

CC 07-21-20

Oral
Communications

Written Comments

Cyrah Caburian

From: Connie Cunningham <cunninghamconniel@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, July 18, 2020 3:52 PM
To: City Clerk
Subject: Oral Communications, in support of Rainbow Crosswalk

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.


Hi, would you please read this for me during oral communications. Thank you!

Mayor, Vice-Mayor and Councilmembers

I am speaking tonight to support the Rainbow Crosswalk Petition that has been signed by over 500 people of Cupertino. This is a fantastic idea whose time has come in Cupertino. CalTrans regulations do not forbid Rainbow crosswalks. They are vaguely worded and many crosswalks have been personalized before. Since CalTrans has not removed other rainbow crosswalks, it is a great time to put a happy, friendly crosswalk in a highly visible location to show residents and visitors that Cupertino is a welcoming place!

With just a little paint we can enliven the street and bring a smile to many faces, especially those who may have felt left out. Let's tell them today, that they are loved and that Cupertino is open to everyone.

Sincerely,
Connie Cunningham
33 year resident

 *Watch out for typos; Siri might be on duty.*

Cyrah Caburian

From: Jean Bedord <Jean@bedord.com>
Sent: Monday, July 20, 2020 4:45 PM
To: City of Cupertino Planning Commission; City of Cupertino Planning Dept.; City Council; Cupertino City Manager's Office; City Clerk
Subject: Public comment on consideration of senior housing at Planning Commission, July 14, 2020

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Planning Commission, City Council and City Manager,

As a reasonable member of the public, I was appalled at the consideration of the Westport/Oaks project at the Planning Commission. Our city is desperately in need of market-rate assisted living and memory units as well as senior BMR housing. Rather than solutions, I heard barriers to any type of housing in Cupertino - no wonder the city has an anti-housing reputation.

* The BMR manual is written for dispersal of subsidized housing MARKET rate housing with ZERO services. Why the interpretation that it applies to bundled care services that clients pay for monthly???? The concept of "affordable assisted living" doesn't exist - that's the realm of Medicaid / Medi-Cal, a totally different funding source than resident income baked into the BMR manual.

* BMR housing needs financing. The Veranda required 11 sources of funding for 18 units, essentially a funding source for every 2 apartments. This is not scalable. So why doesn't the city allow the design of buildings to qualify for financial incentives? The city has lost potential housing, strictly due to financing considerations - the approved Marina project is not financially viable, the approved Hamptons is on indefinite hold because of finances, the senior market-rate housing at Main Street died with the financial meltdown of the Great Recession of 2008-2009. There were NO multi-family housing applications in 2019 - and we are already mid-way through 2020, again with no progress.

* The distinction between a waiver and a concession makes no sense to me. Why should a concession, but not a waiver, require an onerous financial pro forma when grants and tax credits are a moving target????

* Lack of familiarity with the reality of senior housing by both commission members and the city were painfully obvious, based on comments. Assisted living is both short-term and long-term, as residents have to move between different levels of care as their needs change, often suddenly. I had 48 hours to find a higher level of care for my mother-in-law when she could no longer live in senior independent living at Chateau Cupertino. My husband was in assisted living for several months following skilled nursing before I could take care of him at home. Adult daycare is a life-saver for couples where one partner has dementia, thus delaying a move to memory care, with the well spouse staying in the family home.

My overall observation is that the city is overly bureaucratic and restrictive resulting in a lack of housing, at all income, and all age levels. Why should contractors/developers even consider doing business here, unless they can operate under state mandates, rather than the city? Less than 2% of our housing stock turned over in 2019 - our community is frozen, and aging without the services needed by the community.

I urge the city to reconsider the municipal code to simplify and incentivize housing, particularly the requirements for LICENSED senior housing.

Please include this email in Written Communications for the city council meeting on Tuesday, July 21.

Warm regards,
Jean Bedord
30 year resident of Cupertino
Age Friendly Cupertino Task Force member

Cyrah Caburian

From: Neil McClintick <neil.mcclintick@berkeley.edu>
Sent: Tuesday, July 21, 2020 6:56 PM
To: City Clerk
Subject: Oral Communication
Attachments: IMG_0608.png

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Hello,

I'd like to give oral comment and provide this as a visual while I'm speaking. Thank you

-Neil

--

Neil Park-McClintick

UC Berkeley '19

Grassroots Organizer, [Cupertino for All](#)

Housing Justice Organizer, [Working Partnerships USA](#)

"Give people what they need: food, medicine, clean air, pure water, trees and grass, pleasant homes to live in, some hours of work, more hours of leisure. Don't ask who deserves it. Every human being deserves it."



Cyrah Caburian

From: Choco Lee <choco.lee57@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 21, 2020 7:04 PM
To: City Clerk
Subject: ATTENTION CITY CLERK, PLEASE READ THIS LETTER INTO RECORD AT THE END OF THE ORAL COMMUNICATION ON 7/21

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear City of Cupertino,

I am speaking today on behalf of CAYLA, the Cupertino Association of Youth LGBTQ+ Advocates, in support of the rainbow crosswalk petition.

I am coca and am a recent graduate of Cupertino High School.

The city of Cupertino has stalled the rainbow crosswalk project for too long against the wishes of its residents, citing regulations and liabilities to undermine the project. The Mayor has cited legal concerns over installing a rainbow crosswalk, despite the well-documented number of crosswalks across the bay, and Cupertino's own red crosswalks near city hall that are neither white, grey, nor yellow. Cupertino has a legacy of being anti-LGBTQ—this is a no brainer that attempts to shine a light on being more inclusive—to stall any further shows a profound lack of allyship from Cupertino. A rainbow crosswalk at the intersection of Stevens Creek Boulevard and Main Street within 1000 feet of Cupertino High School is an important symbol of inclusion and acceptance for the vulnerable LGBTQ+ youth population in our city, and it should not be delayed any further.

I remember the coding camp that I attended, the summer of my junior year. Given many options for a group project, one of them was a website that lists places that LGTBQ+ people can visit without being harassed. Being an LGBTQ+ myself, I was so excited that I told my parents about it.

“What! I thought you were straight!” When I heard that, I felt like I didn't matter. After that event, I stayed quiet and pretended to be someone that I am not.

Not only did that event wounded me, but other small instances hurt my feelings. I would mentally cringe when someone calls me by the wrong pronouns or when someone says something wrong based on the gender that I display. Not only misgendering a person is disrespecting them, but you are also telling me their true gender identity doesn't matter.

Keeping quiet about my true gender identity hurts, but I did this since I don't know if people will accept me as I am or reject me.

I did come out and I was happy people did accept me.

If the City of Cupertino built the Rainbow Crosswalk, that would be a comforting message that not only me, but LGTBQ+ people are welcomed here.

Sincerely,
coca

Cyrah Caburian

From: Alex F <alexandrafurey@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 21, 2020 7:04 PM
To: City Clerk
Subject: Oral communication on 7/21

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

ATTENTION CITY CLERK, PLEASE READ THIS LETTER INTO RECORD AT THE END OF THE ORAL COMMUNICATION ON 7/21. Thank you!

Dear City of Cupertino,

I am speaking today on behalf of CAYLA, the Cupertino Association of Youth LGBTQ+ Advocates, in support of the rainbow crosswalk petition.

My name is Xaander, I live in Cupertino, and I currently go to CHS.

The city of Cupertino has stalled the rainbow crosswalk project for way too long against the wishes of its residents. The Mayor has cited legal concerns over installing a rainbow crosswalk, despite the well-documented number of crosswalks across the bay, and Cupertino's own red crosswalks near city hall that are neither white, grey, nor yellow. Despite many residents of Cupertino trying to prove how they are inclusive and "woke," Cupertino still has a legacy of being anti-LGBTQ and pretending to be more inclusive. Stalling this project any further will show a lack of allyship from Cupertino. A rainbow crosswalk at the intersection of Stevens Creek Boulevard and Main Street within 1000 feet of Cupertino High School is an important symbol of inclusion and acceptance for the vulnerable LGBTQ+ youth population in our city, and it should not be delayed any further.

Sincerely,
Xaander

Cyrah Caburian

From: CG <cg95125@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 21, 2020 6:30 PM
To: City Clerk
Subject: Rainbow crosswalk

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Councilmembers -

The City of Vancouver painted a rainbow crosswalk in a densely populated neighborhood. They were astonished and thrilled with the positivity that ensued. The same happened in Seattle, WA. Happy City (happycity.org) did an experiment with the rainbow crosswalk and discovered that pedestrians were kinder to strangers. It produced a flurry of positive emotions in visitors, regardless of their sexual orientation. Visitors reported feeling 40% happier at the rainbow intersection than they did at the standard one a block away. They were 60% more likely to meet friends at that intersection and want to remain in the area to eat and shop. They also believed that if they lost their wallet there, they were much more likely to get it back if a stranger found it.

Loneliness and social isolation are a pressing concern during these unprecedented times. Even more so for the LGBTQ+ community. Let's spread some cheer and let our residents and visitors know that Cupertino is a unique, inclusive City and one that the locals care about.

Thank you,
Cathy

Cyrah Caburian

From: CG <cg95125@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 21, 2020 7:04 PM
To: City Clerk
Subject: Rainbow crosswalk

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Councilmembers -

The City of Vancouver painted a rainbow crosswalk in a densely populated neighborhood. They were astonished and thrilled with the positivity that ensued. The same happened in Seattle, WA. Happy City (happycity.org) did an experiment with the rainbow crosswalk and discovered that pedestrians were kinder to strangers. It produced a flurry of positive emotions in visitors, regardless of their sexual orientation. Visitors reported feeling 40% happier at the rainbow intersection than they did at the standard one a block away. They were 60% more likely to meet friends at that intersection and want to remain in the area to eat and shop. They also believed that if they lost their wallet there, they were much more likely to get it back if a stranger found it.

Loneliness and social isolation are a pressing concern during these unprecedented times. Even more so for the LGBTQ+ community. Let's spread some cheer and let our residents and visitors know that Cupertino is a unique, inclusive City and one that the locals care about.

Thank you,
Cathy

Cyrah Caburian

From: Draven Valcourt <drav3nvalcourt@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 21, 2020 7:08 PM
To: City Clerk
Subject: Rainbow Crosswalk

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

ATTENTION CITY CLERK, PLEASE READ THIS LETTER INTO RECORD AT THE END OF THE ORAL COMMUNICATION ON 7/21.

Dear City of Cupertino, I am speaking/writing today on behalf of CAYLA, the Cupertino Association of Youth LGBTQ+ Advocates, in support of the rainbow crosswalk petition. I'd like to remain anonymous for privacy and use the name Draven Valcourt, but I am a student and resident of Cupertino.

The city of Cupertino has stalled the rainbow crosswalk project for too long against the wishes of its residents, citing regulations and liabilities in an effort to undermine the project. The Mayor has cited legal concerns over installing a rainbow crosswalk, despite the well-documented number of crosswalks across the bay, and Cupertino's own red crosswalks near city hall that are neither white, grey, nor yellow. Cupertino has a legacy of being anti-LGBTQ—this is a no brainer that attempts to shine a light on being more inclusive—to stall any further shows a profound lack of allyship from Cupertino. A rainbow crosswalk at the intersection of Stevens Creek Boulevard and Main Street within 1000 feet of Cupertino High School is an important symbol of inclusion and acceptance for the vulnerable LGBTQ+ youth population in our city, and it should not be delayed any further. In times like these, where there's much need for equal representation in society, now would be an optimal time to begin the rainbow crosswalk project. As we have seen in the BLM movement, suppressed and ignored societies need more representation in modern day. A rainbow crosswalk would be ideal for the LGBTQ+ community representation because a) it would spread awareness b) it represents LGBTQ+ c) it would make Cupertino a more welcoming town. If we show our support to suppressed groups, people will become more accepting and educated towards them, making our town a much more wholesome and welcoming environment. Please consider starting the rainbow crosswalk.

Sincerely, Draven Valcourt

Cyrah Caburian

From: Phoenix <pragya.natarajan@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 21, 2020 8:00 PM
To: City Clerk
Cc: City Council
Subject: Public Comment for July 21st, 2020 Council Meeting

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear City of Cupertino,

I am emailing the city council today in support of the rainbow crosswalk and the comments made by CAYLA members during the city council meeting on Tuesday 7/21. I agree with the sentiments expressed by many others; a rainbow crosswalk on Stevens Creek being built will signal to the LGBTQ+ students that cross it that their city cares about their wellbeing, despite the discrimination they could face in the public or at home.

Approximately \$30,000 is how much the rainbow crosswalk will cost vs \$10,000 for a regular crosswalk. Materials used for rainbow crosswalks are generally Methyl Methacrylate paint and thermoplastic paint because they last longer and are much more durable. Compared to the 3 years once repainting of regular crosswalks, these can hold up for up to a decade. The usual white paint used is water-based. San Francisco's famous castro street crosswalks are made of thermoplastic and it holds up for nearly a decade.

As transgender health protections have been reversed. Trump lobbied for repealing Section 1557 of the Affordable Care Act, which established that it is illegal to discriminate on the basis of "race, color, national origin, sex, age or disability in certain health programs and activities." Now the trump administration has redefined sex from gender identity to biological sex, so it's legal to discriminate based on gender identity.

Transgender members of our community already have to pay costs equivalent to the rainbow crosswalk for transitioning surgeries and hormonal medications despite having insurance coverage. If hospitals can discriminate against patients, it is simply violating human rights.

In these simply obscene times people of the lgbtq+ community require solidarity. If people of our community, the community of cupertino, aren't allowed to express themselves and feel supported, what kind of a city are we?

Sincerely,
Pragya Natarajan

Cyrah Caburian

From: Phoenix <pragya.natarajan@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 22, 2020 10:39 AM
To: City Council
Cc: Darcy Paul; Jon Robert Willey; Liang Chao; Rod Sinks; Steven Scharf
Subject: [IMPORTANT] 07/21/2020 City Council Meeting Follow Up

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear City of Cupertino,

I am emailing the city council today in support of the rainbow crosswalk and the comments made by CAYLA members during the city council meeting on Tuesday 7/21. I agree with the sentiments expressed by many others; a rainbow crosswalk on Stevens Creek being built will signal to the LGBTQ+ students that cross it that their city cares about their wellbeing, despite the discrimination they could face in the public or at home.

Approximately \$30,000 is how much the rainbow crosswalk will cost vs \$10,000 for a regular crosswalk. Materials used for rainbow crosswalks are generally Methyl Methacrylate paint and thermoplastic paint because they last longer and are much more durable. Compared to the 3 years once repainting of regular crosswalks, these can hold up for up to a decade. The usual white paint used is water-based. San Francisco's famous castro street crosswalks are made of thermoplastic and it holds up for nearly a decade.

As transgender health protections have been reversed. Trump lobbied for repealing Section 1557 of the Affordable Care Act, which established that it is illegal to discriminate on the basis of "race, color, national origin, sex, age or disability in certain health programs and activities." Now the trump administration has redefined sex from gender identity to biological sex, so it's legal to discriminate based on gender identity.

