CALIFORNIA
CITY OF BELMONT

RECEIVED
AUG 29 2016
BELMONT CITY CLERK

Ballot Measure Rebuttal Argument Submission Form

A ballot 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

Ballot Measure I for the general election to be held on 11/8/16.

☑ Rebuttal to Argument in Favor of ☐ Rebuttal to Argument Against

This argument is submitted by: (check all that apply)

☐ **The Legislative Body of the City of Belmont**
If this argument is filed by the legislative body of the City of Belmont, fill in the name of the governing body below and fill in both sides of this form

Legislative Body:	
Contact Person's Printed Name:	Contact Person's Signature:
Title:	
Phone:	Email:

☐ **Member(s) of the Legislative Body of the City of Belmont**
If this argument is filed by any member(s) of the legislative body, fill in the information below and complete both sides of this form.

Member(s) of the Legislative Body:	Name of Legislative Body:
Contact Person's Printed Name:	Contact Person's Signature:
Title:	
Phone:	Email:

☑ **Bona Fide Association of Citizens/Organization**
If this argument is filed by a bona fide association of citizens/organization, the signers of the argument must be affiliated with the association/organization, be authorized to sign the argument on its behalf, provide the printed name and signature of at least one principal officer of the organization, and complete both sides of this form.

Name of Association/Organization: Belmont Citizens for Responsible Spending - Against Measure I	
Principal Officer's Printed Name and Title: Timothy E. Strinden, President	[redacted]
Contact Person's Printed Name: Timothy E. Strinden	
[redacted]	Fax:

☐ **Individual(s) eligible to vote on the measure**
Individual signers must be eligible to vote on the measure.

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, there is no requirement that they be eligible to vote on the measure. However, 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.

	Name:	Title:	Legislative Body of the City of Belmont	Member(s) of the Legislative Body of the City of Belmont	Bona Fide Association of Citizens/Organization	Individual(s) eligible to vote on the measure
1.	Pam Rianda	Former Belmont Mayor	☐	☐	☐	☑
	[redacted]	Date: Aug. 27, 2016				
2.	Phillip E. Mathewson	Former Belmont Mayor	☐	☐	☐	☑
	[redacted]	Date: Aug 28, 2016				
3.	Coralin Feierbach	Former Belmont Mayor	☐	☐	☑	☐
	[redacted]	Date: Aug 27, 2016				
4.	Dale O'Harra II	Electrical Engineering Consultant	☐	☐	☑	☐
	[redacted]	Date: Aug 28, 2016				
5.	Robert Krainz	Former Director of Supply Chain	☐	☐	☐	☑
	[redacted]	Date: 8-28-16				

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

RECEIVED

AUG 2 9 2016

BELMONT CITY CLERK

Authorization Form
Change in Preparer, Submitter, or Signer of Rebuttal Arguments

PLEASE ONLY COMPLETE SECTIONS THAT ARE APPLICABLE

Authorization must be provided by the original author(s) of the primary argument(s) in favor of or against the specified measure, when a different person(s) will prepare, submit or sign the rebuttal argument. *California Elections Code §9285(a)(2), §9317*

The undersigned author(s) hereby authorize(s) the following individual(s) (up to five) to sign prepare, or submit (whichever is applicable) the rebuttal argument to the primary argument in favor of/~~against~~ Measure I for the election to be held on *(date of election)* 11/8/16

I. NEW SIGNER(S):

Name of Rebuttal Argument Signer: Pam Rianda

Name of Rebuttal Argument Signer: Phillip E. Mathewson

Name of Rebuttal Argument Signer: Coralin Feierbach

Name of Rebuttal Argument Signer: Dale O'Harra II

Name of Rebuttal Argument Signer: Robert Krainz

II. NEW PREPARER(S):

Name of Rebuttal Argument Preparer: _____

Name of Rebuttal Argument Preparer: _____

III. NEW SUBMITTER(S):

Name of Rebuttal Argument Submitter: _____

Name of Rebuttal Argument Submitter: _____

NAME(S) & SIGNATURE(S) OF PI[redacted]OR(S):

Timothy E. Strinden / [redacted] 8/28/16

Printed Name and Signature of Author Date

_____ _____

Printed Name and Signature of Author Date

Rebuttal to Argument in Favor of Measure I

City officials used **scare tactics**—claiming that our infrastructure is deteriorating and in worse condition than it is—as well as **"red herrings"** and **empty promises** in pushing Measure I.

- **Street pavement**—Belmont spent more than $2,400,000 the past two years, enough to prevent further deterioration, per City estimates.
- **Storm drain pipes**—The only ones deteriorating are the 5.5% made of metal, costing only $1,700,000 to replace.
- **Sewer Repairs**—These are fully funded by bonds and not a concern.
- **"Maintaining 911…response times" and "quality of life services"**—These services are great with our existing revenues!

For street pavement and storm drains, expected new revenues will allow for steady improvements without raising taxes or hurting local businesses.

Measure I provides a false sense of security with an "Advisory Committee" to "report" on how the tax "has been spent." The term "advisory" is misleading because this committee has no role in determining how the proceeds **should** be spent! The City Manager bypassed the Infrastructure Committee this year in promoting this tax, so it's likely this new committee will also be **ignored and ineffective**.

The proponents say there will be annual audits "to ensure funds are spent…as promised"—That is a **wasteful duplication** of existing audits and an **empty promise as the funds may be spent for any City purpose whatsoever!**

The City's "impartial analysis" was prepared by the City Attorney, who may gain from this measure in salary and other benefits.

Vote NO on Measure I!