people are not abiding by this order. I realize that there are jurisdictional matters at play, here, because the City of Santa Barbara manages the airport; however, I have written to both the City of Santa Barbara and the Santa Barbara Airport about these issues, but they have been unresponsive. In epidemic times,

however, I would contend that public health orders trump any local jurisdictional operations. It would seem that, under a public health order, prohibitions on nonessential travel should be emphasized. Experiences in other countries, such as Italy, show the extreme importance of prohibiting the movement of people in early stages of a pandemic (see <https://youtu.be/dkozG3IcXUU>)

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Scott Cooper

Ramirez, Angelica

From: CORI HAYMAN <corihayman@cox.net>
Sent: Monday, March 23, 2020 12:35 PM
To: sbcob
Cc: Supervisor Das Williams; Elliott, Darcel
Subject: PLEASE READ INTO THE RECORD UNDER DEPARTMENTAL AGENDA ITEM (1) 20-00232 (COVID-19) (with exception of attached document). Please accept attached document as public comment.
Attachments: Letter to Elected Officials re COVID-1903232020.pdf

Caution: This email originated from a source outside of the County of Santa Barbara. Do not click links or open attachments unless you verify the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Clerk:

Please read into the record under Departmental Agenda Item (1) 20-00232 (COVID-19) the following email. Please accept for public comment submission (not to read into the record) the attached document:

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Attached to this comment, please find a policy recommendation prepared by Brian Goebel and sent to various elected officials for a sustainable approach to managing the COVID-19 outbreak. There are grave concerns that the well-intentioned policies established during the past several weeks to protect public health are creating potentially catastrophic consequences for the County and the State of California.

In addition, please require County Health and other pertinent agencies to provide as part of the regular County updates to the public and in your agenda items (including this agenda) relative to COVID-19 the following:

- (1) The number of COVID-19 patients requiring hospitalization and daily hospital capacity;
- (2) The rate of increase, rather than just the amount of increase, with respect to all COVID-19 statistics (number of tested, number of infected, number hospitalized); and,
- (3) Establishment of criteria for the County to present to the Governor's Office to lift the statewide stay at home order as to the County and replace it with more carefully tailored public health measures.

Thank you for your consideration,

Cori Hayman.

March 23, 2020

The Honorable Gavin Newsom
Governor, California

The Honorable Hannah-Beth Jackson
Senator, 19th District, California

The Honorable Monique Limon
Assemblymember, 37th District, California

The Honorable Das Williams
Supervisor, 1st District, Santa Barbara County

Via electronic and U.S. mail

Re: *Planning for the end of the statewide stay at home order, transitioning to a "new normal," and managing the COVID-19 outbreak in the months ahead*

Elected Officials,

For the past several weeks, our State and Local governments have escalated from one public health measure to another to combat the spread of COVID-19 in California, hindered by a poor Federal response. Although the spread of the virus has undoubtedly been slowed by these actions, our economy is in tatters, virtually everyone in California is home, and no official can tell us how or when this will end. I understand the challenges of managing a crisis with imperfect information and limited policy tools. But I also know that the time has come to begin transitioning to a "new normal" if we are to manage the outbreak and avoid other forms of catastrophic harm to our State and its residents.

I've spent most of my career in public policy. I served as senior official in the Treasury and Homeland Security Departments immediately following 9/11. I built a successful strategic consulting firm that advised the U.S. and foreign governments on border security. I built an applied analytics firm that served government clients. Today, I'm an elected Director for the Montecito Water District, helping devise solutions to our serious water supply challenges. I understand the policy making challenges we face in confronting COVID-19.

I also take COVID-19 very seriously. I fully support the goal of flattening the curve – ensuring that our healthcare system can function and provide the highest quality care to those who need it.

But I do not believe an indefinite statewide "stay at home" order is the only way, or the best way, to achieve this goal. It is likely overly-broad, does not reflect comprehensive long-term cost-benefit analysis, and is not sustainable.

To begin with, the government has not explained whether it analyzed the effectiveness of narrower alternatives to a statewide stay at home order, including the measures that had been put in place by the State and Local Governments in preceding weeks as well as other tailored measures that could have been adopted to ensure social distancing and the protection of the most vulnerable. Not only is this type of analysis a cornerstone of good public policy development, but it is quite possible (if not likely) that it would have shown that less draconian measures would have sufficiently flattened the curve. In Santa Barbara County, for example, which was carefully crafting social distancing measures before the statewide order was adopted, there have been only

18 confirmed cases of COVID-19 and few, if any, have required hospitalization. We may not even have a curve to flatten.

Critically, there has been virtually no discussion, outside the pages of the Wall Street Journal and a handful of op-eds in other publications, of the enormous costs associated with the stay at home order, despite the fact that comprehensive long-term cost-benefit analysis is another hallmark of sound public policy development. Our State economy is in tatters. With the stock market imploding, California's tax revenues are going to plummet. It seems increasingly unlikely that our "rainy day fund" will be able to absorb the loss in tax revenue. If it cannot, the State will likely have to cut vital programs that affect health and safety, from preventing fires to alleviating poverty to reducing homelessness (to name but a few). Business revenues are collapsing, leading to layoffs and a surge in unemployment benefit filings. This will further erode our tax base and deplete our State coffers. If businesses permanently close as a result of public health measures, it will be even more difficult to recover because there will be fewer employers to hire the unemployed when the draconian measures are finally lifted. County and city finances will inevitably suffer as a result of the economic downturn, resulting in further cuts to necessary services. With the best of intentions, we may be well on our way toward trading one calamity for several others, with catastrophic long-term consequences for the well-being of our State and its residents.

