

DEPARTMENT OF SAN FRANCISCO

John Arntz, Director

Ballot Argument Control Sheet A

Control Sheet A must be submitted for every ballot argument, with required signatures and author information. If your argument has more than one author, you must also submit Control Sheet B with required signatures and information for all additional authors.

An argument submitted on behalf of an organization must be signed by a principal officer of the organization who must be a registered San Francisco voter.

If an argument states that an individual or organization other than the author suppoposes the ballot measure, or agrees with or endorses the argument, a complete signed Consent Form is required.

Office Use Only

2022 MAR 2 1 AM 9: 39

DEPARTMENT OF ELECTIONS

Time/Date Stamp

Rebuttal to Proponent Argument



Facilitate typesetting, and reduce the possibility of transcription error by sending an electronic copy of your ballot argument text within 24 hours after submission to the Department at publications@sfgov.org.

Section 1: Argument li	nformation	
Proposition C		
Proponent Argument	Rebuttal to Proponent Argument	Paid Argument in Favor
Opponent Argument	Rebuttal to Opponent Argument	Paid Argument Against
Section 2: Author Info		
Chi manifest and marketing and all	onent and Opponent Arguments	
	rjury that I am an Author of the Proponent Argume measure. A Non-supporter is defined as a person of	
 Has received or been that committee; or 	or member of a committee that has made or plans to promised any compensation or thing of value from some or likeness to appear on campaign literature or	such a committee to perform consulting services for
	erjury that I am an Author of the Opponent Argumer re. A Supporter is defined as a person who with resp	nt for Proposition $\underline{\mathcal{C}}$ being submitted and that I anect to a measure:
 Has received or been that committee; or 		to make expenditures in support of the measure; such a committee to perform consulting services for r in advertising that advocates for the adoption of the
Select one of the following to	o indicate whether the Author is an individual or	an organization:
Individual		
Full Name (Print) SAC	HIN AGARWAL	Title (If Applicable) Director
San Francisco Address (Whe	ere vou are Registered)	
	ne you are registeredy	
Signature		Email
Organization (Entity)		
Name of Organization (Print)	Coalition to Grow San Fra	meisco - Grow SF
Who should be listed as an A	uthor for your Organization?	
Only the Organization	Both the Officer and the Organization (If selected, complete both the Individual Au	No othor section and the Organization Section)
* Check if the title or identifying if you are signing as an indivi	ng information is for identification purposes only, anization.	
Signature		Email
Section 3: Submitter In	nformation	
	no delivers the argument and supporting materials to	the Department. If there is a question or issue with
Full Name (Print) Mar	isa McCarthy	Phone
Mailing Address		
Signature Signature		
oignature		Email

Section 4: Information for Paid Arguments	
Paid arguments must include information about the true source of funds for the publication of the indicate whether the true source of funds is a recipient committee. This information will be printe information in the Voter Information Pamphlet.	
The true source of funds for the printing fee of this argument:	
Is the true source of funds a recipient committee, as defined by CA Gov. Code §82013?	

If the true source(s) of funds is a recipient committee, list the three largest contributors below:

Section 5: Argument Text

Yes

3.

No

The text of your argument will be printed exactly as submitted. Ensure that your argument meets the legal word limit. You may request that specific argument text be printed in bold, italic, or bold italic type. Type your argument with the desired formatting, or underline the argument text to be formatted and in the left column, mark "B" for bold, "I" for italics, or "BI" for bold italics. Other special formatting is not permitted.

Format B, /, BI Keep Text Within the Vertical Lines # of words per line

The proponents of Prop C are Supervisors who did NOT support the recall of all three failed School Board members this year, directly at odds with the overwhelming majority of San Francisco voters.

Because they didn't like the results, these Supervisors now want to rig the system to make it EVEN HARDER for voters to ever hold failed politicians accountable again by recalling them from office.

The proponents of Prop C use disingenuous arguments about saving money or "special interests," ignoring the many costs to residents of keeping incompetent or corrupt politicians in office. And we profoundly disagree that the San Francisco parents — and nearly 70% of voters — who voted to recall the failed school board members this year are a "special interest."

The Supervisors behind Prop C are pretending to solve a problem that simply does not exist. Under current law, it's already very hard to qualify a recall election. Since 1907, just six local recall elections have ever qualified for the ballot in San Francisco. And the first successful recall in over 100 years was this year's landslide recall of the three School Board commissioners. But it would not even have been permitted if the Supervisors behind Prop C had their way!

The recall process is our LAST protection against politicians who flagrantly ignore the will of the voters. Protect your vote and your voice. Please join parents, public education advocates and your fellow San Franciscans and VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION C!

- GrowSF
- SF Parent Action
- Autumn Looijen, Co-Leader, Recall the SF School Board
- √Todd David, Chair, Concerned Parents for the Recall
- Kit Lam, public school parent
- Quincy Yu, public education advocate

If handwritten information or a revision is unclear, Department staff will interpret the handwritten information to the best of their abilities; this interpretation is final.

Total Word Count

Office Use Only
Total # of words= X \$2/word = + \$200 publication fee = Staff Initials
of signatures submitted in lieu of publication fee Receipt

X \$0.50/signature Check #

Adjusted Fee Total Amount Paid

Ballot Argument Control Sheet B	Office Use Only
Control Sheet A must be submitted for every ballot argument, with required signatures and author information.	2022 MAR 21 AM 9: 39
For an argument submitted on behalf of an organization, the "Individual" section must also be completed by a principal officer of the organization who must be a registered San Francisco voter.	DEPARTMENT OF ELECTIONS Time/Date Stamp
If your argument has more than one author, you must also submit Control Sheet B with required signatures and information for all additional authors.	Timo Bato Giarrip
Section 1: Argument Information	
Proposition C_	Label
Proponent Argument Rebuttal to Proponent Argument	Paid Argument in Favor
Opponent Argument Rebuttal to Opponent Argument	Paid Argument Against
Section 2: Additional Author Information	
Declaration Related to Proponent and Opponent Arguments	
attest under the penalty of perjury that I am an Author of the Proponent Argument for am not a Non-supporter of this measure. A Non-supporter is defined as a person who,	Proposition being submitted and that I with respect to a measure:
 Is a treasurer, officer, or member of a committee that has made or plans to ma Has received or been promised any compensation or thing of value from such that committee; or Has authorized their name or likeness to appear on campaign literature or in a measure. 	a committee to perform consulting services for
attest under the penalty of perjury that I am an Author of the Opponent Argument for not a Supporter of this measure. A Supporter is defined as a person who with respect to	Proposition <u>C</u> being submitted and that I are a measure:
 Is a treasurer, officer, or member of a committee that has made or plans to made. Has received or been promised any compensation or thing of value from such that committee; or Has authorized their name or likeness to appear on campaign literature or in a measure. 	a committee to perform consulting services for
Complete the following to indicate whether the Author is an individual or an organ	nization:
Individual (or principal officer of Organization)	
Full Name (Print) Meredith W. Dod son	Title (If Applicable) Executive Director
San Francisco Address (Where you are Registered)	
Signature Signature	Email
Organization (Entity) (If selected, complete both the Individual Author se	ection and the Organization Section)
Name of Organization (Print) SF Parent Action	
Who should be listed as an Author for your Organization?	
Only the Organization Both the Officer and the Organization	
* Check if the title or identifying information is for identification purposes only,	
if you are signing as an individual and not of behalf of an organization.	
Signature Signature	U.S ** 1

Additional Author Information

Declaration Related to Proponent and Opponent Arguments

I attest under the penalty of perjury that I am an Author of the **Proponent Argument** for Proposition _____ being submitted and that I am not a Non-supporter of this measure. A Non-supporter is defined as a person who, with respect to a measure:

. Is a treasurer, officer, or member of a committee that has made or plans to make expenditures in opposition to the measure;

Email

- Has received or been promised any compensation or thing of value from such a committee to perform consulting services for that committee; or
- Has authorized their name or likeness to appear on campaign literature or in advertising that advocates for the defeat of the measure.

