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

MARK CHURCH
CHIEF ELECTIONS OFFICER &
ASSESSOR-COUNTY CLERK-RECORDER

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 P Foster City Levee Bond for the Primary to be held on June 5, 2018.

☑ Rebuttal to Argument in Favor of Measure P ☐ 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:	Phone:
Mailing Address:	
Fax:	Email:

Please complete the reverse side of this form.

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 Association; Phone: [redacted]; Email: [redacted]; Address: [redacted] Morgan Hill, CA 95037; Signature: [redacted]; Date: 3-26-2018	☐	☐	☑	☐
2. Name: Harland Harrison; Title: Chair, Libertarian Party of San Mateo County; Phone: [redacted]; Email: [redacted]; Address: [redacted] Belmont CA; Signature: [redacted]; Date: 3-26-2018	☐	☐	☑	☐
3. Name:; Title:; Phone:; Email:; Address:; Signature:; Date:	☐	☐	☐	☐
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

Rebuttal to Argument in Favor of Measure P

Don't let the City Council scare you! If voters reject this measure, the City Council can just offer a better deal in November. The complete project design is not expected until October. Don't rush.

Can the Foster City City Council really offer a better deal? Yes! Foster City has over $57,000,000 in reserve funds. The City Council could spend some of that money and borrow less.

Sure, Measure P funds would "stay local"; they would protect properties in San Mateo and Foster City. But Foster City would pay the entire cost! Why should only Foster City pay? A flood would not stop at the San Mateo boundary. A special assessment district, where all protected properties pay for their benefit, would spread the cost fairly. Why should only the people of Foster City pay for a regional problem?

Foster City has about $37,300,000 in the Capital Asset Preservation/Acquisition Fund and over $20,000,000 in the General Reserve Fund. Just $30 million would cover a third of the cost and still leave millions for emergencies. But the City Council voted against using even $10 million in February. What better investment could the Foster City City Council plan for that money than protecting their voters from flooding? Refusing to spend $30 million already available, makes the tax burden 50% higher!

That $272 estimate might look small, but Ad Valorem taxes in California are terribly unfair. Some families pay many times what others pay for identical houses. The tax collector does not care.

Let the Foster City City Council offer a better deal, getting everyone to pay their share, and using money that Foster City already has.

Vote "No" on Measure P

http://www.svtaxpayers.org/2018-fostercity-bond

247