

## **Rebuttal to Argument Against Measure EE**

It's good to read that the opposition statement agrees "services funded by this measure are vital." However, five-bedroom houses are rare in Albany, and Target is not our typical retailer. Good policy is not based on extreme examples, but on what is common. In Albany that's smaller houses, apartments and businesses.

The relationship between the size of a house and disposable income is murky. That's true for ambulance calls, too. Families with children have more expenses, need bigger houses, and pay a lot for them. Seniors tend to be the main users of ambulance services, but they may or may not live in large homes, and they may be asset-rich but cash-poor. Square footage simply isn't a good way to determine who should pay more for ambulance calls.

The opposition statement fails to mention that the proposed measure already includes a better plan—a low-income exemption for both homeowners and renters. In addition, the measure requires commercial parcels to pay twice the amount of residential units, and industrial parcels to pay four times as much. Concerns about regressive taxation have been addressed.

The opposition statement assumes that policies that work in Berkeley and other California cities are appropriate for us. Given the relatively small size of our city government, a simple policy that is not costly to implement and maintain is the best policy. Albany has a unique ambulance service that meets our needs. Our method for supporting it should meet our needs as well.

Nick Pilch, Albany Mayor

Peggy McQuaid, Albany Vice Mayor

Peter Maass, Albany City Council Member

Michael Barnes, Albany City Council Member