I attest under the penalty of perjury that I am an Author of the **Opponent Argument** for Proposition _____ being submitted and that I am not a Supporter of this measure. A Supporter is defined as a person who with respect to a measure:

Has received or been promised any compensation or thing of value from such a committee to perform consulting services for that committee: or Has authorized their name or likeness to appear on campaign literature or in advertising that advocates for the adoption of the measure. Complete the following to indicate whether the Author is an individual or an organization: Individual (or principal officer of Organization) EXECUTIVE Meredith W. Dalson Title (If Applicable) Full Name (Print) San Francisco Address (Where you are Registered) Signature | Email Organization (Entity) (If selected complete both the Individual Author section and the Organization Section) Name of Organization (Print) Who should be listed as an Author for your Organization? Only the Organization Both the Officer and the Organization * Check if the title or identifying information is for identification purposes only, if you are signing as an individual and not of behalf of an organization. Signature | Email Section 3: Argument Text The text of your argument will be printed exactly as submitted. Ensure that your argument meets the legal word limit. You may request that specific argument text be printed in bold, Italic, or bold Italic type. Type your argument with the desired formatting, or underline the argument text to be formatted and in the left column, mark "B" for bold, "I" for italics, or "BI" for bold italics. Other special formatting is not permitted. Include Author information in argument text. Keep Text Within the Vertical Lines Format words B, I, BI per line The proponents of Prop C are Supervisors who did NOT support the recall of all three failed School Board members this year, directly at odds with the overwhelming majority of San Francisco voters. Because they didn't like the results, these Supervisors now want to rig the system to make it EVEN HARDER for voters to ever hold failed politicians accountable again by recalling them from office. The proponents of Prop C use disingenuous arguments about saving money or "special interests," ignoring the many costs to residents of keeping incompetent or corrupt politicians in office. And we profoundly disagree that the San Francisco parents - and nearly 70% of voters who voted to recall the failed school board members this year are a "special interest." The Supervisors behind Prop C are pretending to solve a problem that simply does not exist. Under current law, it's already very hard to qualify a recall election. Since 1907, just six local recall elections have ever qualified for the ballot in San Francisco. And the first successful recall in over 100 years was this year's landslide recall of the three School Board commissioners. But it would not even have been permitted if the Supervisors behind Prop C had their way! The recall process is our LAST protection against politicians who flagrantly ignore the will of the voters. Protect your vote and your voice. Please join parents, public education advocates and your fellow San Franciscans and VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION C! GrowSF SF Parent Action Autumn Looijen, Co-Leader, Recall the SF School Board Todd David, Chair, Concerned Parents for the Recall Kit Lam, public school parent Quincy Yu, public education advocate If handwritten information or a revision is unclear, Department staff will interpret the handwritten information to the best of their abilities; this interpretation is final. **Total Word Count**

John Arntz, Director

Ballot Argument Control Sheet B

Control Sheet A must be submitted for every ballot argument, with required signatures and author information.

For an argument submitted on behalf of an organization, the "Individual" section must also be completed by a principal officer of the organization who must be a registered San Francisco voter.

If your argument has more than one author, you must also submit Control Sheet B with required signatures and information for all additional authors.

Section 1: Argument Information

Proposition ____

Proponent Argument Opponent Argument

Rebuttal to Proponent Argument Rebuttal to Opponent Argument

2022 MAR 2 I AM 9: 39
DEPARTMENT OF ELECTIONS
Time/Date Stamp

Label

Paid Argument in Favor

Paid Argument Against

Office Use Only

Section 2: Additional Author Information

Declaration Related to Proponent and Opponent Arguments

I attest under the penalty of perjury that I am an Author of the **Proponent Argument** for Proposition _____ being submitted and that I am not a Non-supporter of this measure. A Non-supporter is defined as a person who, with respect to a measure:

- Is a treasurer, officer, or member of a committee that has made or plans to make expenditures in opposition to the measure;
- Has received or been promised any compensation or thing of value from such a committee to perform consulting services for that committee; or
- Has authorized their name or likeness to appear on campaign literature or in advertising that advocates for the defeat of the measure.

I attest under the penalty of perjury that I am an Author of the **Opponent Argument** for Proposition ____ being submitted and that I am not a Supporter of this measure. A Supporter is defined as a person who with respect to a measure:

- Is a treasurer, officer, or member of a committee that has made or plans to make expenditures in support of the measure;
- Has received or been promised any compensation or thing of value from such a committee to perform consulting services for that committee; or
- Has authorized their name or likeness to appear on campaign literature or in advertising that advocates for the adoption of the measure.

Complete the following to indicate whether the Author is an individual or an organization:

Individual (or principal officer of Organization)

Full Name (Print) Autumn Looijen	Title (If Applicable) Co-kad, School Boa
San Francisco Address (Where you are Registered)	
Signature Signature	Email
Organization (Entity) (If selected, complete both the Ind	ividual Author section and the Organization Section)
Name of Organization (Print)	
Who should be listed as an Author for your Organization?	
Only the Organization Both the Officer and the Organ	ization
* Check if the title or identifying information is for identification purpo if you are signing as an individual and not of behalf of an organization	
Signature Signature	Email

Additional Author Information

Declaration Related to Proponent and Opponent Arguments

I attest under the penalty of perjury that I am an Author of the **Proponent Argument** for Proposition _____ being submitted and that I am not a Non-supporter of this measure. A Non-supporter is defined as a person who, with respect to a measure:

- Is a treasurer, officer, or member of a committee that has made or plans to make expenditures in opposition to the measure;
- Has received or been promised any compensation or thing of value from such a committee to perform consulting services for that committee; or
- Has authorized their name or likeness to appear on campaign literature or in advertising that advocates for the defeat of the measure.

