AGENDA

1. ROLL CALL

2. CONFIRMATION OF AGENDA

3. STAFF ANNOUNCEMENTS regarding District business

4. CORRESPONDENCE

   -Letter from SBCERS announcing meeting regarding retirement benefits. (pg. 1)

5. PUBLIC COMMENT. Time reserved for the public to address the Board of Trustees relative to matters of District business not on the agenda. Comment time regarding specific agenda items will be available during consideration of the particular agenda items.

6. ITEMS OF GENERAL CONSENT. The following items can be approved by a single action of the Board. Items requiring additional discussion may be withdrawn from the listing and addressed in separate actions. [see attachments for each]

   A. Approval of the Minutes of the regular meeting held April 12th, 2012. (pg. 4)
   B. Approval of the Financial Statements for County Fund 4160, for April 2012. (pg. 8)
   C. Approval of the Warrant Register, for April 2012. (pg. 12)
   D. Approval of the Disease Surveillance Report, for April 2012. (pg. 18)
   E. Approval of the District Operations Report, for April 2012. (pg. 20)

7. OLD BUSINESS

   A. FY 2012-2013 Budget Discussions-Discuss upcoming budget year goals. (pg.21)

      1. NPDES Permitting and MVCAC Cost Share for Monitoring
      2. Health Benefit Premium Increases
      3. Increased Fuel Costs
      4. Strategic Plan
5. Professional Services

FY 2012-2013 Draft Budgetary Timeline:

- May 10 – Board approval of final budget document
  - Board considers Resolution declaring intent to levy benefit assessment
  - Board preliminary approval of Engineer’s Reports
- June 14 – Publish notice of Public Hearing
- July 12 – Public Hearing regarding intent to levy benefit assessment
  - Board approval of Resolution approving final Engineer’s Report and ordering levy of benefit assessment

8. NEW BUSINESS.

   A. Approval of Engineers Report – Engineers report prepared by SCI Consulting for FY 2012-13 benefit assessment. (pg. 27)

   B. Approval of Resolution 2012-01 – Approval to declare intent to levy assessments, approve the engineers report and provide notice of public hearing for FY 2012-13 Zone 1 benefit assessment. (pg. 77)

   C. Approval of Resolution 2012-02 – Approval to declare intent to levy assessments, approve the engineers report and provide notice of public hearing for FY 2012-13 Zone 2 benefit assessment. (pg. 82)

   D. Discussion and action regarding employee health care benefits. See attached documents. (pg. 86)

9. MANAGER’S REPORT (pg. 90)

10. BOARD ANNOUNCEMENTS

11. ADJOURNMENT (next scheduled meeting: Thursday, June 14th 2012, 2pm)

CERTIFICATE OF POSTING

I, Larry Fausett, General Manager for the Mosquito and Vector Management District of Santa Barbara County, verify under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California, that the foregoing agenda was posted not less than 72 hours prior to the afore mentioned meeting.

______________________________
Larry Fausett
General Manager
April 6, 2012

To: All Employers (Districts) participating in the
Santa Barbara County Employees’ Retirement System (“SBCERS”)

RE: EFFECT OF NEW COUNTY PLAN ON DISTRICT EMPLOYERS

To Whom It May Concern:

The County of Santa Barbara (the "County") has recently negotiated with general member bargaining units a new retirement plan that will provide a different benefit formula for general member employees who are hired on or after June 25, 2012. The County is in the process of considering and adopting this new plan. Such adoption raises questions regarding its impact on the 10 District employers who participate in SBCERS along with the County.

When a significant modification to retirement benefits is made by the primary plan sponsor for its employees, questions arise regarding the impact of such modification on participating district employers who contract with the retirement system to provide retirement benefits to their employees. Historically, districts in the County have been encouraged to modify retirement benefits provided to their employees consistent with modifications adopted by the County as the primary plan sponsor (employing over 90% of SBCERS members), and most have done so. An opinion of the California Attorney General provided to the County in 1961 suggests that districts are obligated to follow the County's lead in this regard, to avoid a "patchwork" of retirement plans that would be exceedingly difficult for the system to administer.

However, other provisions of the retirement law suggest that participating districts may have some autonomy to make their own decisions regarding retirement benefits for their employees, particularly where those districts have historically maintained benefit plans different than those provided to County employees, or where district employers are obligated to negotiate with employee groups regarding the terms and conditions of employment. With respect to SBCERS, some districts, in particular the Air Pollution Control District, have provided retirement benefit plans to their employees somewhat different than those provided by the County or other districts.

In order to reconcile these competing objectives, SBCERS encourages districts, to the extent possible, to ratify modifications to retirement benefits provided to their employees consistent with modifications made by the County from time to time with respect to County employees, in order to promote uniformity in retirement benefits provided to SBCERS members similarly situated, and to avoid the burden on SBCERS of administering multiple benefit plans requiring separate actuarial study and valuation.

At the same time, it is recognized that certain districts may be constrained in adopting such modifications due to existing collective bargaining agreements or other legal requirements or unique conditions.
circumstances. In such instances, SBCERS is prepared to work with districts to accommodate their special needs and to assist them in providing retirement benefits to their employees that may be different than those provided to similarly situated County employees. However, we believe it essential that the benefits provided in such circumstances must be consistent with those already provided by SBCERS to an existing group of County or district employees, and may not require creation of a new and different plan mandating separate actuarial study and valuation. SBCERS is simply not in the position to construct a separate and unique benefit plan for each participating district.

Because districts are distinct entities separate from the retirement system, SBCERS cannot provide legal advice to districts as to their obligations to provide retirement benefits to their employees or the legal ramification of modifying such benefits. Accordingly, district employers are encouraged to obtain independent legal advice regarding these issues. SBCERS is happy to work with districts directly or with their legal counsel to implement solutions consistent with this policy.

SBCERS is hosting a meeting for the Districts to discuss the new plan. Particulars as to the meeting are detailed on the enclosed flyer. Each district is encouraged to attend. The meeting is held in the Southern portion of the County where 8 of the 10 districts are located. Arrangements will be made to meet with the other two districts, unless they elect to attend the group session.

A summary of the changes to the General Plan are detailed on the attached flyer, for your review prior to the meeting. Thank you in advance, for your cooperation. I look forward to meeting and working with you.

Very truly yours,

[Signature]

Gary A. Amelio
Chief Executive Officer
INVITATION TO MEETING

To Administrative Heads of the 8 Districts located in southern Santa Barbara County participating in the SBCERS

(note: the 2 Districts located in northern Santa Barbara County will be contacted directly for separate meetings, although they are welcome to attend this group session)

Tuesday, April 24, 2012
10:00 a.m.

Wisteria Room
at Casa Nueva
260 N. San Antonio Road
Santa Barbara, CA


THE NEW GENERAL PLAN, WHICH IS ANTICIPATED TO APPLY TO NON-SAFETY COUNTY EMPLOYEES HIRED ON OR AFTER JUNE 25, 2012, WILL PROVIDE SOMewhat LESS RICH BENEFITS THAN THE CURRENT PLAN AND CONSEQUENTLY WILL REDUCE THE EMPLOYER'S RETIREMENT COSTS AS NEW EMPLOYEES COME INTO THE SYSTEM OVER TIME. IN BRIEF, THE CURRENT AND NEW PLAN BENEFITS COMPARE AS FOLLOWS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CURRENT GENERAL PLAN 5</th>
<th>NEW GENERAL PLAN 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BENEFIT FORMULA</td>
<td>2% AT AGE 57</td>
<td>1.67% AT AGE 57.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FINAL AVERAGE SALARY</td>
<td>1 OR 3 YEARS, DEPENDING ON TIER</td>
<td>3-YEAR AVERAGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEMBER CONTRIBUTIONS</td>
<td>HALF OR FULL RATES, DEPENDING ON TIER</td>
<td>HALF RATES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RETIREE COLA</td>
<td>3% MAXIMUM</td>
<td>2% MAXIMUM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEALTHCARE BENEFITS</td>
<td>$15/$4 PER MONTH/YEAR OF SERVICE</td>
<td>INELIGIBLE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The regular meeting of the Board of Trustees of the Mosquito and Vector Management District of Santa Barbara County was held at 2:00 PM, on Thursday, April 12th, 2012 at the Hope School Library, 3970 La Colina Road, Santa Barbara, CA.

1. **ROLL CALL.**

   **TRUSTEES PRESENT:**
   John Olson, Board President
   Susan Swarbrick, Vice-President
   Ron Hurd, Board Secretary
   Cathy Schlottmann
   Charles Blair
   Dan Eidelson (following Oath of Office)

   **TRUSTEES ABSENT:**
   Chris Pankau

   **IN ATTENDANCE:**
   Larry Fausett, General Manager
   Kenneth Learned, Operations Manager
   Jessica Sprigg, Administrative Assistant

2. **OATH OF OFFICE FOR A NEW TRUSTEE**

   -Board Secretary Hurd performed the Oath of Office recitation for returning Board member, Dan Eidelson.

3. **CONFIRMATION OF AGENDA**

   -No changes were requested.

4. **STAFF ANNOUNCEMENTS regarding District business.**

   -NONE.

5. **CORRESPONDENCE**

   -Letter from LAFCO announcing the recent appointments made.

6. **PUBLIC COMMENT.**

   -NONE.
7. **ITEMS OF GENERAL CONSENT.** The following items are approved by a single action of the Board. Items requiring additional discussion may be withdrawn from the listing and approved in a separate action.

   a. Approval of Minutes of the Regular Meeting held March 8th, 2012
   b. Approval of Financial Statements for County Fund 4160, for Mar. 2012
   c. Approval of the Warrant Register, for Mar. 2012

   -Secretary Hurd motioned to approve the Items of General Consent after discussion. Trustee Schlottmann seconded the motion and it passed with Trustee Eidelson abstaining from the March minutes since he was not present at that meeting.

8. **OLD BUSINESS**

   A. **FY 2012-2013 Budget Discussions**-Discuss upcoming budget year goals.

      1. NPDES Permitting and MVCAC Cost Share for Monitoring
      2. Health Benefit Premium Increases
      3. Increased Fuel Costs
      4. Strategic Plan
      5. Professional Services

   FY 2012-2013 Draft Budgetary Timeline:

   - March/April – SCI creates Engineer’s Reports
   - April 12 – Board review of draft budget and discussion of options
   - May 10 – Board approval of final budget document
     - Board considers Resolution declaring intent to levy benefit assessment
     - Board preliminary approval of Engineer’s Reports
   - June 14 – Publish notice of Public Hearing
   - July 12 – Public Hearing regarding intent to levy benefit assessment
     - Board approval of Resolution approving final Engineer’s Report and ordering levy of benefit assessment

   -Expenditures, or possible expenses, that are not in the draft budget include eight thousand in unfunded retiree medical benefits for the year, repair and replacement fund, grant to Mosquito Research Foundation, funds for SBCERS retiree medical benefits. Costs related to NPDES regulations and MVCAC cost sharing should be considered in budgeting the Special Departmental Expense.
District relocation, though tentative, is also an important consideration. SCI Consulting has indicated that the CPI increase is approximately one percent.

9. NEW BUSINESS

A. **Approval to Dispose of Surplus Equipment** - Authorize the sale of the 2002 Dodge Dakota truck that was replaced by the purchase of the Chevrolet Silverado. Authorize the District General Manager to sign necessary paperwork to allow purchaser to re-register the vehicle with the California Department of Motor Vehicles.

   - *Trustee Schlottmann motioned to authorize sale of the 2002 Dodge Dakota truck. Trustee Eidelson seconded and the motion passed unanimously.*

B. **Approval to Dispose of Surplus Equipment** - The District has a Phoenix ULV “Fogger” that was purchased in early 2003 for just over $10,000. It has a total of 1.6 hours of operations, all having been accumulated during the required annual calibration. The calibration process involves loading the machine in the back of one of our trucks and taking it to the Prado dam area for the “Calibration day”. This is a costly, time consuming process for a machine that is very unlikely that the District will ever use.

   - *Vice-President Swarbrick motioned to authorize General Manager Fausett to locate a buyer and report back to the Board. Trustee Schlottmann seconded and the motion passed unanimously.*

C. **Carpinteria-Summerland Fire-Protection District Memorandum of Understanding and Lease and Option Agreement** - These documents are included for informational purposes at the request of President Olson.

   - *Management and staff have located a building on Aero Camino that would suit the needs of the District. It is a one story cinder block building in close proximity to the SB Airport. The property is zoned for outside storage and consists of almost one acre of paved area. Radius Group represents the seller and has provided a figure of $1.9 million for purchase of the property. The previous property at Devereux that management was investigating is still available in the form of a 5 year lease which would be arranged on a year-by-year basis after the five year period. Management and the Board would prefer a longer term agreement or outright purchase.*

D. **Discussion and/or Approval to Provide a Grant to the Mosquito Research Foundation (MRF) as requested in Writing by MRF President.**

   - *The Mosquito Research Foundation is a group which has taken on the role of providing grants to researchers in the field of mosquitoes and mosquito-borne diseases. Vice-President Swarbrick expressed her desire for research of this type to work on additional bio-control agents and encourages District support of this group. Trustee Schlottmann motioned to include $4,500 in the budget for a grant to the Mosquito Research Foundation, with a final determination on its inclusion at the next meeting when the budget is finalized and adopted. Motion was seconded by Trustee Blair and passed unanimously.*
10. **MANAGER’S REPORT**

   -The City of Santa Barbara holds its appointment process biannually and the deadline for nominations is in early May.

11. **BOARD ANNOUNCEMENTS**

   - Trustee Blair announced that the April SBSDA meeting, to be held at the Glen Annie Golf Club, will feature Grant Hoag of Black & Veatch speaking about cost of service studies and the requirements for special district rate adjustments. The Southern California Vector Control Environmental Task Force held a conference call on March 20th and will be holding a forum in Los Angeles on the 3rd Tuesday of June. Trustee Blair also presented his poster entitled “Invasive Aquatic Weeds: Implications for Mosquito and Vector Management Activities” at the Western Aquatic Plant Management Society conference in San Diego.

12. **CLOSED SESSION**

    NONE.

13. **ADJOURNMENT**

    As there was no further business to be brought before the Board, the meeting was adjourned.

    I certify that the above minutes substantially reflect the actions of the Board:

    **BY:**

    John Olson
    Board President

    **APPROVED:**

    Ron Hurd
    Board Secretary
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### Fund 4160 -- Mosquito & Vector Mgt District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line Item Account</th>
<th>6/30/2012 Fiscal Year Adjusted Budget</th>
<th>4/30/2012 Fiscal Year Year-To-Date Actual</th>
<th>6/30/2012 Fiscal Year Variance</th>
<th>6/30/2012 Fiscal Year Pct of Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revenues</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Taxes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3010 -- Property Tax-Current Secured</td>
<td>315,000.00</td>
<td>303,747.74</td>
<td>-11,252.26</td>
<td>96.43 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3011 -- Property Tax-Unitary</td>
<td>4,700.00</td>
<td>4,656.86</td>
<td>-43.14</td>
<td>99.08 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3020 -- Property Tax-Current Unsecured</td>
<td>15,000.00</td>
<td>15,573.94</td>
<td>573.94</td>
<td>103.83 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3040 -- Property Tax-Prior Secured</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-1,470.04</td>
<td>-1,470.04</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3050 -- Property Tax-Prior Unsecured</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>210.02</td>
<td>210.02</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3054 -- Supplemental Pty Tax-Current</td>
<td>5,000.00</td>
<td>2,125.20</td>
<td>-2,874.80</td>
<td>42.50 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3056 -- Supplemental Pty Tax-Prior</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>158.08</td>
<td>158.08</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Taxes</strong></td>
<td>339,700.00</td>
<td>325,001.80</td>
<td>-14,698.20</td>
<td>95.67 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Use of Money and Property</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3380 -- Interest Income</td>
<td>5,000.00</td>
<td>2,840.18</td>
<td>-2,159.82</td>
<td>56.80 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3381 -- Unrealized Gain/Loss Invstmnts</td>
<td>1,104.00</td>
<td>-395.75</td>
<td>-1,499.75</td>
<td>-35.85 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Use of Money and Property</strong></td>
<td>6,104.00</td>
<td>2,444.43</td>
<td>-3,659.57</td>
<td>40.05 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intergovernmental Revenue-State</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4220 -- Homeowners Property Tax Relief</td>
<td>1,300.00</td>
<td>1,998.96</td>
<td>698.96</td>
<td>153.77 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intergovernmental Revenue-State</strong></td>
<td>1,300.00</td>
<td>1,998.96</td>
<td>698.96</td>
<td>153.77 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intergovernmental Revenue-Other</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4840 -- Other Governmental Agencies</td>
<td>4,000.00</td>
<td>4,913.56</td>
<td>913.56</td>
<td>122.84 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intergovernmental Revenue-Other</strong></td>
<td>4,000.00</td>
<td>4,913.56</td>
<td>913.56</td>
<td>122.84 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Charges for Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4877 -- Other Special Assessments</td>
<td>488,150.00</td>
<td>471,615.62</td>
<td>-16,534.38</td>
<td>96.61 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Charges for Services</strong></td>
<td>488,150.00</td>
<td>471,615.62</td>
<td>-16,534.38</td>
<td>96.61 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Miscellaneous Revenue</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5909 -- Other Miscellaneous Revenue</td>
<td>120,000.00</td>
<td>133,509.30</td>
<td>13,509.30</td>
<td>111.26 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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---

**Fund 4160 -- Mosquito & Vector Mgt District**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line Item Account</th>
<th>6/30/2012 Fiscal Year Adjusted Budget</th>
<th>4/30/2012 Year-To-Date Actual</th>
<th>6/30/2012 Fiscal Year Variance</th>
<th>6/30/2012 Fiscal Year Pct of Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous Revenue</td>
<td>120,000.00</td>
<td>133,509.30</td>
<td>13,509.30</td>
<td>111.26 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenues</td>
<td>959,254.00</td>
<td>939,483.67</td>
<td>-19,770.33</td>
<td>97.94 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Expenditures**

- **Salaries and Employee Benefits**
  - 6100 -- Regular Salaries: $415,402.41 (75.54%)
  - 6400 -- Retirement Contribution: $121,931.40 (67.16%)
  - 6500 -- FICA Contribution: $25,754.99 (75.37%)
  - 6550 -- FICA/Medicare: $6,000.00 (75.66%)
  - 6600 -- Health Insurance Contrib: $111,311.20 (73.09%)
  - 6700 -- Unemployment Ins Contribution: $2,000.00 (138.42%)

- **Services and Supplies**
  - 7030 -- Clothing and Personal: $5,000.00 (60.01%)
  - 7050 -- Communications: $8,500.00 (72.37%)
  - 7070 -- Household Expense: $3,500.00 (57.56%)
  - 7090 -- Insurance: $30,000.00 (111.27%)
  - 7120 -- Maintenance - Equipment: $11,000.00 (52.25%)
  - 7121 -- Operating Supplies: $8,000.00 (51.71%)
  - 7124 -- IT Software Maintenance: $2,200.00 (70.14%)
  - 7200 -- MTC-Struct/Impr & Grounds: $8,000.00 (28.49%)
  - 7400 -- Medical, Dental and Lab: $3,000.00 (63.45%)
  - 7430 -- Memberships: $11,500.00 (89.05%)
  - 7450 -- Office Expense: $8,500.00 (56.71%)
  - 7460 -- Professional & Special Service: $70,000.00 (74.31%)
  - 7506 -- Administration Fees: $0.00 (0.00%)
  - 7530 -- Publications & Legal Notices: $800.00 (0.00%)
  - 7630 -- Small Tools & Instruments: $1,250.00 (0.00%)

---

**Financial Status (Real-Time)**

- **As of:** 4/30/2012 (83% Elapsed)
- **Accounting Period:** OPEN
- **Selection Criteria:** Fund = 4160
- **Layout Options:** Summarized By = Fund, LineItemAccount; Page Break At = Fund

