

REBUTTAL TO ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF MEASURE HH

VOTE NO for a tax that only “**COULD**” fund clean energy programs.

This measure holds no assurance at all for discerning voters, who want their tax dollars spent wisely. If you care about climate change and low-income families, DEMAND that proponents put forward a special tax that, with a two-thirds vote, would REQUIRE the revenues are spent towards specific, useful purposes, not spent on who-knows-what.

Even though Berkeley passed a Climate Action Plan, there is no implementation scheme. Any funds available to be spent is always channeled to City payroll. In fact, the City's \$28 Million expense increases in 2019 went to increased salaries and benefits according to their last Financial Report. Why didn't the funds go clean electricity or clean transportation or energy efficient homes?

The Proponents want to 'Prioritize equity and environmental justice.' Good! The Proponents can do that NOW without this Tax Increase. The truth is, the City has insufficient capability to successfully implement the Proponents' laundry list of complex, wide-ranging program ideas, many of which would duplicate state and utility programs.

A smart and effective tax would have specific assurances and would make the Sierra Club and League of Women Voters and every Berkeley citizen proud.

VOTE NO and tell Proponents to return after the pandemic with a specific plan that will use our tax dollars effectively and with oversight. With climate change and economic uncertainty, we cannot afford to waste money on well-intentioned, but half-baked ideas.

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