I attest under the penalty of perjury that I am an Author of the **Opponent Argument** for Proposition _____ being submitted and that I am not a Supporter of this measure. A Supporter is defined as a person who with respect to a measure:

Has received or been promised any compensation or thing of value from such a committee to perform consulting services for that committee; or Has authorized their name or likeness to appear on campaign literature or in advertising that advocates for the adoption of the measure. Complete the following to indicate whether the Author is an individual or an organization: Individual (or principal officer of Organization) Full Name (Print) Title (If Applicable) Co-lea San Francisco Address (Where you are Registered) Signature | Organization (Entity) ed, complete both the Individual Author section and the Organization Section) Name of Organization (Print) Who should be listed as an Author for your Organization? Only the Organization Both the Officer and the Organization Check if the title or identifying information is for identification purposes only, if you are signing as an individual and not of behalf of an organization. Signature | Email Section 3: Argument Text The text of your argument will be printed exactly as submitted. Ensure that your argument meets the legal word limit. You may request that specific argument text be printed in bold, italic, or bold italic type. Type your argument with the desired formatting, or underline the argument text to be formatted and in the left column, mark "B" for bold, "I" for italics, or "BI" for bold italics. Other special formatting is not permitted. Include Author information in argument text. Format Keep Text Within the Vertical Lines B, I, BI words per line The proponents of Prop C are Supervisors who did NOT support the recall of all three failed School Board members this year, directly at odds with the overwhelming majority of San Francisco voters. Because they didn't like the results, these Supervisors now want to rig the system to make it EVEN HARDER for voters to ever hold failed politicians accountable again by recalling them from office. The proponents of Prop C use disingenuous arguments about saving money or "special interests," ignoring the many costs to residents of keeping incompetent or corrupt politicians in office. And we profoundly disagree that the San Francisco parents - and nearly 70% of voters who voted to recall the failed school board members this year are a "special interest." The Supervisors behind Prop C are pretending to solve a problem that simply does not exist. Under current law, it's already very hard to qualify a recall election. Since 1907, just six local recall elections have ever qualified for the ballot in San Francisco. And the first successful recall in over 100 years was this year's landslide recall of the three School Board commissioners. But it would not even have been permitted if the Supervisors behind Prop C had their way! The recall process is our LAST protection against politicians who flagrantly ignore the will of the voters. Protect your vote and your voice. Please join parents, public education advocates and your fellow San Franciscans and VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION C! GrowSF SF Parent Action Autumn Looijen, Co-Leader, Recall the SF School Board Todd David, Chair, Concerned Parents for the Recall Kit Lam, public school parent Quincy Yu, public education advocate If handwritten information or a revision is unclear, Department staff will interpret the handwritten information to the best of their abilities; this interpretation is final. **Total Word Count**

John Arntz, Director

Office Use Only Ballot Argument Control Sheet B Control Sheet A must be submitted for every ballot argument, with required signatures and author 2022 MAR 21 AM 9: 39 information. For an argument submitted on behalf of an organization, the "Individual" section must also be completed by DEPARTMENT OF ELECTIONS a principal officer of the organization who must be a registered San Francisco voter. Time/Date Stamp If your argument has more than one author, you must also submit Control Sheet B with required signatures and information for all additional authors Section 1: Argument Information Proposition C Label Paid Argument in Favor Rebuttal to Proponent Argument Proponent Argument Rebuttal to Opponent Argument Paid Argument Against Opponent Argument Section 2: Additional Author Information Declaration Related to Proponent and Opponent Arguments being submitted and that I attest under the penalty of perjury that I am an Author of the Proponent Argument for Proposition am not a Non-supporter of this measure. A Non-supporter is defined as a person who, with respect to a measure: Is a treasurer, officer, or member of a committee that has made or plans to make expenditures in opposition to the measure; Has received or been promised any compensation or thing of value from such a committee to perform consulting services for that committee; or Has authorized their name or likeness to appear on campaign literature or in advertising that advocates for the defeat of the I attest under the penalty of perjury that I am an Author of the Opponent Argument for Proposition C being submitted and that I am not a Supporter of this measure. A Supporter is defined as a person who with respect to a measure: Is a treasurer, officer, or member of a committee that has made or plans to make expenditures in support of the measure;

- Has received or been promised any compensation or thing of value from such a committee to perform consulting services for that committee: or
- Has authorized their name or likeness to appear on campaign literature or in advertising that advocates for the adoption of the measure.

Complete the following to indicate whether the Author is an individual or an organization:

Full Name (Print) Quincy Yu	Title (If Applicable)	Rublic education davocate
San Francisco Address (Where you are Registered)		
Signature Signature	Email	
Organization (Entity)	idual Author section and the Organ	nization Section)
Name of Organization (Print)		
Who should be listed as an Author for your Organization?		
Only the Organization Both the Officer and the Organiza	ation	
Check if the title or identifying information is for identification purpose fyou are signing as an individual and not of behalf of an organization.		

Additional Author Information

Declaration Related to Proponent and Opponent Arguments

I attest under the penalty of perjury that I am an Author of the Proponent Argument for Proposition being submitted and that I am not a Non-supporter of this measure. A Non-supporter is defined as a person who, with respect to a measure:

- Is a treasurer, officer, or member of a committee that has made or plans to make expenditures in opposition to the measure;
- Has received or been promised any compensation or thing of value from such a committee to perform consulting services for that committee; or
- Has authorized their name or likeness to appear on campaign literature or in advertising that advocates for the defeat of the

I attest under the penalty of perjury that I am an Author of the Opponent Argument for Proposition ____ being submitted and that I am not a Supporter of this measure. A Supporter is defined as a person who with respect to a measure:

- Has received or been promised any compensation or thing of value from such a committee to perform consulting services for that committee; or
 Has authorized their name or likeness to appear on campaign literature or in advertising that advocates for the adoption of the measure.
 Complete the following to indicate whether the Author is an individual or an organization:

 Individual (or principal officer of Organization)
 Full Name (Print)
 Duncy full
 San Francisco Address (Where you are Registered)
- Individual (or principal officer of Organization) Full Name (Print) San Francisco Address (Where you are Registered) Signature **Email** Organization (Entity) (If selected ete both the Individual Author section and the Organization Section) Name of Organization (Print) Who should be listed as an Author for your Organization? Both the Officer and the Organization Only the Organization * Check if the title or identifying information is for identification purposes only, if you are signing as an individual and not of behalf of an organization. Signature | Email Section 3: Argument Text The text of your argument will be printed exactly as submitted. Ensure that your argument meets the legal word limit. You may request

that specific argument text be printed exactly as submitted. Ensure that your argument meets the legal word limit. You may request that specific argument text be printed in bold, italic, or bold italic type. Type your argument with the desired formatting, or underline the argument text to be formatted and in the left column, mark "B" for bold, "I" for italics, or "BI" for bold italics. Other special formatting is not permitted. Include Author information in argument text.

Format B, /, BI Keep Text Within the Vertical Lines —

of words per line

The proponents of Prop C are Supervisors who did NOT support the recall of all three failed School Board members this year, directly at odds with the overwhelming majority of San Francisco voters.

Because they didn't like the results, these Supervisors now want to rig the system to make it EVEN HARDER for voters to ever hold failed politicians accountable again by recalling them from office.

