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CANDIDATE STATEMENTS

Each Candidate’s Statement in this pamphlet is volunteered by the candidate and is printed at the City’s expense. A complete list of candidates appears on the sample ballot page of this pamphlet.

BALLOT MEASURES, ANALYSIS, ARGUMENTS AND REBUTTALS

ANALYSIS: The Impartial Analysis is an impartial summary of the results of the proposed measure or proposition.

ARGUMENTS: Arguments and/or rebuttal arguments in support of or in opposition to the proposed laws are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

LOS ANGELES COUNTY
General Voter Information

To view your sample ballot, find your polling place, and/or verify your voter registration status, go to:
http://www.lavote.net
SAMPLE BALLOT

CITY
SANTA MONICA CITY GENERAL MUNICIPAL ELECTION

Member of the City Council Vote for no more than Four
TERRY O'DAY
Councilmember/Environmental Executive

JAMES T. WATSON
Financial Manager

TED WINTERER
Mayor Pro Tempore

TONY VAZQUEZ
Mayor/Educational Consultant

MENDE SMITH
Writer/Author

OSCAR DE LA TORRE
Santa Monica-Malibu Unified School District Board Member

GLEAM OLIVIA DAVIS
Santa Monica Councilmember

TERENCE LATER
Producer

ARMEN MELKONIANS
Civil/Environmental Engineer

JON MANN
Retired Parole Agent

Member of the Rent Control Board Vote for no more than Two
CHRISTOPHER D. WALTON
Incumbent

ELAINE GOLDEN-GEALER
Nonprofit Association Executive

ANASTASIA FOSTER
Appointed Incumbent

CAROLINE M. TOROSIS
Consumer Protection Attorney

SANTA MONICA CITY SPECIAL MUNICIPAL ELECTION

GS
MEASURE GS: ADVISORY VOTE ONLY: If a local transactions and use tax is enacted in Santa Monica, should half of its revenue be used to improve and maintain local public schools, attracting and retaining high-quality teachers, expanding access to pre-schools, assisting at-risk students, and improving school technology, arts, music, math, and science instruction; and half to help preserve and ensure housing in Santa Monica that is affordable, protect residents from displacement by rising housing costs, and reduce homelessness?

YES ➡ O

NO ➡ O

GSH
MEASURE GSH: To maintain and improve Santa Monica community services including support for preservation of affordable housing, reducing homelessness, school repair and improvement, education of Santa Monica children and students, and other general fund services, shall an ordinance be adopted to increase by one-half percent Santa Monica’s transactions and use tax, subject to independent annual audits, all funds used locally, no money going to Sacramento, raising approximately $16 million annually, until ended by the voters?

YES ➡ O

NO ➡ O

CONTINUE VOTING ON NEXT PAGE

BT 1
CITY
SANTA MONICA CITY SPECIAL MUNICIPAL ELECTION

LV MEASURE LV: Shall the City's General Plan and Municipal Code be amended to require a new permit process for major development projects exceeding base sizes or heights of 32-36 feet, with exceptions such as single unit dwellings and some affordable housing projects, voter approval of major development projects and development agreements, excluding affordable housing and moderate income and senior housing projects, among others, and voter approval of changes to City land use and planning policy documents? [ ] YES [ ] NO

SM MEASURE SM: Shall Article XXII of the City Charter be amended to, among other things: expand the prohibition against kickbacks as rewards for certain official actions, create an exemption for volunteers serving certain City-funded non-profits, clarify the application of the Article's prohibitions, the City Attorney's authority and enforcement responsibilities, and the scope of available remedies? [ ] YES [ ] NO

SCHOOL
SANTA MONICA COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT

Member of the Board of Trustees Vote for no more than Three: MARGARET QUINONES-PEREZ Santa Monica College Trustee/Professor [ ] [ ] [ ] SION ROY College Professor/Physician [ ] [ ] [ ] ROB GREENSTEIN RADER Santa Monica College Trustee/Professor [ ] [ ] [ ] SUSAN AMINOFF Santa Monica College Trustee/Professor [ ] [ ] [ ]

SANTA MONICA COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT SPECIAL ELECTION

V SANTA MONICA COLLEGE CLASSROOM REPAIR, CAREER TRAINING, HIGHER EDUCATION ACCESS MEASURE. To improve local access to affordable higher education for high school graduates/adults/veterans; improve education/career training in math, science, writing, arts, business; shall Santa Monica Community College District issue $345,000,000 in bonds at legal rates, with citizens oversight/annual audits, to repair, upgrade, construct, modernize, equip facilities for technology, science/biotech, college readiness; repair aging, leaky classrooms, remove asbestos, upgrade disabled access, seismic and campus safety? [ ] YES [ ] NO

END OF BALLOT
FOR MEMBER OF THE CITY COUNCIL

TERRY O’DAY
Male – Age: 42
Occupation: Environmental Executive
E-Mail Address: today@terryoday.com
Website Address: www.terryoday.com

For over six years my decisions as your Councilmember have been guided by putting people first. I have been a strong voice for residents and human scale neighborhoods. I have led the Council to:

• Keep Big Blue Bus fares low
• Support senior housing programs and services
• Keep water rates low while achieving water conservation goals
• Increase school funding
• Improve bike and pedestrian safety
• Impose tough traffic restrictions on new development
• Support our police and firefighters to keep our community safe

As the cofounder of successful green businesses, I have cultivated the tools to make our city the national standard for sustainability, human-scale neighborhoods, regional traffic solutions, and green jobs. My BA in Public Policy from Stanford and MBA from UCLA have helped me make responsible, informed decisions to balance the City’s budget, cut waste and still protect the well-being of all residents – from cradle to career, and beyond.

As a parent, homeowner, and activist for renters’ rights and housing, I seek re-election to keep Santa Monica a place where all of our children thrive.

I am endorsed by a broad coalition of Santa Monicans, including six former mayors and Assemblymember Richard Bloom. I would be honored to have your vote too.

/s/ Terry O’Day

FOR MEMBER OF THE CITY COUNCIL

JAMES T. WATSON
Male – Age: 37
Occupation: Financial Manager
E-Mail Address: jamestwatsonSM@gmail.com

As a long time resident of Santa Monica, it is important to me to represent the voices within our community, whether it is in relation to our family neighborhoods or local businesses. My goal in running for City Council is to continue to respect, preserve, and responsibly improve our city and community in a fair and equitable manner.

A brief summary of my education and qualifications are as follows:
- Double Major in Finance and Accounting at the University of Vermont.
- Community outreach, communication, and an optimistic approach in all that I do.
- Financial & Accounting Management professional with 16 years of career experience ranging from managing multi-billion dollar asset portfolios to owning a successful consulting company, with expertise in financial, budgetary, and administrative management.
- I bring with me a fair mind for accommodating both residents and businesses alike.

I believe in RENT CONTROL and keeping Santa Monica an affordable place to live, preserving our beaches and community, being environmentally responsible, supporting sustainable business practices, welcoming entrepreneurship, improving education, resolving homelessness, reducing pollutions of all kinds, and encouraging everyone who lives in Santa Monica to do all they can to make our city the best it can be!

/s/ James T. Watson
FOR MEMBER OF THE CITY COUNCIL

TED WINTERER  Male – Age: 59
Occupation: Marketing
E-Mail Address: ted@tedforcouncil.com
Website Address: www.tedforcouncil.com

I’ve lived in Santa Monica for 24 years, am a proud father of two kids attending our public schools and have been honored to serve the voters as Councilmember and now Mayor Pro Tem over the last four years.

Santa Monica is a great place to live, but we can make it even better by preserving and protecting our past and preparing for our future. I will work to:

• Protect our residential neighborhoods from commercial intrusions and overdevelopment.
• Preserve existing housing to keep Santa Monicans in Santa Monica.
• Maintain our diversity by protecting low-income tenants and seniors.
• Address our most important challenge: improving mobility on our congested streets.
• Incentivize adaptive reuse of our historic buildings.
• Continue and enhance our commitment to education.
• Support robust public safety budgets.
• Reduce homelessness.
• Assure a safe, reliable supply of local water.
• Add 15 acres of parks to the 8 recently created.
• Convert the airport to a great park.
• Support locally owned small businesses.
• Assure the economic engine of our downtown thrives in a manner sensitive to community standards.

Congressman Ted Lieu, State Senator Ben Allen and many others endorse my reelection. I hope you will also support me with your vote.

/s/ Ted Winterer

FOR MEMBER OF THE CITY COUNCIL

TONY VAZQUEZ  Male
Occupation: Mayor/Education Consultant

It has been a privilege serving you these past 4 years. As Mayor, I have one simple and fundamental goal; to get things done, and I am very proud of our accomplishments. Among them:

• Oversaw the completion of the Metro Expo Line extension, reconfigured our Big Blue Bus routes, and started the Breeze Bike Share program
• Approved one of the strongest minimum wage ordinances in the country
• City won major Appeals Court victory to assert local control at Santa Monica Airport
• Instituted “best practices” in hiring, ethics and government transparency

I am now seeking re-election to finish the projects we have already started but yet to complete.

• Secure sustainable funding to increase affordable housing options
• Protect our neighborhoods by ensuring “smart growth” development while balancing the needs of our thriving business community
• Support our “Learn + Thrive” program in providing a quality education for all our children
• Form a coalition of all concerned stake-holders in formulating the Downtown Community Plan

I am committed to meeting each and every challenge with careful planning, responsible oversight, and innovative programs that address the needs of all residents.

Respectfully, I ask for your continued support.

Thank you.

www.VoteVazquez4Council.com

/s/ Tony Vazquez
FOR MEMBER OF THE CITY COUNCIL

MENDE SMITH  Female – Age: 43
Occasion:  Writer/Author
E-mail Address:  mende@menesmith.com
Website Address:  www.mendesmith.com

As you consider who will do a better job for Santa Monicans, please consider Mende Smith: poet, environmentalist, journalist and community activist.

My philosophy is simple - listen to the community and enact policies that meet our basic needs. I stand for more parks and open space, affordable housing and environmental sustainability.

I believe we can promote living wages and economic opportunity for all, without overdeveloping the city and without ruining our neighborhoods.

I also believe in an ethical government that helps those who don’t have the basics, enabling them to provide for themselves, their families, and to contribute positively to their communities.

The political revolution happening nationally can also happen here in Santa Monica.

In addition to these goals, I want to continue Santa Monica’s new vision of proposing aggressive climate action, restoring our kelp beds, and enact a “Green Hour” in our city where kids engage in outdoor activities daily.

I’m ready to bring creative solutions to our daily and long-term challenges, and to strengthen our local democracy by giving you a greater voice in your local government.

/s/ Mende Smith

---

FOR MEMBER OF THE CITY COUNCIL

OSCAR DE LA TORRE  Male – Age: 45
Occasion:  Santa Monica Malibu Unified School District, School Board Member
E-mail Address:  vote@oscar4council.com
Website Address:  www.oscar4council.com

As a lifelong resident of Santa Monica’s Pico Neighborhood, I have DEEP ROOTS in Santa Monica. While serving as Student Body President at Santa Monica High I decided to commit my life to public service. I have a MA DEGREE in public administration and 14 years of governance experience on the Santa Monica Malibu Unified School District Board of Education.

A father of two children, I have a personal commitment to advancing public safety and the well-being of ALL Santa Monica’s. I am FOUNDER/EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR of a youth center and I serve on Community Corporation of Santa Monica’s board working daily to expand affordable housing, educational and economic opportunity for the residents of our City.

I am a PROVEN LEADER who will:

• STOP OVER DEVELOPMENT, and protect renter’s from gentrification and displacement.
• Keep Santa Monica DIVERSE!
• Challenge the culture of corruption at City Hall that promotes profit over people.
• Ensure resident needs and concerns are given priority over tourists.
• Fight for social & economic justice, environmental & racial justice.

Santa Monica needs a resident voice on the City Council that has a proven record of holding our government accountable. Elect OSCAR DE LA TORRE, a leader we can trust to move Santa Monica forward!

Visit:  www.oscar4council.com

/s/ Oscar de la Torre
Gleam Olivia Davis
Female – Age: 60
Occupation: Santa Monica Councilmember
E-mail address: gleam.davis@gmail.com
Website Address: www.gleamdavis2016.com

As your councilperson, I have worked to preserve and create more affordable housing, and to protect livable neighborhoods that provide a safe and stable community for all residents – especially children and seniors.

If re-elected, I will continue to focus on:

- Promoting a safer and more sustainable Santa Monica that is pedestrian and bike friendly;
- Expanding educational opportunities for all;
- Partnering with business to build a modern and robust local economy that provides good jobs and good wages;
- Looking for innovative solutions to traffic and parking problems;
- Encouraging the development of more open space and recreational facilities including conversion of Santa Monica Airport to a great park;
- Working for the wellbeing of seniors;
- Reducing the number of homeless persons;
- Supporting increased employment and educational opportunities for all residents to help everyone reach their full potential;
- Helping all residents reach their full potential.

I am endorsed by:
- Santa Monicans for Renters’ Rights-SMRR
- Congresswoman Julia Brownley
- State Senator Ben Allen
- Assemblymember Richard Bloom
- Los Angeles County Supervisor Sheila Kuehl
- Former Santa Monica Mayors Nat Trives, Michael Feinstein, and Judy Abdo

I am pleased to have such a broad base of support and would be honored to have your vote on November 8.

/s/ Gleam Olivia Davis

Terence Later
Male

If anyone understands Santa Monica and all of her majesty on a deeply rooted level it’s me. I am a Santa Monica born, third generation Santa Monica citizen and have lived here all my life. My family and myself have helped build this city to greatness and have contributed both fiscally and physically and have ties to many of Santa Monica’s longest standing businesses and 91,000 citizens.

I attended Will Rogers, John Adams, Lincoln, Olympic, Samohi, SMC and UCLA and have lived in neighborhoods from Santa Monica to Ocean Park to north of Montana as a renter and business owner. I have tremendous pride for our school district, our parks, our beaches and every community that makes up our wonderful city.

Over the years I have seen Santa Monica grow from a little seaside town into a thriving metropolis. This growth has come with its upside and downside. When elected I will strive to make Santa Monica a cleaner, greener, safer place to raise our families.

I will strive for transparency and government accountability to make sensible expenditure of taxpayer funds as I did in for Prop W in 2006. Safety in schools and recreation areas along with a proposed dog beach are high on my campaign list.

/s/ Terence Later
FOR MEMBER OF THE CITY COUNCIL

ARMEN MELKONIANS  Male – Age: 45
Occupation: Civil/ Environmental Engineer
E-mail Address: armen@residocracy.org
Website Address: www.armenourman.org

Santa Monica is facing an over-development and leadership crisis and together we can make a real change on November 8th.

That’s why I co-authored Measure LV, the Land Use Voter Empowerment (LUVE) Initiative.

That’s why I led the all-volunteer Residocracy effort to gather 10,000+ signatures to place Measure LV on the ballot - giving residents a voice.

That’s why I wrote the Hines Development Referendum and led the successful Residocracy effort to gather 13,000+ signatures to veto our City Council’s approval of the massive 765,000 square foot development project that would have added 7,000 daily car trips to Santa Monica.

That’s why I founded Residocracy.org.

Every election year, we hear empty campaign promises to protect Santa Monica from over-development and increased traffic congestion, but virtually every proposed development project continues to get approved at City Hall.

Over-development is not only destroying Santa Monica’s character and adding traffic, it is resulting in the demolition of existing rent-controlled apartments, displacement of long-term residents, and the destruction of our neighborhoods.

It’s time to elect a leader who puts residents first for a change.

It’s time to elect someone who doesn’t just make promises, but delivers.

I would be honored to have your Vote.

/s/ Armen Melkonians

FOR MEMBER OF THE CITY COUNCIL

JON MANN  Male – Age: 70
Occupation: Retired Parole Agent
E-mail Address: net_democracy@yahoo.com
Website Address: www.jonathanmannsmartvoter.org

There once was a candidate named Mann
15 times for City Council he ran
Virtual Town Hall
Democracy for all
Transparency/Accountability the plan

I'm running for City Council to end cronyism, conflict of interest and revolving door politics.

I want to lower building heights all over the City, to be determined by city residents.

I'M JON MANN AND I APPROVE THIS MESSAGE!

/s/ Jon Mann
FOR MEMBER OF THE RENT CONTROL BOARD

CHRISTOPHER D. WALTON  Male

I am one of the 99%. I’ve occupied my rent controlled apartment for over 3 decades. Without rent control, I could not afford to live here.

I’m proud of all we’ve accomplished during my first term of office. We implemented Measure GA. During my tenure as Chairman of the Board, we had one of the lowest annual rent increases ever. We also implemented Measure FS which requires landlords to pay a fair share of the annual rent control fees. This reduced the tenant’s share of fees by 50%.

The interests of landlords and tenants continue to collide with unhappy results. During my first term, we’ve applied the rule of law fairly to deliver justice and equity. Dancing on the racer’s edge that separates the rights of landlords and tenants requires special skills and commitment to noble outcomes. I’ve proven that I have those skills and commitment.

I am running on my successful record of service. The battle for Renter’s Rights continues. Please re-elect me and give me the honor of continuing to serve as your Rent Control Commissioner. I remain your faithful, fearless warrior.

/s/ Christopher D. Walton

FOR MEMBER OF THE RENT CONTROL BOARD

ELAINE GOLDEN-GEALER  Female

Occupation: Nonprofit Association Executive
Website Address: www.elaine4rentboard.com
Email Address: elaine@elaine4rentboard.com

RENT CONTROL IS HERE TO STAY – Now What?

Elect the TOP Candidate for a Change!
The only candidate with a TENANT OWNERSHIP PLAN

Elaine Supports:
1. Legislation allowing tenants to purchase their apartments!
   o Tenants who purchased their apartments in the 1990’ averaged a 1,000% return on their downpayment when selling!
   o Keep renting or buy if you and your landlord can make a deal
   o One TOP sale can prevent your entire building from being Ellised

2. The LUVE Ballot Measure – Can protect your home
   o Discourages big developers from Ellising & tearing down smaller older apartment buildings
   o Limits overdevelopment and gridlock

Interesting Facts:
• Employees yearly salary and benefits average OVER $170,000 (about $109 per hour)!!!
• Public servants? I don’t think so!
• I will not be a rubber stamp vote for bloated salaries and benefits!

Elaine:
• Nonprofit Association Executive
• Founder Coldwell Banker Condominium Division - Over 2,000 Condo sales
• Master’s Degree in Social Work – Majored in Community Organizing.
• Will make Rent ‘Bored’ Meetings Exciting Again.
• Support Diversity – Elect an OUTCUMBENT for a change!

Elect the TOP Candidate
The only candidate with a TENANT OWNERSHIP PLAN

Elect Elaine Golden-Gealer

/s/ Elaine Golden-Gealer
FOR MEMBER OF THE RENT CONTROL BOARD

ANASTASIA FOSTER  
Female
Occupation: Broadcaster/Businesswoman  
E-mail Address: ARFoster888@gmail.com

I am a strong and joyful advocate for renters’ rights in Santa Monica. Driving Meals on Wheels for over 5 years has shown me the challenges that face many of our most vulnerable friends and neighbors in every corner of this city. I, myself, am a 10-year renter who has worked the tenant hotline at Santa Monicans for Renters’ Rights, which gives an incredible education on our rent control law, tenant harassment ordinance and city code enforcement. I’ve participated in the SMRR Housing Committee and “Housing California” in Sacramento, seeking ideas and policies that will keep our citizens in their homes in the face of vacancy decontrol and Ellis evictions.

