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 ______ 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 anyone 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

Mailing Address: [Complete Address]

Fax: None

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, 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 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Legislative Body of the City of Pacifica</th>
<th>Member of the Legislative Body of the City of Pacifica</th>
<th>Bona Fide Association of Citizens/Organization</th>
<th>Individual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Karen Rosenstein</td>
<td>Co-Chair Committee to Oppose Rezoning the Pacifica Quarry</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Date: 8/24/16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Mike Ferreira</td>
<td>Chair Sierra Club Loma Prieta Chapter</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Date: August 24, 2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>David Davidson</td>
<td>Member Pacifica Climate Committee</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Date: 8/24/16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>William &quot;Leo&quot; Leon</td>
<td>Former Planning Commissioner, Pacifica</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Date: 8-24-16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Victor Carmichael</td>
<td>Chair Committee to Save the Fish &amp; Bowl 2.0</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Date: 8-24-16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

---

Signers ☐ Registered N/A Signed Dated
Bona Fide Association ☐ Verified N/A Signed Dated

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY
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 Measure _____ 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):

Julie Starobin, Treasurer & Principal Officer
Committee to Oppose Rezoning the Pacifica Quarry

Date 8/24/16

Printed Name and Signature of Author

Peter Loeb, Former Pacifica Mayor

Date 8-24-16

Printed Name and Signature of Author

Bryan Beck, Secretary, Committee for Green Foothills

Date 8/25/16

Printed Name and Signature of Author
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 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: 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):

[Signature]
Cynthia Kaufman, Former Pacifica School Board Trustee
Printed Name and Signature of Author

[Signature]
Chaya Gordon, Co-Chair, Pacifcans for Highway 1 Alternatives
Printed Name and Signature of Author

[Signature]

Date
8.24.16

Date
8.24.16
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