

From: [David Cutaia](#)
To: [David Cutaia](#)
Subject: RE: Goleta City Council to Consider Short-Term Vacation Rental Ordinance Amendments
Date: Wednesday, April 29, 2026 9:00:12 AM

From: Nicolas Scozzaro <nscozzaro@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, April 28, 2026 6:09:23 PM
To: Anne Wells <awells@cityofgoleta.org>
Subject: Fwd: Goleta City Council to Consider Short-Term Vacation Rental Ordinance Amendments

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Mrs. Wells,

I'm a Goleta property owner working to add housing the city actually needs. I previously reached out to you for help reforming attached-ADU permitting rules — a path that would produce real new housing units, and which under current rules cannot be used as STVRs. That request did not advance.

Separately, I recently obtained an STVR license for an existing unit on my property (Unit C) that I own as an LLC and have committed approximately \$1M in improvements based specifically on the current Chapter 5.08 framework.

The amendments before Council on May 5 would pull the rug and retroactively undermine that investment — and the data the City itself commissioned does not support the policy. I respectfully urge a **no vote**.

The May 20, 2025 BAE study concluded:

- Active STVRs in Goleta: 51 permits — 0.4% of 12,584 total housing units. ~69 active listings citywide versus ~2,400 in Santa Barbara County.
- Consultant finding (verbatim): STVRs are "not currently a significant driver of the observed shortage of available long-term housing."
- Local jobs: ~77 supported (1.5 per STVR × 51 active permits), plus ongoing TOT revenue.
- 44% of STVR listings are 1-bedroom units — not the family-sized housing the Housing Element targets.
- Hotel ADRs locally exceed \$300/night; STVRs keep middle-income visitors,

researchers, and contractors spending in Goleta rather than in Santa Barbara or Ventura.

The proposed LLC prohibition, night caps, waiting periods, and three-strike suspension would shrink supply and TOT revenue while addressing a problem the City's own consultant says STVRs aren't causing. They also signal to anyone considering long-term investment in Goleta that ordinance terms can be rewritten after capital is committed.

If the Council's underlying concern is housing supply, the highest-leverage action is on the production side — ADU rule reform, attached-ADU pathways, and similar measures that actually add units. Restricting 51 existing STVRs that the City's own analysis identifies as a non-driver does not produce housing, it keeps hotel prices high, reduces jobs, and TOT revenue for the city.

The consultant's own recommendation was continued monitoring. That is the measured, evidence-based path. I'd ask the Council to take it: preserve the current ordinance, monitor annually, and protect property owners investing in good faith.

Thank you for your service to the City.

Respectfully,
Nic Scozzaro
459 Linfield Place, Goleta
(805) 698-0457

Notice of Support for Proposed Amendments:

Discussion Agenda Item C2—Short-Term Vacation Rental (STVR) Ordinance Amendments and Administrative Changes

This letter is to express support for the proposed amendments to STVR policy.

Background

STVRs are problematic because they erode communities in a way that is only understood by those who have experienced living in a home that has a stream of next-door visitors who use the location as a vacation staging area instead of a permanent residence. The accompanying flow of maintenance and cleaning personnel to support the STVR further erode privacy and tranquility and leave the feeling that one is living next to a mini hotel rather than a family home in a neighborhood.

Without the proposed amendments, current policy is overly broad and permissive. For example, STVR policy fails to account for the needs of residents who live along a narrow private road, resulting in the complications of an STVR that limits access for emergency vehicles, parking, or exit in the event of fire or other emergencies. In a similar vein, current policy leaves unaddressed the unique needs of areas where homes rely upon septic systems, allowing STVRs to generate overuse and susceptibility to system failures.

Furthermore, STVRs are divisive since they place neighbors in the role of enforcement regulators; there is no other way to monitor compliance. Events such as vomit in the street or emergency nighttime pumping of septic wells go unreported unless neighbors seek conflict with an STVR owning neighbor. Furthermore, if homeowners report problems, home values are diminished because such complaints are reported on disclosure statements prior to the sale of a home. In my case, hoping to maintain good relations with the STVR owners and my home value, I withhold complaint when issues arise. The proposed three strikes provision is reasonable, but the burden of tension and hostility that results is placed upon neighboring families.

