


ANNEXATION?

MUNICIPAL
ADVISORY
COUNCIL?



SOLANA BEACH
AT THE CROSS-ROADS

CONTINUE
COUNTY
GOVERNMENT?

INCORPORATION?

A STUDY REPORT BY THE
SOLANA BEACH TOWN COUNCIL, INC.
JULY 1972

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>INTRODUCTION:</u>	Page 1
I. <u>WHY HOME RULE</u>	2
Some problems concerning taxation, representation, credibility, accessibility	
II. <u>HOME RULE -- ALTERNATE METHODS:</u>	9
* Continuation of County Government	10
* Annexation to Del Mar	11
* Municipal Advisory Council (MAC)	12
* Incorporation of San Dieguito Area	13
III. <u>INCORPORATION OF SOLANA BEACH:</u>	
* Steps toward Incorporation	15
* Financing a City	17
* A Working Budget	19, 20
* Explanation of Budget Items	21
IV. <u>CALL FOR ACTION</u>	25

INTRODUCTION:

The Solana Beach Town Council believes that only through self-government can we achieve the kind of harmonious development the community desires. During the past year the council has conducted a study of home rule alternatives for Solana Beach. We believe that any movement to secure home rule must unfold in full view of the community, and we therefore consider it our obligation to present to all interested parties the results of our study.

This report, while of a specific nature, should not be considered a final blueprint. Our purpose is to provide a framework for constructive thought and for the development of a home rule plan based on the wishes of a broad segment of our population. We hope our presentation will help you formulate your own position, and lead to an exchange of views with you in the near future. We are anxious to determine how we may work together to secure home rule for Solana Beach.

I. WHY HOME RULE?

The Case of Too Many Voters

Puzzle: Name a place where the government for 300,000 people is determined by 1,100,000 other people.

Answer: The unincorporated area of San Diego County.

That's because the Board of Supervisors, which is supposedly the government of, by and for the unincorporated areas, is elected largely by people living in the county's 13 cities-- where the Board has little or no jurisdiction. The city people are, in effect, electing a government under which someone else must live. They have no real stake in it.

The important decisions affecting the cities--those dealing with services, recreation, roads, planning, zoning, and land use-- are made by the cities themselves, not by the Board of Supervisors. Where the Board does have jurisdiction in the incorporated areas, such as in welfare, health services, jails, and tax assessments, the county is usually acting only as an agent for state and federally dictated programs.

The inequity is further reflected in the way the county spends our money. Approximately 90 per cent of the 1971-72 county budget of \$228.4 million was spent in the cities--on 78 per cent of the people.

Now 300,000 people can be a powerful bloc, but not if their strength is fragmented into five supervisorial districts--which is the case. If the districts are properly gerrymandered--which is also the case-- the city tails wag the county dog! Four of the five supervisorial districts are dominated by city voters:

First District--93 percent
 Second District--79 per cent
 Third District--76 percent
 Fourth District--85 per cent

In the Fifth District (ours), 56 percent of the population is in the unincorporated area, but this slight majority is heavily diluted by the preponderance of city voters in the other four districts, and it is lost entirely in the mechanics of Board voting. We are further handicapped by the lack of an organization to present our views to the Board on a day-to-day basis. Not so handicapped are the special interests and the seven cities within our district. They have the funds and means to make their views known. The Board of Supervisors still does business only during working hours--downtown--twenty-five miles away from Solana Beach.

Accessibility and Credibility--

Many years ago when development and change progressed at a slower pace, the County government with its Board of Supervisors probably was capable of keeping up and keeping touch with its citizens and their needs. Now, however, it is obvious that the pace is too fast, the pressures too numerous, the job of the Supervisors too large for the old methods. What revisions it has been possible to make are inadequate to cope with the problems. It is impractical for the citizens of Solana Beach to revamp the county government especially when we have such difficulties even knowing the time of specific hearings, in getting to the hearings, in having a reasonable chance of being heard or receiving decisions based on the needs and rights of our citizens. Decisions must be based on accurate information and on knowledge of the needs and desires of those represented. Try as he does, Supervisor Craven and his staff just do not have and cannot take the time required to be informed because of too many pressures. The other supervisors have less interest in Solana Beach and are saddled with the same numerous problems and demands as is Craven.

