

## **Tim Smith**

**The County of Sonoma pension system must be fixed if there is going to be any hope for us to obtain significant additional funding for roads or any other services relied upon by county residents which requires General Fund spending. According to your April 2012 newsletter, my opponent "indicated the importance of making pension reforms and that pension costs are absorbing an ever increasing portion of the county budget that is needed for basic county services such as roads."**

**The time for simply making statements, talking at forums and issuing reports about pension reform should be long past. Unfortunately, for my opponent it clearly isn't. During her term the pension problems were exacerbated by a unanimous vote for the issuance of even more pension bonds, further restricting General Funds available for our future.**

**In order to avoid any self-interest in solving this crisis, upon being sworn in as supervisor I will opt-out of the county pension system. I have refused to sign pre-election pledges required by any labor union or other organizations to be considered for their campaign support.**

**The current supervisors, including my opponent, contend that pension changes can not be implemented without labor negotiations. While true for county employees represented by unions, that is not true for others. For example, the supervisors, other elected officials and senior staff are not represented by any labor unions. The board of supervisors could adopt pension plan revisions applicable to themselves and others which would make a real difference in solving the challenges we are facing and set an example showing their commitment to shared sacrifice. Why haven't they done this already? You should ask them yourself, but isn't their self-interest against any change affecting themselves quite clear?**