

Opinion: Reasons to vote for Measure R

To the community,

Several months ago at JPA public meetings on Measure R, I made arguments similar to those in Stephen Reinhard's recent letter opposing Measure R. Unlike Reinhard who didn't attend any of the meetings, I participated in all of the JPA public meetings, and learned about important facts Reinhard has wrong.

The JPA will not seek voter approval again for using the accumulating money for fields or "old" bike trails if Measure R is defeated. They have other options to resolve the situation; those options will make the "extra" money unavailable in the future for fields or "old" bike trails.

The JPA has had unplanned increases in revenue that will amount to several hundred thousand dollars over the life of Measure S. Fields will get \$500,000, with bike trails getting the rest plus all the originally planned new bike trail maintenance money; over \$800,000 more than if Measure R is defeated.

Next summer, fields and bike trails each get about \$235,000. Then fields get all of the money until about 2016 because fields need money "up front" for major work that must be done all at once, and for matching fund donations. We agreed so fields people will support using Measure S money for "old" bike trails. Bike trail renovation can be done in smaller increments and after fields get \$500,000, bike trails will get all of the money until Measure S sunsets in 2030.

Reinhard omitted the important final words of the Measure R sentence he quoted. It actually says the JPA can "... direct up to 100% of available JPA funding to pre-September 19, 2000

separated bicycle trails renovation.” This allows money to also be used for “old” bike trail maintenance or additional “new” bike trail maintenance.

Vote “Yes” on Measure R and give “old” bike trails \$235,000 now.

Charles W. Nelson, founding member and board member of Lake Tahoe Bicycle Coalition