As a result, we find ourselves in a perpetual position of trying to fend off Board actions--usually unsuccessfully. From the local point of view the Board appears to be inconsistent, unpredictable, and frequently illogical. The same can be said of the Zoning Administrator and the Planning Commission, whose decisions are crucial in shaping the future of our community. The Town Council believes that county government can no longer adequately serve the interests and needs of Solana Beach.

Here are a few of numerous examples to make the point:

*The county was unable to recognize the bluffs along the coastline as a unique natural asset of our community. Despite sustained efforts to bring this matter up for consideration, actions have only been taken on a piecemeal, after-the-fact basis. Other areas with more responsive and imaginative governments have recognized the irreplaceable value of such natural features. Even crowded Santa Monica and San Pedro were able to preserve their palisades and develop them into beautiful public parks. San Diego County should have planned adequately, purchased the bluffs area and developed them for public use too. Instead they have allowed them to be developed for private residences and clubs and to be restricted or denied to general public use.

The County Board of Supervisors has not even enforced the Coastal Overlay Zoning Ordinance it passed to control beach and bluff development. Aside from continuing to grant variances contrary to the intent of their ordinance, there have been several outright violations. In one instance the developer, with no authority whatever, constructed a piling-type retaining wall on the face of the bluff. The Town Council alerted the proper county authorities, but to date, the violation still remains.

*The County denied a request for a stop-go traffic signal at the dangerous intersection of Lomas Santa Fe, Stevens, and Glencrest Drive. Nor could they afford sidewalks for use by the children attending Skyline Elementary School, Earl Warren Junior High School, the United Presbyterian Church and School, and the San Dieguito Boy's Club, all located there. Instead, the County widened Lomas Santa Fe Drive to a fast four-lane freeway approach, thereby increasing the danger to pedestrians. For that they had money. Solana Beach citizens felt the need strongly enough to raise sidewalk funds privately.

*The Board of Supervisors authorized renaming Skyline Drive, Lomas Santa Fe Drive--apparently for the purpose of promoting the residential development of the same name.

*The Board of Supervisors ordered a \$25,000 study of the impact on the San Elijo Lagoon of a proposed Escondido sewer hookup to the Solana-Cardiff ocean outfall. This study was 80% financed by Solana-Cardiff Sanitation District funds although the District would receive no benefit from the hookup. Under pressure from Escondido without benefit of the final results of the impact study and without public hearings or discussions, the Board of Supervisors in their capacity as directors of the Solana-Cardiff Sanitation District (they wear many hats) approved the sewer hookup. This action will have a serious effect on Solana Beach for years to come.

Earlier, a regional sewer plan involving the San Dieguito area was dropped by the county. Apparently the county lost interest when local citizens repeatedly (and unsuccessfully) requested factual data on which to evaluate this proposal. This means that Solana and Cardiff must now pay the total costs of their own sewers. The meager information supplied by the county indicates that dropping the plan will cost each Solana Beach homeowner at least \$20 per year for the next 20 years.

Meanwhile, Escondido using OUR outfall, can qualify for state and federal funds--as a regional sewer district because it can contract to process sewage for other communities such as Rancho Bernardo and Olivenhain. Escondido gets the money--Solana gets the sewage! In addition, Solana will be expected to bear a share of the improvement or expansion costs resulting from an overburdened sewer system. All this is the result of a far-reaching decision in which we had little or no voice.

*The Board of Supervisors took no action to prevent the proposed relocation of scenic highway 101 for the convenience and profit of the La Costa Beach Club development. This move would have eliminated a beautiful stretch of scenic drive, would have terminated public use of several hundred yards of prime beach, and quite likely would have resulted in high-rise construction right on the beach. For approximately \$2 million in taxpayers money, the public was to get a 50 car parking lot and a few rest rooms. La Costa, by simply surrendering a strip of less desirable land adjacent the Santa Fe tracks, would have consolidated its holdings to the ocean side of the relocated highway. The benefits that La Costa would have obtained are obvious.

Only the dogged efforts of the San Elijo Alliance and the Solana Beach Town Council delayed the relocation until the Beaches and Parks Department of the State of California came to the rescue. The issue has not yet been resolved but it now appears the State is negotiating to buy out La Costa's beach property and preserve it for public use.