The proponents of Prop C use disingenuous arguments about saving money or "special interests," ignoring the many costs to residents of keeping incompetent or corrupt politicians in office. And we profoundly disagree that the San Francisco parents – and nearly 70% of voters – who voted to recall the failed school board members this year are a "special interest."

The Supervisors behind Prop C are pretending to solve a problem that simply does not exist. Under current law, it's already very hard to qualify a recall election. Since 1907, just six local recall elections have ever qualified for the ballot in San Francisco. And the first successful recall in over 100 years was this year's landslide recall of the three School Board commissioners. But it would not even have been permitted if the Supervisors behind Prop C had their way!

The recall process is our LAST protection against politicians who flagrantly ignore the will of the voters. Protect your vote and your voice. Please join parents, public education advocates and your fellow San Franciscans and VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION C!

GrowSF

SF Parent Action

Autumn Looijen, Co-Leader, Recall the SF School Board Todd David, Chair, Concerned Parents for the Recall

Kit Lam, public school parent

Quincy Yu, public education advocate

If handwritten information or a revision is unclear, Department staff will interpret the handwritten information to the best of their abilities; this interpretation is final.

Total Word Count

John Anntz, Director

Office Use Only Ballot Argument Control Sheet B 2022 MAR 21 AM 9: 39 Control Sheet A must be submitted for every ballot argument, with required signatures and author information. DEPARTMENT OF ELECTIONS For an argument submitted on behalf of an organization, the "Individual" section must also be completed by a principal officer of the organization who must be a registered San Francisco voter. Time/Date Stamp If your argument has more than one author, you must also submit Control Sheet B with required signatures and information for all additional authors Section 1: Argument Information Proposition U Label Paid Argument in Favor Proponent Argument Rebuttal to Proponent Argument Opponent Argument Rebuttal to Opponent Argument Paid Argument Against Section 2: Additional Author Information Declaration Related to Proponent and Opponent Arguments being submitted and that I I attest under the penalty of perjury that I am an Author of the Proponent Argument for Proposition am not a Non-supporter of this measure. A Non-supporter is defined as a person who, with respect to a measure: Is a treasurer, officer, or member of a committee that has made or plans to make expenditures in opposition to the measure; Has received or been promised any compensation or thing of value from such a committee to perform consulting services for that committee; or Has authorized their name or likeness to appear on campaign literature or in advertising that advocates for the defeat of the measure. I attest under the penalty of perjury that I am an Author of the Opponent Argument for Proposition _____ being submitted and that I am not a Supporter of this measure. A Supporter is defined as a person who with respect to a measure:

- Is a treasurer, officer, or member of a committee that has made or plans to make expenditures in support of the measure;
- Has received or been promised any compensation or thing of value from such a committee to perform consulting services for that committee: or
- Has authorized their name or likeness to appear on campaign literature or in advertising that advocates for the adoption of the measure.

Complete the following to indicate whether the Author is an individual or an organization:

Full Name (Print)	Title (If Applicable) Public School Paren
San Francisco Address (Where you are Registered)	
Signature Signature	Email
	Individual Author section and the Organization Section)
Name of Organization (Print) Who should be listed as an Author for your Organization?	
Only the Organization Both the Officer and the O	rganization
* Check if the title or identifying information is for identification p if you are signing as an individual and not of behalf of an organization.	
Signature Signature	Email
if you are signing as an individual and not of behalf of an organiz	zation.

Additional Author Information

Declaration Related to Proponent and Opponent Arguments

Individual (or principal officer of Organization)

I attest under the penalty of perjury that I am an Author of the Proponent Argument for Proposition being submitted and that I am not a Non-supporter of this measure. A Non-supporter is defined as a person who, with respect to a measure:

- Is a treasurer, officer, or member of a committee that has made or plans to make expenditures in opposition to the measure;
- Has received or been promised any compensation or thing of value from such a committee to perform consulting services for that committee; or
- Has authorized their name or likeness to appear on campaign literature or in advertising that advocates for the defeat of the

being submitted and that I am I attest under the penalty of perjury that I am an Author of the Opponent Argument for Proposition not a Supporter of this measure. A Supporter is defined as a person who with respect to a measure:

- Has received or been promised any compensation or thing of value from such a committee to perform consulting services for that committee; or
- Has authorized their name or likeness to appear on campaign literature or in advertising that advocates for the adoption of the measure.

