

STAFF REPORT

DATE: July 1, 2014
TO: City Council
FROM: Gene Rogers, Interim City Manager
SUBJECT: Potential Tax Measure

Recommendation

Consider the information provided in this report and advise staff of next steps.

Council Goal(s)

Fiscal stability

Background and Analysis

On several occasions Council discussed the possibility of placing a tax measure on the upcoming November election ballot or sometime soon thereafter. At its meeting of June 24 Council requested that staff provide additional information pertaining to a potential tax measure for the purpose of funding certain projects that were considered by Council at that meeting.

Parcel Tax

Pursuant to Council direction, a chart is provided that identifies the annual and cumulative revenue that would be raised by several different iterations of tax measures that address different amounts of parcel fees, from \$50 to \$100 per year, through time ranging from 6 through 20 years. The upper limits of \$100 tax and 20 years were selected in recognition of the polling data released last week.

The chart includes estimates of the debt or bond capacity associated with the funds collected over time (e.g 10 years) at specified annual parcel tax levies. It also provides an estimate of the present value of the funds in the same manner. The present value projects the decline in buying power of a dollar due to inflation over the duration of the term. For example, what is the present value of a \$50 annual parcel fee collected for 10 years? It would be the cumulative value (of a \$50 parcel tax) of \$1.4 million, for a total of ten years to equal \$14 million. In this case the present value of \$14 million is \$11.9 million using an estimated inflation average of 3% per year. This is useful in comparing the value of the projects that may be funded over time. It is also helpful in determining the relative merits of funding through issuing debt supported by the parcel taxes vs. pay-as-you-go.

Utility User Tax*

The purpose of this section is to provide information requested regarding the possible imposition of a utility user tax (UUT). The UUT was addressed in a previous staff report. In summary, it is a tax imposed upon the users of certain utilities, which could include gas, electric,

telephone/communications, water, sewer, sanitation, and cable tv. State and Federal governments are exempt as well as gas and water used by utility companies to generate electricity. Cities may also determine to include low income full or partial exemptions in their ordinance.

UUT is almost always imposed as a general tax, an act which requires a simple majority vote conducted at municipal election. There is an exception to the municipal election requirement if there is an emergency and the elected body unanimously approves the placement of the tax ordinance on the ballot at any other time.

There are 154 California cities and 4 counties that impose UUT. UUT comprises a significant portion of the general fund revenues of many city budgets. Most large cities have UUT. On average, UUT provides 15% of the general-purpose revenue of the cities that levy it. The average rate of the tax is 5.5%.

It should be noted that one advantage of a UUT is that is a durable tax that is more consistent than the city's most significant general taxes. UUT inflates with time and it tracks with growth in consumption of the elements that are subject to the tax. It is less susceptible to economic downturns than property tax and sales tax though it must be acknowledged that effective resource conservation may have some impact upon future consumption patterns. In a city such as Davis, which is largely built-out, a UUT would provide needed stability to the general fund budget.

An important question being addressed in this section is an estimate of revenue that may be derived by a UUT levied in Davis. This is a difficult task insofar as there are several important data points that would need to be known to make an accurate estimate. These include the extent to which there may be exemptions and the array of services upon which that UUT would be levied. Also, it is conceivable that there may be a different tax levy imposed upon different services, i.e. 6% on electric and gas, 2% on sanitation. Finally, it is not known whether any eligible services may not be taxed at all.

For purposes of this exercise, staff is using the average UUT rate, 5.5%, as the model for projecting revenues that would be raised annually for the UUT. It is reasonable to assume the tax would be applied to both electricity and gas. Based upon reliable information it is known that about 9% of the gross revenues for electric and gas would be exempted for federal, state and local government facilities, and also low income. Applied to these two only, the tax would raise about \$2.7 million annually.

Applying the 5.5% UUT to the other eligible utilities is less certain and there is a larger unknown factor about the impact of exemptions for each specific utility. Assuming a 10% exemption factor, sanitation might produce about \$500,000 and cable television might produce the same amount. Water utility would produce about \$800,000 and sewer utility would produce about \$700,000. An alternative to not taxing some or all of these services is to increase the tax rate levied on electricity and gas.