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line Item Account</th>
<th>6/30/2012 Fiscal Year Adjusted Budget</th>
<th>4/30/2012 Year-To-Date Actual</th>
<th>6/30/2012 Fiscal Year Variance</th>
<th>6/30/2012 Fiscal Year Pct of Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous Revenue</td>
<td>120,000.00</td>
<td>133,509.30</td>
<td>13,509.30</td>
<td>111.26 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenues</td>
<td>959,254.00</td>
<td>939,483.67</td>
<td>-19,770.33</td>
<td>97.94 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Expenditures**

- **Salaries and Employee Benefits**
  - 6100 -- Regular Salaries: $415,402.41 (75.54%)
  - 6400 -- Retirement Contribution: $121,931.40 (67.16%)
  - 6500 -- FICA Contribution: $25,754.99 (75.37%)
  - 6550 -- FICA/Medicare: $6,000.00 (75.66%)
  - 6600 -- Health Insurance Contrib: $111,311.20 (73.09%)
  - 6700 -- Unemployment Ins Contribution: $2,000.00 (138.42%)

- **Services and Supplies**
  - 7030 -- Clothing and Personal: $5,000.00 (60.01%)
  - 7050 -- Communications: $8,500.00 (72.37%)
  - 7070 -- Household Expense: $3,500.00 (57.56%)
  - 7090 -- Insurance: $30,000.00 (111.27%)
  - 7120 -- Maintenance - Equipment: $11,000.00 (52.25%)
  - 7121 -- Operating Supplies: $8,000.00 (51.71%)
  - 7124 -- IT Software Maintenance: $2,200.00 (70.14%)
  - 7200 -- MTC-Struct/Impr & Grounds: $8,000.00 (28.49%)
  - 7400 -- Medical, Dental and Lab: $3,000.00 (63.45%)
  - 7430 -- Memberships: $11,500.00 (89.05%)
  - 7450 -- Office Expense: $8,500.00 (56.71%)
  - 7460 -- Professional & Special Service: $70,000.00 (74.31%)
  - 7506 -- Administration Fees: $0.00 (0.00%)
  - 7530 -- Publications & Legal Notices: $800.00 (0.00%)
  - 7630 -- Small Tools & Instruments: $1,250.00 (0.00%)

---

**County of Santa Barbara, FIN**

**Last Updated:** 5/3/2012 2:06 PM
## Financial Status (Real-Time)

As of: 4/30/2012 (83% Elapsed)

**Accounting Period:** OPEN

**Selection Criteria:** Fund = 4160

**Layout Options:** Summarized By = Fund, LineItemAccount; Page Break At = Fund

### Fund 4160 -- Mosquito & Vector Mgt District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line Item Account</th>
<th>6/30/2012 Fiscal Year Adjusted Budget</th>
<th>4/30/2012 Year-To-Date Actual</th>
<th>6/30/2012 Fiscal Year Variance</th>
<th>6/30/2012 Fiscal Year Pct of Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7650 -- Special Departmental Expense</td>
<td>65,000.00</td>
<td>50,262.59</td>
<td>14,737.41</td>
<td>77.33 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7653 -- Training Fees &amp; Supplies</td>
<td>5,750.00</td>
<td>2,272.46</td>
<td>3,477.54</td>
<td>39.52 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7730 -- Transportation and Travel</td>
<td>15,000.00</td>
<td>8,850.31</td>
<td>6,149.69</td>
<td>59.00 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7731 -- Gasoline-Oil-Fuel</td>
<td>10,000.00</td>
<td>6,542.00</td>
<td>3,458.00</td>
<td>65.42 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7760 -- Utilities</td>
<td>4,500.00</td>
<td>3,004.47</td>
<td>1,495.53</td>
<td>66.77 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Services and Supplies</strong></td>
<td>271,500.00</td>
<td>198,170.82</td>
<td>73,329.18</td>
<td>72.99 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Capital Assets</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8200 -- Structures&amp;Struct Improvements</td>
<td>2,250.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2,250.00</td>
<td>0.00 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8300 -- Equipment</td>
<td>5,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>5,000.00</td>
<td>0.00 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Capital Assets</strong></td>
<td>7,250.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>7,250.00</td>
<td>0.00 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expenditures</strong></td>
<td>961,150.00</td>
<td>701,941.62</td>
<td>259,208.38</td>
<td>73.03 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Changes to Fund Balances

**Decrease to Restricted**

- 9797 -- Unrealized Gains
  - 6/30/2012 Actual: 718.00
  - 4/30/2012 Year-To-Date Actual: 717.29
  - Variance: -0.71
  - Pct of Budget: 99.90 %

**Increase to Restricted**

- 9797 -- Unrealized Gains
  - 6/30/2012: 322.00
  - 4/30/2012: 321.54
  - Variance: 0.46
  - Pct of Budget: 99.86 %

### Net Financial Impact

- Mosquito & Vector Mgt District: -1,500.00
- Net Financial Impact: -1,500.00

---

**County of Santa Barbara, FIN**

Last Updated: 5/3/2012 2:06 PM
# Cash Balances (Real-Time)

As of: 4/30/2012  
Accounting Period: OPEN

Selection Criteria: Fund = 4160-4164  
Layout Options: Summarized By = Fund; Page Break At = Fund

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund</th>
<th>4/1/2012 Beginning Balance</th>
<th>Month-To-Date Cash Receipts (+)</th>
<th>Month-To-Date Treasury Credits (+)</th>
<th>Month-To-Date Warrants and Wire Transfers (-)</th>
<th>Month-To-Date Treasury Debits (-)</th>
<th>4/30/2012 Ending Balance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4160 -- Mosquito &amp; Vector Mgt District</td>
<td>665,420.83</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>359,510.25</td>
<td>32,828.25</td>
<td>60,768.22</td>
<td>931,334.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4161 -- SB Vector-Cap Asset Reserve</td>
<td>315,956.79</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>469.23</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>316,426.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Report</td>
<td>981,377.62</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>359,979.48</td>
<td>32,828.25</td>
<td>60,768.22</td>
<td>1,247,760.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Vendor Disbursements (Real-Time)

**Selection Criteria:** Fund = 4160  
**Layout Options:** Summarized By = Fund, Vendor; Page Break At = Fund

#### Fund 4160 -- Mosquito & Vector Mgt District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disbursement</th>
<th>Disbursement Date</th>
<th>Dept</th>
<th>Purchase Order</th>
<th>Remit Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vendor 000129 -- South Coast Landscape</td>
<td>04/17/2012</td>
<td>880</td>
<td></td>
<td>Vendor Invoice #: 9365; Vendor Account: VECTOR</td>
<td>186.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total South Coast Landscape</td>
<td>186.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vendor 000887 -- Charles Blair</td>
<td>04/02/2012</td>
<td>880</td>
<td></td>
<td>REIMBURSE FOR SBCSDA MEETING</td>
<td>62.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total Charles Blair</td>
<td>62.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vendor 002786 -- ERLAB</td>
<td>04/05/2012</td>
<td>880</td>
<td></td>
<td>Vendor Invoice #: 14834; Vendor Account: MOSVEC</td>
<td>451.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total ERLAB</td>
<td>451.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vendor 004369 -- STATE DISBURSEMENT UNIT, CA</td>
<td>04/05/2012</td>
<td>880</td>
<td></td>
<td>Vendor Account: 004369</td>
<td>296.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>04/19/2012</td>
<td>880</td>
<td></td>
<td>Vendor Account: 004369</td>
<td>296.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total STATE DISBURSEMENT UNIT, CA</td>
<td>593.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vendor 006215 -- US BANK CORPORATE PAYMENT SYSTEM</td>
<td>04/10/2012</td>
<td>880</td>
<td></td>
<td>Vendor Account: 4246 0445 5565 2944</td>
<td>796.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total US BANK CORPORATE PAYMENT SYSTEM</td>
<td>796.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vendor 008116 -- HOWELL MOORE &amp; GOUGH LLP</td>
<td>04/17/2012</td>
<td>880</td>
<td></td>
<td>Vendor Invoice #: 30058; Vendor Account: 18472-0001</td>
<td>247.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total HOWELL MOORE &amp; GOUGH LLP</td>
<td>247.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vendor 009136 -- TECHEASE COMPUTER SOLUTIONS LLC</td>
<td>04/05/2012</td>
<td>880</td>
<td></td>
<td>Vendor Invoice #: 18460</td>
<td>223.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>04/17/2012</td>
<td>880</td>
<td></td>
<td>Vendor Invoice #: 18266</td>
<td>180.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>04/17/2012</td>
<td>880</td>
<td></td>
<td>Vendor Invoice #: 18572</td>
<td>120.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total TECHEASE COMPUTER SOLUTIONS LLC</td>
<td>523.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vendor 019355 -- JESSICA SPRIGG</td>
<td>04/17/2012</td>
<td>880</td>
<td></td>
<td>REIMBURSE FOR PEST CONTROL EXAM</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Vendor Disbursements (Real-Time)

**From 4/1/2012 to 4/30/2012**

Selection Criteria: Fund = 4160  
Layout Options: Summarized By = Fund, Vendor; Page Break At = Fund

### Fund 4160 -- Mosquito & Vector Mgt District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disbursement</th>
<th>Disbursement Date</th>
<th>Dept</th>
<th>Purchase Order</th>
<th>Remit Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vendor 032624 -- SANTA BARBARA ICE &amp; PROPANE</td>
<td>04/17/2012</td>
<td>880</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mosquito VECTOR Inv# 1158</td>
<td>218.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vendor 050379 -- ADP INC</td>
<td>04/06/2012</td>
<td>880</td>
<td>EFT</td>
<td>Vendor Account: 00070-E95101</td>
<td>167.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vendor 050379 -- ADP INC</td>
<td>04/18/2012</td>
<td>880</td>
<td>EFT</td>
<td>Vendor Invoice #: 164350; Vendor Account: 00070-E95101</td>
<td>172.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vendor 194683 -- Allied Administrators for Delta Dental</td>
<td>04/13/2012</td>
<td>880</td>
<td>Vendor Link</td>
<td>Vendor Account: 2501-1344</td>
<td>165.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vendor 244645 -- AFLAC</td>
<td>04/27/2012</td>
<td>880</td>
<td>W - 09521188</td>
<td>Vendor Invoice #: 199593; Vendor Account: BWN82</td>
<td>264.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vendor 252027 -- Educated Car Wash</td>
<td>04/17/2012</td>
<td>880</td>
<td>Vendor Link</td>
<td>Vendor Invoice #: 684684; Vendor Account: 3735023</td>
<td>14.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vendor 285433 -- Mission Uniform Service Inc</td>
<td>04/18/2012</td>
<td>880</td>
<td>Vendor Link</td>
<td>Vendor Account: SAP# 242387</td>
<td>402.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vendor 308867 -- VERIZON CALIFORNIA</td>
<td>04/17/2012</td>
<td>880</td>
<td>W - 09519803</td>
<td>Vendor Account: 01 1753 115555737906</td>
<td>366.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vendor 346888 -- CARRIE TROUP CPA</td>
<td>04/17/2012</td>
<td>880</td>
<td>Vendor Link</td>
<td>Vendor Invoice #: 0312V</td>
<td>1,325.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total**

- Total JESSICA SPRIGG: 100.00
- Total SANTA BARBARA ICE & PROPANE: 218.19
- Total ADP INC: 339.85
- Total Allied Administrators for Delta Dental: 165.48
- Total AFLAC: 264.30
- Total Educated Car Wash: 14.95
- Total Mission Uniform Service Inc: 402.25
- Total VERIZON CALIFORNIA: 366.20
- Total CARRIE TROUP CPA: 1,325.00
## Vendor Disbursements (Real-Time)

**Selection Criteria:** Fund = 4160  
**Layout Options:** Summarized By = Fund, Vendor; Page Break At = Fund

### Fund 4160 -- Mosquito & Vector Mgt District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disbursement</th>
<th>Disbursement Date</th>
<th>Dept</th>
<th>Purchase Order</th>
<th>Remit Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Vendor 522736 -- McCormix Corporation  
Vendor Link | 04/18/2012 | 880 |              | Vendor Account: C0478 | 1,071.69 |
| Total McCormix Corporation |          |     |               |                   | 1,071.69     |
| Vendor 548522 -- KENNEDYS AUTOMOTIVE CTR INC  
W - 09520100 | 04/18/2012 | 880 |              | Vendor Invoice #: 20840 | 69.76 |
| W - 09520100 | 04/18/2012 | 880 |              | Vendor Invoice #: 20848 | 64.05 |
| Total KENNEDYS AUTOMOTIVE CTR INC |          |     |               |                   | 133.81     |
| Vendor 551710 -- ADAPCO INC  
Vendor Link | 04/18/2012 | 880 |              | Vendor Invoice #: 87629; Vendor Account: 20205 | 4,172.08 |
| Total ADAPCO INC |          |     |               |                   | 4,172.08     |
| Vendor 556712 -- MONTECITO WATER DISTRICT  
Vendor Link | 04/13/2012 | 880 |              | Vendor Account: 20-1620-01 | 38.75 |
| Total MONTECITO WATER DISTRICT |          |     |               |                   | 38.75     |
| Vendor 710175 -- STATE/FEDERAL TAXES & DIRECT DEPOSITS  
EFT | 04/05/2012 | 880 |              | Vendor Account: 710175 | 16,213.28 |
| EFT | 04/19/2012 | 880 |              | Vendor Account: 710175 | 15,681.58 |
| Total STATE/FEDERAL TAXES & DIRECT DEPOSITS |          |     |               |                   | 31,894.86 |
| Vendor 740582 -- SERVICEMASTER OF SANTA BARBARA  
W - 09519804 | 04/17/2012 | 880 |              | Vendor Invoice #: 414831; Vendor Account: VE603 | 180.00 |
| Total SERVICEMASTER OF SANTA BARBARA |          |     |               |                   | 180.00     |
| Vendor 767200 -- SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON  
Vendor Link | 04/06/2012 | 880 |              | Vendor Account: 2-03-674-6246 | 132.78 |
| Total SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON |          |     |               |                   | 132.78     |
| Vendor 767800 -- THE GAS COMPANY  
Vendor Link | 04/17/2012 | 880 |              | Vendor Account: 067 514 4833 0 | 37.35 |
| Total THE GAS COMPANY |          |     |               |                   | 37.35     |
Vendor Disbursements (Real-Time)

Selection Criteria: Fund = 4160
Layout Options: Summarized By = Fund, Vendor; Page Break At = Fund

Fund 4160 -- Mosquito & Vector Mgt District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disbursement</th>
<th>Disbursement Date</th>
<th>Dept</th>
<th>Purchase Order</th>
<th>Remit Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vendor 778083 -- STAPLES CREDIT PLAN</td>
<td>04/17/2012</td>
<td>880</td>
<td></td>
<td>Vendor Account: 6035 5178 2032 6543</td>
<td>207.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vendor 849629 -- VECTOR CONTROL JOINT POWERS AGENCY</td>
<td>04/17/2012</td>
<td>880</td>
<td></td>
<td>Vendor Invoice #: VCJPA-2012-091; Vendor Account: SAN003</td>
<td>93.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total STAPLES CREDIT PLAN 207.93
Total VECTOR CONTROL JOINT POWERS AGENCY 93.45
Total Mosquito & Vector Mgt District 44,019.95
**CORPORATE ACCOUNT SUMMARY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MVM DISTRICT</th>
<th>Previous Balance</th>
<th>Purchase And Other Charges</th>
<th>Cash Advances</th>
<th>Late Payment Charges</th>
<th>Credits</th>
<th>Payments</th>
<th>New Balance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Company Total</td>
<td>$4,183.30</td>
<td>$633.99</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$28.55</td>
<td>$798.88</td>
<td>$3,991.86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CORPORATE ACCOUNT ACTIVITY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MVM DISTRICT</th>
<th>TOTAL CORPORATE ACTIVITY</th>
<th>$798.88 CR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Post Date</th>
<th>Tran Date</th>
<th>Reference Number</th>
<th>Transaction Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>04-11</td>
<td>04-11</td>
<td>747962621020000000038</td>
<td>PAYMENT - 384509 00000 A</td>
<td>798.88 PY</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NEW ACTIVITY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KENNETH W LEARNED</th>
<th>CREDITS</th>
<th>PURCHASES</th>
<th>CASH ADV</th>
<th>TOTAL ACTIVITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$345.11</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$345.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Post Date</th>
<th>Tran Date</th>
<th>Reference Number</th>
<th>Transaction Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>03-26</td>
<td>03-21</td>
<td>24299120082002473268326</td>
<td>USA PETROLEUM 68224 THOUSAND OAKS CA</td>
<td>88.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03-26</td>
<td>03-26</td>
<td>2407105200078977175914257</td>
<td>LA CUMBRE FEED SANTA BARBARA CA</td>
<td>120.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04-13</td>
<td>04-11</td>
<td>2463622321103900014500123</td>
<td>ISLAND SEED &amp; FEED, INC GOLETA CA</td>
<td>128.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CUSTOMER SERVICE CALL**

800-344-5696

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACCOUNT NUMBER</th>
<th>ACCOUNT SUMMARY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PREVIOUS BALANCE</td>
<td>4,183.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PURCHASES &amp; OTHER CHARGES</td>
<td>633.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATEMENT DATE</td>
<td>04/23/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CASH ADV</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CASH ADVANCE FEES</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LATE PAYMENT CHARGES</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CREDITS</td>
<td>28.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAYMENTS</td>
<td>798.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMOUNT DUE</td>
<td>3,991.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCOUNT BALANCE</td>
<td>3,991.86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### NEW ACTIVITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Post Date</th>
<th>Tran Date</th>
<th>Reference Number</th>
<th>Transaction Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>03-23</td>
<td>03-21</td>
<td>74071052082987115091299</td>
<td>LA CUMBRE FEED SANTA BARBARA CA</td>
<td>28.55CR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04-02</td>
<td>03-30</td>
<td>24692162090089993101932</td>
<td>ACT*COMMENVIRONCOUNCIL 877-551-5560 CA</td>
<td>155.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04-09</td>
<td>04-05</td>
<td>24761972097116909010099</td>
<td>BOOT BARN #2 IRVINE CA</td>
<td>101.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04-05</td>
<td>04-03</td>
<td>243877520950040503444955</td>
<td>ORCHARD SUPPLY #560 GOLETA CA</td>
<td>32.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Department: 00000 Total: $905.44
Division: 00000 Total: $905.44
West Nile Virus Activity
No West Nile Virus (WNV) activity has been reported from Santa Barbara County in 2012 to date. However, four dead wild birds, one each from Los Angeles, Sacramento, Contra Costa, and Santa Clara Counties, have tested positive for WNV. Additionally, one mosquito pool from Riverside County near the Salton Sea has tested positive for WNV.

Statistics for California WNV activity in can be found online at www.westnile.ca.gov. National statistics for WNV can be found at the National Centers for Disease Control and Prevention website at www.cdc.gov.

West Nile Virus Dead Bird and Squirrel Submissions
The District submitted one dead bird in April 2012, a Crow from Montecito. The Crow tested negative for WNV.

The dead birds are submitted to the California Animal Health and Food Safety Laboratory at Davis, California to be analyzed for the presence of West Nile Virus. The District and other agencies submit dead birds that are found by citizens who report them to the California Department of Public Health’s (DPH) toll free West Nile Virus Dead Bird Hotline (1-877-968-2473 or 1-877-WNV-BIRD) or online at www.westnile.ca.gov. The District cannot submit dead birds or squirrels without the DPH’s approval.