Transgender members of our community already have to pay costs equivalent to the rainbow crosswalk for transitioning surgeries and hormonal medications despite having insurance coverage. If hospitals can discriminate against patients, it is simply violating human rights.

In these simply obscene times people of the lgbtq+ community require solidarity. If people of our community, the community of cupertino, aren't allowed to express themselves and feel supported, what kind of a city are we?

Sincerely,
Pragya Natarajan

CC 07-21-20

#19,

Weed Abatement

Written Comments

Cyrah Caburian

From: City of Cupertino Written Correspondence
Subject: FW: Photo for Weed control

From: Liang-Fang Chao <lfchao@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 21, 2020 9:23 PM
To: City Clerk <CityClerk@cupertino.org>
Subject: Fwd: Photo for Weed control

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Liang-Fang Chao <lfchao@gmail.com>
Date: Tue, Jul 21, 2020 at 5:32 PM
Subject: Photo for Weed control
To: Liang-Fang Chao <lfchao@gmail.com>



Cyrah Caburian

From: City of Cupertino Written Correspondence
Subject: FW: 7/21 webinar info

From: Kirsten Squarcia <KirstenS@cupertino.org>
Sent: Wednesday, July 22, 2020 12:22 AM
To: City Clerk <CityClerk@cupertino.org>
Subject: FW: 7/21 webinar info

For written comms – weeds



Kirsten Squarcia

City Clerk
City Manager's Office/City Clerk's Office
KirstenS@Cupertino.org
(408) 777-3225



From: Bhanu Pisupati <bnp979@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 21, 2020 5:19 PM
To: Kirsten Squarcia <KirstenS@cupertino.org>
Subject: Re: 7/21 webinar info

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Hi Kirsten
Thank you for your phone call today.
Please find attached pictures of our lawn.

Thank you.





Sent from my iPhone

On Jul 21, 2020, at 4:41 PM, Kirsten Squarcia <KirstenS@cupertino.org> wrote:

To address the City Council, click on the link below to register in advance and access the meeting:

Online

Register in advance https://cityofcupertino.zoom.us/webinar/register/WN_uCcBdPYkQauVNrhcS5KjA

Phone

Dial: (888) 788 0099 and enter Webinar ID: 954 8674 1464 (Type *9 to raise hand to speak). Unregistered participants will be called on by the last four digits of their phone number.

Thanks, Kirsten

Kirsten Squarcia
City Clerk
City Manager's Office/City Clerk's Office
KirstenS@Cupertino.org
(408) 777-3225

<image001.png>



<image005.png><image007.png><image009.png><image011.png>



<image015.png>

<072120 Closed Session and Regular.pdf>

CC 07-21-20

#20,

Proposition 15

Written Comments

BALLOT LABEL

INCREASES FUNDING SOURCES FOR PUBLIC SCHOOLS, COMMUNITY COLLEGES, AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT SERVICES BY CHANGING TAX ASSESSMENT OF COMMERCIAL AND INDUSTRIAL PROPERTY. INITIATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Taxes such properties based on current market value, instead of purchase price. Fiscal Impact: Increased property taxes on commercial properties worth more than \$3 million providing \$6.5 billion to \$11.5 billion in new funding to local governments and schools.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
DEPARTMENT OF REVENUE
1500 CALIFORNIA STREET, SUITE 100
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95833
916.227.2800

**SUBJECT TO COURT
ORDERED CHANGES**

OFFICIAL TITLE AND
SUMMARY PREPARED BY
THE ATTORNEY GENERAL

Initiative 19-0008 (Amdt. #1)

INCREASES FUNDING SOURCES FOR PUBLIC SCHOOLS, COMMUNITY COLLEGES, AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT SERVICES BY CHANGING TAX ASSESSMENT OF COMMERCIAL AND INDUSTRIAL PROPERTY. INITIATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT.

- Increases funding sources for K-12 public schools, community colleges, and local governments by requiring commercial and industrial real property be taxed based on current market value, instead of purchase price.
- Exempts from taxation changes: residential properties; agricultural land; and owners of commercial and industrial properties with combined value of \$3 million or less.
- Any additional education funding will supplement existing school funding guarantees.
- Exempts small businesses from personal property tax; for other businesses, provides \$500,000 exemption.

Summary of Legislative Analyst's Estimate of Net State and Local Government Fiscal Impact:

- Increased property taxes on commercial properties worth more than \$3 million providing \$6.5 billion to \$11.5 billion in new funding to local governments and schools.

Proposition 15
Increases Funding for Public Schools, Community Colleges, and
Local Government Services by Changing Tax Assessment of
Commercial and Industrial Property.
Initiative Constitutional Amendment.

BACKGROUND

Local Governments Tax Property. California cities, counties, schools, and special districts (such as a fire protection district) collect property taxes from property owners based on the value of their property. Property taxes raise around \$65 billion each year for these local governments. Overall, about 60 percent of property taxes go to cities, counties, and special districts. The other 40 percent goes to schools and community colleges. These shares are different in different counties.

Property Includes Land, Buildings, Machinery, and Equipment. Property taxes apply to many kinds of property. Land and buildings are taxed. Businesses also pay property taxes on most other things they own. This includes equipment, machinery, computers, and furniture. We call these things "business equipment."

How Is a Property Tax Bill Calculated? Each property owner's annual property tax bill is equal to the taxable value of their property multiplied by their property tax rate. The typical property owner's property tax rate is 1.1 percent.

Taxable Value of Land and Buildings Is Based on Original Purchase Price. In the year a piece of land or a building is purchased, its taxable value typically is its purchase price. Each year after that, the property's taxable value is adjusted for inflation by up to 2 percent. When a property is sold again, its taxable value is reset to its new purchase price. The taxable value of

most land and buildings is less than what they could be sold for. This is because the price most properties could be sold for grows faster than 2 percent per year.

Taxable Value of Business Equipment Is Based on How Much It Could Be Sold for.

Unlike land and buildings, business equipment is taxed based on how much it could be sold for today.

Counties Manage the Property Tax. County assessors determine the taxable value of property. County tax collectors bill property owners. County auditors distribute tax revenue to local governments. Statewide, counties spend about \$800 million each year on these activities.

PROPOSAL

Tax Commercial and Industrial Land and Buildings Based on How Much They Could Be Sold for. The measure requires commercial and industrial (after this referred to simply as “commercial”) land and buildings to be taxed based on how much they could be sold for instead of their original purchase price. This change is put in place over time starting in 2022. The change does not start before 2025 for properties used by California businesses that meet certain rules and have 50 or fewer employees. Housing and agricultural land continues to be taxed based on its original purchase price.

Some Lower Value Properties Not Included. This change does not apply if the owner has \$3 million or less worth of commercial land and buildings in California (adjusted for inflation every two years). These properties continue to be taxed based on original purchase price.

Reduce Taxes on Business Equipment. The measure reduces the taxable value of each business's equipment by \$500,000 starting in 2024. Businesses with less than \$500,000 of

equipment pay no taxes on those items. All property taxes on business equipment are eliminated for California businesses that meet certain rules and have 50 or fewer employees.

FISCAL EFFECTS

Increased Taxes on Commercial Land and Buildings. Most owners of commercial land and buildings worth more than \$3 million would pay higher property taxes. Only some of these property owners would start to pay higher taxes in 2022. By 2025, most of these property owners would pay higher taxes. Beginning in 2025, total property taxes from commercial land and buildings probably would be \$8 billion to \$12.5 billion higher in most years. The value of commercial property can change a lot from year to year. This means the amount of increased property taxes also could change a lot from year to year.

Decreased Taxes on Business Equipment. Property taxes on business equipment probably would be several hundred million dollars lower each year.

Money Set Aside to Pay Costs of the Measure. The measure sets aside money for various costs created by the measure. This includes giving **several hundred million dollars per year** to counties to pay for their costs of carrying out the measure. The measure would increase the amount of work county assessors do and could require changes in how they do their work. Counties could have costs from the measure before new money is available to cover these costs. The state would loan money to counties to cover these initial costs until new property tax revenue is available.

New Funding for Local Governments and Schools. Overall, \$6.5 billion to \$11.5 billion per year in new property taxes would go to local governments. 60 percent would go to cities, counties, and special districts. Each city, county, or special district's share of the money depends

on several things including the amount of new taxes paid by commercial properties in that community. Not all governments would be guaranteed new money. Some in rural areas may end up losing money because of lower taxes on business equipment. The other 40 percent would increase funding for schools and community colleges. Each school or community college's share of the money is mostly based on how many students they have.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION 15

Argument in Favor of Proposition 15

We are all better off when everyone pays their fair share. But California is giving away billions of dollars in property tax breaks to wealthy corporations. These billions could be used instead to deal with increasing inequality, persistent poverty, unemployment, unaffordable housing, homelessness and underfunded schools.

While the wealthiest corporations avoid paying their fair share, our schools have the most crowded classrooms in the nation and our local communities are struggling to respond to the impact of COVID-19.

Prop 15 is a fair and balanced reform which:

- closes property tax loopholes benefiting wealthy corporations
- cuts small business taxes
- reclaims billions of dollars to invest in our schools and local communities.

Prop 15 will:

Close corporate loopholes: Wealthy corporations avoid reassessment by employing highly paid tax lawyers and accountants to exploit loopholes in the law. Prop 15 closes these loopholes by requiring nonresidential commercial properties to be assessed based on their actual fair market value.

- The top 10% of California's most valuable nonresidential commercial properties account for 92% of Prop 15's new revenues.

Does not impact homeowners and renters: Prop 15 exempts all residential properties, maintaining FULL PROP 13 PROTECTIONS for homeowners and renters.

Cut taxes for small businesses: Prop 15 protects small businesses and cuts their taxes by:

- Exempting businesses operated out of a home and businesses owning \$3,000,000 or less of nonresidential commercial property

SUBJECT TO COURT
ORDERED CHANGES

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION 15

- Cutting business personal property taxes on equipment, computers and fixtures.

Restore balance to the property tax: Since Prop 13 passed, the residential share of property taxes has skyrocketed from 55% to 72% and the nonresidential commercial share has fallen. Meanwhile we're paying more in fees, fines and other taxes. Prop 15 rebalances the scales.

Increase funding for schools and community colleges: Every school district and community college will receive additional funding over and above existing funding guarantees. Prop 15 funds go directly to education and state politicians can't take it away.

Invest in essential workers and local services: Prop 15 gives local communities desperately needed resources so essential services and frontline workers can respond to current challenges and prepare for future crises, whether from a wildfire, pandemic, or earthquake.

Support economic and racial equity: Prop 15 makes sure schools with the greatest needs get the most help and gives local communities critically needed resources to deal with the unequal impacts of COVID-19, unemployment, and housing costs on communities of color.

Prioritize full transparency and accountability by requiring schools and local governments to publicly disclose all new revenues they receive and how they are spent.

Protect agricultural land: Prop 15 makes no change to existing laws affecting the taxation or preservation of agricultural land.

We can't afford business as usual. Prop 15 rebalances the scales by closing loopholes and supporting our schools, local communities and small businesses.

Prop 15 takes a big step forward toward a better future for all Californians. It was placed on the ballot by the signatures of over 1,700,000 voters who want wealthy corporations to pay their fair share.

Please add your voice to theirs: Vote Yes on Prop 15.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION 15

Tony Thurmond, California Superintendent of Public Instruction

Jacqueline Martinez, CEO, Latino Community Foundation

Sasha Cuttler, Public Health Nurse, San Francisco Department of Public Health

SUBJECT TO COURT
ORDERED CHANGES

REBUTTAL TO THE ARGUMENT SUPPORTING PROP 15

PROP 15: ALL CALIFORNIANS WILL PAY FOR THE LARGEST PROPERTY TAX INCREASE IN STATE HISTORY!

**REBUTTAL TO ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF
PROPOSITION 15**

REPEALS PROP 13 PROTECTIONS

Prop 13 limits property tax increases to 2% annually, providing certainty to homeowners and small businesses that they can afford their taxes in the future. Prop 15 allows state politicians to raise property taxes on millions of home-based businesses. Even worse, supporters of Prop 15 admit they'll go after Prop 13 protections for homes next – meaning skyrocketing property taxes for all homeowners!

PROP 15: RAISES OUR COST OF LIVING AND MAKES INCOME INEQUALITY WORSE

Billions in higher taxes will be passed on to California's small businesses in the form of higher rents, forcing businesses that are barely surviving now to lay off employees and raise prices. Higher costs for food and everyday necessities will hit all of us and low-income families hardest. We can't afford to raise our cost of living.

PROP 15: DOESN'T SOLVE OUR CURRENT BUDGET CRISIS

Prop 15 will not solve today's budget deficits. The nonpartisan Legislative Analyst says most funding won't arrive until 2025. Additionally, the California Assessors' Association says Prop 15 will cost more than \$1 billion to implement, meaning deeper cuts to already stretched local government budgets.

PROP 15: MISLEADING AND LACKS ACCOUNTABILITY

Prop 15's supporters say it's about more money for education, but nearly 70% of the tax money doesn't even go to schools and there's no accountability how the money is spent. Politicians can even divert the local government tax money for other purposes, just like they're doing with the gas tax.

NO ON PROP 15. www.NOonProp15.org

SUBJECT TO COURT
ORDERED CHANGES

REBUTTAL TO ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF
PROPOSITION 15

JON COUPAL, President
Howard Jarvis Taxpayers Association

ALICE HUFFMAN, President
California State Conference of the NAACP

BETTY JO TOCCOLI, President
California Small Business Association

03/16/12
04/10/12
05/01/12
05/15/12

SUBJECT TO COURT
ORDERED CHANGES

BALLOT ARGUMENT OPPOSING PROPOSITION 15

PROP 15 WILL BE THE LARGEST ANNUAL PROPERTY TAX INCREASE IN CALIFORNIA HISTORY – UP TO \$12.5 BILLION PER YEAR!

Prop 15's massive increase in annual property taxes will have disastrous economic impacts for every Californian – from small businesses and consumers to farmers and homeowners.

PROP 15 REPEALS TAXPAYER PROTECTIONS IN PROP 13

Prop 13's taxpayer protections have kept property taxes affordable by capping property taxes and limiting increases annually, providing taxpayers certainty they can afford their property taxes now and into the future. Prop 15 eliminates that certainty for millions of taxpayers.

- “Prop 15 is a direct threat to homeowners. Supporters of the tax hike openly admitted that this is merely the first step in completely dismantling Prop 13 which voters approved to stop skyrocketing property taxes.” – *Jon Coupal, President, Howard Jarvis Taxpayers Association*

PROP 15 RAISES OUR COST OF LIVING

Prop 15's tax hike will increase costs on everything people buy, including groceries, fuel, utilities, day care and health care.

