## STATEMENT BY PROPONENTS/AUTHORS OF ARGUMENTS

Elections Code section 9600 requires that all arguments concerning measures shall be accompanied by the following statement, to be signed by each proponent and by each author, if different, of the argument.

The undersigned proponent(s) or author(s) of the:

Check the appropriate box below:		
☐ Argument In Favor of (Proponents)		
☐ Rebuttal to the Argument In Favor of (Opponents)		
Argument Against (Opponents)		
☐ Rebuttal to the Argument Against (Proponents)		
Ballot measure at the at the 5	election for the (Title of Election)	
City of Reclands to be held on March 3, 2020 hereby state that this (Jurisdiction)		
argument is true and correct to the best of Redlanders For Responsible knowledge and belief.  (his/her/their) Growth Management		
Proponents/Authors:		
edlanders for Responsible Grawth rint Name Management	Signature ( 4 2019	
Print Name William Chaves	Signature Welliam Chauss Date 12/14/19	

Print Name James K. Forsythe Title Nesident	Signature 6 12/15/19
Print Name Title	Signature Date
Print Name	Signature

•

## Argument Against Measure G

In 1978 the voters of Redlands adopted Prop R to limit and control the quality of development in our town. In 1987 they strengthened R with Measure N. A council attack on N led voters to adopt Measure U in 1997. Beginning with R, over a 41 year span those measures have guided the development of our town.

In 1998 SCAG (Southern California Association of Governments), the six county planning body, identified Redlands as one of the four most livable places in the region and printed a brochure on our town. Recognized were our schools, the university, Smiley Library, our historic homes and our historic, small town-feeling downtown. An important element of that recognition was our sense of community, of commitment, of civic pride, in no small measure a product of our perception that while other cities have lost their character and livability Redlands is still a special place.

This ballot measure would change our town forever. Its intent is to promote multi-story apartments downtown. Proposed are 2,400 apartments, thirty percent recommended to be five story. If placed on a FEMA required elevated pad, they would be comparable to the Bank building.

If we assume that each building contained 150 apartments, 16 would be required to meet the goal.

For many, our cherished view of the mountains would be blocked and lost.

With no annual limit, development could overwhelm our schools and public services. The additional demand on our precious water could result in further restrictions. With no provision for schools or green spaces children of those apartments will be left with little.

Traffic, parking, air quality will worsen.

Downtown needs businesses and preservation, not thousands of multi-story apartments.

Protect our town, our quality of life, our future. Protect R, N and U.

VOTE NO on G

W.E. Cunningham, Treasurer of Redlanders for Responsible Growth Management William Chaves, Resident
James K. Forsythe, Resident