In addition, city staff lacks capacity to oversee STVR regulations. For example, even though a written request was made, we never received a Nuisance Response Plan. It has been over a year since the application was approved.

The issue of Transient Occupancy Tax is troublesome because our city government should never be in the business of raising revenue through income generated by policy detrimental to its permanent residents.

Finally, it is common sense to understand that the use of homes as STVRs reduces housing availability for long-term rental or purchase. Decreased supply generates increased demand, aggravating problems of affordability.

For all the above reasons, I strongly support the proposed amendments to:

1. Differentiate between hosted and non-hosted STVRs, with relaxed rules for homeowners who choose to run a hosted STVR.
2. Limit the annual number of days for STVR rentals to 120 days per year. I suggest consideration of 90 days per year as an annual limit.
3. Prohibit business entities from purchasing homes for conversion to STVR use.
4. Require two years of ownership before a home could be converted to STVR use.
5. Prohibit eviction of tenants to enable conversion of housing to STVR use.

While additional regulations would provide even greater protection against the erosion of community by STVRs, the current amendments are a step towards a reasonable balance between the rights and interests of residential neighbors and property owners who wish to use their holdings to generate income through creation of an STVR.

Without these amendments, Goleta residents are unfairly burdened by the interests of STVR owners. The proposed amendments help to curtail the uncontrolled growth of STVRs in Goleta that current policy allows.

Thank you for this opportunity to provide input. Your time and service to our city is appreciated.

Sincerely,

Dan Cooperman

TO: Goleta Mayor Perotte and Council Members

FROM: George Relles

RE: Item C2 on your May 5, 2026 Agenda

DATE: May 4, 2026

Mayor and Council members, I respectfully request that you consider my testimony below regarding item C2 on your agenda.

I also respectfully request that you support staff's recommendations that would update Goleta's short-term rental regulations, especially limiting non-hosted short-term rentals.

Please review my testimony below.

* * *

**GOLETA'S SHORT-TERM RENTAL (STR)
UPDATES TO POLICIES ARE NEEDED**

**NON-HOSTED STRS IN GOLETA MUST BE LIMITED IN ORDER TO AVOID
SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS TO RESIDENTS AND THE CITY**

1. Non-hosted STRs threaten to increase the loss of already scarce Goleta housing for residents in favor of visitors.
2. Conversion of Goleta's residential housing to non-hosted STRs will increase as Carpinteria and the City of Santa Barbara are restricting STRs there.
3. New Goleta housing coming on the market, like 340-unit Heritage Ridge, offer big financial opportunities for profit-seeking non-hosted STR investors.
4. Residents have a fair expectation that residential will not be de facto converted to commercial. non-hosted STRs create issues of parking, strangers cycling through neighborhoods, and sometimes dangerous activity by short-term renters.
5. The more housing is converted to non-hosted STRs, the housing shortage will increase and higher RHNA quotas will be imposed on Goleta.
6. Hotels have a 30% vacancy. Allowing unrestricted un-hosted STRs threatens to undermine local hotels. And if hotel occupancy increases to a level that visitors strain to find a place to stay in Goleta, new hotels and motels can be approved. It's more effective and safer to house visitors in hotels than in residential properties.
7. Cost of STR administration and enforcement does not need to be excessive, by partnering with STR companies and by checking online advertising once a week. An intern can do the latter. Plus, revenue from hefty fines for non-compliance would help offset cost of administration and enforcement. The City needs an

incentive for registering and conforming to certain standards like health and safety, and pay TOT. Regulations with carrots and sticks work best.

8. Even if the City's enforcement costs rise a bit, the cost of preserving even one residence would be much less than the \$1-2 million for City to finance with in lieu fees.
9. The idea that some people have invested in STRs doesn't mean that City needs to ensure their profit; investing in an STR carries the same risks of any investment (see Spirit airlines.) But City could mitigate such investor investment losses by allowing a 6-month grace period so current owners of non-hosted could rent or sell the residence intended to be an STR.
10. Goleta doesn't have to expend a lot of effort in fashioning a revised STR ordinance. There are many working and successful models that other cities are using to take a balanced approach to STRs. They do so primarily by measures like allowing hosted STRs liberally while limiting the non-hosted ones to 90 days a year.