I feel so strongly about my work with tenants’ rights that I sought and achieved appointment to the Rent Control Board this past February where I am an active policymaker and a responsible and well-prepared commissioner.

Apartments are not just a stopover on the way to somewhere else. Apartments are our homes. Our citizens deserve to be treated with respect, and that’s why I feel so strongly about serving another term on the Rent Control Board.

I thank you for your support.

/s/ Anastasia Foster

FOR MEMBER OF THE RENT CONTROL BOARD

CAROLINE M. TOROSIS  
Female - Age: 30
Occupation: Consumer Protection Attorney  
Email Address: ctorosis@gmail.com  
Website Address: torosis2016.com

My name is Caroline Torosis, and I am running for the Rent Control Board because I believe that protecting renters’ rights protects the integrity of our community. Tenants and landlords are entitled to fair and reasonable rent controls, which is why serving on the Rent Control Board is so deeply important. We must ensure that those controls remain in place and that our laws are enforced.

I am a consumer rights attorney and currently work to pass laws and regulations that protect consumer rights, protect tenant rights, and promote a fair and vibrant rental marketplace. As a certified mediator, I have personally mediated hundreds of Unlawful Detainer cases where I successfully helped tenants and landlords reach an amicable resolution and avoid eviction proceedings.

As a member of the Rent Control Board, I will work to ensure that (1) everyone is afforded habitable premises in which to live, (2) local control is given back to Santa Monica to decide when units can be removed from the rental market, and (3) the supply of rent controlled units in Santa Monica is maintained. I would be honored to have your vote for the Rent Control Board.

/s/ Caroline M. Torosis
FOR THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE SANTA MONICA COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT

SION ROY

Male

Occupation: Physician (cardiologist)
Email: roy4santamonica@gmail.com
Website: www.roy4santamonica.com

I’m running because the importance of education is personal for my wife Kathy and me. I’m a first generation American and the son of a college professor. A great education allowed my immigrant parents to make a better life for themselves in this country, and allowed me to achieve my dreams as a professor and cardiologist helping the underserved at Harbor UCLA, a county hospital.

I’ve been an education advocate in Santa Monica as chair of our school district’s Health and Safety committee, vice chair of the college’s bond committee, and as adjunct faculty at the college; where I learned about the everyday challenges in the lives of SMC students, faculty, staff, and surrounding community. I’ve also served on the California and LA County Medical Association boards, and am a union member.

I’ll advocate for:
- Expanding medical curriculum because healthcare offers the jobs of the future
- Increased ties between the college and school district, so that our local students show up at SMC with the basic skills for success
- Hire more fulltime faculty, because this is a student equity issue

I hope to bring a new voice with a positive vision to the SMC board.

/s/ Sion Roy

FOR THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE SANTA MONICA COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT

Margaret Quinones-Perez is an experienced, committed, and passionate community college leader that believes in serving Santa Monica/Malibu residents and all students with excellence. Dr. Quinones-Perez has been a Trustee for 16 years and a former Board of Governor for all 113 California Community colleges. She wants to give back to the College that has been so supportive to her when she was a Santa Monica College student, her children and the community.

Margaret Quinones-Perez Accomplishments:
- Promoted equitable compensation for faculty and staff
- Supported student success, transfer and graduation of SMC students making sure the college met the goals of the State’s Student Support Services Program (SSSP)
- Guided facilities planning and construction to the 21st Century
- Increased financial aid and scholarships for students

Margaret Quinones-Perez Goals:
- Preserve fiscal stability including prudent use of bond funds
- Support Emeritus College and high school dual enrollment programs
- Increase student success through orientation, support services, and 100% completion of student education plans
- Expand work force programs and career opportunities for students
- Develop Community College programs at SMC for Students on the Autism Spectrum

/s/ Margaret Quinones-Perez

Margaret Quinones-Perez

Occupation: Santa Monica College Trustee, Professor - Military Veteran Counselor

Margaret Quinones-Perez

Female

Margaret Quinones-Perez is an experienced, committed, and passionate community college leader that believes in serving Santa Monica/Malibu residents and all students with excellence. Dr. Quinones-Perez has been a Trustee for 16 years and a former Board of Governor for all 113 California Community colleges. She wants to give back to the College that has been so supportive to her when she was a Santa Monica College student, her children and the community.

Margaret Quinones-Perez Accomplishments:
- Promoted equitable compensation for faculty and staff
- Supported student success, transfer and graduation of SMC students making sure the college met the goals of the State’s Student Support Services Program (SSSP)
- Guided facilities planning and construction to the 21st Century
- Increased financial aid and scholarships for students

Margaret Quinones-Perez Goals:
- Preserve fiscal stability including prudent use of bond funds
- Support Emeritus College and high school dual enrollment programs
- Increase student success through orientation, support services, and 100% completion of student education plans
- Expand work force programs and career opportunities for students
- Develop Community College programs at SMC for Students on the Autism Spectrum

/s/ Margaret Quinones-Perez

FOR THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE SANTA MONICA COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT

SANTA MONICA
FOR THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE SANTA MONICA COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT

ROB GREENSTEIN RADER, J.D., M.A.  Male - Age: 49
Occupation: Santa Monica College Trustee; Law Professor, Pepperdine; General Counsel, Ovation TV Network
Email Address: rader4smc@earthlink.net
Website Address: www.VoteRobRader.com

As the first in my family to graduate college straight through, I believe all students deserve the same opportunity.

My community experience includes:

• Director, KCRW
• Chair, Malibu Public Facilities Authority
• Secretary/Treasurer, Downtown Santa Monica Inc. (Third Street Promenade)
• Chair, Wilshire/Montana Neighborhood Coalition
• Professor, Pepperdine

I am General Counsel for Ovation TV network (50 million households) and former MGM vice-president. I attended Harvard for my undergraduate/law degrees and Stanford for my master’s. I raise two amazing kids – Dash (11) and Zora (8).

I am proud of our accomplishments:

• Expanded vocational/technical programs (e.g., Recycling, Solar Installation, LA HI-TECH).
• Established Broad Stage with Dustin Hoffman and Placido Domingo.
• Maintained services at Emeritus College.
• Continued tradition as number one transfer school.
• Pioneered new ways to deliver remedial/distances education.
• Founded Public Policy Institute with Sheila Kuehl.
• Brought light rail to Santa Monica.
• Started B.A. degree in Interaction Design.
• Chose new president Dr. Kathryn Jeffery.

My goals include:

• Preserve academic excellence.
• Increase opportunities for local students.
• Improve results for all students and close the equity gap.
• Support local economy through LA HI-TECH training.
• Ensure efficient bond/operating budgets.

I’m excited about what we can accomplish together! Please re-elect me as Santa Monica College Trustee.

/s/ Rob Greenstein Rader

FOR THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE SANTA MONICA COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT

SUSAN AMINOFF, Ph.D.  Female
Occupation: Santa Monica College Trustee/ Professor

I am running for re-election to ensure that our unique community college stays on track as SMC implements initiatives to prepare our students for today’s careers. My leadership as a trustee and classroom experience as a community college professor have helped SMC to:

• Remain the #1 Community College in California for transfers to the UC.
• Become an important community resource to residents throughout the district.
• Create partnerships with our schools and exceptional programming at SMC’s Performing Arts Campus where I serve on the Broadstage Board.
• Preserve state funding for Emeritus College
• Earn accreditation for our newly created Baccalaureate program in Interaction Design.
• Expand Workforce Development programs that are responsive to the business and technology needs of our community.
• Ensure that SMC continues to operate with strong fiscal management.
• Obtain approvals to begin construction on SMC’s new Malibu campus.

I am proud to share some of my endorsements, including:

• State Senator Ben Allen
• State Assembly member Richard Bloom
• Supervisor Sheila Kuehl

I hope to have your support for another term.

/s/ Susan Aminoff
Measure GS is an advisory measure related to measure GSH. See the full text of Measure GSH.

CITY ATTORNEY'S IMPARTIAL ANALYSIS OF MEASURE GS

ADVISORY MEASURE ON USE OF REVENUES FROM THE TRANSACTION AND USE TAX INCREASE

This is an advisory measure placed on the ballot by the City Council. It relates to, but is separate from, the Transaction and Use Tax Measure that is on the same ballot. That Transaction and Use Tax Measure would increase by one-half percent (1/2%), the City's current Transaction and Use Tax, which is collected on the sale of goods that are not exempt from sales taxes. A separate impartial analysis has been prepared for the Transaction and Use Tax Measure.

This advisory measure allows voters to provide advice to the City Council on how voters prefer the additional tax revenues to be used if the voters approve the proposed change in the Transaction and Use Tax. Specifically, this advisory measure asks whether half of the additional revenue should be used to improve and maintain local public schools and whether half of the additional revenue should be used to improve and maintain affordable housing, protect residents from housing displacement and reduce homelessness. It is anticipated that the tax increase if adopted by the voters would raise revenue by approximately $16 Million annually.

Because this measure is advisory, its passage would not legally require the City Council to expend the revenues in any particular way. Instead, the advisory measure would supply information to the City Council about how the voters prefer any additional revenues are to be spent.

/s/ MARSHA JONES MOUTRIE, City Attorney
**ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF MEASURE GS**

Vote Yes on Measure GS.

Santa Monica is a special place to live. We all take pride in our wonderful community. We have exciting opportunities, but we also face serious challenges. It has become difficult for many longtime residents to afford to stay here. And, limited State funding challenges our schools. Measures GSH & GS are a package of measures that work together to help address these issues.

Together, Measure GSH & Measure GS provide funding to be shared equally between our local public schools -- an essential resource for Santa Monica families -- as well as proven programs to protect renters, seniors and working families from losing their homes and falling into homelessness and to provide housing for struggling low-income residents.

Tourists and visitors will contribute a large share of this revenue.

Our terrific local public schools operate on inadequate budgets and face uncertain State funding every year. Measure GSH and Measure GS will provide locally-controlled funds for our schools that State government cannot touch. This funding will help maintain rigorous academic programs, prepare students for college and high-demand careers, and help ensure safe, 21st century learning environments.

State government also recently eliminated funding Santa Monica used for affordable housing. Measure GSH and Measure GS will provide locally-controlled funds to help rent-burdened residents, often seniors, stay in their homes through their golden years, and help local workers find homes near jobs -- strengthening both our community’s diversity and economy while reducing traffic.

Measure GS tells our City Council – and future City Councils – we want to protect and maintain both exceptional schools and a diverse community for all Santa Monicans.

Join EDUCATION LEADERS, AFFORDABLE HOUSING and HOMELESS ADVOCATES, and BUSINESS AND CIVIC LEADERS in voting YES on both Measures GS and GSH. We need both to pass to protect our schools and our residents.

/s/ Sarah Braff, President, Santa Monica-Malibu Classroom Teachers Association
/s/ Michael Soloff, Chair, Santa Monica Housing Commission
/s/ Jennifer Smith, President, Santa Monica-Malibu Council of PTAs
/s/ Patricia Hoffman, Co-chair, Santa Monicans for Renters Rights
/s/ Barry Seid, District Coordinator, AARP

**REBUTTAL TO THE ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF MEASURE GS**

Vote No on GS. The **Giant Structure** Initiative!

Giant buildings will be everywhere - San Vicente, Montana, Wilshire, Ocean Park - you name it. And, it will be current renters who are displaced as their buildings are torn down to make way for these new projects.

There is no halo on this anything goes, over-development scheme.

We have already paid, in the declining quality of our daily life as thousands of new housing and commercial units go up only to overcrowd Santa Monica. And, now they ask us to pay, with our checkbooks, to build more!

Your tax dollars will be used solely to fund City Hall’s favorite developers in producing large, high-density projects anywhere City Hall wants.

The City has taken away your right to review or protest all development funded by this tax. It will be built in your immediate proximity - you cannot object.

In the past, the City promised “housing” for our community - teachers, first responders, disabled people, even seniors - but never delivered.

City projects are built for non-residents who have no connection to Santa Monica. Now the City even claims these projects will “reduce” traffic!! Really? Do you believe that?

Say no to City Hall - no blank check to build large, high-density developments of any kind, wherever the bureaucrats want.

/s/ Roberto Rodriguez, Santa Monica Renter
/s/ Scott Kelso, Union Member
/s/ Donald Gray, Former Chair, Pico Neighborhood Assn.
/s/ Clara Benrey, Retired School Teacher
/s/ Robert Kronovet, Former Rent Board Commissioner
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ARGUMENT AGAINST MEASURE GS</th>
<th>REBUTTAL TO THE ARGUMENT AGAINST MEASURE GS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>The city has promised housing to teachers, first responders, city workers and seniors to get your vote in past elections but never delivered.</strong> City-funded housing has gone to non-Santa Monica residents. This pattern will continue. Giving City Hall a blank check to build large, high-density developments of any kind, anywhere in the City is a mistake. You have no say where these projects are sited. No say in their size. No say in their design. No say in the density/numbers of units. Your right to review, comment and object has been taken away by those now wanting your tax dollars to build their pet projects. The City zoning code gives developers of these buildings height and density bonuses plus reduced parking requirements. Large, overcrowded, under parked projects will be common in your neighborhood. Stop over development and taxing yourself to pay for it! Vote NO! The City has huge pension obligations that, as a matter of law, they HAVE TO fund. This advisory is non-binding and will become an empty promise at the City Council’s whim. <strong>Don’t believe false promises. Vote NO!</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

/s/ Roberto Rodriguez, Santa Monica Renter  
/s/ Clara Benrey, Retired School Teacher  
/s/ Donald Gray, Former Chair, Pico Neighborhood Assn.  
/s/ Scott Kelso, Union Member  
/s/ Robert Kronovet. Former Rent Board Commissioner  

Opponents of Measures GS & GSH are the same people who oppose every school funding and affordable housing initiative, and **they have their facts wrong** – wildly wrong. Measures GS & GSH have **NOTHING** to do with relaxing development standards or making parking worse. **FACT:** Voting YES on Measures GS & GSH directs our City government to help ensure great schools and affordable housing in Santa Monica. **FACT:** Measures GS & GSH provide local funding to improve classroom instruction, support great teachers and maintain our local schools. **FACT:** Measures GS & GSH provide local funding to assist long-term residents from losing their homes due to rising rents. Measures GS & GSH also will help build and renovate existing buildings to provide affordable housing for Santa Monica families and residents. **FACT:** The state government has taken millions of dollars from Santa Monica and other cities and depleted funds for both schools and affordable housing programs. **FACT:** Without locally controlled funds, Santa Monica schools will be forced to make cuts in programs. And school facility repairs and upgrades will only become more costly as the state provides little to no school facility maintenance funding. **FACT:** Without Measures GS & GSH Santa Monica families in need of affordable housing will not get the assistance they need. Please vote Yes on Measures GS & GSH to protect Santa Monica schools, families and senior citizens and support the diversity and quality of life that make our city a great place to live. **VOTE YES on Measures GS & GSH.** |

/s/ Sarah Braff, President, Santa Monica-Malibu Classroom Teachers Association  
/s/ Michael Soloff, Chair, Santa Monica Housing Commission  
/s/ Jennifer Smith, President, Santa Monica-Malibu Council of PTAs  
/s/ Patricia Hoffman, Co-chair, Santa Monicans for Renters Rights  
/s/ Barry Seid, District Coordinator, AARP
MEASURE GSH

AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SANTA MONICA
ENACTING A ONE-HALF PERCENT INCREASE IN THE TRANSACTION AND USE TAX,
TO BE ADMINISTERED BY THE STATE BOARD OF EQUALIZATION, SUBJECT TO ADOPTION BY THE ELECTORATE

WHEREAS, all redevelopment agencies in California, including the Santa Monica Redevelopment Agency, were dissolved on February 1, 2012; and

WHEREAS, the Santa Monica Redevelopment Agency generated nearly $40 million per year that was used for Santa Monica community priorities such as seismic safety improvements to public buildings, affordable housing, and capital improvements; and

WHEREAS, the dissolution of the Santa Monica Redevelopment Agency severely diminished the funds available to address Santa Monica community priorities; and

WHEREAS, many residents live in the City of Santa Monica because the City invests in community priorities, offering extensive services and programs that substantially enhance quality of life; and

WHEREAS, residents depend upon the City to continue to protect their quality of life and effectuate community priorities, but with the loss of redevelopment funds, the City must seek other resources; and

WHEREAS, creating and preserving local revenue sources will help ensure that the City can maintain and improve the quality of life that residents expect and effectuate community priorities; and

WHEREAS, the City adopted a transaction and use tax ordinance on July 13, 2013, which authorized the City to impose a retail transaction and use tax in the amount of one-half of one percent of the gross receipts of any retailer from the sale of all tangible personal property sold at retail within the territory of the City; and

WHEREAS, increasing the City's transaction and use tax by one-half percent would partially fill the revenue gap left by the loss of redevelopment funds; and

WHEREAS, all City revenues are subject to annual independent audits with public review of the City Budget being widely available, including at City Hall, on-line and at the public libraries; and

WHEREAS, in accordance with the provisions of California Revenue and Taxation Code Parts 1.6 and 1.7, Sections 7251 et seq. and Section 7285.9, the City of Santa Monica is authorized to enact a transaction and use tax; and

WHEREAS, the City of Santa Monica proposes to enact a one-half-percent increase in the transaction and use tax as permitted by law; and

WHEREAS, under applicable law, to enact a transaction and use tax, the City Council of the City of Santa Monica must adopt the transaction and use tax ordinance and the electorate of the City of Santa Monica must also adopt it upon majority vote at an election.

NOW, THEREFORE, the City Council of the City of Santa Monica does ordain as follows:

SECTION 1. Chapter 6.62 of the Santa Monica Municipal Code is amended to read as follows:

TRANSACTIONS AND USE TAX

Section 6.62.010 TITLE

This ordinance shall be known as the City of Santa Monica Transactions and Use Tax Ordinance.

Section 6.62.020 DEFINITIONS

The following words and phrases shall be defined as set forth in this Ordinance, except that any term or phrase not defined in this Ordinance shall have the same meaning as that term or phrase is defined in Parts 1.6 and 1.7 of the State of California Revenue and Taxation Code:
(a) “City” means the City of Santa Monica

(b) “Operative date” means the first day of the first calendar quarter commencing more than 110 days after the adoption of this ordinance by vote of the electorate on November 2, 2010.

(c) “Ordinance” means the City of Santa Monica Transactions and Use Tax Ordinance.

(d) “State” means the State of California.

Section 6.62.030 PURPOSE

This Ordinance is adopted to achieve the following, among other purposes, and the Ordinance shall be interpreted liberally in order to accomplish all of its lawful purposes:

A. To impose a retail transactions and use tax to be applied throughout the entire territory of the City to the fullest extent permitted by law and in accordance with the provisions of the California Revenue and Taxation Code Sections 7251 et seq., and 7285.9, which authorizes the City to adopt this Ordinance if a majority of the electors voting on the measure vote to approve the imposition of the tax at an election called for that purpose.

