

MARK CHURCH

CHIEF ELECTIONS OFFICER & ASSESSOR-COUNTY CLERK-RECORDER

Ballot Measure Rebuttal Argument Submission Form

If both an argument in favor of <u>and</u> an argument against a measure have been selected for publication in the Sample Ballot & Official Voter Information Pamphlet, a **typed** rebuttal to the argument in favor of or the argument against the measure may be submitted as outlined in this form.

The author(s) of the primary argument of the measure may prepare and submit a rebuttal argument or may authorize in writing any other person or persons to prepare, submit or sign the rebuttal argument.

A rebuttal argument will 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, the name of the association and the printed name and signature of at least one of its principal officers. Please make sure you are using proper format before submitting to the Elections Office.

Rebuttal to Argument in Favor of Measure Rebuttal to Argument Against Measure				
it				
If the rebuttal argument is signed by the same individual(s) as those already selected for the Voter Information Pamphlet for the primary argument, check the following box and skip the back side of this form.				
the				
Signed by Different Individual(s) than Individual(s) Selected for the Voter Information Pamphlet for the Primary Argument				
The author(s) of the primary argument may authorize any other person or persons to sign the rebuttal argument. If signers are new for the rebuttal argument, please check the following box, complete the back side of this form and attach the written authorization (the Authorization Form for Change in Signers of Rebuttal Argument) from the primary argument author(s).				

Arguments will be emailed to the contact person listed here for review before they are printed in the Sample Ballot & Official Voter Information Pamphlets.

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.gov web www.smcacre.gov

Rebuttal Argument Signers Form			Pron	ouns
No sul	No more than five signatures shall appear with any argument. If more than five signatures are submitted, the first five listed shall be printed.			
Na title	Names and titles listed will be printed in the order that they are listed below. A signer can only list one title. Honorifics such as M.D., Dr., Esquire, etc. with a name are not accepted.			>
If the signers are part of a bona fide association, for each such signing individual(s), the title under the signer's name shall list the name of that bona fide association and may include their position within that association. By signing below, the undersigned state that they have read the argument and believe it not to be false or misleading. Type information clearly.				boxes below
1.	Name: MARK WA HINKLE	THE PRESIDENT: SILICON Valley THYPAYERS ASSOCIATION	He/ His:	$\mathbf{\Sigma}$
Pho		- Company of the comp	She/ Her:	
Sig	natur	10RGAN H1LL (A 95037 Date: 8-17-29	They/	
		8-17-24	Them	: Ш
2.	Name:	Title:	He/ His:	
	one: dress:	Email:	She/ Her:	
Sig	nature:	Date:	They/	
			Them	:⊔
3.	Name:	Title:	He/ His:	
Pho	one:	Email:	She/ Her:	_
Address:				Ц
Sig	nature:	Date:	They/ Them	: 🗆
4.	Name:	Title:	He/ His:	
	ne:	Email:	She/ Her:	
Auc	Addiess.			
Sigi	nature:	Date:	They/ Them:	
5.	Name:	Title:	He/ His:	
Pho		Email:	She/	
Address:			Her:	
Sign	nature:	Date:	They/ Them:	: 🗆

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

Rebuttal to the Argument in Favor: Measure J

Millbrae Elementary School District \$95,000,000 Bond Tax:

In 2022, district voters rejected a \$90 million bond measure.

Did district trustees get the message? Clearly, no!

Instead they've come back and tacked on an extra \$5million.

Your money paid for placing this measure on the ballot, again!

Supporters propose "rebuilding aging school facilities" — while enrollment is **DECLINING** significantly. Average Daily Attendance is down to just 1,985 students.

Does that make any sense to you? NO? Then please vote NO on J.

This bond equals \$47,858 per student — and that's before 30+ years of interest expenses at rates up to 12%. Yikes!!!

Will this \$95million bond debt be spent to hire or train great teachers to improve dismal student academics?

Answer: NO, such usage is not legally permitted.

Let's look at students' recent academic performance:

2022-23 school year test results:

37.38% below grade level for English

38.94% below grade level for math.

The District rewarded teachers — despite this dismal performance — by increasing the average salary of \$82,192 in 2018-19 to \$95,773 (2022-23).

Source: Education Data Partnership - www.ed-data.org

Should you, the voter, reward the district for such poor scores??

If your answer is "no," we encourage you to vote NO on Measure J.

If you reward failure, you will get more failure!

<u>Reject failure – Vote No on Measure J.</u>

For more information: www.SVTaxpayers.org



4137128726111

9