

ARGUMENTS

AUTHORIZATION FOR ANOTHER PERSON TO SIGN REBUTTAL ARGUMENT

The following majority of _____ authors of the Argument
X In Favor of ☐ Against

Measure _____ authorize the following person(s) to prepare, submit or sign the Rebuttal to the Argument
X In Favor of ☐ Against

Measure _____ for the City of San Clemente Election to be held on November 3, 2026.

Signatures of a majority of the authors of the Argument

X In Favor of ☐ Against

Measure _____ are required:

Benjamin Severson _____
Name (Print)

Signature

5/28/26
Date

Name (Print)

Signature

Date

Name (Print)

Signature

Date

The following authors are authorized to prepare, submit or sign the Rebuttal to the Argument
X In Favor of ☐ Against

Measure _____

Print Name _____ Cameron Cosgrove _____ Title _____ Proponent _____	Signature _____ Date 5/28/26
Print Name _____ Rick Loffler _____ Title _____ Mayor of San Clemente _____	Signature _____ Date 5-28-2026
Print Name _____ Tim Brown _____ Title _____ Former Mayor of San Clemente _____	Signature _____ Date 5-28-2026
Print Name _____ Suzie Whitelaw, PhD _____ Title _____	Signature _____ Date 5/28/26
Print Name _____ Charlie Fox _____ Title _____	Signature _____ Date 5/28/2026

Attach this form to the Form of Statement of Authors Form submitted with the Argument
X In Favor of ☐ Against

Measure _____

Rebuttal to the Against Argument for The San Clemente Natural Hazards Protection and Resilience Act of 2026 (Measure number TBD)

Opposition's solution: Do nothing. That is how we got here.

Nearly two-thirds of San Clemente voters previously supported dedicated beach protection funding because residents understand these problems are real — and getting worse.

Claim: Hurts Residents.

Wrong! Protecting San Clemente now is less costly than waiting until our beaches completely disappear. Wildfire risk is driving insurance costs higher and causing cancellations, costing families thousands more annually, impacting property values, and creating risk of family displacement if disaster strikes.

Doing nothing is risky and a very costly option.

Visitors share the cost. Groceries and medicine remain exempt.

Claim: Beach Fund Overreach.

Misleading! OCTA's pledged 540,000 cubic yards of sand to protect the rail corridor is not contractually guaranteed and only about 240,000 cubic yards are proposed for San Clemente beaches. Experts estimate San Clemente's sand deficit exceeds 2 million cubic yards after decades of erosion.

Claim: Fire Fund Loophole.

False! OCFA provides emergency response and fire protection services. This measure expands San Clemente's ability to fund proactive wildfire prevention and preparedness efforts — including citywide vegetation management, Firewise initiatives, and emergency preparedness designed to address very high fire hazard areas and support long-term insurance stability before disaster strikes.

Claim: Blank Check.

False! Every dollar for beach protection and wildfire preparedness is restricted by law. Funds cannot be transferred to the General Fund. The measure requires operational plans, cost estimates, accountability reports, independent oversight, and annual audits.

Vote YES on Measure  to protect your home, your beaches, and San Clemente.

Get the facts at ProtectSanClemente.org