

COUNTY OF SONOMA
REGISTRAR OF VOTERS OFFICE

(FOR OFFICE USE ONLY)

ELECTION DATE: _____

CONTEST ID: _____

AUTHOR ELIGIBILITY VERIFIED BY: _____

MEASURE LETTER DESIGNATION: _____

JURISDICTION: _____

STATEMENT OF ACCURACY

The undersigned author(s) of the (select one of the following)

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR (300 WORDS)

REBUTTAL TO ARGUMENT IN FAVOR (250 WORDS)

ARGUMENT AGAINST (300 WORDS)

REBUTTAL TO ARGUMENT AGAINST (250 WORDS)

ballot measure W at the General election for
(Letter) (Name of Election)
the City of Sonoma being held on Nov 3, 2020
(Jurisdiction) (Date of Election)

hereby state that such argument is true and correct to the best of his/her/their knowledge and belief.

1. _____
Signature/Date (Principal Officer signing of behalf of an Association? Yes No)

Simon Blattner
Print/type your name or Association's name as it should appear on argument

Title to appear below name on argument (optional-limited to 4 words)

3. _____
Signature/Date (Principal Officer signing of behalf of an Association? Yes No)

EMMA LIPP
Print/type your name or Association's name as it should appear on argument

Title to appear below name on argument (optional-limited to 4 words)

5. _____
Signature/Date (Principal Officer signing of behalf of an Association? Yes No)

Mario Castillo
Print/type your name or Association's name as it should appear on argument

Title to appear below name on argument (optional-limited to 4 words)

2. _____
Signature/Date (Principal Officer signing of behalf of an Association? Yes No)

David Brigode
Print/type your name or Association's name as it should appear on argument

Title to appear below name on argument (optional-limited to 4 words)

4. _____
Signature/Date (Principal Officer signing of behalf of an Association? Yes No)

Mario Castillo
Print/type your name or Association's name as it should appear on argument

Title to appear below name on argument (optional-limited to 4 words)

FOR INFORMATION CONTACT:

Name: David Brigode

Address: 240 Del Rio Paseo

Sonoma, CA 95416

Phone: 707-495-9769

Email: DBrigode@Comcast.net

OPTIONAL TITLES SHOULD NOT EXCEED FOUR (4) WORDS.
TITLES WHICH DO NOT FIT IN ALLOTTED SPACE WILL BE ABBREVIATED.

A ballot argument or rebuttal argument shall not be accepted unless accompanied by the name or names of the person(s) submitting it, or, if submitted on behalf of an organization, the name of the organization and the name of at least one of its principal officers. As of May 2020, it is no longer required that signers who are signing as individuals be registered voters in the district. No more than five signatures shall appear with any argument submitted. Arguments may be changed or withdrawn by their proponents until and including the date fixed by the election official for filing. There is a 10 calendar day review period prior to submitting arguments for printing. E.C. §§9164, 9190, 9283, 9295, 9380, 9501, 9600

Text of arguments/rebuttal arguments should either be typewritten (see reverse side of form) on the reverse side of this form or a typewritten or computer generated statement may be attached to this form. Statements are electronically scanned for typesetting, therefore handwritten arguments will not be accepted for filing.

Sonoma can have an Urban Growth boundary that does not discriminate against desperately needed affordable housing.

While the language of the ordinance purports to allow annexation for such purpose, the devil lies in the details. There are numerous "poison pills" that in reality make it nearly impossible, in reality, to create housing for first responders, medical and educational personnel, families, and essential workers who are suffering from increased COVID -19 due to overcrowded and inadequate lodgings. Acreage restrictions, prohibitions against the extension of utility services, unrealistic affordability levels, and other "hooks" to allow endless litigation effectively sabotage efforts of affordable housing developers and advocates. Given the existing shortage of developable land in Sonoma, which is being snapped up by market rate companies for houses priced at over a million dollars each, this UGB proposal sets us backwards.

Moreover, this wording is ethnically discriminatory, and, quite frankly, maintains the overwhelmingly white character of our town.

As a recent Index-Tribune editorial argued –"Perhaps we are not racists, but we may be blind to the possibility that we allow racism to continue in a more subtle way, as in the way we support restrictions on affordable housing developments, urban growth boundaries, and the like". This is systemic bias, and should be acknowledged and rejected.

Under cover of the pandemic, this UGB renewal was rushed through at the last minute without a thorough and honest review of its impacts (over the next 20 years.) This ordinance is in violation of Federal Fair Housing law, the Sonoma Housing Element, the California Housing Accountability Act, and the stated goals in the city General Plan for Inclusivity and Affordability for all.