Live Mosquito-Borne Virus Surveillance
The District conducted 7 live mosquito trapping surveys in April 2012. Even with the late winter storms of March and April, mosquito population numbers have been low to this point, probably attributable to the cool, dry weather of December, January, and February. The results of the surveys are listed in the table below. The District has submitted 15 mosquito pools to be analyzed for mosquito-borne viruses in 2012 to date. The results are pending.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>NUMBER of MOSQUITOES</th>
<th>NUMBER of TRAPS</th>
<th>MOSQUITOES PER TRAP NIGHT*</th>
<th>POOLS SUBMITTED</th>
<th>RESULT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>El Estero Wastewater Plant, S. Barbara</td>
<td>4/3-4/12</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCSB/ Santa Barbara Airport Bluffs</td>
<td>4/9-10/12</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chumash Park, Pismo Beach</td>
<td>4/17-18/12</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pismo Ecol. Reserve, Pismo State Beach</td>
<td>4/17-18/12</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Beach Campg., Pismo State Beach</td>
<td>4/17-18/12</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceano Campground, Pismo State Beach</td>
<td>4/17-18/12</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Los Carneros, Goleta</td>
<td>4/24-25/12</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Pending</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Mosquitoes Per Trap Night = Number of Mosquitoes ÷ (Number of Traps x 1 Night)
This surveillance technique utilizes battery-powered traps that use dry ice as a source of carbon dioxide to attract adult female mosquitoes that are actively seeking a blood meal. The live female mosquitoes are taken into the District’s laboratory where they are anesthetized with triethylamine under the fume hood. They are then separated by species using a stereo zoom microscope and placed into “pools.” The pools (1 pool = up to 50 adult female mosquitoes of a single species collected at one place at one time) are stored in the District’s ultra-low temperature freezer at -70°C until they can be submitted to the U.C. Davis Center for Vector-Borne Diseases at Davis, California where they are analyzed for the presence of live mosquito-borne viruses including WNV.

**Sentinel Chicken Flocks**

District personnel have been obtaining blood samples from all 5 of the District’s flocks every two weeks. All samples tested to date have been negative for WNV and other mosquito-borne viruses.

Samples of blood are collected from each chicken on strips of filter paper and dried overnight. They are then submitted to the California Department of Public Health Vector-Borne Disease Laboratory at Richmond, California where they are analyzed for antibodies to WNV and other mosquito-borne viruses.

---

**COASTAL MALARIA MOSQUITO (Anopheles hermsi)**

Adult Female

This mosquito species is very common in Santa Barbara County and is found abundantly in marshes and slow-moving creeks. This specimen was collected in a recent trapping survey at Lake Los Carneros, Goleta. The Coastal Malaria Mosquito is a potential vector of Malaria of humans. They can cause an outbreak of the disease in the local area by feeding upon people in the local area who have acquired Malaria infections elsewhere.
## Report of District Operations - April 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Mosquito Inspection Hours</th>
<th>Mosquito Treatment Hours</th>
<th>Mosquito Service Requests</th>
<th>Mosquitofish Requests</th>
<th>Standing Water Reports</th>
<th>Bees &amp; Wasps Inspection Hours</th>
<th>Bees &amp; Wasps Treatment Hours</th>
<th>Bees &amp; Wasps Service Requests</th>
<th>Rats &amp; Mice Inspection Hours</th>
<th>Rats &amp; Mice Treatment Hours</th>
<th>Rats &amp; Mice Service Requests</th>
<th>Surveillance Inspection Hours</th>
<th>Surveillance Treatment Hours</th>
<th>Surveillance Service Requests</th>
<th>Other WNV Bird</th>
<th>Mosquitofish Requests</th>
<th>Mosquito Pools</th>
<th>Green Pools</th>
<th>Ticks, etc.</th>
<th>Total hours devoted to zone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Goleta</td>
<td>43.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>65.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>210.5</td>
<td>794.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goleta Valley</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>57.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>57.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rancho Embarcadero</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>57.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isla Vista</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCSB</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>86.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hope Ranch</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hidden Valley</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Santa Barbara</td>
<td>58.0</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>86.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission Canyon</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montecito</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summerland</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Carpinteria</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpinteria Valley</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpinteria Salt Marsh</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South County</td>
<td>200.5</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>282.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year to Date</td>
<td>713.5</td>
<td>214.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>193.5</td>
<td>47.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1251.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Total Inspection Hours
- This Month: 210.5
- Year to Date: 794.5

### Total Treatment Hours
- This Month: 34.5
- Year to Date: 339.0

### Total Mileage
- This Month: 4,093.0
- Year to Date: 14,196.0
### Mosquito & Vector Management District

**Budget Worksheet 2012/2013**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line Item Account</th>
<th>6/30/2009 Year-To-Date Actual</th>
<th>6/30/2010 Year-To-Date Actual</th>
<th>6/30/2011 Year-To-Date Actual</th>
<th>6/30/12 Projected Based on Actual</th>
<th>2012/2013 Proposed Budget (based on actual)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revenues</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Taxes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3010 -- Property Tax-Current Secured</td>
<td>302,837.87</td>
<td>308,915.54</td>
<td>311,306.79</td>
<td>343,863.96</td>
<td>315,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3011 -- Property Tax-Unitary</td>
<td>4,713.68</td>
<td>4,386.73</td>
<td>4,308.97</td>
<td>4,789.82</td>
<td>4,400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3020 -- Property Tax-Current Unsecd</td>
<td>14,794.53</td>
<td>15,813.40</td>
<td>15,456.02</td>
<td>15,147.00</td>
<td>16,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3040 -- Property Tax-Prior Secured</td>
<td>-132.90</td>
<td>-1,404.40</td>
<td>-103.31</td>
<td>(925.40)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3050 -- Property Tax-Prior Unsecured</td>
<td>49.02</td>
<td>1,433.42</td>
<td>231.72</td>
<td>420.04</td>
<td>250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3054 -- Supplemental Pty Tax-Current</td>
<td>6,962.62</td>
<td>3,540.48</td>
<td>4,731.66</td>
<td>2,973.28</td>
<td>5,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3056 -- Supplemental Pty Tax-Prior</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-2.56</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxes</td>
<td>329,224.82</td>
<td>332,660.93</td>
<td>335,929.29</td>
<td>366,607.28</td>
<td>340,650.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Use of Money and Property** |                               |                               |                               |                                   |                                             |
| 3380 -- Interest Income | 15,473.87 | 7,390.13 | 5,683.34 | 2,685.63 | 2,000.00 |
| 3381 -- Unrealized Gain/Loss Invstmnts | 4,581.73 | -1,246.88 | -2,548.30 | 241.13 | 250.00 |
| Use of Money and Property | 20,055.60 | 6,143.25 | 3,135.04 | 2,926.76 | 2,250.00 |

| **Intergovernmental Revenue-State** |                               |                               |                               |                                   |                                             |
| 4220 -- Homeowners Property Tax Relief | 2,505.22 | 2,341.94 | 2,414.36 | 2,351.72 | 2,000.00 |
| Intergovernmental Revenue-State | 2,505.22 | 2,341.94 | 2,414.36 | 2,351.72 | 2,000.00 |

| **Intergovernmental Revenue-Federal** |                               |                               |                               |                                   |                                             |
| 4690 -- Payments In Lieu of Taxes | 43.25 | 42.17 | 40.10 | - | - |
| Intergovernmental Revenue-Federal | 43.25 | 42.17 | 40.10 | - | - |

| **Intergovernmental Revenue-Other** |                               |                               |                               |                                   |                                             |
| 4840 -- Other Governmental Agencies | 8,700.20 | 9,357.86 | 9,026.41 | 7,371.08 | - |
| Intergovernmental Revenue-Other | 8,700.20 | 9,357.86 | 9,026.41 | 7,371.08 | - |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Charges for Services</strong></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>Projected based on actual</td>
<td>Proposed Budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4877 -- Other Special Assessments</td>
<td>396,035.87</td>
<td>453,813.76</td>
<td>462,895.47</td>
<td>490,000.00</td>
<td>488,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charges for Services</td>
<td>396,035.87</td>
<td>453,813.76</td>
<td>462,895.47</td>
<td>490,000.00</td>
<td>488,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Miscellaneous Revenue</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5909 -- Other Miscellaneous</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>47,247.20</td>
<td>60,963.56</td>
<td>117,467.20</td>
<td>158,509.00</td>
<td>134,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous Revenue</td>
<td>47,247.20</td>
<td>60,963.56</td>
<td>117,467.20</td>
<td>158,509.00</td>
<td>134,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revenues</strong></td>
<td>803,812.16</td>
<td>865,323.47</td>
<td>930,907.87</td>
<td>1,027,765.84</td>
<td>966,900.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expenditures</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Salaries and Employee Benefits</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6100 -- Regular Salaries</td>
<td>341,000.58</td>
<td>375,604.31</td>
<td>402,054.06</td>
<td>377,513.31</td>
<td>410,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6400 -- Retirement Contribution</td>
<td>63,390.64</td>
<td>77,447.78</td>
<td>104,614.44</td>
<td>113,100.00</td>
<td>123,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6475 -- Retiree Medical OPEB</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8,000.00</td>
<td>8,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6500 -- FICA Contribution</td>
<td>21,130.56</td>
<td>23,127.35</td>
<td>24,648.85</td>
<td>23,417.33</td>
<td>25,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6550 -- FICA/Medicare</td>
<td>4,990.66</td>
<td>5,408.81</td>
<td>5,764.64</td>
<td>5,476.61</td>
<td>6,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6600 -- Health Insurance Contrib</td>
<td>62,336.65</td>
<td>82,381.85</td>
<td>89,054.14</td>
<td>112,319.65</td>
<td>112,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6700 -- Unemployment Ins Contribution</td>
<td>1,766.79</td>
<td>1,446.61</td>
<td>2,886.10</td>
<td>3,797.94</td>
<td>3,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries and Employee Benefits</td>
<td>494,615.88</td>
<td>565,416.71</td>
<td>629,022.23</td>
<td>643,624.84</td>
<td>688,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Services and Supplies</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7030 -- Clothing and Personal</td>
<td>3,294.31</td>
<td>3,413.05</td>
<td>6,311.84</td>
<td>3,414.21</td>
<td>5,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7050 -- Communications</td>
<td>7,721.41</td>
<td>7,771.23</td>
<td>8,720.54</td>
<td>8,361.85</td>
<td>7,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7070 -- Household Expense</td>
<td>2,160.00</td>
<td>3,130.46</td>
<td>2,464.98</td>
<td>3,481.99</td>
<td>3,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7090 -- Insurance</td>
<td>19,841.00</td>
<td>27,685.00</td>
<td>29,210.00</td>
<td>33,288.90</td>
<td>36,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7120 -- Maintenance - Equipment</td>
<td>6,620.75</td>
<td>11,930.79</td>
<td>9,832.64</td>
<td>8,399.67</td>
<td>8,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7121 -- Operating Supplies</td>
<td>5,450.36</td>
<td>7,211.41</td>
<td>7,590.78</td>
<td>7,333.00</td>
<td>8,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7124 -- IT Software Maintenance</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,530.15</td>
<td>1,300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7200 -- MTC-Struct/Impr &amp; Grounds</td>
<td>20,961.00</td>
<td>1,970.01</td>
<td>4,735.70</td>
<td>4,861.00</td>
<td>5,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7400 -- Medical, Dental and Lab</td>
<td>3,934.69</td>
<td>3,270.65</td>
<td>4,314.63</td>
<td>2,528.02</td>
<td>3,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7430 -- Memberships</td>
<td>7,650.04</td>
<td>6,460.46</td>
<td>7,627.55</td>
<td>9,244.00</td>
<td>10,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7450 -- Office Expense</td>
<td>7,177.66</td>
<td>8,112.30</td>
<td>8,638.73</td>
<td>7,785.00</td>
<td>8,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7460 -- Professional &amp; Special</td>
<td>53,111.96</td>
<td>43,952.91</td>
<td>47,762.63</td>
<td>65,502.04</td>
<td>68,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line Item Account</th>
<th>6/30/2009 Year-To-Date Actual</th>
<th>6/30/2010 Year-To-Date Actual</th>
<th>6/30/2011 Year-To-Date Actual</th>
<th>6/30/12 Projected based on actual</th>
<th>2012/2013 Proposed Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7506 -- Administration Fees</td>
<td>5,473.38</td>
<td>4,629.00</td>
<td>12,355.26</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7530 -- Publications &amp; Legal Notices</td>
<td>500.00</td>
<td>200.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7540 -- Rents/Leases-Equipment</td>
<td>200.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7650 -- Special Departmental Expense</td>
<td>37,174.72</td>
<td>43,336.93</td>
<td>112,133.80</td>
<td>73,142.00</td>
<td>77,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7653 -- Training Fees &amp; Supplies</td>
<td>2,509.93</td>
<td>3,969.07</td>
<td>6,912.92</td>
<td>3,165.71</td>
<td>4,100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7730 -- Transportation and Travel</td>
<td>7,350.16</td>
<td>8,733.02</td>
<td>20,187.27</td>
<td>8,573.61</td>
<td>14,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7731 -- Gasoline-Oil-Fuel</td>
<td>9,112.52</td>
<td>11,844.15</td>
<td>10,358.05</td>
<td>11,170.27</td>
<td>14,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7760 -- Utilities</td>
<td>4,216.64</td>
<td>4,013.98</td>
<td>3,799.07</td>
<td>3,654.86</td>
<td>4,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services and Supplies</td>
<td>204,460.53</td>
<td>201,634.42</td>
<td>302,956.39</td>
<td>255,436.28</td>
<td>278,900.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Capital Assets</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>266,250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8300 -- Equipment</td>
<td>11,373.87</td>
<td>61,052.20</td>
<td>1,479.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Assets</td>
<td>11,373.87</td>
<td>61,052.20</td>
<td>1,479.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditures</td>
<td>710,450.28</td>
<td>828,103.33</td>
<td>933,457.62</td>
<td>899,061.13</td>
<td>966,900.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9797 -- Unrealized Gains</td>
<td>-62,157.37</td>
<td>1,246.88</td>
<td>1,836.30</td>
<td>(241.13)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mosquito &amp; Vector Mgt District</td>
<td>31,204.51</td>
<td>43,536.56</td>
<td>-713.45</td>
<td>128,463.58</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Financial Impact</td>
<td>31,204.51</td>
<td>43,536.56</td>
<td>-713.45</td>
<td>128,463.58</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
STAFF REPORT

DATE: May 10, 2012

TO: The Board of Trustees

FROM: Larry Fausett, General Manager

SUBJECT: Resolution 12-01 declaring the Intention to Continue Assessments, Preliminarily Approving Engineer’s Report, and Providing for Notice of Hearing on July 12, 2012 for Fiscal Year 2012-13 for the Mosquito and Vector Management District of Santa Barbara County for Service Zone 1

Resolution 12-02 declaring the Intention to Continue Assessments, Preliminarily Approving Engineer’s Report, and Providing for Notice of Hearing on July 12, 2012 for Fiscal Year 2012-13 for the Mosquito and Vector Management District of Santa Barbara County for Service Zone 2

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Board approve Resolutions that would declare the Board’s intention to continue assessments for fiscal year 2012-13, preliminarily approve the Engineer’s Report and provide for the notice of a public hearing on July 12, 2012 for fiscal year 2012-13 for the Mosquito and Vector Management District of Santa Barbara County for Service Zone 1 and Service Zone 2.

RESULT OF RECOMMENDED ACTION

The Board will declare its intention to levy the continued assessments for fiscal year 2012-13, will preliminarily approve the Engineer’s Report, including the proposed rates included in the Engineer’s Report for the Mosquito and Vector Management District of Santa Barbara County (Service Zone 1 and 2). The Engineer will administer and process the current parcel data to establish continued assessments for each parcel in the assessment district boundaries. The Engineer will cause a Notice to be published in a local newspaper in order to notify the public of the hearing that will be held on July 12, 2012 for the continued levy of the assessments.

BACKGROUND

Since the early 1990’s, the Mosquito and Vector Management District of Santa Barbara County (“District”) has been responsible for Enhanced Vector Control Services for the City of Goleta, the City of Santa Barbara Municipal Airport, and most of the unincorporated territory of the Goleta Valley including the communities of Hope Ranch and Isla Vista, which are all included in Service Zone No. 1 (Goleta area) & Service Zone No. 2 (Carpinteria area), including the City of Carpinteria and the Carpinteria Valley.

In order to allow property owners to ultimately decide whether the District should extend its Service Zone No. 1 to include the unincorporated areas of Montecito, Mission Canyon, Summerland, Hidden Valley, and the Goleta and Carpinteria foothills in southern Santa Barbara County as well as to the non-serviced portions of the City of Santa Barbara, the Board, on January 29, 2004, authorized the initiation of proceedings for a benefit assessment. This new area is referred to as the “Service Zone No. 1 Extension 1” or the “Extension Areas.”

- Balloting Conducted: February to April, 2004
- Ballot Results: 65.1% of the weighted returned ballots were in support of the proposed assessment
- Board Approval of 1st Year Assessment Levies (Extension Areas): May 13, 2004
- Service Zone 1 Fiscal Year 1996 Approved Rate: $6.17 per single family equivalent benefit unit (SFE)
- Service Zone 1 Fiscal Year 2004-05 Approved Rate (Extension Areas): $6.17 per single family equivalent benefit unit (SFE)
• **Service Zone 1 Fiscal Year 2011-12 Approved Rate**: $8.58 per single family equivalent benefit unit (SFE)

• **Service Zone 1 Annual CPI**: In each subsequent year, the maximum assessment rate increases by the annual change in the Consumer Price Index, not to exceed $20.00 per single family equivalent benefit unit (SFE)

• **Service Zone 2 Rate Established in 1996**: $7.91 per single family equivalent benefit unit (SFE)

• **Service Zone 1 Fiscal Year 2011-12 Approved Rate**: $8.58 per single family equivalent benefit unit (SFE)

• **Service Zone 2 Annual CPI**: The maximum assessment rate is not to exceed $16.00 per single family equivalent benefit unit (SFE)

SCI Consulting Group prepared the Engineer’s Report that includes the special and general benefits from the assessments, the proposed budget for the assessments for fiscal year 2012-13, the updated proposed assessments for each parcel in the District, and the proposed assessments per single family equivalent benefit unit for the fiscal year. At the May 10, 2012 Board meeting, the Board will review the Engineer’s Report and adopt a resolution to declare its intention to continue the assessments, preliminarily approve the Engineer’s Report, and provide for notice of the annual public hearing for Service Zone 1 and Service Zone 2.

Each year, in order to continue to levy the assessments for the coming fiscal year, the Board conducts a noticed public hearing and receives public input on the proposed assessments and the services that they would fund. After hearing the public testimony, the Board may take final action on setting the assessment rate, establishing the services and improvements to be funded and ordering the levy of the continued assessments for fiscal year 2012-13.

