

**IMPARTIAL ANALYSIS BY COUNTY COUNSEL
SHERIFF'S PATROL SERVICES FEE
ADVISORY MEASURE C**

This "advisory" measure allows voters within the unincorporated portions of Santa Cruz County to indicate to the Santa Cruz County Board of Supervisors, the voter's approval or disapproval of imposing a "county service area charge" to provide additional Sheriff's patrol services within the unincorporated portions of the County of Santa Cruz. Funds from this charge would be used for the direct costs of providing additional Sheriff's patrol services within the entire unincorporated area of Santa Cruz County and would not be used to pay for or supplant the cost of existing operations within the unincorporated portion of the County.

State Law contained in the Government Code (Sections 25210.1 et seq.) authorizes the Santa Cruz County Board of Supervisors to establish a "service area" and per-parcel service charges to provide financing for certain enumerated services. One of those services specifically enumerated in the Government Code is police protection. Police protection in the unincorporated areas of Santa Cruz County is provided by the Sheriff's office. The County Board of Supervisors has established a "service area" consisting of the unincorporated areas of the County to provide additional Sheriff's services.

Currently no charge is made (levied) or collected to provide additional Sheriff's services. This measure asks the voter's approval or disapproval of imposing such a service charge. The service charge would be determined by the number of units and the type of parcel owned.

Four categories are proposed within the service area. The charges range from \$10 to \$80 depending on the number of units and the type of parcel owned. The following annual service charges would be authorized:

| Item | Service Charge |
|---------------------------|----------------|
| Vacant Parcel Rate | \$10/year |
| Residential Rate Per Unit | 20/year |
| Commercial Unit | 40/year |
| Major Commercial Unit | 80/year |

Under this ballot proposal, the Board of Supervisors would be authorized to annually adjust the service charge by an amount calculated by the County Auditor to be needed to pay for the increases in the direct cost of providing the additional patrol services. The County Board of Supervisors has submitted this proposal to an advisory vote in accordance with Section 5353 of the California Elections Code to obtain an indication of general voter opinion regarding the ballot proposal.

A "yes" vote on this measure will indicate support at this time for the imposition of the above service charges to provide additional Sheriff's services within the unincorporated portions of the County of Santa Cruz.

A "no" vote on this measure will indicate opposition at this time to the imposition of the above service charges to provide additional Sheriff's services within the unincorporated portions of the County of Santa Cruz.

DWIGHT L. HERR, COUNTY COUNSEL

By/ Samuel Torres, Jr.
Assistant County Counsel

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF MEASURE C

Since 1974 the number of authorized patrol deputies in the county has remained constant at 52. During this 13-year period, the unincorporated population has jumped 55%. Calls for patrol services during these years have increased over 100%. Tourism has also added to the workload.

The current 52 deputies provide coverage 24 hours a day, seven days a week. This means that there are normally only 7 deputies on duty at a time in the county. This results in each deputy patrolling an average of 60 square miles and trying to provide service and protection to over 18,000 residents in that area.

The City of Santa Cruz has 1 officer for every 940 residents, the City of Watsonville has 1 to 875, the City of Scotts Valley has 1 to 681 and the City of Capitola has 1 to 833. The Sheriff's Office ratio is 1 officer for every 2,413 residents.

Without additional manpower, service and protection will suffer. Revenues generated by this service fee would increase patrol coverage in the unincorporated areas of the county. These areas include the San Lorenzo Valley, the North Coast, Live Oak, rural Scotts Valley, the Summit area, Soquel, Aptos, La Selva, Corralitos, and Freedom. It will result in a shorter response time to calls for service. It will also provide greater safety for the deputies on patrol.

The cost of this service to vacant parcels of land valued over \$1,000 will be \$10 per year. Residential units will pay \$20 a year, which is \$1.60 a month. Most businesses will pay \$40 a year, and major commercial establishments, such as large chain stores and automobile agencies, will pay \$80 annually.

Although no one likes additional fees, the cost is minimal. The men and women of the Sheriff's Office and I urge you to support them in putting more deputies on patrol.

s/ Alfred F. Noren
Sheriff-Coroner

s/ E. Joseph Heartsner, President
Deputy Sheriffs' Association

REBUTTAL TO ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF MEASURE C

We agree with the Sheriff's Department that they should receive more money for patrol deputies, because protection of our lives and property is the first duty of government. But that is why we already pay taxes, and why the County Board of Supervisors should fund this important service through revenues already available.

The population of our county has increased greatly during the past 14 years. So has crime. But the number of patrol deputies has remained the same. We know it. You know it. And the Board of Supervisors knows it.

The Supervisors admit that you need more protection, but they are betting that you will be willing to pay extra for it. That way they will have more money to spend on their other projects. They don't even have enough commitment to our welfare and safety to join the ballot argument in favor of this measure.

The Supervisors won't explain why they have given over \$1 million to private social service agencies but not one dime toward more patrol deputies, or why they give themselves hefty raises and increased staff but don't provide for even one more deputy sheriff.

The Supervisors hold an increase in needed patrol deputies hostage, hoping we will pay the "ransom" instead of questioning their spending priorities.

Let's hold the Supervisors accountable!

Vote NO on Measure C.

s/ Jeffrey J. Bosshard
s/ Robert J. McKenzie

11/87

ARGUMENT AGAINST MEASURE C

We urge you to vote NO on the proposed County Sheriff's patrol service area fee, which would add over \$1,000,000 to our already bloated property taxes.

The Board of Supervisors has adopted two budgets in a row which shift more than \$1,000,000 to private social service agencies; those budgets did not provide for increased sheriffs' patrols.

In fact, patrol services have not increased in 14 years. Although population and crime rates have increased, we have the same number of deputies as in 1973. The Board of Supervisors acknowledges the need, but now tells us that if we want desperately needed patrol services, we must pay Extra! We say that is wrong. Law enforcement is the most basic county service, and we are already paying for it.

We support the Sheriff, but we don't think his office should be used as a battering ram to undo the protections given us by Proposition 13.

The only effective way we can tell the Board of Supervisors that they have their spending priorities wrong is to vote NO on this measure. Let them ask for extra money for Social Services, not for basic, adequate law enforcement.

s/ Robert J. McKenzie, CPA

s/ Jeffrey J. Bosshard
Attorney at Law

REBUTTAL TO ARGUMENT AGAINST MEASURE C

We all agree that we need more deputies. The issue is quite simple: if people vote "Yes" on this measure, the number of deputies will increase. If people vote "No," we stay at the 1974 level.

To vote "No" on this ballot measure in order to send a message to the Board of Supervisors would be using the Sheriff's Office as a battering ram against the Board. The Sheriff's Office doesn't wish to be used as a battering ram, not by the Board against Proposition 13 and conversely not by the voters against the Board. The Sheriff's Office just wishes to provide adequate law enforcement services to the people who deserve it.

The authors of the Arguments Against Measure "C" urge you to vote "No" in order to send a message to the Board of Supervisors. The message this is supposed to send to the Board is that funding for Sheriff's Services should come out of the tax money people are already paying. It is dangerous to assume that this is the message the Board will receive. The Board could interpret a "No" vote as meaning that the voters do not want more law enforcement services.

To go without adequate law enforcement is a very high price to pay in order to send a message to the Board of Supervisors.

The proper way for people to send a message to the Board of Supervisors is by using their vote when the Board members themselves are on the ballot.

If you want adequate law enforcement protection, vote "YES".

s/ Alfred F. Noren
Sheriff-Coroner

s/ E. Joseph Heartsner, President
Deputy Sheriffs' Association

11/87