

Rebuttal Argument in Favor of Measure B-22


This rebuttal addresses the arguments against in order presented:

“through preventative maintenance and capital improvements”—The City Attorney's Impartial Analysis and the Ballot Text itself stipulate the parcel tax revenue can ONLY be used for projects to maintain City infrastructure for the existing harbor and waterfront. It cannot be used for Harbor day-to-day operations, or the City's general fund operating budget.

Capital Improvements—Except where infrastructure is so deteriorated it must be replaced (e.g., Dune/Beach Street slips), the \$10 million investment needed is for maintaining existing structures. While the possibility of \$1.5M T-Pier grant is good news, we cannot rely on grant funding for our harbor. The last significant grant the Harbor received was for the Ice Machine 20 years ago. We need a reliable funding source.


“adjusted for inflation”—Annual inflation adjustment would be based on the “Consumer Price Increase of all Urban California Consumers” which in the past 5 years has averaged 3.9%. The Argument Against questions whether the tax will drop if inflation drops. This is nonsense: if inflation is zero, the increase is zero.

“until ended by the voters”—True. An initiative to rescind the tax can be placed on the ballot by the City Council or by petition with sufficient citizens' signatures. The argument against fails to note that citizens, including at least two of the opponents, recently collected enough signatures to generate a ballot item denying the Harbor Department \$175,000 in annual operating revenue. Their argument that this can't happen again is hypocritical.


Cherise Hansson
Chair, MB Harbor Advisory Board


Martin Lomell
Interim MB City Manager (Ret)


Jan Goldman
Member, MB Public Works Advisory Board


Glenn Silloway
Former, Citizen of the Year