



OFFICE OF
**ASSESSOR-COUNTY CLERK-
RECORDER & ELECTIONS**
COUNTY OF SAN MATEO

RECEIVED

AUG 17 2026

MARK CHURCH
CHIEF ELECTIONS OFFICER &
ASSESSOR-COUNTY CLERK-RECORDER

City of Menlo Park

City Manager's Office

Ballot Measure Rebuttal Argument Submission Form

If both an argument in favor of and an argument against a measure have been selected for publication in the Sample Ballot & Official Voter Information Pamphlet, a **typed** rebuttal to the argument in favor of or the argument against the measure may be submitted as outlined in this form.

The author(s) of the primary argument of the measure may prepare and submit a rebuttal argument or may authorize in writing any other person or persons to prepare, submit or sign the rebuttal argument.

A rebuttal argument will not be accepted unless accompanied by this completed form, which shall contain the printed name(s) and signature(s) of the person(s) submitting it or, if submitted on behalf of a bona fide association of citizens, the name of the association and the printed name and signature of at least one of its principal officers. **Please make sure you are using proper format before submitting to the Elections Office.**

Word count limit for Rebuttal Arguments = 250 words

Ballot Measure P for the General Election to be held on Nov 3, 2026.

☒ Rebuttal to Argument in Favor of Measure P ☐ Rebuttal to Argument Against Measure _____

Signed by Same Individual(s) Selected for the Voter Information Pamphlet for the Primary Argument

If the rebuttal argument is signed by the same individual(s) as those already selected for the Voter Information Pamphlet for the primary argument, check the following box and **skip** the back side of this form.

☐

Rebuttal Argument Is Signed by Same Individual(s) Selected for the Voter Information Pamphlet for the Primary Argument

Contact Person's Printed Name:

Phone:

Email:

Signed by Different Individual(s) than Individual(s) Selected for the Voter Information Pamphlet for the Primary Argument

The author(s) of the primary argument may authorize *any other person or persons* to sign the rebuttal argument. If signers are new for the rebuttal argument, please check the following box, complete the back side of this form and attach the written authorization (the Authorization Form for Change in Signers of Rebuttal Argument) from the primary argument author(s).

☒

Rebuttal Argument Is Signed by New Signers as Authorized by Primary Argument Author(s)

Contact Person's Printed Name:

Karen Grove

Phone:

Email:

Arguments will be emailed to the contact person listed here for review before they are printed in the Sample Ballot & Official Voter Information Pamphlets.

Please complete the reverse side of this form.

40 Tower Road, San Mateo, CA 94402

P 650.312.5222 F 650.312.5348 email registrar@smcacre.gov web www.smcacre.gov



OFFICE OF
**ASSESSOR-COUNTY CLERK-
RECORDER & ELECTIONS**
COUNTY OF SAN MATEO

MARK CHURCH
CHIEF ELECTIONS OFFICER &
ASSESSOR-COUNTY CLERK-RECORDER

**Authorization Form for
Change in Signers of Rebuttal Arguments**

Pursuant to California Elections Code §§9167, 9317 and 9504, the author(s) of the primary argument in favor of or against a measure may authorize in writing *any other person or persons* to sign the rebuttal argument.

The undersigned author(s) of the primary argument hereby authorize(s) the following individual(s) to sign (up to five) the rebuttal argument to the primary argument in favor of against (circle one) Measure P for the Election to be held on 11/03/2026 :
(date of election)

NEW SIGNER(S) (PRINT CLEARLY):

Name of Rebuttal Argument Signer: Betsy Nash

Name of Rebuttal Argument Signer: Ross Silverstein

Name of Rebuttal Argument Signer: Margarita Méndez ← Z

Name of Rebuttal Argument Signer: Erin Paruszewski

Name of Rebuttal Argument Signer: Jeffery Liang

(The new signers listed here must sign the Ballot Measure Rebuttal Argument Submission Form)

NAME(S) & SIGNATURE OF ARGUMENT AUTHOR(S):

Rick Bonilla
Printed Name and Signature of Author

8-12-2026
Date

Betsy Nash
Printed Name and Signature of Author

Date



OFFICE OF
**ASSESSOR-COUNTY CLERK-
RECORDER & ELECTIONS**
COUNTY OF SAN MATEO

MARK CHURCH
CHIEF ELECTIONS OFFICER &
ASSESSOR-COUNTY CLERK-RECORDER

**Authorization Form for
Change in Signers of Rebuttal Arguments**

Pursuant to California Elections Code §§9167, 9317 and 9504, the author(s) of the primary argument in favor of or against a measure may authorize in writing *any other person or persons* to sign the rebuttal argument.