**PROPOSED RATE AND CPI HISTORY**

The assessments can be continued annually and can be increased by the change in the Los Angeles-Riverside-Orange County Consumer Price Index. The following table summarizes the CPI history and the rates assessed:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>LA Area CPI</th>
<th>CPI Increase</th>
<th>Zone 1 Rate/SFE</th>
<th>Zone 2 Rate/SFE</th>
<th>Annual Revenues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY 04-05</td>
<td>1.75%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>$6.17</td>
<td>$7.91</td>
<td>$239,860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 05-06</td>
<td>4.02%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>$6.17</td>
<td>$7.91</td>
<td>$351,334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 06-07</td>
<td>4.67%</td>
<td>4.70%</td>
<td>$6.46</td>
<td>$7.91</td>
<td>$373,015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY07-08</td>
<td>3.84%</td>
<td>3.25%</td>
<td>$6.67</td>
<td>$7.91</td>
<td>$383,731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 08-09</td>
<td>3.28%</td>
<td>3.30%</td>
<td>$6.89</td>
<td>$7.91</td>
<td>$396,393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 09-10</td>
<td>-1.00%</td>
<td>15.97%</td>
<td>$7.99</td>
<td>$7.99</td>
<td>$454,010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 10-11</td>
<td>1.86%</td>
<td>5.41%</td>
<td>$8.14</td>
<td>$8.14</td>
<td>$463,117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 11-12</td>
<td>3.00%</td>
<td>3.00%</td>
<td>$8.58</td>
<td>$8.58</td>
<td>$488,129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 12-13</td>
<td>2.02%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>$8.58</td>
<td>$8.58</td>
<td>$489,028</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A comparison of potential assessment rates and revenues is depicted in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed % Increase</th>
<th>Proposed Rate per SFE</th>
<th>Increase per SFE</th>
<th>Total Revenue</th>
<th>Increased Revenue to District</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.00%</td>
<td>$8.75</td>
<td>$0.17</td>
<td>$498,808</td>
<td>$9,780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00%</td>
<td>$8.84</td>
<td>$0.26</td>
<td>$503,699</td>
<td>$14,671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.00%</td>
<td>$8.92</td>
<td>$0.34</td>
<td>$508,589</td>
<td>$19,561</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# PROPOSED FY 2012-13 BUDGET, SERVICES & IMPROVEMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary of revenue and total cost</th>
<th>FY 2012-13</th>
<th>FY 2011-12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>$967,928</td>
<td>$956,829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costs:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services</td>
<td>$966,900</td>
<td>$1,032,948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incidentals</td>
<td>$490,056</td>
<td>$412,010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Services to be performed by the Mosquito and Vector Management District this fiscal year include:

- Mosquito control
- Rodent inspections and source reduction
- Bee Inspections
- Enhanced Disease Surveillance
- Door-to-door mosquito inspections
- Mosquitofish for backyard fish ponds
- Public education outreach

Respectfully submitted,
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Larry Fausett  
General Manager
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INTRODUCTION

ASSESSMENT BACKGROUND

Since the early 1990’s, the Mosquito and Vector Management District of Santa Barbara County ("District") has been responsible for Enhanced Vector Control Services for the City of Goleta, the City of Santa Barbara Municipal Airport, and most of the unincorporated territory of the Goleta Valley including the communities of Hope Ranch, and Isla Vista, which are all included in Service Zone No. 1 (Goleta area) & Service Zone No. 2 (Carpinteria area), including the City of Carpinteria and the Carpinteria Valley.

In order to allow property owners to ultimately decide whether the District should extend its Service Zone No. 1 to include the unincorporated areas of Montecito, Mission Canyon, Summerland, Hidden Valley, and the Goleta and Carpinteria Foothills in southern Santa Barbara County as well as to the non-serviced portions of the City of Santa Barbara, the Board, on January 29, 2004, authorized the initiation of proceedings for a benefit assessment. This new area is referred to as the “Service Zone No. 1 Extension 1” or the “Extension Areas.” The “Extension Areas” were narrowly drawn to include sections of Santa Barbara County not previously within the District boundaries. The Extension Areas included only properties that, upon approval of the assessment, may request and receive direct service, that are located within the scope of the vector surveillance area, that are located within flying or traveling distance of mosquitoes from potential vector sources monitored by the District, and that will benefit from a reduction in the amount of mosquitoes and vectors reaching and impacting the property and its residents as a result of the vector surveillance and control. The Assessment Diagram included in this report shows the boundaries of the Extension Areas.¹

ASSESSMENT PROCESS

In February through April of 2004, the District conducted an assessment ballot proceeding pursuant to the requirements of Article XIIID of the California Constitution ("The Taxpayer's Right to Vote on Taxes Act") and the Government Code to provide funding for mosquito control services in the Extension Areas. During this ballot proceeding, owners of property in the District were provided with a notice and ballot for the proposed special assessment. A 45-day period was provided for balloting and a public hearing was conducted on April 12, 2004.

To allow for tabulation of ballots, a continuation of the public hearing was held on May 13, 2004, at which it was determined that 65.1% of the weighted ballots returned were in support of the

¹ Note that the assessment area boundaries have been drawn narrowly to include lands and property in the more populated areas of the County that previously did not receive mosquito control and vector-borne disease prevention services. Other lands in Santa Barbara County that mainly are in the northern and western portions of the County were not included because these excluded areas have a very low population and consequently would receive lower benefit to property from mosquito and disease prevention services.
assessment. Since the assessment ballots submitted in opposition to the proposed assessments did not exceed the assessment ballots submitted in favor of the assessments (with each ballot weighted by the proportional financial obligation of the property for which ballot was submitted), the District gained the authority to approve the levy of the assessments for fiscal year 2004-05 and to continue to levy them in future years. The Board took action, by Resolution No. 04-05, on May 13, 2004, to approve the levy of the assessments. The “Extension Areas” are now part of Service Zone 1. Service Zone 1 and Service Zone 2 are herewith referred to collectively as the “Service Areas” or the “Service Zones.”

Prior to the assessment ballot proceeding, neither the District, nor any other public agency, provided mosquito control and vector-borne disease protection and prevention services in the populated areas in Santa Barbara County that were outside of the District’s jurisdictional boundaries (the “Extension Areas.”) In other words, the “baseline” level of services in Santa Barbara County (in the areas that were outside the District’s boundaries) was essentially zero.

ENGINEER'S REPORT AND CONTINUATION OF ASSESSMENTS
This Engineer’s Report ("Report") was prepared by SCI Consulting Group to describe the vector control services to be funded by the proposed 2012-13 assessment, to establish the estimated costs for the continued mosquito, vector, disease surveillance and control services, supplies, equipment, facilities and related costs, determine the special benefits and general benefits received by property within the Service Zones from the services by the District, and to apportion the assessments to lots and parcels within the District’s Service Areas based on the estimated special benefit each parcel receives from the services funded by the benefit assessment.

If the Board approves this Engineer’s Report and the continuation of assessments it establishes for fiscal year 2012-13, the assessments will be submitted to the County Auditor for inclusion on the property tax rolls for fiscal year 2012-13. The assessments for Service Zone 1 may be continued in future years and may be increased in future years by an annual adjustment tied to the Consumer Price Index for the Los Angeles-Riverside-Orange County Area, with a maximum annual assessment rate not to exceed $20.00 per benefit unit, as established by Resolution 96-01 by the District Board of Trustees of the Goleta Valley Vector Control District in May, 1996. The assessment for Service Zone 2 is not subject to a CPI limitation. However, the maximum assessment rate may not exceed $16.00 per benefit unit, as established by Resolution 96-01 by the District Board of Trustees of the Carpinteria Mosquito Abatement District in June, 1996. The procedures for continuation of the assessments in future years commence with the creation of a budget for the upcoming fiscal year’s costs and services, an updated assessment roll listing all parcels and their proposed assessments for the upcoming fiscal year and the preparation of an updated Engineer’s Report. After these documents are prepared and submitted, they could be reviewed and preliminarily approved by the District Board of Trustees at a public meeting. At this meeting, the Board could also call for the publication in a local newspaper of the intent to continue the assessment and set the date for a noticed public hearing. At the annual public hearing, members of the public may provide input to the
Board prior to the Board’s decision on continuing the services and assessments for the next fiscal year.

**District Overview**

Previously known as the Santa Barbara Coastal Vector Control District, in 2006 the District adopted its new name of “Mosquito and Vector Management District of Santa Barbara County” (“District”) and shall be referred to as such throughout the remainder of this Report.

As used within this Report, the following terms are defined:

“Vector” means any animal capable of transmitting the causative agent of human disease or capable of producing human discomfort or injury, including, but not limited to, mosquitoes, flies, mites, ticks, other arthropods, and small mammals and other vertebrates (Health and Safety Code Section 2002(k)).

“Vector Control” shall mean any system of public improvements or services that is intended to provide for the surveillance, prevention, abatement, and control of vectors as defined in subdivision (k) of Section 2002 of the Health and Safety Code and a pest as defined in Section 5006 of the Food and Agricultural Code (Government Code Section 53750(l)).

Services are primarily funded by Ad Valorem property taxes and a benefit assessment paid by the property owners in the Service Zones. The District provides basic services including public information service and basic disease surveillance service throughout the District, and it provides Enhanced Vector Control Service in the Service Zones.

The following is an outline of the primary services that are provided to property within the Service Zone boundaries:

- Mosquito control
- Rodent inspections and source reduction
- Bee Inspections
- Enhanced Disease Surveillance
- Door-to-door mosquito inspections
- Mosquitofish for backyard fish ponds
- Public education outreach

The District is controlled by the Mosquito Abatement and Vector Control District Law of the State of California (the “Act”). Following are excerpts from the Mosquito Abatement and Vector Control District Law of 2002, codified in the Health and Safety Code, Section 2000, et. seq. which serve to summarize the State Legislature’s findings and intent with regard to mosquito abatement and other vector control services:
2001. (a) The Legislature finds and declares all of the following:

(1) California's climate and topography support a wide diversity of biological organisms.

(2) Most of these organisms are beneficial, but some are vectors of human disease pathogens or
directly cause other human diseases such as hypersensitivity, envenomization, and secondary
infections.

(3) Some of these diseases, such as mosquitoborne viral encephalitis, can be fatal, especially in
children and older individuals.

(4) California's connections to the wider national and international economies increase the transport
of vectors and pathogens.

(5) Invasions of the United States by vectors such as the Asian tiger mosquito and by pathogens
such as the West Nile virus underscore the vulnerability of humans to uncontrolled vectors and
pathogens.

(b) The Legislature further finds and declares:

(1) Individual protection against the vectorborne diseases is only partially effective.

(2) Adequate protection of human health against vectorborne diseases is best achieved by
organized public programs.

(3) The protection of Californians and their communities against the discomforts and economic
effects of vectorborne diseases is an essential public service that is vital to public health, safety, and
welfare.

(4) Since 1915, mosquito abatement and vector control districts have protected Californians and
their communities against the threats of vectorborne diseases.

(c) In enacting this chapter, it is the intent of the Legislature to create and continue a broad
statutory authority for a class of special districts with the power to conduct effective programs for the
surveillance, prevention, abatement, and control of mosquitoes and other vectors.

(d) It is also the intent of the Legislature that mosquito abatement and vector control districts
cooperate with other public agencies to protect the public health, safety, and welfare. Further, the
Legislature encourages local communities and local officials to adapt the powers and procedures
provided by this chapter to meet the diversity of their own local circumstances and responsibilities.

Further, the Health and Safety Code, Section 2082 specifically authorizes the creation of benefit
assessments for vector control, as follows:

(a) A district may levy special benefit assessments consistent with the requirements of
Article XIIIID of the California Constitution to finance vector control projects and programs.

PROPOSITION 218

The Service Zone 1 Extension 1 assessment was formed consistent with Proposition 218, The Right
to Vote on Taxes Act, which was approved by the voters of California on November 6, 1996, and is
now Article XIIIIC and XIIIID of the California Constitution. Proposition 218 provides for benefit
assessments to be levied to fund the cost of providing services, improvements, as well as maintenance and operation expenses to a public improvement which benefits the assessed property.

(The Service Zone 1 and Service Zone 2 assessments were formed prior to the passage of Proposition 218. Proposition 218 provides for benefit assessments to be levied to fund the cost of providing services, improvements, as well as maintenance and operation expenses to a public improvement which benefits the assessed property.) Although these assessments are consistent with Proposition 218, the California judiciary has generally referred to pre-Proposition 218 assessments as “grandfathered assessments” and held them to a lower standard than post Proposition 218 assessments.)

Proposition 218 describes a number of important requirements, including a property-owner balloting, for the formation and continuation of assessments, and these requirements are satisfied by the process used to establish this assessment. When Proposition 218 was initially approved in 1996, it allowed for certain types of assessments to be “grandfathered” in, and these were exempted from the property–owner balloting requirement.

Beginning July 1, 1997, all existing, new, or increased assessments shall comply with this article. Notwithstanding the foregoing, the following assessments existing on the effective date of this article shall be exempt from the procedures and approval process set forth in Section 4:

(a) Any assessment imposed exclusively to finance the capital costs or maintenance and operation expenses for sidewalks, streets, sewers, water, flood control, drainage systems or vector control.

Vector control was specifically “grandfathered in,” underscoring the fact that the drafters of Proposition 218 and the voters who approved it were satisfied that funding for vector control is an appropriate use of benefit assessments, and therefore confers special benefit to property.

**Silicon Valley Taxpayers Association, Inc. v Santa Clara County Open Space Authority**

In July of 2008, the California Supreme Court issued its ruling on the Silicon Valley Taxpayers Association, Inc. v. Santa Clara County Open Space Authority (“SVTA vs. SCCOSA”). This ruling is the most significant court case in further legally clarifying the substantive assessment requirements of Proposition 218. Several of the most important elements of the ruling included further emphasis that:
• Benefit assessments are for special benefits to property, not general benefits\(^2\)
• The services and/or improvements funded by assessments must be clearly defined
• Special benefits are directly received by and provide a direct advantage to property in the assessment district

This Engineer’s Report, and the process used to establish this assessment are consistent with the SVTA vs. SCCOSA decision.

**Dahms V. Downtown Pomona Property**

On June 8, 2009, the 4\(^{th}\) Court of Appeal amended its original opinion upholding a benefit assessment for property in the downtown area of the City of Pomona. On July 22, 2009, the California Supreme Court denied review. On this date, Dahms became good law and binding precedent for assessments. In Dahms the Court upheld an assessment that was 100% special benefit (i.e. 0% general benefit) on the rationale that the services and improvements funded by the assessments were directly provided to property in the assessment district. The Court also upheld discounts and exemptions from the assessment for certain properties.

**Bonander V. Town of Tiburon**

On December 31, 2009, the 1\(^{st}\) District Court of Appeal overturned a benefit assessment approved by property owners to pay for placing overhead utility lines underground in an area of the Town of Tiburon. The Court invalidated the assessments on the grounds that the assessments had been apportioned to assessed property based on in part on relative costs within sub-areas of the assessment district instead of proportional special benefits.

**Beutz v. County of Riverside**

On May 26, 2010 the 4th District Court of Appeals issued a decision on the Steven Beutz v. County of Riverside (“Beutz”) appeal. This decision overturned an assessment for park maintenance in Wildomar, California, primarily because the general benefits associated with improvements and services was not explicitly calculated, quantified and separated from the special benefits.

**Compliance with Current Law**

This Engineer’s Report is consistent with the requirements of Article XIIIC and XIIID of the California Constitution and with the SVTA decision because the Services to be funded are clearly defined; the Services are available to and will be directly provided to all benefiting property in the Assessment District; and the Services provide a direct advantage to property in the Assessment District that would not be received in absence of the Assessments.

\(^2\) Article XIII D, § 2, subdivision (d) of the California Constitution states defines “district” as “an area determined by an agency to contain all parcels which will receive a special benefit from the proposed public improvement or property-related service.”
This Engineer’s Report is consistent with Dahms because, similar to the Downtown Pomona assessment validated in Dahms, the Services will be directly provided to property in the Assessment District. Moreover, while Dahms could be used as the basis for a finding of 0% general benefits, this Engineer’s Report establishes a more conservative measure of general benefits.

The Engineer’s Report is consistent with Bonander because the Assessments have been apportioned based on the overall cost of the Services and proportional special benefit to each property. Finally, the Assessments are consistent with Beutz because the general benefits have been explicitly calculated and quantified and excluded from the Assessments.
GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THE DISTRICT AND SERVICES

ABOUT THE DISTRICT

The Mosquito and Vector Management District of Santa Barbara County ("District") is an independent special district (not part of the County or any city) that protects the usefulness, utility, desirability and livability of property and the inhabitants of property within its jurisdictional area by controlling and monitoring disease-carrying insects and other vectors such as mosquitoes and stinging insects, and inspections and source reductions of rodents such as roof rats. In addition, the District regularly tests for diseases carried by these vectors and educates the public about how to protect themselves from such diseases.

The Santa Barbara Coastal Vector Control District was originally formed in 1959 as the Goleta Valley Mosquito Abatement District, initially encompassing about 15 square miles. In 1998 the name of the District was changed to “Santa Barbara Coastal Vector Control District.” In 1999, the District annexed the territory of the Carpinteria Mosquito Abatement District, which was dissolved. The District then created two special benefit zones. Service Zone No. 1 included the existing territory of the Santa Barbara Coastal Vector Control District and Service Zone No. 2 included the territory of the dissolved Carpinteria Mosquito Abatement District. In 2004, the District conducted a Proposition 218 compliant mailed ballot proceeding to annex the Service Zone No. 1 Extension Area into the Assessment District. In 2006, the District again changed its name to “Mosquito and Vector Management District of Santa Barbara County” to more accurately describe itself as a county-wide agency and to reflect the entire territory of the District.

Both districts had adopted special benefit assessments in 1996 to provide additional funding for vector control services because of the dramatic decreases in moneys available from property taxes and state subventions in prior years. These benefit assessments were carried over to land in the respective zones.

In addition to its mosquito abatement and vector control services, the District provides education programs on vectors and disease prevention at school and civic group meetings. The District maintains a website and distributes printed material and brochures that describe what property owners and residents can do to keep their homes and property free of rats, mosquitoes, and other pests.
SUMMARY OF SERVICES

The purpose of the District is to provide vector surveillance, prevention, abatement, and control services to properties in the District to ensure protection of property owners and residents from vector annoyance and vector-borne diseases, such as St. Louis Encephalitis, Western Equine Encephalitis, West Nile Virus, Malaria, Lyme Disease, Hanta Virus Pulmonary Syndrome, and Sylvatic Plague. (A vector, as defined by the Act, is any animal capable of transmitting the causative agent of human disease or capable of producing human discomfort or injury). To fulfill this purpose, the Board may take any and all necessary or proper steps for the control of mosquitoes, flies, or other vectors, and inspection and source reduction of rodents, either in the District or in territory that is located outside of the District from which mosquitoes, flies, rodents, or other vectors and vector-borne disease may enter the District.

Specifically, the assessments provide funding for projects and programs for the surveillance, prevention, abatement, and control of vectors for the benefit of the lands in the Service Zones. Such mosquito abatement and vector control projects and programs include, but are not limited to, source reduction, larvicide and adulticide applications, disease monitoring, public education, reporting, accountability, research and interagency cooperative activities, as well as capital costs, maintenance and operation expenses (collectively “Services”). The cost of these services also includes capital costs comprised of equipment, capital improvements and facilities necessary and incidental to vector control programs. Currently, the District provides basic surveillance service and public information service in all areas of the District, as well as Enhanced Vector Control Service in the Service Zones.

Following are the Services, and resulting level of service, for properties in the Service Zones of the Assessment District. These Services are over and above the baseline level of service in place prior to the assessment. In Service Zone 1 and Service Zone 2, the baseline level of service was the level of service funded by the ad valorem property taxes, prior to the adoption of the assessments in 1996. In the Extension Areas, the baseline level of service was effectively zero, because no services were provided prior to the annexation to the Assessment District in 2004. The formula below describes the relationship between the final level of service, the previous baseline level of service, and the enhanced level of service funded by the assessment.

\[
\text{Final Level of Service} = \text{Baseline Level of Service} + \text{Enhanced Level of Service}
\]

In this case, the baseline level of service is nil, and the final level of service is precisely the enhanced level of service funded by the assessment.