*Because of a county "oversight", Dome Limited now has until November 30, 1972 to start construction on several hundred houses in San Elijo Lagoon. Their plan calls for dredging and filling the lagoon, eliminating it entirely as open space, a wildlife refuge, and an important stop for migratory waterfowl on the Pacific Flyway. As a result of the "oversight," (their

permit should have expired last year) all of Dome's lagoon properties are protected against zoning changes, including flood plain zoning, until the above date.

*Over the years, the Board of Supervisors has ignored the 1967 San Dieguito General Plan. When state legislation was passed in 1971 requiring conformance of zoning to the general plans by January 1973 the County Planning Department became alarmed. After a series of public meetings where we learned that much of Solana Beach zoning does not conform to the 1967 Plan, it was decided that the San Dieguito Planning Group (SDPG) would routinely review developer applications in the square mile bounded by Lomas Santa Fe Drive and Via de la Valle on north and south, the freeway on the east and highway 101 on the west. This was intended as a stop-gap measure of several months duration, until the SDPG could complete its own goals, which would then become part of the new General Plan.

The San Dieguito Citizens Planning Group (SDPG) on its very first application review approved the plans submitted by a developer and the requested zoning change. The Planning Commission however, approved zoning changes in addition to those originally requested over the protest of the SDPG. Such actions can hardly be taken as solid evidence that the Planning Commission will adhere to a new General Plan any more than they did the old one. The Town Council feels it is time Solana Beach took over its own planning.

The above examples do not exhaust the list but are fairly representative of the treatment accorded us by county government.

There is raging here the age-old battle between private and public rights. Private rights were established to benefit individual owners in the development of their property for their own use. These rights are being

misused by some corporate owners who develop their properties to maximize profits with minimum regard to the public. They then move on to leave the problems they create to the small home owners and the community to solve or live with. County government has demonstrated its inability to cope--only local control through incorporation can shift the balance to protect the community and home owners and still be fair to the private sector. The Town Council has no desire to stop progress and development, but these must be reasonable, well planned, and compatible with the needs and wishes of those who live here. We feel that land-use planning, and building design regulation can best be executed through local control. We feel certain that Solana Beach contains the necessary expertise, energy, and leadership for exercising self government.

II. HOME RULE--ALTERNATE METHODS:

In January 1971, the Solana Beach Town Council distributed a questionnaire to nearly every household in Solana Beach. It asked for an indication of preference on a number of home rule alternatives. The results showed that a large fraction of those who responded favored some form of home rule:

Incorporation as City of Solana Beach	21%
Form Special District for zoning control through San Diego County	16%
Annexation to Del Mar	15%
Incorporation with Cardiff--as one city	8%
Other	5%
TOTAL favoring some kind of home rule	<u>65%</u>
Retain present unincorporated status of Solana Beach	29%
No Reply	6%
	<u>100%</u>

Over the past year and a half, the Town Council has noticed an increasing interest in home rule. During that time, the council has conducted studies to determine which course would be best for Solana Beach. Those considered were: 1) continuation of county government; 2) annexation to Del Mar; 3) municipal advisory council; 4) incorporation of the San Dieguito area; and 5) incorporation of Solana Beach.

The Town Council felt that only the latter two alternatives had any practicability, and only incorporation of Solana Beach as a city seemed realistic. Following are our reasons for this conclusion:

Continuation of County Government

This is sometimes called the "status quo" and as such is very deceptive in that it suggests that to do nothing would be to preserve our community pretty much as it is. This, of course, will not be the case under any form of government, particularly under the "status quo" of county government.

Continuation of county government for Solana Beach only appears to be the easiest, most painless solution because it is already established, requires no effort, and seems to contain no uncertainties or unknowns. But is this true? Is the future under county rule all that secure? It's true that present taxes are known, but future rates and assessments will depend upon developments now in progress and pending. Can we project future costs under county rule any better than we can for an alternative form of government--say incorporation? Not at all! Incorporation might mean an immediate increase in the tax burden, but does not necessarily mean it will carry into the future. With growing maturity as a city, we would be able to free ourselves from dependence on county services, and reduce costs as other communities have done.

On the other hand, it is very difficult to estimate the future costs of county rule because no methods have been developed for measuring the affects of poor, capricious, and unbalanced planning. How do you assess the costs of visual and aural pollution; that extra half-hour of bumper-to-bumper freeway driving each evening; the added risk of accident? Just how do you put a price tag on a town's identity, its atmosphere, its feel? How much for a bird's song, clean air, safe streets, an uncrowded beach? Yes, we have all of those now--but they can slip away easily. Without some changes in our form of government we know what to expect: look at

the squalor of the cities in the East; the sprawl of Los Angeles; and, more recently, the congestion of once-spacious Orange County. Now we can include San Diego City.