- “Too many families have been priced out of their neighborhoods because of the rising cost of living. Prop 15 will raise the cost of living for California families by up to \$960 and will especially hurt lower-income communities.” – *Alice Huffman, President, California State Conference of the NAACP*

PROP 15 DESTROYS JOBS AND SMALL BUSINESSES

Seven million Californians work for a small business. Millions of Californians are filing for unemployment and are at risk of losing everything. NOTHING in Prop 15 stops the tax from being passed on to small business tenants. Prop 15 will make the economic crisis worse by devastating small businesses – including our neighborhood restaurants, barbershops, and dry cleaners.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION 15

- “Most small businesses rent the property on which they operate. Prop 15’s higher property taxes will mean skyrocketing rents at a time we can least afford it.” – *Jot Condie, President, California Restaurant Association*

PROP 15 RAISES TAXES FOR FAMILY FARMERS, RESULTING IN HIGHER COSTS FOR FOOD

Prop 15 will raise property taxes on farming – including barns, dairies, processing plants and even fruit and nut trees.

- “Prop 15 hurts family farmers and we all will end up paying higher costs for groceries including milk, eggs and meat.” – *Jamie Johansson, President, California Farm Bureau Federation*

PROP 15 LETS THE LEGISLATURE RAISE PROPERTY TAXES ON HOMEOWNERS

Two million Californians operate small businesses from their homes. Prop 15 gives the Legislature the power to increase property taxes on those homeowners – WITHOUT A VOTE OF THE PEOPLE.

- “Prop 15 will be devastating to homeowners - local plumbers, gardeners, bookkeepers, day cares and small businesses operating out of their home.” – *Julian Canete, President and CEO, California Hispanic Chambers of Commerce*

PROP 15 LACKS ACCOUNTABILITY

Prop 15 will cost taxpayers \$1 billion each year in bureaucratic expenses, and politicians can spend the higher property tax revenue on anything they want, including administrative costs, outside consultants and pay raises.

- “Prop 15 allows politicians to divert its tax hike revenue to anything the special interests want, just like they’re doing with the gas tax.” – *Marilyn Markham, Board Member, California Senior Advocates League*

INDEPENDENTS, DEMOCRATS AND REPUBLICANS AGREE – NO ON PROP 15.

NOW IS NOT THE TIME TO RAISE PROPERTY TAXES IN CALIFORNIA.

ROBERT GUTIERREZ, President
California Taxpayers Association

ALICE HUFFMAN, President
California State Conference of the NAACP

BETTY JO TOCCOLI, President
California Small Business Association

ROBERT GUTIERREZ
ALICE HUFFMAN
BETTY JO TOCCOLI

REBUTTAL TO ARGUMENT AGAINST

PROPOSITION 15

PROP. 15 PROPONENTS' REBUTTAL

Prop 15 is a fair and balanced reform which:

- Closes property tax loopholes benefiting wealthy corporations
- Cuts small business taxes
- Does not impact homeowners and renters
- Reclaims billions of dollars for schools and local communities

California must take these steps right now to secure a better future for us all.

Wealthy owners of the MOST EXPENSIVE 10% OF BUSINESS PROPERTIES account for 92% of Prop 15's revenues.

Prop 15 supporters: teachers, nurses, small business owners, clergy, affordable housing advocates, and community organizations who want to close corporate tax loopholes and rebalance the scales.

Prop 15 opponents: wealthy corporations and out-of-state investors trying to keep their tax breaks by using scare tactics to confuse the issue.

Read the measure for yourself and remember, Prop 15:

- Maintains FULL PROP 13 PROTECTIONS for homeowners and renters.
- CUTS small business taxes AND specifically exempts all home-based businesses AND exempts all small businesses owning \$3,000,000 or less in business property.

SUBJECT TO COURT
ORDERED CHANGES

REBUTTAL TO ARGUMENT AGAINST

PROPOSITION 15

- Guarantees transparency and accountability by requiring full public disclosure of all new revenues and how they're spent.
- Keeps Prop 13's low 1% limit, so California's business property taxes will still be below most states.

Learn more at scaretactics15.org.

As we rebuild from the COVID-19 shut down and prepare for challenges ahead, business as usual won't do. It's time we invest in small businesses, students, healthy families, and safe neighborhoods.

Prop 15 is a balanced reform that closes corporate loopholes benefitting the top 10% and restores billions to our schools and communities —Vote Yes on Prop 15.

E. Toby Boyd, President, California Teachers Association

Carol Moon Goldberg, President, League of Women Voters

Tara Lynn Gray, ~~President and~~ CEO, Fresno Metro Black Chamber of Commerce

TEXT OF PROPOSITION 15

**SUBJECT TO COURT
ORDERED CHANGES**

SECTION 1. Title

This measure shall be known as "The California Schools and Local Communities Funding Act of 2020."

SEC. 2. Findings

- (a) California is the fifth largest economy in the world, but if we don't invest in our future, we'll fall behind. To grow our economy and provide a better quality of life now, and for future generations of Californians, we need to do a better job of investing in our schools, community colleges, and local communities, and do more to encourage small businesses and start-ups.
- (b) Our competitiveness begins with making children and their education a priority. Decades of cuts and underfunding have undermined California schools. A recent national study ranked the performance of California schools in the bottom half of all states. The top ranked states spend thousands of dollars more per student than California.
- (c) California's funding shortfall has direct consequences for our kids: we're dead last in the nation in teacher-to-student ratios, last in guidance counselor to student ratios, and last in librarian-to-student ratios.
- (d) The quality of life in our local communities is also critical to our economic future. It depends on streets that are safe and clean, emergency services we can count on, parks and recreation programs that keep our youth off the streets, and roads that are well maintained. Our cities, counties, and local agencies are on the front line facing the consequences of the lack of affordable housing and increasing homelessness as well as worsening risks from wildfires and other disasters.
- (e) Property taxes on commercial and industrial properties are a principal source of funding for our schools and local communities. While virtually every other state assesses commercial and industrial property based on its fair market value, California allows commercial and industrial property taxes to go many years, even decades, without reassessment. This unusual system is prone to abusive tax avoidance schemes, diverts funds away from schools and local communities, contributes to the shortage of affordable housing, distorts business competition, and disadvantages business start-ups.
- (f) California's under-assessment of commercial and industrial properties is a growing problem. Large investors and corporations, many of whom are from other states and countries, are using a variety of schemes to get around the law and buy and sell properties without being reassessed, costing our schools and local communities billions of dollars.
- (g) A recent study by the University of Southern California has found that under-assessed commercial and industrial property allows owners to avoid over \$11 billion in local property taxes each year that should be going to support our schools and local communities.

- (h) California's unusual commercial and industrial property tax system contributes to California's affordable housing crisis. Studies by the Legislative Analyst Office and the University of California have demonstrated that California's property tax system incentivizes owners to hold idle vacant and under-utilized commercial and industrial property. A reformed system, that assesses all properties based on their fair market value, would create a powerful new incentive to build new housing. *Analyst's*
- (i) Every commercial and industrial property owner benefits from local schools and services like public safety and infrastructure. It is unfair and anti-competitive that the property tax system forces some businesses to pay higher property taxes to support our schools and local communities while their competitors pay much lower property taxes because their properties are assessed far below their fair market value.
- (j) California's unusual property tax system not only distorts competition, it discourages business investments. Under the current system, businesses that invest in improving their properties trigger reassessment and higher property taxes. But businesses that don't invest in improving their properties continue to enjoy the low cost of under assessment.
- (k) A study done at the University of California demonstrates that reassessing commercial property will have a net positive benefit on jobs and the California economy.
- (l) If we reformed California's under-assessment problem on business properties, California would still rank among the lowest states for business property taxes in the nation because of the California Constitution's provisions related to the 1% limitation on property tax rates.
- (m) Thriving small businesses and start-ups are essential to California's economy now and for our future. The property tax on equipment and fixtures discourages new start-ups, small businesses and larger businesses from making new productive investments. By requiring under-assessed large properties to be assessed at fair market value, small businesses can be fully exempted from the property tax on equipment and fixtures and the tax can be substantially reduced for other businesses, removing this disincentive without harm to funding for our schools and local communities.
- (n) Reassessing under-assessed commercial and industrial property in California would primarily impact a small number of properties owned by the largest corporations and wealthiest investors. Almost 80% of the tax benefits of the under-assessment allowed by the current system go to just 8% of the properties.
- (o) The benefits to our schools, local communities and economy resulting from ending the under-assessment of commercial and industrial property can be achieved while protecting small businesses through exemptions and deferrals of reassessment and at the same time encouraging small businesses by creating a more level playing field and by eliminating the property tax on business equipment and fixtures.

- (p) Reforming commercial and industrial property assessments to fair market value will result in a fairer system for our schools, our local communities and our businesses. All businesses will compete on a level playing field, generating billions of dollars in additional support for our schools and local communities.

SEC. 3. Purpose and Intent.

It is the intent of the People of the State of California to do all of the following in this measure:

- (a) Preserve in every way Proposition 13's protections for homeowners and for residential rental properties. This measure only affects the assessment of taxable commercial and industrial property.
- (b) Provide for increased and stable revenues for schools, cities, counties and other local agencies by requiring under-assessed commercial and industrial properties to be assessed based on their fair market value.
- (c) Distribute the new revenues resulting from this measure to schools and local communities, not to the State.
- (d) Ensure that the portion of any new revenues going to local schools and community colleges as a result of this measure is treated as new revenues that are in addition to all other funding for schools and community colleges, including Proposition 98.
- (e) Guarantee every school district and community college will receive additional funding from this measure and that funds going to schools and community colleges are allocated in a manner that is consistent with local control funding formulas intended to advance equity.
- (f) Ensure that any new revenues going to cities, counties, and special districts as a result of this measure will be allocated in the same manner as other property tax revenues, consistent with prior ballot measures approved by voters, to improve the quality of life in local communities in all parts of California.
- (g) Make certain there is complete public transparency by requiring schools, community colleges, cities, counties, and special districts to publicly disclose the new revenues they receive and how those revenues are spent in a manner that is widely available and easily understood.
- (h) Be very clear that this measure only applies to taxable commercial and industrial real property by including provisions stating that:
 - (1) All residential property is exempt so homeowners and renters will not be affected in any way by this measure.
 - (2) This measure makes no change to existing laws affecting the taxation or preservation of agricultural land.

Do not
revert (1)
(2)

- (i) Make no change to Proposition 13's constitutional provisions relating to the 1% limitation on property tax rates for all taxable real property so local property taxes on commercial and industrial property will continue to be among the lowest in the country after this measure is approved by voters.
- (j) Ensure stability for owners of small business properties by providing an exclusion for small commercial and industrial real property owners. The intent of this provision is to provide an exclusion that applies only to the true owners of small businesses and that large property owners shall be prevented from using the exclusion for their own benefit.
- (k) Defer reassessments for properties in which small businesses account for 50% or more of the occupied space until the 2025-2026 lien date to provide those small business tenants additional time to choose the leasing option that works for them, recognizing that the impact of this measure will be different for each property, depending on how close the current assessment is to the fair market value and whether or not it qualifies for the small property exclusion for properties with a fair market value of \$3 million or less. *endash*
- (l) Encourage new and existing businesses to make new investments by eliminating the business tangible personal property tax on equipment and fixtures for small businesses and providing a \$500,000 per year exemption for all other businesses. The Legislature may not reduce this exemption, but it may increase it.
- (m) Provide greater equity in the taxation of commercial and industrial properties by assessing all of them based on their actual fair market value just like start-ups and new commercial and industrial properties that already are being assessed based on their actual fair market value. The intent is for all businesses to compete on a more level playing field and make sure all businesses are paying their share to support the schools and local communities from which they benefit.
- (n) Require the Legislature, after conferring with a Task Force on Property Tax Administration, to provide by statute for the phase-in of reassessments of under-assessed commercial and industrial real properties so that county assessors may effectively implement the new law. Such phase-in will begin with the lien date for the 2022-23 fiscal year and occur over several years. Affected owners shall only be obligated to pay the taxes based on the new assessed value beginning with the lien date for the fiscal year when the assessor has completed the reassessment. *endash*
- (o) Require the Legislature to ensure that the phase-in provisions provide affected owners of under-assessed commercial and industrial real properties reasonable time to pay any increase in their tax obligations resulting from this measure.
- (p) Provide for the recovery of actual direct administrative costs incurred by counties to effectively implement the new law.

(q) Ensure that the General Fund and other funds of the State are held harmless by reimbursing the State for reductions in tax revenue caused by the deductibility of the property tax.

State

(r) Maintain the Board of Equalization's oversight over the property tax system to assure the public that assessments of commercial and industrial real property in every county are equitable and uniform as required by this measure, and to further ensure that the Board of Equalization provides statewide assistance as necessary to support the efficient implementation of this measure within all 58 counties.

State

SEC. 4. Section 8.7 of Article XVI of the California Constitution is added to read:

SEC. 8.7. (a) The Local School and Community College Property Tax Fund is hereby created in the State Treasury, to be held in trust, and is continuously appropriated for the support of local education agencies as that term is defined in section 421 of the Education Code as that statute read on January 1, 2020, and for the support of community college districts. The moneys deposited in the Local School and Community College Property Tax Fund shall be held in trust for schools, and shall be distributed as follows:

(1) Eleven percent (11%) of the moneys shall be allocated by the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges to community college districts in proportion to the funding calculated for each district pursuant to the distribution formulas operative in statute as of January 1, 2020, or any successor statute, provided that property tax revenues calculated pursuant to section 84751 of the Education Code, or any successor statute, that exceed the total funding calculated for a district pursuant to the then-operative distribution formulas shall be subtracted from that district's proportionate share of the Local School and Community College Property Tax Fund.

(2) Eighty-nine percent (89%) of the moneys shall be allocated by the Superintendent of Public Instruction to school districts, charter schools, and county offices of education as follows:

(A) To school districts and charter schools, in proportion to each school district's or charter school's total funding calculated pursuant to subdivisions (a)-(i), inclusive, of section 42238.02 of the Education Code, as those provisions read on July 1, 2019. Any school district or charter school that qualifies as a "basic aid school district" or "excess tax entity" under subdivision (o) of that section shall have subtracted from its proportionate share of the Local School and Community College Property Tax Fund the amount by which the sum calculated in subdivision (j) of that section exceeds the amount calculated pursuant to subdivisions (a)-(i), inclusive, as each of those provisions read on July 1, 2019.

(B) To county offices of education, in proportion to each office's total funding calculated pursuant to section 2574 of the Education Code as that section read on July 1, 2019.

(3) Notwithstanding the above, no school district or charter school shall receive from the Local School and Community College Property Tax Fund less than \$100 per unit of average daily attendance, adjusted annually upward or downward by the same percentage that the Local School and Community College Property Tax Fund grew or declined from the previous year, and no community college district shall receive from the Local School and Community College

one hundred dollars (\$100)

Section 42238.02 of the Education Code

of Section 42238.02 of the Education Code

SUBJECT TO COURT ORDERED CHANGES

(5)

pg 6

S added to

Small caps education

S

S

Ital

paragraphs (1) and (2) of this subdivision.

One hundred dollars (\$100)

Property Tax Fund less than \$100 per enrolled full time equivalent student, adjusted annually upward or downward by the same percentage that the Local School and Community College Property Tax Fund grew or declined from the previous year.

