

Primary Argument Against Measure B, Palo Alto USD Parcel Tax

*By Ken Dauber and Todd Collins
PAUSD Board Members from 2014-2022 and 2016-2024
and Former Board Presidents*

Good news - with over \$100 million in reserves and \$35,000 per pupil, Palo Alto schools don't need a parcel tax anymore.

We are both former PAUSD board presidents and have supported every local bond and parcel tax measure - until now.

Things have changed substantially since the last renewal. Funding per pupil has shot up, and is almost certain to continue to rise.

Over the last 10 years, enrollment has fallen by almost 20%, while property taxes have doubled. Further enrollment declines are ahead.

Per pupil funding now stands at \$35,000, more than double the level in 2014 - and in 2014, we already felt well-funded.

The parcel tax now represents less than 5% of total funding and becomes a smaller percentage every year.

How do we know we don't need the extra money? The most telling sign is that reserves have risen to over \$100 million, up from just \$25 million in 2019. This wasn't planned - it just happened as revenue piled up beyond the district's needs.

The school board has never discussed any of these issues. They never looked at enrollment or funding trends, or made any attempt to see how much funding the district needs. Sadly, they focused solely on how much they thought voters would approve - not what students actually need.

So we need to send a message: PAUSD needs to be a responsible steward of the community's resources. If we vote down this measure, the board will do the work and return with a more reasonable proposal in November.

We love and support our schools and students. But with over \$100 million in reserves and \$35,000 per student, the board needs to figure out what they really need - not just how much they can get.

Please join us in voting "no" on Measure B.