Who can predict the tax rate resulting from piecemeal, unbalanced development, excessive density. What will be the costs--measurable and unmeasurable--of increased police and fire protection, traffic control and maintenance (one signal costs \$35,000 installed), car and home insurance, schools, crime, vice, vandalism, corruption--all handmaidens of uncontrolled growth. Then there are the daily tensions, noises, smog, traffic of urban sprawl. All this will be ours very soon if we continue on our present course.

On the other hand, one need look no farther than Del Mar to see how local control can bring about change in a more desirable, healthful, and yet realistic way, (In this context, a common misconception about the Del Mar race track supplying huge tax revenues should be corrected. The track reduces Del Mar's tax rate by only about \$.50 per \$100 of assessed valuation, or about 4% of the total property taxes).

Annexation to Del Mar:

This course does not offer a realistic alternative because Solana Beach is too large for Del Mar to annex. Solana's population numbers approximately 7,000 residents, while Del Mar has only about 4,500. In addition, the land area of Solana Beach--from the ocean to Rancho Santa Fe-- is three or four times that of Del Mar. Much of Del Mar's land has already been developed; Solana Beach is only now being intensively developed. Del Mar's racetrack provides that city with revenues equivalent to those of a somewhat larger population. These would be significantly diluted by annexation of Solana Beach. Furthermore, the people of Del Mar, being

outnumbered, would worry about losing control of their city to the annexed area.

Del Mar has made substantial progress in their thirteen years as a city. They have landscaped their main street, passed an effective sign control ordinance, solved their water and sewage problems, adopted land and zoning controls, and are planning and funding for open space and parks. They have a responsive five-member city council which meets evenings-- convenient for citizen participation.

In 1970, two members of the Town Council appeared before the Del Mar City Council and suggested the possibility of annexation of Solana Beach to their city. They met with no enthusiasm. While annexation might solve many of the problems of Solana Beach, it offers no apparent advantage to Del Mar.

Municipal Advisory Council (MAC):

In 1971, the California Legislature passed a statute enabling county boards of supervisors to establish Municipal Advisory Councils (MAC). Such a council could be either elected by area residents or appointed by a board of supervisors. Its function would be to advise the board of supervisors on the views and sentiments of MAC area residents in matters affecting them. Aside from defining the advisory role of MAC, the legislation gave little guidance.

According to Supervisor William Craven, currently chairman of the Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO), MAC was established as a special provision to legalize an already-existing situation in East Palo Alto. Craven told the March meeting of the Town Council that a MAC was created there to function as a "riot control" measure in a black community that none of the adjacent incorporated areas wanted to annex. County plans

and projects were submitted to the MAC for its advice and consent. Craven explained that the MAC's authority was largely by "gentleman's agreement" however, because no legal or autonomous powers were granted it. In short, MAC was permitted effectiveness in Palo Alto only because the board of supervisors wanted to stabilize a volatile situation.

To be effective, Craven said, MAC would have to establish its powers over planning, zoning, and land-use by unwritten consent of the board of supervisors, and the board could not legally delegate those powers. He emphasized that any degree of home rule derived from a MAC would be quite tenuous in that any supervisor could scuttle the "agreement" at any time. So could LAFCO.

Autonomy that can be withdrawn is no autonomy at all, so MAC is not an acceptable alternative for Solana Beach or the San Dieguito area.

Incorporation with the San Dieguito Communities:

At a recent Town Council meeting, Supervisor William Craven termed the San Dieguito area "a collection of communities looking for a city hall." He recommended that San Dieguito incorporate as one city and indicated that LAFCO would look favorably upon such a proposal if it were recommended by an independent, professional study.

Over the years, there have been a number of incorporation studies of San Dieguito communities, usually by independent professional consultants under contract. Most of these studies have developed fiscal data but have failed to make any specific recommendations. They seemed directed only toward the economics of incorporation, without identifying any urgent social need for incorporating.