(b) Except as provided in paragraph (2) of subdivision (d) of Section 8.6 of this Article, notwithstanding any other law, the moneys deposited in the Local School and Community College Property Tax Fund shall not be subject to appropriation, reversion, or transfer by the Legislature, the Governor, the Director of Finance, or the Controller for any purpose other than those specified in this section, nor shall these revenues be loaned to the General Fund or any other fund of the State or any local government fund.

educational

(c) Moneys allocated to local education agencies, as that term is defined in section 421 of the Education Code as that statute read on January 1, 2020, and to community college districts from the Local School and Community College Property Tax Fund shall supplement, and shall not replace, other funding for education. Funds deposited into or allocated from the Local School and Community College Property Tax Fund shall not be part of "total allocations to school districts and community college districts from General Fund proceeds of taxes appropriated pursuant to Article XIII B and allocated local proceeds of taxes" for purposes of paragraphs (2) and (3) of subdivision (b) of Section 8 of this Article or for purposes of Section 21 of this Article. Except as provided in subdivision (c) of Section 8.6 of this Article, revenues generated by Section 2.5 of Article XIII A shall not be deemed to be General Fund revenues which may be appropriated pursuant to Article XIII B for purposes of paragraph (1) of subdivision (b) of Section 8 of this Article, nor shall they be considered in the determination of per capita General Fund revenues for purposes of subdivisions (b) and (e) of Section 8 of this Article.

Σ

- Ital

(d) Except as provided in subdivision (c) of Section 8.6 of this Article, revenues generated by Section 2.5 of Article XIII A shall not be deemed to be General Fund proceeds of taxes that may be appropriated pursuant to Article XIII B for purposes of Section 20 or Section 21 of this Article.

S added to

SEC. 5. Section 8.6 of Article XVI of the California Constitution is added to read:

small caps

SEC. 8.6. (a) The Legislature shall provide by statute a methodology, based on historical experience, for determining the additional revenue generated in each county each fiscal year as a result of the application of the tax rate specified in subdivision (a) of Section 1 of Article XIII A and the application of Section 2.5 of Article XIII A. The determination as to the amount of additional revenue in each county shall be transmitted to the county auditor annually for use for the calculations required by this section.

- Ital

(b) After transferring the necessary funds pursuant to subdivisions (c), (d), and (e) and subparagraph (B) of paragraph (1) of this subdivision, all additional revenue resulting from the application of the tax rate specified in subdivision (a) of Section 1 of Article XIII A and the

(6)

application of Section 2.5 of Article XIII A shall be allocated and transferred by the county auditor as follows:

(1) (A) First, to the Local School and Community College Property Tax Fund created pursuant to Section 8.7 of this Article, in an amount equal to the school entities' share of property taxes as determined pursuant to Chapter 6 (commencing with Section 95) of Part 0.5 of Division 1 of the Revenue and Taxation Code, as that chapter read on January 1, 2020.

(B) Prior to making the transfer pursuant to subparagraph (A) of this subdivision, the county auditor shall subtract an amount equal to the county's share of the increase in appropriations of State General Fund proceeds of taxes for the support of school districts and community college districts pursuant to Section 8 of Article XVI due to the revenue loss resulting from the exemptions provided by Section 3.1 of Article XIII, as determined by the Director of Finance. The county's share of additional State General Fund appropriations shall be transferred by the county auditor to the General Fund prior to the allocation specified in subparagraph (A) of this subdivision. The amount determined by the Director of Finance pursuant to this subparagraph shall for each fiscal year be apportioned by county in proportion to the revenue loss resulting from the exemptions provided by Section 3.1 of Article XIII.

(2) Second, among cities, counties, and special districts pursuant to Chapter 6 (commencing with Section 95) of Part 0.5 of Division 1 of the Revenue and Taxation Code, as that chapter read on January 1, 2020.

(c) The Franchise Tax Board shall determine the reduction to the General Fund and any other affected state fund of revenues derived from the taxes imposed by the Personal Income Tax Law (Part 10 (commencing with Section 17001) of Division 2 of the Revenue and Taxation Code) and the Corporation Tax Law (Part 11 (commencing with Section 23001) of Division 2 of the Revenue and Taxation Code), as those laws read on January 1, 2020, due to the deduction of any net increase in property taxes resulting from the implementation of Section 2.5 of Article XIII A and subdivision (a) of Section 3.1 of Article XIII. The amount of reduction as determined by the Franchise Tax Board shall be transferred by the county auditor to the General Fund and any other affected state fund prior to the allocation specified in subdivision (b). For purposes of making the determinations required by Section 8, 20, and 21 of this Article, the amount transferred to the General Fund pursuant to this subdivision shall be deemed to be General Fund revenues which may be appropriated pursuant to Article XIII B and General Fund proceeds of taxes appropriated pursuant to Article XIII B, and shall be included in the calculation of per capita General Fund revenues. The amount transferred pursuant to this subdivision shall for each fiscal year be apportioned among the counties in proportion to each county's contribution to the total additional revenue resulting from the application of the tax rate specified in subdivision (a) of Section 1 of Article XIII A and the application Section 2.5 of Article XIII A determined for all counties.

(d) (1) Each county or city and county shall be annually compensated for the actual direct administrative costs of implementing Section 2.5 of Article XIII A and Section 3.1 of Article XIII as identified by the board of supervisors of the county or city and county consistent with statutes identifying those costs. The Legislature shall determine by statute what constitutes actual direct administrative costs for purposes of this subdivision. Such costs shall at a minimum

include the costs of assessment, assessment appeals, legal counsel, tax allocation and distribution, and auditing and enforcement of the provisions of Section 3.1 of Article XIII and Section 2.5 of Article XIII A. It is the intent of this subdivision to provide full adequate funding to counties to cover all costs associated with implementation of the Act.

(2) The Legislature shall determine by statute the initial start-up costs necessary for each county or city and county and the Board of Equalization to implement the Act and shall appropriate State General Fund monies to pay for such startup costs until sufficient funds are available to pay for all ongoing costs to implement the Act, at which time the statute shall provide for the State General Fund to be reimbursed.

(e) Each county or city and county shall annually be reimbursed for actual refunds of property taxes paid in the prior fiscal year as a result of corrections to assessments made pursuant to Section 2.5 of Article XIII A. The amount reimbursed pursuant to this subdivision shall for each fiscal year be subtracted from each county's contribution to the total additional revenue resulting from the application of Section 2.5 of Article XIII A as a result of the application of the tax rate specified in subdivision (a) of Section 1 of Article XIII A.

(f) All local education agencies, community colleges, counties, cities and counties, cities, and special districts that receive funds from the revenues generated by Section 2.5 of Article XIII A shall publicly disclose for each fiscal year, including in their annual budgets, the amount of property tax revenues they received for that fiscal year as the result of Section 2.5 of Article XIII A and how those revenues were spent. Such disclosure shall be made so that it is widely available to the public and written so as to be easily understood.

SEC. 6. Section 2.5 of Article XIII A of the California Constitution is added to read:

SEC. 2.5. (a) (1) Notwithstanding Section 2 of this Article, for the lien date for the 2022-23 fiscal year and each lien date thereafter, the "full cash value" of commercial and industrial real property that is not otherwise exempt under the Constitution is the fair market value of such real property as of that date as determined by the county assessor of the county in which such real property is located, except as provided by the Legislature pursuant to subdivision (b).

(2) Paragraph (1) of this subdivision shall not apply to residential property as defined in this section, whether it is occupied by a homeowner or a renter. Residential property as defined in this section shall be assessed as required by Section 2 of this Article. Paragraph (1) of this subdivision shall also not apply to real property used for commercial agricultural production as defined in this section. Real property used for commercial agricultural production as defined in this section shall be assessed as required by Section 2 of this Article.

(b) The Legislature shall establish a Task Force on Property Tax Administration immediately after this section is enacted, including a county assessor or designee, a Board of Equalization member or designee, a proponent of this Act or designee, a taxpayer representative, and a member of the Legislature or designee. The Task Force shall publicly convene immediately upon its creation to examine and recommend to the Legislature all statutory and regulatory changes

education

-Ital

s added to

small caps

-Ital

State

ndash necessary for the equitable implementation of this measure consistent with its purpose and intent. The Legislature, after conferring with the Task Force, shall provide by statute for the phase-in of the reassessment of commercial and industrial real property as required by paragraph (1) of subdivision (a). Any such phase-in shall provide for reassessment of a percentage of all commercial and industrial real properties within each county commencing with the lien date for the 2022-23 fiscal year and extending over two or more lien dates each fiscal year thereafter, in order to ensure a reasonable workload and implementation period for county assessors, including provision for processing and timing of assessment appeals. An owner shall first be obligated to pay the taxes based on the new assessed value beginning with the lien date for the fiscal year when the county assessor has completed the reassessment. The phase-in also shall provide taxpayers whose property has been reassessed a reasonable timeframe within which to pay any increase in taxes. After the initial reassessment of commercial and industrial real property pursuant to this subdivision, such commercial and industrial real property shall be periodically reassessed no less frequently than every three years as determined by the Legislature. Notwithstanding existing statutes, the Legislature shall, in consultation with county assessors, develop a process for hearing appeals resulting from the reassessment of properties pursuant to this section that is consistent with the following:

- (1) The process shall not include automatic acceptance of the applicant's opinion of values within a given time-frame.
- (2) The process shall impose on the taxpayer the burden of proof that the property was not properly valued.
- (3) The process shall require the taxpayer to provide evidence relevant to any appeal in the initial application before the local assessment appeals board.
- (4) The process shall ensure that decisions by local administrative hearing bodies such as assessment appeals boards, if subject to judicial review, are subject only to de novo judicial review on issues of law, while issues of fact, including valuation, shall be reviewed under the substantial evidence standard.

(c) For purposes of this section:

- (1) "Commercial and industrial real property" means any real property that is used as commercial or industrial property, or is vacant land not zoned for residential use and not used for commercial agricultural production. For purposes of this paragraph, vacant land shall not include real property that is used or protected for open space, a park, or the equivalent designation for land essentially free of structures, natural in character to provide opportunities for recreation and education, and intended to preserve scenic, cultural, or historic values.
- (2) "Mixed-use real property" means real property on which both residential and commercial or industrial uses are permitted.
- (3) "Real property used for commercial agricultural production" means land that is used for producing commercial agricultural commodities.
- (4)(A) "Residential property" shall include real property used as residential property, including both single-family and multi-unit structures, and the land on which those structures are constructed or placed.

(B) The Legislature shall provide by statute that any property zoned as commercial or industrial but used as long-term residential property shall be classified as residential for purposes of paragraph (2) of subdivision (a). For mixed-use real property, the Legislature shall ensure only that portion of the property that is used for commercial and industrial purposes shall be subject to reassessment as required by paragraph (1) of subdivision (a). The Legislature shall also define and provide by statute that limited commercial uses of residential property, such as home offices, home-based businesses or short-term rentals, shall be classified as residential for purposes of paragraph (2) of subdivision (a). The Legislature may provide for an exclusion from reassessment for the commercial share of mixed use property provided seventy-five percent ⁷⁵ (75%) or more of the property by square footage or value is residential.

(d) (1) Subject to paragraph (2) of this subdivision, upon reassessment pursuant to subdivisions (a) and (b), each commercial and industrial real property with a fair market value of three million dollars (\$3,000,000) or less shall not be subject to reassessment pursuant to paragraph (1) of subdivision (a) and shall be assessed as required by Section 2 of this Article. The amount specified in this paragraph shall be adjusted for inflation every two years commencing January 1, 2025, as determined by the State Board of Equalization. The State Board of Equalization shall calculate the adjustment separately for each county taking into consideration differences in average commercial and industrial market values among counties. -Ital

(2) Notwithstanding paragraph (1) of this subdivision, real property that would otherwise comply with the exclusion set forth in paragraph (1) of this subdivision shall be subject to reassessment pursuant to paragraph (1) of subdivision (a) if any of the direct or indirect ^{interest} beneficial owners of such real property own a direct or indirect beneficial ownership interest(s) ^{or} in other commercial and/or industrial real property located in the State, which such real property in the aggregate ⁵ (including the subject property) has a fair market value in excess of three million dollars (\$3,000,000). The amount specified in this paragraph shall be adjusted for inflation every two years commencing January 1, 2025, as determined by the State Board of Equalization.

(3) All determinations of fair market value under this subdivision shall be determined by the county assessor of the county in which the property is located, and such determinations by the county assessor shall be conclusive and subject only to judicial review for abuse of discretion.

(4) In order to be eligible for the exclusion provided by paragraph (1) of this subdivision, the owner of the real property shall make a claim and certify annually to the county assessor under penalty of perjury that the conditions required by paragraphs (1) and (2) of this subdivision for exemption from reassessment have been met and shall be subject to audit by the county or the ^{State} State as to that certification. The Board of Equalization shall have the authority to conduct any audits on behalf of the State.

(5) Any real property excluded from reassessment under paragraph (1) of this subdivision shall only be excluded from reassessment so long as it meets the conditions imposed by paragraphs (1) and (2) of this subdivision. If there is any change in the direct or indirect beneficial ownership of such real property, a new claim and certification must be made to the county assessor.

(6) Any appeals by taxpayers who are found not to be excluded from reassessment pursuant to paragraph (1) of this subdivision shall be subject to the process for hearing appeals as provided in subdivision (b).

50 (e) (1) Provided fifty percent (50%) or more of the occupied square footage of a commercial or industrial real property is occupied by a small business as defined in paragraph (4) of this subdivision, the provisions of paragraph (1) of subdivision (a) shall not take effect prior to the lien date for the 2025-26 fiscal year; provided, however, that if the Legislature establishes by statute pursuant to subdivision (b) that a real property qualified under this paragraph shall be reassessed on a lien date subsequent to the 2025-26 fiscal year, then such property shall be reassessed commencing on that subsequent lien date.

(2) In order to be eligible for the deferral provided by paragraph (1) of this subdivision, the owner of the property shall make a claim and certify annually to the county assessor under penalty of perjury that the conditions required by paragraph (1) of this subdivision for deferral from reassessment have been met and shall be subject to audit by the county or the Board of Equalization as to that certification.

(3) Any real property for which reassessment is deferred under paragraph (1) of this subdivision shall only be eligible for deferral so long as it meets the conditions imposed by paragraph (1) of this subdivision and if there is any change in the direct or indirect beneficial ownership of such real property, a new claim and certification must be made to the county assessor. Upon termination of the deferral, the property shall be subject to paragraph (1) of subdivision (a).

(4) For purposes of this subdivision, the term small business shall include only those businesses which meet all of the following conditions:

(A) The business has fewer than 50 annual full-time equivalent employees.

(B) The business is independently owned and operated such that the business ownership interests, management and operation are not subject to control, restriction, modification or limitation by an outside source, individual or another business.

(C) The business owns real property located in California.

(f) For purposes of this section the failure in any year to claim, in a manner required by the laws in effect at the time the claim is required to be made, an exclusion or classification which reduces or defers an assessment or reassessment shall be deemed a waiver of the exclusion or classification for that year.

