

E 688-3767 or 688-4645 FOR ADVERTISING, PHONE 688-2114

lls its side of cityhood

revenues from Sears Roebuck and other stores in the Sutter Hill shopping complex at 41st Ave.

She emphasized that in its projection of revenues, LOCAL-G includes no income from this source.

"We took our sales tax figures from present revenues as reported by the State Board of Equalization."

She presented a document to show that county officials in their report on the Live Oak incorporation proposal included \$90,000 for Sears' revenues. LOCAL-G crossed this amount out and did not include it in its income estimate.

One vocal incorporation opponent is supposed to have referred to LOCAL-G as "a little group of high pressure political extremists."

However, they seemed far from that as they sat in the living room of the Ward's comfortable, modest home, sipping tea, munching cookies and chatting about how they got started on their venture of trying to make a city out of Live Oak.

Mauro explained that he and Mrs. White were both in the Live Oak Improvement Association about two years ago. They found that both of them were interested in the Live Oak incorporation idea but found no support from others in the association.

"This was about the time that the mid-county report was prepared by the students at

UCSC, recommending a mid-county city," Mauro said.

"The Live Oak Improvement Association grabbed it, and surmised that the students did a good enough job to ignore the incorporation of Live Oak." (The report found this not feasible for fiscal reasons.)

"I wasn't satisfied, and I knew others weren't. We started doing some investigation on our own, talking to supervisors, state officials, compiling information, and we concluded a city in Live Oak could be successful."

They found revenues of over \$500,000 at that time, Mauro said, and saw that the proposed city could spend as much on Live Oak roads as the county is "with a higher level of service."

Mrs. White, who has done much of the research required for the incorporation effort, declared, "We know we're not getting services in proportion to the revenue generated in the area. Higher services can be generated for the same amount of money without taxation."

She pointed out that the LOCAL-G budget shows \$13,000 more for Live Oak streets and roads than the county says it is spending on them. (She placed heavy emphasis on the word "says.")

Ward was convinced that the Live Oak road department would be more efficient because less "unwieldy" than the county road department.

"Our men would not be sent all over the county," Mauro said. "We would have three men full time right here."

As for police protection, LOCAL-G has proposed a seven-man police department costing \$102,650 a year.

This has been criticized by Sheriff Doug James, who says the proposed budget would not provide the level of service now provided the area by his office and the highway patrol.

The LOCAL-G group does not agree with this at all.

"I asked a sheriff's deputy, and he said Live Oak is a quiet community," Mauro said. "There is one 24-hour-a-day patrol car here now."

But Mrs. White thought there might be more, adding "It is impossible to tell from their figures."

The LOCAL-G people emphasize that they have done their homework and have come up with a concrete budget establishing the feasibility of incorporating Live Oak.

Two months ago, the Local Agency Formation Commission, after a three-hour hearing, gave LOCAL-G the green light to try to get enough signatures on a petition for an incorporation election.

It will have to obtain signatures of owners of 25 per cent of the assessed land value of the area proposed for incorporation.

This roughly includes the area

from the east city limits of Santa Cruz at Seventh Avenue to the west city limits of Capitola at 41st Avenue, north of Monterey Bay and south of Soquel Drive.

It is a compact, three-and-a-half square mile area with an estimated population of 14,600 and an approximate assessed valuation of \$23,892,000.

Mrs. White points out that after the presentation, not a single question was raised about the proposed budget.

The LOCAL-G members are unhappy about being "pressured" to speed up their incorporation efforts. They point out that it took them two months to get a complete boundary description of Live Oak, which they are now checking for errors. (A couple of minor ones have been found.)

Their next step will be to obtain at least 25 and not more than 50 signatures on a "notice of intention to circulate a petition to incorporate." This document will then be presented to the Board of Supervisors.

After that, LOCAL-G will be able to go ahead and circulate the incorporation petitions. It will have a year from that time to complete the incorporation proceedings and hold an election.

One complication is that the law says a name must be selected at the time the notice of intent is presented to the Board of Supervisors.

Mauro would rather have the people choose a name at the election, but the law isn't written that way.

Live Oak, can't be called Live Oak because there is already a city by that name in Sutter County.

LOCAL-G hasn't come up with a name yet. One suggestion considered was "Vera Cruz," which means "True Cross." (Santa Cruz means Holy Cross.) Others include Live Oak Shores and Opal Cliffs. The latter was rejected because the present Opal Cliffs is not included within the proposed boundaries.

LOCAL-G leaders know that they have a selling job to do.

"We figure that most of the people in Live Oak may be against incorporation," Ward said. "They feel it would put city taxes on top of county. But we don't plan it that way. Our council would listen to the people, and if they demanded improvements, they would get them."

Mrs. Ward said, "Most people say, 'Let's stay the way we are.' 'We feel incorporation is the best way to do that.'"