In the past, factionalism among community groups has prevented the unity necessary to move San Dieguito toward incorporation. While this is still undoubtedly a factor, attitudes are changing, and the possibility for groups cooperating is less remote than it was even a few years ago. It is clear, however, that if the San Dieguito area is ever to incorporate, each community desiring to be included must be able to mount its own local campaign. Solana Beach cannot hope to initiate incorporation moves in other communities. These efforts must be indigenous.

Unfortunately, there are no such efforts at present, so Solana Beach must proceed independently. If serious efforts are demonstrated in other San Dieguito communities, Solana Beach should remain ready to consider incorporation as part of a larger unit. Meantime, we cannot afford to wait for something that may never come about.

It has been suggested that the San Dieguito Planning Group might serve as a nucleus for an area-wide incorporation action group when it has completed its present task. That, however, could be many months in developing, if at all.

Conclusions:

Incorporation offers one realistic course, and we believe, the most practical course toward increased self government for Solana Beach. Clearly no other form studied by the Town Council offers a degree of autonomy attainable by incorporation.

III. INCORPORATION OF SOLANA BEACH:

This section deals specifically with the facts of incorporation; including necessary legal steps, city responsibilities, financing a city, and a projected budget for the City of Solana Beach.

Steps Toward Incorporation

Any community of at least 500 inhabitants, located entirely within a county having a population of less than 2 million, may incorporate as a city. The process of incorporation requires:

1. Action by a nucleus of interested citizens to:
 - a. circulate petitions
 - b. raise money (\$1,000 to \$3,000)
 - c. generate public support
2. Submitting an application to LAFCO specifying:
 - a. boundaries
 - b. population
 - c. budget
 - d. services
 - e. revenues
 - f. city government organizations
 - g. the need for a city
3. Hearing, review, and approval by LAFCO
4. Filing Notice of Intention with Board of Supervisors:
 - a. containing the names of at least 25, but not more than 50 landowners, as proponents willing to circulate the incorporation petition.
 - b. indicating boundaries of the incorporation area
5. Filing with Board of Supervisors within 120 days of filing Notice of Intention, a petition signed by at least 25% of the incorporation area's landowners, representing at least 25% of the assessed valuation of the area.

6. Payment of costs for publication of:
 - a. Notice of Public Hearing
 - b. Notice of Election
7. A public hearing before the Board of Supervisors at which:
 - a. protests representing at least 51% of the assessed valuation can defeat incorporation proceedings
 - b. incorporation election (two weeks for publicity) is announced
8. An election by the resident registered voters of the area.

Financing a City

A newly formed city is responsible for assuring all required city services. Some of the more important are fire protection, law enforcement, public works, and planning. The county and service districts can be requested to continue any or all of these services, under contract to the city. For example, in the event of Solana incorporation, it is likely the special service districts would continue to provide the city's water service and fire protection.

A city's budget is comprised of its income, or revenues, and its estimated expenditures. Revenues are of two kinds: general fund revenues, including property taxes, which may be used for any city purpose, and; limited expenditure funds, which are marked for particular purposes.

Estimated general fund revenues for the City of Solana Beach, exclusive of property tax revenues, are listed in Table I (following), together with the sources from which they are derived. General and limited expenditure funds are shown in Table II. To assist in assessing the validity of the estimates, the corresponding 1971-72 Del Mar budget figures are also given. An explanation of the budgeted items follows the tables. For our estimates we have used a Solana Beach population of 7,000 and a Del Mar population of 4,500.

The increased property tax required to finance the City of Solana Beach is the difference between the sum of items 1-14 (Table II), and the total general fund revenues (Table I). The increment in property taxes needed to support the new city would be \$81,250. At an estimated assessed valuation of \$18.2 million, the city's property tax rate would be \$0.45 per hundred dollars of assessed valuation. The owner of a \$40,000 home would pay an additional \$45. in property taxes equivalent

to an increase of approximately 5 to 6% of his total property tax. This tax would, of course, be in addition to current property taxes, and would provide a level of service comparable to that now provided by the City of Del Mar. If we add to the \$0.45 per \$100 assessed valuation city property tax, the \$0.546 per \$100 for fire protection and \$0.07 per \$100 for CSA No. 33 tax we obtain a tax rate of \$1.07 per \$100 of assessed valuation. The latter figure should be compared to \$1.05 per \$100 assessed valuation in Del Mar, an amount that would increase to \$1.55 per \$100 assessed valuation in the event that racetrack and fairground revenues were replaced by property taxes.

