



RECEIVED

Ballot Measure Argument Rebuttal Submission Form

AUG 24 2015

City of San Carlos  
City Clerk's Department

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 ✓ for the City of San Carlos to be held on Nov. 3, 2015.

Rebuttal to Argument in Favor of Measure ✓       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: Betsy Karfoed


Please complete the reverse side of this form.

Rebuttal Argument Signers Form

Each signer must designate in which capacity they are signing. Check the appropriate box.

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: <u>MATT GROCOTT</u>	Title: <u>an SC City Council Member</u>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	Phone:	Email:				
	[Redacted Address]					
2.	Name: <u>Tom Mase</u>	Title: <u>volunteer trail builder</u>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	Phone:	Email:				
	[Redacted Address]					
3.	Name: <u>STEVE HUNSADER</u>	Title: <u>ADJACENT PROPERTY OWNER</u>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	Phone:	Email:				
	[Redacted Address]					
4.	Name: <u>ANDREW SHENK</u>	Title: <u>HOMEOWNER &amp; TAX PAYER</u>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	Phone:	Email:				
	[Redacted Address]					
5.	Name: <u>BETSY "DAFFODIL" KORFOED</u>	Title: <u>COURL SCOUT &amp; HOMEOWNER</u>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	Phone:	Email:				
	[Redacted Address]					

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 V

**Measure V just doesn't add up:**

**Zero transparency**

Measure V asks taxpayers to commit to spending millions without telling us key details: the properties' appraised value, the total purchase price, and the percentage of the land that's even usable for recreation.

**The "100 new homes" claim has no basis in fact**

The developers who own the land now aren't building. Instead, they've been trying to sell for more than a decade—including through two housing booms.

The properties are steep and difficult to access. Existing plans for part of the property reveal that challenging slopes dictate no more than one home per half acre. This is not the prime real estate that proponents would have you believe developers are clamoring for. This rhetoric may even drive the price up!

**Bait and switch**

Supporters and the city are telling everyone what they want to hear. Open space and trails? You got it! More sports fields or a public pool? You got it! The only thing that's certain is that there certainly is no plan.

**Our current parks need more support**

Millions of dollars for San Carlos parks projects have gone unfunded according to the city, including North Crestview. From field drainage to stair repair, improvements are needed throughout. Let's fix the parks we have before taking on debt for another.

Before we sign a \$45mm mortgage, we respectfully ask the city for more information, greater transparency, and better funding for the parks we already own.

**Vote NO on Measure V.**

[www.VoteNoBlackMountainBond.org](http://www.VoteNoBlackMountainBond.org)

**RECEIVED**

AUG 24 2015

City of San Carlos  
City Clerk's Department