Off-Municipal Election Timing

As noted above, Council could schedule an election to accommodate an emergency UUT election. This could be accomplished through a regular election or a pilot mail ballot election. It is the County Elections Office preference that off-elections not interfere with a regularly scheduled election. The windows of time for 2014 would appear to be early spring and mid-summer though other options could be explored. The City Council must vote to place a measure on the ballot and then forward the measure to the County, who must then call for the election at least 88 days before the desired election date.

Advisory Measure

A Utility Users Tax could be specified for certain types of services or projects, such as transportation, public safety, parks maintenance or animal control, but the identification of such restriction(s) in the adopting ordinance would invoke a requirement for two-thirds majority voter approval because the UUT would no longer be characterized as a general tax—it would be transformed into a special tax subject to the super-majority vote per the California constitution. To staff's knowledge there are no existing circumstances where UUT special taxes are being collected.

In some cases city leaders have desired to identify the probable municipal service beneficiaries of the UUT and have placed companion measures on the same ballot for the purposes of having the voters advise the elected officials on how the new revenues should be used. An advisory measure cannot, however, be constructed in a way that would place any requirement upon the elected officials that would override their discretion on the use of the revenues. Examples of such advisory measures are attached. The use of such advisory measures is limited and there is no evidence that they are effective in building support for the UUT. Opponents often argue that the use of an advisory measure is a way of getting around the intent of Propositions 13 to require a two-thirds vote for special taxes.

*The source of much of the factual information about UUT is The California Municipal Revenue Source Handbook authored by Michael Coleman (<http://californiacityfinance.com/>)

**As noted, more detailed research and information is needed to provide more reliable UUT revenue estimates, however, these estimates are of reasonable scale to indicate that Staff is still seeking more information about the profile of city electrical and gas utility users. An update if that information becomes available.

Attachments

1. Parcel Tax Calculations
2. Examples of Advisory Ordinances

Attachment 1

Parcel Tax

Amt. Per year	Revenue per yr	6 years	10 years	12 years	15 years	20 years
\$50	\$1.4 M	\$8.4 M	\$14 M	\$16.8 M	\$21 M	\$28 M
\$60	\$1.7 M	\$10.2 M	\$17 M	\$20.4 M	\$25.5 M	\$34 M
\$70	\$1.9 M	\$11.4 M	\$19 M	\$22.8 M	\$28.5 M	\$38 M
\$80	\$2.2 M	\$13.2 M	\$22 M	\$26.4 M	\$33 M	\$44 M
\$90	\$2.5 M	\$15 M	\$25 M	\$30 M	\$37.5 M	\$50 M
\$100	\$2.8 M	\$16.8 M	\$28 M	\$33.6 M	\$42 M	\$56 M

Attachment 1

Parcel Tax (Net Bond & Adjusted for Inflation)

Parcel Tax Amount	6 years	10 years	12 years	15 years	20 years
\$50	\$8.4 M	\$14 M	\$16.80	\$21 M	\$28 M
Net Bond Amount	\$6.9 M	\$10.9 M	\$11.9 M	\$14.2 M	\$17.3 M
Parcel Tax (adj.)	\$7.6 M	\$11.9 M	\$13.1 M	\$15.6 M	\$19 M
\$60	\$10.2 M	\$17 M	\$20.4 M	\$25.5 M	\$34 M
Net Bond Amount	\$8.4 M	\$13.2 M	\$14.5 M	\$17.2 M	\$21 M
Parcel Tax (adj.)	\$9.2 M	\$14.5 M	\$16 M	\$18.9 M	\$23.1 M
\$70	\$11.4 M	\$19 M	\$22.8 M	\$28.5 M	\$38 M
Net Bond Amount	\$9.4 M	\$14.7 M	\$16.2 M	\$19.2 M	\$23.5 M
Parcel Tax (adj.)	\$10.3 M	\$16.2 M	\$17.8 M	\$21.1 M	\$25.8 M

