

## Argument Against Measure W

During these tough economic times, San Jose politicians are recklessly proposing to eliminate the essential taxpayer protections that limit how much the city contributes to employee retirement costs. Measure W is a risky scheme that puts libraries, parks, and public safety services in jeopardy.

Measure W opens up City pensions to more political influence. Currently, the City Charter restricts the maximum proportion that the City can spend on pension benefits. Only the voters can approve an increase.

Measure W completely removes these restrictions. Instead, it allows the City Council to establish the maximum costs that taxpayers will bear. Voters would no longer have a veto. Ambitious politicians can increase pension costs at any council meeting.

We can't trust city politicians to establish multi-billion dollar retirement funds without any taxpayer safeguards. Just look at their past record of wasteful spending.

Measure W deliberately leaves out all specific details. It has no guarantee of cost savings, no limits on employee pensions, and no protection of the City's General Fund. Measure W threatens funding for police, fire, library, and park services.

At the 11<sup>th</sup> hour and without public debate, the Council rushed this measure to the ballot. It is filed with vague provisions that will lead to unpredictable costs to the taxpayers.

City retirees do not get social security. Pensions enable city workers to earn a retirement with dignity.

However, we agree that pension reform is necessary. Real reform contains clear limits on how much taxpayers must contribute. Anything less, like Measure W, is irresponsible.

Measure W leaves retirement costs solely in the hands of politicians. Would you give a blank check to the City Council? No? Then vote "no" on Measure W.

Tom Cochran, Senior Financial Consultant  
Karl Hoffower, former member, San Jose Sunshine Task Force  
Stephen Kline, Buena Vista/Del Monte Neighborhood Leader  
Michele Bertolone, Small Business Owner  
Annie Dandavati, Attorney

*Revised by Court Order dated August 27, 2010*