(g) Using the methodology prescribed by the Legislature pursuant to subdivision (a) of Section 8.6 of Article XVI, the percentage change in gross taxable assessed valuation within a city, county, or a city and county used to calculate an entity's vehicle license fee adjustment amount pursuant to Section 97.70 of the Revenue and Taxation Code shall not include the additional assessed valuation that results from the application of this section.

(h) Notwithstanding Section 16 of Article XVI or any other law, the additional assessed valuation that results from the application of this section shall not be factored into any division

of taxes or calculation of growth for treatment as tax increment and shall not be diverted in any manner whatsoever.

Ital

SEC. 7. Section 3.1 of Article XIII of the California Constitution is added to read:

SEC. 3.1. (a) (1) For each taxpayer paying the tax on tangible personal property, including business equipment and fixtures, used for business purposes, either of the following shall apply:
(A) (i) For a taxpayer that is a small business, as defined in paragraph (4) of subdivision (e) of Section 2.5 of Article XIII A, all tangible personal property owned and used for business purposes is exempt from taxation.

(ii) A taxpayer shall make a claim and certify annually to the county assessor under penalty of perjury that the condition required by this subparagraph for exemption has been met and such claim shall be subject to audit by the county or the state as to that certification.

(B) Except for a taxpayer subject to subparagraph (A) of paragraph (1) of this subdivision, an amount of up to five hundred thousand dollars (\$500,000) of combined tangible personal property and fixtures, per taxpayer, is exempt from taxation.

(2) Aircraft and vessels shall not be subject to this exemption.

(3) The Legislature shall not lower the exemption amounts provided by this subdivision or change their application, but may increase the exemption amount specified in subparagraph (B) of paragraph (1) of this subdivision consistent with the authority enumerated in Section 2 of this Article.

(b) The Legislature shall provide by statute that all related entities, including but not limited to any subsidiaries, holding companies, or parent corporations, are considered one "taxpayer" for the purposes of this section.

Ital

SEC. 8. Section 16 of Article XIII B of the California Constitution is added to read:

SEC. 16. (a) For purposes of this article, "proceeds of taxes" shall not include the additional revenues generated by Section 2.5 of Article XIII A.

(b) For purposes of this article, appropriations subject to limitation of each entity of government shall not include appropriations of the additional revenues collected as a result of the implementation of Section 2.5 of Article XIII A.

Ital

SEC. 9. Effective Date.

This measure shall become operative on January 1, 2022, except that subdivision (a) of Section 3.1 of Article XIII shall become operative on January 1, 2024, and subdivision (d) of Section 8.6 of Article XVI and subdivision (b) of Section 2.5 of Article XIII A shall become operative immediately upon passage of this measure.

SEC. 10. Severability

s added to small caps

s added to small caps

(12)

SUBJECT TO COURT ORDERED CHANGES

pg 13

The provisions of this Act are severable. If any portion, section, subdivision, paragraph, clause, sentence, phrase, word, or application of this Act is for any reason held to be invalid by a decision of any court of competent jurisdiction, that decision shall not affect the validity of the remaining portions of this Act. The People of the State of California hereby declare that they would have adopted this Act and each and every portion, section, subdivision, paragraph, clause, sentence, phrase, word, and application not declared invalid or unconstitutional without regard to whether any portion of this Act or application thereof would be subsequently declared invalid. Notwithstanding the foregoing, Section 7 of this Act is non-severable from Section 6 of this Act.

SEC. 11. Liberal Construction.

This Act shall be liberally construed in order to effectuate its purposes as articulated in Section 3 of this Act.



Allocation of Revenues From Schools and Communities First for Selected Counties

Prepared by

Blue Sky Consulting Group

May 4, 2020

METHODOLOGY

Estimates of the amount of additional property taxes from the SCF initiative for individual local jurisdictions were developed by first estimating the additional revenue to be contributed by individual parcels in each community. The additional revenue from each parcel was then allocated to the relevant jurisdictions in which the parcel is located (e.g., to the city, school district, any special districts serving the parcel and the county) based on the current allocation of property taxes for that parcel. For each jurisdiction, the total amount of additional revenue was calculated by summing the contributions from each parcel in that jurisdiction. The amount of additional revenue generated by each parcel was adjusted to reflect estimated 2021-22 revenues and reduced by the proportionate share of the anticipated administrative costs.

The amount of additional revenue to be generated by each parcel was estimated based on disparity ratio for that parcel as calculated by USC PERE. (The disparity ratio is the relationship between a property's market value and its assessed value.)

The total amount of revenue based on USC PERE's midpoint estimate of new revenues for 2021-22 is \$11.4 billion, and the net revenue is \$10.9 billion after subtracting the LAO's estimate of reductions due to administrative costs, etc., (\$0.5 billion).

Commercial Property Tax Reform

Estimated Allocation of Revenues 2021-22

Alameda

Entity	Amount
COUNTY GENERAL	175,369,000
COUNTY LIBRARY	4,291,000
ALAMEDA CO. FIRE DEPT.	3,070,000
BAY AREA AIR QUALITY MANAGEMENT	1,353,000
ALAMEDA CO. MOSQUITO ABATEMENT	562,000
AC TRANSIT	24,168,000
SF-BART	3,973,000
EAST BAY REGIONAL PARK	17,610,000
ALAMEDA COUNTY WATER	1,220,000
E.B.M.U.D.	6,563,000
CITY OF ALAMEDA	6,947,000
CITY OF EMERYVILLE	5,245,000
CITY OF FREMONT	20,660,000
CITY OF HAYWARD	15,182,000
HAYWARD AREA REC & PARK	3,985,000
CITY OF NEWARK	4,521,000
CITY OF OAKLAND	60,466,000
OAKLAND ZOO	297,000
CITY OF PLEASANTON	12,918,000
CITY OF SAN LEANDRO	8,357,000
CITY OF UNION CITY	5,635,000
CITY OF LIVERMORE	8,218,000
LIVERMORE AREA REC & PARK	2,267,000
CITY OF BERKELEY	17,557,000
CITY OF ALBANY	1,247,000
CITY OF DUBLIN	6,076,000
CITY OF PIEDMONT	419,000
OTHER	11,085,000
TOTAL	429,261,000

Commercial Property Tax Reform

Estimated Allocation of Revenues 2021-22

Fresno

Entity	Amount
FRESNO COUNTY	23,879,000
FRESNO CO FIRE	1,166,000
FRESNO CO LIBRARY	1,089,000
CITY OF CLOVIS	2,445,000
CITY OF COALINGA	238,000
CITY OF FIREBAUGH	348,000
CITY OF FOWLER	167,000
CITY OF FRESNO	15,391,000
CITY OF HURON	80,000
CITY OF KERMAN	248,000
CITY OF KINGSBURG	346,000
CITY OF MENDOTA	130,000
CITY OF PARLIER	249,000
CITY OF REEDLEY	404,000
CITY OF SANGER	441,000
CITY OF SELMA	222,000
CITY ORANGE COVE	109,000
CITY SAN JOAQUIN	40,000
CEMETARY DISTRICTS	236,000
NORTH CENTRAL FIRE	232,000
CONSOLIDATED MOSQ	335,000
FRESNO MET FLOOD	1,399,000
FRESNO MOSQ ABMT	156,000
COAL HURON PRK-REC	309,000
CLOVIS MEMORIAL	280,000
COALINGA HOSPITAL	263,000
COALINGA LIBRARY	125,000
OTHER	615,000
TOTAL	50,942,000

Commercial Property Tax Reform Estimated Allocation of Revenues 2021-2022

KERN

Entity	Amount
CO. GENERAL FUND	25,694,000
CO ADVERTISING	59,000
CO. FIRE FUND	5,297,000
CITY OF ARVIN	218,000
CITY OF BAKERSFIELD	9,787,000
CITY OF CALIFORNIA CITY	350,000
CITY OF DELANO	1,038,000
CITY OF MARICOPA	14,000
CITY OF MC FARLAND	166,000
CITY OF RIDGECREST	302,000
CITY OF SHAFTER	467,000
CITY OF TAFT	169,000
CITY OF TEHACHAPI	366,000
CITY OF WASCO	394,000
CEMETARY DISTRICTS	213,000
EAST KERN HEALTH CARE DISTRICT	52,000
KERN VALLEY HOSPITAL	21,000
MUROC HOSPITAL	50,000
NORTH KERN-SO TULARE HOSPITAL	53,000
TEHACHAPI VALLEY HLTH CARE DST	53,000
WEST SIDE HOSPITAL	54,000
DELANO MOSQ ABATE	84,000

Entity	Amount
KERN VECTOR CONT	503,000
WEST SIDE MOSQ	39,000
BEAR MNT REC&PARK	83,000
MCFARLAND REC-PK	30,000
NOR REC & PK DIST	533,000
SHAFTER REC & PK	60,000
TEH. REC & PARK	64,000
WASCO REC & PARK	51,000
WST SIDE REC & PK	25,000
MOJAVE UTIL DIST	48,000
S SAN JOAQUIN MUNICIPAL UTILITY	107,000
EAST KERN AIRPORT	42,000
E NILES COM SER	32,000
STALLION SPRG CSD	27,000
KERN DELTA WTR	204,000
TEHACHAPI-CUMMINGS WATER	343,000
ANTELOPE VAL E KERN WTR AGENCY	110,000
KERN CO WATER AGENCY	516,000
NOR MUNI WATER	63,000
OTHER	196,000
TOTAL	47,781,000

Commercial Property Tax Reform

Estimated Allocation of Revenues 2021-2022

Los Angeles County

Entity	Amount
LOS ANGELES COUNTY GENERAL	1,337,450,000
L.A. COUNTY ACCUM CAP OUTLAY	353,000
L A COUNTY LIBRARY	16,485,000
COUNTY ROAD DISTRICT	907,000
CONSOL. FIRE PRO.DIST.OF L.A.CO.	128,246,000
L A C FIRE-FFW	21,540,000
CO LIGHTING MAINT DIST	3,036,000
L.A.CO.FL.CON.DR.IMP.DIST.MAINT.	5,133,000
LA CO FLOOD CONTROL MAINT	29,041,000
BELVEDERE GARBAGE DISPOSAL DIST	431,000
FIRESTONE GARBAGE DISPOSAL DIST	374,000
L A CO WATER WORKS	585,000
PALOS VERDES LIBRARY DIST MAINT	359,000
L A CO WEST VECTOR CONTROL DIST.	293,000
GREATER L A CO VECTOR CONTROL	477,000
CO SANITATION DIST	17,470,000
STA CLRTA VLY SANIT DIS OF LA CO	992,000
SOUTH BAY CITIES SANIT DIST OPER	281,000
BEACH CITIES HOSPITAL DIST	370,000
CITY-ALHAMBRA	4,933,000
CITY-ALHAMBRA - OTHER	327,000
CITY-AGOURA HILLS	1,063,000
CITY-ARCADIA	4,054,000
CITY-ARTESIA CTRL COM'L CORR RP	785,000
CITY-AVALON	496,000
CITY-AZUSA	3,256,000
CITY-BALDWIN PK	3,595,000
CITY-BALDWIN PK CONSOL. LT DIST	389,000
CITY-BELL	1,309,000
CITY-BELLFLOWER	2,741,000
CITY-BELL GARDEN	1,608,000
CITY-BEV HILLS	14,462,000
CITY-BRADBURY	35,000
CITY-BURBANK	16,720,000
CITY-CARSON	6,909,000
CITY-CALABASAS	1,039,000
CITY-CALABASAS - OTHER	349,000
CITY-CLAREMONT	1,740,000

Entity	Amount
CITY-COMMERCE	2,917,000
CITY-COMPTON	5,097,000
CITY-COVINA	3,262,000
CITY-CUDAHY	841,000
CITY-CULVER CITY	4,973,000
CITY-CERRITOS LOS COYOTES RP	3,159,000
CITY-CERRITOS - OTHER	578,000
CITY-DOWNEY	6,397,000
CITY-DOWNEY - OTHER	153,000
CITY-EL MONTE	5,291,000
CITY-DUARTE	1,541,000
CITY-DUARTE - OTHER	334,000
CITY-DIAMOND BAR	1,978,000
CITY-EL SEGUNDO	4,580,000
CITY-GARDENA	3,753,000
CITY-GLENDALE	15,529,000
CITY-GLENDORA	2,521,000
CITY-HAWAII GDNS	575,000
CITY-HAWTHORNE	4,379,000
CITY-HERMOSA BCH	1,585,000
CITY-HIDDEN HILL	69,000
CITY-HUNTINGTN P	2,332,000
CITY-INDUSTRY	4,716,000
CITY-INGLEWOOD	7,592,000
CITY-IRWINDALE	1,599,000
CITY-LA PUENTE	1,420,000
CITY-LA PUENTE - OTHER	106,000
CITY-LAKEWOOD	2,892,000
CITY-LA VERNE	2,253,000
CITY-LAWNDALE	1,162,000
CITY-LA MIRADA	2,357,000
LA MIRADA - S. E. REC AND PARK	697,000
CITY-LOMITA	781,000
CITY-LOMITA - OTHER	102,000
CITY-LONG BEACH	32,031,000
CITY-LA CANADA-F	933,000
CITY-LANCASTER	5,179,000
CITY-LANCASTER - OTHER	175,000
CITY-LA HABRA HT	176,000
CITY-LOS ANGELES	473,601,000

Los Angeles, cont.

