

Argument Against Measure \_\_\_\_\_

This line item, \$6.25 a month for a home with an assessed value of \$500,000, generates \$4.2 million dollars a year for the City of Huntington Beach.

If this measure passes, the City will lose these funds, but will still be contractually required to pay for the benefits. **If passed, each year the general fund will lose \$4.2 million dollars.**

The city has made \$29.5 million dollars in cuts over the last five years, and our services are stretched woefully thin.

If passed, there will be serious repercussions for Huntington Beach residents. The city will be forced to make more cuts including:

- **Eliminate Five Police Officers**
- **Eliminate the Crime Scene Investigation Unit**
- **Eliminate the Urban Search and Rescue Program**
- **Eliminate Fire Department Hazmat Response**
- **Closing Two Branch Libraries**
- **Reduction of Hours at the Central Library**
- **Closing the Huntington Beach Art Center**
- **45% Reduction in Park Maintenance**

2012 JUL 27 PM 1:47  
 HUNTINGTON BEACH  
 CITY OF HUNTINGTON BEACH

**These are real consequences, and will go into effect immediately if passed.**

We agree it is imperative that the City continues to negotiate reductions in employee pension benefits and that city employees pay their fair share of pension costs. The City Council has unanimously directed the City Manager to negotiate for all employees to pay their full share of pension costs as contracts expire in the next two years.

However, this poorly written measure will severely limit the City's ability to fund its current and ongoing pension obligations.

When your house is being burglarized, is on fire, or you're having a heart attack you want fast response. **This measure will increase response time of our police and fire departments.**

Our public services enhance our property values. This measure threatens the wonderful quality of life we have in Huntington Beach.

**Please Vote NO on this ill-conceived charter amendment.**

**For more information visit <http://www.SaveOurHB.com>**

*Connie Boardman*  
*Connie Boardman*  
*Councilwoman, City of Huntington Beach*  
*Jill Shaw*  
*Jill Shaw, Councilman, City of Huntington Beach*

*Keith Bohr*  
*Keith Bohr*  
*Councilman, City of Huntington Beach*



# City of Huntington Beach

2000 Main Street ♦ Huntington Beach, CA 92648

(714) 536-5227 ♦ [www.huntingtonbeachca.gov](http://www.huntingtonbeachca.gov)

---

## Office of the City Clerk

Joan L. Flynn, City Clerk

July 25, 2012

Council Members Boardman, Bohr and Shaw  
City of Huntington Beach  
2000 Main Street  
Huntington Beach, CA 92646

Re: Requested Revisions to the Argument in Opposition of Measure \_\_\_\_\_

Dear Council Members,

As the City of Huntington Beach's City Clerk I serve as the Elections Official. The position comes with considerable responsibility to follow and enforce elections laws and standards. One of the laws that I must seek strict compliance of is that all election materials printed and presented to the voters must be true and accurate. In viewing the ballot argument that you submitted I found a clause which violates the standard and I would like to present you with the opportunity to review and edit the statement.

The law provides that ballot arguments shall be made available for inspection and copying for a period of ten calendar days following the deadline for submission of those materials. (ELEC. CODE § 9295.) During those ten days, any voter or the elections official may seek a writ of mandate or injunction requiring any of the materials to be amended or deleted. A writ of mandate or an injunction may be issued upon clear and convincing proof that the material in question is false, misleading, or inconsistent with the requirements of the Elections Code, and that issuance of the writ or injunction will not substantially interfere with the printing or distribution of official election materials as provided by law. The writ may be filed by any voter of the jurisdiction in which the election is being held or the elections official. It must name the elections official as respondent, and the person or official who authored the material in question as real parties in interest. If the elections official brings the mandamus or injunctive action, the board of supervisors of the county shall be named as the respondent and the person or official who authored the material in question shall be named as the real party in interest. (ELEC. CODE § 9295.)

Boardman, Bohr, Shaw Letter  
July 25, 2012

The one clause in which I am requesting a revision is the following sentence: "Our employees will be paying the full share of their pension costs in the next two years." While this may be the goal of the council, there is nothing legally binding the employees to comply with this timeline, thus the statement is not true. I am requesting you modify the sentence so that it indicates this is what Council hopes to achieve. One option might be "*The goal of the City Council is that our employees will be paying the full share of their pension costs in the next two years.*"

If you have any questions, please give me a call.

In the interest of complying with the law and avoiding unnecessary court proceedings I urge you to revise your ballot argument and resubmit it by 5:00 p.m. on Friday, July 27<sup>th</sup>.

**Rebuttal arguments will now be due on Wednesday, August 1<sup>st</sup> by 5:00 p.m.**

Sincerely,



Joan L. Flynn, CMC, MPA  
City Clerk

Attachment: Impartial Analysis