Ballot Measure Argument Rebuttal Submission Form

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 the printed name(s) and signature(s) of the author(s) submitting it, or, if submitted on behalf of an organization, the name of the organization and the printed name and signature of at least one of its principal officers who is the author of the argument; and the form statement provided in Elections Code section 9600 signed by each proponent and by each author, if different, of the argument.

Word count limit for Rebuttal Arguments = 250

The rebuttal arguments shall be submitted to the elections official conducting the election no later than 5pm on August 29, 2016. These rules apply to all rebuttal arguments unless a rebuttal argument is otherwise provided by law.

Ballot Measure W for the General Municipal Election for the City of Pacifica to be held on November 8, 2016.

☒ Rebuttal to Argument in Favor of Measure W ☐ 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 <u>anyone</u> 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: Karen Rosenstein, Co-Chair Committee to Oppose Rezoning the Pacifica Quarry	[redacted]
Mailing Address [redacted]	
Fax: None	[redacted]

Please complete the reverse side of this form.

Rebuttal Argument Signers Form

Each signer must designate in which capacity they are signing. Check the one box that applies.

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~~ to the KR position within that association/organization.

2 By signing below, the undersigned proponent(s) or author(s) of the rebuttal argument against (in favor of/against) ballot proposition W (name or number) at the General Municipal election for the City of Pacifica to be held on November 8, 2016 hereby state that this argument is true and correct to the best of their (his/her/their) knowledge and belief.

	Name	Title	Legislative Body of the City of Pacifica	Member of the Legislative Body of the City of Pacifica	Bona Fide Association of Citizens/Organization	Individual
1.	Karen Rosenstein	Co-Chair Committee to Oppose Rezoning the Pacifica Quarry	☐	☐	☒	☐
	[redacted]	Date: 8/24/16				
2.	Mike Ferreira	Chair Sierra Club Loma Prieta Chapter	☐	☐	☒	☐
	[redacted]	Date: August 24, 2016				
3.	David Carlos Davidson	Member Pacifica Climate Committee	☐	☐	☐	☒
	[redacted]	Date: 8/24/16				
4.	William "Leo" Leon	Former Planning Commissioner, Pacifica	☐	☐	☐	☒
	[redacted]	Date: 8-24-16				
5.	Victor Carmichael	Chair Committee to Save the Fish & Bowl 2.0	☐	☐	☒	☐
	[redacted]	Date: 8-24-16				

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

Authorization Form (Page 1 of 2)

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. EC 9285

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 [redacted] Measure W for the election to be held on **November 8, 2016.**

I. NEW SIGNER(S):

Name of Rebuttal Argument Signer: Karen Rosenstein, Co-Chair
Committee to Oppose Rezoning the Pacifica Quarry

Name of Rebuttal Argument Signer: Mike Ferreira, Chair
Sierra Club Loma Prieta Chapter

Name of Rebuttal Argument Signer: David Carlos Davidson, Member
Pacifica Climate Committee

Name of Rebuttal Argument Signer: William "Leo" Leon
Former Planning Commissioner, Pacifica

Name of Rebuttal Argument Signer: Victor Carmichael, Chair
Committee to Save the Fish & Bowl 2.0

II. NEW PREPARER(S):

Name of Rebuttal Argument Preparer: Karen Rosenstein, Co-Chair
Committee to Oppose Rezoning the Pacifica Quarry

Name of Rebuttal Argument Preparer: ______

III. NEW SUBMITTER(S):

Name of Rebuttal Argument Submitter: Karen Rosenstein, Co-Chair
Committee to Oppose Rezoning the Pacifica Quarry

Name of Rebuttal Argument Submitter: ______

NAME(S) AND SIGNATURE(S) OF PRIMARY ARGUMENT AUTHOR(S):

[redacted]
Julie Starobin, Treasurer & Principal Officer
Committee to Oppose Rezoning the Pacifica Quarry
Printed Name and Signature of Author — Date: 8/24/16

[redacted]
Peter Loeb, Former Pacifica Mayor
Printed Name and Signature of Author — Date: 8-24-16

[redacted]
Bryan Beck, Secretary, Committee for Green Foothills
Printed Name and Signature of Author — Date: 8/25/16

Authorization Form (Page 2 of 2)

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. EC 9285

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 [redacted] Measure W for the election to be held on **November 8, 2016.**

I. **NEW SIGNER(S):**

Name of Rebuttal Argument Signer: Karen Rosenstein, Co-Chair, Committee to Oppose Rezoning the Pacifica Quarry

Name of Rebuttal Argument Signer: Mike Ferreira, Chair, Sierra Club Loma Prieta Chapter

Name of Rebuttal Argument Signer: David Carlos Davidson, Member, Pacifica Climate Committee

Name of Rebuttal Argument Signer: William "Leo" Leon, Former Planning Commissioner, Pacifica

Name of Rebuttal Argument Signer: Victor Carmichael, Chair, Committee to Save the Fish & Bowl 2.0

II. **NEW PREPARER(S):**

Name of Rebuttal Argument Preparer: Karen Rosenstein, Co-Chair, Committee to Oppose Rezoning the Pacifica Quarry

Name of Rebuttal Argument Preparer: ________________

III. **NEW SUBMITTER(S):**

Name of Rebuttal Argument Submitter: Karen Rosenstein, Co-Chair, Committee to Oppose Rezoning the Pacifica Quarry

Name of Rebuttal Argument Submitter: ________________

NAME(S) AND SIGNATURE(S) OF PRIMARY ARGUMENT AUTHOR(S):

[redacted]

Cynthia Kaufman, Former Pacifica School Board Trustee

Printed Name and Signature of Author

8.24.16

Date

[redacted]

Chaya Gordon, Co-Chair, Pacificans for Highway 1 Alternatives

Printed Name and Signature of Author

8.24.16

Date

Arguments in support or opposition of the proposed laws are the opinions of the authors.

REBUTTAL TO ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF MEASURE W

VOTE NO ON 4-STORY OCEANSIDE BUILDINGS WITH 206 HOUSING UNITS

DON'T BE MISLED. Measure W authorizes the City Council to rezone the Quarry to allow 4-story buildings with 206 multi-family units — bad development that doesn't belong on our coastside. **The proponents conveniently left this out of their argument.**

VOTE NO ON EMPTY PROMISES

DON'T BE FOOLED by empty promises of "community benefits" and "significant new tax revenue." The City's official report confirms that **Measure W neither guarantees nor requires that a hotel or any commercial components ever be built**. We believe any Quarry development must be appropriate for our coastside and be revenue-positive. Measure W **doesn't** ensure this. **The developer's promises are unenforceable.**

VOTE NO ON A BLANK CHECK

The City's official report says that Measure W doesn't approve a specific project. It is a vague proposal to build a **whole new neighborhood, with no review of traffic and environmental impacts until after we vote**. The City's report concludes that under this measure, neither the City nor the voters could compel the developer to build the things he is promising.

VOTE NO ON ELIMINATING YOUR RIGHT TO VOTE

Proponents say you aren't giving up your rights. **WRONG**. The City's official report says that Measure W will "eliminate the vote requirement for any residential development on the Quarry Site" except under limited circumstances. **The developer could build housing without any commercial elements, with no further public vote.**

VOTE NO ON MEASURE W