Entity	Amount
CITY-LYNWOOD	3,313,000
CITY-MALIBU	1,021,000
CITY-MANHATTAN B	3,329,000
CITY-MAYWOOD	885,000
CITY-MONROVIA	3,202,000
CITY-MONTEBELLO	3,627,000
CITY-MONTEREY PK	4,065,000
CITY-NORWALK	3,758,000
NORWALK - S. E. REC AND PARK	752,000
CITY-PALOS VRD	484,000
CITY-PALMDALE	5,338,000
CITY-PALMDALE STREETLIGHT DIST	244,000
CITY-PARAMOUNT	2,587,000
CITY-PASADENA	21,460,000
CITY-PICO RIVERA	2,829,000
CITY-PICO RIVERA - OTHER	279,000
CITY-POMONA	11,017,000
CITY-POMONA - OTHER	25,000
CITY-RANCHO P V	1,693,000
CITY-REDONDO BCH	5,651,000
CITY-ROSEMEAD	2,276,000
CITY-ROSEMEAD - OTHER	225,000
CITY-ROLLING HLS	55,000
CITY-ROLL HLS ES	438,000
CITY-S FERNANDO	1,550,000
CITY-SAN DIMAS	1,583,000
CITY-SAN DIMAS - OTHER	275,000
CITY-SAN GABRIEL	2,303,000
CITY-SAN MARINO	859,000
CITY-SANTA CLARITA	7,832,000
STA CLRTA STREET LIGHT MAINT #2	475,000

Entity	Amount
CITY-SANTA CLARITA LIBRARY	956,000
CITY-SANTA FE SP	3,683,000
CITY-SANTA MONIC	16,418,000
CITY-SIERRA MADR	545,000
CITY-SIGNAL HILL	839,000
CITY-SO EL MONTE	1,515,000
CITY-SOUTH GATE	3,434,000
CITY-SO PASADENA	1,763,000
CITY-TEMPLE CITY	1,499,000
CITY-TEMPLE CITY - OTHER	111,000
CITY-TORRANCE	14,494,000
CITY VERNON	2,794,000
CITY-WALNUT	1,095,000
CITY-WEST COVINA	5,289,000
CITY-W LAKE VILL	769,000
CITY-W LAKE VILL - OTHER	143,000
CITY-W HOLLYWOOD	6,885,000
W HOLLYWOOD LIGHTING MAINT DIST	411,000
CITY-WHITTIER	4,023,000
ANTELOPE VY.-EAST KERN WATER AGY	1,082,000
SANTA CLARITA VALLEY WATER-CLWA	3,470,000
PALMDALE WATER DIST	327,000
THREE VALLEY MWD	454,000
SAN GABRIEL VAL MUN WATER DIST	949,000
OTHER	9,383,000
TOTAL	2,415,008,000

Commercial Property Tax Reform

Estimated Allocation of Revenues 2021-22

Merced

Entity	Amount
COUNTY GENERAL FUND	6,887,000
COUNTY FIRE	1,017,000
ATWATER CITY	590,000
ATWATER CITY FIRE	141,000
DOS PALOS CITY	59,000
GUSTINE CITY	54,000
MERCED CITY	2,173,000
MERCED CITY FIRE	13,000
LIVINGSTON CITY	427,000
LOS BANOS CITY	626,000
REGIONAL OCCUPATIONAL	47,000
MOSQUITO ABATEMENT	238,000
CEMETARY DISTRICTS	117,000
WINTON LT	6,000
BLOSS HEALTHCARE DIST	41,000
WESTSIDE HOSPITAL	10,000
DELHI COUNTY WATER	7,000
HILMAR COUNTY WATER	12,000
SANTA NELLA CO WATER	17,000
WINTON SANITARY	6,000
DOS PALOS DRAINAGE	7,000
GUSTINE DRAINAGE	5,000
MERCED IRRIGATION DIS	316,000
OTHER	48,000
TOTAL	12,864,000

Commercial Property Tax Reform

Estimated Allocation of Revenues 2021-2022

ORANGE

Entity	Amount
ORANGE CO GEN. FUND	126,735,000
ORANGE COUNTY PUBLIC LIBRARY	8,486,000
O C FLOOD CONTROL DISTRICT	19,338,000
O C PARKS CSA 26	14,948,000
ANAHEIM CITY	19,453,000
ALISO VIEJO CITY	1,249,000
BREA CITY	3,997,000
BUENA PARK CITY	4,450,000
COSTA MESA CITY	10,015,000
COSTA MESA CITY - DISTRICTS	10,000
CYPRESS CITY	1,982,000
CYPRESS CITY - DISTRICTS	248,000
DANA POINT CITY	1,184,000
DANA POINT CITY - OTHER	607,000
FOUNTAIN VALLEY CITY	4,029,000
FULLERTON CITY	8,417,000
GARDEN GROVE CITY	6,609,000
GARDEN GROVE CITY - DISTRICTS	548,000
HUNTINGTON BEACH CITY	10,550,000
IRVINE CITY	9,058,000
IRVINE CITY - DISTRICTS	678,000
LA HABRA CITY	3,097,000
LA PALMA CITY	632,000
LA PALMA CITY - DISTRICTS	13,000
LAGUNA BEACH CITY	3,046,000
LAGUNA BEACH CITY - DISTRICTS	301,000
LAGUNA HILLS CITY	1,130,000
LAGUNA HILLS CITY - DISTRICTS	300,000
LAGUNA NIGUEL CITY	1,330,000
LAGUNA NIGUEL CITY - DISTRICTS	913,000
LAGUNA WOODS CITY	426,000
LAKE FOREST CITY	2,133,000
LAKE FOREST CITY - OTHER	749,000
LOS ALAMITOS CITY	881,000
LOS ALAMITOS CITY - OTHER	80,000
MISSION VIEJO CITY	2,166,000
MISSION VIEJO CITY - OTHER	2,935,000

Entity	Amount
NEWPORT BEACH CITY	11,650,000
ORANGE CITY	9,121,000
PLACENTIA CITY	1,911,000
PLACENTIA CITY - DISTRICTS	118,000
RANCHO SANTA MARGARITA CITY	1,094,000
SAN CLEMENTE CITY	3,136,000
SAN CLEMENTE CITY - OTHER	90,000
SAN JUAN CAPISTRANO CITY	1,711,000
SAN JUAN CAPISTRANO CITY - OTHER	158,000
SANTA ANA CITY	19,189,000
SANTA ANA CITY - OTHER	83,000
SEAL BEACH CITY	1,388,000
STANTON CITY	1,398,000
STANTON CITY - OTHER	201,000
TUSTIN CITY	3,678,000
TUSTIN CITY - DISTRICTS	313,000
VILLA PARK CITY	125,000
WESTMINSTER CITY	3,128,000
WESTMINSTER CITY - OTHER	414,000
YORBA LINDA CITY	1,991,000
YORBA LINDA CITY - OTHER	371,000
CYPRESS RECREATION AND PARK DIST	1,038,000
BUENA PARK LIBRARY DIST-GEN FUND(FMR 704.01)	789,000
IRVINE RANCH WATER DIST	2,826,000
MIDWAY CITY SANITARY DIST-GEN.FUND	691,000
MOULTON NIGUEL WATER DIST	3,014,000
ORANGE CO VECTOR CONTROL DIST	1,092,000
SANTA MARGARITA WATER DIST	484,000
O C FIRE AUTHORITY-GEN FUND	35,639,000
ORANGE COUNTY WATER DISTRICT	5,295,000
ORANGE COUNTY TRANSIT AUTHORITY	2,744,000
OC SANITATION	20,809,000
OTHER	2,432,000
TOTAL	410,844,000

Commercial Property Tax Reform

Estimated Allocation of Revenues 2021-2022

Riverside

Entity	Amount
COUNTY GENERAL PURPOSE	82,695,000
CO FREE LIBRARY	2,224,000
CO STRUCTURE FIRE PROTECTION	6,248,000
COUNTY - DISTRICTS	106,000
CITY OF BANNING	751,000
CITY OF BEAUMONT ANX	1,252,000
CITY OF BLYTHE ANX	415,000
CITY OF CALIMESA	222,000
CALIMESA CITY FIRE	147,000
CITY OF CANYON LAKE	167,000
CATHEDRAL CITY FIRE	330,000
CITY OF CATHEDRAL CITY	1,138,000
CITY OF COACHELLA ANX	935,000
CITY OF CORONA	6,863,000
CITY OF DESERT HOT SPRINGS	564,000
CITY OF LAKE ELSINORE ANX	1,473,000
CITY OF LA QUINTA	1,103,000
CITY OF HEMET BASIC AREA ANX	1,986,000
CITY OF INDIAN WELLS	257,000
CITY OF INDIO DS	2,807,000
CITY OF MORENO VALLEY	4,524,000
MORENO VALLEY FIRE	1,152,000
CITY OF MORENO VALLEY LIBRARY	318,000
CITY OF MURRIETA	2,095,000
CITY OF MURRIETA LIBRARY	183,000
CITY OF NORCO	802,000
CITY OF PALM DESERT	1,077,000
CITY OF PALM SPRINGS	3,657,000
CITY OF PERRIS	2,374,000
CITY OF RANCHO MIRAGE	687,000
CITY OF RIVERSIDE	11,062,000
CITY OF SAN JACINTO ANX	833,000
CITY OF TEMECULA	2,414,000
CITY OF MENIFEE	1,507,000
CITY OF MENIFEE FIRE PROTECTION	356,000
CITY OF WILDOMAR	568,000

Entity	Amount
CITY OF WILDOMAR FIRE PROTECTION	143,000
CITY OF EASTVALE	905,000
CITY OF EASTVALE FIRE PROTECTION	295,000
CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY	2,433,000
RIV CO REGIONAL PARK & OPEN SP	685,000
FLOOD CONTROL	8,235,000
COUNTY SERVICE AREAS	121,000
RANCHO MIRAGE CSD FIRE	672,000
RANCHO MIRAGE CSD LIBRARY	280,000
CEMETERY DISTRICTS	418,000
CATHEDRAL CITY COMMUNITY SERVICE	304,000
EDGEMONT COMMUNITY SERVICES	373,000
JURUPA COMMUNITY SERVICES	835,000
RUBIDOUX COMMUNITY SERVICES	520,000
MORENO VALLEY CS	338,000
COACHELLA FIRE PROTECTION	227,000
IDYLLWILD FIRE PROTECTION	167,000
MURRIETA FIRE	1,174,000
DESERT HOSPITAL	997,000
SAN GORGONIO PASS MEM HOSPITAL	175,000
BANNING LIBRARY DIST	76,000
BEAUMONT LIBRARY	110,000
CV MOSQUITO & VECTOR CONTROL	787,000
NW MOSQUITO & VECTOR CNTL DIST	353,000
BEAUMONT CHERRY VALLEY REC & PK	130,000
DESERT RECREATION	545,000
JURUPA AREA REC & PK	177,000
VALLEY WIDE REC & PK	129,000
VALLEY SANITARY	243,000
COACHELLA VALLEY WATER DISTRICT	1,714,000
CVWD	2,709,000
MISSION SPRINGS WTR DIST	241,000
IDYLLWILD CO WATER	120,000

Riverside, cont.

Entity	Amount
DESERT WTR AGENCY	204,000
SAN GORGONIO PASS WTR AGENCY DS	320,000
EMWD	4,232,000
ELSINORE VALLEY MUNICIPAL WATER	762,000
LAKE HEMET MUNICIPAL WATER	79,000
WESTERN MUNICIPAL WATER	2,943,000
CITY BEAUMONT - OTHER	140,000
RIV CORONA RESOURCE CONSERVATION	156,000
RCWD	1,568,000
OTHER	550,000
TOTAL	182,877,000

Commercial Property Tax Reform

Estimated Allocation of Revenues 2021-22

Sacramento

Entity	Amount
COUNTY - OTHER	56,000
SACRAMENTO WATER AGENC	447,000
COUNTY LIBRARY	1,122,000
COUNTY GENERAL	38,274,000
SACRAMENTO METRO FIRE	10,703,000
COSUMNES CSD	2,343,000
NATOMAS FIRE	374,000
PACIFIC-FRUITRIDGE FIRE	405,000
MISSION OAKS PARK	160,000
SUNRISE PARK	274,000
FULTON - EL CAMINO PAR	209,000
RIO LINDA-ELVERTA PARK	158,000
CORDOVA PARK	473,000
SOUTHGATE PARK	300,000
CITY OF RANCHO CORDOVA	1,799,000
REGIONAL OCCUP CENTER	109,000
CITY OF CITRUS HEIGHTS	1,130,000
SACTO-YOLO MOSQUITO	986,000
CITY OF FOLSOM	2,636,000
CITY OF GALT	387,000
CITY OF ISLETON	25,000
CITY OF SACRAMENTO	19,519,000
CITY OF ELK GROVE	1,723,000
ELK GROVE CITY-LAGUNA	254,000
CITY OF FOLSOM SOUTH	50,000
DEV CENTER HANDICAPPED	139,000
OTHER	1,006,000
TOTAL	85,061,000

Commercial Property Tax Reform

Estimated Allocation of Revenues 2021-22

San Bernardino

Entity	Amount
COUNTY GENERAL FUND	138,321,000
FLOOD CONTROL	10,844,000
COUNTY FREE LIBRARY	3,000,000
CITY OF ADELANTO	827,000
TOWN OF APPLE VALLEY	2,645,000
CITY OF BARSTOW	1,102,000
CITY OF BIG BEAR LAKE	488,000
CITY OF CHINO	6,096,000
CITY OF CHINO HILLS	2,671,000
CITY OF COLTON	2,477,000
CITY OF FONTANA	7,012,000
CITY OF GRAND TERRACE	550,000
CITY OF HIGHLAND	2,001,000
CITY OF LOMA LINDA	1,563,000
CITY OF HESPERIA	2,451,000
CITY OF MONTCLAIR	1,989,000
CITY OF NEEDLES	297,000
CITY OF ONTARIO	18,729,000
CITY OF RANCHO CUCAMONGA	7,474,000
CITY OF REDLANDS	5,794,000
CITY OF RIALTO	6,345,000
CITY OF SAN BERNARDINO	11,477,000

Entity	Amount
CITY OF TWENTYNINE PALMS	1,162,000
CITY OF UPLAND	4,367,000
CITY OF VICTORVILLE	5,471,000
CITY OF YUCAIPA	2,101,000
TOWN OF YUCCA VALLEY	984,000
FONTANA FIRE PROTECTION DISTRICT	9,411,000
HESPERIA FIRE PROTECTION DISTRICT	1,293,000
RANCHO CUCAMONGA FIRE DISTRICT	5,090,000
SAN BDNO CNTY FIRE PROTECT DISTRICT	5,679,000
BARSTOW FIRE PROTECTION DISTRICT	844,000
APPLE VALLEY FIRE PROTECTION DIST	1,409,000
CHINO VALLEY INDEPENDENT FIRE DIST	3,851,000
CHINO BASIN WTR CONSERVATION DIST	836,000
INLAND EMPIRE UTILITIES AGENCY	9,782,000
SAN BERNARDINO VALLEY MUNI WATER	2,915,000
WATER DISTRICTS	1,747,000
CSAs	1,182,000
OTHER	3,946,000
TOTAL	296,223,000

Commercial Property Tax Reform

Estimated Allocation of Revenues 2021-22

San Francisco

Entity	Amount
GENERAL FUND	480,611,000
BAY AREA RAPID TRANSIT DISTRICT	4,434,000
BAY AREA AIR QUALITY MANAGEMENT DIST.	1,462,000
TOTAL	486,507,000

Commercial Property Tax Reform

Estimated Allocation of Revenues 2021-22

San Joaquin

Entity	Amount
COUNTY GENERAL	24,350,000
ROAD DISTRICTS	658,000
COUNTY LIBRARY	669,000
CEMETARY DISTRICTS	75,000
FIRE DISTRICTS	2,855,000
SJC FLOOD CONTROL	219,000
LIGHTING DISTRICTS	9,000
SJC MOSQUITO ABATEMENT	531,000
RECL.DISTRICTS	36,000
CSA/CSD	51,000
WATER DISTRICTS	113,000
IRRIGATION DISTRICTS	902,000
S J REGIONAL TRANSIT DISTRICT	126,000
CITY OF ESCALON	208,000
CITY OF LODI	1,850,000
CITY OF MANTECA	1,545,000
CITY OF RIPON	335,000
CITY OF STOCKTON	6,379,000
CITY OF TRACY	2,071,000
CITY OF LATHROP	847,000
OTHER	48,000
TOTAL	43,877,000