The Services are further defined as follows:
- Response to mosquito problems as well as other pestiferous or disease carrying organisms in properties in the Assessment District, including responding to service call requests by property owners in the Assessment District.
- Control of mosquito larvae in catch basins, ditches, drain lines, vaults, wastewater treatment plants, under buildings, residences, horse troughs, freshwater marshes, salt marshes, creeks and other sources on all assessed properties in the Assessment District.
- Monitoring of Hanta Virus-bearing rodents, and other harmful vectors, such as Wood Rats, Deer Mice, Harvest mice, and Meadow Voles, through property inspection, harborage and home entry point identification, advice for exclusion and recommendations for removal of attractants at properties in the Assessment District, as well as public education.
- Survey and data analysis of mosquito larvae populations to assess public health risks and allocate control efforts.
- Monitoring of mosquito populations in the Assessment District using various generally accepted scientific methods.
- Testing and monitoring for diseases carried and transmitted by mosquitoes and other arthropods in the Assessment District, such as Encephalitis, Malaria, Dog Heartworm, and West Nile Virus.
- Deployment of sentinel chicken flocks, collection of mosquito pools for virus testing, and blood analytical studies for State and local agencies.
- Testing of new insecticide materials and investigation of their efficacy.
- Survey and identification of arthropod-borne diseases such as Lyme disease, Hanta Virus and plague found in parks, trails, and other locations frequented by the public in the Assessment District.
- Inspections and advice for property owners who have reported bee swarm behavior or the presence of hives, in addition to providing contact information to private bee keepers for live removal of nuisance bees.
- Monitoring and/or control of other nuisance and potentially hazardous organisms and vectors in properties in the Assessment District, as directed by policy established by the Board of Trustees. (Only vectors found outside of structures will be monitored and controlled.)
- Education of property owners and residents about the risks of diseases carried by insects and small mammals and how to better protect themselves and their pets.
- Monitoring of new and emerging vectors such as the Asian Tiger Mosquito at entry points in the Assessment District.
- Testing for and control of new and emerging pathogens in the Assessment District.
**INTRODUCTION TO SURVEILLANCE AND MONITORING**

Mosquitoes and other vectors most often are produced in areas of standing water including catch basins, vaults, wastewater treatment plants, water under buildings, horse troughs, pools, ponds, gutters, flood control devices, freshwater and saltwater marshes and wetlands as well as organic waste and debris.

The District performs surveillance of adult mosquitoes and surveillance of other vectors on properties in the Assessment District in order to discover new sites of larval development, allocation of control efforts, level of public health risk, population densities, and species composition. The District primarily uses New Jersey light traps, Reiter Gravid traps and Carbon Dioxide traps for this surveillance. Through these efforts, the District has successfully identified and controlled new strains of vector-borne disease. For example, through the disease surveillance efforts carried out by the District, a new strain of Hantavirus was detected in the Isla Vista area, appropriately called the “Isla Vista” strain. In another case, the District analyzed several swarms of Honey Bees found in outdoor trash containers located in a Goleta apartment complex. The District’s genetic confirmation found that the Honey Bees were “Africanized.” As a result, the State officially declared the majority of Santa Barbara County to be “colonized.”

Additionally, the District monitors vector-borne diseases in efforts to prevent human cases. Three pathogenic mosquito-borne Encephalitis viruses occur in California: Western Equine Encephalitis, St. Louis Encephalitis and West Nile virus. All three are carried in birds and can be transferred to horses or humans through the bite of an infected mosquito. There is neither specific cure nor vaccine for these diseases so the District regularly monitors flocks of sentinel chickens for viruses. Malaria, Lyme Disease, and small mammal-borne diseases such as Plague, Hanta Virus and Arena Virus are also monitored.

**LARVAL MOSQUITO SURVEILLANCE PROGRAM**

The District will identify any medically important arthropod submitted by property owners, businesses or residents in the Service Zone Areas. Laboratory staff will provide information on its biology, public health significance and control.

All mosquito production sites located in the Service Zones will be added to a detailed catalog mapping, tracking and monitoring system of sources and placed on a schedule to be checked regularly and treated as needed.

Property owners, businesses or residents can call the District when experiencing problems with mosquitoes on their property. A mosquito control technician will thereafter survey and treat the source, as appropriate.
ADULT MOSQUITO SURVEILLANCE PROGRAM

Laboratory personnel will monitor populations to access the level of public health risk and effectiveness of control measures.

Mosquito traps will be deployed on properties in the Service Zones as deemed appropriate by the District staff. Traps will be collected and their contents identified and counted. This information is maintained in a computerized database and used to track long-term trends in mosquito density.

WEST NILE VIRUS SURVEILLANCE PROGRAM

The District maintains flocks of sentinel chickens to detect the presence of West Nile Virus and other Encephalitis viruses.

The District collects adult mosquitoes from properties in the Service Zones and submits them to various laboratories to test for West Nile and other Encephalitis viruses. Laboratory staff will collect mosquitoes from the Service Zones using specialized traps for this purpose. Mosquitoes must be collected alive, anesthetized, identified, and shipped on dry ice the same day.

The District participates in a statewide program to collect and test dead wild birds for West Nile Virus. Dead birds are picked up from properties in the Service Zones within 24 hours, packaged and sent to the State Health Department for testing.

INTRODUCTION TO TREATMENT AND CONTROL

Strategically, the District addresses vectors through a comprehensive approach, which is based upon effective prevention of vectors. The District controls mosquitoes through a program of integrated vector management (IVM). This program focuses on controlling mosquitoes in their larval stage, and preventing problems before the mosquito pupae hatch and have the ability to transmit diseases. Larval control has many benefits:

- Less toxic: Often, mosquitofish and other environmentally safe approaches can be used. When needed, the bacterial agents or pesticides used to control the larval stage are much less toxic to the environment than those used in the past and are highly specific to mosquitoes.

- Less pesticides: The bacterial agents or pesticides are applied to a smaller area than would be required for treatment of adult mosquitoes.

- Less disease: Targeting immature mosquitoes kills them before they are capable of transmitting disease.

The end result is a program that protects public health, is more cost effective than other methods, and has low impact on the environment. The District used biorational materials such as VectoBac.
(Bacillus thuringiensis israelensis), and VectoLex (B. sphaericus). Also used is the product Altosid (methoprene) which is an insect growth regulator. These materials have been shown to have minimal effects on non-target species and are regulated by the US EPA and the California Department of Pesticide Regulation. They are approved for use in aquatic habitats.

**LARVAL MOSQUITO CONTROL PROGRAM**

Many different water sources exist on properties within the District, such as marshes, creeks, ponds, storm drain systems, and poorly maintained pools. Mosquitoes utilize these sources in their life cycle. Certain mosquitoes are of great concern in that they are capable of transmitting viral diseases, such as West Nile and encephalitis, to humans and horses.

Water sources found to be producing mosquitoes on properties in the Service Zones will be addressed using integrated vector management procedures involving appropriate physical, biological and chemical control. These inspection and control measures will be repeated on a routine schedule to manage the insect population.

The Mosquito and Vector Management District of Santa Barbara County will monitor pesticide resistance levels and determine the efficacy of available larvicides for local mosquito populations.

Mosquito fish are used to control immature mosquitoes on properties in various bodies of water, both large and small. For backyard sources such as ponds and pools, residents may obtain the fish at the District office.

The District will directly bill publicly owned or government owned parcels those costs which are deemed to result from inspection and control procedures performed by the District to manage mosquito production.

**ADULT MOSQUITO CONTROL PROGRAM**

In the event of virus recoveries or human cases of diseases transmitted by mosquitoes or other vectors in major metropolitan areas in the Service Zones, the District may institute widespread application of adulticide materials. In addition, an expanded and intensified larvicide program may be instituted to interrupt the transmission cycle and reduce the adult populations of vector species.

The Mosquito and Vector Management District of Santa Barbara County will monitor pesticide resistance levels and determine the efficacy of available adulticides for the suppression of local mosquito populations.

Any additional descriptions and plans for the services will be filed with the General Manager of the Mosquito and Vector Management District of Santa Barbara County, and are incorporated herein by reference.
ESTIMATE OF COST

The estimated costs and revenues for the District for Fiscal Year 2012-13 are depicted on the following page.
### Figure 1 – Summary Cost Estimate, FY 2012-13

**MOSQUITO AND VECTOR MANAGEMENT DISTRICT OF SANTA BARBARA COUNTY**

**Service Zone No. 1 and Service Zone No. 2 Assessments**

**Estimate of Cost**

**Fiscal Year 2012-13**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beginning Fund Balance</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Zone 2 Revenue</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Tax Revenue</td>
<td>$102,195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Interest on Fund Balance</td>
<td>$675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intergovernmental Revenue</td>
<td>$600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Assessment</td>
<td>$45,980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>$149,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Zone 1 Revenue</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Tax Revenue</td>
<td>$238,455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Interest on Fund Balance</td>
<td>$1,575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intergovernmental Revenue</td>
<td>$1,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Assessment</td>
<td>$443,048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract Revenue</td>
<td>$134,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>$818,478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Operating Revenue</strong></td>
<td>$967,928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vector Control Services and Related Expenditures</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations</td>
<td>$830,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services and Supplies</td>
<td>$136,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed Assets - Equipment</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed Assets - Capital Structure</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Services and Operation</strong></td>
<td>$966,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Incidental Costs</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Collection and Levy Administration</td>
<td>$66,004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allowance for Contingencies</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Contribution to/(from) Reserves</td>
<td>$419,052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>$489,056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Less: Beginning Fund Balance</strong></td>
<td>$500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Vector Control Services and Incidental Expenses</strong></td>
<td>($489,028)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Net Amount to be Assessed)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zone</th>
<th>Total SFE Units</th>
<th>Assessment per SFE$</th>
<th>Total Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>51,637.25</td>
<td>$8.58</td>
<td>$443,048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5,359.00</td>
<td>$8.58</td>
<td>$45,980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Assessment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$489,028</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes**

1. This allowance is to account for any uncollectible assessments.
2. Assessment rates per SFE shown do not include $1.00 County collection fee per parcel.
METHOD OF ASSESSMENT

This section of the Report explains the benefits to be derived from the Services provided for property by the District, and the methodology used to apportion the total assessment to properties within the Service Zone No. 1 and Service Zone No. 2.

Service Zone No. 1 and Service Zone No. 2 consist of all Assessor Parcels within the boundaries of the Service Zones, as defined by the assessment diagram at Appendix A hereof. The assessments allow the District to continue providing its enhanced mosquito abatement, disease control and other Enhanced Vector Control Services throughout the Service Zones.

The method used for apportioning the assessment is based upon the proportional special benefits to be derived by the properties in the Service Zones over and above general benefits conferred on real property or to the public at large. Special benefit is calculated for each parcel in the Service Zones.

1. Identification of total benefit to the properties derived from the Services
2. Calculation of the proportion of these benefits that are special vs. general
3. Determination of the relative special benefit within different areas within the Service Zones
4. Determination of the relative special benefit per property type and property characteristic
5. Calculation of the specific assessment for each individual parcel based upon special vs. general benefit; location, property type and property characteristics

DISCUSSION OF BENEFIT

In summary, the assessments can only be levied based on the special benefit to property. This special benefit is received by property over and above any general benefits from the Services. With reference to the engineering requirements for property related assessments, under Proposition 218, an Engineer must determine and prepare a report evaluating the amount of special and general benefit received by property within the Service Zones as a result of the improvements or services provided by a local agency. The special benefit is to be determined in relation to the total cost to that local entity of providing the service and/or improvements.

Proposition 218 as described in Article XIIIID of the California Constitution has confirmed that assessments must be based on the special benefit to property:
"No assessment shall be imposed on any parcel which exceeds the reasonable cost of the proportional special benefit conferred on that parcel."

The below benefit factors, when applied to property in the Service Zones, confer special benefits to property and ultimately improve the safety, utility, functionality and usability of property in the Service Zones. These are special benefits to property in the Service Zones in much the same way that storm drainage, sewer service, water service, sidewalks and paved streets enhance the utility and functionality of each parcel of property served by these improvements, providing them with more utility of use and making them safer and more usable for occupants.

It should also be noted that Proposition 218 includes a requirement that existing assessments in effect upon its effective date were required to be confirmed by either a majority vote of registered voters in the assessment area, or by weighted majority property owner approval using the new ballot proceeding requirements. However, certain assessments were excluded from these voter approval requirements. Of note is that in California Constitution Article XIID Section 5(a) this special exemption was granted to assessments for sidewalks, streets, sewers, water, flood control, drainage systems and vector control. The Howard Jarvis Taxpayers Association explained this exemption in their Statement of Drafter’s Intent:

“This is the "traditional purposes" exception. These existing assessments do not need property owner approval to continue. However, future assessments for these traditional purposes are covered.”

Therefore, the drafters of Proposition 218 acknowledged that vector control assessments were a “traditional” and therefore acknowledged and accepted use.

Since all assessments existing before or after Proposition 218 must be based on special benefit to property, the drafters of Proposition 218 impliedly found that vector control services confer special benefit on property. Moreover, the statement of drafter’s intent also acknowledges that any new or increased vector control assessments after the effective date of Proposition 218 would need to comply with the voter approval requirements it established. This is as an acknowledgement that additional assessments for such “traditional” purposes would be established after Proposition 218 was in effect. Therefore, the drafters of Proposition 218 clearly recognized vector assessments as a “traditional” use of assessments, acknowledged that new vector assessments may be formed after

Proposition 218 and impliedly were satisfied that vector control services confer special benefit to properties.

The Legislature also made a specific determination after Proposition 218 was enacted that vector control services constitute a proper subject for special assessment. Health and Safety Code section 2082, which was signed into law in 2002, provides that a district may levy special assessments consistent with the requirements of Article XIIIID of the California Constitution to finance vector control projects and programs. The intent of the Legislature to allow and authorize benefit assessments for vector control services after Proposition 218 is shown in the Assembly and Senate analysis of the Mosquito Abatement and Vector Control District Law where it states that the law:

*Allows special benefit assessments to finance vector control projects and programs, consistent with Proposition 218.*

Therefore the State Legislature agreed that vector control services are a valuable and important public service that can be funded by benefit assessments. To be funded by assessments, vector control services must confer special benefit to property.

**MOSQUITO CONTROL IS A SPECIAL BENEFIT TO PROPERTIES**

As described below, this Engineer’s Report concludes that mosquito control is a special benefit that provides direct advantages to property in the Service Zones. For example, the assessment provides for 1) surveillance throughout the Service Zones to measure and track the levels and sources of mosquitoes impacting property in the area and the people who live and work on the property, 2) mosquito and mosquito source control, treatment and abatement throughout the Service Zones such that all property in the area benefits from a comparable reduction of mosquito levels, 3) monitoring throughout the Service Zones to evaluate the effectiveness of District treatment and control and to ensure that all properties are receiving the equivalent level of mosquito reduction benefits, and 4) the properties in the Service Zones to be eligible for service requests which result in District staff directly visiting, inspecting and treating property. Moreover, the Services funded by the Assessments reduce the level of mosquitoes and vectors arriving at and negatively impacting properties within the Service Zones.

---

4 Senate Bill 1588, Mosquito Abatement and Vector Control District Law, Legislative bill analysis
The following section, Benefit Factors, describes how the Services specially benefit properties in the Service Zones. These benefits are particular and distinct from its effect on property in general or the public at large.

**Benefit Factors**

In order to allocate the assessments, the Engineer identified the types of special benefit arising from the services and that would be provided to property within the Service Zones. These types of special benefit are as follows:

- **Increased safety of property in the Service Zones.**

The Assessments provide funding for year-round, proactive Services to control and abate mosquitoes and other vectors that otherwise would occupy properties throughout the Service Zones. Mosquitoes and other vectors are transmitters of diseases, so the reduction of mosquito populations makes property in the Service Zones safer for use and enjoyment. In absence of the assessments, these Services would not be provided, so the Services funded by the assessments make properties in the Service Zones safer, which is a distinct special benefit to property in the Service Zones. This is not a general benefit to property in the Service Zones or the public at large because the Services are tangible mosquito and disease control services that will be provided directly to the properties in the Service Zones and the Services are over and above what otherwise would be provided by the District or any other agency.

This finding was confirmed in 2003 by the State Legislature:

> “Mosquitoes and other vectors, including but not limited to, ticks, Africanized honey bees, rats, fleas, and flies, continue to be a source of human suffering, illness, death, and a public nuisance in California and around the world. Adequately funded mosquito and vector control, monitoring and public awareness programs are the best way to prevent outbreaks of West Nile Virus and other diseases borne by mosquitoes and other vectors.”

Also, the Legislature, in Health and Safety Code Section 2001, finds that:

---

5. By reducing the risk of disease and increasing the safety of property, the proposed Services will materially increase the usefulness and desirability of certain properties in the Service Zones.

6. Assembly Concurrent Resolution 52, chaptered April 1, 2003
“The protection of Californians and their communities against the discomforts and economic effects of vectorborne diseases is an essential public service that is vital to public health, safety, and welfare.”

- Reductions in the risk of new diseases and infections on property in the Service Zones.

Mosquitoes have proven to be a major contributor to the spread of new diseases such as West Nile Virus, among others. A highly mobile population combined with migratory bird patterns can introduce new mosquito-borne diseases into previously unexposed areas.

“Vector-borne diseases (including a number that are mosquito-borne) are a major public health problem internationally. In the United States, dengue and malaria are frequently brought back from tropical and subtropical countries by travelers or migrant laborers, and autochthonous transmission of malaria and dengue occasionally occurs. In 1998, 90 confirmed cases of dengue and 1,611 cases of malaria were reported in the USA and dengue transmission has occurred in Texas.”

“During 2004, 40 states and the District of Columbia (DC) have reported 2,313 cases of human WNV illness to CDC through ArboNET. Of these, 737 (32%) cases were reported in California, 390 (17%) in Arizona, and 276 (12%) in Colorado. A total of 1,339 (59%) of the 2,282 cases for which such data were available occurred in males; the median age of patients was 52 years (range: 1 month--99 years). Date of illness onset ranged from April 23 to November 4; a total of 79 cases were fatal.” (According to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention on January 19, 2004, a total of 2,470 human cases and 88 human fatalities from WNV have been confirmed).

The Services funded by the assessments help prevent, on a year-round basis, the presence of vector-borne diseases on property in the Service Zones. This is another tangible and direct special benefit to property in the Service Zones that would not be received in the absence of the assessments.

---

- Reduced mosquito and vector populations on property and as a result, enhanced desirability, utility, usability and functionality of property in the Service Zones.

The assessments provide new and enhanced services for the control and abatement of nuisance and disease-carrying mosquitoes. These Services materially reduce the number of vectors on properties throughout the Service Zones. The lower mosquito and vector populations on property in the Service Zones is a direct advantage to property that serve to increase the desirability and “usability” of property. Clearly, properties are more desirable and usable in areas with lower mosquito populations and with a reduced risk of vector-borne disease. This is a special benefit to residential, commercial, agricultural, industrial and other types of properties because all such properties directly benefit from reduced mosquito and vector populations and properties with lower vector populations are more usable, functional and desirable.

Excessive mosquitoes and other vectors in the area can materially diminish the utility and usability of property. For example, prior to the commencement of mosquito control and abatement services, properties in many areas in the State were considered to be nearly uninhabitable during the times of year when the mosquito populations were high.⁹ The prevention or reduction of such diminished utility and usability of property caused by mosquitoes is a clear and direct advantage and special benefit to property in the Service Zones.

The State Legislature made the following finding on this issue:

“Excess numbers of mosquitoes and other vectors spread diseases of humans, livestock, and wildlife, reduce enjoyment of outdoor living spaces, both public and private, reduce property values, hinder outdoor work, reduce livestock productivity; and mosquitoes and other vectors can disperse or be transported long distances from their sources and are, therefore, a health risk and a public nuisance; and professional mosquito and vector control based on scientific research has made great advances in reducing mosquito and vector populations and the diseases they transmit.” ¹⁰

---

⁹ Prior to the commencement of modern mosquito control services, areas in the State of California such as the San Mateo Peninsula, Napa County and areas in Marin and Sonoma Counties had such high mosquito populations that they were considered to be nearly unlivable during certain times of the year and were largely used for part-time vacation cottages that were occupied primarily during the months when the natural mosquito populations were lower.

¹⁰ Assembly Concurrent Resolution 52, chaptered April 1, 2003
Protection of economic activity on property in the Service Zones.

As recently demonstrated by the SARS outbreak in China and outbreaks of Avian Flu, outbreaks of pathogens can materially and negatively impact economic activity in the affected area. Such outbreaks and other public health threats can have a drastic negative effect on tourism, business and residential activities in the affected area. The assessments help to prevent the likelihood of such outbreaks in the Service Zones.

