

Council Meeting of  
March 9, 2010

Honorable Mayor and Members  
of the City Council  
City Hall  
Torrance, California

Members of the City Council:

**SUBJECT: Adding a proposed Charter Amendment to the General Municipal Election called for June 8, 2010**

### **RECOMMENDATION**

Recommendation of the City Clerk that City Council:

- 1) Adopt a **RESOLUTION** proposing a charter amendment to be placed on the Tuesday, June 8, 2010 General Municipal Election;
- 2) Take action on other election **RESOLUTIONS** and **ORDINANCE** as necessary and appropriate.

### **Funding**

Funding is available in the City Clerk's 2009-2011 budget.

### **BACKGROUND / ANALYSIS**

In December the City Council Citizen Development & Enrichment Committee met with a committee from the Torrance Unified School District to discuss the possible consolidation of school district elections with the Torrance general municipal election. On January 12, 2010 the City Council approved in concept the placing of a ballot measure to change the general municipal election date to the last Tuesday in April of even years.

The City Council called the general municipal election on January 26, 2010 and was given the option to add a charter amendment at a later date. On January 12, 2010 Mayor Scott appointed an Ad Hoc Ballot Measure Committee to work on ballot arguments and look at the issues surrounding the placement of the proposed ballot measure to change the Torrance General Municipal election date to the last Tuesday in April of even years. That committee met on February 22, 2010. The Committee asked that all material be brought forward for full review by the City Council. Material from that meeting is attached and will be referenced.

### **DISCUSSION**

The Committee had asked that all options be brought back to the full City Council for consideration. The proposal to allow two arguments in favor and two arguments against is not in the options as it was the opinion of the City Attorney that under California Election Code 9287 the City Council is not clearly able to specifically authorize a signer or specific signers of a second argument in favor. The City Attorney has noted that the City Council can, under Government Code 9285, authorize specific other individuals to sign rebuttal arguments to any argument against, if filed.

It is optional to allow rebuttals but if the City Council chooses that option it must be done by resolution.

A series of resolutions and an urgency ordinance follow.

A. To add the measure:

**RESOLUTION 2010 – 22 FOR THE SUBMISSION OF A PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT RELATING TO A CHANGE OF ELECTION DATE.**

This is a yes or no question to voters to change the date of the election to the last Tuesday in April of each even number year. Section 500 of the Charter is shown with replacement in strike-through fashion.

B. To allow up to seven signatures on ballot arguments

**URGENCY ORDINANCE NO. 3725 AUTHORIZING SEVEN SIGNATURES ON AN ARGUMENT AND ANY AUTHORIZED REBUTTAL TO AN ARGUMENT SUBMITTED IN OPPOSITION TO ANY MEASURE THAT WILL BE SUBMITTED TO THE VOTERS AT THE JUNE 8, 2010 GENERAL MUNICIPAL ELECTION.**

The Election Code currently holds the signers to no more than five names. Under Charter section 500 the City Council may by ordinance set procedures for the holding of elections. The Election Code states that any ordinance related to an election take effect immediately.

C. Setting argument priorities and request for preparation of an impartial analysis

**RESOLUTION NO. 2010 -23 SETTING PRIORITIES FOR FILING A WRITTEN ARGUMENT REGARDING A CITY MEASURE AND DIRECTING THE CITY ATTORNEY TO PREPARE AN IMPARTIAL ANALYSIS.**

The City Clerk as the elections official is given discretion, with protocols, in choosing the 300 word arguments to be printed. As this measure is being submitted by the City Council the City Council will be given first priority in filing the argument in favor. If the City Council does not file an argument the City Clerk will follow the protocols. If no arguments are filed against the measure the sample ballot pamphlet will reflect that.

If the City Council feels that an impartial analysis is necessary the City Attorney should be directed to prepare a document that will also be published in the sample ballot.

D. Providing for the filing of rebuttal arguments

**RESOLUTION NO. 2010 – 24 PROVIDING FOR THE FILING OF REBUTTAL ARGUMENTS FOR CITY MEASURES SUBMITTED AT MUNICIPAL ELECTIONS.**

Rebuttals are optional. In order to be allowed, the City Council must adopt a resolution substantially in the form it is written.

The City Clerk sets the dates for preparation of arguments in favor and arguments against and will provide direction and materials for the submission. All arguments will be open for public examination.

Note that each actual author of an argument either in favor or against, may authorize in writing any other person or persons to prepare, submit, or sign the rebuttal argument.

E. Request for specific measure designation on the ballot

The City is allowed to request a specific letter for any submitted ballot measure and the City Clerk will make that request if the City Council so desires.

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

The City Clerk recommends that the City Council take action on the resolutions and ordinance attached.

Respectfully submitted,



Sue Herbers  
City Clerk

Noted:



LEROY JACKSON  
CITY MANAGER

Attachments:

- A Resolution 2010-22 Submitting Charter amendment
- B Ordinance 3725 Authorizing seven signatures
- C. Resolution 2010-23 Setting priorities for arguments
- D. Resolution 2010-24 Providing for filing rebuttal arguments
- E. Material from Feb 22, 2010 Ad Hoc City Council Ballot Measure Committee meeting.