Commercial Property Tax Reform

Estimated Allocation of Revenues 2021-22

San Diego County

Entity	Amount
COUNTY GENERAL	147,281,000
COUNTY LIBRARY	3,642,000
COUNTY DISTRICTS - OTHER	66,000
PERMANENT ROAD DIVISION	10,000
COUNTY SERVICE AREA	255,000
SAN DIEGO COUNTY FLOOD CONTROL DISTRICT	214,000
ALPINE FIRE PROTECTION DISTRICT	120,000
FIRE PROTECTION DISTRICTS - OTHER	149,000
NORTH COUNTY FIRE PROTECTION DISTRICT OF SD COUNT	510,000
LAKESIDE FIRE PROTECTION DISTRICT	503,000
RANCHO SANTA FE FIRE PROTECTION DIST. OF SD COUNT	347,000
SAN MIGUEL CONSOL. FIRE PROTECTION DISTRICT	880,000
BORREGO SPRINGS FIRE PROTECTION DISTRICT	103,000
NORTH COUNTY CEMETERY	162,000
CEMETERY DISTRICTS - OTHER	88,000
CARLSBAD CITY	6,516,000
CARLSBAD CITY 1973 ANNEX ORD 1147	265,000
CHULA VISTA CITY	4,849,000
CHULA VISTA CITY - OTHER	829,000
CORONADO CITY	2,785,000
DEL MAR CITY	281,000
EL CAJON CITY	2,890,000
ENCINITAS CITY	3,175,000
ENCINITAS CITY - OTHER	64,000
ESCONDIDO CITY	3,692,000
IMPERIAL BEACH CITY	521,000
LA MESA CITY	1,554,000
LEMON GROVE CITY	615,000
NATIONAL CITY	2,477,000
OCEANSIDE CITY - DIST	5,531,000
POWAY CITY	1,209,000

Entity	Amount
POWAY CITY POWAY MUNICIPAL WATER DISTRICT	1,665,000
POWAY CITY - OTHER	203,000
SAN DIEGO CITY	79,741,000
SAN MARCOS CITY	1,835,000
SANTEE CITY	1,903,000
SOLANA BEACH CITY	879,000
SOLANA BEACH CITY - OTHER	54,000
VISTA CITY	3,674,000
GROSSMONT HEALTHCARE DISTRICT	684,000
PALOMAR HEALTH	2,092,000
TRI CITY HOSPITAL DISTRICT MAINT	1,078,000
SAN MARCOS FIRE PROTECTION DISTRICT	855,000
VISTA FIRE PROTECTION DISTRICT	140,000
FALLBROOK PUBLIC UTILITY DISTRICT	148,000
SANTA FE IRRIGATION LAN	122,000
VALLECITOS WATER DISTRICT	614,000
CARLSBAD MUNICIPAL WATER DISTRICT	428,000
OLIVENHAIN MUNICIPAL WATER DISTRICT	151,000
OTAY WATER IMP DIST B - WATER SERVICE	250,000
RAMONA MUNICIPAL WATER DISTRICT	417,000
RINCON DEL DIABLO MUNICIPAL WATER DISTRICT	124,000
PADRE DAM MUNICIPAL WATER DISTRICT	251,000
CWA CITY OF SAN DIEGO	1,203,000
CWA VISTA IRRIGATION	120,000
OTHER	543,000
Total	290,757,000

Commercial Property Tax Reform

Estimated Allocation of Revenues 2021-22

SANTA BARBARA

Entity	Amount
SANTA BARBARA COUNTY GENERAL	28,906,000
BUELLTON CITY PROPERTY TAX	359,000
CARP CITY	480,000
GOLETA CITY PROPERTY TAX	1,222,000
GUADALUPE CITY	145,000
LOMPOC CITY	883,000
SANTA BARBARA CITY	5,326,000
SANTA MARIA CITY	3,455,000
SOLVANG CITY	231,000
SB COUNTY FIRE PROTECTION DIST	4,973,000
SB COUNTY FLOOD CNTRL/WTR CNSRV	301,000
SANTA MARIA FLOOD ZN 3	218,000
SOUTH COAST FLOOD ZN 2	856,000
SANTA BARBARA COUNTY WTR AGENCY	387,000
SANTA MARIA PUBLIC AIRPORT DIST	273,000
SANTA MARIA CEMETERY DIST	134,000
CARP/SUMMERLAND FIRE DIST	867,000
MONTECITO FIRE DIST	377,000
SANTA BARBARA MET TRANSIT DIST	136,000
GOLETA WEST SAN RUNNING	395,000
OTHER	1,025,000
Total	50,949,000

Commercial Property Tax Reform

Estimated Allocation of Revenues 2021-22

Santa Clara

Entity	Amount
SANTA CLARA COUNTY	255,781,000
SANTA CLARA COUNTY LIBRARY	4,658,000
CAMPBELL	3,463,000
CUPERTINO	4,914,000
GILROY	2,891,000
LOS ALTOS	2,423,000
LOS ALTOS HILLS	341,000
LOS GATOS	2,932,000
MILPITAS	9,396,000
MONTE SERENO	111,000
MORGAN HILL	2,378,000
MOUNTAIN VIEW	18,624,000
PALO ALTO	20,940,000
SAN JOSE	76,867,000
SANTA CLARA	18,413,000
SARATOGA	1,272,000
SUNNYVALE	22,602,000
SARATOGA FIRE PROTECTION DISTRICT	318,000
CENTRAL FIRE PROTECTION DISTRICT	10,934,000
CENTRAL FIRE PROTECTION ZONE NO. 1	349,000
LOS ALTOS HILLS COUNTY FIRE DISTRICT	308,000
SOUTH SANTA CLARA COUNTY FIRE PROTECTION DISTRICT	303,000
MIDPENINSULA REGIONAL OPEN SPACE DISTRICT	9,146,000
SANTA CLARA VALLEY WATER DISTRICT	19,431,000
EL CAMINO HOSPITAL	4,832,000
BAY AREA AIR QUALITY MANAGEMENT DISTRICT	2,449,000
CAMPBELL MUNICIPAL LIGHTING DISTRICT	279,000
MOUNTAIN VIEW PARKING DISTRICT NO.02	548,000
SANTA CLARA COUNTY IMPORTATION WATER-MISC DISTRICT	6,473,000
OTHER	359,000
TOTAL	503,735,000

Commercial Property Tax Reform

Estimated Allocation of Revenues 2021-22

VENTURA

Entity	Amount
COUNTY GENERAL FUND	40,497,000
COUNTY LIBRARY	480,000
FIRE PROTECTION DIST	12,397,000
County Flood	2,878,000
CONEJO REC & PK	2,277,000
PL VLY REC & PK	607,000
SIMI REC & PK	976,000
WATER DISTRICTS	57,000
VENTURA PORT	217,000
UNITED WTR CONS DIST	399,000
CITY CAMARILLO	1,379,000
CITY FILLMORE	425,000
CITY OJAI	288,000
CITY OXNARD	8,567,000
CITY PORT HUENEME	414,000
CITY SANTA PAULA	831,000
CITY SIMI VALLEY	2,435,000
CITY SIMI VALLEY - DISTRICTS	965,000
CITY THOUSAND OAKS	3,657,000
THOUSAND OAKS VRSD	180,000
CITY SAN BUENAVENTURA	5,056,000
CITY OF MOORPARK	729,000
CITY OF MOORPARK - DISTRICTS	31,000
CAMARILLO SAN M & O	131,000
CALLEGUAS MUN WTR	1,047,000
CASITAS MUN WTR	326,000
CAM LTE MAINT	245,000
T O CITY WIDE LTE ZN 1	266,000
VTA CO MAINT #1 T O	141,000
CAMARILLO HEALTH CARE	248,000
OTHER	418,000
TOTAL	88,564,000

CC 07-21-20

#22,

FY 2020-21 City
Work Program

Written Comments

Cyrah Caburian

From: Connie Cunningham <cunninghamconniel@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, July 18, 2020 2:48 PM
To: City Council; City Clerk
Subject: Agenda Item 22, City Council Meeting July 21, 2020

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Mayor, Vice-Mayor, and Councilmembers:

I urgently call on you to NOT remove the Housing Program for De Anza College Students as described in this Agenda Item 22 for several reasons.

Agenda Item 22, City Council Meeting July 21, 2020

Subject: FY 2020-21 City Work Program- Consider adding a Housing Survey item and removing the Housing Program for De Anza College Students item.

Recommended Action: 1. Consider adding the Housing Survey item to the FY 2020-21 City Work Program

2. Remove the Housing Program for De Anza College Students item from the FY

2020-21 City Work Program

3. Authorize expenditures not to exceed \$24,000 to fund the Housing Survey

Here are my reasons:

1. Since the Housing Commission handles only Below Market-Rate (BMR) strategies, it would be more appropriate to put the Housing Survey under the Planning Commission's work items. The Planning Commission will be holding a study session for RHNA (Item #1) which also feeds into the next General Plan and Housing Element. This Housing Survey covers all housing needs for the city, not just BMR housing.

2. A closer look at the various line items under the Housing section of the FY2020-21 Work Plan might yield funding for this Housing Survey. However, all other line items except for Item #4, ADU's, (Planning Commission) were designed for BMR housing strategies, and helping our most vulnerable neighbors. It is not appropriate to fund the Housing Survey in this way.

3. The Housing Survey estimate is for \$24,000. As noted below in excerpts from the FY 2020-21 City Work Plan approved June 2, 2020, there is no need to remove Item #6. Although I urge the City Council to look elsewhere for ways to fund the Housing Survey, please note that the Item 6 estimate is \$50,000, so could be modified rather than eliminated.

4. That idea is true also of Items #2, #3, #5 and #7. (Described below) All have estimates larger than \$24,000. The Council should direct City Staff to look more closely at the details of those budgets and keep Item #6 on the City Work Program,

5. Housing Work Plan Item #8 is to look into the Governor's \$1.4 Billion pledge to help the homeless (unhoused resident) population. Not only does the Governor pledge funding for programs that help unhoused people, but, also, Senator Beall has been helping housing insecure students in our County for many years. I, specifically, refer to the building recently set-aside with his help in San Jose for San Jose State students who are housing insecure.

6. On January 20, 2020, the City Council received a report on Homelessness (Unhoused Residents). Partners in that report included De Anza College, West Valley Community Services, and the Santa Clara County Office of Supportive Housing. Ideas were presented about a variety of needs in our City, and possible solutions.

7. I have heard the misconception stated that, since schools are closed except for online classes, all the De Anza College students have probably gone home. Please remember that students without housing before the pandemic did not all have homes to which to return. They are still sleeping in their cars or other places that are not intended for human habitation.

For these reasons and more, I urgently call upon you to NOT approve this Agenda Item 22. Details below include the Work Items discussed in this email.

Sincerely,
Connie Cunningham
33 years living in Cupertino
Housing Commission (self-only)

Proposed FY2020-21 City Work Plan, approved June 1, 2020

Housing

Item #1: Planning Commission: Study Session... for next RHNA cycle. \$5,000 Size: Small

Item #2: Housing Commission: For FY 2020-21, the City Work Plan was edited to state that the Housing Commission's Housing Strategies Work Item is limited to Affordable Housing Strategies. *Continued from FY2019-20 City Work Plan. \$50,000. Size: Medium. (Note: Last year's Item was not completed due to COVID-19.)

Item #3: Housing Commission: Find a way to build moderate income and ELI/DD homes.\$150,000 *Continued from FY2019-20 City Work Plan. \$150,000. Size: Medium.

Item #4 Planning Commission: ADU Plans. City Council Study Session Directive. \$10,000 Size: Small.

Next section of five items has subtitle of Homelessness (Unhoused residents)


Item #5: Housing Commission: Review Human Services Housing and Human Services Grants (HSG). City Council Study Session Directive. \$500,000 Size: Small

Item #6 Housing Commission: Housing Program for De Anza College Students. City Council Study Session Directive. \$50,000 Size: Small

Item #7 Housing Commission: Homeless (Unhoused Residents)Services and Facilities. \$100,000. Size: Small

Item #8: Housing Commission: Research Governor's \$1.4 Billion (\$1,400,000,000) pledge for use with local programs. No budget required. Size: Small

Item #9: Housing Commission: Transportation to/from Service Providers, \$25,000. HSG Grants. Size: Small.

 Watch out for typos; Siri might be on duty.

Cyrah Caburian

From: Marisa Spatafore <spataforemarisa@fhda.edu>
Sent: Tuesday, July 21, 2020 4:55 PM
To: City Clerk
Subject: Fw: De Anza College submission to City Council and city staff
Attachments: De_Anza_President_Letter_to_City_Council_July_2020.pdf

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Also sending to the generic City Clerk address. Thank you.

From: Marisa Spatafore <spataforemarisa@fhda.edu>
Sent: Tuesday, July 21, 2020 4:46 PM
To: Kirsten Squarcia <KirstenS@cupertino.org>; Kerri Heusler <KerriH@cupertino.org>
Subject: De Anza College submission to City Council and city staff

Dear Kirsten (cc Kerri),

Please see attached for the letter from De Anza College President Lloyd Holmes to City Council and relevant city staff. This is essentially what we would like read with the item, and per your request, will send a submission closer to 9 p.m. Thank you.

Best,
Marisa

Marisa Spatafore
Associate Vice President
Communications & External Relations
De Anza College
21250 Stevens Creek Blvd.
Cupertino, CA 95014
408.864.8672
www.deanza.edu
www.facebook.com/deanzacollege
instagram.com/deanzacollege/
@deanza_college

July 21, 2020

21250 Stevens Creek Blvd.
Cupertino, CA 95014

Cupertino City Council
ATTN: Kirsten Squarcia
10300 Torre Ave.
Cupertino, CA 95014

Via email: KirstenS@cupertino.org

Dear City Council Members,

First, I would like to say that as the new president of De Anza College, as of July 1, I look forward to meeting each of you.

I am writing today, however, to express my disappointment at the message sent by today's agenda item #22, the elimination of \$50,000 in funding for a partnership with De Anza College on a student home share program, with those funds to be diverted to funding a city housing survey. I ask that City Council continue to be attentive to the needs of students at your local college, including the serious issues of housing insecurity and homelessness. I am aware that both City Council and the Housing Commission have heard from members of college senior staff on this issue, which remains significant through the historic travails of this pandemic, and that these senior staff members have been working closely with city staff over the past year and more.

Certainly, we at the college understand the need for surveys. In fact, the recent De Anza College survey of student basic needs revealed, among other findings, that of students responding:

- 40% of are housing insecure
- 12% of students are homeless
- More than one-third – 36% – are food insecure
- Almost half (48%) had lost employment or had their hours reduced as a result of coronavirus closures

The full report is available at <https://www.deanza.edu/ir/deanza-research-projects/surveys/BasicNeeds2020.pdf>.

Clearly, addressing these issues requires a multipartite approach, which the college has been working on extensively, and on which you have seen presentations. Information is available at www.deanza.edu/resources.

A key aspect of this is informing students of available resources, including Catholic Charities' home sharing program, which matches students with those in the community who have a room available to rent. Once we learned how well established this program is – although certainly there are significant associated costs —we told city staff that in our view it is not necessary for Cupertino to, in effect, re-create this wheel with the college.

