

## 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.

Word	count limit for Rebuttal Arguments = 250 words		
Ballot	Measure V for the <u>GENER</u>	A L to be held on 1/-5-24	
<b>∑</b> Re	ebuttal to Argument in Favor of Measure	Rebuttal to Argument Against Measure	
Sign	ed by Same Individual(s) Selected for the Voter	Information Pamphlet for the Primary Argument	
	rebuttal argument is signed by the same individual oblet for the primary argument, check the following	(s) as those already selected for the Voter Information box and <b>skip</b> the back side of this form.	
X	Rebuttal Argument Is Signed by Same Individual Primary Argument	(s) Selected for the Voter Information Pamphlet for the	
	Contact Person's Printed Name:		
	MARK WAHINKLE		
	Phone:	Email·	
	ed by Different Individual(s) than Individual(s) S ary Argument	elected for the Voter Information Pamphlet for the	
signe attacl	ers are new for the rebuttal argument, please check	y other person or persons to sign the rebuttal argument. If the following box, complete the back side of this form and for Change in Signers of Rebuttal Argument) from the	
	Rebuttal Argument Is Signed by New Signers as Authorized by Primary Argument Author(s)		
	Contact Person's Printed Name:		
	Phone:	Email:	

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			
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. 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. <b>Type</b> information clearly.			
1. Name:  MARK WA HINKLE	Title: PRESIDENT: SIZICON Valley TAXPAYERS Associa Tion	He/ His:	
Phone:	Small:	She/	
Address:		Her:	
	MOKGAN HILL (A 95037	They/	
	MORGAN HILL CA 95037  Date: 8-17-29	Them: 🔲	
2. Name:	Title:	He/ His:	
Phone:	Email:	She/ Her:	
Address:			
Signature:	Date:	They/ Them: 🔲	
3. Name:	Title:	He/ His:	
Phone:	Email:	She/ Her: 🎵	
Address:			
Signature:	Date:	They/ Them:	
4. Name:	Title:	He/ His:	
Phone:	Email:	She/	
Address:			
Signature:	Date:	They/ Them: 🔲	
5. Name:	Title:	He/ His:	
Phone:	Email:	She/ Her:	
Address:			
Signature:	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 U

## Menlo Park City Elementary School District \$123,600,000 Bond Tax:

Proponents say they want to purchase "modern technology" with a 30-year loan, despite "technology" being obsolete in 5 or 6 years, and **while enrollment is DECLINING significantly**. Average Daily Attendance is down to 2,584 students.

Would you buy a computer via a 30-year loan? Nuts, right?

But that's exactly what the district is doing (to you).

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

This bond equals \$47,832 per student — that's before 30+ years of interest expense at rates up to 12%. Yikes!!!

Will this whopping \$123,600,000 bond debt be spent to hire or train great teachers to improve student academics?

Answer: NO, such usage is not legally permitted by the measure.

Let's look at recent academic performance:

2022-23 school year results:

20.47% of students below grade level in English.

22.11% of students below in math.

The district "thanked" students, parents, and taxpayers for the passage of the 2017 parcel tax (\$360) with those failures in proficiency in English and math!!!

The district rewarded teachers, despite this performance, by increasing the average salary of \$119,736 in 2020-21 to \$132,501 (2022-23) plus benefits.

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

Should you, the voter, reward Menlo Park City Elementary School District for belowgrade level scores in English and math?

If you answered "no," we encourage you to vote NO on Measure U.

If you reward failure, you will get more failure!

Reject failure - Vote No on U.

For more information, please visit us at: www.SVTaxpayers.org.

SOGIOUNS BOILOBG BRICES BAR 96

246