The undersigned author(s) of the primary argument hereby authorize(s) the following individual(s) to sign (up to five) the rebuttal argument to the primary argument in favor of against (circle one) Measure P for the Election to be held on 11/03/2026 :
(date of election)

NEW SIGNER(S) (PRINT CLEARLY):

Name of Rebuttal Argument Signer: _____

Name of Rebuttal Argument Signer: _____

Name of Rebuttal Argument Signer: _____

Name of Rebuttal Argument Signer: _____

Name of Rebuttal Argument Signer: _____

(The new signers listed here must sign the Ballot Measure Rebuttal Argument Submission Form)

NAME(S) & SIGNATURE(S) OF THE PRIMARY ARGUMENT AUTHOR(S):

Rick Bonilla

Printed Name and Signature of Author _____

_____ Date

Betsy Nash

Printed Name and Signature of Author _____

8-12-2026

_____ Date

Rebuttal Argument Signers Form

Pronouns

No more than five signatures shall appear with any argument. If more than five signatures are submitted, the first five listed shall be printed.

Names and titles listed will be printed in the order that they are listed below. A signer can only list one title. Honorifics such as M.D., Dr., Esquire, etc. with a name are not accepted.

If the signers are part of a bona fide association, for each such signing individual(s), the title under the signer's name shall list the name of that bona fide association and may include their position within that association. By signing below, the undersigned state that they have read the argument and believe it not to be false or misleading. **Type** information clearly.

Check one of the boxes below

1.	Name: <u>Betsy Nash</u>	Title: <u>Mayor City of Menlo Park</u>	He/His: ☐
			She/Her: ☒
			They/Them: ☐
	Date: <u>8-12-2020</u>		
2.	Name: <u>✓</u>	Title:	He/His: ☐
	Phone:	Email:	She/Her: ☐
	Address:		They/Them: ☐
	Signature:	Date:	
3.	Name:	Title:	He/His: ☐
	Phone:	Email:	She/Her: ☐
	Address:		They/Them: ☐
	Signature:	Date:	
4.	Name:	Title:	He/His: ☐
	Phone:	Email:	She/Her: ☐
	Address:		They/Them: ☐
	Signature:	Date:	
5.	Name:	Title:	He/His: ☐
	Phone:	Email:	She/Her: ☐
	Address:		They/Them: ☐
	Signature:	Date:	

Submit a second form (this side only) for alternate signers attached to this form and the argument.

Rebuttal Argument Signers Form

Pronouns

No more than five signatures shall appear with any argument. If more than five signatures are submitted, the first five listed shall be printed.

Names and titles listed will be printed in the order that they are listed below. A signer can only list one title. Honorifics such as M.D., Dr., Esquire, etc. with a name are not accepted.

If the signers are part of a bona fide association, for each such signing individual(s), the title under the signer's name shall list the name of that bona fide association and may include their position within that association. By signing below, the undersigned state that they have read the argument and believe it not to be false or misleading. **Type** information clearly.

Check one of the boxes below

1.	Name:	Title:	He/ His: ☐
	Phone:	Email:	She/ Her: ☐
	Address:		They/ Them: ☐
	Signature:	Date:	
2.	Name: Ross Silverstein	Title: Chair, Menlo Park Planning Commission	He/ His: ☒
			She/ Her: ☐
			They/ Them: ☐
	Date: 8/15/26		
3.	Name:	Title:	He/ His: ☐
	Phone:	Email:	She/ Her: ☐
	Address:		They/ Them: ☐
	Signature:	Date:	
4.	Name:	Title:	He/ His: ☐
	Phone:	Email:	She/ Her: ☐
	Address:		They/ Them: ☐
	Signature:	Date:	
5.	Name:	Title:	He/ His: ☐
	Phone:	Email:	She/ Her: ☐
	Address:		They/ Them: ☐
	Signature:	Date:	

Submit a second form (this side only) for alternate signers attached to this form and the argument.

Rebuttal Argument Signers Form

Pronouns

No more than five signatures shall appear with any argument. If more than five signatures are submitted, the first five listed shall be printed.

Names and titles listed will be printed in the order that they are listed below. A signer can only list one title. Honorifics such as M.D., Dr., Esquire, etc. with a name are not accepted.

If the signers are part of a bona fide association, for each such signing individual(s), the title under the signer's name shall list the name of that bona fide association and may include their position within that association. By signing below, the undersigned state that they have read the argument and believe it not to be false or misleading. **Type** information clearly.

Check one of the boxes below

1.	Name:	Title:	He/ His: ☐
	Phone:	Email:	She/ Her: ☐
	Address:		They/ Them: ☐
	Signature:	Date:	
2.	Name:	Title:	He/ His: ☐
	Phone:	Email:	She/ Her: ☐
	Address:		They/ Them: ☐
	Signature:	Date:	
3.	Name: Margarita Mendez	Title: Public School Teacher	He/ His: ☐
			She/ Her: ☐
			They/ Them: ☐
4.	Name: Erin Pareszewski	Title: Menlo Park Small Business Owner	He/ His: ☐
			She/ Her: ☒
			They/ Them: ☐
5.	Name:	Title:	He/ His: ☐
	Phone:	Email:	She/ Her: ☐
	Address:		They/ Them: ☐
	Signature:	Date:	

Submit a second form (this side only) for alternate signers attached to this form and the argument.