B. To adopt a retail transactions and use tax ordinance that incorporates provisions identical to those of the Sales and Use Tax Law of the State of California insofar as those provisions are not inconsistent with the requirements and limitations contained in Part 1.6 of Division 2 of the California Revenue and Taxation Code.

C. To adopt a retail transactions and use tax ordinance that imposes a tax and provides a measure that can be administered and collected by the State Board of Equalization in a manner that adapts itself as fully as practicable to, and requires the least possible deviation from, the existing statutory and administrative procedures followed by the State Board of Equalization in administering and collecting the California State Sales and Use Taxes.

D. To adopt a retail transactions and use tax ordinance that can be administered in a manner that will be, to the greatest degree possible, consistent with the provisions of Part 1.6 of Division 2 of the California Revenue and Taxation Code, minimize the cost of collecting the transactions and use taxes, and at the same time, minimize the burden of record keeping upon persons subject to taxation under the provisions of this ordinance.

E. To provide transactions and use tax revenue to the City to be used for the general governmental purposes of the City and with any transactions and use tax revenue received being placed into the City’s general fund.

Section 6.62.040 CONTRACT WITH STATE

Prior to the Operative Date, the City shall contract with the State Board of Equalization to perform all functions incident to the administration and operation of this Ordinance; provided, that if the City shall not have contracted with the State Board of Equalization prior to the Operative Date, it shall nevertheless so contract and in such a case the operative date shall be the first day of the first calendar quarter following the execution of such a contract.

Section 6.62.050 TRANSACTIONS TAX RATE

For the privilege of selling tangible personal property at retail, a transactions tax is imposed upon all retailers in the incorporated territory of the City at the rate of 0.50% of the gross receipts of any retailer from the sale of all tangible personal property sold at retail within the territory of the City on and after the Operative Date of this Ordinance.

Section 6.62.060 PLACE OF SALE

For the purposes of this Ordinance, all retail sales are consummated at the place of business of the retailer unless the tangible personal property sold is delivered by the retailer or his or her agent to an out-of-state destination or to a common carrier for delivery to an out-of-state destination. The gross receipts from the sale shall include delivery charges, when such charges are subject to the state sales and use tax, regardless of the place to which delivery is made. In the event a retailer has no permanent place of business in the State or has more than one place of business, the place or places at which the retail sales are consummated shall be determined under rules and regulations to be prescribed and adopted by the State Board of Equalization.
Section 6.62.070  USE TAX RATE

An excise tax is hereby imposed on the storage, use or other consumption in the City of tangible personal property purchased from any retailer on and after the Operative Date of this Ordinance for storage, use or other consumption in the territory of the City at the rate of 0.50% of the sales price of the property. The sales price shall include delivery charges when such charges are subject to State sales or use tax regardless of the place to which delivery is made.

Section 6.62.080  ADOPTION OF PROVISIONS OF STATE LAW

Except as otherwise provided in this Ordinance, and except insofar as they are inconsistent with the provisions of Part 1.6 of Division 2 of the Revenue and Taxation Code, all of the provisions of Part 1 (commencing with Section 6001) of Division 2 of the Revenue and Taxation Code are adopted, incorporated and made a part of this Ordinance as though fully set forth in it.

Section 6.62.090  LIMITATIONS ON ADOPTION OF STATE LAW AND COLLECTION OF USE TAXES

In adopting the provisions of Part 1 of Division 2 of the California Revenue and Taxation Code:

A. Wherever the State of California is named or referred to as the taxing agency, the name of the City of Santa Monica shall be substituted. However, the substitution shall not be made when:

1. The word “State” is used as a part of the title of the State Controller, State Treasurer, State Board of Control, State Board of Equalization, State Treasury, or the Constitution of the State of California;

2. The result of the substitution would require action to be taken by or against the City or any agency, officer, or employee thereof rather than by or against the State Board of Equalization, in performing the functions incident to the administration or operation of this Ordinance;

3. In those sections, including, but not necessarily limited to sections referring to the exterior boundaries of the State of California, where the result of the substitution would be to:

   a. Provide an exemption from the taxes of this Ordinance with respect to certain sales, storage, use or other consumption of tangible personal property which would not otherwise be exempt from the tax while such sales, storage, use or other consumption remain subject to tax by the State under the provisions of Part 1 of Division 2 of the Revenue and Taxation Code, or;

   b. Impose this tax with respect to certain sales, storage, use or other consumption of tangible personal property which would not be subject to tax by the state under the said provision of that code.

4. In Sections 6701, 6702 (except in the last sentence thereof), 6711, 6715, 6737, 6797 or 6828 of the California Revenue and Taxation Code.

B. The word “City” shall be substituted for the word “State” in the phrase “retailer engaged in business in this State” in Section 6203 and in the definition of that phrase in Section 6203.

Section 6.62.100  PERMIT NOT REQUIRED

If a seller’s permit has been issued to a retailer under Section 6067 of the California Revenue and Taxation Code, an additional transactor’s permit shall not be required by this Ordinance.

Section 6.62.110  EXEMPTIONS AND EXCLUSIONS

A. There shall be excluded from the measure of the transactions tax and the use tax the amount of any sales tax or use tax imposed by the State of California or by any city, city and county, or county pursuant to the Bradley-Burns Uniform Local Sales and Use Tax Law or the amount of any state-administered transactions or use tax.

B. There are exempted from the computation of the amount of transactions tax gross receipts from:

1. Sales of tangible personal property, other than fuel or petroleum products, to operators of aircraft to be used or consumed principally outside the county in which the sale is made and directly and exclusively in the use of such aircraft as common carriers of persons or property under the authority of the laws of this State, the United States, or any foreign government;
2. Sales of property to be used outside the City, which is shipped to a point outside the City pursuant to the contract of sale by delivery to such point by the retailer or his agent, or by delivery by the retailer to a carrier for shipment to a consignee at such point. For the purposes of this paragraph, delivery to a point outside the City shall be satisfied:

   a. With respect to vehicles (other than commercial vehicles) subject to registration pursuant to Chapter 1 (commencing with Section 4000) of Division 3 of the Vehicle Code, aircraft licensed in compliance with Section 21411 of the Public Utilities Code, and undocumented vessels registered under Division 3.5 (commencing with Section 9840) of the Vehicle Code by registration to an out-of-City address and by a declaration under penalty of perjury, signed by the buyer, stating that such address is, in fact, his or her principal place of residence; and

   b. With respect to commercial vehicles, by registration to a place of business out-of-City and declaration under penalty of perjury, signed by the buyer, that the vehicle will be operated from that address.

3. The sale of tangible personal property if the seller is obligated to furnish the property for a fixed price pursuant to a contract entered into prior to the operative date of this Ordinance.

4. A lease of tangible personal property which is a continuing sale of such property, for any period of time for which the lessor is obligated to lease the property for an amount fixed by the lease prior to the operative date of this Ordinance.

5. For the purposes of subparagraphs (3) and (4) of this section, the sale or lease of tangible personal property shall be deemed not to be obligated pursuant to a contract or lease for any period of time for which any party to the contract or lease has the unconditional right to terminate the contract or lease upon notice, whether or not such right is exercised.

C. There are exempted from the use tax imposed by this Ordinance, the storage, use or other consumption in this City of tangible personal property:

1. The gross receipts from the sale of which have been subject to a transactions tax under any state-administered transactions and use tax ordinance;

2. Other than fuel or petroleum products purchased by operators of aircraft and used or consumed by such operators directly and exclusively in the use of such aircraft as common carriers of persons or property for hire or compensation under a certificate of public convenience and necessity issued pursuant to the laws of this State, the United States, or any foreign government. This exemption is in addition to the exemptions provided in Sections 6366 and 6366.1 of the Revenue and Taxation Code of the State of California;

3. If the purchaser is obligated to purchase the property for a fixed price pursuant to a contract entered into prior to the Operative Date of this Ordinance;

4. If the possession of, or the exercise of any right or power over, the tangible personal property arises under a lease which is a continuing purchase of such property for any period of time for which the lessee is obligated to lease the property for an amount fixed by a lease prior to the Operative Date of this Ordinance.

5. For the purposes of subparagraphs (3) and (4) of this section, storage, use, or other consumption, or possession of, or exercise of any right or power over, tangible personal property shall be deemed not to be obligated pursuant to a contract or lease for any period of time for which any party to the contract or lease has the unconditional right to terminate the contract or lease upon notice, whether or not such right is exercised.

6. Except as provided in subparagraph (7), a retailer engaged in business in the City shall not be required to collect use tax from the purchaser of tangible personal property, unless the retailer ships or delivers the property into the City or participates within the City in making the sale of the property, including, but not limited to, soliciting or receiving the order, either directly or indirectly, at a place of business of the retailer in the City or through any representative, agent, canvasser, solicitor, subsidiary, or person in the City under the authority of the retailer.

7. “A retailer engaged in business in the City” shall also include any retailer of any of the following: vehicles subject to registration pursuant to Chapter 1 (commencing with Section 4000) of Division 3 of the Vehicle Code, aircraft licensed in compliance with Section 21411 of the Public Utilities Code, or undocumented vessels registered under Division 3.5 (commencing with Section 9840) of the Vehicle Code. That retailer shall be required to collect use tax from any purchaser who registers or licenses the vehicle, vessel, or aircraft at an address in the City.
D. Any person subject to use tax under this ordinance may credit against that tax any transactions tax or reimbursement for transactions tax paid to a district imposing, or retailer liable for a transactions tax pursuant to Part 1.6 of Division 2 of the Revenue and Taxation Code with respect to the sale to the person of the property the storage, use or other consumption of which is subject to the use tax.

Section 6.62.120 AMENDMENTS

All amendments subsequent to the effective date of this ordinance to Part 1 of Division 2 of the Revenue and Taxation Code relating to sales and use taxes and which are not inconsistent with Part 1.6 and Part 1.7 of Division 2 of the Revenue and Taxation Code, and all amendments to Part 1.6 and Part 1.7 of Division 2 of the Revenue and Taxation Code, shall automatically become adopted and a part of this Ordinance without further action of the City Council of the City of Santa Monica or the City’s electorate, provided however, that no such amendment shall operate so as to affect the rate of tax imposed by this Ordinance. The City Council may amend this Ordinance to comply with applicable law or as may be otherwise necessary in order to further the Ordinance’s stated purposes.

Section 6.62.130 PROHIBITION ON ENJOINING COLLECTION

No injunction or writ of mandate or other legal or equitable process shall issue in any suit, action or proceeding in any court against the State or the City, or against any officer of the State or the City, to prevent or enjoin the collection under this Ordinance, or Part 1.6 of Division 2 of the Revenue and Taxation Code, of any tax or any amount of tax required to be collected under this Ordinance.

Section 6.62.140 SEVERABILITY

If any provision of this Ordinance or the application of it to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the remainder of the Ordinance and the application of such provision to other persons or circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

Section 6.62.150 EFFECTIVE DATE

This Ordinance relates to the levying and collecting of a transactions and use tax and shall take effect without second reading by the City Council of the City of Santa Monica in accordance with the City Charter Section 619 (c), except that also in accordance with applicable law, no tax imposed by this Ordinance shall take effect unless this Ordinance is adopted by the electorate at an election to be held on November 2, 2010.

SECTION 2. Any provisions of the Santa Monica Municipal Code or appendices thereto inconsistent with the provisions of this Ordinance, to the extent of such inconsistencies and no further, is hereby repealed or modified to that extent necessary to effect the provisions of this Ordinance.

SECTION 3. The Mayor shall sign and the City Clerk shall attest to the passage of this Ordinance. The City Clerk shall cause the same to be published once in the official newspaper within 15 days after its adoption.
CITY ATTORNEY’S IMPARTIAL ANALYSIS OF MEASURE GSH

BALLOT MEASURE AMENDING THE MUNICIPAL CODE TO INCREASE THE TRANSACTIONS AND USE TAX BY AN ADDITIONAL ONE-HALF PERCENT OF THE SALE PRICE OF PERSONAL PROPERTY

This measure proposes to raise local City of Santa Monica revenues by amending the Municipal Code to increase the City’s transactions and use tax by an additional 0.50%, from 0.50% to 1%, of the sales price of personal property.

This kind of tax is generally called a “sales” tax. However, it is a legally different tax that is collected along with sales taxes and administered by the State Board of Equalization. However, all revenues generated would be paid into the City’s general fund, and none would go to the state.

The increase in the City’s transactions and use tax would only apply to goods and services that are subject to the existing tax. Items exempt from the City’s transactions and use tax include, among other things, purchases of prescription medications and food store items. These would not be taxed. It is anticipated that the tax increase would raise approximately $16 Million annually. It would remain in effect until the voters decide to repeal or amend it.

The City Council voted by more than a two-thirds majority to approve the proposed increase to the existing transactions and use tax; but the tax increase can only go into effect if it is also approved by a majority of voters at the November 2016 election. The current transactions and use tax was approved by Santa Monica voters in 2010.

If the measure is passed by the voters, the services and programs that potentially could receive funding include, but are not limited to: education, afterschool programs, affordable housing, police, fire, paramedic and emergency 911 response, public transit, environmental and library services.

Accompanying the transactions and use tax measure is a non-binding advisory measure, asking voters for their preference on how the additional revenue should be used if the voters approve the measure. In particular, voters are asked whether, if the measure passes, their preference is for half of the additional revenues to be used to improve and maintain public schools, with remaining half to improve and maintain affordable housing, protect residents from displacement and reduce homelessness.

If the transactions and use tax increase passes, the City Council may be guided by the voter’s decision on the advisory question in deciding how to use the revenue. However, the City Council is not legally bound by the outcome of the vote on the advisory question. The City Council can use the revenue collected as a result of the measure for any lawful City purpose.

The City Council placed this measure on the ballot.

/is/ MARSHA JONES MOUTRIE, City Attorney
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF MEASURE GSH

Measure GSH will bring critically needed resources to protect renters, seniors and working families from losing their homes and help keep our excellent schools strong and able to serve our community for years to come.

Every penny from Measure GSH will stay in Santa Monica and cannot be taken away by Sacramento.

Voting Yes on GSH is a vote to maintain and protect the quality of our local schools while also ensuring that rent burdened residents, often seniors, are able to age in place and providing local workers with homes near jobs, reducing local traffic.

Santa Monica had a proven, effective affordable housing program in place until Sacramento raided city budgets. Measure GSH will help offset those funding cuts and fund programs to provide stability for long-term residents.

Santa Monica has great schools, but State funding is unreliable and doesn’t provide adequate funds to maintain them.

Passage of Measure GSH will help our local schools attract high quality teachers, assist at-risk students, improve instruction in the arts, music, math, and science, and provide ongoing maintenance at our schools, reducing the cost of expensive repairs.

In addition, half of the funds from Measure GSH will be used for preserving existing buildings as affordable housing for current and future tenants, and for providing rental assistance and other affordable housing opportunities to low-income families and seniors.

Measure GSH is a half-cent sales tax -- paid largely by tourists and visitors -- to generate critically needed funds for City services, especially for our schools and for programs to keep low income rent-burdened Santa Monicans in their homes.

Measure GSH is supported by parents, grand parents, elected officials, civic leaders, and local business leaders who know that high-quality schools and a stable and diverse community are important.

Please vote Yes on Measure GSH.

/s/ Sarah Braff, President, Santa Monica-Malibu Classroom Teachers Association
/s/ Michael Saloff, Chair, Santa Monica Housing Commission
/s/ Jennifer Smith, President, Santa Monica-Malibu Council of PTAs
/s/ Patricia Hoffman, Co-chair, Santa Monicans for Renters Rights
/s/ Barry Seid, District Coordinator, AARP

REBUTTAL TO THE ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF MEASURE GSH

Vote no on GSH! This is a Growth Stimulating Hormone plan to increase development!

This measure is an increase to a sales tax we just approved in 2010. City Hall wants even more money to spend for even more high-density development! The sales tax never expires guaranteeing over-development as our future!

This scheme is shocking for its audacity. This measure means that we not only suffer the development pain, but must shoulder the financial burden, as well.

Millions of dollars yearly will pour into the general fund. Behind closed doors the money will be given to the City’s favorite developers for more large, high-density projects that are ruining the low scale beach community we want Santa Monica to remain. To add insult to injury, Santa Monica residents do not have priority for the low-income housing!

It gets worse.

Projects funded by this unprecedented tax are given extra height, density and lower parking requirements. Plus - there is no public review! You are powerless.

These high-density giants can be built next door to you … or on the corner … or down the block. You will live in shadow filled streets with no available parking.

If you care for the wonderful quality of life you enjoy and want to protect that environment Vote No on TAX Measure GSH. The Growth Stimulating Hormone Development Tax!

If you care that your tax dollars are spent to shape a better community and not an over-development nightmare Vote No on TAX Measure GSH.

/s/ Roberto Rodriguez, Santa Monica Renter
/s/ Scott Kelso, Union Member
/s/ Donald Gray, Former Chair, Pico Neighborhood Assn.
/s/ Clara Benrey, Retired School Teacher
/s/ Robert Kronovet, Former Rent Board Commissioner
**ARGUMENT AGAINST MEASURE GSH**

Vote NO on tax increase measure GSH.

Do you want MORE development in Santa Monica?

Do you want to GIVE DEVELOPERS YOUR MONEY to over build our city?

1. This is a sales tax slated to fuel and accelerate even more high density, multi-floor development.

2. This tax does not expire and thus insures development given extra height and density will continue forever, burdening infrastructure (exacerbating water and traffic problems), eroding quality of life and overcrowding schools.

3. You will have no say where these large, high-density projects will be built. The city has removed your right to review or protest all development funded by this tax.

4. New federal guidelines insure that projects must be placed in all areas of the city. Even Sunset Park and north of Montana will experience high-density development. All residential and all commercial property will be targeted for these large buildings that exceed normal zoning rules and are allowed reduced parking.

5. This tax amount is exorbitant and is a regressive tax on lower income residents. It will lead to higher housing costs, higher rents, and higher prices for nearly everything you buy.

6. This is yet another local increase to a sales tax voters approved in 2010. With additional County increases on this ballot, you will pay 10.5% - 11% on all purchases!

**Measure GSH funds more development with your money.**

Vote NO and save our city!

/s/ Roberto Rodriguez, Santa Monica Renter

/s/ Clara Benrey, Retired School Teacher

/s/ Donald Gray, Former Chair, Pico Neighborhood Assn.

/s/ Scott Kelso, Union Member

/s/ Robert Kronovet, Former Rent Board Commissioner

---

**REBUTTAL TO THE ARGUMENT AGAINST MEASURE GSH**

Arguments made by opponents of Measures GS & GSH are simply wrong.

Measures GS & GSH will accomplish two important goals: provide locally-controlled funds to keep our excellent schools strong, and protect proven, effective affordable housing programs needed by long-term residents, especially seniors and disabled persons.

If voters approve both Measures GS & GSH, half the funds will support local schools to improve instruction in math, science, music and the arts, support our great teachers, and maintain classrooms and schools.