**RESOLUTION 2010 - 22****A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF TORRANCE, CALIFORNIA, FOR THE SUBMISSION OF A PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT RELATING TO A CHANGE OF ELECTION DATE.**

**WHEREAS**, pursuant to authority provided by Article XI of the Constitution, Title 4, Division 2, Chapter 3 of the Government Code and Division 9, Chapter 3, Article 3 (commencing at § 9255) of the Elections Code of the State of California, the City Council of the City of Torrance desires to submit to the voters a proposed charter amendment relating to changing the general municipal election date; and

**WHEREAS**, the City Council is authorized and directed by statute to submit the proposed charter amendment to the voters;

**NOW, THEREFORE, THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF TORRANCE, CALIFORNIA, DOES RESOLVE, DECLARE, DETERMINE AND ORDER AS FOLLOWS:**

**SECTION 1:** That pursuant to Article XI of the Constitution, Title 4, Division 2, Chapter 3 of the Government Code and Division 9, Chapter 3, Article 3 (commencing at § 9255) of the Elections Code of the State of California, there is called and ordered to be held in the City of Torrance, California, on Tuesday, June 8, 2010, a General Municipal Election for the purpose of submitting the following proposed charter amendment:

<b>Should section 510 of the Charter of the City of Torrance be amended to change the date of holding the general municipal election to the last Tuesday in April of each even numbered year?</b>	YES
	NO

**SECTION 2.** That the text of the charter amendment submitted to the voters is as follows:

**SECTION 510. GENERAL MUNICIPAL ELECTIONS**

General municipal elections shall be held in said City on the ~~same day as the statewide direct primary election~~ last Tuesday in April of each even numbered year.

**SECTION 3.** That the ballots to be used at the election shall be in form and content as required by law.

**SECTION 4.** That the City Clerk is authorized, instructed and directed to procure and furnish any and all official ballots, notices, printed matter and all supplies, equipment and paraphernalia that may be necessary in order to properly and lawfully conduct the election.

**SECTION 5.** That the polls shall be open at seven o'clock a.m. of the day of the election and shall remain open continuously from that time until eight o'clock p.m. of the same day when the polls shall be closed, pursuant to Election Code § 10242, except as provided in § 14401 of the Elections Code of the State of California.

**SECTION 6.** That in all particulars not recited in this resolution, the election shall be held and conducted as provided by law for holding municipal elections.

**SECTION 7.** That notice of the time and place of holding the election is given and the City Clerk is authorized, instructed and directed to give further or additional notice of the election, in time, form and manner as required by law.

**SECTION 8.** That the City Clerk shall certify to the passage and adoption of this resolution and enter it into the book of original resolutions.

PASSED, APPROVED AND ADOPTED ON MARCH 9, 2010.

APPROVED AS TO FORM:  
JOHN FELLOWS III, City Attorney

\_\_\_\_\_  
Mayor Frank Scotto  
ATTEST:

By \_\_\_\_\_  
Patrick Q. Sullivan, Assistant City Attorney

\_\_\_\_\_  
Sue Herbers, City Clerk

**URGENCY ORDINANCE NO. 3725****AN URGENCY ORDINANCE OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF TORRANCE AUTHORIZING SEVEN SIGNATURES ON AN ARGUMENT AND ANY AUTHORIZED REBUTTAL TO AN ARGUMENT SUBMITTED IN OPPOSITION TO ANY MEASURE THAT WILL BE SUBMITTED TO THE VOTERS AT THE JUNE 8, 2010 GENERAL MUNICIPAL ELECTION.**

This ordinance is adopted with reference to the following facts:

- A. Section 9282 of the California Elections Code provides that the City Council or any member or members of the City Council may file a written argument in favor or against any city measure.
- B. Section 9283 of the Elections Code limits the number of signatures that may appear on a ballot argument to five.
- C. The Torrance City Council is composed of seven council members.
- D. Section 500 of the City's Charter allows the City Council by ordinance to set forth its own procedures for the holding of City elections.

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

**SECTION 1**

That the City Council authorizes up to seven Council members to sign any argument and any authorized rebuttal to an argument submitted in opposition to any measure that will be submitted to the voters at the election of June 8, 2010.

**SECTION 2**

That the City Council authorizes not more than seven signatures on any argument or authorized rebuttal submitted in opposition to any measure that will be submitted to the voters at the election of June 8, 2010.

**SECTION 3**

Any provisions of the Torrance Municipal Code or its appendices, or any other ordinances of the City inconsistent with this ordinance, to the extent of the inconsistencies and no further, are repealed.

**SECTION 4**

If any section, subsection, sentence, clause, or phrase of this ordinance is for any reason held to be invalid or unconstitutional by the decision of any court of competent jurisdiction, the decision will not affect the validity of the remaining portions of the ordinance. The City Council declares that it would have passed this ordinance and each section, subsection, sentence, clause and phrase, irrespective of the fact that any one or more sections, subsections, sentences, clauses or phrases are declared invalid or unconstitutional.

**SECTION 5**

This ordinance relating to an election will take effect and be in full force immediately upon its passage and adoption. Within fifteen days following adoption, this ordinance or a summary of this ordinance, if authorized by the City Council, will be published at least once in the Daily Breeze, a newspaper of general circulation, published and circulated in the City of Torrance.

**INTRODUCED, APPROVED, AND ADOPTED THE 9<sup>TH</sup> DAY OF MARCH, 2010.**

APPROVED AS TO FORM:  
JOHN L. FELLOWS III, City Attorney

\_\_\_\_\_  
Mayor Frank Scotto  
ATTEST:

By \_\_\_\_\_  
Patrick Q. Sullivan, Assistant City Attorney

\_\_\_\_\_  
Sue Herbers, City Clerk

**RESOLUTION NO. 2010 -23**

**A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF TORRANCE, CALIFORNIA, SETTING PRIORITIES FOR FILING A WRITTEN ARGUMENT REGARDING A CITY MEASURE AND DIRECTING THE CITY ATTORNEY TO PREPARE AN IMPARTIAL ANALYSIS.**

**WHEREAS**, a General Municipal Election is to be held in the City of Torrance California, on June 8, 2010, at which there will be submitted to the voters the following measure:

<p><b>Should section 510 of the Charter of the City of Torrance be amended to change the date of holding the general municipal election to the last Tuesday in April of each even numbered year?</b></p>	<p>YES</p>
	<p>NO</p>

**SECTION 1.** That the City Council authorizes any or all seven members of the City Council to file a written argument In Favor of or Against City measure not exceeding 300 words, accompanied by the printed names and signatures of the authors submitting it, in accordance with Article 4, Chapter 3, Division 9 of the Elections Code of the State of California and to change the argument until and including the date fixed by the City Clerk after which no arguments for or against the City measure may be submitted to the City Clerk.

