

OFFICE OF

ASSESSOR-COUNTY CLERK-RECORDER & ELECTIONS REGISTRATION & ELECTIONS DIVISION

COUNTY OF SAN MATEO

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 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.

Word o	count limit for Rebuttal Arguments = 250 words					
Ballot I	Measure L for the Presidential P	rimary to be held on March 03, 2020				
✓ Re	Rebuttal to Argument in Favor of Measure Rebuttal to Argument Against Measure					
Signe	ed by Same Individual(s) Selected for the Voter	Information Pamphlet for the Primary Argument				
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.						
	Rebuttal Argument Is Signed by Same Individual(s) Selected for the Voter Information Pamphlet for the Primary Argument					
Contact Person's Printed Name:						
3	Phone:	Email:				
	ed by Different Individual(s) than Individual(s) S ary Argument	elected for the Voter Information Pamphlet for the				
signer attach	rs are new for the rebuttal argument, please check	by 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				
V	Rebuttal Argument Is Signed by New Signers as Authorized by Primary Argument Author(s)					
	Contact Person's Printed Name: Mark Hinkle	in a fight of the				
<	Phone:	Freelle				

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.

222	- NAME OF	1000	P ROTTER BY	V 1000000000000000000000000000000000000		CONTRACT CONT.	T. British Street	N-127-1-128	Form
- T	4-3	A 1 8 b	- T 20	A W of a	SHERRY	- 1 a 1 200	Tala	7-14-8	-Katasa
988	76	avos	15.18	m I h	Faller	-181 W.	PILOTE	ALC: NO	EN JERRE

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. 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. Print information clearly

misleading. Print information clearly.	MN
1. Name: LEO PATRICK MCARILE	Title: Ve Texan Actives T Email:
	Email:
Address:	
BUL	11WCAME, CA 94010-5732 Date:
	16 Recember 2019
2. Name: SEORGE W. SMOTH	Title: 5MFD RETIRED
Phone:	Email:
Address SA.	N MATEO CA 9440/
Si	Date: /2/16/19
3. Name: / Trapanii Phone:	Title: Regired Doveloper
Phone:	Email:
Address	Millhour as Orchaza
	Millbrue Cz 94030 Date: 12/16/19
4. Name: Karen Kennedy	Title: Home maker
Phono:	Fmail:
Address	n Matro CA 94403
SiamAture:	Date: / 2 - 1 7 - 19
5. Name: CORA JEAN KLEPPE	Title: retired TEACHER
Phon	Email:
Address	AN MATEO CA 94403
Signature:	Date: 12 17 2019

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



OFFICE OF

ASSESSOR-COUNTY CLERK-RECORDER & ELECTIONS REGISTRATION & ELECTIONS DIVISION

COUNTY OF SAN MATEO

Authorization Form for Change in Signers of Rebuttal Arguments

Pursuant to California Elections Code §§9167, 9317 and 9504, the author(s) of the primary argument in favor of or against a measure may authorize in writing *any other person or persons* to sign the rebuttal argument.

The undersigned author(s) of the primary argument hereby authorize(s) the following					
individual(s) to sign (up to five) the rebuttal argument to the primary argument in favor					
of/arainst (sixels and) Massure 1 for the Election to be hold on May 03709					
of/against (circle one) Measure for the Election to be held on (date of election)					
(
NEW SIGNER(S) (PRINT CLEARLY):					
Name of Rebuttal Argument Signer: Leo Patrick McArdle					
Name of Rebuttal Argument Signer: George W. Smith					
Name of Rebuttal Argument Signer: Andrew Trapani					
Name of Rebuttal Argument Signer: Karen Kennedy					
Name of Rebuttal Argument Signer: Lova Jean Kleppe					
(The new signers listed here must sign the Ballot Measure Rebuttal Argument Submission Form)					
NAME(S) & SIGNATURE(S) OF THE PRIMARY ARGUMENT AUTHOR(S):					
MARK W. A. HINKLE 12-21-19					
Printed Name and Signature of Author Date					
Printed Name and Signature of Author Date					

Rebuttal Argument San Mateo High School District \$385M Bond Issue: Measure L

How greedy can you get? In 2010 voters approved \$186,000,000 in debt to "Provide classrooms" and in 2006 they approved \$298,000,000 in additional debt to "Build new and replace old classrooms". 11 They want \$385,000,000 to do the same things all over again??? 10 Do schools really need upgrading every four to ten years? Have they even spent the \$186,000,000 from the 2010 bond or the \$298,000,000 from 2006? If not, why are they asking for more of your hard-earned tax dollars? Budgets set priorities. San Mateo High School District is saying every educational dollar spent today is going to a higher priority than to "provide classrooms". 13 Do you agree? 13 The website: www.ed-data.org shows at 9,484 students in the district, which means this bond expense is \$40,594 per student, on top of the \$19,611 per student expenses from 2010 and the \$17,534 per student in the annual school budget. Would you take out a 25-30-year loan to buy a personal computer? Nuts, right? But that's what the District wants you pay for now, like they did in 2010. They issued bond debt to purchase technology in 2010 that is now obsolete, but you are still paying for it. You deserved to know the truth about measure L. If you value school maintenance more than making principal and interest payments for 25-30 years, vote NO on Measure L. Remember, financing school projects via bonds, routinely double the cost of the project. And purchasing technology via bond debt is just nuts!



For more information: www.SVTaxpayers.org

DEC 2 3 2019

MARK CHURCH Chief Flections Officer

By: ______

DEPUTY*CLERK

