

Toni Taber,

August 16, 2016

San Jose City Clerk

The Silicon Valley Taxpayers Association, along with other individuals, submit this argument against Measure F (San Jose).

Please for any arguments submitted for or against Measure F, and when appropriate, the rebuttals, forward all arguments to Mark W.A. Hinkle and Jay Carson, at email addresses below:

Mark Hinkle email address is [REDACTED]

Jay Carson email address is [REDACTED]

Fax, by arrangement is [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Thanks.....Mark W.A. Hinkle,

President: Silicon Valley Taxpayers Association

[REDACTED]

RECEIVED
San Jose City Clerk
2016 AUG 17 AM 11:33

Cover Page for Argument Against Measure F

The undersigned or author of the primary argument against ballot Measure F at the General Election for the City of San Jose to be held on November 8, 2016 hereby state that the argument is true and correct to the best of their knowledge and belief.

RECEIVED
San Jose City Clerk
2016 AUG 17 AM 11:33

ARGUMENT AGAINST MEASURE F

RECEIVED
San Jose City Clerk

Let's call this Measure F what it is: FISCAL FAILURE

Full REPEAL of Pension Reform and a Massive INCREASE in Public Pensions
APR 17 AM 11:33

This measure had no public input in its drafting. Public union bosses and city leaders negotiated in secret, not revealing the ballot language until mere hours before the council vote.

Why the secrecy? Maybe this is why:

For many employees:

- Pension benefits are increased by a whopping 23%
- Cost of living increase maximums for retirees will rise by 33%
- The city's pension contribution rates will skyrocket by 36%

San Jose reports it will contribute over \$369,000,000 more just to pay for these pension increases. With these extra pension costs, how are we going to pay from much needed services, like libraries, parks, potholes and public safety?

Is this why they had to raise the sales tax and are now trying to raise the business tax?

Over 1000 employees will even receive RETROACTIVE pension increases. We don't even know how many millions that will come to, because city leaders didn't calculate the cost - even though state law requires it.

Employees under this new benefit can receive much higher pensions than CalPERS employees in other cities, because this measure doesn't have the compensation limits that the California Public Employees' Pension Reform Act put in place. This will lead to much higher six-figure pensions in San Jose than many other cities - for the exact same jobs.

70% of San Jose voters approved Measure B in 2012 because the old pension system was unsustainable. Now this measure will put more people back into that system where pension contributions continue to rise, some now exceeding 92% of payroll. While Measure B pensions are stable: contributions are less than 22% of payroll.

Measure B provided fair, sustainable pensions. This measure undoes that.

Don't go backward. Vote NO on Measure F: www.ProtectPensionReform.com

MARK W. A. Higgle



President Silicon Valley Taxpayers Association



SAN JOSE CITY COUNCILMAN

PIERLUIGI OLIVIERO

STEVEN HAUG

TREASURER SILICON VALLEY TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION



Alberta L. Brierly, Retired Library Worker





FORM OF STATEMENT TO BE FILED BY AUTHORS OF ARGUMENTS

All arguments concerning measures filed pursuant to Division 9, Chapter 3 (beginning with § 9200) of the Elections Code shall be accompanied by the following form statement to be signed by each proponent, and by each author, if different, of the argument:

RECEIVED
San Jose City Clerk
2016 AUG 17 AM 11:33

The undersigned proponent (s) or author(s) of the (primary/rebuttal) argument (in favor of/against) ballot proposition (name or number) at the General Municipal Election for the City of San Jose to be held on November 8, 2016 hereby state that the argument is true and correct to the best of (his/her/their) knowledge and belief.

Office use only

Print Name <u>Mark W.A. Hinkle</u> M/F Title <u>President</u> (If applicable): Submitted on behalf of : <u>Silicon Valley Taxpayers Association</u> (name of organization)	Sig [Redacted] Date	
Print Name <u>Pierluigi OLIVENIO</u> M/F Title <u>SAN JOSE City Council member</u> (If applicable): Submitted on behalf of : (name of organization)	Sig [Redacted] Date	
Print Name <u>Alberta L. Brierly</u> M/F Title <u>Retired Library Worker</u> (If applicable): Submitted on behalf of : (name of organization)	Sig [Redacted] Date	
Print Name <u>STEVEN B HALL</u> M/F Title <u>TREASURER SILICON VALLEY TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION</u> (If applicable): Submitted on behalf of : (name of organization)	Sig [Redacted] Date	
Print Name _____ M/F Title _____ (If applicable): Submitted on behalf of : (name of organization)	Signature _____ Date _____	

All Authors must print his/her name **and sign this form** (EC 9600) AND
 Print his/her name **and sign the Argument itself** (EC 9283) AND
 Print his/her name **and sign the Rebuttal Argument itself** (EC 9285)

Further, pursuant to Election Code § 9282, printed arguments submitted to the voters shall be titled either "Argument In Favor Of Measure ___" or "Argument Against Measure ___".

Likewise, printed rebuttal arguments submitted pursuant to Election Code § 9285 shall be titled either "Rebuttal To Argument In Favor Of Measure ___" or "Rebuttal to Argument Against Measure ___".