Send this flawed piece of legislation back to the City Council to get it right. Vote NO on "W".

COUNTY OF SONOMA
REGISTRAR OF VOTERS OFFICE

(FOR OFFICE USE ONLY)

ELECTION DATE: _____

CONTEST ID: _____

AUTHOR ELIGIBILITY VERIFIED BY: _____

MEASURE LETTER DESIGNATION: _____

JURISDICTION: _____

STATEMENT OF ACCURACY

The undersigned author(s) of the (select one of the following)

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR (300 WORDS)

REBUTTAL TO ARGUMENT IN FAVOR (250 WORDS)

ARGUMENT AGAINST (300 WORDS)

REBUTTAL TO ARGUMENT AGAINST (250 WORDS)

ballot measure W at the general election for
(Letter) (Name of Election)
the City of Sonoma being held on Nov 3, 2020
(Jurisdiction) (Date of Election)

hereby state that such argument is true and correct to the best of his/her/their knowledge and belief.

1. [Redacted] 8/8/2020
Signature/Date (Principal Officer signing of behalf of an Association? Yes No)

2. _____
Signature/Date (Principal Officer signing of behalf of an Association? Yes No)

Whitney Evans
Print/type your name or Association's name as it should appear on argument

Print/type your name or Association's name as it should appear on argument

Title to appear below name on argument (optional-limited to 4 words)

Title to appear below name on argument (optional-limited to 4 words)

3. _____
Signature/Date (Principal Officer signing of behalf of an Association? Yes No)

4. _____
Signature/Date (Principal Officer signing of behalf of an Association? Yes No)

Print/type your name or Association's name as it should appear on argument

Print/type your name or Association's name as it should appear on argument

Title to appear below name on argument (optional-limited to 4 words)

Title to appear below name on argument (optional-limited to 4 words)

5. _____
Signature/Date (Principal Officer signing of behalf of an Association? Yes No)

FOR INFORMATION CONTACT:
Name: David Brigade

Address: 240 Del Rio Paredo
Sonoma, CA 95426

Phone: 707-495-9769

Email: D.Brigade@Comcast.net

Title to appear below name on argument (optional-limited to 4 words)

OPTIONAL TITLES SHOULD NOT EXCEED FOUR (4) WORDS.
TITLES WHICH DO NOT FIT IN ALLOTTED SPACE WILL BE ABBREVIATED.

A ballot argument or rebuttal argument shall not be accepted unless accompanied by the name or names of the person(s) submitting it, or, if submitted on behalf of an organization, the name of the organization and the name of at least one of its principal officers. As of May 2020, it is no longer required that signers who are signing as individuals be registered voters in the district. No more than five signatures shall appear with any argument submitted. Arguments may be changed or withdrawn by their proponents until and including the date fixed by the election official for filing. There is a 10 calendar day review period prior to submitting arguments for printing. E.C. §§9164, 9190, 9283, 9295, 9380, 9501, 9600

Text of arguments/rebuttal arguments should either be typewritten (see reverse side of form) on the reverse side of this form or a typewritten or computer generated statement may be attached to this form. Statements are electronically scanned for typesetting, therefore handwritten arguments will not be accepted for filing.

Sonoma can have an Urban Growth boundary that does not discriminate against desperately needed affordable housing.

While the language of the ordinance purports to allow annexation for such purpose, the devil lies in the details. There are numerous “poison pills” that in reality make it nearly impossible, in reality, to create housing for first responders, medical and educational personnel, families, and essential workers who are suffering from increased COVID -19 due to overcrowded and inadequate lodgings. Acreage restrictions, prohibitions against the extension of utility services, unrealistic affordability levels, and other “hooks” to allow endless litigation effectively sabotage efforts of affordable housing developers and advocates. Given the existing shortage of developable land in Sonoma, which is being snapped up by market rate companies for houses priced at over a million dollars each, this UGB proposal sets us backwards.

Moreover, this wording is ethnically discriminatory, and, quite frankly, maintains the overwhelmingly white character of our town.

As a recent Index-Tribune editorial argued –“Perhaps we are not racists, but we may be blind to the possibility that we allow racism to continue in a more subtle way, as in the way we support restrictions on affordable housing developments, urban growth boundaries, and the like”. This is systemic bias, and should be acknowledged and rejected.

Under cover of the pandemic, this UGB renewal was rushed through at the last minute without a thorough and honest review of its impacts (over the next 20 years.) This ordinance is in violation of Federal Fair Housing law, the Sonoma Housing Element, the California Housing Accountability Act, and the stated goals in the city General Plan for Inclusivity and Affordability for all.

Send this flawed piece of legislation back to the City Council to get it right. Vote NO on “W”.