The arguments shall be filed with the City Clerk, signed, with the printed names and signatures of the authors submitting it, or if submitted on behalf of an organization, the name of the organization, and the printed name and signature of at least one of its principal officers who is the author of the argument. The arguments shall be accompanied by the Declaration by Authors of Arguments or Rebuttals Form provided by the Los Angeles County Registrar Recorder/County Clerk through the City Clerk.

**SECTION 2.** That the city council directs the City Clerk to transmit a copy of the measure to the city attorney, unless the organization or salaries of the office of the city attorney are affected. The city attorney shall prepare an impartial analysis of the measure not exceeding 500 words showing the effect of the measure on the existing law and the operation of the measure. The impartial analysis shall be filed by the date set by the City Clerk for the filing of primary arguments.

**SECTION 3.** That the City Clerk shall certify to the passage and adoption of this resolution and enter it into the book of original resolutions.

**PASSED, APPROVED AND ADOPTED ON MARCH 9, 2010.**

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

JOHN L. FELLOWS III, City Attorney

\_\_\_\_\_  
 Mayor Frank Scotto  
 ATTEST:

By \_\_\_\_\_  
 Patrick Q. Sullivan, Assistant City Attorney

\_\_\_\_\_  
 Sue Herbers, City Clerk



RESOLUTION NO. 2010 - 24

**A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF  
TORRANCE, CALIFORNIA, PROVIDING FOR THE FILING OF  
REBUTTAL ARGUMENTS FOR CITY MEASURES SUBMITTED  
AT MUNICIPAL ELECTIONS.**

**WHEREAS**, § 9285 of the Elections Code of the State of California authorizes the City Council, by majority vote, to adopt provisions to provide for the filing of rebuttal arguments for city measures submitted at municipal elections;

**NOW, THEREFORE, THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF TORRANCE, CALIFORNIA, DOES RESOLVE, DECLARE, DETERMINE AND ORDER AS FOLLOWS:**

**SECTION 1.** That pursuant to Section 9285 of the Elections Code of the State of California, when the elections official has selected the arguments for and against the measure which will be printed and distributed to the voters, the elections official shall send a copy of an argument in favor of the proposition to the authors of any argument against the measure and a copy of an argument against the measure to the authors of any argument in favor of the measure immediately upon receiving the arguments.

The author or a majority of the authors of an argument relating to a city measure may prepare and submit a rebuttal argument not exceeding 250 words or may authorize in writing any other person or persons to prepare, submit, or sign the rebuttal argument.

A rebuttal argument may not be signed by more than seven authors.

The rebuttal arguments shall be filed with the City Clerk, signed, with the printed name(s) and signature(s) of the author(s) submitting it, or if submitted on behalf of an organization, the name of the organization, and the printed name and signature of at least one of its principal officers, **not more than 10 days after** the final date for filing direct arguments. The rebuttal arguments shall be accompanied by the Declaration by Authors of Arguments or Rebuttals Form provided by the Los Angeles County Registrar Recorder/County Clerk through the City Clerk. Rebuttal arguments shall be printed in the same manner as the direct arguments. Each rebuttal argument shall immediately follow the direct argument which it seeks to rebut.

**SECTION 2.** That all previous resolutions providing for the filing of rebuttal arguments for city measures are repealed.

**SECTION 3.** That the provisions of Section 1 shall apply only to the election to be held on June 8, 2010, and shall then be repealed.

**SECTION 4.** That the City Clerk shall certify to the passage and adoption of this Resolution and enter it into the book of original Resolutions.

**PASSED, APPROVED AND ADOPTED ON MARCH 9, 2010.**

APPROVED AS TO FORM:  
JOHN L. FELLOWS III, City Attorney

\_\_\_\_\_  
Mayor Frank Scotto  
ATTEST:

By \_\_\_\_\_  
Patrick Q. Sullivan, Assistant City Attorney

\_\_\_\_\_  
Sue Herbers, City Clerk



# A G E N D A

## CITY COUNCIL AD HOC BALLOT MEASURE COMMITTEE

DATE: Monday, February 22, 2010

TIME: 4:30 p.m.

PLACE: Torrance City Hall, City Manager's Assembly Room, Third Floor

COMMITTEE MEMBERS: Councilman Pat Furey, Chair  
Councilman Gene Barnett  
Councilwoman Susan Rhilinger

STAFF: Sue Herbers, City Clerk  
Aram Chaparyan, Assistant to the City Manager  
Deputy City Attorney Thompson Bell  
Deputy City Attorney Poblete

**SUBJECT: ELECTION BALLOT MEASURE**

---

- |      |  |                         |
|------|--|-------------------------|
| I.   | Welcome and Introductions                          | Chairman Furey          |
| II.  | Proposed Charter Change Ballot Measure Information | Sue Herbers, City Clerk |
| III. | Discussion   | Committee Members       |
|      | ▶ Arguments  |                         |
|      | ▶ Order of Preference                              |                         |
|      | ▶ Number of Signers                                |                         |
|      | ▶ Number of Arguments                              |                         |
|      | ▶ Rebuttals  |                         |
|      | ▶ Argument Deadlines                               |                         |
|      | ▶ Public Review                                    |                         |
|      | ▶ Impartial Analysis                               |                         |
| III. | Public Comment                                     |                         |
| VII. | Adjournment  |                         |