The other half of funding from Measures GS/GSH will support long-term Santa Monica residents, who are at risk of losing their homes due to the rising cost of housing. Measures GS & GSH will also help enable working families to live closer to their jobs, reducing traffic.

Measure GSH will add just 50 cents to a $100 purchase, with groceries, medicine, gasoline and other essential items exempt.

Measures GS/GSH are SUPPORTED by teachers, school board members, and PTA leaders because they are essential to ensure our schools are not forced to cut academic programs and school building maintenance.

Measures GS/GSH are SUPPORTED by slow-growth champions, advocates for community preservation and renters' rights, homeowners and local business owners who care about preserving neighborhoods and maintaining economic diversity in Santa Monica.

It's ridiculous to say that Measures GS/GSH will increase development. They do not relax zoning restrictions or development standards. That claim is false.

Measures GS/GSH will help ensure great schools and affordable housing.

Please vote YES.

/s/ Sarah Braff, President, Santa Monica-Malibu Classroom Teachers Association

/s/ Michael Soloff, Chair, Santa Monica Housing Commission

/s/ Jennifer Smith, President, Santa Monica-Malibu Council of PTAs

/s/ Patricia Hoffman, Co-chair, Santa Monicans for Renters’ Rights (SMRR)

/s/ Barry Seid, District Coordinator, AARP
MEASURE LV

The proposed amendments read as follows:

Section I: TITLE

This initiative measure may be known and referred to as the “Land Use Voter Empowerment Initiative” or “LUVE Initiative.”

Section II: FINDINGS AND PURPOSE

The People of the City of Santa Monica find as follows:

WHEREAS, the residents of Santa Monica love the beauty of the open skies and ocean breezes of their low-rise City and want to protect them for future generations;

WHEREAS, the residents of Santa Monica rely on the goals of the Land Use and Circulation Element (LUCE), adopted by our City Council in 2010, to “maintain our City’s character” and “protect our neighborhoods;”

WHEREAS, the 2010 LUCE permitted the construction of taller and larger buildings with a three-tiered approach to development by exchanging so-called “community benefits” for increased height above the Tier 1 base height;

WHEREAS, the residents of Santa Monica currently have no say, other than public input at public hearings, as to what “community benefits” would justify the impacts of taller and larger buildings on our quality of life;

WHEREAS, the residents of Santa Monica have repeatedly expressed concern about City Hall policies that incentivize increased height in both commercial and residential developments throughout the city;

WHEREAS, elected officials continue to make campaign promises to protect our city from overdevelopment but, once elected, choose instead to approve taller and larger buildings;

WHEREAS, the voters of Santa Monica wish to have the final word on whether “community benefits” exchanged for increased height above the Tier 1 base will outweigh the impacts on our quality of life;

WHEREAS, the voters of Santa Monica wish to have the final word on major modifications to the City’s land use planning documents;

WHEREAS, providing housing opportunities to a broad range of Santa Monica residents, including persons and families of low and moderate income, and including senior citizens, is an important objective for Santa Monica;

WHEREAS, nothing in this Initiative is intended to prevent the City from meeting its regional fair share of housing needs, nor to prevent the approval and construction of affordable or senior housing projects;

WHEREAS, the voters of Santa Monica have a long history of being informed and engaged while actively working to protect the city we love;

NOW THEREFORE, based upon the foregoing findings, the People find and declare that the Land Use and Circulation Element and the Zoning Ordinance be amended by this Initiative to provide an opportunity for the people of the City to vote upon major development projects and significant changes to land use planning documents that will directly affect the quality of life in the City of Santa Monica, as set forth herein.

Section III: AMENDMENT OF LAND USE AND CIRCULATION ELEMENT

A. Section 2.1 of the Land Use and Circulation Element of the General Plan of the City of Santa Monica is amended as follows (new text is shown by underline and deleted text is shown by strikethrough):

ACHIEVING COMMUNITY BENEFITS

The essence of the LUCE land use policy is to identify an allowable building height for each land use as a baseline. Proposed development that requests additional height above the base will be subject to discretionary review, possible voter approval as established by ordinance, and additional requirements consistent with the community’s broader social and environmental goals. This approach is defined in three tiers; the base tier (ministerial up to the discretionary review thresholds established by the Zoning Ordinance) and two discretionary tiers. In most commercial areas of the City, including the major boulevards such as Wilshire Boulevard and portions of Lincoln and Santa Monica Boulevards, the maximum base height (Tier 1) for a project without providing community benefits is 32 feet (two stories). In these areas, a project with housing is eligible for a height bonus above the base height, allowing for an additional floor of housing, by providing the percentage of required affordable housing units on-site or within close proximity along the transit corridors. Thus the base height generally ranges from 32 to 36 feet.
To be above the base height, new development must provide community benefits for the City and the neighborhood. Under the LUCE, an applicant for a commercial or mixed-use project requesting additional height above the base, known as Tier 2, will need to provide community benefits that will be considered through a discretionary permit or Development Agreement. Heights identified as Tier 3 require additional community benefits. Projects seeking Tier 2 or Tier 3 approvals may also be subject to voter approval requirements, as established by ordinance. Several land use designations have a lower base height (Tier 1), a lower maximum height for Tier 2 and no Tier 3. The exceptions are called out later in this chapter in the discussion of each land use designation.

The community identified the following five priority categories of Community Benefits.

1. Trip Reduction and Traffic Management
   The LUCE specifies that all new development will be measured and evaluated with respect to its ability to reduce vehicle trips in Santa Monica which are a source of numerous environmental impacts, including air quality degradation, increased congestion, and exacerbation of global climate change. Projects above the base height will be required to provide Transportation Demand Management (TDM) trip reduction measures to reduce congestion and GHG emissions.
   These measures -- which are intended to encourage walking, biking and transit use in the City while deemphasizing use of the automobile -- could include:
   - Bicycle Facilities
   - Dedicated Shuttles
   - Car-sharing
   - Transit Passes
   - Parking “Cash-out”
   - Shared Parking
   - Pricing Parking Separately from Housing Units

2. Affordable and Workforce Housing
   The LUCE outlines requirements for housing that is affordable to lower-income residents. Projects that include a significant amount of such housing achieve the highest level of community benefit. The Plan also incentivizes workforce housing to provide additional units for employees who are increasingly priced out of our community. To continue to foster diversity, it is important to create the conditions which allow employees to live in the City. This reduces commuting, which contributes to air pollution, traffic congestion, and global climate change. Workforce housing is an emerging sustainable policy for the City. Being able to live near employment and transit significantly reduces vehicle miles traveled. Thus, this housing should be located near transit and near existing job centers (e.g., hospitals, Santa Monica College, school district offices, and entertainment industry centers). Businesses are encouraged to provide workforce housing for which priority is given to employees. Residential or mixed-use projects that provide affordable and workforce housing will be eligible for height over the base of 32–35 feet in recognition of the environmental and social benefits of such housing.

3. Community Physical Improvements
   In certain parts of the City, the community benefits could address necessary or desired physical improvements such as:
   - Reconnecting the street grid with Green Streets
   - Quality pedestrian, biking, and Green Connections
   - Community gathering and green open spaces
   - Recreational open space
   - Neighborhood-serving retail and services

4. Social and Cultural Facilities
   In addition to the traffic mitigation and housing, the LUCE also specifies a range of community benefits that may be applied to residential or nonresidential projects. Incentives may be achieved by incorporating some of the following community benefits into the project:
   - Support for arts and cultural facilities and uses such as providing public art and/or gallery space within the building
   - The creation of child care, senior, or youth facilities as part of the project

5. Historic Preservation
   A community benefit could also include the preservation of historic structures, and/or adaptive reuse of cultural buildings as part of or near to the project, or participation in a Transfer of Development Rights program.

(See chapter 3.2 Community Benefits for further information on the desired list of community benefits.)

B. Section 2.1, Goal LU10 of the Land Use and Circulation Element of the General Plan of the City of Santa Monica is amended as follows (new text is shown by underline and deleted text is shown by strikethrough):

IMPROVING THE QUALITY OF LIFE

GOAL LU10: Community Benefits- Require new development to contribute directly to the community’s core social, physical and transportation goals through mechanisms such as community benefits.
COMMUNITY BENEFITS

The LUCE articulates and clarifies the community's future vision and expectations. What is innovative about the LUCE is the requirement that when a developer seeks to develop property at a height greater than the City's ministerial standard, the developer must include in the project certain preferred uses or beneficial project design features, or meet other development standards that serve the community's core needs – those standards that contribute directly to the community's fundamental social, cultural, physical, transportation and environmental goals.

This approach provides the City and the community with the ability to shape how projects contribute to the City as a whole, ensuring that new buildings will be rich additions to the urban fabric, creating special places in the City that enhance its unique character and quality of life. This regulatory approach also strives to ensure that local services are located within walking distance of both existing and new uses so as to create complete neighborhoods that increase livability, reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions and relieve congestion.

THE COMMUNITY IDENTIFIES CORE VALUES FOR COMMUNITY BENEFITS

The community's vision of desired community benefits has evolved through an extensive participation process. Through the LUCE's three-year community outreach process, a continuing and interactive dialogue identified the core values of the community. Participants responded to the question of "what makes a livable city?" For Santa Monicans, it is preservation of the vibrant, beach town atmosphere, the enhancement of the sense of community, the conservation of unique and diverse neighborhoods, and the ability to enjoy walkable streets, easy access to transit, green streets and open space, and a range of housing choices for all income levels. The community identified the overarching principle of maintaining the City's unique attributes while enhancing and enriching neighborhood livability, including housing that is affordable to people of all income levels, ages and cultural backgrounds.

COMMUNITY BENEFITS

The LUCE addresses the following questions about development projects:

- Does this project contribute to the community?
- Does the project protect and enhance the neighborhood?
- Is the project in the right location to reduce automobile dependence?
- Does the project contribute to the City's overall traffic reduction and management strategy?
- Does the project adversely impact or enhance the current or future open space and community gathering spaces?
- Does the project contribute to the City's long-term sustainability?

Five Priority Categories of Community Benefits:

The community identified the following five priority categories of community benefits:

1. New Affordable and Workforce Housing

For all projects in which a developer seeks to develop a project that is greater in height than the base height of 32 feet, affordable housing or a contribution to the affordable housing fund shall be required. The objective is to incentivize housing along the City's commercial corridors where there is transit, local-serving retail and an enhanced pedestrian environment, facilitating a complete neighborhood for a range of socioeconomic levels. While affordable housing is identified as a primary community benefit, the provision of a significantly higher percentage of workforce housing units is also a community benefit.

A project developer who chooses to provide affordable housing as part of the base project in accordance with the percentage requirements specified in the City’s Affordable Housing Production Program will be entitled to receive a height bonus of 3 feet for a total height of 35 feet.

2. GHG Emissions and Future Congestion Reduction Requirement

A developer who seeks to develop projects above the base height shall also be required to provide additional Transportation Demand Management...
(TDM) trip reduction measures to address congestion and GHG emission reduction. TDM incentive programs could include: bicycle facilities, shower facilities, dedicated shuttles, flex cars, transit passes, parking cash-out programs, car-sharing programs, on-site transportation information, and shared parking programs.

3. Community Physical Improvements
In certain parts of the City, the community benefits could address necessary or desired physical improvements such as: reconnecting the street grid; quality pedestrian, biking and green connections; and additional ground level open space, trees and wider sidewalks. It could also include improvements, such as gathering places, recreation open space and the provision of neighborhood-serving retail and services.

4. Social, Cultural and Educational Facilities
This category of benefits could include space for preferred uses such as child care, senior care, youth and teen services and educational uses. The community also endorsed incentives for the provision of artist workspaces and additional cultural venues celebrating Santa Monica’s arts and cultural heritage.

5. Historic Preservation
This category of benefits could include adaptive reuse, sensitive restoration and treatment, compatible new construction, and participation in a Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) program.

There are numerous factors in assessing the type and extent of community benefit that must be provided. Benefits that merely meet or go slightly beyond standard requirements for all projects, such as TDM or Green Building requirements, would not qualify as community benefits. Benefits that are for the immediate neighborhood should also be considered in addition to those that apply citywide.

HOW THE LUCE ACHIEVES COMMUNITY BENEFITS
In addition to articulating the community's long-term vision, the LUCE establishes the broad goals and policies that set the framework for community benefits. In each land use designation, the Plan sets a base height and allowable development intensity which permits quality lower-scale, generally ministerial development. Using the citywide vision for urban form, the Plan then sets a maximum height and intensity, even with provision of community benefits, along with sensitive transitions to homes and neighborhoods. The specific standards and procedures for providing community benefits will be incorporated into the revised Zoning Ordinance using the LUCE concepts.

The LUCE land use policy establishes a baseline building height for nonresidential land use designations. Any proposed development that seeks to build above the base height in these nonresidential areas of the City, except for 100 percent affordable housing projects, will be subject to a public review process, which may include a vote of the people of the City, and additional requirements consistent with the community’s broader social and environmental goals. These additional requirements shall consist of the provision of preferred uses, the incorporation of beneficial project design features, and/or compliance with additional development standards. These design features and development standards may be traditional aesthetic zoning requirements or, in many instances, be reasonably related to the amelioration of increased burdens placed on the City due to the increased height. In most commercial areas of the City, including the major boulevards such as Wilshire Boulevard and portions of Lincoln and Santa Monica Boulevards, the maximum height for a project without providing community benefits is 32 feet or two stories (the base height can go to three stories if a percentage of affordable housing is included). Above the baseline height, new development must provide community benefits for the City and the neighborhood. Depending on the project type and height, an applicant may pursue either a Major Development Review Permit or its equivalent or a Development Agreement (DA).

COMPONENTS OF THE PROCESS

Transparency and Early Community Involvement
The LUCE provides for early community input on new projects. Changes to the existing development review process will create a framework to ensure that projects will be consistent with the City’s vision, focus on quality outcomes and contribute to the community’s quality of life. An early concept phase prior to submission of a formal development application will allow the City and community to review and comment on the appropriateness of the proposed land use and design and address the City policies and priorities identified in the LUCE.

The Community Shapes the Future: A Three-Tiered Approach
The Plan defines a comprehensive program that incentivizes permits new development above the 32-foot established base. A three-tiered approach, based on increments of height and floor area, defines additional requirements consistent with the community's broader social and environmental goals. Consistent with the Plan's goals and objectives of obtaining community input into development decisions, the people of the City shall review all projects above the 32-foot established base, with limited exceptions to be established in the Zoning Ordinance, by a vote of the people of the City in a general or special election.

Tier 1 - Base Height
The LUCE establishes a base height of 32 feet (2 stories). A project will receive a height bonus above the base height, allowing for an additional floor of housing, by providing the required affordable housing units on-site, or within close proximity along the boulevard, in accordance with the percentage requirements specified in the City's Affordable Housing Production Program. While the 32-foot base accommodates 2 stories, the height available with this incentive allows 3 stories. A Tier 1 project is ministerial up to the discretionary review threshold established by the Zoning Ordinance. Even these ministerial projects may be subject to discretionary review such as use permits, architectural review, historic resource review, etc.
Tier 2 - Height Above Base Height

In order to seek additional height above the base, a project will be required to provide additional community benefits. By maintaining discretionary control for a project over the ministerial base height, the City is better positioned to ensure compliance with LUCE principles. The process will differ slightly depending on the type of land use and the specific project as described below.

Commercial Projects

Unless a developer seeks a Development Agreement, a discretionary process will apply to all commercial projects and mixed-use projects. Under the LUCE, applicants will be required to undergo a community participation process. Approval of the project will require affirmative findings, including, but not limited to: (1) the project will promote the general welfare of the community, (2) the project will not have unacceptable adverse effects on public health or safety, and (3) in exchange for the privilege of being given additional height, the proposal must provide the City with enumerated community benefits as previously identified in the “Five Priority Categories of Community Benefits” section of this chapter.

Economic analysis of various development scenarios determined that the requirement of an increased level of community benefits corresponding to increased heights are realistic, even with a reasonable return on investment for the project, due to the land values required community benefits. An alternative to this approach would be the establishment of an objective point-based incentive system. However, this approach has not been recommended in the LUCE.

Tier 3 - Additional Height

In the few areas where additional project height above Tier 2 may be requested, the required process is a Development Agreement to allow the City Council to ensure that these significant projects provide community benefits as previously identified in the “Five Priority Categories of Community Benefits” section of this chapter. Compared to the development review process, the Development Agreement process has greater public review and participation, allows more flexibility to create high-quality projects and achieve greater community benefit, providing the greatest discretionary control of the City. Housing and mixed-use housing projects will be required to provide a percentage affordable units either on- or off-site. Other projects above the base height will contribute applicable project mitigation fees, including affordable housing fees.

Residential Projects and Mixed Use Projects

Except for deed-restricted 100 percent affordable housing projects, housing projects and mixed-use housing projects shall be processed through a Development Agreement or a discretionary review process. Housing and mixed-use housing projects will be required to provide a percentage of affordable units either on- or off-site. The proposal must also provide the City with enumerated community benefits as previously identified in the “Five Priority Categories of Community Benefits” section of this chapter.

An alternative to this approach would be the establishment of an objective point-based incentive system. However, this approach has not been recommended in the LUCE.

One Hundred Percent Affordable Housing Projects

One hundred percent affordable housing projects (up to a maximum of 80% of median income only) of 50 or fewer units will be processed ministerially.

Preservation of Historic Resource

When the project would preserve a City-designated landmark or structure of merit, the project may be reviewed by a discretionary review process other than development agreement so long as project does not exceed the FAR for Tier 2 projects.

FINANCIAL FEASIBILITY OF THIS APPROACH

Financial feasibility testing has documented that there is sufficient site value created by additional height over the base to fund the required community benefits. Economic analysis of various development scenarios determined that the requirement of an increased level of benefits corresponding to increased heights are realistic, even with a reasonable return on investment for the project, due to the land values along the City’s respective corridors. Each height tier increases the site value above the base. A portion of the value enhancement is available for community benefits. This analysis shows that the community benefits concept is economically feasible.

IV. ZONING ORDINANCE AND MAP REVISIONS

The Zoning Ordinance and associated Zoning Map are critical tools for implementing the LUCE. The City will prepare a comprehensive revision to the Zoning Ordinance and Map, consistent with the vision, goals and policies of the LUCE to include, among other things, the land use classifications and development standards outlined in the LUCE. The updated Zoning Ordinance will be a central regulatory mechanism that must be carefully prepared and work in concert with the LUCE in order to achieve the City’s and community’s goals. Innovative LUCE concepts to be incorporated into the revised Zoning Ordinance include, but are not limited to:

Mixed-Use

- The creation of mixed-use boulevards and districts that reorient regional commercial areas toward housing for a range of income levels
- Ground floor pedestrian-oriented uses and standards that encourage local-serving goods and services and community-serving amenities
- Ground floor residential uses that are oriented towards the street within areas designated as Mixed-Use Boulevard Low on Santa Monica
Community Benefits
- Complete neighborhoods achieved through a program for community benefits that responds to the community’s broader social and environmental goals
- Maximum by-right base height and intensity for new development
- Incorporate [sic] of special rules for new development that requests to build above the base height or intensity; such new development will be subject to a Major Development Review Permit or its equivalent or a Development Agreement, subject to voter approval as established by ordinance, with those additional requirements consistent with the community’s broader social and environmental goals.