The boundaries we have used for the City of Solana Beach are Via de la Valle on the south, San Elijo Lagoon on the north, Rancho Santa Fe on the east, and the Pacific Ocean on the west.

Table 1
Estimated General Fund Revenues
(Excluding Property Taxes)

	<u>Del Mar (1971-72)</u>	<u>Solana Beach</u>
Sales Tax	65,000 (1)	156,000 (2)
Franchises	9,000	10,600
Admissions	56,000	-----
Cigarette Tax (3)	13,000	25,800
Real Property Transfer	3,000	4,000
Business Licenses	15,000	15,000
Race Track Licenses	4,200	-----
Horse Info.	2,400	-----
Other Licenses	700	1,000
Other Court Fines	1,000	1,000
Interest	3,500	-----
22nd Agric. Dist.	10,500	-----
Motor Vehicle in Lieu (4)	30,000	55,000
Msc.	3,600	-----
Alcoholic Beverage Control	5,000	4,500
Paper Salvage	800	-----
	<hr style="width: 100px; margin: 0 auto;"/> 222,700	<hr style="width: 100px; margin: 0 auto;"/> 272,900

- (1) The actual sales tax revenues for Del Mar, about \$110,000, far exceed the revenues that were estimated before the beginning of the present fiscal year.
- (2) The figures for Solana Beach were provided by the State Board of Equalization in a communication dated May 17, 1972.
- (3) The cigarette tax revenues amount roughly to 8% of the sales tax revenues plus \$1.90 times population.
- (4) Calculated at 7.82 per capita, a rate provided by the State Board of Equalization in the 5-17-72 communication.

Table 2
 Estimated Expenditures
 General and Limited Expenditure Fund Operating Budgets

<u>General Fund Expenditures</u>	<u>Solana Beach</u>	<u>Del Mar (1971-72)</u>
1. City Council	1,400	1,400
2. City Administration	35,800	43,613
3. City Attorney	12,000	11,330
4. Planning Department	6,000	4,000
5. Non-Departmental	18,000	17,900
6. Law Enforcement	120,000	92,000
7. Civil Defense	450	300
8. Fire Protection	(see item 8)	92,405
9. Public Works	55,000	37,152
10. Lifeguard Department	43,000	43,192
11. Contingencies	33,000	---
12. Interest on Working Capital	3,000	
13. Reserve Fund	15,000	
<u>Limited Fund Expenditures</u>		
14. Retirement Fund	11,500	22,000
15. Gasoline Tax Fund	55,000	27,000
16. Traffic Safety Fund	15,000	11,852
17. Transient Occupancy Tax Fund	2,000	14,000
18. Trees and Boulevards	(see item 18)	8,500
19. Drainage Fund	(see item 19)	6,000
20. Water Fund	(see item 20)	152,189
21. Sewer Fund	(see item 21)	67,830

Explanation of Items

The budget items for the proposed City of Solana Beach were prepared with the cooperation of the City Manager of Del Mar, who has had more than 10 years experience in the Field of city government. For comparative purposes, the budget of the City of Del Mar is presented alongside.

Item 1: City Council

The City Council of Solana Beach is assumed to be composed of five members, serving without pay, as is currently the situation in Del Mar. Budget expenses for the City Council would therefore entail only the costs of memberships, meetings and travel for the council members.

Item 2: City Administration

The City of Solana Beach would be administered by a city manager, with the aid of a secretary. The operating budget for city administration includes salaries and office expenses for these personnel, as well as memberships, meetings, travel and car expenses for the City Manager. Not included in the budget of the City of Solana Beach are the expenses for billing sewer and water services, which would be handled by existing agencies, as they are now. The budget for this item is \$7,805.00 more for the City of Del Mar because it does its own billing for sewer and water services, requiring salary and office expenses for an additional secretary.

Item 3: City Attorney

The services of a City Attorney would be required for Solana Beach, as they are for Del Mar; the budget item takes care of his retainer fee and sundry charges.

Item 4: Planning Department

Planning department services would be contracted from the County of San Diego on a part-time basis. It is anticipated that during the first year or two after incorporation, Solana Beach would require extra service in order

Item 4 continued

to draft zoning ordinances, which is why this budget item is higher than for Del Mar. In later years this item could be expected to decrease.

