

3



Katherine Douglas *Public Comment - Group 2*

From: Anthony Dal Bello <bello510sb@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, February 21, 2025 3:02 PM
To: sbcob
Subject: Salary Increases for Elected Officials

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.

The proposed increase for the Board of Supervisors is sinful ! The added proposed increase plus added benefits including retirement benefits for each Board of Supervisors totals ? _____.

I do believe a reasonable increase would be 10%.

Just because other counties offer more does not mean Santa Barbara County must increase their salaries also. If all the Board of Supervisors in Ventura jumped in the water and drowned, would the Santa Barbara County Supervisors follow them?

I also have concerns with the proposed increase for the Sheriff.

Can you imagine if every employee in the county received 10, 15 or 50% increases.

I believe if you are not happy with a reasonable pay increase there are ample number of qualified persons willing to take on your position.

If you have excess monies available, please pay down the unfunded pension liability.

Thank you.

Anthony Dal Bello, a Santa Barbara County Native
bello510sb@gmail.com

Katherine Douglas

From: G or K Nobis <gknobis@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, February 21, 2025 3:25 PM
To: sbcob; Roy Lee
Subject: No on proposed 48% supervisors' pay raise

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 Mr. Lee and Santa Barbara County Supervisors:

First, congratulations, Mr. Lee, to your election to the Board. We look forward to your fresh point of view and are excited that you were elected.

Thank you all for your service.

We taxpayers and voters in Santa Barbara are against the Board giving itself a 48 percent raise.

Our reasons include the following (not a complete list):

1. The Boards' past performance in the county is not superior performance that deserves a 48% bonus for this and subsequent years.
 - A recent example of unacceptable performance is that of the contracting with AMR and the purchase of ambulances—this looked odd to us when we first heard of the situation and the County recently lost the lawsuit and apparently increased the cost of AMR services.
 - The Board supports increased costs of energy by refusing to support safe oil production in Santa Barbara County, thus affecting many residents who have to pay higher prices and some who are not able to work at higher rates of pay in the oil industry. We still need petroleum-based energy and we now import it from outside of California; that does not make sense.
 - Support of cannabis—a financially losing proposition, with other community issues, well documented.
 - Overall high costs of government in the county due to government compensation policies.
2. We have no reason to believe the Board's performance will change in the future by receiving higher compensation.
3. The job of a Supervisor is not a full-time job—Andy Caldwell and Mike Stoker have cited examples where individual supervisors have operated their businesses while they are Supervisors.
4. Just because other counties pay their Supervisors more is not a justification to pay our Supervisors the rate of \$171,000 a year. If a Supervisor wishes a higher pay, then he or she should move to another country and obtain a position there. Supervisors “signed on” at the current salary and should remain happy with that.

Lastly, few individuals in private industry receive more than a 2 to 4 percent increase yearly.

Please do the right thing for Santa Barbara County, be fiscally responsible, and keep your salary increase to a COLA level.

Respectfully,

Garth and Kathy Nobis
3508 Chuparosa Drive
Santa Barbara 93105