Rebuttal Argument Signers Form			Pronouns
No more than five signatures shall appear with any argument. If more than five signatures are submitted, the first five listed shall be printed. Names and titles listed will be printed in the order that they are listed below. A signer can only list one title. Honorifics such as M.D., Dr., Esquire, etc. with a name are not accepted. If the signers are part of a bona fide association, for each such signing individual(s), the title under the signer's name shall list the name of that bona fide association and may include their position within that association. By signing below, the undersigned state that they have read the argument and believe it not to be false or misleading. Type information clearly.			Check one of the boxes below
1.	Name:	Title:	He/His: ☐
	Phone:	Email:	She/Her: ☐
	Address:		They/Them: ☐
	Signature:	Date:	
2.	Name:	Title:	He/His: ☐
	Phone:	Email:	She/Her: ☐
	Address:		They/Them: ☐
	Signature:	Date:	
3.	Name: Margarita Méndez	Title: Public School Teacher	He/His: ☐
	[Redacted]		She/Her: ☒
			They/Them: ☐
	Date: 8/15/2026		
4.	Name: <i>Jeffery Liang</i>	Title: Menlo Park Small Business owner	He/His: ☒
	[Redacted]		She/Her: ☐
			They/Them: ☐
	Date: 8/15/26.		
5.	Name:	Title:	He/His: ☐
	Phone:	Email:	She/Her: ☐
	Address:		They/Them: ☐
	Signature:	Date:	

Submit a second form (this side only) for alternate signers attached to this form and the argument.

244

Rebuttal to the Argument in Favor of Measure P
City of Menlo Park
245/250 Words

- 15 11 Don't let the group proposing this measure fool you. Voting for Measure P will NOT save downtown, will NOT improve parking, and will NOT create affordable homes. 15 11
- 13 12 11 This small group prioritizes inefficient parking lots over the community's needs. They ignore vacant storefronts. They ignore the young families, seniors, teachers, nurses, firefighters, city staff, retail employees, and others who are priced out of Menlo Park. 13 12 11
- 11 14 15 Measure P will block affordable homes and convenient, modern parking downtown. Measure P risks losing local control city-wide because, despite what the proponents say, the city's annual report shows that the downtown sites are essential to the city's plan for affordable homes. 11 14 15
- 13 12 Measure P ignores reality and the need to address housing costs in Menlo Park. Unnecessary barriers will only worsen our affordability crisis. Our community cannot afford Measure P. 13 12
- 14 14 9 Measure P includes a poison pill: if anyone sues over this measure, only the three people who put it on the ballot — not voters, not City Council — get to make the final decision about defending it. But Menlo Park taxpayers pay the legal fees. 14 14 9
- 14 12 5 Measure P supporters say building housing downtown will hurt business. This is FALSE. As we have seen in neighboring communities, improving parking and adding housing means more small businesses and more customers. 14 12 5
- 11 6 Measure P would interfere with the City's decision-making process related to City-owned downtown parking lot properties, including improvements. 11 6
- 13 Measure P is bad policy that makes our community more expensive and less accessible. 13
- 12 3 Join us, Congressman Sam Liccardo, and Habitat for Humanity in voting NO on Measure P to save Downtown Menlo Park! 12 3

RECEIVED

AUG 17 2026

City of Menlo Park
City Manager's Office

244

244

Rebuttal to the Argument in Favor of Measure P
City of Menlo Park
245/250 Words

Don't let the group proposing this measure fool you. Voting for Measure P will NOT save downtown, will NOT improve parking, and will NOT create affordable homes.

This small group prioritizes inefficient parking lots over the community's needs. They ignore vacant storefronts. They ignore the young families, seniors, teachers, nurses, firefighters, city staff, retail employees, and others who are priced out of Menlo Park.

Measure P will block affordable homes and convenient, modern parking downtown. Measure P risks losing local control city-wide because, despite what the proponents say, the city's annual report shows that the downtown sites are essential to the city's plan for affordable homes.

Measure P ignores reality and the need to address housing costs in Menlo Park. Unnecessary barriers will only worsen our affordability crisis. Our community cannot afford Measure P.

Measure P includes a poison pill: if anyone sues over this measure, only the three people who put it on the ballot — not voters, not City Council — get to make the final decision about defending it. But Menlo Park taxpayers pay the legal fees.

Measure P supporters say building housing downtown will hurt business. This is FALSE. As we have seen in neighboring communities, improving parking and adding housing means more small businesses and more customers.

Measure P would interfere with the City's decision-making process related to City-owned downtown parking lot properties, including improvements.

Measure P is bad policy that makes our community more expensive and less accessible.

Join us, Congressman Sam Liccardo, and Habitat for Humanity in voting NO on Measure P to save Downtown Menlo Park!