

TO:

Diane C Fridley, Registrar of Voters
255 N Forbes St Lakeport CA 95453

Anita L. Grant, County Counsel
255 N Forbes St Lakeport CA 95453

DATE: November 28, 2018

RE: Demand to Not Certify Elections Due to Offenses Against the Elective Franchise

We are extremely disappointed that you did not respond to, much less heed, our notice of August 2, 2018 regarding conforming school measure ballots to the mandatory requirements of the Elections Code and the Education Code.

Non-Conforming Ballot Statements

By not conforming the ballot statements to the law, you have permitted the school and college districts (and other taxing agencies) to deceive the voters about the nature of the underlying measure. When the law is ignored, the measure itself, as you well know, is never referenced in the ballot statement. That is by design. Elections Code 13119(a), if applied as written, vanquishes that deception. In addition, the printed full text of the measure is separated from the sample ballot in the voter information guide by pages and pages of material and advertisements resulting in barely one in twenty voters recognizing that they are voting, not on a marketing question, but on a contractual obligation specified in the text of the measure.

The purpose of the legislature's mandatory requirements are to improve disclosure and end deception. Both of these are substantive and not merely procedural or directory in nature.

The legislature has determined that your printing and circulation of non-conforming ballot statements is an offense against the elective franchise and subject to criminal sanctions.

The following measures appear to or are likely to exceed the constitutional threshold for passage. Each ballot statement contains one or more points of non-conformance.

Measure H (Prop 39 bond) 58.07% (Passing)

To replace outdated portables and construct permanent 21st century learning environments, modernize existing classrooms, enhance student safety and security, upgrade school grounds, and improve career technical and ag facilities, shall Middletown Unified School District issue \$28,000,000 of bonds with an estimated annual average tax levy of \$1,623,000 for 35 years and a projected tax rate of 6 cents per \$100 of assessed valuation, with an independent Citizens' Oversight Committee, annual audits, and no money for administrator salaries?

Non-conforming offenses for this ballot statement include:

- objectively false or deceptive statement in synopsis - ELC 13119(c)[1]
- uses argumentative language - ELC 13119(c)[4]
- benefits language to create prejudice for the measure - ELC 13119(c)[4]
- not in the form "Shall the measure (stating the nature thereof) be adopted?" - ELC 13119(a)
- omission of maximum rate of interest - EDC 15122[3]

Measure I (Prop 39 bond) 60.48% (Passing)

To construct and modernize classrooms, upgrade career technology education, enhance safety/security, provide 21st century learning

environments at Upper Lake High School, and provide the local match for State grants, shall the measure of Upper Lake Unified School District be adopted authorizing \$10,000,000 in bonds at legal rates, averaging \$527,000 raised annually to repay bonds through maturity from levies of approximately three cents per \$100 of assessed valuation, with citizens oversight and audits, and no money for administrator salaries?

Non-conforming offenses for this ballot statement include:

- objectively false or deceptive statement in synopsis - ELC 13119(c)[1]
- benefits language to create prejudice for the measure - ELC 13119(c)[4]
- not in the form "Shall the measure (stating the nature thereof) be adopted?" - ELC 13119(a)
- omission of maximum rate of interest - EDC 15122[3]

Measure J (Prop 39 bond) 61.83% (Passing)

To construct, modernize and rehabilitate K-8 classrooms, improve access to modern technology, install shade structures, improve play areas, enhance safety/security, and provide the local match for State grants, shall the measure of Upper Lake Unified School District SFID #1 be adopted authorizing \$12,000,000 in bonds at legal rates, averaging \$665,000 raised annually to repay bonds through maturity from levies of approximately six cents per \$100 of assessed valuation, with citizens oversight and audits, and no money for administrator salaries?

Non-conforming offenses for this ballot statement include:

- objectively false or deceptive statement in synopsis - ELC 13119(c)[1]
- not in the form "Shall the measure (stating the nature thereof) be adopted?" - ELC 13119(a)
- omission of maximum rate of interest - EDC 15122[3]
- word count of 76 exceeds statutory limit - EDC 5322/ELC 13247

Measure K (cannabis business tax) (Uncertain)

Shall Article VII be added to Chapter 18 of the Lake County Code imposing a Cannabis Business Tax in the unincorporated areas of the County, which, as of January 1, 2021, will impose an annual tax of \$1.00 per square foot for nursery cultivation, 4% of gross receipts on a cannabis dispensary, micro-business, or delivery business, and 2.5% of gross receipts on a cannabis manufacturing, processing, transportation, distribution or other type of cannabis business?