Attachment 1

Parcel Tax (Net Bond & Adjusted for Inflation)

Parcel Tax Amount	6 years	10 years	12 years	15 years	20 years
\$80	\$13.2 M	\$22 M	\$26.4 M	\$33 M	\$44 M
Net Bond Amount	\$10.8 M	\$17.1 M	\$18.8 M	\$22.2 M	\$27.2 M
Parcel Tax (adj.)	\$11.9 M	\$18.8 M	\$20.7 M	\$24.5 M	\$29.9 M
\$90	\$15 M	\$25 M	\$30 M	\$37.5 M	\$50 M
Net Bond Amount	\$12.3 M	\$19.4 M	\$21.3 M	\$25.3 M	\$30.9 M
Parcel Tax (adj.)	\$13.5 M	\$21.3 M	\$23.5 M	\$27.8 M	\$34 M
\$100	\$16.8 M	\$28 M	\$33.6 M	\$42 M	\$56 M
Net Bond Amount	\$13.9 M	\$21.7 M	\$23.9 M	\$28.3 M	\$34.6 M
Parcel Tax (adj.)	\$15.2 M	\$23.9 M	\$26.3 M	\$31.1 M	\$38.1 M

- **City of Stockton Tax and Advisory Measure**

Measure B (City of Stockton, November 5, 2013 election)

Voters will also be asked to consider a non-binding advisory measure on the same ballot, which may prove helpful in communicating the priorities and will of the people. Measure B will provide an opportunity for voters to express an opinion about how the money from the tax will be used.

Measure B - Ballot Question (As it appeared on the November 5, 2013 Ballot)

Advisory Measure

"If Measure A is approved by the voters, shall (i) 65% of its proceeds be used only to pay for law enforcement and crime prevention services in the City such as those described in the City's Marshall Plan on Crime and (ii) 35% of its proceeds be used only to pay for the City's efforts to end the bankruptcy and for services to residents, businesses, and property owners?" This question requires the approval of a majority of those casting votes. It is an advisory measure only.

- A "Yes" vote expresses an opinion that 65% of the tax proceeds should be used to pay for law enforcement and crime prevention services, such as those described in the City's Marshall Plan on Crime, and 35% should be used only to pay for the City's efforts to end bankruptcy and for services to residents, businesses and property owners.
- A "No" vote may be viewed as an opinion against the uses or as neutral, as to the uses proposed.

Measure B - City Attorney's Impartial Analysis (Provided in the Voter Information Guide)

The Stockton City Council has placed Measure "B" on the November 5, 2013, general election ballot asking voters to consider a non-binding, advisory measure concerning the use of revenues that may arise from the voters' approval of a new transactions and use (sales) tax being presented to the City's voters on this same ballot as Measure "A."

Under state law the City Council may place an advisory measure on the ballot in order to receive general voter opinion on an issue. The results of this advisory vote are not controlling on the City, but may prove helpful in communicating the will of the voters to the City Council when making decisions concerning how funds from Measure A will be spent.

Measure "B" provides an opportunity for the voters to offer their opinion regarding the use of revenues that may arise from the approval of the new transactions and use (sales) tax being presented to the City's electorate on this same ballot as Measure "A." A "Yes" vote expresses an opinion supporting the uses of the tax proceeds proposed in the ballot question for Measure "B," which are as follows: 65% of the proceeds would be used only to pay for law enforcement and crime prevention services in the City such as those described in the City's Marshall Plan on Crime and 35% of the proceeds would be used only to pay for the City's efforts to end the bankruptcy and for services to residents, businesses, and property owners. A "No" vote may be viewed as expressing an opinion against the uses of the revenue that have been proposed or as a neutral opinion, neither in favor of, nor in opposition to, the uses proposed.