Mosquitoes hinder, annoy and harm residents, guests, visitors, farm workers, and employees. A vector-borne disease outbreak and other related public health threats would have a drastic negative effect on agricultural, business and residential activities in the Service Zones.

The economic impact of diseases is well documented. According to a study prepared for the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, economic losses due to the transmission of West Nile Virus in Louisiana was estimated to cost over $20 million over approximately one year:

*The estimated cost of the Louisiana epidemic was $20.1 million from June 2002 to February 2003, including a $10.9 million cost of illness ($4.4 million medical and $6.5 million nonmedical costs) and a $9.2 million cost of public health response. These data indicate a substantial short-term cost of the WNV disease epidemic in Louisiana.*  

Moreover, a study conducted in 1996-97 of La Crosse Encephalitis (LACE), a human illness caused by a mosquito-transmitted virus, found a lifetime cost per human case at $48,000 to $3,000,000 and found that the disease significantly impacted life spans of those who were infected. Following is a quote from the study which references the importance and value of active vector control services of the type that would be funded by the assessments:

*The socioeconomic burden resulting from LACE is substantial, which highlights the importance of the illness in western North Carolina, as well as the need for active surveillance, reporting, and prevention programs for the infection.*


The Services funded by the assessments help to prevent the likelihood of such outbreaks on property in the Service Zones and reduce the harm to economic activity on property caused by existing mosquito populations. This is another direct advantage in the Service Zones that would not be received in absence of the assessments.

- **Protection of the Service Zones’ agriculture, tourism, and business industries.**

The agriculture, tourism and business industries in the Service Zones benefit from reduced levels of harmful or nuisance mosquitoes and other vectors. Conversely, any outbreaks of emerging vectorborne pathogens such as West Nile Virus could also materially negatively affect these industries. Diseases transmitted by mosquitoes and other vectors can adversely impact business and recreational functions.

*A study prepared for the United States Department of Agriculture in 2003 found that over 1,400 horses died from West Nile Virus in Colorado and Nebraska and that these fatal disease cases created over $1.2 million in costs and lost revenues. In addition, horse owners in these two states spent over $2.75 million to vaccinate their horses for this disease. The study states that “Clearly, WNV has had a marked impact on the Colorado and Nebraska equine industry.”*

*Pesticides for mosquito control impart economic benefits to agriculture in general. Anecdotal reports from farmers and ranchers indicate that cattle, if left unprotected, can be exsanguinated by mosquitoes, especially in Florida and other southeast coastal areas. Dairy cattle produce less milk when bitten frequently by mosquitoes.*

The assessments serve to protect the businesses and industries in the Service Zones. This is a direct advantage and special benefit to property in the Service Zones.

- **Reduced risk of nuisance and liability on property in the Service Zones.**

In addition to health related factors, uncontrolled mosquito and vector populations create a nuisance for residents, employees, customers, tourists, farm workers and guests in the Service Zones. Properties in the Service Zones benefit from the reduced nuisance factor.

---


that is created by the Services. Agricultural and rangeland properties also benefit from the reduced nuisance factor and harm to horses, livestock and employees from lower mosquito and vector populations.

Agricultural, range, golf course, cemetery, open space and other such lands in the Service Zones contain large areas of mosquito and vector habitat and are therefore a significant source of mosquito and vector populations. In addition, residential and business properties in the Service Zones can also contain significant sources.\(^{15}\) It is conceivable that sources of mosquitoes could be held liable for the transmission of diseases or other harm. For example, in August 2004, the City of Los Angeles approved new fines of up to $1,000 per day for property owners who don’t remove standing water sources of mosquitoes on their property.

The Services provided by the District reduce the mosquito and vector related nuisance and health liability to properties in the Service Zones. The reduction of that risk of liability constitutes a special benefit to property in the Service Zones and this special benefit would not be received in absence of the Services funded by the assessments.

- **Improved marketability of property.**

As described previously, the Services specially benefit properties in the Service Zones by making them more useable, livable and functional. The Services also make properties in the Service Zones more desirable, and more desirable properties also benefit from improved marketability. This is another tangible special benefit to certain property in the Service Zones which will not be enjoyed in absence of the Services.\(^{16}\)

**Benefit Finding**

In summary, the special benefits described in this Report and provision of Services in the Service Zones directly benefit and protect the real properties in the Service Zones in excess of the proposed assessments for these properties. Therefore, the assessment engineer finds that the cumulative special benefits to property from the Services are reasonably equal to or greater than the proposed assessment of $8.58 per benefit unit for Service Zone 1 and Service Zone 2.

---

\(^{15}\) Sources of mosquitoes on residential, business, agricultural, range and other types of properties include removable sources such as containers that hold standing water.

\(^{16}\) If one were to compare two hypothetical properties with similar characteristics, the property with lower mosquito infestation and reduced risk of vector-borne disease will clearly be more desirable, marketable and usable.
GENERAL VS. SPECIAL BENEFIT

Article XIIIIC of the California Constitution requires any local agency proposing to increase or impose a benefit assessment to “separate the general benefits from the special benefits conferred on a parcel.” The rationale for separating special and general benefits is to ensure that property owners subject to the benefit assessment are not paying for general benefits. The assessment can fund the special benefits to property in the assessment area but cannot fund any general benefits. Accordingly, a separate estimate of the special and general benefit is given in this section.

In other words:

Total Benefit = Total General Benefit + Total Special Benefit

There is no widely-accepted or statutory formula for general benefit from vector control services. General benefits are benefits from improvements or services that are not special in nature, are not “particular and distinct” and are not “over and above” benefits received by other properties. General benefits are conferred to properties located “in the district,” but outside the narrowly-drawn Assessment District and to “the public at large.” SVTA vs. SCCOSA provides some clarification by indicating that general benefits provide “an

17 SVTA vs. SCCOSA explains as follows:

OSA observes that Proposition 218’s definition of “special benefit” presents a paradox when considered with its definition of “district.” Section 2, subdivision (i) defines a “special benefit” as “a particular and distinct benefit over and above general benefits conferred on real property located in the district or to the public at large.” (Art. XIII D, § 2, subd. (i), italics added.) Section 2, subdivision (d) defines “district” as “an area determined by an agency to contains all parcels which will receive a special benefit from a proposed public improvement or property-related service.” (Art. XIII D, § 2, subd. (d), italics added.) In a well-drawn district — limited to only parcels receiving special benefits from the improvement — every parcel within that district receives a shared special benefit. Under section 2, subdivision (i), these benefits can be construed as being general benefits since they are not “particular and distinct” and are not “over and above” the benefits received by other properties “located in the district.”

We do not believe that the voters intended to invalidate an assessment district that is narrowly drawn to include only properties directly benefiting from an improvement. Indeed, the ballot materials reflect otherwise. Thus, if an assessment district is narrowly drawn, the fact that a benefit is conferred throughout the district does not make it general rather than special.
indirect, derivative advantage” and are not necessarily proximate to the improvements and services funded by the assessments.

A formula to estimate the general benefit is listed below:

General Benefit =

Benefit to Real Property Outside the Assessment District +
Benefit to Real Property Inside the Assessment District that is Indirect and Derivative +
Benefit to the Public at Large

Special benefit, on the other hand, is defined in the state constitution as “a particular and distinct benefit over and above general benefits conferred on real property located in the district or to the public at large.” The SVTA v. SCCOSA decision indicates that a special benefit is conferred to a property if it “receives a direct advantage from the improvement (e.g., proximity to a park).” In this assessment, the overwhelming proportion of the benefits conferred to property is special, since the advantages from the mosquito and disease protection funded by the Assessments are directly received by the properties in the Assessment District and are only minimally received by property outside the Assessment District or the public at large. For example, property owners within the Assessment District may request service calls to treat for mosquitoes or other vectors on their property.

Hence, arguably, some of the Services benefit the public at large and properties outside the Service Zones. In this report, the general benefit is conservatively estimated and described, and then budgeted so that it is funded by sources other than the assessment.

In the 2009 Dahms case, the court upheld an assessment that was 100% special benefit on the rationale that the services funded by the assessments were directly provided to property in the assessment district. Similar to the assessments in Pomona that were validated by Dahms, the Assessments described in this Engineer’s Report fund mosquito, vector and disease control services directly provided to property in the assessment area. Moreover, as noted in this Report, the Services directly reduce mosquito and vector populations on all property in the assessment area. Therefore, Dahms establishes a basis for minimal or zero general benefits from the Assessments. However, in this report, the general benefit is more conservatively estimated and described, and then budgeted so that it is funded by sources other than the assessment.
CALCULATING GENERAL BENEFIT

The assessment is levied on property in the District that previously received no mosquito and vector control service from any government agency. Consistent with footnote 8 of SVTA v. SCCOSA, and for the reasons described above, the District has determined that all parcels in the Service Zones receive a shared direct advantage and special benefit from the Services. The Services directly and particularly serve and benefit each parcel, and are not a mere indirect, derivative advantage. As explained above, Proposition 218 relies on the concept of “over and above” in distinguishing special benefits from general benefits. As applied to an assessment proceeding concurrent with the annexation of new territory and extension of services to that territory, this concept means that the baseline general benefits are zero and that all vector control services, which provide direct advantage to property in the Service Zones, are over and above the zero baseline and therefore are special.

Nevertheless, the Services may provide a degree of general benefit, in addition to the predominant special benefit. This section provides a conservative measure of the general benefits from the Assessments.

IMPORTANCE TO PROPERTY OUTSIDE THE DISTRICT

Properties within the Assessment District receive almost all of the special benefits from the Services because the Services funded by the Assessments are provided directly to protect property within the Assessment District from mosquitoes and vector-borne disease. However, properties adjacent to, but just outside of, the boundaries may receive some benefit from the Services in the form of reduced mosquito populations on property outside the Service Zones. Since this benefit is conferred to properties outside the district boundaries, it contributes to the overall general benefit calculation and will not be funded by the assessment.

A measure of this general benefit is the proportion of Services that affect properties outside of the Service Zones. Each year, the District provides some of its Services in areas near the boundaries of the Service Zones. By abating mosquito populations near the borders of the Service Zones, the Services may provide benefits in the form of reduced mosquito populations and reduced risk of disease transmission to properties outside the Service Zones. If mosquitoes were not controlled inside the Service Zones, more of them would fly from the Service Zones. Therefore control of mosquitoes within the Service
Zones provides some benefit to properties outside the Service Zones but within the normal flight range of vectors, in the form of reduced mosquito populations and reduced vector-borne disease transmission. Since mosquitoes are the predominant vector that are controlled and mosquitoes most easily travel from their source location to properties in the area, typical mosquito destination ranges will be used to measure the extent that the Services will create reduced vector populations on property outside the Unprotected Areas. This is a measure of the general benefits to property outside the Service Zones because this is a benefit from the Services that is not specially conferred upon property in the assessment area.

The mosquito potential outside the Service Zones is based on studies of mosquito dispersion concentrations. Mosquitoes can travel up to two miles, on average, so this destination range is used. Based on studies of mosquito destinations, relative to parcels in the Service Zones, average concentration of mosquitoes from the Service Zones on properties within two miles of the Service Zones is calculated to be 6%\(^\text{18}\). This relative vector population reduction factor within the destination range is combined with the number of parcels outside the Service Zones and within the destination range to measure this general benefit and is calculated as follows:

**CRITERIA:**
- Mosquitoes may fly up to 2 miles from their breeding source.
- 1,136 parcels within 2 miles of, but outside of the assessment district, may receive some mosquito and disease protection benefit.
- 6% portion of relative benefit that is received.
- 53,387 assessable parcels in the assessment district.

**CALCULATIONS**

General benefit to property outside the assessment district = \( \frac{1,136}{(53,387 + 1,136)} \times 0.06 = 0.13\% \)

Therefore, for the overall benefits provided by the Services to the Service Zones, it is determined that 0.13% of the benefits are received by the parcels within two miles of the Service Zones boundaries. Recognizing that this calculation is an approximation, this benefit will be rounded up to 1.0%.

---
**Benefit to Property Inside the District That is Indirect and Derivative**

The “indirect and derivative” benefit to property within the Assessment District is particularly difficult to calculate. As explained above, all benefit within the Assessment District is special because the mosquito and disease control services in the Service Zones provide direct service and protection that is clearly “over and above” and “particular and distinct” when compared with the lack of such protection under current conditions. Further, the properties are within the Assessment District boundaries and this Engineer’s Report demonstrates the direct benefits received by individual properties from mosquito and disease control services.

In determining the Assessment District area, the District was careful to limit it to an area of parcels that will directly receive the Services. All parcels directly benefit from the surveillance, monitoring and treatment that is provided on an equivalent basis throughout the Service Zones in order to maintain the same improved level of protection against mosquitoes and reduced mosquito populations throughout the area. The surveillance and monitoring sites are spread on a balanced basis throughout the area. Mosquito control and treatment are provided as needed throughout the area based on the surveillance and monitoring results. The shared special benefit - reduced mosquito levels and reduced presence of vector-borne diseases – are received on an equivalent basis by all parcels in the Service Zones. Furthermore, all parcels in the Assessment District directly benefit from the ability to request service from the District and to have a District field technician promptly respond directly to the parcel and address the owner’s or resident’s service need. The SVTA vs. SCCOSA decision indicates that the fact that a benefit is conferred throughout the assessment district area does not make the benefit general rather than special, so long as the assessment district is narrowly drawn and limited to the parcels directly receiving shared special benefits from the service. This concept is particularly applicable in situations involving a landowner-approved assessment-funded extension of a local government service to benefit lands previously not receiving that particular service. The District therefore concludes that, other than the small general benefit to properties outside the Assessment District (discussed above) and to the public at large (discussed below), all of the benefits of the Services to the parcels within the Assessment District are special benefits, and it is not possible or appropriate to separate any general benefits from the benefits conferred on parcels in the Service Zones.

**Benefit to the Public at Large**

With the type and scope of Services to be provided to the Assessment Area, it is very difficult to calculate and quantify the scope of the general benefit conferred on the public at
large. Because the Services directly serve and benefit all of the property in the Assessment Area, any general benefit conferred on the public at large would be small. Nevertheless, there is some indirect general benefit to the public at large.

The public at large uses the public highways and other regional facilities, and when traveling in and through the Assessment Area they will benefit from the Services. A fair and appropriate measure of the general benefit to the public at large therefore is the amount of area of highways and other regional facilities within the Assessment Area relative to the overall land area. An analysis of maps of the Assessment Area shows that approximately 3.0% of the land area in the Assessment Area is covered by highways and other regional facilities. This 3.0% therefore is a fair and appropriate measure of the general benefit to the public at large within the Assessment Area.

**SUMMARY OF GENERAL BENEFITS**

Using a sum of the measures of general benefit for the public at large and land outside the Assessment Area, we find that approximately 4.0% of the benefits conferred by the Mosquito and Disease Control Assessment may be general in nature and should be funded by sources other than the assessment.

\[
\text{GENERAL BENEFIT} = \\
1.0\% \text{ (OUTSIDE THE DISTRICT)} \\
+ \ 0.0\% \text{ (INSIDE THE DISTRICT - INDIRECT AND DERIVATIVE)} \\
+ \ 3.0\% \text{ (PUBLIC AT LARGE)} \\
= \ 4.0\% \text{ (TOTAL GENERAL BENEFIT)}
\]

The estimated cost of the Services for Fiscal Year 2012-13 is $966,900. Of this total amount, the existing District will contribute at least $38,676, or 4% of the total budget from sources other than the Service Zone No. 1 and Service Zone No. 2 Assessment. This contribution offsets any general benefits from the Service Zone No. 1 and Service Zone No. 2 Assessment Services.

**ZONES OF BENEFIT**

The boundaries of the Service Zones have been carefully drawn to include the properties in Santa Barbara County that did not receive mosquito and disease control services prior to the assessment and that materially benefit from the Services. Such parcels are in areas with a material population of people, pets and livestock on the property. The current
and future population of property is a conduit of benefit to property because people, pets and livestock are ultimately affected by mosquitoes and vector-borne diseases and the special benefit factors of desirability, utility, usability, livability and marketability are ultimately determined by the population and usage potential of property.

Certain other properties in the northern and western portion of the County were excluded from the Service Zones because these properties are generally in more remote and mountainous areas and they support a very low population. In other words, the boundaries of the Service Zones have been narrowly drawn to include only properties that specially benefit from the mosquito control services, and previously did receive services from the District.

The SVTA vs. SCCOSA decision indicates:

In a well-drawn district — limited to only parcels receiving special benefits from the improvement — every parcel within that district receives a shared special benefit. Under section 2, subdivision (i), these benefits can be construed as being general benefits since they are not “particular and distinct” and are not “over and above” the benefits received by other properties “located in the district.”

We do not believe that the voters intended to invalidate an assessment district that is narrowly drawn to include only properties directly benefitting from an improvement. Indeed, the ballot materials reflect otherwise. Thus, if an assessment district is narrowly drawn, the fact that a benefit is conferred throughout the district does not make it general rather than special. In that circumstance, the characterization of a benefit may depend on whether the parcel receives a direct advantage from the improvement (e.g., proximity to park) or receives an indirect, derivative advantage resulting from the overall public benefits of the improvement (e.g., general enhancement of the district’s property values).

In the assessment, the advantage that each parcel receives from the mosquito control services is direct, and the boundaries are narrowly drawn to include only parcels that benefit from the assessment. Therefore, the even spread of assessment throughout the narrowly drawn district is indeed consistent with the OSA decision.

The District’s mosquito, vector, and disease control programs, projects and services are funded by Service Zone No. 1 and Service Zone No. 2. Service Zone No. 1 includes the original service area of the Mosquito and Vector Management District of Santa Barbara
County, including the City of Goleta, the City of Santa Barbara Municipal Airport, and most of the unincorporated territory of the Goleta Valley, including the communities of Hope Ranch and Isla Vista. Service Zone No. 2 contains the territory of the dissolved Carpinteria Mosquito Abatement District, including the City of Carpinteria and the Carpinteria Valley. In addition, Service Zone No. 1 also includes the Extension Areas that were annexed into the District in 2004, including the unincorporated areas of Montecito, Mission Canyon, Summerland, Hidden Valley, and the Goleta and Carpinteria Foothills in southern Santa Barbara County, as well as the previously non-serviced portions of the City of Santa Barbara.

**Method of Assessment**

As previously discussed, the assessments fund comprehensive, year-round mosquito control and disease surveillance and control Services that clearly confer special benefits to properties in the Service Zones. These benefits can partially be measured by the property owners, guests, employees, tenants, pets and animals who enjoy a more habitable, safer and more desirable place to live, work or visit. As noted, these benefits ultimately flow to the underlying property.

Therefore, the apportionment of benefit is partially based on people who potentially live on, work at, or otherwise use the property. This methodology of determining benefit to property through the extent of use by people is a commonly used method of apportionment of benefits from assessments.

Moreover, assessments have a long history of use in California and are in large part based on the principle that any benefits from a service or improvement funded by assessments that is enjoyed by tenants and other non-property owners ultimately is conferred to the underlying property.19

With regard to benefits and source locations, the assessment engineer determined that since mosquitoes readily fly from their breeding locations to all properties in their flight range and since mosquitoes are actually attracted to properties occupied by people or

---

19 For example, in *Federal Construction Co. v. Ensign* (1922) 59 Cal.App. 200 at 211, the appellate court determined that a sewer system specially benefited property even though the direct benefit was to the people who used the sewers: “Practically every inhabitant of a city either is the owner of the land on which he resides or on which he pursues his vocation, or he is the tenant of the owner, or is the agent or servant of such owner or of such tenant. And since it is the inhabitants who make by far the greater use of a city’s sewer system, it is to them, as lot owners or as tenants, or as the servants or agents of such lot owners or tenants, that the advantages of actual use will redound. But this advantage of use means that, in the final analysis, it is the lot owners themselves who will be especially benefited in a financial sense.”
animals, the benefits from mosquito control extend beyond the source locations to all properties that would be a “destination” for mosquitoes and other vectors. In other words, the control and abatement of mosquito and vector populations ultimately confers benefits to all properties that are a destination of mosquitoes and vectors, rather than just those that are sources of mosquitoes.