From: Kevin Roberson <kevin@sierrapropsb.com>

Sent: Monday, May 4, 2026 12:52 PM

To: Luz Reyes-Martin <lreyes-martin@cityofgoleta.gov>; Paula Perotte <pperotte@cityofgoleta.gov>; Jennifer Smith <jsmith@cityofgoleta.gov>; James Kyriaco <jkyriaco@cityofgoleta.gov>; Stuart Kasdin <skasdin@cityofgoleta.gov>

Subject: Concerns Regarding Proposed STVR Amendments – Owner-Used Home in Goleta

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Mayor and Members of the City Council,

I am writing regarding the proposed amendments to the City's short-term vacation rental (STVR) ordinance scheduled for consideration on May 5. Restricting homes like ours will not create housing, but it may remove long-term community members from Goleta.

My family owns a home in Goleta that we continue to consider our primary home, even though we now split our time between Goleta and Texas due to our daughter's educational needs. Our entire family regularly returns on long weekends, holidays, and throughout the summer, and the home remains an important part of our daily lives.

In addition, either my husband or I are in Goleta during the week for business purposes. We manage approximately 30 employees in Goleta, many of whom live in the surrounding community. Maintaining our presence in Goleta is important both personally and professionally.

When we made the difficult decision to temporarily relocate, we did not intend to leave Goleta permanently. Converting our home to a short-term rental on a limited basis has simply allowed us to maintain ownership in the face of significant carrying costs, which exceed \$100,000 annually.

I respectfully offer the following concerns with the proposed amendments:

1. No Impact on Housing Supply

Our home is a 4,200-square-foot single-family residence. It is not part of the City’s attainable housing stock and would not realistically transition into a long-term rental. Restricting occasional short-term use of homes like ours will not increase housing availability but may instead force long-term owners to sell.

2. “Non-Hosted” Classification Does Not Reflect Actual Use

Although we may not always be physically present during guest stays, our home is actively used by our family throughout the year. We also share it with extended family, our church community, and neighbors hosting visiting family. A strict “non-hosted” classification does not capture this hybrid, community-oriented use.

3. Economic Viability of Maintaining Ownership

Limitations on the number of rental nights per year could make it financially unsustainable for us to retain our home. Short-term rentals are not a commercial enterprise for us—they are a practical tool that allows us to maintain ties to the community and return regularly.

4. Demonstrated Compatibility with the Neighborhood

Since beginning limited short-term rentals, we have not received any complaints related to safety or nuisance. In fact, our own family gatherings are likely the most active use of the property. This experience suggests that responsible, well-managed homes can operate without negatively impacting neighborhood character.

5. Risk of Overbroad Regulation

Broad restrictions—such as rigid classifications, ownership limitations, or blanket caps—may disproportionately impact responsible homeowners while failing to address the small number of problematic operators, including those who do not comply with existing rules.

6. Accountability Through Professional Management

Our home is professionally managed, ensuring clear guest rules, prompt responsiveness, and ongoing oversight. This level of management provides accountability and consistency that aligns with the City’s goals of responsible operation.

We support reasonable regulations that:

- Address nuisance properties
- Require accountability
- Promote good neighbor behavior

However, we respectfully ask the Council to consider a more tailored approach that distinguishes between:

- Investor-owned, full-time short-term rental properties

- Owner-used homes with occasional short-term rental activity

Preserving that distinction will better align regulation with actual impacts and allow families like ours to remain connected to Goleta.

I would also note that many homeowners hold property in limited liability entities for standard liability protection. This alone does not indicate commercial or investor-driven use and should not be used as a proxy for regulation.

Finally, our home has provided visiting families the opportunity to stay together in a residential setting, supporting local businesses and contributing to the community in ways that are not always reflected in regulatory analysis.

We are not asking for no regulation, we are asking for the right regulation.

Thank you for your time and thoughtful consideration.