- **City of Plymouth Tax and Tax Advisory Resolution**

RESOLUTION NO. 2012-04

A RESOLUTION CALLING AN ELECTION TO ASK THE VOTERS OF THE CITY OF PLYMOUTH TO APPROVE AN INCREASE TO THE TRANSIENT OCCUPANCY TAX CONTAINED IN SECTION 3.30.030 OF CHAPTER 3.30 OF THE PLYMOUTH MUNICIPAL CODE TO TEN PERCENT (10%) OF THE RENT CHARGED BY HOTEL OPERATORS; AND FURTHER SUBMITTING AN ADVISORY MEASURE TO THE VOTERS REGARDING THE USE OF SUCH PROPOSED TAX REVENUES; AND REQUESTING THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF AMADOR COUNTY TO CONSOLIDATE THE ELECTION WITH THE STATEWIDE GENERAL ELECTION TO BE HELD ON TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 6, 2012, AND DIRECTING THE COUNTY ELECTIONS DEPARTMENT TO CONDUCT THE ELECTION ON BEHALF OF THE CITY

WHEREAS, the City of Plymouth ("City") requires additional revenue to fund important municipal programs; and

WHEREAS, the City Council may propose that voters approve an increase to the transient occupancy tax contained in Chapter 3.30 of the Plymouth Municipal Code from six percent (6%) to ten percent (10%) of the rent charged by hotel operators within the City to raise additional funds for general municipal purposes; and

WHEREAS, a transient occupancy tax is a type of general tax collected by hotel operators and remitted to the City tax collector that may be increased to achieve these purposes; and

WHEREAS, California Constitution Article XIIC, Section 2(b) requires that an election on an increase to general tax, including a transient occupancy tax, be consolidated with a statewide general election at which members of the City Council will be elected; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to Government Code Sections 53723 and 53724 an ordinance proposing to increase a general tax, including a transient occupancy tax, must be approved by two-thirds vote of all members of the City Council, and thereafter be approved by a majority vote of qualified voters of the City voting in an election in order for the increase to the transient occupancy tax to become effective; and

WHEREAS, November 6, 2012 is the date of the statewide general election at which members of the City Council will be elected; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to Elections Code Section 9603, the City may place an advisory measure on the ballot for the purpose of allowing voters to voice their opinion on a substantive issue or to indicate approval or disapproval of a ballot proposal and such vote will not be controlling upon the City Council; and

WHEREAS, the City would like to place an advisory measure on the ballot to seek voter input regarding how revenue from the proposed increase to the transient occupancy tax should be used; and

WHEREAS, Elections Code Section 9282 sets forth the procedures for arguments in favor of or

in opposition of City measures; and

WHEREAS, Elections Code Sections 9285 set forth the procedures for rebuttal arguments; and

WHEREAS, The City Council finds that under CEQA Guidelines 15060(c)(2) and (c)(3) and 15378, subdivisions (b)(2) and (b)(4), that a measure to increase the transient occupancy tax contained in Chapter 3.30 of the Plymouth Municipal Code to ten percent (10%) does not constitute a project under CEQA and therefore review under CEQA is not required.

NOW, THEREFORE, THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF PLYMOUTH DOES HEREBY RESOLVE:

1. The foregoing Recitals are true and correct and are hereby adopted by the City Council.
2. Pursuant to California Constitution Article XIIC, Section 2; Government Code Section 53724, and Elections Code Section 9222, the City Council of the City of Plymouth hereby calls an election at which it shall propose to the voters of the City, a measure that, if approved, would increase the City's existing transient occupancy tax contained in Chapter 3.30 of the Plymouth Municipal Code from a rate of six percent (6%) of the rent charged by hotel operators to ten percent (10%) of the rent charged by hotel operators, pursuant to the provisions of Revenue and Taxation Code Section 7280 *et seq.* This measure shall be designated by letter by the Amador County Elections Department. Pursuant to Election Code Section 10400 *et seq.*, the City Council hereby requests that the Board of Supervisors of the Amador County consolidate the election for this measure with the statewide election to be conducted on November 6, 2012, which is also the date of the City's regular municipal election, at which an election for members of the City Council will also occur.
3. The ordinance authorizing the increase to the transient occupancy tax contained in Chapter 3.30 of the Plymouth Municipal Code to be approved by the voters pursuant to Section 2 is as set forth in Exhibit A hereto. The City Council hereby approves the ordinance, subject to the approval of a majority of the voters voting on the measure at the election called by the adoption of this resolution, further approves its submission to the voters of the City at the November 6, 2012 election. The entire text of the ordinance attached hereto as Exhibit A shall be printed in the voter information portion of the sample ballot. The ordinance specifies that transient occupancy tax shall be increased from six percent (6%) of the rent charged by hotel operator to ten percent (10%) of the rent charged by hotel operators within the City.
4. The proposed increase to the transient occupancy tax shall be submitted to the voters on the ballot in the form of the following question:

MEASURE : APPROVAL OF INCREASE TO THE TRANSIENT OCCUPANCY TAX.		
Shall City of Plymouth Ordinance No. 2012-03 increasing the transient occupancy tax to ten percent (10%) of the rent charged by hotel operators within the city limits, with tax revenues to be used for general municipal purposes, be approved?	YES	
	NO	

5. The proposed advisory measure shall be submitted to the voters on the ballot in the form of the following question.

MEASURE _____ : ADVISORY VOTE ONLY.		
Should two percent (2%) of revenue from the increase in the transient occupancy tax be used for streets, parking and landscaping, and the remaining two percent (2%) for tourism including promotions, events, signage, advertising, and other related expenses?	YES	
	NO	

6. The official ballot to be used at said election shall conform to the provisions of the laws of the State of California.
7. The City Attorney shall prepare an impartial analysis of tax ballot measure and the advisory measure, not to exceed five hundred words in length, showing the effect of each measure on the existing law and the operation of the measure.
8. Arguments for and against the ballot measures may be filed with the City Clerk in accordance with the Elections Code 9280 *et seq.* The arguments shall not exceed 300 words in length, and shall be signed by not more than five persons. Rebuttal arguments shall be filed with the City Clerk in accordance with the Elections Code 9280 *et seq.*, and shall not exceed 250 words in length and shall be signed by not more than five persons; those persons may be different persons that the persons who signed the direct arguments. Pursuant to Section 9285 of the California Elections Code, when the City Clerk has selected the arguments for and against the measures, which will be printed and distributed to the voters, the City Clerk shall send copies of the arguments in favor of the measure to the authors of the arguments against, and copies of the arguments against to the authors of the arguments in favor. Rebuttal arguments shall be printed in the same manner as the direct arguments. Each rebuttal argument shall immediately follow the direct arguments, which it seeks to rebut.
9. The City authorizes and requests the County Registrar of Voters to consolidate this election with the statewide general election on November 6, 2012.
10. The City Clerk may request the assistance of the Amador County Elections Department in regard to this election, as the City Clerk deems necessary, and the City shall pay the incurred cost of such assistance.
11. In accordance with Section 12111 of the Elections Code, the City Clerk is hereby authorized and directed to cause notice of the measures to be posted and published once in a daily newspaper of general circulation, printed, published, and circulated in the City of Plymouth at least one week prior to the statewide general election. The City Clerk may request that the Amador County Elections Department prepare and publish the required notice.
12. The election on the measures set forth above shall be held and conducted, the votes canvassed and the returns made, and the results ascertained and determined as provided for herein. In all particulars not prescribed in this resolution, the election shall be held as prescribed in accordance

with the Elections Code of the State of California. The Board of Supervisors of the Amador County is authorized and requested to canvas the returns of that election with respect to the votes cast in the City of Plymouth and certify the results to the City Council. At the next regular meeting of the City Council occurring after the returns of the election have been canvassed and the certification of the results to the City Council, the City Council shall cause to be entered in its minutes a statement of the results of the election.

13. The City Manager is hereby authorized and directed to expend the necessary funds to pay for the City's cost of placing the measures on the election ballot.
14. The City Clerk is hereby authorized and directed to certify the adoption of this resolution and to transmit a copy hereof so certified to the Board of Supervisors and the Registrar of Voters of Amador County. The City Clerk is further directed to take all steps necessary to place the measures on the ballot and to cause the ordinance attached as Exhibit A to be printed and published. A copy of the ordinance shall be made available to any voter upon request.