Item 5: Non-departmental

Non-departmental expenses cover such things as rental, furnishings and utilities for a City Hall, legal advertising, auditing, insurance, and miscellaneous contractual services.

Item 6: Law Enforcement - General

Law enforcement, including related services such as traffic enforcement, narcotics bureau, and probation department would be provided by contract with the Sheriff's Department for the County of San Diego, as Del Mar does presently. These services are provided on a \$17.35 per capita basis.

Solana Beach, with its larger population, would pay more for this item than does Del Mar.

If additional traffic enforcement is desired, as is the case with Del Mar, then a traffic officer could be contracted for. The cost of a traffic officer patrolling by car 8 hours a day, 7 days a week amount to about \$23,000. This expense could be partially covered by revenues obtained from vehicle fines and forfeitures.

Item 7: Civil Defense

This item is assessed on a per capita basis, which is the reason that it would be more for Solana Beach than for Del Mar. Participation in the Civil Defense Program would allow Solana Beach to purchase various equipment and supplies from the federal government at low cost.

Item 8: Fire Protection

Fire protection for the City of Solana Beach would continue under the existing fire district and thus would not be an expense of the City. Solana residents are currently taxed at the rate of \$0.546/100 A. V. for fire protection.

Item 9: Public Works

This item includes the salaries and expenses of a Public Works Department, which has the responsibility for maintenance and repair of streets and street signs. This item would be larger for Solana Beach than Del Mar because there are more streets requiring these services in Solana Beach.

Item 10: Lifeguard Services

Lifeguard services for the City of Solana Beach are based upon the same level of service as that provided by Del Mar, which has three towers and a motorized beach patrol.

Item 11: Contingencies

Item 12: Interest on Working Capital

In order to provide cash flow in the initial 6 months period prior to receipt of substantial revenues, a \$100,000 loan at 6% was assumed.

Item 13: Reserve Fund

Based on 5% of \$300,000 to establish a reserve fund for future cash flow, capital improvements, unpredictable opportunities.

Item 14: Retirement Fund

The Retirement Fund is the contribution of the City of Solana Beach to its employee's retirement program. This item would be less for Solana Beach than for Del Mar, because in the latter, with its sewer and water departments there are more city employees.

Item 15: The Gasoline Tax Fund

The Gasoline Tax Fund provides for repair, maintenance, grading and sweeping of select streets. In the City of Solana Beach, these streets would be Highway 101 and Lomas Santa Fe Dr. A communication from the State Board of Equalization, dated 5-17-72, indicates that Gas Tax Fund receipts should increase to \$64,000.

Item 16: Traffic Safety Fund

The Traffic Safety Fund is financed from vehicle fines and forfeitures. It provides for maintenance and operation of street and signal lights, and for street paint and signs. A portion of this fund may be used for purchase of equipment including, for example, patrol cars.

Item 17: Transient Occupancy Tax Fund

The Transient Occupancy Tax Fund provides funds for promoting the attributes of the City of Solana Beach. It also provides funds for capital improvements to the recreational areas of the City. This item would be less for Solana Beach than for Del Mar, because there are fewer motels in Solana Beach and thus, less revenue.

Item 18: Trees and Boulevards Operating

This item takes into account the services of personnel required to maintain the landscaped area of Solana Beach. This assumes full landscaping of Highway 101, including the median strip and the entire area along the railroad tracks. Since the City of Solana Beach would continue to use the services of maintenance district #33 and would not be a City expense, this item is not budgeted.

Item 19: Drainage Fund

This item would pay for capital improvements for construction of drainage channels should they be required in Solana Beach.

Item 20: Water Fund

The City of Solana Beach would continue to use the services of the Santa Fe Irrigation District. Since this item would not be a City expense it is not budgeted.

Item 21: Sewer Fund

The City of Solana Beach would continue to use the services of the Solana Beach Sanitation District. Since this item would not be a City expense it is not budgeted.

Call For Action:

The Solana Beach Town Council believes that Solana Beach has come of age. We must govern ourselves--incorporate--for our own preservation. It is urgent for us all to act now since experience shows that it takes about 18 months to incorporate. Any additional delay will only reduce the results of incorporation since most of the development of Solana Beach will occur in the next few years.

The existing organizations in the community must be the deciding factor in rallying support for an incorporation effort. A community-wide incorporation committee is proposed to spearhead an incorporation drive supported by the town's organizations and associations and its citizens.