Sincerely,
Kevin S. Roberson

From: [Dustin Hoiseth](#)
To: [City Clerk Group](#)
Cc: [Rachel Murphy](#)
Subject: Public Comment 5/5 Goleta City Council: Chamber position on STVRs
Date: Tuesday, May 5, 2026 1:45:55 PM
Attachments: [2026_5_5_ShortTermVacationRentals_GoletaCityCouncil.pdf](#)

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Hello,

Please share the following public comment (attached and below) for the 5/5 City Council meeting with the City Council, and to be added to the public record. I understand this is a last-minute submission and that distribution to Council may be limited. I have BCCed them to this email.

This public comment is from the Santa Barbara South Coast Chamber of Commerce, in opposition of the proposed STVR Ordinance.

Thank you for your assistance!

Dear Mayor Perotte and Councilmembers,

The Santa Barbara South Coast Chamber of Commerce, representing business and economic interests from Goleta to Carpinteria, opposes the amendments and administrative changes to the Short-Term Vacation Rental Ordinance. We want to clarify that we do not oppose regulating short-term vacation rentals (STVRs). Instead, we advocate for a policy that considers the impact to the visitor economy and City tax revenue. We strongly urge the City to evaluate the long-term economic and fiscal impacts of the proposed ordinance before moving forward.

The City's 2025 study on the impact of STVRs on the local housing market shows only about 0.7% of Goleta's housing stock is classified as STVRs or part-time second homes, while another 2.2% is vacant. This indicates that STVRs account for a very small portion of Goleta's housing market. Given the study's findings, the following two ordinance provisions are disproportionate to the actual scale of STVR activity in Goleta. 1) A prohibition on STVR licenses for properties owned by corporations, LLCs, or any form of business trust. 2) A cap on the number of nights per year a non-hosted STVR may be rented.

The proposed cap and restrictions on STVRs may create impacts beyond the City's intent, particularly for owners who operate as businesses through entity ownership, including those with only one or two units. These provisions do not distinguish between large-scale operators and small business owners, and risk unintentionally penalizing individuals who are operating in a compliant, limited capacity.

A 2025 City report also states that vacation rentals are not correlated with the shortage of available long-term housing. Therefore, it seems unnecessary to pursue changes that would harm STVR operators and their valuable contributions to the visitor economy and TOT revenue, if the changes do

not improve housing feasibility. While the Chamber is deeply concerned about the community's housing crisis, this issue is fundamentally driven by limited supply.

Moreover, STVRs are not a marginal component of the City's lodging market; they are an essential part of the visitor economy. Vacation rentals and hotels complement each other and serve different travelers with different needs. Couples and smaller groups typically choose hotel rooms, while families and larger groups often book vacation rentals for their multiple rooms and shared gathering spaces. For these reasons, decreasing STVRs does not simply shift TOT revenue to hotels. Therefore, this ordinance would likely decrease overall visitation to Goleta, leading to lower, not redistributed, TOT revenue.

We ask that the Council consider a more balanced alternative that supports the visitor economy and STVR operators and aligns with the City's fiscal realities. This does not mean that STVRs should be unregulated. The Chamber supports reasonable guardrails, including enforcement mechanisms, penalties for bad actors, and clear licensing requirements that ensure compliance and full TOT collection. We respectfully encourage the Council to reconsider the entity-ownership and annual night cap provisions of this ordinance and recommend conducting a study to evaluate the long-term economic and housing impacts before making a permanent policy decision.

Sincerely,

Dustin Hoiseth
Director of Economic Development
Santa Barbara South Coast Chamber of Commerce

[DUSTIN HOISETH](#) | Director of Economic Development
SANTA BARBARA SOUTH COAST CHAMBER OF COMMERCE
(805) 729-5525 | Dustin@SBSCChamber.com



805.967.2500 | www.SBSCChamber.com
Mailing Address: 5662 Calle Real #204, Goleta, CA
Visitor Center: 120 State Street, Santa Barbara, CA

May 5, 2026

Mayor Perotte and Goleta City Council
City Hall, Council Chambers
130 Cremona Dr.
Goleta, CA 93117

RE: Short-Term Vacation Rental Ordinance Amendments and Administrative Changes

Dear Mayor Perotte and Councilmembers,

The Santa Barbara South Coast Chamber of Commerce, representing business and economic interests from Goleta to Carpinteria, opposes the amendments and administrative changes to the Short-Term Vacation Rental Ordinance. We want to clarify that we do not oppose regulating short-term vacation rentals (STVRs). Instead, we advocate for a policy that considers the impact to the visitor economy and City tax revenue. We strongly urge the City to evaluate the long-term economic and fiscal impacts of the proposed ordinance before moving forward.