Enhanced Public Engagement Process
Changes to the development review process to allow for early public review and input during the conceptual phase of a project. The purpose of early consultation is two-fold:
- It provides an opportunity for residents to gain a clear understanding of the timing and steps involved in the development review process
- It takes place at a time when the project concept is still flexible, providing the community the greatest opportunity to actuate change in the project components. These concept review meetings will also increase certainty for the neighborhood and developer and reduce costly changes during the entitlement process.

Transportation Demand Management and Circulation Standards
- Incorporation of requirements for TDM into the Zoning Ordinance that will be applied to project review in order to achieve the City’s goals for GHG reduction and climate change prevention.
- Coordination of TDM provisions with potentially reduced or shared parking requirements to maximize land efficiency and minimize disruption, while still providing adequate parking for area uses.
- Consideration for shared and reduced parking requirements for projects with comprehensive TDM programs located near transit.
- Updating the Municipal Code, as appropriate, with the Circulation Element actions and programs in Section VI of this Chapter.

V. REVIEW OF PROPOSED PROJECTS
Development proposals that conform with stated goals and policies of the LUCE are the implementation tools that have the most direct influence on the City’s ability to achieve complete communities, housing opportunities, and integrated transportation and land use. Exacting review is the primary method by which the City ensures that individual projects achieve the vision, goals, and standards of the community. The vision is set by the General Plan, and the standards are established in the Zoning Ordinance. Although Santa Monica has limited vacant land, it is anticipated that over the time horizon of this Plan, some properties in the City will redevelop as existing structures reach the end of their useful life, and/or as property owners seek more effective use of their sites.

Objective Standards and Criteria
- By stating the goals and policies for each land use designation and each neighborhood, boulevard, district, and activity center, the LUCE creates certainty for residents and developers and establishes how development projects can positively affect the character, form, and quality of the city.
- Objective standards and criteria rooted in community priorities and measures to mitigate the impacts of new development will be the method by which all administrative projects will be reviewed. Review of discretionary projects that involve new construction will be guided by a new incentive system that places significant emphasis on inclusion of affordable housing and other community benefits with the objective...
that new development should contribute to the city’s physical, environmental, and cultural goals. Types of review for new projects are described below and include:

- Ministerial review for projects that fall within established base height and FAR limits
- Planning Commission and/or City Council review for projects that exceed base height and FARs, with voter approval required for certain projects as established by ordinance
- Development Agreements, subject to voter approval for certain projects as established by ordinance

Maximum Ministerial Base Height and FAR and Provisions for Increases when Projects Offer Community Benefits

The LUCE establishes a maximum ministerial base height of 25–35 feet. As an incentive, additional height and FAR above the base may be granted, subject to a discretionary review process, if it meets community benefit criteria. A Development Agreement may be required for these increases in height and FAR. (See chapter 3.2 Community Benefits for further information.)

E. Chapter 1.0 the Land Use and Circulation Element of the General Plan of the City of Santa Monica is amended as follows (new text is shown by underline and deleted text is shown by strikeout):

Require Community Benefits

Traditional planning has long required development to meet minimum community benefit standards. The LUCE proposes a comprehensive approach to benefits designed to serve the community’s core needs—new affordable housing opportunities, cultural and social facilities, employee housing, preservation of historic resources, and the creation of quality “places.”

The LUCE establishes a review process which conditions new development above a base height to provide community benefits. This approach provides the City and the community with the capability to shape how individual projects contribute to the City as a whole. This will ensure that new buildings will be rich additions to the urban fabric while creating special places in the City that enhance its unique character and quality of life.

To accomplish this, the Plan establishes a base height of 32 feet for new development (ministerial up to the discretionary review thresholds established by the Zoning Ordinance), initiating a Major Development Review Permit or Development Agreement process for development beyond this height. This approach incentivizes certain major projects to create benefits for the City, such as affordable and employee housing, historic preservation, quality pedestrian and biking connections, new gathering places, neighborhood-oriented retail, shared parking solutions, or space for social services such as child or senior care. Future projects must also exhibit compatibility in scale, setting and transitions to residential neighborhoods.

Section IV: AMENDMENT OF MUNICIPAL CODE CHAPTER 9.40

Article 9, Division 4, Chapter 9.40 of the Santa Monica Municipal Code is hereby amended as follows (deleted text is shown by strikeout).

Chapter 9.40 DEVELOPMENT REVIEW PERMIT

9.40.010 Purpose

A Development Review Permit is intended to allow the construction of certain projects for which the design and siting could result in an adverse impact on the surrounding area. The permit allows for:

A. Review of the location, size, massing, and placement of the proposed structure on the site;
B. The location of proposed uses within the project;
C. An evaluation of the project with regard to fixed and established standards; and
D. A determination of whether the proposed siting and design should be permitted by weighing the public need for the benefit to be derived from the proposed site plan use against the impact which it may cause. (Added by Ord. No. 2486CCS §§ 1, 2, adopted June 23, 2015)

9.40.020 Applicability

A. Except as provided in subsection (B), a Development Review Permit approved by the Planning Commission shall be required prior to issuance of any building permit for the development if any of the following occurs:

1. Any project that exceeds Tier 1 maximum limits. Repealed;
2. All new construction and new additions to existing buildings of more than 10,000 square feet of floor area located in Residential Districts or more than 7,500 square feet of floor area in Neighborhood Commercial and Oceanfront Districts;
3. All new construction and new additions to existing buildings of more than 15,000 square feet of floor area located in Nonresidential Districts
4. Notwithstanding subsection (A)(3) above, all new construction of more than 30,000 square feet of floor area of a development project containing no more than 15% commercial floor area located in Nonresidential Districts not specified in subsection (A)(2);

5. Notwithstanding subsections (A)(2)—(4) above and until the adoption of a Pico Neighborhood Plan, all new construction and new additions to existing buildings of more than 7,500 square feet of floor area located in the Pico Neighborhood Area.

FIGURE 9.40.020.A: PICO NEIGHBORHOOD AREA (AS OUTLINED)

B. The following types of projects are exempt from Development Permit Review requirements:

1. Single unit dwellings; and

2. 100% Affordable Housing Projects of 50 units or less. (Added by Ord. No. 2486CCS §§ 1, 2, adopted June 23, 2015)

9.40.030 Application

Application for a Development Review Permit shall be filed in a manner consistent with the requirements contained in Section 9.37.020, Application Forms and Fees. (Added by Ord. No. 2486CCS §§ 1, 2, adopted June 23, 2015)

9.40.040 Procedures

A. Upon receipt in proper form of a Development Review Permit application, a meeting with the Architectural Review Board shall be set to receive a recommendation on the design of the proposal.

B. Following receipt of a recommendation of the Architectural Review Board, a public hearing before the Planning Commission shall be set and notice of such hearing given in a manner consistent with Section 9.37.050, Public Notice. (Added by Ord. No. 2486CCS §§ 1, 2, adopted June 23, 2015)

9.40.050 Required Findings

Following a public hearing, the Director shall prepare a written decision which shall contain the Planning Commission’s findings of fact upon which such decision is based. The Planning Commission, or City Council on appeal, shall approve or conditionally approve a Development Review Permit application in whole or in part if all of the following findings of fact can be made in an affirmative manner:

A. The physical location, size, massing, setbacks, pedestrian orientation, and placement of proposed structures on the site and the location of proposed uses within the project are consistent with applicable standards and are both compatible and relate harmoniously to surrounding sites and neighborhoods;

B. The rights-of-way can accommodate autos, bicycles, pedestrians, and multi-modal transportation methods, including adequate parking and access;
C. The health and safety services (police, fire etc.) and public infrastructure (e.g., utilities) are sufficient to accommodate the new development;
D. The project is generally consistent with the Municipal Code and General Plan;
E. Based on environmental review, the proposed project has no potentially significant environmental impacts or any potentially significant environmental impacts have been reduced to less than significant levels because of mitigation measures incorporated in the project or a Statement of Overriding Considerations has been adopted;
F. The project promotes the general welfare of the community;
G. The project has no unacceptable adverse effects on public health or safety; and
H. The project provides Community Benefits consistent with Chapter 9.23.

9.40.060 Conditions

In granting a Development Review Permit, the Review Authority or the Review Authority on appeal shall require that the use and development of the property conform with a site plan, architectural drawings, or statements submitted in support of the application, or in such modifications thereof, as may be deemed necessary to protect the public health, safety, and general welfare and secure the objectives of the General Plan and this Ordinance, and may also impose such other conditions as may be deemed necessary to achieve these purposes and to support the findings of approval.

9.40.070 Term, Extension, Revocation, and Appeal

The term of permit, exercise of rights, extension, revocation, and appeal for Development Review Permits shall be in accordance with the applicable provisions of Chapter 9.37, Common Procedures.

Section V: ADDITION OF MUNICIPAL CODE CHAPTER 9.51

Article 9, Division 4 of the Santa Monica Municipal Code is amended by the addition of a new Chapter 9.51 as follows:

CHAPTER 9.51 MAJOR DEVELOPMENT REVIEW PERMIT

9.51.010 Purpose

A Major Development Review Permit is to provide a means for the City Council to approve and impose conditions upon those projects for which the City Council concludes that the provision of community benefits outweighs the adverse impact of increased height and density over that allowed in baseline Tier 1 zoning.

9.51.020 Applicability

A. Except as provided in subsection (B), a Major Development Review Permit approved by the City Council shall be required prior to issuance of any building permit for any project that exceeds Tier 1 maximum limits.

B. The following types of projects are exempt from Major Development Permit Review requirements:

1. Single unit dwellings;
2. 100% Affordable Housing Projects of 50 units or less;
3. Projects that satisfy requirements for Tier 1 including On Site Affordable Housing in compliance with the Affordable Housing Production Program; and
4. Projects that exceed Tier 1 baseline standards only due to height or density bonuses granted for the provision of affordable housing pursuant to state law requirements.

9.51.030 Application

Application for a Major Development Review Permit shall be filed in a manner consistent with the requirements contained in Section 9.37.020, Application Forms and Fees.

9.51.040 Procedures and Planning Commission Hearing

A. Upon receipt in proper form of a Major Development Review Permit application, a meeting with the Architectural Review Board shall be set
to receive a recommendation on the design of the proposal.

B. Following receipt of a recommendation of the Architectural Review Board, a public hearing before the Planning Commission shall be set and notice of such hearing given in a manner consistent with Section 9.37.050, Public Notice.

C. Following the public hearing, the Planning Commission shall make a recommendation on the Major Development Review Permit to the City Council. Such recommendation shall include the reasons for the recommendation, and the findings related to the criteria for the issuances of a Major Development Review Permit in section 9.51.060, and shall be transmitted to the City Council.

9.51.050 City Council Hearing and Action

A. After receiving the recommendation from the Planning Commission, the City Council shall hold a duly-noticed public hearing. The notice shall include a summary of the Planning Commission recommendation. If the Planning Commission does not recommend approval of a Major Development Review Permit, the City Council is not required to take any further action unless an interested party files a written request for a hearing with the City Clerk within 14 days after the Planning Commission action.

B. After the conclusion of the public hearing, the City Council may approve, modify, or deny the proposed Major Development Review Permit.

9.51.060 Required Findings

The Planning Commission shall not recommend and the City Council shall not approve or conditionally approve a Major Development Review Permit unless the following findings can be made:

A. The project is consistent with the objectives, policies, general land uses, and programs of the General Plan;

B. The approval of the project is consistent with the purpose of the Zoning Ordinance to promote the growth of the City in an orderly manner and to promote and protect the public health, safety, and general welfare;

C. The project is compatible with the uses authorized in the district in which the project is located;

D. The project will not have unacceptable adverse impacts on health and safety; and

E. The Community Benefits provided by the project meet, at a minimum, the benefits identified in Chapter 9.23, and the provision of such benefits outweighs any negative impacts to the environment due to the increased height or density that results from the construction of a project that exceeds Tier 1 baseline limits.

9.51.070 Conditions

In granting a Major Development Review Permit, the City Council shall require that the use and development of the property conform with a site plan, architectural drawings, or statements submitted in support of the application, or within such modifications thereof, as may be deemed necessary to protect the public health, safety, and general welfare and secure the objectives of the General Plan and this Ordinance, and may also impose such other conditions as may be deemed necessary to achieve these purposes and to support the findings of approval.

9.51.080 Term, Extension, Revocation, and Appeal

The term of permit, exercise of rights, extension, revocation, and appeal for Major Development Review Permits shall be in accordance with the applicable provisions of Chapter 9.37, Common Procedures.

9.51.090 Voter Approval Required

Unless otherwise exempted by the provisions of Chapter 9.69, no Major Development Review Permit shall be effective until it has been approved by a simple majority vote of the voting electorate of the City of Santa Monica, as set forth in Chapter 9.69, Land Use Voter Empowerment.

Section VI: AMENDMENT OF MUNICIPAL CODE CHAPTER .9.60

Article 9, Division 6, Chapter 9.60 of the Santa Monica Municipal Code is hereby amended as follows (deleted text is shown by strikeout, new text is shown by underline).

Chapter 9.60 DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENTS

9.60.010 Purpose

The purpose of this Chapter is to establish procedures and regulations for Development Agreements.
9.60.020 Authority and Scope

This Chapter is adopted pursuant to Article 11, Section 7 of the California Constitution and pursuant to Government Code Section 65864 et seq. All Development Agreements entered into after the effective date of this Chapter shall be processed in accordance with the provisions of this Chapter. In performing his or her functions under this Chapter, the Planning Director shall act under the direction of the City Manager.

9.60.030 Application Forms

The Planning Director shall prescribe the form of each application, notice and documents provided for or required under this Chapter for the preparation, processing, and implementation of Development Agreements. The application shall include a fiscal impact statement on the proposed development. The Planning Director may require an applicant for a Development Agreement to submit such information and supporting data as the Planning Director considers necessary to process the application.

9.60.040 Qualified Applicant

An application for a Development Agreement may only be filed by a person who has a legal or equitable interest in the real property for which a Development Agreement is sought or the authorized representative of such a person.

9.60.050 Proposed Agreement

Each application shall be accompanied by the form of Development Agreement proposed by the applicant.

9.60.060 Filing of Application

The Planning Director shall endorse on the application the date it is received. The Planning Director shall review the application and may reject the application if it is not completed in the manner required by this Chapter.

9.60.070 Review of Application

The application shall be reviewed by the Planning Director. After reviewing the application and any other pertinent information, the Planning Director shall prepare a staff report. The staff report shall analyze the proposed development and shall contain a recommendation as to whether or not the Development Agreement proposed or in an amended form should be approved or disapproved.

9.60.080 Processing

A. The Planning Commission shall consider the proposed development agreement and make a recommendation thereon to the City Council in the manner set forth in this Chapter. The Planning Commission shall conclude its consideration of and make its recommendation on the proposed development agreement within ninety days of the time specified for the public hearing in the notice of intention. The applicant may agree to extend this ninety-day review period.

B. In addition to formal consideration of the proposed development agreement by the Planning Commission pursuant to this Section, the City Council may establish procedures for early conceptual review of the development agreement proposal by the City Council and City Boards and Commissions or a combination thereof preceding the Planning Commission's formal consideration.

9.60.090 Notice of Intention

Upon completion of the staff report required by Section 9.60.070, the Planning Director shall give notice of intention to consider adoption of a Development Agreement. The notice shall contain:

A. The time and place of the public hearing.

B. A general explanation of the Development Agreement including a general description of the property proposed to be developed.

C. Other information that the Planning Director considers necessary or desirable.

9.60.100 Notice Requirements

A. The Planning Commission shall hold a public hearing on the proposed Development Agreement at the time and place specified in the notice.

B. All notice required by this Chapter shall be given in the following manner:

1. Mailing or delivery to the applicant and to all persons, including businesses, corporations or other public or private entities, shown on the last equalized assessment roll as owning real property within 500 feet of the property which is the subject of the development agreement.
2. Mailing or delivery to all tenants of property within 500 feet of the property which is the subject of the development agreement.

3. Mailing by first class mail to any person who has filed a written request therefor with the Planning Director.

4. Publication at least once in a newspaper of general circulation published and circulated in the City.

C. The failure to receive notice by any person entitled thereto by law or this Chapter does not affect the authority of the City to enter into a Development Agreement.

9.60.110 Required Findings

The Planning Commission shall make its recommendation to the City Council in writing. The recommendation shall include whether or not the proposed Development Agreement:

A. Is consistent with the objectives, policies, general land uses and programs specified in the general plan and any applicable specific plan;

B. Is compatible with the uses authorized in the district in which the real property is located;

C. Is in conformity with the public necessity, public convenience, general welfare, and good land use practices;

D. Will be detrimental to the health, safety and general welfare;

E. Will adversely affect the orderly development of the property; and

F. Will have a positive fiscal impact on the City.

9.60.120 Hearing by City Council

After the recommendation of the Planning Commission or after the expiration of the time period specified in Section 9.60.080, the Planning Director shall give notice of a public hearing before the City Council in the manner provided for in Section 9.60.100.

9.60.130 Decision by City Council

A. After it completes the public hearing and considers the recommendation, if any, of the Planning Commission, the City Council may accept, modify or disapprove the proposed Development Agreement. It may, but need not, refer the matters not previously considered by the Planning Commission during its hearing back to the Planning Commission for report and recommendation. The Planning Commission shall hold a public hearing on matters referred back to it by the City Council.

B. The Development Agreement may not be approved unless the City Council finds that the Development Agreement is consistent with the general plan and any applicable specific plan.

9.60.140 Approval of Development Agreement, Effective Date

The Development Agreement shall be approved by the adoption of an ordinance. Upon the adoption of the ordinance, the City shall enter into the Development Agreement by the execution thereof by the City Manager. Unless otherwise exempted by the provisions of Chapter 9.69, no Development Agreement shall be effective until it has been approved by a simple majority vote of the voting electorate of the City of Santa Monica as set forth in Chapter 9.69.

9.60.150 Amendment and Cancellation

A. Either the City or the applicant or successor in interest thereto may propose an amendment or cancellation in whole or in part of the Development Agreement.

B. The procedure for proposing and approving an amendment to or cancellation in whole or in part of the Development Agreement shall be the same as the procedure for entering into a Development Agreement.

C. Except as provided for in Section 9.60.180, the development agreement may only be amended or cancelled in whole or in part by the mutual consent of all parties to the Development Agreement.

9.60.160 Recordation

No later than ten days after the City enters into the development agreement, the effective date of a Development Agreement, the City Clerk shall record with the County Recorder a copy of the Development Agreement.
9.60.170 Periodic Review
A. The City Council shall review the Development Agreement at least every twelve months from the effective date of the Development Agreement.
B. The Planning Director shall give the applicant or successor in interest thereto at least ten days’ advance notice of the time at which the City Council will review the Development Agreement.
C. The applicant or successor in interest thereto shall demonstrate good faith compliance with the terms of the Development Agreement.
D. If, as a result of such periodic review, the City Council finds and determines, on the basis of substantial evidence, that the applicant or successor in interest thereto has not complied in good faith with the terms or conditions of the Development Agreement, the City Council may commence proceedings to enforce, modify or terminate the Development Agreement.

