

REBUTTAL TO ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF MEASURE GG

Here is what the tax proponents should say: 'Berkeley wants more money because pension liabilities continue to grow. Therefore, Berkeley is picking on Uber & Lyft and trying to copy San Francisco's tax, even though our tax is more regressive and will not have any accountability nor dedicate any money for infrastructure.'

Look at the argument again – there are very few relevant facts in their argument.

- 1) The TNCs pay gas taxes like everyone else, hence they do pay their "fair share."
- 2) Transit (i.e. AC transit and BART) is only being "hurt" because of the virus and because TNCs provide more useful service for some people, not because Berkeley doesn't have enough revenue.
- 3) Berkeley is not San Francisco, and SF's congestion is irrelevant to ours.
- 4) This tax will NOT encourage ridesharing because this measure makes it MORE expensive, not less.
- 5) This Tax MIGHT "support general municipal services like paving streets and improving pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure," but it could also pay for "raises for the city council, firefighter pensions and shadow studies." The money can go anywhere.

Our city may not even have the legal right to tax the TNCs, and if GG passes, we are likely to get sued (SF needed a state law to tax the TNCs: google *AB1184 TNC*).

Vote No!

s/Marcus Crawley
President – Alameda County Taxpayers Assoc., Inc.

s/Damian Park
Berkeley Voter

s/Orlando Martinez
Berkeley Voter

s/David Denton
Berkeley Voter

s/Laura Minard
Berkeley Voter