The City's 2025 study on the impact of STVRs on the local housing market shows only about 0.7% of Goleta's housing stock is classified as STVRs or part-time second homes, while another 2.2% is vacant. This indicates that STVRs account for a very small portion of Goleta's housing market. Given the study's findings, the following two ordinance provisions are disproportionate to the actual scale of STVR activity in Goleta. 1) A prohibition on STVR licenses for properties owned by corporations, LLCs, or any form of business trust. 2) A cap on the number of nights per year a non-hosted STVR may be rented.

The proposed cap and restrictions on STVRs may create impacts beyond the City's intent, particularly for owners who operate as businesses through entity ownership, including those with only one or two units. These provisions do not distinguish between large-scale operators and small business owners, and risk unintentionally penalizing individuals who are operating in a compliant, limited capacity.

A 2025 City report also states that vacation rentals are not correlated with the shortage of available long-term housing. Therefore, it seems unnecessary to pursue changes that would harm STVR operators and their valuable contributions to the visitor economy and TOT revenue, if the changes do not improve housing feasibility. While the Chamber is deeply concerned about the community's housing crisis, this issue is fundamentally driven by limited supply.

Moreover, STVRs are not a marginal component of the City's lodging market; they are an essential part of the visitor economy. Vacation rentals and hotels complement each other and serve different travelers with different needs. Couples and smaller groups typically choose hotel rooms, while families and larger groups often book vacation rentals for their multiple rooms and shared gathering spaces. For these reasons,



805.967.2500 | www.SBSCChamber.com
Mailing Address: 5662 Calle Real #204, Goleta, CA
Visitor Center: 120 State Street, Santa Barbara, CA

decreasing STVRs does not simply shift TOT revenue to hotels. Therefore, this ordinance would likely decrease overall visitation to Goleta, leading to lower, not redistributed, TOT revenue.

We ask that the Council consider a more balanced alternative that supports the visitor economy and STVR operators and aligns with the City's fiscal realities. This does not mean that STVRs should be unregulated. The Chamber supports reasonable guardrails, including enforcement mechanisms, penalties for bad actors, and clear licensing requirements that ensure compliance and full TOT collection. We respectfully encourage the Council to reconsider the entity-ownership and annual night cap provisions of this ordinance and recommend conducting a study to evaluate the long-term economic and housing impacts before making a permanent policy decision.

Sincerely,

Dustin Hoiseth

Dustin Hoiseth
Director of Economic Development
Santa Barbara South Coast Chamber of Commerce



May 5, 2026

Mayor Paula Perotte
Mayor Pro Tempore Stuart Kasdin
Councilmember Luz Reyes-Martín
Councilmember James Kyriaco
Councilmember Jennifer Smith
130 Cremona Drive
Goleta, CA 93117

RE: Short-Term Vacation Rental Ordinance Amendments and Administrative Changes

Dear Mayor Perotte and Councilmembers,

The Santa Barbara Association of REALTORS® (SBAOR) represents about 1,200 REALTORS® throughout the South Coast and our mission includes engaging in real estate related community issues affecting our members and/or their clients who are homeowners, housing providers, tenants, and commercial owners. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the proposed amendments to the City's short-term rental (STR) ordinance.

SBAOR was actively engaged in the development of Goleta's original STR ordinance and worked collaboratively with the City to help shape a framework that balances neighborhood compatibility, property rights, and economic benefit. Since its adoption, we have consistently highlighted Goleta's approach as a model ordinance, one that represents a true "win-win" and has been shared as an example of effective STR regulation in conversations across California and nationally.

Importantly, available data indicates that this framework is working as intended. Current estimates show approximately 50–55 active STR units citywide, representing roughly 0.4% of Goleta's housing stock, and prior analysis has found no measurable impact on overall housing availability. In addition, STR activity contributes to the local economy through Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue and related visitor spending, providing a tangible public benefit alongside appropriate regulation.

