

VOTER INFORMATION PAMPHLET

MEASURES, ANALYSES AND ARGUMENTS

(whichever is applicable to your ballot)

Arguments in support of, or in opposition to, the proposed laws are the opinions of the authors.



Shall the Loma Prieta Joint Union Elementary School District continue for four years (July 1, 2004 to June 30, 2008) the Gann Appropriations Limit increase approved by the voters in 2000, thus allowing the district to continue to use the revenue generated by the existing special tax of \$150 per parcel?

IMPARTIAL ANALYSIS BY COUNTY COUNSEL MEASURE I

This measure, if approved by a majority of those voting, would permit the Loma Prieta Joint Union Elementary School District to maintain its current Proposition 4 spending limitation for four years.

Existing law, enacted in 1979 as part of Proposition 4 (now California Constitution Article XIII B), restricts governmental spending by setting an annual appropriations (i.e., expenditures) limit for governmental agencies. This appropriations limit is sometimes called the "Gann limit."

The California Constitution authorizes voters to change this appropriations limit for a maximum period of four years at a time. Unless the voters do so, the appropriations limit will be based on an earlier year's limit, adjusted for changes in the cost of living and population. In 2000 the voters of the District approved a special tax and an increase of the appropriations limit in the amount of that special tax. At this time the Trustees of the Loma Prieta Joint Union Elementary School District have resolved to submit to the voters the question whether the appropriations limit approved in 2000 should continue for four more years, from July 1, 2004, to June 30, 2008.

The ballot measure does not authorize the District to impose a new assessment or increase the property tax rate. Instead it would permit the District to continue to spend the special tax which was previously approved by the voters.

A "yes" vote on Measure I is a vote to continue the previously approved increase in the District's appropriations (expenditures) limit.

A "no" vote on Measure I is a vote against continuing the previously approved increase in the District's appropriations (expenditures) limit.

Dated: December 15, 2003

DANA McRAE, COUNTY COUNSEL

By JANE M. SCOTT

Assistant County Counsel

The statement to the left is an impartial analysis of
Measure I.

If you desire a copy of the measure, please call the
Santa Cruz County Elections Department at
831-454-2060 and a copy will be mailed
at no cost to you.

VOTER INFORMATION PAMPHLET

MEASURES, ANALYSES AND ARGUMENTS

(whichever is applicable to your ballot)

Arguments in support of, or in opposition to, the proposed laws are the opinions of the authors.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF MEASURE I

The children of the Loma Prieta Joint Union Elementary School District need your YES vote for Measure I to continue for 4 years the Gann Appropriations Limit increase approved by the voters in 1996, thus allowing the district to continue to use the revenue generated by the existing special tax of \$150. The facts in support of this measure speak for themselves:

The facts are:

- The Loma Prieta Joint Union School District offers local children educational programs and instructional options that many other school districts around the state are unable to provide.
- The \$283,000 that the parcel tax brings to Loma Prieta Elementary School and C.T. English Middle School every year represents approximately 10% of the annual district budget and makes a critical difference in the quality of education we can offer local children.
- The instructional programs funded by the parcel tax directly benefit children. Losing these funds would mean immediate cuts in critical educational programs.
- The authorization to spend the tax expires every four years and must be re-authorized by local voters.

Measure I will fund the following educational programs and services:

- Maintain or improve math, science, language arts and educational technology program.
- Maintain music and performing arts, developmental P.E., library, and nurse.
- Maintain small class sizes.
- Equip and maintain the schools, facilities and grounds to meet requirements of increased safety and technology.

The cost is reasonable and fair:

Measure I is a valuable investment in the future of our children, our grandchildren and our community. It provides exemptions for senior citizens, adjacent parcels and certain impacted property. As specified since its inception, no Measure I funds may be used for salary enhancement or benefits.

s/ Alexander E. Leman, Chief Officer Loma Prieta Fire & Rescue

s/ Bradford P. Radonich, Parent

s/ Lydia J. Dobyns, President, Loma Prieta School Board,

s/ Susan A. Pierce, President, Loma Prieta Community Foundation

s/ Stephen Glauz-Todrank, Minister of Skyland Church

REBUTTAL TO ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF MEASURE I

A recent edition of the Santa Cruz Sentinel had the following line:

“...say they would support a cap (on spending) but want spending to grow with the amount of tax revenue raised.”

School districts, including Loma Prieta, appear to be no different.

Like virtually every school district in this area, enrollment in the Loma Prieta School District dropped from 1999-2000 to 2002-2003 while ADA (Average Daily Attendance) spending per student rose from \$5,358 to \$6,920. Thus, it seem like the honorable thing to do would be to implement the sunset clause on the parcel tax that they are now trying to extend, for another four years, through Measure I. But, **NO**, what rears its ugly head is a “spend all we can get our hands” on mentality, giving **NO MEANING**, and we repeat **NO MEANING** on public bureaucracy assurances that tax ballot measures have built in sunset clauses.

Given the huge infusion of cash into the California educational system, **there is no reason why our children's education should suffer with the defeat of Measure I.**

To this end we heartily support and recommend a NO vote on Measure I. Make our elected representatives practice fiscal responsibility. Make them learn to live within the year-to-year annual revenue increases they get. **Make them keep their promise to sunset the current parcel tax.**

ON MARCH 2, 2004 – VOTE NO ON MEASURE I

For more information: visit www.VoteNoOnI.us

s/ H.R. Strong, Chair, Libertarian Party of Santa Clara County

s/ Jack E. Davis, Member, Republican Central Committee

s/ Mark W.A. Hinkle, Past Chair – Libertarian Party of California

s/ George M. Swenson, President, Silicon Valley Taxpayers' Association

VOTER INFORMATION PAMPHLET

MEASURES, ANALYSES AND ARGUMENTS

(whichever is applicable to your ballot)

Arguments in support of, or in opposition to, the proposed laws are the opinions of the authors.

ARGUMENT AGAINST MEASURE I

When is it ever enough? The School Board put this original tax increase on the June 6th, 2000 ballot and Measure K on the March 5th, 2002 ballot, and now they're back again to extend this tax another 4 years. **Thus, costing you \$600 per parcel more.**

Milton Friedman once said, "There's nothing more permanent than a temporary tax".

The School Board has yet to complete the projects funded by Measure K and now they're back for more of your money. In fact, they authorized this ballot on July 30th, 2003.

There's a 2-year pattern of tax increases. And unless you put a stop to it, you can bet they'll be back in another 2 years (or less) for another "emergency" tax increase. It'll be for safety (fire, earthquake, etc.), or new technology labs, or something else.

But, what about the children? What about their education? Isn't it the business of the school district to educate our kids? Is this endless search for tax increases for the children? **Or, for the district employees?**

Don't be afraid to say no to another tax.

We all have to live with a budget. That's the real world. Say no to Measure I and send a message to the School Board that they, too, have to live within a budget. That's what they were elected to do. They were elected to make the tough choices, to prioritize where funds are spent and to say NO to inefficient or wasteful spending.

You can be for good education and against this tax extension.

Please vote NO on Measure I and tell the School Board to live within their means.

For more information, please visit: www.VoteNoOnI.us

s/ H.R. Strong, Chair Libertarian Party of Santa Clara County

s/ Mark W.A. Hinkle, Past Chair-Libertarian Party of California

s/ George M. Swenson, President, Silicon Valley Taxpayers' Association

NO REBUTTAL TO THE ARGUMENT AGAINST MEASURE I WAS FILED.