AUTHORIZATION FORM FOR CHANGE IN SIGNER(S) OF REBUTTAL ARGUMENTS

PLEASE ONLY COMPLETE SECTIONS THAT ARE APPLICABLE

Authorization must be provided by the original signer(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. CA Elections Code §9167, §9317, §9504

To be completed by the signer(s) of the Primary Argument

The undersigned signer(s) of the Primary Argument ☑ In Favor ☐ Against

Measure M (Letter) at the GENERAL (Name of Election) election to be held on 11/6/18 (Date of Election)

authorize(s) the following individual(s) to sign the Rebuttal Argument in his/her/their place:

1. Robin Aeschliman — Robin Aeschliman (Print name of Rebuttal Argument signer) to sign instead of [signature] (Signature of Primary Argument signer) 8-21-18 (Date)
2. Pamela Chrislock — Pamela Chrislock (Print name of Rebuttal Argument signer) to sign instead of K M Akeman (Signature of Primary Argument signer) 8-22-18 (Date)
3. Donald Murphy — Donald Murphy (Print name of Rebuttal Argument signer) to sign instead of Tod Hollister (Signature of Primary Argument signer) 8-22-2018 (Date)
4. Thom Akeman — Thom Akeman (Print name of Rebuttal Argument signer) to sign instead of [signature] (Signature of Primary Argument signer) 8/21/18 (Date)
5. _____ (Print name of Rebuttal Argument signer) to sign instead of _____ (Signature of Primary Argument signer) _____ (Date)

RECEIVED
CITY MANAGER'S OFFICE
2018 AUG 23 P 3:15
CITY OF PACIFIC GROVE

California Elections Code – Ballot Arguments, Form of Statement to be filed

§§9164, 9283, 9501.5 A ballot argument shall not be accepted unless accompanied by the printed name and signature or printed names and signatures of the person or persons 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.
No more than five signatures shall appear with any argument submitted under this article. In case any argument is signed by more than five persons, the signatures of the first five shall be printed.

REQUIRED FORM STATEMENT

§9600. All arguments concerning measures filed pursuant to this division shall be accompanied by the following form statement, to be ***signed by each proponent*** of the argument:

The undersigned proponent(s) or signer(s) of the REBUTTAL (primary/rebuttal) argument AGAINST (in favor of/against)

ballot proposition M (name or letter) at the GENERAL (title of election) election for the CITY OF PACIFIC GROVE (name of district/jurisdiction)

to be held on 11/6/18 (date) hereby state that this argument is true and correct to the best of THEIR (his/her/their) knowledge and belief.

Signatures of Proponents (in order of appearance):

(1) Printed Name Pamela Chrislock Title (one) Resident
Signed Pamela Chrislock Date 8.23.18

(2) Printed Name DONALD MURPHY Title (one) Resident
Signed Donald Murphy Date 8/23/18

(3) Printed Name Thom Akeman Title (one) Resident
Signed Thom Akeman Date 8/23/18

(4) Printed Name ROBIN AESCHLIMAN Title (one) Resident
Signed robin aeschliman Date 23 AUG 2018

(5) Printed Name _____ Title (one) _____
Signed _____ Date _____

RECEIVED CITY MANAGER'S OFFICE AUG 23 2018 CITY OF PACIFIC GROVE

Filer:

(1) Printed Name Luke Coletti Title (one) Initiative Petition Filer
Signed Luke Coletti Date 8/23/18

Primary Contact Information: 718 Walnut Pacific Grove, CA 93950 - ljc@groknet.net - (831) 238-0714

REBUTTAL TO ARGUMENT AGAINST MEASURE M

The argument against Measure M completely ignores the **quality of life of residents** who are impacted by the Short-Term Vacation Rentals (STRs) – long-term renters evicted to make room for them, and neighbors subjected to all hours coming and going, noisy disruptions, rowdy parties, blocked driveways, and trash left in the streets.

STR owners and supporters won't acknowledge those disruptions because few of them live near the "mini-motels" from which they profit. City records list out-of-town addresses for 82% of the STR owners.

Here are the facts:

- We need more housing for people to live and work in PG, not less.
- We have more than 1,000 rooms, suites and cottages for visitors at established inns that have supported the local economy for decades.
- Measure M will not impair city services as opponents claim. That is hysteria. PG has survived more than 100 years without STRs.
- The city placed Measure U on the ballot, a proposal to raise Transient Occupancy Tax on overnight rentals. City surveys indicate it will easily pass.
- The city's fiscal analysis indicates voter approval of both Measures M and U could cause a net loss of $265,182 – 1% of the city budget.
- STRs haven't boosted the local economy as they claim. City sales tax collections have been about the same for the past five years.

The city's largest Homeowners Associations (Country Club Gate, Forest Grove, The Glen and Monarch Pines) all prohibit STRs. Why should your neighborhood be any different? Please Vote YES on Measure M.

/s/ Robin Aeschliman, Resident
/s/ Pamela Chrislock, Resident
/s/ Donald Murphy, Resident
/s/ Thom Akeman, Resident