The collateral costs of the stay at home order are not just economic. Public health will likely suffer in other ways. As people lose their jobs, they will not be able to afford housing and will be less likely to seek and be able to pay for healthcare. Increased homelessness and decreased access to healthcare would create its own public health crisis, as would a potential decline in mental health. Despite the best efforts of school districts, there will almost certainly be children who cannot get the meals they need while schools are closed. They will suffer from the myriad maladies associated with poor nutrition. And who is providing critical therapy for school children with special needs?

What sacrifice are we forcing an entire generation of school children to make? We are on the verge of depriving students of a third of a school year (or much more, if alarmist warnings of months-long stay at home orders prove to be correct). Already, many students are not learning because they do not have access to the internet while home. For those that do, remote learning is a poor substitute for being in the classroom. What are the schools going to do with our under-educated children when the outbreak finally subsides? Socially promote them? Make every student repeat a grade? Require summer school? Whatever the answer, we are imposing real and costly burdens on our schools and children.

A statewide stay at home order is not sustainable for other reasons as well. The longer the order lasts, the less compliance we should expect. People will gather. We are social. People will challenge the order as insufficiently tailored under the First Amendment. We believe in liberty. People will shop. We are consumers. Of course, non-compliance will erode the benefits of the order.

The order has no end date, and there are no stated criteria for evaluating when it should be lifted. This is troubling because it strongly suggests that we do not have a plan for what comes next. I looked for evidence of such a plan on the CDC, California, and Santa Barbara County websites devoted to COVID-19, and I could not find anything about how we transition from the extraordinary stay at home order to a "new normal."

This is our last chance to engage in sober and sound decision making. We need to develop and implement a plan for flattening the curve in the months ahead that is sustainable and dramatically reduces the enormous collateral consequences of our well-intentioned efforts to protect public health. Such a plan should have three phases:

Phase I: Immediately develop and publicize objective criteria for assessing when to end the stay at home order. This should be simple. We know our healthcare capacity. We know the virus trajectory that will overwhelm that

capacity. As data come in over the next 2.5 weeks, we can far more accurately model our actual trajectory weeks and months into the future and discern whether we have flattened the curve. If we have successfully flattened the curve and created health care capacity, we must commit to lifting the stay at home order and transitioning to the least disruptive public health measures that will ensure continued capacity in the months ahead.

Phase 2: To do this, we need to develop and model potentially viable alternatives to the statewide stay at home order. This list could include policies such as: continuing aggressive communications strategies re: hygiene, social distancing, and staying home when not feeling well; sheltering in place and restricted visitation for highly vulnerable populations; requiring businesses to have dedicated hours for the most vulnerable as well as enhanced social distancing, reduced capacity, stay home when sick, and cleanliness measures in place before re-opening; staggering non-essential outings based on license plate or last name; allowing children to return to school, perhaps alternating days based on last name and leaving schools closed on Wednesdays for cleaning. We should then compare the costs and benefits of viable measures and implement the most cost-effective ones. I am confident our public health professionals can develop a wide array of less restrictive and equally effective policies. These policies will become our "new normal," and this period should begin within four weeks.

Phase 3: Implement, monitor, and adjust. As we implement a "new normal," we should be gathering the data we need through testing and treatment to better understand virus behavior and impacts on various demographics. We should be assessing what impacts, if any, warmer and more humid weather has on virus transmission and whether a seasonal management strategy is warranted. We should also be adjusting measures as advances are made in therapeutic treatments that reduce the need for, and duration of, hospital stays. In short, we should be constantly analyzing alternatives based on the latest data to reduce restrictions on daily life while ensuring healthcare system capacity.

This plan should be communicated to the public immediately to reduce anxiety and encourage compliance with the stay at home order.

Eventually, there will be no restrictions on daily life, and we can hope that breakthroughs in treatment or a vaccine will hasten the arrival of this day. But for now we should recognize (and take comfort in the fact) that our very low rate of tobacco use compared to Western Europe and China, along with the measures we adopted over the past several weeks, will flatten the curve in California. By how much will become clearer in the data over the next 2.5 weeks as our trajectory continues to diverge significantly from that of Italy, despite our similar starting points. We should also recognize that our current course is unsustainable. We therefore must begin taking steps to end the stay at home order as soon as possible and replace it with more carefully crafted measures with fewer collateral costs. I urge you to do so. California's future depends on it.

Thank you for your service and dedication during these unprecedented times.

Sincerely,



Brian C. Goebel
Montecito, California

cc: The Honorable Salud Carbajal, U.S. Representative, 24th District
The Honorable Peter Adam, Supervisor, 4th District, Santa Barbara County
Ms. Mona Miyasato, CEO, Santa Barbara County