

MEASURE A

CITY ATTORNEY'S IMPARTIAL ANALYSIS OF MEASURE A

These proposed Charter amendments would change Sunnyvale's method of choosing a mayor. The Charter now provides that the City Council selects one of its members by majority vote as mayor for a two-year term. The proposed Charter amendments would change the method of selecting the mayor to a direct election by voters. The proposed Charter amendments would establish a four-year term for the mayor and an eight-year lifetime term limit for the mayor. A term as a directly-elected mayor would not be considered as a Council term for purposes of term limits, and an individual could serve a total of sixteen years in a twenty year period as a Councilmember and directly-elected mayor. The job duties of a directly-elected mayor would not change from those of a Council-selected mayor.

Charter Section 600 now provides that the elective offices of the City are the seven members of the City Council. The proposed amendment changes one of the elective offices to be designated as the mayor.

Charter Section 601 now provides that the City Council is selected from the City at large for a term of four years. The proposed amendment will provide that the mayor is also elected from the City at large for a term of four years, and that the total number of elected positions remains at seven. The proposed amendment provides that Seat 1 on the Council shall be designated the mayor's seat and filled at the 2013 general election and every four years thereafter.

Charter Section 602 now provides that there is a term limit of two consecutive four year terms for a Councilmember, with a required break of four years after two consecutive terms or two years after one term, and not more than eight years' service in a twelve year period. The amendment provides that the lifetime term limit as directly-elected mayor is eight years, and a person can serve as a Councilmember and directly-elected mayor for a total of sixteen years in any twenty year period.

Charter Section 605 now provides that the mayor is selected by the City Council from one of its members for a term of two years, and can be removed by a vote of five members of the City Council. The proposed amendment deletes the selection or removal of the mayor by the City Council. It does not change the mayor's job duties or position as a voting member of the Council.

A "YES" vote is a vote to amend Charter Sections 600, 601, 602 and 605 to change from the current Council-selected mayor to a directly-elected mayor with a four-year term as mayor and eight-year lifetime term limit, and with possible service as a Councilmember and mayor of sixteen years in any twenty year period. The role and duties of the mayor would not change.

A "NO" vote is a vote to retain the current Council-selected mayor with a term of two years.

The above statement is an impartial analysis of Measure A. If you desire a copy of the measure, please call the elections official's office: Office of the City Clerk, telephone (408) 730-7483, located at 603 All America Way, Sunnyvale, California and a copy will be mailed at no cost to you.

CITY ATTORNEY'S IMPARTIAL ANALYSIS OF MEASURE A - Continued

You may also access the full text of the measure on the City's website at the following website address:
www.Elections.inSunnyvale.com.

/s/ David Kahn
City Attorney

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF MEASURE A

The performance of the Mayor affects us all. The Mayor's leadership skills determine whether critical projects, like the downtown, proceed smoothly, and whether the Mayor stands up for our City against outside interests. The Mayor's management skills determine whether citizens can have their say at meetings without sitting there all night. The Mayor's priorities strongly influence which services get funded. The Mayor is the most important elected official in Sunnyvale.

Yet the City Charter denies the public the right to choose the Mayor.

That choice is made by as few as four of the seven Councilmembers, with only themselves eligible. Virtually all of the discussion takes place behind the scenes, featuring secret deals and pressure from special interests outside the city.

To fix this problem and strengthen City government, we must change the Charter so that the Mayor is elected by voters rather than by incumbent Councilmembers.

A directly-elected Mayor is accountable to all the voters, not just to his/her friends on the Council. Candidates for the position would have to campaign on their qualifications. Voters would be more engaged, and the winning candidates would better reflect the community's needs and priorities. With a four-year term, Mayors would become more experienced and would represent the City more effectively.

The role of the Mayor would not change under Measure A. Only the term and the selection method would change. The Measure includes a lifetime limit of two terms.

The current process for selecting Sunnyvale's Mayor is essentially a game of musical chairs, where the voters don't even get to hear the music, much less play it. It's time to trust the voters of Sunnyvale.

A "YES" vote on Measure A restores this important power to the people—to you.

/s/ Geoffrey R. Ainscow
Member, 2006 Charter Review Committee

/s/ Carol L. Ludlow
Vice Chair, 2011 Charter Review Committee

/s/ Willis W. Ritter, Jr.
Member, 2011 Charter Review Committee

/s/ Gail L. Swegles

/s/ Carol L. Weiss
Chair, 2011 Charter Review Committee

REBUTTAL TO ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF MEASURE A

For 100 years, Sunnyvale's council/city manager government has served our residents well. We are nationally recognized as a well run city. Now, the proponents make a "big city" claim that a separately elected mayor is somehow better.

Special interest politics, expensive special elections, and more partisan political bickering — this is not what Sunnyvale needs.

Sunnyvale cannot afford hundreds of thousands of dollars in new special elections.