Having said that, however, we were surprised to learn that the funding as it relates to De Anza College is proposed to be diverted, and are concerned that this may send the message that City Council is not supportive of the demonstrable needs of our students.

We ask for reaffirmation from City Council that it supports efforts on behalf of the students of De Anza College with basic human needs. Thank you.

Sincerely,



Lloyd Holmes

cc: Deborah Feng, City Manager
Kerri Heusler, Housing Manager

Cyrah Caburian

From: Marisa Spatafore <spataforemarisa@fhda.edu>
Sent: Tuesday, July 21, 2020 9:04 PM
To: City Clerk
Cc: Kirsten Squarcia; Kerri Heusler; Lloyd Holmes; Rob Mieso
Subject: Agenda item #22: De Anza College comments for the record
Attachments: De_Anza_President_Letter_to_City_Council_July_2020.pdf

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Please find below abbreviated comments that we are requesting be read for the record at the appropriate point for Agenda Item #22. Attached, for your convenience, is the letter submitted earlier to City Council and city staff. Please feel free to be in touch with any questions. Thank you.

First, I would like to say that as the new president of De Anza College, as of July 1, I look forward to meeting each member of City Council, as well as city staff.

I am writing today, however, to express my disappointment at the message sent by today's agenda item #22, the elimination of \$50,000 in funding for a partnership with De Anza College on a student home share program, with those funds to be diverted to funding a city housing survey. I ask that City Council continue to be attentive to the needs of students at your local college, including the serious issues of housing insecurity and homelessness. I am aware that both City Council and the Housing Commission have heard from members of college senior staff on this issue, which remains significant during this pandemic, and that these senior staff members have been working closely with city staff over the past year and more.

We work to inform students of available resources, including Catholic Charities' home share program, which matches students with those in the community who have a room available to rent. Once we learned how well established this program is – although certainly there are significant associated costs – we told city staff that in our view, it is not necessary for Cupertino to, in effect, re-create this wheel with the college.

Having said that, however, we were surprised to learn that the funding as it relates to De Anza College is proposed to be diverted, and are concerned that this may send the message that City Council is not supportive of the demonstrable needs of our students. Please refer to the more extensive letter submitted to City Council and city staff earlier today.

We ask for reaffirmation from City Council that it supports efforts on behalf of the students of De Anza College with unmet basic human needs. Thank you.

Lloyd Holmes, President, De Anza College

Marisa Spatafore
Associate Vice President
Communications & External Relations
De Anza College
21250 Stevens Creek Blvd.
Cupertino, CA 95014
408.864.8672
www.deanza.edu
www.facebook.com/deanzacollege
[instagram.com/deanzacollege/](https://www.instagram.com/deanzacollege/)
@deanza_college

July 21, 2020

21250 Stevens Creek Blvd.
Cupertino, CA 95014

Cupertino City Council
ATTN: Kirsten Squarcia
10300 Torre Ave.
Cupertino, CA 95014

Via email: KirstenS@cupertino.org

Dear City Council Members,

First, I would like to say that as the new president of De Anza College, as of July 1, I look forward to meeting each of you.

I am writing today, however, to express my disappointment at the message sent by today's agenda item #22, the elimination of \$50,000 in funding for a partnership with De Anza College on a student home share program, with those funds to be diverted to funding a city housing survey. I ask that City Council continue to be attentive to the needs of students at your local college, including the serious issues of housing insecurity and homelessness. I am aware that both City Council and the Housing Commission have heard from members of college senior staff on this issue, which remains significant through the historic travails of this pandemic, and that these senior staff members have been working closely with city staff over the past year and more.

Certainly, we at the college understand the need for surveys. In fact, the recent De Anza College survey of student basic needs revealed, among other findings, that of students responding:

- 40% of are housing insecure
- 12% of students are homeless
- More than one-third – 36% – are food insecure
- Almost half (48%) had lost employment or had their hours reduced as a result of coronavirus closures

The full report is available at <https://www.deanza.edu/ir/deanza-research-projects/surveys/BasicNeeds2020.pdf>.

Clearly, addressing these issues requires a multipartite approach, which the college has been working on extensively, and on which you have seen presentations. Information is available at www.deanza.edu/resources.

A key aspect of this is informing students of available resources, including Catholic Charities' home sharing program, which matches students with those in the community who have a room available to rent. Once we learned how well established this program is – although certainly there are significant associated costs —we told city staff that in our view it is not necessary for Cupertino to, in effect, re-create this wheel with the college.

Having said that, however, we were surprised to learn that the funding as it relates to De Anza College is proposed to be diverted, and are concerned that this may send the message that City Council is not supportive of the demonstrable needs of our students.

We ask for reaffirmation from City Council that it supports efforts on behalf of the students of De Anza College with basic human needs. Thank you.

Sincerely,



Lloyd Holmes

cc: Deborah Feng, City Manager
Kerri Heusler, Housing Manager

Cyrah Caburian

From: Peggy Griffin <griffin@compuserve.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 21, 2020 10:29 PM
To: City Clerk
Subject: Fwd: 2020-07-21 CC Agenda Item #22 - Housing Survey - SUPPORT OPTION 4!

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Hi Kirsten,

Q: Would you be able to read my email during Agenda Item #22 for me when the public speaks?

I need to go but need to have this info spoken.

Sincerely,
Peggy

Begin forwarded message:

From: Peggy Griffin <Griffin@Compuserve.com>
Date: July 21, 2020 at 8:02:05 PM PDT
To: City Council <CityCouncil@cupertino.org>
Cc: City Clerk <CityClerk@cupertino.org>, Deborah Feng <DebF@cupertino.org>
Subject: 2020-07-21 CC Agenda Item #22 - Housing Survey - SUPPORT OPTION 4!

Dear Honorable Mayor Scharf, Vice Mayor Paul, and Council Members,

I support Option 4-mail survey to each resident with a household-specific code. Although this option is the most expensive, it guarantees that the data you collect is correct. Sending to each home ensures that you reach everyone, even those that don't do online surveys

Options 1-3 DO NOT guarantee that the data actually is from Cupertino residents. Why waste money on invalid data? Why pay for trash data? Bad data IN results in inaccurate analysis OUT.

If you're going to do this survey, do it right! Get accurate data!

Thank you,
Peggy Griffin

Cyrah Caburian

From: Peggy Griffin <griffin@compuserve.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 21, 2020 10:35 PM
To: City Clerk
Subject: Re: 2020-07-21 CC Agenda Item #22 - Housing Survey - SUPPORT OPTION 4!

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

I think I need to say...

Please include my original email below as Written Communication for the 2020-07-21 City Council meeting agenda #22. I would like it read during the public comment for this agenda item if possible.

thank you,
Peggy Griffin

On Jul 21, 2020, at 10:28 PM, Peggy Griffin <Griffin@compuserve.com> wrote:

Hi Kirsten,

Q: Would you be able to read my email during Agenda Item #22 for me when the public speaks?

I need to go but need to have this info spoken.

Sincerely,
Peggy

Begin forwarded message:

From: Peggy Griffin <Griffin@Compuserve.com>
Date: July 21, 2020 at 8:02:05 PM PDT
To: City Council <CityCouncil@cupertino.org>
Cc: City Clerk <CityClerk@cupertino.org>, Deborah Feng <DebF@cupertino.org>
Subject: 2020-07-21 CC Agenda Item #22 - Housing Survey - SUPPORT OPTION 4!

Dear Honorable Mayor Scharf, Vice Mayor Paul, and Council Members,

I support Option 4-mail survey to each resident with a household-specific code. Although this option is the most expensive, it guarantees that the data you collect is correct. Sending to each home ensures that you reach everyone, even those that don't do online surveys

Options 1-3 DO NOT guarantee that the data actually is from Cupertino residents. Why waste money on invalid data? Why pay for trash data? Bad data IN results in inaccurate analysis OUT.

If you're going to do this survey, do it right! Get accurate data!

Thank you,
Peggy Griffin

CC 07-21-20

#23,

Ordinance
Regarding
Prohibition of
Parking

Written Comments

Cyrah Caburian

From: Ram Namita Sripathi <rnsripathi@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, July 20, 2020 6:20 PM
To: City Council
Subject: Re: removal of parking on mccllellan road

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

In addition to the inconvenience caused in my previous email, a few drivers have mentioned that the existing barrier is a potential danger in the night. It is dangerous in the night especially if they are turning left from Stelling into Mccllellan or turning right from Stelling into Mccllellan. A new driver to the area has to be particularly careful to ensure they avoid the separation.

I request the city to kindly take the residents' opinion into consideration before starting any work on this project. We live on the street and have to face the reality of your decision everyday. We have an equal number of senior citizens who live on the street and it is difficult for them to maneuver the planned barrier. They will not be able to attend the city meeting because of technological challenges and social isolation will prevent them from attending in any other way.

This is a kind request.

Best regards,
Ram Sripathi

On Mon, Jul 13, 2020 at 10:03 PM Ram Namita Sripathi <rnsripathi@gmail.com> wrote:

Hello City Council,

We received a letter in the mail regarding loss of parking on Mccllellan road. This is a bad idea as it puts visitors in great risk and also risk to residents when backing out of their driveways. This feature or facility seems to create a great inconvenience to the residents living on the street.

I'm not sure if you've been on Mccllellan during busy hours (non-COVID times). There is quite a risk posed to backing out. Now with the divider the risk becomes more. It's possible there have been no fatal accidents but there have been many near misses. Please ask any resident who lives on the street about their experience and how it's become worse over the years.

If we have to back into the driveway, even that poses a risk as we have to signal to the traffic behind that we want some space. Please imagine how difficult it is with constant traffic.

Any repair person visiting the home or visitor (family and friends) will have to park their vehicle on a side street and come over. They may even have to cross a street that is busy. Can you please consider these facts before coming to a decision.

I'll speak to the folks on the street and ask them to email you or attend the city council meeting on 7/18.

Please treat this as a formal notice or a complaint against taking this basic right away from the residents. I hope you understand the problems tax-paying long-term residents will face should their family and friends be inconvenienced.

Thanks and looking forward to explaining during the meeting.

Regards,
Ram Sripathi

CC 07-21-20

#24,

RHNA Bay Area

Written Comments

Cyrah Caburian

From: Kirsten Squarcia
Sent: Tuesday, July 21, 2020 10:59 AM
To: Deborah L. Feng
Cc: Lauren Sapudar; Cyrah Caburian
Subject: RE: Regional Housing Needs Allocation timeline
Attachments: 2020-07-16 Newsom and HCD final.pdf

Thanks Deb – we will include as a written communication for tonight.



Kirsten Squarcia

City Clerk
City Manager's Office/City Clerk's Office
KirstenS@Cupertino.org
(408) 777-3225



From: Deborah L. Feng <DebF@cupertino.org>
Sent: Tuesday, July 21, 2020 10:55 AM
To: Deborah L. Feng <DebF@cupertino.org>
Cc: Kirsten Squarcia <KirstenS@cupertino.org>
Subject: FW: Regional Housing Needs Allocation timeline

For Council consideration; see item #24 on tonight's agenda.

Deb



Deborah L. Feng

City Manager
City Manager's Office
DebF@Cupertino.org
(408) 777-3250



From: Andi Jordan <andi@citiesassociation.org>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 1:37 PM
Subject: Fw: Regional Housing Needs Allocation timeline

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Executive Board, Board of Directors, Legislative Action Committee Members:
cc: City Managers, Planning Collaborative Members

Please see the attached letter sent to the Governor and HCD Director.

Andi Jordan

Executive Director

Cities Association of Santa Clara County

PO Box 3144

Los Altos, CA 94024

408.766.9534

[LinkedIn](#) | [email](#) | [Twitter](#) | [website](#)

From: Andi Jordan <andi@citiesassociation.org>

Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 1:32 PM

Subject: Regional Housing Needs Allocation timeline

Dear Governor Newsom & Gustavo Velasquez, HCD Director

cc: Senators Wieckowski, Beall, Hill, Monning
Assembly Members Rivas, Kalra, Chu, Berman, Low, Stone
Therese Watkins McMillan, Executive Director, Association of Bay Area Governments
Seth Miller, Peninsula Division, League of California Cities

Please see the attached letter from the Cities Association of Santa Clara County President and Legislative Action Committee Chair.

My best,
~Andi

Andi Jordan
Executive Director
Cities Association of Santa Clara County
PO Box 3144
Los Altos, CA 94024
408.766.9534

[LinkedIn](#) | [email](#) | [Twitter](#) | [website](#)



P.O. Box 3144
Los Altos, CA 94024
www.citiesassociation.org
408-766-9534

July 16, 2020

Governor Gavin Newsom
State of California
1303 10th Street, Suite 1173
Sacramento, CA 95814

Gustavo Velasquez, Director
Department of Housing and Community Development
2020 West El Camino Avenue
Sacramento, CA 95833

RE: Regional Housing Needs Allocation timeline

Dear Governor Newsom and Mr. Velasquez:

Thank you for all your work toward housing solutions in California. We are writing to respectfully request a pause in the Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) schedule so that we may realize the true implications of Covid-19 and allow for a more thorough and productive process.

Recently, the Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) presented the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) the minimum housing need determination of 441,176. To that end, these are actions being taken in our region and in Santa Clara County to reach the goals and comply with government code:

- ABAG has received Regional Early Action Planning Grants
- All 16 local jurisdictions will or have applied for Local Early Action Planning Grants;
- The CASCC has also formed a “Planning Collaborative” of all of sixteen jurisdictions of Santa Clara County
- Santa Clara County has established an “Unhoused” Task Force to deal with current homelessness

Notwithstanding those actions, we still believe a postponement is warranted. The Covid-19 pandemic is affecting every aspect of our communities, and the results are widely unknown: budgetary impacts of unemployment to state and local economies, possible population shifts, transportation and housing needs may increase or decrease. Additionally, preparing to accommodate 441,176 additional units will require abundant public participation. In the pandemic era, virtual public meetings are not accessible to all or those most affected by this crisis. As a result, many jurisdictions will not be able to conduct and facilitate the normal community engagement process required for the success of RHNA.

Accordingly, we respectfully ask that the current RHNA schedule be modified to give the jurisdictions, community and also the State adequate time to assess the impact of COVID19 and ensure the process achieves HCD’s goals.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,



Larry Klein
President, Cities Association
Mayor, City of Sunnyvale



Neysa Fligor
Chair, Legislative Action Committee
Vice-Mayor, City of Los Altos

cc: Senators Wieckowski, Beall, Hill, Monning
Assembly Members Rivas, Kalra, Chu, Berman, Low, Stone
Therese Watkins McMillan, Executive Director, Association of Bay Area Governments
Seth Miller, Peninsula Division, League of California Cities

Who we are: The Cities Association of Santa Clara County (CASCC) is an association of the fifteen cities of the county and the elected representatives of more than 1.9 million Bay-Area residents. Since 1990, these representatives have been successfully collaborating to discuss and find consensus and solutions for regional issues to best serve the community. Our cities range from a few thousand people to a city of over a million people.