Full Name (Print) Full San Francisco Address (Where you are Registered) Full Signature Email Organization (Entity) Full Selected, complete both the Individual Author section and the Organization Section) Name of Organization (Print) Who should be listed as an Author for your Organization? Only the Organization Both the Officer and the Organization Full Name of Organization Both the Officer and the Organization Full Name of Organization Both the Officer and the Organization Both the Officer and the Organization Full Name of Organization Full Name of Organization Both the Officer and the Organization Full Name of Organization Full Name of Organization Both the Officer and the Organization Full Name of Organization Both the Officer and the Organization Both the Officer and the Organization Full Name of Organization Both the Officer and the Organization Full Name of Organization Both the Officer and the Organization Full Name of Organization Both the Officer and the Organization Full Name of Organization Full Name	•	e following to indicate whether the Author is an individual or an organization:	
Signature	Individual	Information 1	
Signature	Full Name	(Print) Title (If Applicable) Volume Sch	loo/ Part
Organization (Entity) [If selected, complete both the Individual Author section and the Organization Section) Name of Organization (Print) Who should be listed as an Author for your Organization? Only the Organization Both the Officer and the Organization [If the Stephen Section of the Organization of Section of Se	San Francis	sco Address (Where you are Registered)	
Organization (Entity)	Signature	Email	
Who should be listed as an Author for your Organization? Only the Organization Both the Officer and the Organization from the Organ	Organizat	() A Common () A	
Section 3: Argument Text The text of your argument will be printed exactly as submitted. Ensure that your argument meets the legal word limit. You may request at specific argument text be printed in bold, falls, or bold italic, or bold italic, or bold italic, or bold italics. Other special formatting, or underline the argument text be printed in bold, falls, or bold italic, or bold italics, or 'Bi' for bold, "I' for italics, or 'Bi' for bold italics. Other special formatting, or underline the argument text be included. Include Author information in argument text. Format B, , BI The proponents of Prop C are Supervisors who did NOT support the recall of all three falled School Board members this year, directly at odds with the overwhelming majority of San Francisco voters. Because they didn't like the results, these Supervisors now want to rig the system to make it EVEN HARDER for voters to ever hold falled politicians accountable again by recalling them from office. The proponents of Prop C use disingenuous arguments about saving money or "special interests," ignoring the many costs to residents of keeping incompetent or corrupt politicians in office. And we profoundly disagree that the San Francisco parents — and nearly 70% of voters — who voted to recall the failed school board members this year are a "special interest." The Supervisors behind Prop C are pretending to solve a problem that simply does not exist. Under current law, it's already very hard to qualify a recall election. Since 1907, just six local recall elections have ever qualified for the ballot in San Francisco. And the first successful recall in over 100 years was this year's landslider recall of the three School Board commissioners. But it would not even have been permitted if the Supervisors behind Prop C had their way! The recall process is our LAST protection against politicians who flagrantly ignore the will of the voters. Protect your vote and your voice. Please join perents, public education advocates and your fellow San Francisca	Name of O	rganization (Print)	
**Check if the title or identifying information is for identification purposes only,	Who should	d be listed as an Author for your Organization?	
Section 3: Argument Text The text of your argument will be printed exactly as submitted. Ensure that your argument meets the legal word limit. You may request hat specific argument text be printed in bold, italic, or bold fallic type. Type your argument with the desired formatting, or underline the argument text to be formatted and in the left column, mark "B" for bold, "T" for fallics, or "BI" for bold italics. Other special formatting is not permitted. Include Author information in argument text. Keep Text Within the Vertical Lines Keep Text Within the Vertical Lines Format B, I, BI Recause they didn't like the results, these Supervisors now want to rig the system to make it EVEN HARDER for voters to ever hold failed politicians accountable again by recalling them from office. The proponents of Prop C use disingenuous arguments about saving money or "special interests," ignoring the many costs to residents of keeping incompetent or corrupt politicians in office. And we profoundly disagree that the San Francisco parents — and nearly 70% of voters — who voted to recall the failed school board members this year are a "special interest." The Supervisors behind Prop C are pretending to solve a problem that simply does not exist. Under current law, it's already very hard to qualify a recall election. Since 1907, just six local recall elections have ever qualified for the ballot in San Francisco. And the first successful recall in over 100 years was this year's landslide recall of the three School Board commissioners. But it would not even have been permitted if the Supervisors behind Prop C had their way! The recall process is our LAST protection against politicians who flagrantly ignore the will of the voters. Protect your vote and your voice. Please join parents, public education advocates and your fellow San Franciscans and VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION C! GrowSF SF Parent Action Autumn Looijen, Co-Leader, Recall the SF School Board Todd David, Chair, Concerned Parents for the Recall	Only the Or	ganization Both the Officer and the Organization	
Section 3: Argument Text The text of your argument will be printed exactly as submitted. Ensure that your argument meets the legal word limit. You may request that specific argument text be printed in bold, italic, or bold italic type. Type your argument with the desired formatting, or underline the argument text be printed in bold, italic, or bold italic type. Type your argument with the desired formatting, or underline the argument text to be formatted and in the left column, mark "B" for bold, "I" for italics, or "BI" for bold italics. Other special formatting is not permitted. Include Author information in argument text. Format Format R, I, BI The proponents of Prop C are Supervisors who did NOT support the recall of all three failed School Board members this year, directly at odds with the overwhelming majority of San Francisco voters. Because they didn't like the results, these Supervisors now want to rig the system to make it EVEN HARDER for voters to ever hold failed politicians accountable again by recalling them from office. The proponents of Prop C use disingenuous arguments about saving money or "special interests," ignoring the many costs to residents of keeping incompetent or corrupt politicians in office. And we profoundly disagree that the San Francisco parents – and nearly 70% of voters – who voted to recall the failed school board members this year are a "special interest." The Supervisors behind Prop C are pretending to solve a problem that simply does not exist. Under current law, it's already very hard to qualify a recall election. Since 1907, just six local recall elections have ever qualified for the ballot in San Francisco. And the first successful recall in over 100 years was this year's landslide recall of the three School Board commissioners, But it would not even have been permitted if the Supervisors behind Prop C had their way! The recall process is our LAST protection against politicians who flagrantly ignore the will of the voters. Protect your vote and your voice. Please			
The text of your argument will be printed in bold, italic, or bold italic type. Type your argument meets the legal word limit. You may request hat specific argument text be printed in bold, italic, or bold italic type. Type your argument with the desired formatting, or underline the grayment text be formatted and in the left column, mark. "For bold, "If for italics, or "BI" for bold italics. Other special formatting is not permitted. Include Author information in argument text. Keep Text Within the Vertical Lines #for words per line The proponents of Prop C are Supervisors who did NOT support the recall of all three failed School Board members this year, directly at odds with the overwhelming majority of San Francisco voters. Because they didn't like the results, these Supervisors now want to rig the system to make it EVEN HARDER for voters to ever hold failed politicians accountable again by recalling them from office. The proponents of Prop C use disingenuous arguments about saving money or "special interests," ignoring the many costs to residents of keeping incompetent or corrupt politicians in office. And we profoundly disagree that the San Francisco parents – and nearly 70% of voters – who voted to recall the failed school board members this year are a "special interest." The Supervisors behind Prop C are pretending to solve a problem that simply does not exist. Under current law, it's already very hard to qualify a recall election. Since 1907, just six local recall elections have ever qualified for the ballot in San Francisco. And the first successful recall in over 100 years was this year's landslide recall of the three School Board commissioners. But it would not even have been permitted if the Supervisors behind Prop C had their way! The recall process is our LAST protection against politicians who flagrantly ignore the will of the voters. Protect your vote and your voice. Please join parents, public education advocates and your fellow San Franciscans and VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION C! GrowSF SF Par	Signature	Email	