Although some primary mosquito sources may be located outside of residential areas, residential properties can and do generate their own, often significant, populations of mosquitoes and vector organisms. For example, storm water catch basins in residential areas in the Service Zones are a common source of mosquitoes. Since the typical flight range for a female mosquito, on average, is 2 miles, most homes in the Service Zones are within the flight zone of many mosquito sources. Moreover, there are many other common residential sources of mosquitoes, such as miscellaneous backyard containers, neglected swimming pools, leaking water pipes and tree holes. Clearly, there is a potential for mosquito sources on virtually all property. More importantly, all properties in the Service Zones are within the destination range of mosquitoes and most properties are actually within the destination range of multiple mosquito source locations.

Because the Services are provided throughout the Service Zones with the same level of control objective, mosquitoes can rapidly and readily fly from their breeding locations to other properties over a large area, and there are current or potential breeding sources throughout the Service Zones, the Assessment Engineer determined that all similar properties in the Service Zones have generally equivalent mosquito “destination” potential and, therefore, receive equivalent levels of benefit.

In the process of determining the appropriate method of assessment, the Engineer considered various alternatives. For example, a fixed assessment amount per parcel for all residential improved property was considered but was determined to be inappropriate because agricultural lands, commercial property and other property also receive benefits from the assessments. Likewise, an assessment exclusively for agricultural land was considered but deemed inappropriate because other types of property, such as residential and commercial, also receive the special benefit factors described previously.

A fixed or flat assessment was deemed to be inappropriate because larger residential, commercial and industrial properties receive a higher degree of benefit than other similarly used properties that are significantly smaller. (For two properties used for commercial purposes, there is clearly a higher benefit provided to a property that covers several acres in comparison to a smaller commercial property that is on a 0.25 acre site. The larger property generally has a larger coverage area and higher usage by employees, customers,
tourists and guests that benefit from reduced mosquito and vector populations, as well as
the reduced threat from diseases carried by mosquitoes and other vectors. This benefit
ultimately flows to the property.) Larger commercial, industrial and apartment parcels,
therefore, receive an increased benefit from the assessments.

In conclusion, the Assessment Engineer determined that the appropriate method of
assessment apportionment should be based on the type and use of property, the relative
size of the property, its relative population and usage potential and its destination potential
for mosquitoes. This method is further described below.

The method and formulas for calculating and allocating annual assessments to property in
the Service Zones was established by the Resolution 96-01 by the District Board of
Trustees of the Goleta Valley Vector Control District in May, 1996 and by Resolution 96-01
by the District Board of Trustees of the Carpinteria Mosquito Abatement District in June,
1996, and is described in detail in a report entitled “Staff Report on the Need for
Implementing the Benefit Assessment Funding Mechanism Based on Land Use” approved
May 14, 1996 on file in the office of the District. The method and formulas are summarized
below.

**ASSESSMENT APPORTIONMENT**

The special benefits derived from the Mosquito and Disease Control Assessment are
conferred on property and are not based on a specific property owner’s occupancy of
property or the property owner’s demographic status, such as age or number of
dependents. However, it is ultimately people who do or could use the property and who
enjoy the special benefits described above. The opportunity to use and enjoy property
within the Service Zones without the excessive nuisance, diminished “livability” or the
potential health hazards brought by mosquitoes and the diseases they carry is a special
benefit to properties in the Service Zones. This benefit can be in part measured by the
number of people who potentially live on, work at or otherwise could use a property, not how
the property is currently used by the present owner.20

In order to apportion the cost of the Services to property, each property in the Service
Zones is assigned a relative special benefit factor. This process involves determining the
relative benefit received by each property in relation to a single family home, or, in other

---

20 Benefits conferred upon property are related to the average number of people who could
potentially live on, work at or otherwise could use a property, not how the property is currently used
by the present owner.
words, on the basis of Single Family Equivalents (SFE). This SFE methodology is commonly used to distribute assessments in proportion to estimated special benefit. For the purposes of this Engineer's Report, all properties are designated a SFE value, which is each property's relative benefit in relation to a “benchmark” parcel in the Service Zones. The "benchmark" property is the single family detached dwelling on a parcel of less than one acre. This benchmark parcel is assigned one Single Family Equivalent benefit unit or one SFE.

The calculation of the special benefit apportionment and relative benefit to properties in the Service Zones from the Services is summarized in the following equation:

\[
\text{Special Benefit (per property)} = \frac{\sum (\text{Special Benefits})}{\sum (\text{Benefit Units (SFEs)})} \\
\text{(Property Specific attributes such as use, property types, size as well as vector-specific attributes such as destination potential and population potential)}
\]

**RESIDENTIAL PROPERTIES**

Single family homes, condominiums, and mobile homes on mobile home pads are assigned the basic unit of benefit for vector control services. This category is described as individual homes. The benefit unit for these categories of land use is 1.0.

**MULTI-FAMILY PROPERTIES**

Multi-Family properties consist of more than one family thus increasing the benefit received for that individual property. The amount of benefit received increases for Multi-Family properties with a large number of family units. Specifically, this category is segmented into two functions: Multi-Family properties ranging from 2-4 units and Multi-family properties with 5 or more units.

For Multi-family residences up to 4 units, the benefit unit assigned is 1.25.

For Multi-family residences with 5 or more units, the benefit unit assigned is 1.5.

**COMMERCIAL PROPERTIES**

All commercial properties experience increased benefit from vector control services due to the higher numbers of people using the property on a transient basis, including employees and the public. This property includes uses such as department stores, service stations,
restaurants, and professional buildings. This category receives significantly higher benefit because it is continuously utilized at intense levels and is therefore assigned 1.75 benefit units.

**Institutional, Industrial, and Recreational**

These properties experience the greatest increased benefit from vector control services due to continual transient use by high numbers of employees, customers and recreationalists. The uses associated with these properties also include the use of transportation of goods and people from outside of the area and includes increased benefits from mosquito and other vector control. This category includes such categories as manufacturing, warehousing, open storage, recreation areas, auditoriums, stadiums, golf courses, and colleges. The benefit unit assigned to this category is 2.0.

**Vacant and Agriculture Properties**

Vacant properties consist of undeveloped parcels in all land use categories. These parcels are unoccupied and therefore receive a more limited benefit. Farm parcels are similar to undeveloped parcels in that they are generally unoccupied. The amount of benefit is limited to a lesser degree. The benefit unit assigned to this category is 0.75.

**Exempt Government Properties**

Government parcels are exempt from the special assessment since they were not included in the original assessment schematic prior to Proposition 218. In lieu of the assessment, the District provides services under contract with these parcels, and the parcels are in turn billed directly by the District for abatement costs, according to the provisions of the California State Health and Safety Code.

**Other Properties**

All properties that are specially benefited are assessed. Miscellaneous, small and other parcels such as roads, right-of-way parcels, and common areas typically do not generate significant numbers of employees, residents, customers or guests and have limited economic value. These miscellaneous parcels receive minimal benefit from the Services and are assessed an SFE benefit factor of 0.

**Duration of Assessment**

It is proposed that the Assessment be levied for fiscal year 2012-13 and continued every year thereafter, so long as mosquitoes remain in existence and the Mosquito and Vector Management District of Santa Barbara County requires funding from the Assessment for its Services in the Service Zones. As noted previously, the Assessment can continue to be
levied annually after the Mosquito and Vector Management District of Santa Barbara County Board of Trustees approves an annually updated Engineer’s Report, budget for the Assessment, Services to be provided, and other specifics of the Assessment. In addition, the District Board of Trustees must hold an annual public hearing to continue the Assessment.

**APPEALS AND INTERPRETATION**

Any property owner who feels that the assessment levied on the subject property is in error as a result of incorrect information being used to apply the foregoing method of assessment, may file a written appeal with the General Manager of the Mosquito and Vector Management District of Santa Barbara County or his or her designee. Any such appeal is limited to correction of an assessment during the then current Fiscal Year or, if before July 1, the upcoming fiscal year. Upon the filing of any such appeal, the General Manager or his or her designee will promptly review the appeal and any information provided by the property owner. If the General Manager or his or her designee finds that the assessment should be modified, the appropriate changes shall be made to the assessment roll. If any such changes are approved after the assessment roll has been filed with the County of Santa Barbara for collection, the General Manager or his or her designee is authorized to refund to the property owner the amount of any approved reduction. Any dispute over the decision of the General Manager, or his or her designee, shall be referred to the Board. The decision of the Board shall be final.
ASSESSMENT

WHEREAS, the Board contracted with the undersigned Engineer of Work to prepare and file a report presenting an estimate of costs of Services, a diagram for an assessment district and an assessment of the estimated costs of Services, and the special and general benefits conferred thereby, upon all assessable parcels within the Service Zone No. 1 and Service Zone No. 2;

NOW, THEREFORE, the undersigned in accordance with the provisions of Article XIIIID of the California Constitution, the Government Code and the Health and Safety Code and the order of the Board of said Mosquito and Vector Management District of Santa Barbara County, hereby make the following determination of a continued assessment to cover the portion of the estimated cost of the Services, and the costs and expenses incidental thereto to be paid by the Service Zone No. 1 and Service Zone No. 2.

The District has evaluated and estimated the costs of providing the Services to the Service Zones. The estimated costs are summarized in Figure 1 and detailed in Figure 2, below.

The amount to be paid for the services and improvements and the expenses incidental thereto, to be paid by the Mosquito and Vector Management District of Santa Barbara County for the fiscal year 2012-13 is generally as follows:

FIGURE 2 – SUMMARY COST ESTIMATE, FY 2012-13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vector &amp; Disease Control Services</td>
<td>$966,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incidents</td>
<td>$490,056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL BUDGET</td>
<td>$1,456,956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Contribution</td>
<td>$967,928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Amount To Assessments</td>
<td>$489,028</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
An Assessment Diagram is hereto attached and made a part hereof showing the exterior boundaries of the Service Zones. The distinctive number of each parcel or lot of land in the Service Zones is its Assessor Parcel Number appearing on the Assessment Roll.

I do hereby determine and apportion the net amount of the cost and expenses of the Services, including the costs and expenses incidental thereto, upon the parcels and lots of land within the Service Zones, in accordance with the special benefits to be received by each parcel or lot, from the Services, and more particularly set forth in this Engineer’s Report.

The assessment determination is made upon the parcels or lots of land within the Service Zones in proportion to the special benefits to be received by the parcels or lots of land, from the Services.

The District may finance the cost of acquiring or constructing capital facilities over time and pledge a portion of assessment revenues received in any fiscal year towards the repayment of the principal amount of such borrowed funds together with interest over the repayment period.

The assessment for Service Zone 1 is subject to an annual adjustment tied to the Consumer Price Index (CPI) for the Los Angeles-Riverside-Orange County Area as of March of each succeeding year (the “CPI”), with a maximum annual rate not to exceed $20.00 per benefit unit. Any CPI increase not levied in any given year shall be cumulatively reserved as the “Unused CPI” and shall be used to increase the maximum authorized assessment rate in future years. The maximum authorized assessment rate is equal to the maximum assessment rate in the first fiscal year the assessment was levied adjusted annually by the minimum of the change in the CPI plus any Unused CPI as described above.

The change in the CPI from March 2011 to March 2012 was 2.02% and the Unused CPI carried forward from the previous fiscal year for Service Zone 1 is 5.10%. Therefore, the maximum authorized assessment rate for Service Zone 1 for fiscal year 2012-13 is increased by 7.12%, which equates to $9.29 per single family equivalent benefit unit. The estimate of cost and budget in this Engineer’s Report proposes assessments for Service Zone 1 for fiscal year 2012-13 at the rate of $8.58 per single family equivalent benefit unit, which is less than the maximum authorized assessment rate.
The assessment for Service Zone 2 is not subject to a CPI limitation. However, the maximum assessment rate may not exceed $16.00 per benefit unit. The estimate of cost and budget in this Engineer's Report also proposes assessments for Service Zone 2 for fiscal year 2012-13 at the rate of $8.58 per single family equivalent benefit unit, which is less than the maximum authorized assessment rate.

Following Board preliminary approval of the Engineer's Report and the assessments it establishes for fiscal year 2012-13, the assessments may continue to be levied annually and may be adjusted by the maximum rates allowed by Resolution 96-01 adopted by the District Board of Trustees of the Goleta Valley Vector Control District in May, 1996 and by Resolution 96-01 adopted by the District Board of Trustees of the Carpinteria Mosquito Abatement District in June, 1996, without any additional assessment ballot proceeding.

Each parcel or lot of land is described in the Assessment Roll by reference to its parcel number as shown on the Assessor's Maps of the County of Santa Barbara for the fiscal year 2012-13. For a more particular description of the property, reference is hereby made to the deeds and maps on file and of record in the office of the County Recorder of the County of Santa Barbara.

I hereby place opposite the Assessor Parcel Number for each parcel or lot within the Assessment Roll, the proposed amount of the assessment for the fiscal year 2012-13 for each parcel or lot of land within the said Service Zone No.1 and Service Zone No. 2.
Dated: May 4, 2012

Engineer of Work

By
John W. Bliss, License No. C52091
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APPENDIX A – ASSESSMENT DIAGRAM

The Mosquito and Vector Management District of Santa Barbara County Assessment areas include all properties within Service Zone No. 1 and Service Zone No. 2.

The boundaries of Service Zone No. 1 and Service Zone No. 2 are displayed on the following Assessment Diagram.

REFERENCE IS HEREBY MADE TO THE MAPS AND DEEDS OF RECORD IN THE OFFICE OF THE ASSESSOR OF THE COUNTY OF SANTA BARBARA FOR A DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF THE LINES AND DIMENSIONS OF ANY PARCEL SHOWN HEREIN. THOSE MAPS SHALL GOVERN FOR ALL DETAILS CONCERNING THE LINES AND DIMENSIONS OF SUCH PARCELS. EACH PARCEL IS IDENTIFIED IN SAID MAPS BY ITS DISTINCTIVE ASSESSOR'S PARCEL NUMBER.

PREPARED BY SCI CONSULTING GROUP
4745 MANGELS BLVD.
FAIRFIELD, CA 94534
707-430-4300
APPENDIX B – ASSESSMENT ROLL, FY 2012-13

Reference is hereby made to the Assessment Roll in and for the Assessment District on file in the office of the General Manager of the District, as the Assessment Roll is too voluminous to be bound with this Engineer’s Report.
RESOLUTION NO. 12-01

A RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE MOSQUITO AND VECTOR MANAGEMENT DISTRICT OF SANTA BARBARA COUNTY DECLARING INTENTION TO CONTINUE ASSESSMENTS, PRELIMINARILY APPROVING THE ENGINEER’S REPORT, AND PROVIDING NOTICE OF A PUBLIC HEARING FOR FISCAL YEAR 2012-2013 FOR SERVICE ZONE NO. 1

WHEREAS: In the reorganization of this District and the Carpinteria Mosquito Abatement District (CMAD), it was ordered by the Santa Barbara County Local Agency Formation Commission and Board of Supervisors that CMAD be dissolved and its territory be annexed to this District, that this District then create two separate zones for purposes of levying assessments consisting of the territory of CMAD and of this District before the reorganization, respectively, and that the assessments of the said two prior districts continue in the reorganized district; and

WHEREAS: By Resolution 99-03 this District created Service Zone No. 1, consisting of the territory of this District prior to reorganization, and Service Zone No. 2, consisting of the territory of CMAD prior to its dissolution, and adopted the assessments levied by resolutions of the prior districts; and

WHEREAS: By Resolution 04-04 this District extended Service Zone No. 1 by adding territory, including the area of the City of Santa Barbara not previously a part of Service Zone No. 1 and certain unincorporated areas of south Santa Barbara County, to Service Zone No. 1 thereby making property in the extension area subject to the annual levy of said assessment; and

WHEREAS: By Resolution 96-01, which is incorporated herein by this reference, this District adopted a vector surveillance and control project for a zone of benefit encompassing the entire territory of the District as it then existed; and

WHEREAS: Said Resolution established an assessment of $6.17 per benefit unit for the 1996-1997 fiscal year, as defined in the Staff Report on the Need for Implementing the Benefit Assessment Funding Mechanism Based on Land Use (the "Staff Report"), which is on file at the office of the District, and further established a schedule of assessments for various land uses within the District as it then existed for the 1996-1997 fiscal year; and

WHEREAS: Resolution 96-02 provides for an annual evaluation of the amount of the benefit unit assessment, the schedule of assessments by land use derived therefrom, and an annual increase in the
maximum assessment amounts based on the change in the Consumer Price Index not to exceed $20.00 per benefit unit; and

WHEREAS: The District finds that it is not necessary for the proper administration of the District to levy an increased rate of assessment for the 2012-2013 fiscal year, after adjustment for the increase in the Consumer Price Index;

WHEREAS, an Engineer’s Report (“Engineer’s Report”) has been prepared by SCI Consulting Group (“Assessment Engineer”) and submitted to the Mosquito and Vector Management District of Santa Barbara County Board of Trustees (“Board”). The Report, which is available for public review at the District’s office (2450 Lillie Avenue, Summerland, CA 93067), is hereby incorporated by reference. This Engineer’s Report includes: (1) a description of the mosquito abatement and vector control Services to be funded with assessment proceeds; (2) an estimate of the annual cost of such Services; (3) a description of the assessable parcels of land within the District and proposed to be subject to the new assessment; (4) a description of the proportionate special and general benefits conferred on property by the proposed assessment; (5) a description of the boundaries of the District, and (6) a specification of the amount to be assessed upon various types of assessable land to fund the cost of the mosquito abatement and vector control services. This assessment shall be described as the “Service Zone 1 Assessment” (hereinafter the “Assessment”) of the Mosquito and Vector Management District of Santa Barbara County.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Trustees of the Mosquito and Vector Management District of Santa Barbara County as follows:

1. An Engineer’s Report by a registered professional engineer (the Engineer of Work) has been prepared in accordance with Article XIIID of the California Constitution and the California Government and Health and Safety Codes. The Engineer’s Report has been made, filed with the Board and duly considered by the Board and is hereby deemed sufficient and preliminarily approved. The Engineer’s Report shall stand as the Engineer’s Report for all subsequent proceedings under and pursuant to the foregoing resolution.

2. This Board intends to continue and to collect annual assessments within the District to fund the cost of providing mosquito, vector and disease control services and the proposed projects and services set forth in the Engineer’s Report. Within the District, the proposed projects, services and programs are generally described as surveillance, disease prevention, abatement, and control of vectors within the District boundaries. Such mosquito abatement, vector control and disease prevention projects and programs include, but are not limited to, source reduction, biological control, larvicide applications, adulticide applications, disease monitoring, public education, reporting, accountability, research and interagency cooperative activities, as well as capital costs,
maintenance, and operation expenses and incidental expenses (collectively “Services”). The cost of these Services also includes capital costs comprised of equipment, capital improvements and facilities necessary and incidental to the District’s mosquito and vector control program.

3. The Assessment consists of the lots and parcels shown on the assessment diagram of the Assessment, on file with the District Manager, and reference is hereby made to such diagram for further particulars.

4. Reference is hereby made to the Engineer’s Report for a full and detailed description of the proposed projects and services, the boundaries of the Assessment and the proposed assessments upon assessable lots and parcels of land within the Assessment.

5. The District hereby estimates that the amount of assessments necessary to provide vector surveillance and control in Service Zone No. 1 during the fiscal year 2012-2013 is $443,048, which is the estimated amount that will be raised by the foregoing assessments.