**City of Torrance  
Office of the City Clerk**

Date: February 19, 2010  
 To: Ad Hoc Ballot Measure Committee  
 Chairman Furey  
 Councilmembers Barnett and Rhilinger  
 cc: Deputy City Attorney Thompson Bell  
 Deputy City Attorney Poblete  
 From: Sue Herbers, City Clerk  
 RE: Proposed Charter Change Ballot Measure Information

The committee has been charged with writing the ballot argument and to review the options that the City Council can take regarding the arguments. The options will be presented to the entire Council which will allow the City Clerk to have correct resolutions and ordinances, as desired, in place for adoption at the March 9 meeting as the election deadlines are quite tight.

**GENERAL INFORMATION**

The proposed ballot measure itself is a simple question - to ask voters if they wish to change the date of the Torrance General Municipal Election to the last Tuesday in April of even years.

Neither the consolidation with TUSD nor a Vote By Mail (VBM) election are questions on the ballot at this time.

The measure is proposed as follows:

<b>CITY OF TORRANCE CHARTER AMENDMENT</b>	
<b>Should section 510 of the Charter of the City of Torrance be amended to change the date of holding the general municipal election to the last Tuesday in April of each even numbered year?</b>	<b>YES</b>
	<b>NO</b>

**TIMING**

All ballot measure resolutions and actions need to be taken by the city council at the same time.

- The action to add a measure must be taken no later than March 12, 2010 (E-83).
- City Council action must be taken **no later than the meeting of March 9, 2010.**

**METHODS OF CONDUCTING ELECTIONS**

Torrance is a charter city and the charter gives the city council the ability to propose and adopt by ordinance the method of holding that election as allowed by the California Elections Code.

Note that all ordinances related to elections are effective immediately and do not require a second reading.

**ARGUMENTS**

Arguments are capped at 300 words. The formatting is as provided for by the Los Angeles County Registrar. (Attachment) Each argument will require at least one page in the Sample Ballot Pamphlet.

### Order of Preferences

Arguments for and against may be written by anyone with preference given based on the nature of the initiative.

- This is a charter amendment initiated by the city council thereby giving the City Council the first opportunity to write the argument for.
- If any member of the council wishes to oppose the initiative that member is also given first priority for the argument against.

### Number of Signers

The Elections Code allows ballot arguments to be signed by up to five (5) proponents. Torrance has a seven member body. In order for all seven members to sign an ordinance is required to that effect. This process has been used previously. The ordinance would be written as being effective for this one election only and expire at the end of the process. Note that if any member of the Council is against the measure they are not required to sign.

If the city council wishes to have signatories other than council members, those allowed to sign must be designated.

If the higher number is desired the ordinance can be written to allow up to seven members to sign the argument against.

### Number of Arguments

If more than one argument in favor or against the measure is submitted within the time prescribed, the city clerk shall select one of the arguments in favor and one of the arguments against for printing and distribution to voters.

The city clerk shall give preference and priority, in the order named, to the arguments of the following:

- a) the legislative body, or member or members of the legislative body authorized by that body;
- b) the individual voter, or bona fide association of citizens, or combination of voters and associations, who are bona fide sponsors or proponents of the measure;
- c) bona fide associations of citizens;
- d) individual voters who are eligible to vote on the measure. (Elections Code Section 9287).

Elections consultant Scott Martin has indicated that as Torrance is a charter city the City Council may also adopt an ordinance to allow for two arguments in favor. As there has been discussion that the election date change could allow TUSD to consolidate its election with the City of Torrance, if the Committee or the City Council wishes to allow the school district board members the opportunity to add an argument that needs to be done by ordinance.

If the City Council wishes to authorize specific signers then those individuals need to be given written authority to submit on their behalf.

### Rebuttals

Rebuttal arguments are optional and may be permitted. If desired, the resolution to that effect must be adopted at the same meeting.

Copies of rebuttal arguments for the "Argument in Favor" and the "Argument Against" will be made available to the public and to the opposing authors as soon as the "direct" arguments are known.

Rebuttal arguments are not to exceed 250 words and are due to the city clerk not more than 10 days after the direct arguments are due.

Argument deadlines

The City Clerk will set the deadline for arguments within 14 days of calling the election based on the time reasonably necessary to prepare and print the arguments and sample ballots and to permit a 10 calendar day public examination period for review of arguments that must be called.

During that calendar day period the any voter in the jurisdiction may seek court action to require any or all such materials be amended or deleted.

No later than March 22, 2010 the city clerk is required to submit arguments to the Los Angeles County Registrar/Recorder.

Public Review

The schedule for filing and public review periods will be posted once the formal actions have been taken.

Impartial Analysis

The City Council may direct the city clerk to transmit a copy of the measure to the city attorney. The city attorney may prepare a not-to-exceed 500 word impartial analysis of the measure showing the effect of the measure on the existing law and the operation of the measure. It is suggested that the analysis be filed with the city clerk by the deadline for filing arguments.

**RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE COMMITTEE**

The Committee is asked to give direction for the City Council and the City Clerk for the preferences recommended below:

- Allow one argument for and one argument against.
- Adopt Ordinance to allow up to seven members to sign any ballot arguments or rebuttals.
- Allow two arguments for and two arguments against.
- Adopt Ordinance to allow two arguments for and two arguments against.
- Authorize specific signers for the argument for.
- Allow rebuttals to arguments for and arguments against.
- Direct City Clerk to ask City Attorney to prepare an impartial analysis.