that specific argument text be printed in bold, italic, or bold italic type. Type your argument with the desired formatting, or underline the grayment text to be formatted and in the left column, mark "B" for bold, "i" for italics, or "BI" for bold italics. Other special formatting is not permitted. Include Author information in argument text. Format Keep Text Within the Vertical Lines Keep Text Within the Vertical Lines Words per line The proponents of Prop C are Supervisors who did NOT support the recall of all three failed School Board members this year, directly at odds with the overwhelming majority of San Francisco voters. Because they didn't like the results, these Supervisors now want to rig the system to make it EVEN HARDER for voters to ever hold failed politicians accountable again by recalling them from office. The proponents of Prop C use disingenuous arguments about saving money or "special interests," ignoring the many costs to residents of keeping incompetent or corrupt politicians in office. And we profoundly disagree that the San Francisco parents – and nearly 70% of voters – who voted to recall the failed school board members this year are a "special interest." The Supervisors behind Prop C are pretending to solve a problem that simply does not exist. Under current law, it's already very hard to qualify a recall election. Since 1907, just six local recall elections have ever qualified for the ballot in San Francisco. And the first successful recall in over 100 years was this year's landslide recall of the three School Board commissioners. But it would not even have been permitted if the Supervisors behind Prop C had their way! The recall process is our LAST protection against politicians who flagrantly ignore the will of the voters. Protect your vote and your voice. Please join parents, public education advocates and your fellow San Franciscans and VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION C! GrowSF SF Parent Action Autumn Looijen, Co-Leader, Recall the SF School Board Todd David, Chair, Concerned P			327
The proponents of Prop C are Supervisors who did NOT support the recall of all three failed School Board members this year, directly at odds with the overwhelming majority of San Francisco voters. Because they didn't like the results, these Supervisors now want to rig the system to make it EVEN HARDER for voters to ever hold failed politicians accountable again by recalling them from office. The proponents of Prop C use disingenuous arguments about saving money or "special interests," ignoring the many costs to residents of keeping incompetent or corrupt politicians in office. And we profoundly disagree that the San Francisco parents – and nearly 70% of voters – who voted to recall the failed school board members this year are a "special interest." The Supervisors behind Prop C are pretending to solve a problem that simply does not exist. Under current law, it's already very hard to qualify a recall election. Since 1907, just six local recall elections have ever qualified for the ballot in San Francisco. And the first successful recall in over 100 years was this year's landslide recall of the three School Board commissioners. But it would not even have been permitted if the Supervisors behind Prop C had their way! The recall process is our LAST protection against politicians who flagrantly ignore the will of the voters. Protect your vote and your voice. Please join parents, public education advocates and your fellow San Franciscans and VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION C! GrowSF SF Parent Action Autumn Looijen, Co-Leader, Recall the SF School Board Todd David, Chair, Concerned Parents for the Recall Kit Lam, public school parent	hat specific argument tex	argument text be printed in bold, italic, or bold italic type. Type your argument with the desired formatting, or und tt to be formatted and in the left column, mark "B" for bold, "I" for italics, or "BI" for bold italics. Other special form	erline the
per line The proponents of Prop C are Supervisors who did NOT support the recall of all three failed School Board members this year, directly at odds with the overwhelming majority of San Francisco voters. Because they didn't like the results, these Supervisors now want to rig the system to make it EVEN HARDER for voters to ever hold failed politicians accountable again by recalling them from office. The proponents of Prop C use disingenuous arguments about saving money or "special interests," ignoring the many costs to residents of keeping incompetent or corrupt politicians in office. And we profoundly disagree that the San Francisco parents – and nearly 70% of voters – who voted to recall the failed school board members this year are a "special interest." The Supervisors behind Prop C are pretending to solve a problem that simply does not exist. Under current law, it's already very hard to qualify a recall election. Since 1907, just six local recall elections have ever qualified for the ballot in San Francisco. And the first successful recall in over 100 years was this year's landslide recall of the three School Board commissioners. But it would not even have been permitted if the Supervisors behind Prop C had their way! The recall process is our LAST protection against politicians who flagrantly ignore the will of the voters. Protect your vote and your voice. Please join parents, public education advocates and your fellow San Franciscans and VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION C! GrowSF SF Parent Action Autumn Looijen, Co-Leader, Recall the SF School Board Todd David, Chair, Concerned Parents for the Recall Kit Lam, public school parent		Keep Text Within the Vertical Lines	
School Board members this year, directly at odds with the overwhelming majority of San Francisco voters. Because they didn't like the results, these Supervisors now want to rig the system to make it EVEN HARDER for voters to ever hold failed politicians accountable again by recalling them from office. The proponents of Prop C use disingenuous arguments about saving money or "special interests," ignoring the many costs to residents of keeping incompetent or corrupt politicians in office. And we profoundly disagree that the San Francisco parents – and nearly 70% of voters – who voted to recall the failed school board members this year are a "special interest." The Supervisors behind Prop C are pretending to solve a problem that simply does not exist. Under current law, it's already very hard to qualify a recall election. Since 1907, just six local recall elections have ever qualified for the ballot in San Francisco. And the first successful recall in over 100 years was this year's landslide recall of the three School Board commissioners. But it would not even have been permitted if the Supervisors behind Prop C had their way! The recall process is our LAST protection against politicians who flagrantly ignore the will of the voters. Protect your vote and your voice. Please join parents, public education advocates and your fellow San Franciscans and VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION C! GrowSF SF Parent Action Autumn Looijen, Co-Leader, Recall the SF School Board Todd David, Chair, Concerned Parents for the Recall Kit Lam, public school parent	<i>5</i> , ,, <i>5</i> ,		1
Francisco voters. Because they didn't like the results, these Supervisors now want to rig the system to make it EVEN HARDER for voters to ever hold failed politicians accountable again by recalling them from office. The proponents of Prop C use disingenuous arguments about saving money or "special interests," ignoring the many costs to residents of keeping incompetent or corrupt politicians in office. And we profoundly disagree that the San Francisco parents – and nearly 70% of voters – who voted to recall the failed school board members this year are a "special interest." The Supervisors behind Prop C are pretending to solve a problem that simply does not exist. Under current law, it's already very hard to qualify a recall election. Since 1907, just six local recall elections have ever qualified for the ballot in San Francisco. And the first successful recall in over 100 years was this year's landslide recall of the three School Board commissioners. But it would not even have been permitted if the Supervisors behind Prop C had their way! The recall process is our LAST protection against politicians who flagrantly ignore the will of the voters. Protect your vote and your voice. Please join parents, public education advocates and your fellow San Franciscans and VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION C! GrowSF SF Parent Action Autumn Looijen, Co-Leader, Recall the SF School Board Todd David, Chair, Concerned Parents for the Recall Kit Lam, public school parent		The proponents of Prop C are Supervisors who did NOT support the recall of all three failed	
Because they didn't like the results, these Supervisors now want to rig the system to make it EVEN HARDER for voters to ever hold failed politicians accountable again by recalling them from office. The proponents of Prop C use disingenuous arguments about saving money or "special interests," ignoring the many costs to residents of keeping incompetent or corrupt politicians in office. And we profoundly disagree that the San Francisco parents — and nearly 70% of voters — who voted to recall the failed school board members this year are a "special interest." The Supervisors behind Prop C are pretending to solve a problem that simply does not exist. Under current law, it's already very hard to qualify a recall election. Since 1907, just six local recall elections have ever qualified for the ballot in San Francisco. And the successful recall in over 100 years was this year's landslide recall of the three School Board commissioners. But it would not even have been permitted if the Supervisors behind Prop C had their way! The recall process is our LAST protection against politicians who flagrantly ignore the will of the voters. Protect your vote and your voice. Please join parents, public education advocates and your fellow San Franciscans and VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION C! GrowSF SF Parent Action Autumn Looijen, Co-Leader, Recall the SF School Board Todd David, Chair, Concerned Parents for the Recall Kit Lam, public school parent		School Board members this year, directly at odds with the overwhelming majority of San	
EVEN HARDER for voters to ever hold failed politicians accountable again by recalling them from office. The proponents of Prop C use disingenuous arguments about saving money or "special interests," ignoring the many costs to residents of keeping incompetent or corrupt politicians in office. And we profoundly disagree that the San Francisco parents – and nearly 70% of voters – who voted to recall the failed school board members this year are a "special interest." The Supervisors behind Prop C are pretending to solve a problem that simply does not exist. Under current law, it's already very hard to qualify a recall election. Since 1907, just six local recall elections have ever qualified for the ballot in San Francisco. And the first successful recall in over 100 years was this year's landslide recall of the three School Board commissioners. But it would not even have been permitted if the Supervisors behind Prop C had their way! The recall process is our LAST protection against politicians who flagrantly ignore the will of the voters. Protect your vote and your voice. Please join parents, public education advocates and your fellow San Franciscans and VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION C! GrowSF SF Parent Action Autumn Looijen, Co-Leader, Recall the SF School Board Todd David, Chair, Concerned Parents for the Recall Kit Lam, public school parent		Francisco voters.	