PASSED AND ADOPTED this 26th day of April, 2012, by the following vote:

AYES: Peter Amoruso, Jon Colburn, Patricia Shackleton, Greg Baldwin, Sandy Kyles

NOES: None

ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: None

Sandy Kyles, Mayor

ATTEST:

Gloria Stoddard, City Clerk

- **Draft City of Woodland Tax and Tax Advisory Resolution**

RESOLUTION NO. _____

RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WOODLAND CALLING A GENERAL MUNICIPAL ELECTION FOR THE ELECTION OF TWO COUNCIL MEMBERS AND CALLING A SPECIAL ELECTION FOR THE PURPOSE OF SUBMITTING A GENERAL TAX MEASURE TO CONTINUE A ONE QUARTER CENT SALES TAX THAT WOULD EXPIRE IN EIGHT YEARS AND FOUR ADVISORY MEASURES, SAID ELECTIONS TO BE HELD IN THE CITY OF WOODLAND ON JUNE 3, 2014, AND DIRECTING THE CONSOLIDATION OF THE ELECTIONS WITH THE STATEWIDE PRIMARY ELECTION AND ALL OTHER ELECTIONS

WHEREAS, the City Council of the City of Woodland, by adoption of Ordinance 1299 on December 16, 1997, established that the City's regular municipal election would be consolidated with the Statewide primary election; and

WHEREAS, on October 6, 1997, Assembly Bill 1472 became law, adding Chapter 2.93 (commencing with Section 7286.52) to Part 1.7 of Division 2 of the Revenue and Taxation Code; and

WHEREAS, Assembly Bill 1472 authorizes the City of Woodland (hereinafter "the City"), subject to approval by a majority vote of the qualified voters of the City voting in an election on the issue, to continue to levy a transactions and use tax pursuant to the Transactions and Use Tax Law at a rate of 0.25%, not to exceed a total of 2.0% in any County, for general revenue purposes; and

WHEREAS, Section 2(b) of Article XIII C of the California Constitution, added by Proposition 218 effective November, 1996, requires that the measure proposing a general tax be submitted to the voters at an election consolidated with a regularly scheduled general election for members of the governing body of the local government; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to California Constitution Article XIII C, Section 2(b) and Elections Code section 10201, the City has determined to submit a proposition to enact an Ordinance re-authorizing a supplemental transactions and use tax to the voters at the City's next regular election; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to Elections Code section 9603, the City has determined to submit to the voters, concurrent with the proposed Ordinance re-authorizing a transactions and use tax in the City, four advisory measures concerning the City services, programs and facilities that could be funded by the transactions and use tax fund, if approved; and

WHEREAS, the City may request the Yolo County Board of Supervisors to direct the County Elections Official to render services to the City relating to the conduct of an election.

THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WOODLAND DOES HEREBY RESOLVE AS FOLLOWS:

Section 1. Calling of the General Municipal Election. Pursuant to the requirements of the laws of the State of California relating to municipal elections, there shall be, and there is hereby called and ordered held in the City of Woodland, County of Yolo, State of California, on June 3, 2014, a general municipal election of the qualified electors of the City of Woodland, for the purpose of electing two (2)

members of the City Council for a full term of four (4) years each. The general municipal election shall be held and conducted as provided for by law for the holding of municipal elections in the City.

Section 2. Calling of the Special Election. Pursuant to the requirements of the laws of the State of California relating to municipal elections, including municipal elections consolidated with other elections, the City Council of the City of Woodland hereby calls and orders held a special municipal election to be held in the City of Woodland, County of Yolo, State of California, on June 3, 2014, for the purpose of placing on the ballot five ballot measures. Pursuant to Elections Code section 9222, a measure to enact an Ordinance continuing a transactions and use tax, and four advisory measures, shall be submitted to the voters at the City's next regular municipal election on June 3, 2014.

