

# Recommendations for the May 3, 2011 Election

Everett DePangher

Released May 2, 2011

---

*We have yet another emergency election. It is ironic that this one occurs just two days before I move away from California, and I do not envy those I leave behind. It appears that this ongoing budget crisis will continue for some time, and as a lame duck Californian, that is something I shall not miss.*

---

## Contents

Summary of Recommendations	1
Recommendations	2

## Summary of Recommendations

<b>Vote for</b>	<b>Office or Referendum</b>	<b>Jurisdiction</b>	<b>Candidate / Vote</b>
1	Measure C	Cupertino Union School District	No

## Recommendations

<b>Measure C</b>		
<u>Jurisdiction</u> Cupertino Union School District	<u>Vote for</u> 1	<b>No</b>
<p>The District’s Board of Education has placed this \$125/parcel/year property tax increase on the ballot. It would go into effect July 1 and expire after six years. This adds to Measure B, which we approved on May 5, 2009 to implement an essentially identical increase, thus effectively establishing an overall \$250/parcel/year hike.</p> <p>I am truly torn on this. In the last couple of years, we have been voting on a string of state and municipal tax increases, several of which have been handled through emergency elections like this. As is rather obvious from previous recommendations, I have not maintained a consistent position although, I hope, my ambivalence has always been apparent. For awhile, I deferred to school boards and supported property tax increases to protect students. However, when an entire group of local tax increases went on the November 2, 2010 ballot, I voted against them collectively fearing that the entire system was spinning out of control. With state revenue shrinking in the ongoing recession, many local governments lose payouts from the state. As a result, they desperately go to the voters directly for supplementary funds.</p> <p>This creates a real problem because we do need to cut net government spending in the recession. Shifting greater responsibility to municipalities and then hiking local taxes certainly does not accomplish this. Our different levels of government must figure out some way to coordinate proportionate cuts among themselves. I am voting No to encourage such a process.</p> <p>I know that this may cause disruption to schools, but then again it may just be forcing schools to streamline and do more for less. All along, I have said that I do not know much about school budgets. I read what I can in the press, but there is no way that I can judge whether a district needs this particular amount of money. I would like to show deference but cannot defer to all municipalities all the time. California needs a better system.</p>		