

MAR 26 2018



OFFICE OF
**ASSESSOR-COUNTY CLERK-
RECORDER & ELECTIONS**
COUNTY OF SAN MATEO

MARK CHURCH, Chief Elections Officer
By: [Redacted Signature]
ASSESSOR-COUNTY CLERK-RECORDER DEPUTY CLERK

Ballot Measure Rebuttal Argument Submission Form

If both an argument in favor of and against a measure have been selected for publication in the voter information pamphlet, a rebuttal to the argument in favor of or the argument against the measure may be submitted as outlined in this form.

The author of the argument in favor of the measure may prepare and submit a rebuttal argument to the argument against the measure or may authorize in writing any other person or persons to prepare, submit, or sign the rebuttal argument. Likewise, the author of the argument against the measure may prepare and submit a rebuttal argument to the argument in favor of the measure or may authorize in writing any other person or persons to prepare, submit, or sign the rebuttal argument.

A rebuttal argument shall not be accepted unless accompanied by this completed form, which shall contain the printed name(s) and signature(s) of the person(s) submitting it or, if submitted on behalf of a bona fide association of citizens/organization, the name of the association/organization and the printed name and signature of at least one of its principal officers.

Word count limit for Rebuttal Arguments = 250

The rebuttal arguments shall be submitted to the elections official conducting the election no later than _____.

These rules apply to all rebuttal arguments unless a rebuttal argument is otherwise provided by law.

Ballot Measure J for the June Primary to be held on 6/5/18

Rebuttal to Argument in Favor of Measure J Rebuttal to Argument Against Measure _____

Signed by Exact Same Individual(s) as Argument Already Selected for the Voter Information Pamphlet

If you are submitting a rebuttal argument and the individual(s) signing the rebuttal argument are the same as the individual(s) signing the original Ballot Measure Primary Argument Submission Form, check the following box and complete the back side of this form.

Rebuttal Argument Is Signed by Same Individual(s) as Argument Already Selected For the Voter Information Packet

Submitted by Different Individual(s) as the Opposing Primary Argument

If the rebuttal argument is signed by anyone different than the signer(s) of the Ballot Measure Primary Argument Submission Form already submitted—including whether there is only one different individual or whether there are up to five new individuals—you must complete the section below, complete the back side of this form, and attach to this form the written authorization by the author that indicates: (i) your name(s); and (ii) the author's name, contact information, statement of authorization, and signature.

Contact Person: <u>MARK W.A. HINKLE</u>	Phone: [Redacted]
Mailing Address: [Redacted]	<u>Morgan Hill, CA 95037</u>
Fax: [Redacted]	Email: [Redacted]

Please complete the reverse side of this form.

40 Tower Road, San Mateo, CA 94402
P 650.312.5222 F 650.312.5348 email registrar@smcacre.org web www.smcacre.org

Rebuttal Argument Signers Form

Each signer must designate in which capacity they are signing. Check the one box that applies.

No more than five signatures shall appear with any argument. If more than five signatures are submitted, the first five listed shall be printed. Names and titles listed will be printed in the order that they are listed below.

If the signers are part of a bona fide association/organization, for each such signing individual(s), the title under the signer's name shall list the name of that bona fide association/organization and may include their position within that association/organization.

By signing below, the undersigned state that they have read the argument and believe it not to be false or misleading.

		Governing Body of San Mateo County, a School District, or a Special District	Member of the Governing Body of San Mateo County, a School District, or a Special District	Bona Fide Association of Citizens/Organization	Individual
1.	Name: MARK W.A. HINKLE Title: President <i>SILICON VALLEY TAXPAYERS ASSN.</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Phone: [Redacted] Address: [Redacted] Signature: [Redacted]				
	Email: [Redacted] Date: Morgan Hill, CA				
2.	Name: William Collins Title:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	Phone: [Redacted] Address: [Redacted] Signature: [Redacted]				
	Email: [Redacted] Date: Pacific 94044				
	Signature: [Redacted] Date: March 26 18				
3.	Name: Title:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Phone: Address: Signature: Date:				
4.	Name: Title:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Phone: Address: Signature: Date:				
5.	Name: Title:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Phone: Address: Signature: Date:				

Submit a second form (this side only) for alternate signers attached to this form and the argument.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

Signers	<input type="checkbox"/> Registered	N/A	Signed	Dated
Bona Fide Association	<input type="checkbox"/> Verified	N/A	Signed	Dated

Actual: 236w.
+ Guidelines:

Rebuttal to Argument in Favor of Measure J

We value education, but these tax overrides add up!

9 9

This school district didn't even bother applying for any of the \$9 billion school facilities bond money California voters approved in 2016.

13
9 22

Measure J benefits a few favored school employees (including administrators), but this latest \$54 million tax increase, including interest, makes living here more expensive for everyone else, both homeowners and renters.

9
12
9 30

School employees receive competitive compensation with benefits, including lifelong pensions and medical, for working short school years. **They should pay for housing from wages as we do.**

8
12
7 27

Taxpayers already generously fund the Jefferson United High School District:

6 6

- 1) state apportionments (up 66% since 2012);
- 2) ~~ever increasing~~ local property taxes (schools get almost half);
- 3) multiple local bonds and taxes OK'd in 2006, 2012 and 2014, about \$600 million total cost; and
- 4) a parcel tax. See your tax bill.

7
10
14
4
8 43

Never satisfied, now they want us to pay for staff rent, too! Measure J is a slippery slope to taxpayer - paid rents for all. What's next, staff cars?

15
12 27

Measure J has no ~~senior~~ ~~low~~ income exemption.

7 7

\$21+ million of the bond goes to banks for interest - not to education.

13 13

Schools' expertise isn't apartment management. **Who wants new administrators hired as landlords?**

8
4 12

Why are taxpayers' wallets the low hanging fruit to pick? Voting "no" doesn't mean we don't value schools, but the rest of us face costly housing, too.

13
14 27

Please vote NO on Measure J

5 5

228w.

FILED IN THE OFFICE OF THE CHIEF ELECTIONS OFFICER OF SAN MATEO COUNTY, CALIF.

MAR 26 2018.

MARK CHURCH, Chief Elections Officer
By: [Redacted] DEPUTY CLERK