Rebutal to in favor of G



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.

	ount limit for Rebuttal Arguments = 250 words	obite for Price	
Ballot N	Measure G for the primary	election to be held on	6-7-22
	outtal to Argument in Favor of Measure		
Signe	ed by Same Individual(s) Selected for the Vote	Information Pamphlet for the Prim	ary Argument
If the Pamp	rebuttal argument is signed by the same individua hlet for the primary argument, check the following	l(s) as those already selected for the box and skip the back side of this for	Voter Information m.
W.	Rebuttal Argument Is Signed by Same Individual(s) Selected for the Voter Information Pamphlet for the Primary Argument		
	Contact Person's Printed Name: MARK HINKLE		
	Phone:	Email:	
	ed by Different Individual(s) than Individual(s) ary Argument	Selected for the Voter Information P	amphlet for the
signer attach	uthor(s) of the primary argument may authorize a rs are new for the rebuttal argument, please chech the written authorization (the Authorization Form ry argument author(s).	the following box, complete the back	side of this form and
	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.org web www.smcacre.org

Brisbane Elementary School District \$166 Parcel Tax: Rebuttal - Measure G

Just when families are expecting RELIEF from the supposedly "temporary" \$131/year parcel tax, Brisbane Elementary School District requests a NEW TAX OF \$786 PER HOME (\$131 x 6 years) — on top of the current \$166/year tax.

Our state has an estimated \$31 billion budget surplus — some say higher.

While families grapple with a 7.9% rise in prices, how does it make sense to raise our taxes? Why not utilize the state's massive surplus — i.e., our tax money?

The district spends \$19,879 per student per year or \$314,088 per class (latest figure, 2019–20). That's 151% of the average for elementary schools, statewide.

One purpose of this new parcel tax is to "maintain...reading instruction."

Why is the most fundamental skill we should be teaching our children — reading — apparently not a priority in the district's regular budget?

Has the district earned this tax increase?

Per the California Department of Education's Education Data Partnership (www.ed-data.org):

- 36.16% of students are below grade level in English.
- 46.12% are below in math.

If you got 36.16% wrong on an English test, you would get a D grade, right? And for 46.12% wrong on a math test, an F?

Should voters and taxpayers be rewarding poor performance? If "NO!" then please:

Vote NO on Measure G.

District teachers' average salary and benefits are \$101,356 per shortened work year.

As parents, we know that rewarding poor behavior just reaps more poor behavior.

Urge Brisbane Elementary School District's board to financially responsible.

Vote NO on Measure G.

For information: www.SVTaxpayers.org

FILED IN THE OFFICE OF THE OF SAN MATEO COUNTY

MAR 2 8 2022

MARK CHURCH ST. 1 Florings Offices
By:

DEPUTY CLERK

1812

18 8

17

15 0

OV

120

90

70

7

EV

19 /

12 / 9

24

11

£ 4

3

238