9.60.180 Modification or Termination
A. If upon a finding under Section 9.60.170, the City Council determines to proceed with modification or termination of the Development Agreement, the City Council shall give notice to the applicant or successor in interest thereto of its intention to do so. The notice shall contain:
1. The time and place of the hearing;
2. A statement as to whether or not the City Council proposes to modify or terminate the development agreement;
3. Any proposed modification to the development agreement; and
4. Other information which the City Council considers necessary to inform the applicant or successor in interest thereto of the nature of the hearing.
B. At the time set for the hearing on the modification or termination, the City Council may take such action as it deems necessary to protect the interests of the City.

9.60.190 Irregularity in Proceedings
No action, inaction, or recommendation regarding the proposed development agreement shall be held void or invalid or be set aside by a court by reason of any error, irregularity, informality, neglect or omission as to any matter pertaining to the application, notice, finding, record, hearing, report, recommendation, or any other matters of procedure whatsoever unless after an examination of the entire record the court is of the opinion that the error complained of was prejudicial and that a different result would have been probable if the error had not occurred or existed.

Section VII: ADDITION OF MUNICIPAL CODE CHAPTER 9.69

Article 9, Division 6 of the Santa Monica Municipal Code is hereby amended by adding a new Chapter 9.69, to read as follows:

CHAPTER 9.69 LAND USE VOTER EMPOWERMENT

9.69.010 Purpose
The purpose of Land Use Voter Empowerment is to provide for public input into major development decisions in the City of Santa Monica by requiring a public vote on specified development projects or significant changes to the land use planning documents of the City. Therefore, no Development Agreement, Major Development Review Permit, or Major Amendment to the City’s Planning Policy Documents shall be effective until the majority of voters of the City of Santa Monica voting in a general or special election approve the Development Agreement, Major Development Review Permit, or Major Amendment to the City’s Planning Policy Documents.

9.69.020 Applicability to Development Projects
All Development Agreements or Major Development Review Permits are subject to the provisions of this Chapter, except those issued for:
A. 100% Affordable Housing Projects and 100% Moderate Income Housing Projects;
B. 100% Senior Citizen housing projects;
C. In the Coastal Zone, any project that is consistent with the applicable height and density limitations in the certified Local Coastal Program (LCP), including any future amendments to the certified LCP; and
D. Projects at the sites identified on Table A, at the density indicated on Table A, until 2021, or until a new Housing Element is adopted.
### TABLE A

Downtown Specific Plan Area  
(maximum FAR = 2.50 with 80% minimum Residential)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1216 5th Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1235 5th Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1311 5th Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1313 5th Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1327 5th Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1415 5th Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1423 5th Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1427 5th Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1445 5th Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1552 5th Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1218 6th Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1240 6th Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1437 6th Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1213 7th Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1217 7th Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1227 7th Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1238 7th Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1244 7th Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1313 7th Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1314 7th Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1317 7th Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1331 7th Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1407 7th Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1427 7th Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1448 7th Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1453 7th Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1524 7th Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1547 7th Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1557 7th Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>510 Arizona Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>519 Arizona Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>624 Arizona Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>625 Arizona Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>702 Arizona Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>408 Broadway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 Broadway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>501 Broadway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>609 Broadway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>525 Colorado Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>631 Colorado Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1443 Lincoln Boulevard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1650 Lincoln Boulevard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1660 Lincoln Boulevard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>311 Wilshire Boulevard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>315 Wilshire Boulevard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>317 Wilshire Boulevard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>419 Wilshire Boulevard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>424 Wilshire Boulevard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>427 Wilshire Boulevard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>601 Wilshire Boulevard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>611 Wilshire Boulevard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>626 Wilshire Boulevard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bergamot Plan Area (Bergamot Transit Village)</strong>&lt;br&gt;(Maximum FAR = 2.5 with minimum 40% Residential)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1655 26th Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1681 26th Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2700 Pennsylvania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bergamot Plan Area (Mixed Use Creative)</strong>&lt;br&gt;(Maximum FAR 2.2 with minimum 50% Residential)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2848 Colorado Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3025 Olympic Boulevard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1703 Stewart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Memorial Park Plan Area</strong>&lt;br&gt;(Maximum FAR = 2.0 with minimum 60% Residential)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1654 14th Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1660 14th Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1415 Colorado Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1431 Colorado Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1501 Colorado Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1519 Colorado Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mixed Use Boulevards</strong>&lt;br&gt;(Maximum FAR = 2.0 with minimum 60% Residential)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2050 Broadway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2043 Colorado Avenue</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9.69.030 Planning Policy Documents

The following documents or types of documents are the Planning Policy Documents that require approval by a majority of the voters of the City of Santa Monica in order to effectuate a Major Amendment:

A. General Plan Land Use and Circulation Element;

B. Any Specific Plan, except that any Specific Plan prepared for development of lands currently used by Santa Monica Airport shall not require voter approval if the plan provides exclusively for park and open space use;

C. Any Neighborhood Area Plan

D. The Zoning Ordinance of the City of Santa Monica, as set forth in Santa Monica Municipal Code Article 9; and

E. The Official Districting Map of the City.

9.69.040 Major Amendments

A “Major Amendment” of any of the Planning Policy Documents means any amendment that results in any of the following changes to the development standards for any parcel of land affected by the proposed amendment:

A. Increases the maximum allowable number of residential units that may be constructed on any parcel or group of parcels;

B. Changes zone type for a parcel or parcels from Parks and Open Space, Institutional/Public Lands; or Civic Center to a different zone type;

C. Changes a parcel or parcels from any residential land use to allow any non-residential land use;

D. Increases the allowed maximum height of development or changes how height is measured such that additional height could be permitted than was previously permitted;

E. Increases the maximum allowable commercial or retail square footage for a parcel or group of parcels;

F. Adopts a new Specific Plan or Neighborhood Area Plan, or similar planning document; or

G. Repeals any of the Planning Policy Documents.

9.69.050 Voter Approval Process

A. No Development Agreement or Major Development Review Permit that is not otherwise exempted from the requirements of this Chapter, or Major Amendment to a Planning Policy Document, shall be effective unless and until it is approved by a simple majority vote of the voting electorate of the City of Santa Monica voting “YES” on a ballot measure proposing the Development Agreement, Major Development Review Permit, or Major Amendment of a Planning Policy Document at a regular or special election.

B. The ballot pamphlet for any election required by this Chapter shall include the following, at a minimum:

1. A summary prepared by the City Attorney of the proposed Major Amendment, Major Development Review Permit, or Development Agreement.
The summary shall include a website address where the full text of the Major Amendment, Major Development Review Permit, or Development Agreement can be viewed by a voter. The full text of the Major Amendment, Major Development Review Permit, or Development Agreement must also be made available at City Hall for any voter who requests it.

2. An easily readable map of the geographic area affected by the Major Amendment, Major Development Review Permit, or Development Agreement; and

3. In the case of a Major Development Review Permit or Development Agreement, the summary prepared by the City Attorney shall include the square footage, floor to area ratio, and height of the proposed project, the floor to area ratio and height permitted for a Tier 1 project at the location, and, in 12 point bold font, the proposed community benefits for the proposed project.

C. Any ballot measure required by this Chapter may be voted upon at a general or special election, on a date consistent with those provided for by the California Elections Code as permitted by law. The cost of any special election on a ballot measure seeking approval of a Development Agreement or Major Development Review Permit shall be borne entirely by the applicant or applicants for the Development Agreement or Major Development Review Permit.

D. In addition to the specific requirements of subsection (B), the provisions of the California Elections Code and Article 11 of the Santa Monica Municipal Code apply to any election on any ballot measure required by this Chapter, including those provisions regarding ballot arguments and rebuttal arguments, ballot order, and public examination of ballot information.

Section VII: AMENDMENT OF MUNICIPAL CODE CHAPTER 9.52

Article 9, Division 5, Chapter 9.52 of the Santa Monica Municipal Code is hereby amended to insert the following Terms and Definitions.

Section 9.52.010 List of Terms

The following terms are added to the list of terms, which is otherwise unchanged:

120% Income Household

100% Moderate Income Housing Project

Section 9.52.020 Definitions

The following definitions are added to section 9.52.020, and all other definitions in that section are unchanged:

9.52.020.0041 120% Income Household. A household whose gross income does not exceed 120% of the area median income, adjusted for household size, as published and periodically updated by HUD. 120% income households includes 80% Income Households.

9.52.020.0051 100% Moderate Income Housing Project. Housing projects with 100% of units deed restricted or restricted by an agreement approved by the City for occupancy by 120% Income Households or less.

Section VIII: IMPLEMENTATION

A. The date the notice of intention to circulate this initiative measure was submitted to the City's elections official is referenced herein as the “submittal date.” The City General Plan, its Specific Plans, and Zoning Ordinance in effect on the submittal date and the General Plan and Zoning Ordinance as amended by this Initiative comprise an integrated, internally consistent, and compatible statement of policies for the City. In order to ensure that nothing in this initiative measure would prevent the General Plan and its Specific Plans from being integrated, internally consistent, and compatible statements of the policies of the City, as required by state law, and to ensure that the actions of the voters in enacting this initiative are given effect, any amendment to the General Plan, or new Specific Plan, that is adopted between the submittal date and the date that the General Plan is amended by this Initiative shall, to the extent that such interim-enacted amendment or Specific Plan is inconsistent with the General Plan provisions of this initiative, be amended as soon as possible and in the manner and time required by state law to ensure consistency between the provisions adopted by this initiative and other elements of the General Plan.

B. The City Council is hereby authorized and directed to amend the General Plan, the Land Use and Circulation Element, all specific plans, and the Zoning Ordinance, and any other ordinance and policies, in order to implement this Initiative and to the extent any of the foregoing are affected by this Initiative as soon as possible and in the manner and time required by any applicable state law, to ensure consistency between the policies adopted in this Initiative and other elements of the foregoing laws and policies.

Section IX: EFFECTIVE DATE

The provisions of this Initiative shall be considered to be adopted on the date that the vote is declared by the legislative body, and
shall go into effect as specified in Elections Code section 9217.

Section X: SUNSET DATE

The provisions of this Initiative shall remain in force until 20 years from its Effective Date.

Section XI: AMENDMENT OR REPEAL

Once this Initiative becomes effective, no provision of this initiative may be amended or repealed except by a majority of the voters of the City of Santa Monica voting on the amendment or repeal in a special or general election.

Section XII: CONFLICTING PROPOSITIONS

If any other proposition, appearing on the same ballot as this proposition, addresses the subject matter in a way that conflicts with the treatment of the subject matter in this proposition, and if each proposition is approved by a majority vote of those voting on each proposition, then as to the conflicting subject matter the proposition with the highest affirmative vote shall prevail, and the proposition with the lowest affirmative vote shall be deemed disapproved as to the conflicting subject matter.

Section XIII: SEVERABILITY

This Initiative shall be interpreted so as to be consistent with all federal, state and local laws, rules and regulations. If any section, subsection, subdivision, clause, sentence, phrase or portion of this Initiative is declared unconstitutional or invalid by a court of competent jurisdiction, the remaining sections, subsections, subdivisions, clauses, sentences, phrases and portions shall remain in full force and effect, and to this end the provisions of this Initiative are severable. The voters thus declare that they would have passed all sections, subsections, subdivisions, clauses, sentences, phrases and portions of this Initiative without the section, subsection, subdivision, clause, sentence, phrase or portion held unconstitutional or invalid.

Section XIV: JUDICIAL ENFORCEMENT OR LEGAL DEFENSE

The proponents of this Initiative shall have the right to maintain an action for equitable relief to restrain any violation of this Initiative, to enforce the duties imposed on the City by this Initiative, or to defend the Initiative in the event of a legal challenge to the Initiative after it is approved by the voters.

Section XV: PRIORITY

Once this Initiative becomes effective, its provisions shall prevail over and supersede all provisions of the Municipal Code, ordinances, resolutions, and administrative policies of the City of Santa Monica which may be in conflict with any provisions of this measure.
This measure would amend the City's Land Use and Circulation Element (LUCE) and Zoning Ordinance by adding new requirements for voter approval of "major" development projects, all development agreements and certain changes to planning policy documents. These requirements would last 20 years.

The measure's new permitting process would require a "Major Development Review Permit" (Major DR) for projects exceeding the LUCE's Tier 1 height, which generally ranges from 32-36 feet in different parts of the City. Permit processing would include Architectural Review Board design review, Planning Commission recommendations, and Council approval. If Council approved the project, the permit would not become effective until the voters approved the project in a general or special election. Likewise, all development agreements would not become effective until voter approval. The measure would require developers to pay special election costs.

Some projects would be exempt from the new permit requirements. Exemptions include single unit dwellings, 100% affordable housing projects of 50 units or less, Tier 1 projects meeting on-site affordable housing production requirements, and projects exceeding Tier 1 height and density limits due to state density bonus mandates. Exemptions from the voter approval requirement include 100% affordable and moderate income housing, 100% senior housing, projects in the coastal zone complying with a certified Local Coastal Program, and projects on certain housing sites.

Because the LUCE has no tier system in the Downtown Core and Civic Center Specific Plan areas, proposed projects within these areas would not be subject to the Major DR permit system. However, as long as the City's interim zoning ordinance remains in effect, Projects exceeding 32 feet in height within the Downtown Core would require a development agreement and voter approval.

Voter approval would also be required for "Major Amendments" to the LUCE, Zoning Ordinance, Districting Map, and Neighborhood and Specific Plans.

Portions of this measure potentially conflict with existing law and might not be enforceable if adopted. Legal challenges might occur. For example, court decisions state that "administrative actions" are not subject to voter approval. If a Major DR is an administrative action, voter approval of it may not be allowed. The measure may conflict with state law requirements both concerning the approval process of development agreements, and concerning limitations placed on a city's ability to deny housing projects. The measure may conflict with the City Charter which sets ordinance adoption rules. The measure states that if any part is invalidated, the remainder will remain in effect. A court would decide how to implement this if the measure was successfully challenged.

This initiative measure was placed on the ballot by a petition signed by the requisite number of voters.

/is/ MARSHA JONES MOUTRIE, City Attorney
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF MEASURE LV

Vote YES on LV to protect Santa Monica from overdevelopment and increased traffic congestion.

Measure LV is the Land Use Voter Empowerment (LUVE) Initiative.

Two years ago, Santa Monica residents resoundingly rejected the massive Hines development project and told developers, lobbyists, and politicians at City Hall: “Santa Monica is not for sale.” Somebody didn’t get the message.

City Council continues to approve massive developments, ignoring the will of residents and destroying Santa Monica’s character and livability. Many large projects await Council approvals, including multiple 20+ story hotel/luxury condo projects on Ocean Avenue, the demolition of a public parking structure to be replaced with a movie theatre complex (with no parking), and the development of a 12-story office/hotel/mixed-use project on publicly-owned land.

Measure LV gives voters back our voice.

Measure LV gives voters back our voice to ensure that Santa Monica is not transformed into an extension of West Los Angeles. It simply states that the voters must approve projects negotiated by our City Council exchanging “community benefits” for increased heights and densities. It also requires voters to approve major changes to Land Use Policy documents so there is real community buy-in.

Measure LV ensures that future development will protect our quality of life. It permits sensible growth, protects existing neighborhoods, prevents resident displacement, all while permitting truly affordable housing that would not require voter approval.

Measure LV protects our existing rent-controlled apartments.

Measure LV takes away the incentives given to developers to tear down smaller buildings and replace them with massive buildings.

Too much has already been approved.

Just one recently approved project - 500 Broadway - could add more than 4,400 additional daily car trips to our already congested city.

Measure LV gives voters the ability to protect Santa Monica from overdevelopment and increased traffic congestion.

Vote YES on LV.

/s/ Armen Melkonians, Founder of Residocracy; Civil and Environmental Engineer

/s/ Kate (Kathleen) Bransfield, Board Member-Wilshire Montana Neighborhood Coalition; Residocracy Board Member

/s/ Zina Josephs, President-Friends of Sunset Park; Residocracy Board Member

/s/ Ellen Hannan, Treasurer-Santa Monica Mid City Neighbors; Residocracy Board Member

/s/ Richard Hilton, Vice chair/former chair Santa Monica City Housing Commission; Executive Director, West LA Council for Seniors

REBUTTAL TO ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF MEASURE LV

The proponents of Measure LV chose not to describe what their initiative really does: sets an arbitrary and extreme two-story height limit citywide, even in downtown.

Why hide that basic fact? Because their concept is reckless, and overrides good public process.

We in Santa Monica have all had a voice, agreeing on a new neighborhood-protecting general plan and zoning ordinance. Measure LV dismisses ten years of hard work and forces us to start over, building by building, with ballot-box zoning.

Proponents list a number of proposed projects as a scare tactic. None is even close to getting built, so they certainly haven’t caused our traffic problems. Only one listed project has even been approved, and that’s housing near a transit stop, with significant new affordability!

In fact, the referendum-rejected “Hines project” wouldn’t have needed voter approval under Measure LV, one of many disturbing loopholes.

Measure LV does not protect renters. Its lack of income restrictions on exempted senior housing encourages luxury condos, replacing apartment buildings.

Measure LV will not reduce traffic. Not one car will be removed from our streets.

Thoughtful long-term planning includes light rail, better bus transit, bikeshare, improved parking options, and strict traffic demand management programs for developers and employers.

Measure LV replaces effective, coordinated action with many individual political campaigns. Will piecemeal planning give us the city we want?

If an extreme two-story limit is a good idea, why weren’t the proponents of Measure LV more upfront about it?

NO on Measure LV.

/s/ Kevin McKeown, Councilmember, Former Mayor

/s/ Barbara Inatsugu, President, League of Women Voters of Santa Monica

/s/ Linda J. Sullivan, Member Santa Monicans for Renters’ Rights Steering Committee

/s/ Nathaniel Trives, Former Mayor of Santa Monica

/s/ Harry Keiley, Teacher-Former President, Santa Monica Malibu Classroom Teachers Association
ARGUMENT AGAINST MEASURE LV

Why do most responsible community leaders and organizations say Measure LV is too extreme? Because a one-size-fits-all height limit of two stories citywide goes too far, and Measure LV is full of unintended consequences.

While it claims to reduce traffic, Measure LV may make our unbearable traffic problems worse by reducing housing for workers, forcing them to commute and clog our streets.

Measure LV would increase outside special interest money in Santa Monica politics because, under Citizens United, developers could spend unlimited money on campaigns for their projects.

The League of Women Voters says Measure LV would not result in real voter empowerment. Voter involvement on very large projects may be appropriate, but requiring an election for almost anything over 32 feet will only cause voter fatigue, and even more campaign flyers in your mailbox.

Measure LV would jeopardize the ability of individual neighborhoods to decide their own futures, with protective neighborhood and preservation plans having to survive a citywide vote.

Measure LV is 23 pages long, and its complexity hides many loopholes. Our new downtown fire station and a recent school science building would require elections, but massive mixed-use projects in exempted locations would not need your vote.

Income limits for “senior housing” were left out. Luxury condos for seniors, under Measure LV, could be built without an election, displacing renters and meaning less affordable housing for working families and young people.

