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

FILED IN THE OFFICE OF THE CHIEF ELECTIONS OFFICER OF SAN MATEO COUNTY, CALIF.
MARK CHURCH
CHIEF ELECTIONS OFFICER &
ASSESSOR-COUNTY CLERK-RECORDER
MAR 26 2018
By [redacted]
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 O for the Primary to be held on June 5, 2018.

☑ Rebuttal to Argument in Favor of Measure O ☐ 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: MARK W. A. Hinkle	Phone: [redacted]
Mailing Address: [redacted] Morgan Hill, CA 95037	
Fax:	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

Measure O

Rebuttal Argument Signers Form

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.

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

Phone: [redacted] | Email: [redacted]

Address: [redacted] Morgan Hill, CA 95037

Signature: [redacted] | Date: 3/26/18

☐ ☐ ☑ ☐

2. Name: William Collins | Title:

Phone: [redacted] | Email: [redacted]

Address: [redacted] Pacifica CA

Signature: [redacted] | Date: March 19, 2018

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒ ✓

3. Name: Baudelia B. Larez | Title:

Phone: [redacted] | Email:

Address: [redacted] Pacifica

Signature: [redacted] | Date: 3/19/18

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒ ✓

4. Name: | Title:

Phone: | Email:

Address:

Signature: | Date:

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

5. Name: | Title:

Phone: | Email:

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	☐ Registered	N/A	Signed	Dated
Bona Fide Association	☐ Verified	N/A	Signed	Dated

Actual = 250 w. + Guidelines:

Rebuttal to Argument In Favor of Measure O

PSD regularly asks taxpayers for more money, but when **California voters OK'd a $9 billion bond for school facilities in 2016, but PSD didn't even bother to apply**.

We generously fund schools, but we don't print money. Measure O is a hefty additional tax on Pacificans, making housing less affordable for renters and homeowners alike.

PSD omits the true cost of borrowing. Including **$59 million interest**, it's really a **$114 million bond**, paid by too few taxpayers. That's $8,908 per average household, or **$297 yearly, for 30 years.)** It'd cost more for many, and still more if Measure J, another school bond, passes. The two pending bonds cost $168 million combined.

There's no senior/low income exemptions.

How did PSD spend the tax overrides, and deplete all the money from the facilities bond we're still paying? Did it fund mailings promoting the next tax increase? It budgets almost nothing to maintain our multi-million investment in facilities.

PSD already gets ample funding for maintenance. It should budget for maintenance from current sources: increasing state apportionments, growing local property taxes, the facilities bond we're paying, and the parcel tax. Instead, we're asked to borrow and pay on **two** facilities bonds! Measure O adds more debt for painting, patching, signs and new furniture for administrators - anything goes. Read it!

Please vote **NO on Measure O**. Borrowing is extravagantly expensive. PSD won't budget wisely as long as it can get taxpayers to cover for mismanagement with new taxes on struggling Pacificans each election year.

12 15 1 28
13 11 2 26
14 12 15 12 2 55
6 6
14 13 11 1 39
11 8 13 13 12 3 60
10 14 9 33

247 w.

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