Nothing would be more damaging than permitting a torrent of special interest money to buy campaign victories for separately elected mayors.

Nothing would be more paralyzing than having the mayor and council competing for voters' attention instead of collaborating on our problems.

But that is exactly what happens if Measure A passes.

This is why multiple citizen charter review committees have rejected this measure. This is why voters already rejected this proposal once.

This year's Citizen Charter Review Committee put it best when it rejected this proposal yet again: we already trust our council to make decisions of great importance to us. If we cannot trust our council to pick its own leader, what can we trust them with?

Don't fall for their "choose your mayor" gimmick. Don't give special interests the power they want. Don't give councilmembers this term limit loophole they want. Don't be fooled by this self-serving proposal.

Trust what already works very well.

Vote NO on Measure A.

For more information, visit www.no-on-A.org.

[Note: the "argument against" erroneously claimed two previous votes, but Sunnyvale has had only one vote.]

/s/ James R. Griffith
Vice Mayor, City of Sunnyvale

/s/ Richard Napier
Former Mayor, City of Sunnyvale

/s/ Kenneth Olevson
Member, 2011 Charter Review Committee

/s/ Howard Chuck
Member, 2006 Charter Review Committee

/s/ Nancy Tivol
Chair, Citizens for Good Government, No on A

ARGUMENT AGAINST MEASURE A

Here we go again.

For a third time, the voters of Sunnyvale are being asked to decide on a separately elected mayor, after being rejected twice before by the voters, and after yet another charter review committee recommended against it.

Why defy the citizens' recommendations? The answer is in who stands to benefit - the elected mayor, not the taxpayers.

At a time when the city is cutting millions of dollars from the budget, the city council put this costly measure on the ballot. It was hastily thrown together without a real discussion of the costs, including expensive special elections.

It's just a matter of time before a separately elected mayor starts requiring additional staff and more travel budget. Such demands have occurred in the past, and these costs have not been considered.

Worse, this proposal is a blatant end-run around term limits, allowing a councilmember to serve 16 consecutive years, instead of the current 8-year limit.

It disrupts the smooth functioning of the collective leadership that makes Sunnyvale one of the best-run cities in the nation.

It creates conflict between the mayor's office, the city council, and city staff.

It gives special interests a greater voice in selecting the mayor through campaign money. It makes the mayor less accountable to the taxpayers and more accountable to the special interests that fund campaigns.

It provides no political benefit. Santa Clara and Milpitas receive no additional federal or state funding, and no greater regional representation because those voters separately elect their mayors.

It encourages personal ego to rule over the public good.

Let's tell our elected officials, once again, that we want what's best for the taxpayers and not just what's best for them.

Vote no on Measure A.

ARGUMENT AGAINST MEASURE A - Continued

For more information, visit www.no-on-A.org.

/s/ Melinda Hamilton
Mayor, City of Sunnyvale

/s/ Dave Whittum
Councilmember, City of Sunnyvale

/s/ Dianne McKenna
Former Mayor, City of Sunnyvale

/s/ Terry Fowler
Member, 2011 Charter Review Committee

/s/ Laura Babcock
Former Sunnyvale Planning Commissioner

REBUTTAL TO ARGUMENT AGAINST MEASURE A

The opponents' "facts" are false.

- Sunnyvale has voted on this issue only once before—20 years ago. 82% of Sunnyvale voter registrations are new since then.
- This change would cost the taxpayers nothing. One council seat would simply be replaced by the Mayor's seat.
- No special elections would be required. The Mayor's seat would come up for election every four years, just like other council seats.
- The term limit for the changed seat would actually be strengthened. While council seats have a limit of two consecutive terms, the Mayor's seat would have a lifetime limit of two terms.
- The Mayor is not currently accountable to the taxpayers at all, so direct election couldn't possibly make the Mayor less accountable. In fact, the Mayor would become accountable to us for the first time.

Their predictions are baseless. Electing the Mayor would not increase budget or staff, disrupt City functioning, increase the influence of outside interests, or create conflict. None of these things has happened in the nearby cities that have changed to a directly-elected mayor—and none of those cities has chosen to switch back.

Our prediction: outside lobbying calls to Councilmembers telling them how to vote for Mayor would stop.

The opponents are right about one thing. We should tell politicians that we want what's best for us, not them. Examine the lists of signers and decide for yourself which group is looking out for Councilmembers and which is looking out for you.

www.chooseyourmayor.com

/s/ Geoffrey R. Ainscow
Member, 2006 Charter Review Committee

/s/ Carol L. Ludlow
Vice Chair, 2011 Charter Review Committee

/s/ Willis W. Ritter, Jr.
Member, 2011 Charter Review Committee

/s/ Gail L. Swegles

/s/ Carol L. Weiss
Chair, 2011 Charter Review Committee