

Daryl Hennessy

From: paul hollar <phollarsr@msn.com>
Sent: Friday, January 20, 2023 2:38 PM
To: Joseph St. John; Damin Cappel; Tim Gose; Dave Martin; Cindi Cooper; John Grumney; Murray Neff
Cc: Steven Pyles; David Brehm; Daryl Hennessy
Subject: Resolution 2023.01

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

I STRONGLY OBJECT to adding to the Sunbury Meadows Community Development Authority NCA as presented in the four petitions submitted via Resolution 2023.01.

As I stated in my letter to Council members 13 months ago (dtd 12-6-2021), requiring school (or City) charges by only a select set of homeowners when other voter approved income generating solutions, which apply to essentially all City residents, are available is grossly NOT FAIR!

The reasons why such a school district charge is not fair to be included as an NCA charge include:

- The future citizens in the NCA District have no say in the amount or duration of the charge assessed (they are not even here to voice an opinion).
- Their neighbors outside the District (like you and me) are likely to pay less for children's education than they would solely via property tax and income tax assessments combined since those in the District pay an additional charge they will not—convenient for you and me, but not fair to those in the District!
- School districts have a more 'fair' mechanism to pay for (some) education expenses and citizens do have a say in the amount and the duration— it's called a levy, which is voted on by citizens, and applies essentially to everyone.
- The additional school revenue generated by this NCA is probably not as significant as you might think. In FY 2022, the total Walnut School District revenue slightly exceeded \$50 million. In 2020, total charges collected by the existing NCA were around \$184k with NCA expenses of around \$24k (for around 470 homes), thus netting around \$160k for schools – a pretty small amount when compared to the total revenue.

The proposed 4 mil charge approximately DOUBLES a homeowners charges (taxes) paid to the school district for the next 20 years.

1. Does the school district NEED the money? – YES
2. Will the school district USE the money wisely? – YES
3. IF IT FAIR? – NO!

As I have stated before, NCA charges to pay for improvements that mainly directly support and/or improve the lives of those living in the specific area are a acceptable and reasonable method to pay for items that improve

their well being. Paying more than their fair share only to support schools is a burden that I have heard no reasonable explanation as to why you think it is a good idea.

I would appreciate your explanation as to why we are so far apart on this issue.

In addition, there are some technical issues with the four petitions which I believe makes them incomplete as required by Revised Code 349.

The issues include:

- No “suggested number” of Board Trustees
- Two maps do not match the properties (lot number) list
- One petition states “bonds” will be used but three do not mention bonds
- A adequate “financial plan” is not included