Respectfully submitted,

Sue Herbers, City Clerk

## HISTORY OF ELECTION DATE CHANGES

2/2010

Year	Date	Type	Registered	Total Voting	% Turnout	Regular ballots	Absentee Ballots	% Absentee	
2004 <small>General Presidential</small>	Nov. 2 RES. 2004-155 ADPT. DEC 07	Special (CONSOLIDATED)	72,320	61,373	85%	45,671	15,702	34%	
<b>Measure</b>		<b>Passed</b>			<b>Defeated</b>				
MEASURE T AMEND SECTION 510 OF THE CHARTER TO CHANGE THE DATE OF HOLDING THE GENERAL MUNICIPAL ELECTION TO THE SAME DAY AS THE STATEWIDE DIRECT PRIMARY ELECTION IN EACH EVEN-NUMBERED YEAR		Yes No			35,830 17,589				

Year	Date	Type	Registered	Total Voting	% Turnout	Regular ballots	Absentee Ballots	% Absentee	
1999	November 2 RES. 99-131 ADPT. DEC 7	Special (CONSOLIDATED)	75,263	8,468	11%	5,742	2,726	32%	
<b>Measure</b>		<b>Passed</b>			<b>Defeated</b>				
MEASURE H: CHANGE CITY ELECTION DATE FROM MARCH TO MAY OF EVEN NUMBERED YEARS					No Yes				
					4,234 3,755				

Year	Date	Type	Registered	Total Voting	% Turnout	Regular ballots	Absentee Ballots	% Absentee	
1974	November 5 RES. 74-258 ADPT. DEC. 10	General Municipal	72,654	45,025	62%	44,040	985	2.2%	
<b>Measure</b>		<b>Passed</b>			<b>Defeated</b>				
PROPOSITION VV CHARTER AMENDMENT NO. 1 ELECTIVE OFFICE VACANCIES		Yes No			26,056 9,466				
PROPOSITION WW CHARTER AMENDMENT NO. 2 GENERAL MUNICIPAL ELECTION IN MARCH OF EACH EVEN YEAR		Yes No			24,660 10,347				
PROPOSITION XX CHARTER AMENDMENT NO. 3 COUNCIL COMPENSATION; CLERK AND TREASURER DUTIES AND COMPENSATION					No Yes				
					27,603 7,979				
PROPOSITION YY CHARTER AMENDMENT NO. 4 POWERS & DUTIES OF CITY MANAGER; COUNCIL ACTION ON BUDGET; DEMANDS & AUDITS		Yes No			19,505 15,440				

**ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF  
CHARTER AMENDMENT NO. 2 — WW**

Almost all the cities in California have changed their election date from April to March. The provisions of the State Election Code which govern municipal elections are now predicated on a March election.

It is desirable that Torrance keep in step with the other cities in California in this respect. Furthermore, we believe that a change in the election date to March may increase the voter turnout at the general municipal elections. The April elections sometimes fall within Easter week, at which time many Torrance voters are on vacation.

VERNON W. COIL

City Clerk

**ARGUMENT AGAINST  
CHARTER AMENDMENT NO. 2 — WW**

(None Filed)

**ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF MEASURE \_\_\_\_\_**

In 1998 the State legislature moved the statewide primary from June to March of even years. This is the same date in which Torrance holds its elections. Unless we move our local election to another date, it will be consolidated with the statewide election and run by Los Angeles County.

**A County-run election will diminish local control.** Since the founding of Torrance, local control has defined and shaped who we are as a community. In a consolidated election, we will have outsiders running our local elections.

As South Bay's largest city and the fourth largest of Los Angeles County's 88 cities, Torrance deserves and should have its stand-alone elections run by its locally elected City Clerk and not by the County.

**A consolidated election will minimize opportunities to debate Torrance issues.** The County will place Torrance Council elections and measures last on a long and complicated ballot. The focus of the voters will be on the presidential and statewide races and ballot measures.

Torrance voters will lose their opportunity to hear about local issues because statewide races will dominate the airwaves and stuff the mail boxes with a barrage of campaign literature. Having a stand-alone election will allow Torrance voters the greatest opportunity to focus on Council races and issues.

**A County-run election will be inefficient.** In a Torrance-run election results are known election night. It will take the County a full month to certify the results of our election; our City Clerk does it in a few days.

If we don't move the date of our election, we will be the only city in Los Angeles County not to have done so. Keep Torrance independent and in control of its affairs. Vote yes for the Charter amendment. It's the right thing to do.

Signed by

Mayor Dee Hardison  
Councilwoman Marcia Cribbs  
Councilman Harvey Horwich  
Councilman Don Lee  
Councilman Jack Messerlian

**REBUTTAL TO ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF MEASURE \_\_\_\_\_**

For the past 25 years, Torrance citizens have voiced concern about the low voter participation in the Torrance municipal elections. Our last City Council election just two years ago had only a 9 percent voter turnout.

With election consolidation and by voting **NO** on this measure, we finally have the opportunity to dramatically increase voter turnout and decrease election costs. We should not vote to change our election date in order to keep voter turnout low and election costs high.

Los Angeles County has been running elections since 1849. The county has been running our Torrance school board elections since our break off from the Los Angeles school system. Election results have always been known on election evening.

Torrance is the only city in California spending **\$90,000** of its taxpayers money in an effort to change its March election date. This change will **increase election costs** and cause confusion by having **two elections** in a **two month period**, with the added confusion of different polling places for most voters.

