

Argument Against Menlo Park City School District Parcel Tax Measure ____

In 2010, voters approved a TEMPORARY parcel tax (Measure C) “in the face of deep state budget cuts and growing local enrollment.”

It’s 2016. The economy has recovered. Property tax revenues are at all time highs. Yet, the district wants to replace this with a PERMANENT parcel tax.

Those budget cuts? In 2011, state funding was cut from \$2.13 million¹ to \$1.07 million¹. In 2012, state funds totaled \$2.02 million. By 2013? The district received over \$3.33 million¹ from the state.

Remember Measure B in 2003? It was passed “to restore programs lost due to state budget cuts.” MPCSD’s revenue has doubled since 2003. Somehow, they managed to stick us with a PERMANENT tax.

We’re still paying long after the budget cuts were restored.

The district is trying to fool you into thinking tax revenues are not keeping up. In 2005-06, MPCSD collected \$19,885,846¹ in revenue. By 2014-15, they collected \$38,089,792². In that 10 year period, enrollment grew 36%.

They’re telling us \$18.2 million is not enough to fund 772¹ additional students. That’s about double Woodside Elementary’s *entire budget* for 452 students¹.

MPCSD is one of the highest funded districts in the entire state. They don’t need the money. But I’ll tell you why they WANT it.

The existing parcel taxes (Fund 17) generated a surplus. Instead of saving it for a rainy day, MPCSD decided to use it to fund their deficit spending. The continued deficit spending will deplete the Fund in 2017.

The obvious solution: balance the budget and end deficit spending.

MPCSD’s solution? They’re adding TWO permanent parcel taxes.

Measures ____ and ____ reward and enable further deficit spending by the district.

ENOUGH IS ENOUGH!

Tell the district to be fiscally responsible by voting **NO** on ____.

¹www-ed-data.org

²MPCSD 2014-2015 Budget

Author, Alexander Keh

Signers:

Alexander Keh, Homeowner

Jennifer Sun, Homeowner