6. The District hereby proposes to continue and to collect assessments for Service Zone No. 1 for fiscal year 2012-2013 in the amounts set forth below, which are computed by the methods established in the Staff Report. They are based on the assessment of $8.58 per benefit unit, which is the proposed benefit unit assessment for fiscal year 2012-2013. The assessments which are to be levied on all parcels of land within Service Zone No. 1 for the 2012-2013 fiscal year, except land owned by governmental agencies or public utilities, are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LAND USE</th>
<th>PROPOSED ASSESSMENT FY 2012-13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VACANT</td>
<td>$6.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FARMLAND</td>
<td>$6.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENCE</td>
<td>$8.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APARTMENTS, 1-4 Units</td>
<td>$10.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APARTMENTS, 5 or More Units</td>
<td>$12.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMERCIAL</td>
<td>$15.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDUSTRIAL</td>
<td>$17.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSTITUTIONAL, RECREATIONAL</td>
<td>$17.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. The assessments are proposed to be continued annually. In each subsequent year in which the assessments will be continued, an updated Engineer’s Report, including a proposed budget and assessment rate, shall be prepared. The updated Engineer’s Report shall be considered by the Board at a noticed public hearing. The updated Engineer’s Report shall serve as the basis for the continuation of the assessments.
8. The assessments include a provision for an annual increase by an amount equal to the annual change in the Consumer Price Index (All Urban Consumers-All Items, 1982-84 = 100) for Los Angeles-Riverside-Orange County CA. The District has computed the maximum allowable assessments for the 2012-2013 fiscal year including the cost of living adjustment using the index for March, 2011 and March, 2012 which is a 2.02% increase during the one year period. Including the authorized annual adjustment, the maximum authorized assessment rate for fiscal year 2012-2013 is $9.29 for Service Zone No. 1. The estimate of cost and budget in the Engineer’s Report proposes assessments for fiscal year 2012-2013 at the rate of $8.58 per single family equivalent benefit unit, which is the same rate as that levied for the previous fiscal year, and is less than the maximum authorized assessment rate.

9. A public hearing shall be held before this Board at the Hope School District Board Room, 3970 La Colina Road, Santa Barbara, CA 93110 as follows: on July 12, 2012 at the hour of 2:00 p.m. for the purpose of conducting a hearing and to consider all protests of property owners regarding the proposed Assessment and this Board’s determination whether the public interest, convenience and necessity require the Services and this Board’s final action upon the Engineer’s Report and the continued assessments therein.

10. The Secretary of the Board shall cause a notice of the hearing to be given by publishing a notice once, at least ten (10) days prior to the date of the hearing above specified, in the Santa Barbara Independent, which is a newspaper of general circulation in the Mosquito and Vector Management District of Santa Barbara County.
THE FOREGOING RESOLUTION WAS ADOPTED by the Board of Trustees of the Mosquito and Vector Management District of Santa Barbara County at a regular meeting thereof held on May 10, 2012, by the following vote:

Ayes:

Noes:

Abstain:

Absent:

President, Board of Trustees
Mosquito and Vector Management District of Santa Barbara County

Attest

Secretary to the Board of Trustees
RESOLUTION NO. 12-02

A RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE MOSQUITO AND VECTOR MANAGEMENT DISTRICT OF SANTA BARBARA COUNTY DECLARING INTENTION TO CONTINUE ASSESSMENTS, PRELIMINARILY APPROVING THE ENGINEER’S REPORT, AND PROVIDING NOTICE OF A PUBLIC HEARING FOR FISCAL YEAR 2012-2013 FOR SERVICE ZONE NO. 2

WHEREAS: In the reorganization of this District and the Carpinteria Mosquito Abatement District (CMAD), it was ordered by the Santa Barbara County Local Agency Formation Commission and Board of Supervisors that CMAD be dissolved and its territory be annexed to this District, that this District then create two separate zones for purposes of levying assessments consisting of the territory of CMAD and of this District before the reorganization, respectively, and that the assessments of the said two prior districts continue in the reorganized district; and

WHEREAS: By Resolution 99-03 this District created Service Zone No. 1, consisting of the territory of this District prior to reorganization, and Service Zone No. 2, consisting of the territory of CMAD prior to its dissolution, and adopted the assessments levied by resolutions of the prior districts; and

WHEREAS: By Resolution 96-01, which is incorporated herein by this reference, the Board of Trustees of CMAD adopted an assessment scheme for annual levy of an assessment to pay for the cost of vector surveillance and control within the District; and

WHEREAS: Said Resolution established an assessment of $7.91 per benefit unit for the 1996-1997 fiscal year, as defined in the Staff Report on the Need for Implementing the Service Charge Assessment Funding Mechanism Based on Land Use (the "Staff Report"), which is on file at the office of the District, established a maximum assessment of $16.00 per benefit unit and further established a schedule of assessments for various land uses within the District for the 1996-1997 fiscal year; and

WHEREAS: Said CMAD Resolution 96-01 provides for an annual evaluation of the amount of the assessment per benefit unit and the schedule of assessments by land use derived therefrom, not to exceed $16.00 per benefit unit; and

WHEREAS, an Engineer’s Report (“Engineer’s Report”) has been prepared by SCI Consulting Group (“Assessment Engineer”) and submitted to the Mosquito and Vector Management District of Santa Barbara County Board of Trustees (“Board”). The Report, which is available for public review at the
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District’s office (2450 Lillie Avenue, Summerland, CA 93067), is hereby incorporated by reference. This Engineer’s Report includes: (1) a description of the mosquito abatement and vector control Services to be funded with assessment proceeds; (2) an estimate of the annual cost of such Services; (3) a description of the assessable parcels of land within the District and proposed to be subject to the new assessment; (4) a description of the proportionate special and general benefits conferred on property by the proposed assessment; (5) a description of the boundaries of the District, and (6) a specification of the amount to be assessed upon various types of assessable land to fund the cost of the mosquito abatement and vector control services. This assessment shall be described as the “Service Zone 2 Assessment” (hereinafter the “Assessment”) of the Mosquito and Vector Management District of Santa Barbara County.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Trustees of the Mosquito and Vector Management District of Santa Barbara County as follows:

1. An Engineer’s Report by a registered professional engineer (the Engineer of Work) has been prepared in accordance with Article XIIID of the California Constitution and the California Government and Health and Safety Codes. The Engineer’s Report has been made, filed with the Board and duly considered by the Board and is hereby deemed sufficient and preliminarily approved. The Engineer’s Report shall stand as the Engineer’s Report for all subsequent proceedings under and pursuant to the foregoing resolution.

2. This Board intends to continue and to collect annual assessments within the District to fund the cost of providing mosquito, vector and disease control services and the proposed projects and services set forth in the Engineer’s Report. Within the District, the proposed projects, services and programs are generally described as surveillance, disease prevention, abatement, and control of vectors within the District boundaries. Such mosquito abatement, vector control and disease prevention projects and programs include, but are not limited to, source reduction, biological control, larvicide applications, adulticide applications, disease monitoring, public education, reporting, accountability, research and interagency cooperative activities, as well as capital costs, maintenance, and operation expenses and incidental expenses (collectively “Services”). The cost of these Services also includes capital costs comprised of equipment, capital improvements and facilities necessary and incidental to the District’s mosquito and vector control program.

3. The Assessment consists of the lots and parcels shown on the assessment diagram of the Assessment, on file with the General Manager, and reference is hereby made to such diagram for further particulars.

4. Reference is hereby made to the Engineer’s Report for a full and detailed description of the proposed projects and services, the boundaries of the Assessment and the proposed
assessments upon assessable lots and parcels of land within the Assessment.

5. The District hereby estimates that the amount of assessments necessary to provide vector surveillance and control in Service Zone No. 2 during the fiscal year 2012-2013 is $45,980, which is the estimated amount that will be raised by the foregoing assessments.

6. The District hereby proposes to continue and to collect assessments for Service Zone No. 2 for fiscal year 2012-2013 in the amounts set forth below, which are computed by the methods established in the Staff Report. They are based on the assessment of $8.58 per benefit unit, which is the proposed benefit unit assessment for fiscal year 2012-2013. The assessments which are to be levied on all parcels of land within Service Zone No. 2 for the 2012-2013 fiscal year, except land owned by governmental agencies or public utilities, are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LAND USE</th>
<th>PROPOSED ASSESSMENT FY 2012-13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VACANT</td>
<td>$6.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FARMLAND</td>
<td>$6.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENCE</td>
<td>$8.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APARTMENTS, 1-4 Units</td>
<td>$10.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APARTMENTS, 5 or More Units</td>
<td>$12.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMERCIAL</td>
<td>$15.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDUSTRIAL</td>
<td>$17.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSTITUTIONAL, RECREATIONAL</td>
<td>$17.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. The assessments are proposed to be continued annually. In each subsequent year in which the assessments will be continued, an updated Engineer's Report, including a proposed budget and assessment rate, shall be prepared. The updated Engineer’s Report shall be considered by the Board at a noticed public hearing. The updated Engineer’s Report shall serve as the basis for the continuation of the assessments.

8. A public hearing shall be held before this Board at the Hope School District Board Room, 3970 La Colina Road, Santa Barbara, CA 93110 as follows: on July 12, 2012 at the hour of 2:00 p.m. for the purpose of conducting a hearing and to consider all protests of property owners regarding the proposed continued assessment and this Board’s determination whether the public interest, convenience and necessity require the Services and this Board’s final action upon the Engineer’s Report and the assessments therein.

9. The Secretary of the Board shall cause a notice of the hearing to be given by publishing a notice once, at least ten (10) days prior to the date of the hearing above specified, in the Santa Barbara Independent, which is a newspaper of general circulation in the Mosquito and Vector Management District of Santa Barbara County.
THE FOREGOING RESOLUTION WAS ADOPTED by the Board of Trustees of the Mosquito and Vector Management District of Santa Barbara County at a regular meeting thereof held on May 10, 2012, by the following vote:

Ayes:

Noes:

Abstain:

Absent:

________________________________________
President, Board of Trustees
Mosquito and Vector Management District of Santa Barbara County

Attest

________________________________________
Secretary to the Board of Trustees
Resolution No. 94-1

RESOLUTION ELECTING TO BE SUBJECT TO PUBLIC EMPLOYEES' MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL CARE ACT FIXING THE EMPLOYER'S CONTRIBUTION FOR EMPLOYEES AND THE EMPLOYER'S CONTRIBUTION FOR ANNUITANTS AT DIFFERENT AMOUNTS

WHEREAS, (1) Government Code Section 22850 extends the benefits of the Public Employees' Medical and Hospital Care Act to contracting agencies on proper application by an agency; and

WHEREAS, (2) Government Code Section 22754 (g) defines a county or special district subject to the County Employee's Retirement Law of 1937 as a contracting agency; and

WHEREAS, (3) Government Code Section 22857 provides that a contracting agency may fix the amount of the employer's contribution for employees and the employer's contribution for retired employees or survivors at different amounts provided that the monthly contribution for retired employees shall be annually increased by an amount not less than 5 percent of the monthly contribution for employees, until such time as the amounts are equal; and

WHEREAS, (4) The Goleta Valley Vector Control District, is a special district subject to the County Retirement Law of 1937, and desires to obtain for its employees and for its retired employees or survivors the benefit of the Act and to accept the liabilities and obligations of an employer under the Act and regulations; now, therefore, be it.

RESOLVED, (a) That the Goleta Valley Vector Control District elect, and it does hereby elect, to be subject to the provisions of the Act; and be it further

RESOLVED, (b) That the employer's contribution for each employee shall be the amount necessary to pay the full cost of his enrollment, including the enrollment of his family members in a health benefits plan up to a maximum of $450.00 per month; and be it further

RESOLVED, (c) That the employer's contribution for each retired employee or survivor shall be the amount necessary to pay the cost of his enrollment, including the enrollment of his family members, in a health benefits plan up to a maximum of $1.00 per month; and be it further

RESOLVED, (d) That the employer's contribution for each retired employee or survivor shall be increased annually by 5 percent of the monthly contribution for employees, until such time as the contributions are equal;

and that the contributions for employees and retired employees or survivors shall be in addition to those amounts contributed by the Goleta Valley Vector Control District for administrative fees and to the Contingency Reserve Fund; and be it further
RESOLVED, (e) That the executive body appoint and direct, and does hereby appoint and direct the District Manager to file with the Board of Administration of the public employees' retirement system a verified copy of this resolution, and to perform on behalf of said all functions required of it under the Act and Regulations of the Board of Administration; and be it further

RESOLVED, (f) That coverage under the Act be effective March 1, 1994.

Adopted at a regular meeting of the Goleta Valley Vector Control District at the UCSB Student Health Center Medical Library Conference Room, this 8th day of February 1994.

AYES: FISCHER, GRAYSON, ROWLAND, WINANT

NOES:

ABSTAIN:

ABSENT: VACANT

Signed: [Signature]

Attest: [Signature]

Chairman

Secretary

COPY
RESOLUTION NO. 00-04

A RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE SANTA BARBARA COASTAL VECTOR CONTROL DISTRICT AMENDING RESOLUTION NO. 94-1 BY ADDING AN ANNUAL COST OF LIVING FACTOR TO COMPENSATE FOR ANNUAL INFLATIONARY INCREASES IN THE DISTRICT'S CONTRIBUTION TOWARDS EMPLOYEE'S HEALTH INSURANCE BENEFIT.

WHEREAS: The District has elected to join the Public Employees Medical and Hospital Care Act (herein referred to as the "Act.") to provide its regular qualified employees and their families with health insurance under the various plans within the Act; and

WHEREAS: By Resolution 94-1 District Board of Trustees authorized in the year 1994, that the District’s contribution for each regular qualified employee shall be the amount necessary to pay the full cost of the employee’s enrollment, including the enrollment of the employee’s family members in a health benefits plan under the Act up to a maximum of $450.00 per month; and

WHEREAS: The maximum amount of $450.00 per month District Contribution must be increased to cover the inflationary cost of living increases over time to support the District’s personnel policy to cover all of the employee’s and employee’s family members cost of the health insurance benefit under the Act: and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Trustees of the Santa Barbara Coastal Vector Control District as follows:

1. The District hereby amends Resolution 94-1, to include an annual cost of living factor increase of 3% per year to be added to the previously established maximum District health benefit contribution amount of $450.00.

2. If any section, subsection, phrase or clause of this resolution is for any reason held invalid, such decision shall not effect the validity of the remaining portion of this resolution.

3. This resolution shall be effective immediately and shall be retroactive from the time of the inception of Resolution 94-1.

THE FOREGOING RESOLUTION WAS ADOPTED by the Board of Trustees of the Santa Barbara Coastal Vector Control District at a regular meeting thereof held on July 13, 2000, by the following vote:

Ayes: ALLEN, HURD, MACGILLIVRY, RAJALA, RUTTEN, VAN WINGERDEN, WINANT

Noes:

Abstain:

Absent: ____________________

President, Board of Trustees
Santa Barbara Coastal Vector Control District
Section 3.0
Employee Benefits

3.01 Introduction.
The District provides a number of benefits to the employees, both discretionary and legislated. Employees are encouraged to share the information with their family members so that in case of emergency they know how to access the benefits. Although it is the District's intent to maintain these benefit arrangements permanently, it reserves the right to modify or terminate any benefit arrangement, in its discretion.

3.02 Health Insurance.
The District provides coverage for each Full-Time regular employee and the employee's family as defined by the specific plan. The District will provide coverage for the employee only for employee's working between thirty (30) and thirty-nine (39) hours per week.

3.03 Dental and Vision Insurance.
The District provides coverage for each Full-Time regular employee and the employee's family as defined by the specific plan. The District will provide coverage for the employee only for employee's working between thirty (30) and thirty-nine (39) hours per week.

3.04 Supplemental Insurance.
Employees may elect to participate in supplemental insurance plans offered by Aflac. These plans utilize pre-tax contributions provided solely by the employee. Details are available in the plan document.

3.05 Retirement Plan.
Full-time employees are provided with retirement benefits administered by the Santa Barbara County Retirement System. In this plan, both the employee and the District contribute funds. Details are available in the plan document. This document and other plan documents mentioned below are available from the General Manager.

3.06 Deferred Compensation Plan.
Employees may make use of a voluntary deferred compensation plan to supplement their retirement. This plan utilizes pre-tax contributions provided solely by the employee. Details are available in the plan document.

3.07 Retiree Health Insurance Benefit.
Employees retiring from District employment may continue to receive health insurance coverage. Depending upon the number of years of full-time service, the District will pay up to 100% of the insurance cost. Details are available in the plan document.

3.08 Sick Leave.
Full-time employees accrue sick leave at the rate of 96 hours per year. The accrual for part-time employees is pro-rated based upon the number of hours worked. Accruals for
General Manager’s Report on District Activities

Board of Trustees Meeting

May 10, 2012

1. Continued to work with PERS and the Actuary to provide information for the OPEB actuarial report.

2. Continued to investigate the situation regarding retiree health care benefits as well as current employee benefits including a review of previously adopted Board Resolutions and policies.

3. Worked with Carrie Troup and the Budget Committee on our Budget including looking into what had been done about depreciation, an operating reserve and the financial questions and issues raised at the April Board meeting.

4. Worked with Angela Pagtalonia of SCI consulting on our Benefit Assessment report, resolutions, and options for the Board to consider.

5. Checked with County General Services to see if they have guidelines to govern disposal of excess equipment.

6. Talked to the Realtor representing the property on Aero Camino, and then talked to President Olson about that. Followed up on his suggestion to talk further with Chief Mingee about the status of the Fire District’s project.

7. Staff participated in Earth Day. Attendance was good and a number of people got information from us.

8. Attended a meeting with the Santa Barbara County Employees Retirement System Chief Executive Officer, Gary Amelio, and Lila Deeds to learn about the County’s new General Plan 7.

9. “Attended” the MVCAC Southern Region quarterly meeting along with Kenny via teleconference. No West Nile virus has shown up in any of the Districts that also attended. The State Department of Public Health representative reported two
cases of Typhus in Long Beach, a fatal case of Hanta Virus in San Francisco, and a case of Ocular onchocerca in a dog in the San Gabriel valley.

10. Sold the 2002 Dodge Dakota and got the title transfer done.
11. Made an appointment with Moss, Levy, and Hartzheim for their visit to the District office to begin the annual audit. They will be down on the 6th, 7th, and 8th of August.
12. Kenny and went to Oceano and Pismo to do a helicopter treatment of the large marsh area and for him to show me the other areas that we treat.
13. Staff went to treat the other areas at Pismo/Oceano the next day.
14. Had an on-site meeting with representatives from UCSB to discuss newly created wetlands in the Faculty Housing development adjacent to Ocean Meadows golf course.
Surplus Property—Revised Procedures

The County Code on surplus property is Section 2-47:

In the event any material, equipment, furnishing or other personal property is no longer needed by any agency of the county, it shall be transferred to the custody of the purchasing agent. If the purchasing agent shall determine that no other agency has need for such item, he shall declare it surplus. Any such item may be sold or otherwise disposed of, except by gift, by the purchasing agent if the current market value does not exceed twenty-five thousand dollars; and in other cases may be sold or otherwise disposed of by the purchasing agent only upon the prior approval of the board of supervisors. (Ord. No. 951, § 9; Ord. No. 2091, § 3; Ord. No. 3052, § 4; Ord. No. 4377, § 1)

The process used in the past has been for the losing department to request pickup of the item by the Mail Center staff, who transport it to a central storage area. When the storage area becomes full, a “viewing” is held so that any interested department could come by and inspect the property. All property not claimed by a department is declared “surplus” and sold or thrown away. It is permissible to give the property to a non-profit that is contracted with the County and not run afoul of the “except by gift” provision of the code. Giving it to anyone else, however, can only be done if there is a finding (by me or the Board for large cost items) that the property is “worthless” (defined as worth less that the cost of disposal).