The proponents of Prop C use disingenuous arguments about saving money or "special interests," ignoring the many costs to residents of keeping incompetent or corrupt politicians in office. And we profoundly disagree that the San Francisco parents — and nearly 70% of voters — who voted to recall the failed school board members this year are a "special interest." The Supervisors behind Prop C are pretending to solve a problem that simply does not exist. Under current law, it's already very hard to qualify a recall election. Since 1907, just six local recall elections have ever qualified for the ballot in San Francisco. And the first successful recall in over 100 years was this year's landslide recall of the three School Board commissioners. But it would not even have been permitted if the Supervisors behind Prop C had their way! The recall process is our LAST protection against politicians who flagrantly ignore the will of the voters. Protect your vote and your voice. Please join parents, public education advocates and your fellow San Franciscans and VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION C! GrowSF SF Parent Action Autumn Looijen, Co-Leader, Recall the SF School Board Todd David, Chair, Concerned Parents for the Recall Kit Lam, public school parent		EVEN HARDER for voters to ever hold failed politicians accountable again by recalling them	
interests," ignoring the many costs to residents of keeping incompetent or corrupt politicians in office. And we profoundly disagree that the San Francisco parents – and nearly 70% of voters – who voted to recall the failed school board members this year are a "special interest." The Supervisors behind Prop C are pretending to solve a problem that simply does not exist. Under current law, it's already very hard to qualify a recall election. Since 1907, just six local recall elections have ever qualified for the ballot in San Francisco. And the first successful recall in over 100 years was this year's landslide recall of the three School Board commissioners. But it would not even have been permitted if the Supervisors behind Prop C had their way! The recall process is our LAST protection against politicians who flagrantly ignore the will of the voters. Protect your vote and your voice. Please join parents, public education advocates and your fellow San Franciscans and VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION C! GrowSF SF Parent Action Autumn Looijen, Co-Leader, Recall the SF School Board Todd David, Chair, Concerned Parents for the Recall Kit Lam, public school parent		nom once.	
office. And we profoundly disagree that the San Francisco parents – and nearly 70% of voters – who voted to recall the failed school board members this year are a "special interest." The Supervisors behind Prop C are pretending to solve a problem that simply does not exist. Under current law, it's already very hard to qualify a recall election. Since 1907, just six local recall elections have ever qualified for the ballot in San Francisco. And the first successful recall in over 100 years was this year's landslide recall of the three School Board commissioners. But it would not even have been permitted if the Supervisors behind Prop C had their way! The recall process is our LAST protection against politicians who flagrantly ignore the will of the voters. Protect your vote and your voice. Please join parents, public education advocates and your fellow San Franciscans and VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION C! GrowSF SF Parent Action Autumn Looijen, Co-Leader, Recall the SF School Board Todd David, Chair, Concerned Parents for the Recall Kit Lam, public school parent		The proponents of Prop C use disingenuous arguments about saving money or "special	
who voted to recall the failed school board members this year are a "special interest." The Supervisors behind Prop C are pretending to solve a problem that simply does not exist. Under current law, it's already very hard to qualify a recall election. Since 1907, just six local recall elections have ever qualified for the ballot in San Francisco. And the first successful recall in over 100 years was this year's landslide recall of the three School Board commissioners. But it would not even have been permitted if the Supervisors behind Prop C had their way! The recall process is our LAST protection against politicians who flagrantly ignore the will of the voters. Protect your vote and your voice. Please join parents, public education advocates and your fellow San Franciscans and VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION C! GrowSF SF Parent Action Autumn Looijen, Co-Leader, Recall the SF School Board Todd David, Chair, Concerned Parents for the Recall Kit Lam, public school parent			
The Supervisors behind Prop C are pretending to solve a problem that simply does not exist. Under current law, it's already very hard to qualify a recall election. Since 1907, just six local recall elections have ever qualified for the ballot in San Francisco. And the first successful recall in over 100 years was this year's landslide recall of the three School Board commissioners. But it would not even have been permitted if the Supervisors behind Prop C had their way! The recall process is our LAST protection against politicians who flagrantly ignore the will of the voters. Protect your vote and your voice. Please join parents, public education advocates and your fellow San Franciscans and VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION C! GrowSF SF Parent Action Autumn Looijen, Co-Leader, Recall the SF School Board Todd David, Chair, Concerned Parents for the Recall Kit Lam, public school parent		•	
Under current law, it's already very hard to qualify a recall election. Since 1907, just six local recall elections have ever qualified for the ballot in San Francisco. And the first successful recall in over 100 years was this year's landslide recall of the three School Board commissioners. But it would not even have been permitted if the Supervisors behind Prop C had their way! The recall process is our LAST protection against politicians who flagrantly ignore the will of the voters. Protect your vote and your voice. Please join parents, public education advocates and your fellow San Franciscans and VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION C! GrowSF SF Parent Action Autumn Looijen, Co-Leader, Recall the SF School Board Todd David, Chair, Concerned Parents for the Recall Kit Lam, public school parent		who voted to recall the failed school board members this year are a "special interest."	
recall elections have ever qualified for the ballot in San Francisco. And the first successful recall in over 100 years was this year's landslide recall of the three School Board commissioners. But it would not even have been permitted if the Supervisors behind Prop C had their way! The recall process is our LAST protection against politicians who flagrantly ignore the will of the voters. Protect your vote and your voice. Please join parents, public education advocates and your fellow San Franciscans and VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION C! GrowSF SF Parent Action Autumn Looijen, Co-Leader, Recall the SF School Board Todd David, Chair, Concerned Parents for the Recall Kit Lam, public school parent		The Supervisors behind Prop C are pretending to solve a problem that simply does not exist.	
in over 100 years was this year's landslide recall of the three School Board commissioners. But it would not even have been permitted if the Supervisors behind Prop C had their way! The recall process is our LAST protection against politicians who flagrantly ignore the will of the voters. Protect your vote and your voice. Please join parents, public education advocates and your fellow San Franciscans and VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION C! GrowSF SF Parent Action Autumn Looijen, Co-Leader, Recall the SF School Board Todd David, Chair, Concerned Parents for the Recall Kit Lam, public school parent		Under current law, it's already very hard to qualify a recall election. Since 1907, just six local	
it would not even have been permitted if the Supervisors behind Prop C had their way! The recall process is our LAST protection against politicians who flagrantly ignore the will of the voters. Protect your vote and your voice. Please join parents, public education advocates and your fellow San Franciscans and VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION C! GrowSF SF Parent Action Autumn Looijen, Co-Leader, Recall the SF School Board Todd David, Chair, Concerned Parents for the Recall Kit Lam, public school parent		recall elections have ever qualified for the ballot in San Francisco. And the first successful recall	
The recall process is our LAST protection against politicians who flagrantly ignore the will of the voters. Protect your vote and your voice. Please join parents, public education advocates and your fellow San Franciscans and VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION C! GrowSF SF Parent Action Autumn Looijen, Co-Leader, Recall the SF School Board Todd David, Chair, Concerned Parents for the Recall Kit Lam, public school parent			
voters. Protect your vote and your voice. Please join parents, public education advocates and your fellow San Franciscans and VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION C! GrowSF SF Parent Action Autumn Looijen, Co-Leader, Recall the SF School Board Todd David, Chair, Concerned Parents for the Recall Kit Lam, public school parent		it would not even have been permitted if the Supervisors behind Prop C had their way!	
your fellow San Franciscans and VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION C! GrowSF SF Parent Action Autumn Looijen, Co-Leader, Recall the SF School Board Todd David, Chair, Concerned Parents for the Recall Kit Lam, public school parent		The recall process is our LAST protection against politicians who flagrantly ignore the will of the	
GrowSF SF Parent Action Autumn Looijen, Co-Leader, Recall the SF School Board Todd David, Chair, Concerned Parents for the Recall Kit Lam, public school parent		voters. Protect your vote and your voice. Please join parents, public education advocates and	
SF Parent Action Autumn Looijen, Co-Leader, Recall the SF School Board Todd David, Chair, Concerned Parents for the Recall Kit Lam, public school parent		your fellow San Franciscans and VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION C!	
SF Parent Action Autumn Looijen, Co-Leader, Recall the SF School Board Todd David, Chair, Concerned Parents for the Recall Kit Lam, public school parent		GrowSF	
Todd David, Chair, Concerned Parents for the Recall Kit Lam, public school parent			
Kit Lam, public school parent			
		Todd David, Chair, Concerned Parents for the Recall	
Quincy Yu, public education advocate			
		Quincy Yu, public education advocate	
	ı		ı
If handwritten information or a revision is unclear, Department staff will interpret the handwritten information to the best of their abilities; this interpretation is final.]