A vote to change our March election date means a **50 percent increase** in the cost of the City Council election to the Torrance taxpayer. Voter interest and participation in City Council race will remain low, and **Council terms, despite voter approved term limits, will be extended.**

We can not repeat often enough; "greater voter participation in local government leads to better government."

Vote **NO** on this ballot measure.

Signed by

Councilman Dan Walker  
Councilwoman Maureen O'Donnell

**ARGUMENT AGAINST MEASURE \_\_\_\_\_**

Every once in a while a bad idea will come from good people.

Changing the date of our City Council election to prevent one consolidated election (federal, state and local) **increases the election cost** to Torrance taxpayers by nearly 50 percent. Having two separate elections just two months apart with different polling places for most voters will result in **increased voter confusion and less voter participation.**

Our last City Council election had a 9 percent voter turnout. Previous consolidated elections in Torrance had an average voter turnout of over 70 percent.

This election date question could have been placed on the March ballot, which would have saved the Torrance taxpayers approximately \$140,000. That is money which could have been used for after school recreational programs, police and fire protection, street and sidewalk repairs, or just saved.

We teach our children the importance of voting. Leaving our March election date unchanged will lead to greater voter participation in local government, which leads to better government.

**Vote no** and you will **increase voter turnout** and **save Torrance taxpayers money!**

Signed by

Councilman Dan Walker  
Councilwoman Maureen B. O'Donnell

**REBUTTAL TO ARGUMENT AGAINST MEASURE \_\_\_\_\_**

Torrance holding its own stand-alone elections **will not result in increased cost** to the taxpayers. Measure H will merely change the date of our elections to retain local control and avoid confusion. It will also curtail the influence of big money and costly campaigns that come with consolidated elections.

**Measure H will retain local control**, a guiding principle of our community during the past 90 years of its existence. That is why we have our own police and fire departments, library system, and school district. That is why we fought and won a lawsuit against the federal government who wanted to tell us who we should hire.

**Measure H will eliminate confusion.** Unless we change the date of our elections, we may have statewide and city elections one week apart! Torrance voters unnecessarily will be confused and inconvenienced. Interest in city elections and issues will drop, since the focus of the voters will be on presidential and statewide races and propositions. Worse yet, in a consolidated election Torrance will be placed at the end of a long, complicated and confusing ballot.

**Measure H will allow our locally elected City Clerk**, rather than outsiders, **run our city elections**. As Los Angeles County's fourth largest city, Torrance deserves and should have its stand-alone elections, as do all other 87 cities of the County.

Let's not give away local control for political ends. Keep Torrance elections local and free of big money influence.

Vote YES for Measure H. It's the right thing to do!

Signed by

Mayor Dee Hardison  
Councilwoman Marcia Cribbs  
Councilman Harvey Horwich  
Councilman Don Lee  
Councilman Jack Messerlian

**“Argument in Favor of Measure     T    ”**

**A yes vote cuts the cost of city elections in half**, saving the taxpayer between \$80,000 and \$100,000 each and every election. **It doubles our voter turnout.** It protects our combined election.

The Daily Breeze when describing the 2000 combined election said “Torrance scored two big prizes by consolidating its local polling with state and presidential elections-more than twice as many voters turned out and the city’s election bill plummeted by more than two thirds from \$180,000 in 1994 to an estimated \$57,000. The turnout was a whopping 48.5 percent in Torrance, up from 9.3 percent in 1998.”

Residents, who normally don’t make a separate trip to go to the polls for a stand alone election, got involved in the combined election. There is more community interest in the election.

Your yes vote insures a combined election for half the cost with twice the voter turnout.

Who could possibly be against it? The same people who five years ago wanted to change the City election date to May, regardless of cost, in order to have a stand alone, low voter turnout election.

At that election, taxpayers rejected the idea of a stand alone election and voted to allow a combined election, save money and increase voter participation.

In the history of our nation many have fought and died to gain and protect our right to vote. **Government should make it easier for people to vote, not more difficult. Vote yes.** “It is good government. It is the right thing to do.”

Signed:

Dan Walker  
Mayor

Ted Lieu  
Councilman

Mike Mauno  
Councilman

Pat McIntyre  
Councilwoman

Hope Witkowsky  
Councilwoman

## REBUTTAL TO ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF MEASURE T

Supporters of Measure T are simply wrong.  
Measure T is a bad idea. And it's bad for Torrance!

Here's why.

**Big money and special interests** will decide the outcome of our municipal elections.

Because it will take large amount of money to run for office in the primary, only the **wealthy** or the **well-connected** will be able to afford to run in such an election.

The Mayor and three councilmembers' terms in office will **be extended beyond the time we elected them!**

We agree with the **Daily Breeze**. The election date should not be changed from year to year as part of some endless political experiment. That's what will happen if the supporters of Measure T have their way.

Supporters of Measure T would have you believe that it is inconvenient and costly for Torrance to have local elections. They're wrong on both counts. We've had our municipal free-standing elections for a long time.

Who will win if Measure T passes? The very same politicians who have personal political agendas. We simply can't afford to have them play games with our city's election date at a time when there is a crisis of confidence.

For our community's sake, it is important we keep our elections independent, and free from the influence of big money and special interests.

Five years ago, Torrance voters sent a loud and clear message to keep our elections in March. We agree.

**Vote NO on Measure T.**  
**Say NO to big money and special interests.**

SIGNED BY:

Patrick J. Furey, ESQ. President, Northwest Torrance Homeowners Association  
Debbie Hayes, President, Old Torrance Neighborhood Association  
Tom Brewer, President, Southwood Riviera Homeowners Association  
Linda Gottshall-Sayed, President, West Torrance Homeowners Association  
Robert Thompson, President, Madrona Homeowners Association

**“Argument Against Measure       T      ”**

**SIMPLY WRONG FOR TORRANCE! VOTE NO!**

This is a proposed City Charter amendment to give away our **Local Control of Elections** by permanently combining them with State elections.