In that context, SBAOR supports targeted refinements that strengthen accountability while preserving fairness and flexibility for property owners. We support the proposed three-strike enforcement framework and strengthened Good Neighbor provisions, which appropriately focus on behavior-based compliance. These measures directly address nuisance concerns such as noise, parking, and occupancy, and represent a practical and effective way to reinforce community standards without imposing unnecessary restrictions on compliant operators.

We also support staff's recommendation to not move forward with a mid-term rental registry. Allowing such uses could create a regulatory gray area that undermines the clarity and enforceability of the ordinance, potentially enabling circumvention of STR rules. Maintaining clear distinctions between permitted uses is important for consistent enforcement.



However, SBAOR opposes the proposed 24-month prohibition on STR use following the purchase of a property. This restriction is not tied to demonstrated impacts and would impose a significant burden on new property owners. Given the extremely limited share of STRs in Goleta's housing market, this measure is unlikely to produce any meaningful increase in long-term housing supply, while reducing flexibility and potentially discouraging property transactions.

Additionally, we oppose the requirement to submit title and deed documentation as part of the STR permitting process. This requirement duplicates information already available through public records, raises privacy considerations, and adds administrative complexity without a clear nexus to improved enforcement outcomes.

In closing, SBAOR encourages the City to continue building upon what is already a successful and balanced framework. Goleta's STR ordinance has demonstrated that it is possible to regulate responsibly without overreaching, and it remains a strong example of how to align community concerns with property owner rights. We respectfully urge the Council to focus on data-driven, behavior-based enforcement tools and avoid broad, preemptive restrictions that may create unintended consequences without delivering measurable public benefit.

Thank you for your time and thoughtful consideration.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Jennifer Berger". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Jennifer Berger
SBAOR President



**2025-5-5 Old Town Restriping Review
May 5th Agenda Item B-4**

**Comments by Richard Foster
Please put this into the record**

A careful review shows that most of the goals of the Old Town project were not met or failed to bring about significant change.

Speed

The report claims success because the 85th percentile is reduced by 4.4 mph. The city lowered the speed limit by 5mph. The 85th percentile of drivers has not changed relative to the speed limit. It is the signs which brought change not the project.

Sales tax revenue.

This is where Trumpian math takes over. Staff reports that in 2025 sales tax rebounded and nearly returned to 2023 levels!

From 2023 to 2025 inflation was 3% per year so collections should now be 6% higher.

Secondly, in January 2024 the sales tax rate rose 1% which is a 12.12% increase in the tax being generated. The severe downturn in 2024 numbers were already lifted by that tax increase but still showed a huge collapse from 2023. .

By all rights, the \$616K collected in 2022 should be 18.2% higher or about \$728K today.

Or if you subtract 18.2% from the 2025 numbers the current collection is only \$494K in 2023 numbers. This is less than the previous years amount of \$564K. This project continues to drive business downward!

Traffic

The report shows a 12% decrease on Hollister Ave but a huge increase on surface streets. The striping project has eliminated 2,162 trips on Hollister but increased residential street trips by at least 498. So the real change in Old Town traffic is perhaps 9%. Another missed goal.

Fatalities

Staff's chart shows deaths increased by one, after the start of the project, Yet because there were no additional deaths the following year the chart shows a 100% reduction. For the years 2022-2026 this death disappears completely and the chart shows nothing.

And what about the child killed on Nectarine Ave. The Old Town project increased residential traffic. One has to wonder did a child die because the city chose to drive traffic off of Hollister Ave?

Pedestrians

With pedestrians we have the same staff reporting problem where the chart shows one pedestrian injury and then claims a 100% reduction for the next year. And nothing in the summary. Pedestrian accidents went up. Another failed goal.

Bike Count.

How many bike trips were north to south along Nectarine and Pine? How many riders were actually counted using Hollister Ave. bike lanes? And how many bikers were riding on the sidewalk?

Summary

Traffic is down on Hollister but missed its target number.

Traffic is up on residential streets which residents hate.

Deaths are up

Pedestrian accidents went up

Bike accidents were unchanged despite the new bike lanes

Old Town small business sales continue to decline.

And sales tax revenue continues downward despite a reopened gas station and increased auto sales.

Time limited parking and lower speed limit signs would have accomplished better results without spending \$65 million dollars.