Non-conforming offenses for this ballot statement include:

- not in the form "Shall the measure (stating the nature thereof) be adopted?" - ELC 13119(a)

Measure L (parcel tax) (Uncertain)

In order to continue to provide sufficient funding for fire and emergency medical services, shall South Lake County Fire Protection District Ordinance No. 2018-19 01 be approved authorizing the District to impose and levy a special tax having a maximum rate of \$10.00 per benefit unit and increasing the District's appropriations limit to permit spending of the revenue raised by the special tax, be approved?

Non-conforming offenses for this ballot statement include:

- benefits language to create prejudice for the measure - ELC 13119(c)[4]
- not in the form "Shall the measure (stating the nature thereof) be adopted?" - ELC 13119(a)

Failure of Measures to Qualify Under the Requirements of Proposition 39

Beyond your willful failure to conform the ballot statements to the statutory requirements, you have failed to qualify the Proposition 39 measures themselves with respect to the constitutional requirements that the measures claim to avail themselves of, to wit:

1) prohibit the use of bond proceeds for any purpose, including salaries and operating costs, other than the construction, reconstruction, rehabilitation, and replacement of school facilities [Art. XIII A, Section 1(b)(3)(A)], and

2) present to the voters, before they vote, a list of the specific school facility projects to be funded by the proceeds. [Art. XIII A, Section 1(b)(3)(B)]

Each and every one of the measures contains language specifically intended to avoid the limitations as to the authorized uses of the bond proceeds.

Each and every one of the measures contains language specifically intended to expend bond proceeds on purposes other than construction of school facilities. Among the unauthorized purposes, the measures explicitly purport to authorize expenditures for administration and operating costs, notwithstanding the explicit prohibition of Proposition 39.

Each and every one of the measures contains language specifically intended to expand the project list to anything and everything under the sun, all to be determined at a later date.

Your failure to qualify Proposition 39 measures appearing on the ballot is, similarly, an offense against the elective franchise.

Impartial Analysis

The allegedly impartial analysis of measures in which county counsel is required to present independent, impartial legal opinions, is merely a regurgitation, often using direct quotations, of language from the measure itself or from the tax rate statement.

A reading of the analysis provides the voting public with no insight that is not already in the other materials in the voter information guide. The highlight of the analysis appears to be that "Yes" means "Yes" and "No" means "No." Woe to those without a top-notch public education who might be confused.

Moreover, county counsel fails to address the requirements of the Elections Code and, for school bond measures, the Education Code with respect to the ballot statement. County counsel also fails to address the language that purports to override the qualification restrictions with respect to Proposition 39 measures.

The effect of a wholly uncritical opinion is that those voters who read the Impartial Analysis are misled by a putatively authoritative source.

Conclusion

By allowing proponents to avoid mandatory disclosure requirements, no one can know, with any degree of certainty, what the will of the voters might have been had they been presented with an honest ballot containing all mandatory disclosures, containing no false or misleading statements, and containing no argumentative or prejudicial language.

As one state supreme court has held:

No one can say with any certainty what the vote of the electorate would have been if the voting public had been given the whole truth, as mandated by the statute, and had been told

"the chief purpose of the measure."

Those who object to forced taxation through the fraudulent and unlawful ballot statements and measures have been injured due to your foregoing willful failures to follow the law. The only adequate remedy for this total contempt and disregard of the laws enacted to guarantee a fair and impartial election process is that you not certify the elections identified above.

Sincerely,

Richard Michael
California School Bonds Clearinghouse

Alex Aliferis
Former Executive Director of Contra Costa Taxpayers Association

Bernadette Chenard-Hsing
Activist

Fred H. Crane
Taxpayer

Linda Davis
Advocate for Honest School Bonds

John A. Davison
Voting and Taxpayers Advocate

Alison Herson
Taxpayer in Allan Hancock College Joint Community College District

Dan Hilker
Taxpayer in Allan Hancock College Joint Community College District

Sandra Kallander
Politics Reduction Activist and Voter

Michael R. Kupperberg
Sonoma County Resident of 30 plus years

David E. Kenney, Esq.

Peter Loeb
Former Mayor, Pacifica, CA

Savina Q. Low
Taxpayer

Douglas Mills
Taxpayer

Stephen C Petzold
The Center for Truth in School Bond Measures ID 1408280

Miyo Prassas
Hermosa Beach Community Advocate

Michael Robertson
Concerned Taxpayer

Honor "Mimi" Robson
Libertarian Party of California Chair

Sally Smith
Taxpayer in San Diego Unified School District

Ludd A. Trozpek
California resident and citizen

Dawn Urbanek
CUSDWatch

