

REBUTTAL AGAINST ARGUMENT FOR MEASURE U

The five good citizens who signed the ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF MEASURE U have earned the high respect that hard working, capable people deserve. However, they have no control over how the proceeds from Measure U can be used. Municipal Code 3.18.010 prohibits general fund revenues to be restricted for "specific purposes." Nothing can be ensured. Unfortunately, the city council is allowed to spend every dollar however they choose. Fortunately, we, the voters, are empowered to choose whether or not to trust them with more tax dollars.

Previous actions of our city council have led to distrust, fostering opposition to higher taxes.

We elect citizens to research issues and make decisions. Twice this year our council decided to hire outsiders to do their job for them. It would be OK if they'd used their own money to pay others to do their work. Instead, they spent \$79,000 of OUR money.

\$40,000 went to the sales tax consultant who wrote Measure U. He recommended a temporary 1% sales tax increase with a six year sunset clause, and a nine member oversight committee. These were the same things that the failed Measure R tried for two years ago. The consultant could have earned \$10,000 per word by simply stating "TRY AGAIN, NO CHANGES." This year, council decided to eliminate the sunset clause, somehow believing the voters might be more receptive to a permanent tax raise.

Please, ask yourself, again, "Should I trust these people with more of my dollars?"



Steve Christensen