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RS1A8R June 2019
You should not let politicians you don’t trust raise your taxes.

Two years ago the City Government begged us to raise our taxes by $4.9 million a year. It was “temporary” until the City solved the crisis. Now they want to extend those taxes forever. What has the City done to solve its money problems?

In 2016, the top five city employees made a total of $2,175,105 annually. Now, they make $2,201,329.

Last year, the City Council enacted rent control which will cost hundreds of thousands of City tax dollars a year to administer and litigate.

A majority of the Council wants to buy and install prefabricated housing units which look like outhouses with windows. They cost at least $15,000 each. At the October 18, 2019 meeting, the majority of the council thought building this homeless slum with TAXPAYER money was a great idea! They were only interested in how many of these units they could crowd into Veterans’ Park. The City has budgeted $23 million so the homeless can live in Culver City.

Also on October 18, 2019, the Council majority (except Councilman Eriksson) attempted to create an “Equity” commission which would “hear” race complaints made by anyone (including non-residents) against city employees (including police and fire). The Council wanted to allow illegal aliens, felons, and 16-year-olds to serve on the Commission. Culver City’s legal and administrative costs for this racial Kangaroo Court would have been staggering. The City has already appointed an “Equity and Human Relations Manager” who will assuredly cost the City over $150,000 annually.

I don’t trust this City Council enough to let them increase my taxes. Do you?

Vote No on Measure ___.

Steven Gourley
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