After an earthquake, Measure LV would compound the disaster. It may conflict with state law on rebuilding. Imagine if your damaged apartment building couldn’t be repaired or replaced without going to court, or to a ballot.

If Measure LV passes, all its unintended consequences would be locked in place for 20 years, and could be remedied only by another costly election.

Vote NO on Measure LV.

/s/ Kevin McKeown, Councilmember, Former Mayor  
/s/ Barbara Inatsugu, President, League of Women Voters of Santa Monica  
/s/ Linda J. Sullivan, Member Santa Monicans for Renters’ Rights Steering Committee  
/s/ Nathaniel Trives, Former Mayor of Santa Monica  
/s/ Harry Keiley, Teacher-Former President, Santa Monica Malibu Classroom Teachers Association

REBUTTAL TO ARGUMENT AGAINST MEASURE LV

Measure LV isn’t “too extreme”, doesn’t go “too far”, and isn’t “full of unintended consequences.”

Measure LV won’t make “traffic problems worse,” “increase outside special interest money,” lead to “voter fatigue,” or prevent us from rebuilding if disaster strikes.

In fact, Measure “LV” does one thing: It gives voters a voice and the final say on how much development is right for Santa Monica. It allows voters to say NO to over-development and increased traffic congestion.

We need that voice because our city does not belong to developers, their lawyers and lobbyists. It belongs to all of us.

It’s time to change course before we’re overwhelmed by a tsunami of development projects. We don’t want to lose what’s left of our blue skies, ocean breezes, and our quality of life.

A YES on Measure LV allows us to ensure that future projects maintain the character and scale of Santa Monica, create truly affordable housing, provide real community benefits, and are planned together with the neighborhoods.

A YES on Measure LV allows us to ensure that our existing rent-controlled buildings are not demolished to make way for new and larger buildings that are exempt from rent-control.

Measure “LV” is simple and sensible.

You can protect Santa Monica by giving the voters the right to decide.

Vote YES on Measure LV.

/s/ Armen Melkonians, Founder of Residocracy; Civil and Environmental Engineer  
/s/ Kate (Kathleen) Bransfield, Board Member-Wilshire Montana Neighborhood Coalition; Residocracy Board Member  
/s/ Zina Josephs, President-Friends of Sunset Park; Residocracy Board Member  
/s/ Ellen Hannan, Treasurer-Santa Monica Mid City Neighbors; Residocracy Board Member  
/s/ Richard Hilton, Vice chair/ former chair Santa Monica City Housing Commission; Executive Director, West LA Council for Seniors

SANTA MONICA 43
MEASURE SM

CITY COUNCIL PROPOSED MEASURE TO AMEND CITY CHARTER ARTICLE XXII - THE CITY OF SANTA MONICA
TAXPAYER PROTECTION AMENDMENT OF 2000 – SO AS TO EXTEND AND TO CLARIFY ITS PROVISIONS

WHEREAS, the City Council wishes to place before the voters a measure that would amend City Charter Article XXII, the City of Santa Monica Taxpayer Protection Amendment of 2000, also sometimes referred to popularly as the “Oaks Initiative”, to strengthen and to better effectuate the provisions of Article XXII.

NOW, THEREFORE,

Section 1. Article XXII of the Santa Monica City Charter is amended as follows:

2202. Definitions.

(a) As used herein, the term public benefit does not include public employment in the normal course of business for services rendered, but includes a contract, benefit, or arrangement between the City and any individual, corporation, firm, partnership, association, or other person or entity to:

(1) provide personal services of a value in excess of $25,000 over any 12 month period,

(2) sell or furnish any material, supplies or equipment to the City of a value in excess of $25,000 over any 12 month period,

(3) buy or sell any real property to or from the City with a value, in excess of $25,000, or lease any real property to or from the City with a value in excess of $25,000 over any 12 month period,

(4) receive an award of a franchise to conduct any business activity in a territory in which no other competitor potentially is available to provide similar and competitive services, and for which gross revenue from the business activity exceeds $50,000 in any 12 month period,

(5) confer a land use variance, special use permit, or other exception to a pre-existing master plan or land use ordinance pertaining to real property where such decision has a value in excess of $25,000,

(6) confer a tax abatement, exception, or benefit not generally applicable of a value in excess of $5,000 in any 12 month period,

(7) receive cash or specie of a net value to the recipient in excess of $10,000 in any 12 month period.

(b) Those persons or entities receiving public benefits as defined in Section 2202(a)(1)-(7) shall include the individual, corporation, firm, partnership, association, or other person or entity so benefiting, and any individual or person who, during a period where such benefit is received or accrues,

(1) has more than a ten percent (10%) equity, participation, or revenue interest in that entity, or

(2) who is a trustee, director, partner, or officer of that entity, or of another entity that owns or controls the entity receiving the public benefit, excepting persons serving in those capacities as volunteers, without compensation, for organizations exempt from income taxes under Section 501(c)(3), (4), or (6) of the Internal Revenues Code. However, this exception shall not apply if the organization is a political committee or controls political committees as defined by California Government Code Section 82013 or 2 U.S.C. Section 431(4) or successor provisions.

(c) As used herein, the term personal or campaign advantage shall include:

(1) any gift, honoraria, emolument, or personal pecuniary benefit of a value in excess of $50;

(2) any employment for compensation;

(3) any campaign contributions for any elective office said official may pursue.

(d) As used herein, the term public official includes any elected or appointed public official acting in an official capacity. This includes, but is not limited to: City Council members, Planning Commission members, and the City Manager and Department Heads and their designees who confer “public benefits” as defined in this section.

2203. City public official shall not receive personal or campaign advantage from those to whom they allocate public benefits.

(a) No City public official who has exercised discretion to approve and who has approved or voted to approve a public benefit as defined in Section 2202(a) may receive a personal or campaign advantage as defined in Section 2202(c) from a person as defined in Section 2202(b)
and no person or entity who has received a public benefit may confer a personal or campaign advantage upon a public official who exercised
discretion to confer that public benefit for a period beginning on the date the official approves or votes to approve the public benefit, and ending
no later than:
(1) two years after the expiration of the term of office that the official is serving at the time the official approves or votes to approve the public
benefit;
(2) two years after the official's departure from his or her office whether or not there is a pre-established term of office; or
(3) six years from the date the official approves or votes to approve the public benefit; whichever is first.

(b) Section 2203(a) shall also apply to the exercise of discretion of any such public official serving in his or her official capacity through a
redevelopment agency, or any other public agency, whether within or without the territorial jurisdiction of the City either as a representative or
appointee of the City.

(c) No City public official who has exercised discretion to approve and who has approved or voted to approve a public benefit as defined in
Section 2202(a) may receive a personal or campaign advantage as defined in Section 2202(c) from a person as defined in Section 2202(B) in
any geographic location, including within and outside the geographic boundaries of Santa Monica.

2206. Penalties and enforcement.

(a) In addition to all other penalties and remedies which might apply, any knowing and willful violation of this Article by a public official or a
person or entity receiving a public benefit as defined in Section 2202(b) constitutes a criminal misdemeanor offense.

(b) A civil action may be brought under this Article against any person public official who violates this article receives a personal or campaign
advantage in violation of Section 2203. A finding of liability shall subject the public official violator to one or more of the following civil remedies:

(1) restitution of the personal or campaign advantage received, which shall accrue to the general fund of the City;
(2) a civil penalty of up to five times the value of the personal or campaign advantage received;
(3) injunctive relief necessary to prevent present and future violations of this Article;
(4) disqualification from future public office or position within the jurisdiction, if violations are willful, egregious, or repeated.

(c) A civil action under subdivision (b) of this section may be brought by any resident of the City. In the event that such an action is brought by
a resident of the City and the petitioner prevails, the respondent public official shall pay reasonable attorney's fees and costs to the prevailing
petitioner. Civil penalties collected in such a prosecution shall accrue 10% to the petitioner, and 90% to the City's general fund.

(d) When the City Attorney receives a complaint containing a violation of this Article from any person or entity, the City Attorney must promptly,
for the purposes of assessment and prosecution, either:

(1) Refer the complaint to the Chief Deputy of the Criminal Division or another attorney in the City Attorney's Office; or
(2) Refer the complaint to an independent investigator hired by the City.

Section 2. If any section, subsection, sentence, clause or phrase of this measure is for any reason held to be unconstitutional or otherwise legally
invalid by a decision of any court of competent jurisdiction, such decision shall not affect the validity and force of the remaining portions of this
measure. The City Council hereby declares that it would have placed this City Charter amendment before the voters, and the voters declare
that they would have adopted this Charter Amendment and each portion thereof regardless of the fact that any portion may be subsequently
declared invalid.
This measure would amend Article XXII of the City Charter, which was adopted by the voters in 2000, and which is commonly known as the “Oaks Initiative”.

Article XXII prohibits a “public official”, who has voted or who has exercised discretion to award someone a “public benefit”, as defined in the Article, from later receiving a “personal or campaign advantage” from that person. Thus, Article XXII’s purpose is to prevent conflicts of interest and corruption by prohibiting a public official from receiving a “personal advantage”, whether a kickback, reward or other favor in return for official actions. For example, the measure prohibits a Council member, who has voted to award a contract to a person, from later accepting a campaign contribution from that person for a specified period of time.

In response to concerns about the application, enforcement and available remedies for violations of the measure, the City Council is proposing amendments to Article XXII. The City Council has placed this proposed measure on the ballot.

The amendments would expand Article XXII’s prohibitions. If this measure is adopted by the voters, the prohibitions would apply not only to “public officials”, who receive “personal or campaign advantages”, but Article XXII’s prohibitions would also apply to those persons giving them. Thus, both receiving and giving advantages would be prohibited. In the example given above, the proposed amendments would prohibit the contractor from making the campaign contribution while in addition prohibiting the Council member from accepting it.

The proposed amendments would also clarify the application of the Article XXII prohibitions by: defining the term “public official” to include City Council members, Planning Commissioners, the City Manager, Department Heads and their designees who exercise discretion to confer “public benefits”. The proposed amendment expressly states that the prohibition against receipt of “personal or campaign advantages” applies outside of the City’s geographic boundaries. This would mean, for example, that a Department Head, who exercised discretion to award a contract, might violate Article XXII if the Department Head later accepted a job from the contractor in another city.

The proposed amendments would also add an exception to the current prohibitions for certain volunteers serving nonprofits organizations in specified capacities. For example, many community members volunteer for nonprofits that receive City funding. This exception makes clear that Article XXII does not apply to persons who volunteer to serve, without compensation, on specified tax exempt nonprofit organizations’ boards of directors.

Article XXII also expands remedies against violators and delineates the City Attorney’s enforcement responsibilities. The proposed amendment specifies that remedies are cumulative against any violator.

/s/ MARSHA JONES MOUTRIE, City Attorney
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF MEASURE SM

Measure SM will strengthen Santa Monica’s anti-corruption law known as Oaks. SM was put on the ballot as the result of the recommendations of respected ethics attorney and Enron prosecutor John Hueston, to make Oaks easier to enforce and provide broader protections for the public.

The original Oaks Initiative was put on the ballot in 2000 to prohibit city officials from awarding public benefits, such as development agreements and contracts, to individuals or entities and then receiving a personal benefit such as campaign contributions or employment from the public benefit recipient. Oaks was aimed at lessening even the appearance that public officials are expecting future personal benefits when carrying out the people’s business. It passed by almost 60%.

Oaks has never been enforced by the City. THIS WILL CHANGE IN NOVEMBER IF YOU VOTE FOR MEASURE SM.

Measure SM expands Oaks, and enables its enforcement by:
--Placing enforcement responsibility in the hands of the independent Criminal Division of the City Attorney’s office or a special prosecutor who have no conflict
--Permitting criminal and civil prosecutions of any violator, including developers or contractors who violate the law
--Clarifying exactly which public officials are covered by Oaks (City Council, City Manager, Planning Commissioners, Department Heads, and their designees)
--Clarifying that receiving a campaign contribution or personal advantage in any location, including outside of Santa Monica, is prohibited
--Requiring companies receiving public benefits to disclose who really owns them, so they cannot hide behind shell companies.

Measure SM also creates an exception for volunteer members of non-profit entities other than PACs or entities controlling PACs.

IT'S TIME TO ENFORCE THE ANTI-CORRUPTION MEASURE THAT WE THE PEOPLE ENACTED IN 2000 AND REAFFIRMED IN 2006.

Vote YES on Measure SM.

/s/ Tony Vazquez, Santa Monica Mayor
/s/ Mary L. Marlow, Chair Santa Monica Transparency Project
/s/ Carmen Balber, Consumer Watchdog, Executive Director
/s/ Diana Gordon, Co-chair, Santa Monica Coalition for a Livable City
/s/ Sue L. Himmelrich, Santa Monica City Councilmember

ARGUMENT AGAINST MEASURE SM

None Filed
MEASURE V
FULL TEXT BALLOT PROPOSITION
OF THE SANTA MONICA COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT
BOND MEASURE ELECTION FOR NOVEMBER 8, 2016

SANTA MONICA COLLEGE CLASSROOM REPAIR, CAREER TRAINING, HIGHER EDUCATION ACCESS MEASURE. To improve local access to affordable higher education for high school graduates/adults/veterans; improve education/career training in math, science, writing, arts, business; shall Santa Monica Community College District issue $345,000,000 in bonds at legal rates, with citizens oversight/annual audits, to repair, upgrade, construct, modernize, equip facilities for technology, science/biotech, college readiness; repair aging, leaky classrooms, remove asbestos, upgrade disabled access, seismic and campus safety?

PROJECT LIST

The Board of Trustees of the Santa Monica Community College District certifies that it has evaluated the District’s urgent and critical capital needs, including school and student safety issues, enrollment trends, class size reduction, overcrowding, energy efficiency and computer technology, seismic safety requirements, and aging, outdated or deteriorating school buildings in developing the scope of projects to be funded. In developing the scope of projects, the District has prioritized the key health and safety and sustainability needs so that the most critical school site needs are addressed. The Board conducted an evaluation at all District sites and received input in developing the scope of projects to be funded. In approving this Project List, the Board of Trustees determines that the District should:

Adhere to specific COMMUNITY ACCOUNTABILITY safeguards such as these:

(a) All bond expenditures are subject to review by a Citizens Oversight Committee which reports to the public, as provided in Education Code Section 15278 et seq.

(b) The District will involve faculty, staff and students in curriculum development at financed facilities throughout the life of the bond construction program.

(c) The District will provide an opportunity for input from community and neighborhood residents during the development of projects to be funded by this bond measure.

(d) The District will apply energy-saving and sustainability standards to all repairs and improvements.

(e) The District will enter into or extend Cooperative Use Agreements with the City of Santa Monica, the City of Malibu and the Santa Monica-Malibu Unified School District in order to make the most efficient use of bond funds whenever feasible.

The Project List includes the following types of projects:

All $345 million of bond proceeds will be spent within the Cities of Santa Monica and Malibu or at sites that share a boundary and are contiguous with the Cities of Santa Monica or Malibu.

None of the bond proceeds can be taken away by the State of California.

All projects funded by bond proceeds will be available for educational and public uses authorized in this Project List.

Replacement safety and modernization projects were identified by means of an independent facilities assessment. Replacement projects and projects to meet new educational needs have been presented to and approved by the District Board of Trustees and are included as priority items in the District’s Capital Improvement Plan on file with the State Chancellor’s Office.

The items proposed for financing in whole or in part with the proceeds of the District’s general obligation bonds include the following capital projects at any or all District facilities:

• provide facilities, classrooms and/or equipment for career education programs in such fields as nursing, computer technology, new media, early childhood education, business, graphic design and other occupations in more than 80 fields of study;

• development and implementation of facilities master plans and related requirements such as environmental impact reports and soils testing, architectural, engineering and similar planning costs;

• demolition of temporary and/or obsolete and unsafe facilities;

• installation and/or upgrading of emergency lighting, fire alarm and security systems;

• installation, upgrade or repair of roadways, walkways, grounds, parking lots and garages;

• entrance improvements; upgrade facilities to comply with Federal mandated Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) handicap accessibility requirements and State of California seismic standards;

• signage for safety and public information;
SAFETY AND MODERNIZATION PROJECTS

Science and Math Extension. Santa Monica College is renowned for its science and allied health programs; however, the existing labs for Life, Physical and Earth Sciences are at capacity; also, the current facility for the Math Department consists of temporary trailers and lacks the infrastructure for smart classrooms or support for the use of modern technology for instructional use. Consolidating Math and Science programs into a new Science Extension building supports interdisciplinary interaction. The building extension would qualify for up to $40 million in State funding, which requires a local match. The building will contain an upgraded planetarium and a community lab for all ages, including a nutrition and culinary lab in support of the College’s nutrition program.

Replacement of Temporary Classrooms. Bond proceeds would be used to replace the 1994 temporary trailer Math Village classroom complex with permanent First Year Experience classrooms, student support study space and instructional support labs. These trailers were rushed into service following the 1994 Northridge Earthquake and have exceeded their time of usable service. Additionally, proceeds would be used to replace the 1984 modular English as a Second Language classroom building. This modular building lacks fire sprinklers, is poorly ventilated and has also exceeded its time of usable service.

Upgrading, Renovation or Replacement of Two 1950’s Buildings. The 1952 Liberal Arts building has the poorest Facility Condition Index rating on the College’s main campus, lacks fire sprinklers and does not have an elevator. The 1952 Letters & Science building has the second poorest Facility Condition Index rating on the main campus, and also lacks both fire sprinklers and an elevator.

Renovation of Business Building. The 1981 Business Building is overdue for renovation. The building houses a large number of computer classrooms and labs.

Replacement of Campus Police Station. The current police facility is antiquated and undersized. Applying bond proceeds to the replacement, construction, renovation and relocation of the campus police station and including a public space for community and neighborhood use will improve public and campus safety.

Upgrading, Renovation or Replacement of Art Building. An upgraded, renovated or newly constructed art structure will replace aging building systems and improve space distribution for the many disciplines within the Art Department. The College is eligible to receive up to $10 million in State funding for this project, which requires a local match.

Landscaping/ Water Conservation Improvements and Completing Pico Boulevard Frontage Improvements. Applying bond proceeds for landscaping improvements, including landscaping improvements to complete the main campus Pico Boulevard frontage, will improve water conservation through water reclamation and installation of drought resistant landscaping.

Completing Master Plan Improvements at the Santa Monica College Performing Arts Center Campus. Construction at the Performing Arts Center campus has proceeded in phases, in coordination with available funding. The first phase added the Broad Stage and the Edye Second Space theaters. The second phase has added an East Wing rehearsal hall and music performance labs. The final phase, to be funded from bond proceeds, will include an underground three-level parking structure to replace most of the existing surface parking, along with related technology and media support space.
with an above-ground art gallery and green-space plaza. The theaters at the Performing Arts Center are among the most heavily used theaters in Los Angeles County.

**Designing and Installing an Outdoor Classroom.** The design, construction, installation and improvement of a venue for outdoor plays and class lectures.

**Converting Library Interiors.** Conversion of existing Library floor space used for book stacks to construct and install additional student study areas, tutoring and collaborative learning spaces that will support student success.