Section 3. Consolidation of the Election. The City Council hereby requests the Yolo County Board of Supervisors to consolidate the general municipal election and the special election on the proposition and the advisory measures with the Statewide election and all other elections to be held within the City on June 3, 2014.

Section 4. Election Related Services. Pursuant to Elections Code section 10002, the City requests and authorizes the Yolo County elections official to provide the services necessary to implement the election and to consolidate the election on the June 3, 2014 Election Ballot for the County of Yolo. Such services include the publication of notices calling the election and calling for ballot arguments, provision of precinct maps, provision of voter lists, obtaining and staffing polling places, hiring and training of precinct workers, provision and delivery of precinct supplies, provision of microfiche of voters and poll locations, if desired, counting of ballots and certification of the election, and all other aspects of elections not specified herein that may be agreed upon between the County Clerk and the City Clerk.

Section 5. Impartial Analysis. Pursuant to Elections Code section 9280, the City Elections Official shall transmit a copy of the measure to the City Attorney, who shall prepare an impartial analysis of the measure showing the effect of the measure on existing law and the operation of the measure.

Section 6. Arguments. The Yolo County Clerk shall fix the dates for submittal of arguments concerning the measure and rebuttal arguments. The City hereby adopts the provisions of Elections Code section 9285, regarding the acceptance of rebuttal arguments.

Section 7. Ballot Measures. Pursuant to Elections Code section 10403, the ballot forms shall have printed on them the following words with regard to the measures:

“**MEASURE ____**: Shall Ordinance No. _____, which would authorize the City of Woodland to continue to collect a one-quarter cent sales tax for general city services, for a period of eight years, and would not increase taxes, be adopted?

_____ YES _____ NO”

“**MEASURE ____**: Advisory Vote Only. Shall the City Council allocate 60% of the tax revenue collected from any sales tax measure re-authorized in the City of Woodland via the June 2014 ballot to expand and enhance youth and teen programs and facilities, including funding to support the re-opening of Hiddleston Pool, and reduction of fees charged for youth programs and use of city recreation facilities?

_____ YES _____ NO”

“**MEASURE ____**: Advisory Vote Only. Shall the City Council allocate 20% of the tax revenue collected from any sales tax measure re-authorized in the City of Woodland via the June 2014

ballot to the Woodland Public Library to enhance educational and youth literacy programs and expand hours of operation?

_____ YES _____ NO”

“**MEASURE**___: Advisory Vote Only. Shall the City Council allocate 15% of the tax revenue collected from any sales tax measure re-authorized in the City of Woodland via the June 2014 ballot to enhance public safety through expanded crime prevention programs such as Neighborhood Watch and services supporting at-risk youth including gang intervention strategies?

_____ YES _____ NO”

“**MEASURE**___: Advisory Vote Only. Shall the City Council allocate up to 5% of the tax revenue collected from any sales tax measure re-authorized in the City of Woodland via the June 2014 ballot to support a city water and sewer utility ratepayer assistance program for low-income residents?

_____ YES _____ NO”

A full and complete copy of Ordinance No. _____ is attached hereto as Exhibit 1 and incorporated herein.

Section 8. City's Reimbursement of Costs. The City of Woodland shall reimburse the County of Yolo for all costs and expenses incurred by the County in conducting said election upon presentation of a bill to the City.

Section 9. Forwarding of Resolution to the County. The City Clerk is authorized and directed to file a copy of this Resolution with the Board of Supervisors and the County Clerk upon its adoption by the City Council.

Section 10. Implementation Actions. The City Manager and the City Clerk, as authorized by the City Manager, are further authorized and directed to take such further actions and execute such documents as are necessary to cause the election to be conducted on behalf of the City of Woodland.

PASSED AND ADOPTED this 7th day of January, 2014, by the following vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

ABSTAIN:

Marlin H. Davies, Mayor

ATTEST:

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

Ana B. Gonzalez, City Clerk

Kara K. Ueda, City Attorney