For over **30 years** Torrance has had a March election.

These are the consequences of this move.

Turning over control to the State would move our election to any date State legislators decide and would change the date as often as they wish.

Increased costs will be incurred if the date is changed with each election.

We will be giving up the independence we have fought to preserve for so many years.

Qualified candidates may be discouraged from running because of the escalated costs. The more expensive it is for a candidate, the more influence special interest groups will have i.e., **developers and unions**.

This is not an action by the public or City Staff, it is an action proposed by the Mayor.

If the state moves their election to June the term of office for the Mayor and Council Members will automatically be extended three months beyond the time we elected them! Future changes could make terms of office very erratic.

In 1999 the voters overwhelmingly supported keeping our elections in March.

The Mayor has proposed this change to address a “possible problem” in the year **2016**.

**PLEASE VOTE NO!**  
**SAY NO TO BIG MONEY AND SPECIAL INTERESTS GROUPS!**

Signed:

Paul M. Nowatka, Council Member  
Frank A. Scotto, Council Member  
Dee Hardison, Former Mayor  
Marcia Cribbs, Former Council Member  
Jack Messerlian, Former Council Member

## REBUTTAL TO THE ARGUMENT AGAINST MEASURE T

A yes vote on Measure T, is the right vote to make. **A yes vote cuts the cost of city elections in half. It doubles our voter turnout.**

Last Sunday's Daily Breeze editorial said that according to a 2002 study by the Public Policy Institute, permanent alignment with statewide elections has two main advantages: Voter turnout increases significantly and consolidating elections can also reduce cities' election costs.

**The institute comes down on squarely on the side of consolidation**, saying that "In the end, the doctrine of 'one person, one vote' – a bedrock of democratic theory – probably outweighs any potential negatives."

Remember the same people who are asking you to vote no on Measure T, in 1999 asked you to move the city election to May, extending council terms by a few months to keep a stand-alone election in place regardless of the cost. Now they try to compare a small one-time fee with the \$80,000 to \$100,000 savings of a combined election.

Remember the Daily Breeze said when describing the 2000 combined election, "Torrance scored two big prizes by consolidating its local polling with state and presidential elections."

**Vote Yes on T.** It is good government. It is common sense.

Signed:

Dan Walker, Mayor

Ted Lieu, Councilmember

Mike Mauno, Councilmember

Pat McIntyre, Councilmember

Hope Witkowsky, Councilmember

## BALLOT ARGUMENT AND REBUTTAL

### GENERAL INFORMATION

1. A ballot argument for any county, district or school district measure shall not exceed 300 words in length.

**Exceptions:** Ballot arguments to reorganize a school or community college district shall not exceed 500 words. (Ed. Code § 35758)

2. No more than five signatures shall appear with any argument.
3. The authors of an argument in favor or against a measure may prepare and submit rebuttal arguments, or may authorize in writing any other person or persons to prepare, submit, or sign the rebuttal. No rebuttal shall exceed 250 words. Authorization forms are available by calling (562) 462-2317.
4. All arguments and rebuttals concerning measures shall be accompanied by a statement, to be signed by each proponent and by each author, if different, declaring that the argument (rebuttal) is true and correct to the best of his/her knowledge and belief.
5. Whenever any ballot arguments for or against any measure are submitted, such arguments may be withdrawn by their proponents at any time prior to and including the final date fixed for filing arguments.
6. A public examination period is allowed for the review of arguments and rebuttal arguments. The inspection time is the ten-day calendar period immediately following the filing deadline for such documents. During this period, any person may seek a writ of mandate or an injunction to require any or all of the material to be amended or deleted. The writ of mandate or injunction request shall be filed no later than the end of ten (10) calendar day public examination period.
7. Rebuttals for County, School and General District Measures all need authorizations signed by the original authors of the argument. An original signer on an argument cannot authorize more than one signer on the rebuttal.

The signers of rebuttals for City Measures will be determined by the City Clerk.

8. Original signatures of faxed arguments or rebuttals must be received by this office within 48 hours.

### CAMPAIGN STATEMENT FILING REQUIREMENTS

California's Political Reform Act was adopted by voter initiative in 1974 and has been periodically amended by legislation and initiatives. The Act requires that campaign disclosure reports provide the public with the identity of contributors and the amounts they give and the amount and purpose of expenditures made by officeholders, candidates, and committees.

Proponents and all committees primarily formed to support or oppose a ballot measure in any election must comply with the campaign statement filing requirements if the committee receives contributions or makes independent expenditures that total \$1,000 or more. Monetary penalties may be assessed for failure to file required statements.

Call the ~~Campaign Finance Disclosure Section~~ at (562) 462-2339, if you have questions relating to filing requirements or need campaign statement forms.

CITY CLERK OF 310 618 2870



## ARGUMENT AND REBUTTAL FORM

ELECTION DATE: \_\_\_\_\_ MEASURE I.D. (if any): \_\_\_\_\_

JURISDICTION: \_\_\_\_\_

(Please mark (x) in the appropriate box)

<input type="checkbox"/> Argument in Favor <input type="checkbox"/> Rebuttal to Argument Against	<input type="checkbox"/> Argument Against <input type="checkbox"/> Rebuttal to Argument in Favor
---	---

Statements will be printed in uniform type, style and spacing. Use block paragraphs and single space format. Text submitted indented or centered will be typeset in block paragraph form. **Entire statements in all capital letters are not acceptable. Indentations, circles, stars, dots, italics and/or bullets cannot be accommodated.** However, you may use dashes/hyphens. Words to be printed in **boldface type**, underscored and/or CAPITALIZED are to be clearly indicated. Any combinations of enhanced words are counted as one word. The number of words/acronyms that are in **boldface type**, underscored and/or CAPITALIZED shall not exceed 30 words per document. All statements should be checked by the authors for spelling and punctuation as the elections official is not permitted to edit any material contained therein.