**Making Environmental Performance Improvements.** Bond funds will be used to upgrade District facilities to achieve energy or resource use efficiency and water conservation and achieve sustainability for District operations.

**Upgrading Technology Infrastructure.** Bond proceeds will be applied to renovate, replace, upgrade, acquire, install and integrate major site, building and utility systems, equipment and related infrastructure, including lighting, electrical, wiring and related infrastructure for modern technology, classroom instructional technology, communications and security technology (including security cameras and monitoring systems), data, voice, public address and audio-visual communication, energy efficiency, management monitoring systems, networks, fixtures, controls and equipment, cable infrastructure, network expansion, wireless access points and other communications and administrative systems.

**COMMUNITY JOINT USE PROJECTS**

**Providing for a Joint Use Project with the City of Santa Monica.** The College will provide up to $20 million in bond funds for the expansion of the City of Santa Monica’s Memorial Park to accommodate soccer and/or other field sports for use by College students and the general public.

**Providing for a Joint Use Project with the Santa Monica-Malibu Unified School District.** The Johns Adams Middle School Auditorium, adjacent to the College’s main campus, has suffered earthquake damage and is no longer in service. The College will make available bond funds as needed to assist the School District in renovating or replacing the auditorium with a seating capacity of approximately 750, for joint use.

**Providing for City of Malibu Infrastructure and Community Educational Facilities.** The College will provide up to $25 million in funding enhancements to its instructional presence in Malibu in partnership with the City of Malibu.

**ADDITIONAL CONDITIONS**

The allocation of bond proceeds may be affected by the District’s receipt of State matching funds and the final costs of each project. In the absence of State matching funds, which the District will aggressively pursue to reduce the District’s share of the costs of the projects, the District may undertake fewer than all of the projects listed above. Some projects may be undertaken as joint use projects in cooperation with other local public or non-profit agencies.

Necessary site preparation/ restoration may occur in connection with new construction, renovation or remodeling, including ingress and egress, removing, replacing or installing irrigation, storm drain, and utility lines, trees and landscaping, relocating fire access roads, and acquiring any necessary easements, licenses, or rights of way to the property. Proceeds of the bonds may be used to pay or reimburse the District for the costs of District staff when performing work on or necessary and incidental to bond projects. Bond proceeds shall only be expended for the specific purposes identified herein.

**NO ADMINISTRATOR SALARIES.** PROCEEDS FROM THE SALE OF THE BONDS AUTHORIZED BY THIS PROPOSITION SHALL BE USED ONLY FOR THE ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION, RECONSTRUCTION, REHABILITATION, OR REPLACEMENT OF DISTRICT FACILITIES, INCLUDING THE FURNISHING AND EQUIPPING OF FACILITIES, AND NOT FOR ANY OTHER PURPOSE, INCLUDING TEACHER AND ADMINISTRATOR SALARIES OR PENSIONS OR OTHER OPERATING EXPENSES.

**FISCAL ACCOUNTABILITY.** THE EXPENDITURE OF BOND MONEY ON THESE PROJECTS IS SUBJECT TO STRINGENT FINANCIAL ACCOUNTABILITY REQUIREMENTS. BY LAW, PERFORMANCE AND FINANCIAL AUDITS WILL BE PERFORMED ANNUALLY, AND ALL BOND EXPENDITURES WILL BE MONITORED BY AN INDEPENDENT CITIZENS’ OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE (EDUCATION CODE SECTION 15278 ET SEQ.) TO ENSURE THAT FUNDS ARE SPENT AS PROMISED AND SPECIFIED. THE CITIZENS’ OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE MUST INCLUDE, AMONG OTHERS, REPRESENTATIVES OF A BONA FIDE TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION, A BUSINESS ORGANIZATION AND A SENIOR CITIZENS ORGANIZATION. NO DISTRICT EMPLOYEES OR VENDORS ARE ALLOWED TO SERVE ON THE CITIZENS’ OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE.

**NOTICE TO VOTERS**

Approval of Measure V does not guarantee that the proposed project or projects in the Santa Monica Community College District that are the subject of bonds under Measure V will be funded beyond the local revenues generated by Measure V. The district’s proposal for the project or projects may assume the receipt of matching state funds, which could be subject to appropriation by the Legislature or approval of a statewide bond measure.
TAX RATE STATEMENT CONCERNING MEASURE V

TAX RATE STATEMENT
REGARDING PROPOSED
$345,000,000
SANTA MONICA COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT
GENERAL OBLIGATION BONDS

An election will be held in Santa Monica Community College District (the “District”) on November 8, 2016, for the purpose of submitting to the electors of the District the question of issuing bonds of the District in the principal amount of $345 million. If such bonds are authorized and sold, the principal thereof and interest thereon will be payable from the proceeds of taxes levied on the taxable property in the District. The following information regarding tax rates is given to comply with Section 9401 of the California Elections Code. This information is based upon the best estimates and projections presently available from official sources, upon experience within the District and other demonstrable factors.

Based upon the foregoing and projections of the assessed valuations of taxable property in the District, and assuming the entire debt service on the bonds will be paid through property taxation:

1. The best estimate from official sources of the tax rate that would be required to be levied to fund the bond issue during the first fiscal year after the first sale of the bonds, based on estimated assessed valuations available at the time of the filing of this statement, or on a projection based on experience within the District or other demonstrable factors, is $18 per $100,000 of assessed valuation of all property to be taxed in the year 2019-20.

2. The best estimate from official sources of the tax rate that would be required to be levied to fund the bond issue during the first fiscal year after the last sale of the bonds and an estimate of the year in which that rate will apply, based on estimated assessed valuations available at the time of the filing of this statement, or on a projection based on experience within the District or other demonstrable factors, is $25 per $100,000 of assessed valuation of all property to be taxed in the year 2025-26.

3. The best estimate from official sources of the highest tax rate that would be required to be levied to fund the bond issue and an estimate of the year in which that rate will apply, based on estimated assessed valuations available at the time of the filing of this statement, or on a projection based on experience within the District or other demonstrable factors, is $25 per $100,000 of assessed valuation of all property to be taxed in the year 2021-22.

Attention of voters is directed to the fact that the foregoing information is based upon projections and estimates. The actual timing of sales of the bonds and the amount to be sold at any time will be governed by the needs of the District and other factors. The actual interest rates at which the bonds will be sold, which will not exceed the maximum permitted by law, will depend upon the bond market at the time of sale. The actual assessed valuations in future years will depend upon the value of property within the District as determined in the assessment and the equalization process. Therefore, the actual tax rates and the years in which those tax rates will be applicable may vary from those presently estimated and stated above.

The District estimates, based on current assumptions that total debt service on the bonds would be $722,483,675.

/s/ Kathryn E. Jeffery
Superintendent/President
Santa Monica Community College District
Impartial Analysis of Measure V

by
Mary C. Wickham, County Counsel

Approval of Measure V ("Measure") would authorize the Board of Trustees ("Board") of the Santa Monica Community College District ("District"), which placed the Measure on the ballot by Resolution No. 2, to issue general obligation bonds in an amount not to exceed $345,000,000.

Proceeds from the sale of the bonds authorized by the Measure shall be used only for the purposes specified in the Measure, including, but not limited to, making capital improvements at any or all District facilities for classrooms and equipment for career development programs; upgrading safety and security systems; upgrading for Americans with Disabilities Act compliance; upgrading or constructing restrooms; installing, repairing, or replacing heating, air conditioning, ventilation and electrical systems, and roofs, windows, walls, and doors; resurfacing or replacing hard courts, turf, irrigation, and landscaping; building or renovating athletic laboratories and lockers; consolidating, constructing, replacing, extending, upgrading, completing, or renovating various buildings for programs in math, science, liberal arts, business, art, and performing arts; replacing the campus police station; making landscaping improvements to increase water conservation; designing and installing an outdoor classroom for plays and lectures; converting library book-shelving areas into additional study, tutoring, and collaborative learning spaces; upgrading facilities to improve energy and resource efficiency; upgrading technology infrastructure; providing a joint-use athletic field at the City of Santa Monica's Memorial Park; providing a joint-use auditorium at the John Adams Middle School; and enhancing the District’s instructional presence in the City of Malibu. Bond proceeds may not be expended on teacher and administrator salaries and pensions and other operating expenses.

The Board shall cause independent performance and financial audits to be conducted annually to ensure that bond proceeds are spent only for the projects identified in the Measure. The Board shall appoint an independent Citizens’ Oversight Committee in accordance with the Education Code to ensure that bond proceeds are spent as specified in the Measure and as provided by law.

The maximum rate of interest on any bond shall not exceed the maximum rate allowed by law. Bonds issued pursuant to Education Code section 15264 et seq. shall have a maturity not exceeding twenty-five (25) years, and bonds issued pursuant to the Government Code shall have a maturity not exceeding forty (40) years. For compound interest bonds, the maturity shall not exceed twenty-five (25) years. According to the District’s Tax Rate Statement, the best estimate of the highest tax rate required to fund the bonds, and an estimate of the year in which that rate will apply, is $25 per $100,000 of assessed valuation of all property to be taxed in the year 2021-22. The estimate is based on estimated assessed valuations available when the District filed its Tax Rate Statement, or on a projection based on experience within the District, or other demonstrable factors.

This Measure requires a fifty-five percent (55%) vote for passage.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF MEASURE V

Vote Yes on Measure V!

For 87 years Santa Monica College has been the premier Community College in California. SMC is number one in transfers to the University of California and provides over 100 affordable fields of study and job-training programs.

50% of Santa Monica High School students attend SMC. SMC serves 1,000 veterans each year.

As technology changes the workplace and the cost of higher education soars, access to a high quality Community College education with safe, modern, and efficient facilities adaptable to changes in technology is more important than ever.

Measure V allows SMC to better meet the needs of our community by completing the 2010 Master Plan:

- Renovating, replacing or modernizing aging and inadequate facilities on the main campus, including replacing classroom trailers from the 1994 earthquake
- Providing a new Science Extension building
- Removing asbestos and bringing facilities up to current seismic, accessibility, and safety standards
- Upgrading for improved information and communications technologies, and greater energy efficiency and water conservation
- Implementing joint use projects including expanding Santa Monica’s Memorial Park, renovating the School District’s John Adams Middle School Auditorium, and enhancing community educational facilities in Malibu

All funds must be used locally. None of the bond proceeds can be taken away by the State. Independent audits are required.

It is the power of the student-teacher connection and the breadth and depth of the program that create the formula for SMC’s success. Its career and transfer oriented programs rival the nation’s best universities.

SMC has served more than 27,000 Santa Monica and Malibu residents in the past decade. More members of our community take classes at SMC than do residents of other districts at their community colleges. That’s why Measure V is supported by educators, parents, and local business and community leaders throughout our community.

Vote Yes on Measure V!

/s/ Dr. Louise Jaffe, Chair, Santa Monica College Board of Trustees
/s/ Tony Vazquez, Mayor, City of Santa Monica
/s/ Lou LaMonte, Mayor, City of Malibu
/s/ Denny Zane, Co-Chair, Santa Monicans for Renters Rights (SMRR); Former Santa Monica Mayor
/s/ Laurie Lieberman, President Santa Monica-Malibu Unified School District

REBUTTAL TO THE ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF MEASURE V

SMC says “show me the money.” We have 4 times.

Why raise our taxes a 5th time when we’re not getting the straight story?

What’s missing?

The amount of accumulated SMC bond debt previously approved for similar purposes -- fix or replace aging buildings -- each new request in sharply escalating amounts.

How this bond will differ from the 4 already passed. Most buildings have already been replaced. Some, funded from a past bond, have yet to be built. Vague descriptions for improvements and land acquisition are inadequate and unconvincing.

There’s no accounting of expenditures from previous bonds. How were they spent? What’s left? Why?

Why were previous approved bonds not enough?

The true amount of indebtedness for this bond is NOT $1.60/month for renters and $8.65/month for property owners as claimed. We’ll pay $722,483,675 in addition to the past 4 SMC bonds -- an astonishing $2 billion -- that won’t be paid until 2046.

The true number of local high school students who attend SMC full-time is a very small percentage despite the misleading statistics the College reports. Yet we are being asked to underwrite the cost of more facilities benefiting mostly out-of-district students. The state recognized that it has responsibility to help fund the open door policy of our community colleges, so Prop 51 on this same ballot, if passed, will provide billions of dollars for state community colleges, including SMC.

We’ve done our research.

Make an informed choice.

Vote NO on Measure V it’s Very excessive.

/s/ Doris Sosin, Former SM Recreation & Parks Commissioner, Founder & former chair, North of Montana Association
/s/ Robert T. Holbrook, Former Mayor, City of Santa Monica, Former Pres., SM-Malibu Unified School District Board
/s/ David Yuguchi, Board member, Northeast Neighbors
/s/ Peter Tigler, Former SM City Charter Review Commissioner, Former Chair, Pico Neighborhood Association
/s/ Colin Maduzia, Former SM Landmarks Commissioner, Former Board Member, Friends of Sunset Park
ARGUMENT AGAINST MEASURE V

$2 BILLION in Bond Obligations Is Too Much. VOTE NO on MEASURE V

Supporting higher education is NOT the issue here. If this bond measure passes, Santa Monica and Malibu property owners and tenants will be saddled with up to $2 billion tax obligations until the year 2046!

And this debt must be paid locally, even though only 4% of the over 30,000 SMC students are graduates of Santa Monica and Malibu high schools.

The 2015/2016 L.A. County Civil Grand Jury cautions that we spend too much on bonds before we have even repaid earlier ones.

Remember these SMC bonds? Here’s why the well is dry.

1992: $23 Million (Not paid off until 2022)
2002: $160 Million (Not paid off until 2032)
2004: $135 Million (Not paid off until 2034)
2008: $295 Million (Not paid off until 2038)
+2016: $345 Million (proposed) (Not paid off until 2046)

Total tax obligations (including interest) = up to $2 Billion

SMC is exempt from local land-use laws. It can build more buildings and generate more traffic without any municipal review. The SMC 2010 Facilities Master Plan estimated 5,600 new daily car trips, increasing traffic congestion at 36 intersections.

The $130 million Student Services building remains a huge hole in the ground since 2009. The new $24 million glass-walled Information Technology building was apparently built without air conditioning.

The Main Campus Quad cost $11 million. The Early Childhood Education Center near City Hall, budgeted at $7 million, will provide child care primarily for 110 children of City Hall, RAND, and SMC employees, many of whom are not local residents.

SMC must wisely spend the money we have generously given four times in recent years, recruit more local students, and be fully transparent and accountable.

Then we can talk about another bond.

/s/ Lorraine Sanchez, former member, SMC Citizens’ Bond Oversight Committee; former Vice President, Friends of Sunset Park; Pico neighborhood resident
/s/ Nancy Coleman, former member of the 2013-2014 Los Angeles County Civil Grand Jury; north of Montana resident
/s/ Ruthann Lehrer, former Santa Monica Landmarks Commissioner; Secretary, Northeast Neighborhood organization
/s/ Sherrill Kushner, former Board member, Santa Monica Public Library and Friends of the Library; Chair of the successful Library Bond Initiative campaign; north of Montana resident
/s/ Laurence Eubank, Former construction, real estate, corporate, and international development executive; Wilmont resident

REBUTTAL TO THE ARGUMENT AGAINST MEASURE V

Yes on Measure V.

Opponents’ claims against Measure V are simply false. Supporting education is the issue here.

All neighboring communities are committing to the same level of support for their community colleges as proposed by Measure V.

Repairing and modernizing Santa Monica College classrooms protects our community’s investment in SMC and gives our local residents facilities designed for a 21st Century education.

SMC has the State’s best faculty. Failing to repair our classrooms risks losing great teachers in future years.

SMC has kept its promises:

REDUCED CAR TRIPS:
- Award-winning public transit program, in place since 2008 = reduced car trips 30%
- Reduction of planned footprint by 20% due to new online education offerings = reduced car trips 10%

FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY:
- All SMC facilities are reviewed locally.
- Santa Monica College passed a County review of all school bond programs with honors.
- The Student Services building, now under construction with a new design, is saving taxpayers $30 million.

LOCAL PRIORITIES:
- The planned child care facility guarantees priority for Santa Monica residents.
- 50% of Santa Monica High School students attend SMC.
- More than 27,000 Santa Monica and Malibu residents have attended Santa Monica College in the past decade.

SMC remains number one in transfers to the University of California, UCLA and USC.

Measure V is supported by educators, parents, and local business and community leaders.

Have more questions? Call Dr. Kathryn Jeffery, SMC President, 310-434-4200 or visit VoteYESforSMC.com for more details and background.

SMC is Valued.

SMC is Vibrant.

SMC is Very Affordable.

Vote Yes for Measure V.

/s/ Barbara Inatsugu, President, League of Women Voters of Santa Monica; Sunset Park resident
/s/ Jennifer Ferro, President, KCRW
/s/ Oscar de la Torre, Co-Chair, Pico Neighborhood Association; Executive Director, Pico Youth & Family Center; Board Member, Santa Monica-Malibu Unified School District
/s/ Tony Vazquez, Mayor, City of Santa Monica
/s/ Lou LaMonte, Mayor, City of Malibu

/s/ Lorraine Sanchez, former member, SMC Citizens’ Bond Oversight Committee; former Vice President, Friends of Sunset Park; Pico neighborhood resident
/s/ Nancy Coleman, former member of the 2013-2014 Los Angeles County Civil Grand Jury; north of Montana resident
/s/ Ruthann Lehrer, former Santa Monica Landmarks Commissioner; Secretary, Northeast Neighborhood organization
/s/ Sherrill Kushner, former Board member, Santa Monica Public Library and Friends of the Library; Chair of the successful Library Bond Initiative campaign; north of Montana resident
/s/ Laurence Eubank, Former construction, real estate, corporate, and international development executive; Wilmont resident
Vote by Mail!

Go to www.lavote.net

It’s Easy!
It’s Convenient!
It’s Weatherproof!
my Vote counts
Mark your calendar. 
Don’t forget to vote on November 8, 2016!

October, 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sunday</th>
<th>Monday</th>
<th>Tuesday</th>
<th>Wednesday</th>
<th>Thursday</th>
<th>Friday</th>
<th>Saturday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Last day to register to vote for this election</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

November, 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sunday</th>
<th>Monday</th>
<th>Tuesday</th>
<th>Wednesday</th>
<th>Thursday</th>
<th>Friday</th>
<th>Saturday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Last day to request a Vote-by-Mail ballot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ELECTION DAY

WARNING !!! Your POLLING PLACE for this CITY ELECTION may be different from the polling place you went to for the last County Election.
POLLS OPEN AT 7 A.M.
AND CLOSE AT 8 P.M.

TAKE THIS SAMPLE BALLOT TO YOUR
POLLING PLACE FOR REFERENCE

NOTE: Your POLLING PLACE LOCATION, and the COMPLETE SAMPLE BALLOT, and the VOTE BY MAIL APPLICATION, are being mailed under separate cover as required by the COUNTY REGISTRAR’S OFFICE, which is conducting this election.

FOR ELECTION AND CAMPAIGN
FINANCING INFORMATION,
GO TO
WWW.SMGOV.NET