Total Word Count

Ballot Argument Control Sheet B

John Arntz, Director

Control Sheet A must be submitted for every ballot argument, with requirinformation.	The state of the s
For an argument submitted on behalf of an organization, the "Individual"	section must also be completed by 2022 MAR 21 AM 9: 39
a principal officer of the organization who must be a registered San Fran If your argument has more than one author, you must also submit Control	TARTHENT OF INDE/Date Stamo
and information for all additional authors. Section 1: Argument Information	
^	
Proposition	Label
Proponent Argument Rebuttal to Proponer	nt Argument Paid Argument in Favor
Opponent Argument Rebuttal to Opponen	nt Argument Against Paid Argument Against
Section 2: Additional Author Information	
Declaration Related to Proponent and Opponent Argum	
I attest under the penalty of perjury that I am an Author of that am not a Non-supporter of this measure. A Non-supporter	ne Proponent Argument for Proposition being submitted and that I is defined as a person who, with respect to a measure:
 Has received or been promised any compensation that committee; or 	hat has made or plans to make expenditures in opposition to the measure; or thing of value from such a committee to perform consulting services for a campaign literature or in advertising that advocates for the defeat of the
I attest under the penalty of perjury that I am an Author of the not a Supporter of this measure. A Supporter is defined as a	
 Has received or been promised any compensation that committee; or 	nat has made or plans to make expenditures in support of the measure; or thing of value from such a committee to perform consulting services for n campaign literature or in advertising that advocates for the adoption of the
Complete the following to indicate whether the Author is	
Individual (or principal officer of Organization)	Chair - Concerned
Full Name (Print) Todd David	Title (If Applicable) Payents for the
San Francisco Address (Where you are Registered)	
Signature	Email
Organization (Entity) (If selected, complete bot	th the Individual Author section and the Organization Section)
Name of Organization (Print)	
Who should be listed as an Author for your Organization?	
Only the Organization Both the Officer and	the Organization
* Check if the title or identifying information is for identifical if you are signing as an individual and not of behalf of an o	
Signature Signature	Email
Additional Author Information	
Additional Author Information Declaration Related to Proponent and Opponent Argum	ents
	ne Proponent Argument for Proposition being submitted and that I

- Is a treasurer, officer, or member of a committee that has made or plans to make expenditures in opposition to the measure;
- Has received or been promised any compensation or thing of value from such a committee to perform consulting services for that committee; or
- Has authorized their name or likeness to appear on campaign literature or in advertising that advocates for the defeat of the
 measure

attest under the penalty of perjury that I am an Author of the **Opponent Argument** for Proposition _____ being submitted and that I am not a Supporter of this measure. A Supporter is defined as a person who with respect to a measure:

Has received or been promised any compensation or thing of value from such a committee to perform consulting services for that committee: or Has authorized their name or likeness to appear on campaign literature or in advertising that advocates for the adoption of the measure. Complete the following to indicate whether the Author is an individual or an organization: Chair - Concerned Individual (or principal officer of Organization) FORENTS FOR the ERCOLL Todd David Title (If Applicable) Full Name (Print) San Francisco Address (Where you are Registered) Signature | Email Organization (Entity) (If selected, complete both the Individual Author section and the Organization Section) Name of Organization (Print) Who should be listed as an Author for your Organization? Only the Organization Both the Officer and the Organization * Check if the title or identifying information is for identification purposes only, if you are signing as an individual and not of behalf of an organization. Signature | Email Section 3: Argument Text The text of your argument will be printed exactly as submitted. Ensure that your argument meets the legal word limit. You may request that specific argument text be printed in bold, Italic, or bold Italic type. Type your argument with the desired formatting, or underline the argument text to be formatted and in the left column, mark "B" for bold, "I" for italics, or "BI" for bold italics. Other special formatting is not permitted. Include Author information in argument text. Format Keep Text Within the Vertical Lines B, I, BI words per line The proponents of Prop C are Supervisors who did NOT support the recall of all three failed School Board members this year, directly at odds with the overwhelming majority of San Francisco voters. Because they didn't like the results, these Supervisors now want to rig the system to make it EVEN HARDER for voters to ever hold failed politicians accountable again by recalling them from office. The proponents of Prop C use disingenuous arguments about saving money or "special interests," ignoring the many costs to residents of keeping incompetent or corrupt politicians in office. And we profoundly disagree that the San Francisco parents - and nearly 70% of voters who voted to recall the failed school board members this year are a "special interest." The Supervisors behind Prop C are pretending to solve a problem that simply does not exist. Under current law, it's already very hard to qualify a recall election. Since 1907, just six local recall elections have ever qualified for the ballot in San Francisco. And the first successful recall in over 100 years was this year's landslide recall of the three School Board commissioners. But it would not even have been permitted if the Supervisors behind Prop C had their way! The recall process is our LAST protection against politicians who flagrantly ignore the will of the voters. Protect your vote and your voice. Please join parents, public education advocates and your fellow San Franciscans and VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION C! GrowSF SF Parent Action Autumn Looijen, Co-Leader, Recall the SF School Board Todd David, Chair, Concerned Parents for the Recall Kit Lam, public school parent Quincy Yu, public education advocate If handwritten information or a revision is unclear, Department staff will interpret the handwritten information to the best of their abilities; this interpretation is final. **Total Word Count**