### ALL AUTHORS MUST SIGN ON THE REVERSE SIDE

Please type statements below in upper and lower case letters. Statement will be typeset in the Official Sample Ballot Booklet using DUTCH801 Rm BT font in 10 point size. However, statement can be submitted using any standard font.

---

**DECLARATION BY AUTHOR(S) OF ARGUMENTS OR REBUTTALS**  
(Elections Code Section 9600)

All arguments concerning measures filed pursuant to Division 9 of the Elections Code shall be accompanied by the following declaration to be signed by each author of the argument/rebuttal. Names and titles listed will be printed in the Voter Information portion of the Official Sample Ballot Booklet in the order provided below.

The undersigned author(s) of the:

<input type="checkbox"/> Argument in Favor	<input type="checkbox"/> Rebuttal to Argument Against
<input type="checkbox"/> Argument Against	<input type="checkbox"/> Rebuttal to Argument in Favor

of ballot measure \_\_\_\_\_ at the \_\_\_\_\_  
(name and/or letter) (title of election)

election for the \_\_\_\_\_ to be held on

\_\_\_\_\_ hereby state that such argument is true and correct to the  
(date)

best of his/her/their knowledge and belief.

1.	_____ Printed Name	_____ Signature
	_____ Title to Appear on Argument	_____ Date
2.	_____ Printed Name	_____ Signature
	_____ Title to Appear on Argument	_____ Date
3.	_____ Printed Name	_____ Signature
	_____ Title to Appear on Argument	_____ Date
4.	_____ Printed Name	_____ Signature
	_____ Title to Appear on Argument	_____ Date
5.	_____ Printed Name	_____ Signature
	_____ Title to Appear on Argument	_____ Date

**IMPORTANT FILING INFORMATION:** I, \_\_\_\_\_ am the designated filer of the above titled argument/rebuttal. Please notify me of any questions pertaining to this filing. Below is my contact information.

Mailing Address: \_\_\_\_\_ E-Mail Address: \_\_\_\_\_

Contact Numbers: \_\_\_\_\_ Daytime \_\_\_\_\_ Evening \_\_\_\_\_ Fax \_\_\_\_\_

**OFFICE USE ONLY**

Time Stamp

Word Counts

NUMBER OF WORDS:	
NUMBER OF WORDS WITH BOLD FACE, ETC.:	
PROJECT CODE NUMBER:	
ELECTION DEPUTY:	



## CANDIDATE STATEMENTS – WORD COUNTING GUIDELINES

(Elections Code Chapter 1 General Provisions, Section 9)

The following guidelines are used by the Registrar-Recorder/County Clerk's Office for counting words on candidate statements, ballot measure text, arguments, rebuttals and other ballot enclosures. The guidelines do **not** apply to ballot designations for candidates. If the text exceeds the specified 200 or 400 word limit, the author will be asked to delete words or change text until the statement conforms with requirements.

1. **PUNCTUATION MARKS** are not counted. Symbols such as "&" (and), and "#" (number/pound) are not considered punctuation and each symbol is counted as one (1) word.
2. **THE WORDS** "I", "a", "the", "and", "an" are counted as individual words.
3. **GEOGRAPHICAL NAMES** such as countries, states, counties, cities, towns, or jurisdictions are counted as one (1) word.  
**EXAMPLE:** "City of Los Angeles" = 1 word  
"City and County of San Francisco" = 1 word
4. **ABBREVIATIONS** such as acronyms or abbreviations for a word, phrase, or expression are counted as one (1) word.  
**EXAMPLE:** UCLA, PTA, USMC, LAPD, U.S.M.C.
5. **HYPHENATED WORDS** that appear in any generally available standard reference dictionary published in the U.S. at any time within the last 10 calendar years immediately preceding the election are counted as one (1) word.  
**EXAMPLE:** Attorney-at-law
6. **DATES...** consisting of a combination of digits are counted as one (1) word.  
**EXAMPLE:** 3/18                      7/21/89  
  
**DATES...** consisting of a combination of words and digits are counted as two (2) words.  
**EXAMPLE:** July 21, 1983                      18 June, 1987
7. **NUMERIC COMBINATIONS** are counted as one (1) word.  
**EXAMPLE:** 1973                      13 1/2                      1971-73                      5%                      8/3/73                      #14
8. **MONETARY AMOUNTS** consisting of a combination of digits are counted as one (1) word.  
**EXAMPLE:** \$1,000.00  
  
**MONETARY AMOUNTS** consisting of a combination of words and digits are counted as two (2) words.  
**EXAMPLE:** \$4 million
9. **NAMES OF PERSONS AND THINGS** are counted as individual words.  
**EXAMPLE:** Gus Enwright                      (2 words)  
                    L. A. Basketball Team                      (3 words)
10. **TELEPHONE/FAX NUMBERS** are counted as one (1) word.  
**EXAMPLE:** 1-800-815-2666                      1-562-462-2317
11. **INTERNET WEB SITES/E-MAIL ADDRESSES** are counted as one (1) word.  
**EXAMPLE:** <http://www.co.la.ca.us>                      [www.lavote.net](http://www.lavote.net)                      <http://www.lacounty.info>