

Measure A defeated! ([final results here](#))

Bond measure narrowly loses while candidates Jack Hickey and Margret Schmidt fall short in bid for seats on the San Mateo County Community College Board
by Robert Giedt

The November 2 general election in San Mateo County was somewhat of a mixed blessing for us libertarians. The best news of the day was that Measure A, the \$148 million community college bond measure, went down to defeat as it only achieved 65% of the vote cast (it needed a $\frac{2}{3}$ vote to pass). The percentage is somewhat deceiving, however, because only 16.3% of the 318,769 registered voters in San Mateo County actually cast their opinion for the measure. The results are as follows:

Measure A ($\frac{2}{3}$ vote needed to pass)

Yes 52,019 (65.2% of votes cast)

No 27,704 (34.8% of votes cast)

On the downside of the election, Jack Hickey and Margret Schmidt--the two LPSM officers that ran for the San Mateo County Community College Board of Trustees--both fell short in their bids for election. As it turns out, the three Trustee incumbents (all of whom supported Measure A) were reelected to their posts--one for a fourth consecutive term and the other two to their second terms. Final results below:

San Mateo County Community College Board of Trustees

| | |
|-------------------------|-------------------------|
| Karen Schwarz | 41,752 (52% of voters)* |
| Patricia Miljanich | 37,335 (47% of voters) |
| Thomas L. Constantino | 36,798 (46% of voters) |
| John J. "Jack" Hickey | 21,103 (26% of voters) |
| Tullio "Til" Bertini | 16,993 (21% of voters) |
| Robert Bentley | 16,143 (20% of voters) |
| Margret Buckley Schmidt | 15,349 (19% of voters) |

*Percentage estimates are based on the number of voters who participated in the SMCCCD bond election.

[Webmaster's note: In Brisbane, Daly City, Hillsborough, Menlo Park, Pacifica, and the unincorporated areas, Margret came in 5th place, right behind Jack, and ahead of former board member Til Bertini and Robert Bentley as well. In East Palo Alto, Margret came in 4th, only 14 votes shy of board member Tom Constantino (the closest we came to doing that in any city)!]

While our candidates didn't secure seats on the board, we should give them accolades for increasing the public's awareness of Measure A and the impact it would have had. Simply entering the race and subsequently voicing opinions on the subject caught the attention of the media and allowed an opposing voice to be heard. Many different sources latched onto this, helping our cause to stop Measure A.

Petition update: There's still time to send them in!

Over \$3,600 worth collected so far!
by Robert Giedt

There's still time to send in the petitions you received last month--so if you haven't done so already, please fill them out and pop them in the mail! Each pair of valid petitions we receive saves us \$22 in filing fees in the north half of the county and \$16 in the south part of the county. The sooner we get your petitions, the quicker we can determine how much door-to-door work we'll have to do to make up the difference.

So far, this round of petitions has saved our candidates over \$3,600! We're still looking to make up about another \$1,000, so if you send off your petition today, we'll be well on our way. We'd like to thank everyone who showed up on October 9 for the petition assembly process. Without all of your help., we wouldn't have been able to get things out the door so smoothly. Many thanks!

Protect your assets from governmental intervention

Reduce government intrusion into your personal affairs at times of grief
by Lori A. Adasiewicz

The government continues to create new and more disturbing ways to intervene in our personal lives. Sometimes there is nothing we can do to avoid this unwelcome intervention, and sometimes we can fight back. Taking these steps not only will draw barriers between the government and your family, but will reduce the tax dollars needed to support the judicial system and demonstrate that individuals prefer to find ways to solve their own problems without Big Brother's "help." This intrusion can come at particularly inconvenient times, such as the incapacity or death of a family member.

To avoid the paternalistic intervention of the government at those times, you should take three simple steps. The first is to create a revocable living trust. The second is to execute durable powers of attorney. The third is to nominate a guardian for your minor children.

Executing and funding a revocable living trust takes your assets *out* of your probate estate. The State of California imposes a court procedure to determine the ownership of property when someone dies with \$100,000.00 or more in his or her name at the time of death. (By the way, the fees for this procedure are not negotiable, as they, too, are imposed by statute!) Holding your assets in trust provides an alternate mechanism to control the disposition of assets on death, or their continued management in trust for the benefit of your children or other beneficiaries. As an added bonus, a Trust can help to minimize the likelihood of a courtimposed Conservatorship over these assets in the event you were to become incapacitated and unable to manage your affairs.

When someone loses capacity to manage their affairs, the State again can step in and have the Public Conservator or an interested person take control of your assets and health care decisions. This would require another court proceeding, and the fees for this "service" are again paid from your assets. Two separate legal documents called "Durable Powers of Attorney"--one for financial management and one for health care decisions--will minimize the possibility of a Conservatorship hearing imposed by the State. In these documents, you nominate someone you know and trust to act as your conservator in the event of your incapacity. The document itself is sufficient to prove the agency relationship, and no court intervention is needed.

If you have minor children and you were to become incapacitated or die, the government would be able to decide who will care for your children and manage your assets for their benefit until they turn 18. You can make these decisions yourself by nominating a Guardian of the Person and a Guardian of the Estate for your minor children. These are simple provisions which should be included in your Will. Discuss your decision in advance with the person or persons you intend to nominate, to ensure that the person is willing and able to take on the responsibility and for your own peace of mind.

Taking affirmative action in advance of any specific tragedy will minimize the possibility of unwanted government intrusion into your personal and family life at a time of loss.

Contributed by Lori A. Adasiewicz, a Libertarian attorney practicing in the areas of estate planning and administration, probate, and business transactions. You can contact her at LoriAdaz@aol.com.

October meeting notes

by Christopher Schmidt

The October meeting at Hobe's was mostly dedicated to an informal re-hash of the question of when it is appropriate to treat with representatives of another political party. Your secretary was concerned that last month's *meeting notes* may have left the impression that the LPSM refrained from recruiting a candidate in the 21st assembly district in order to support a particular Republican candidate.

There are several reasons for our not having a candidate--the most direct being that no Libertarian declared for that race. We would not normally recruit candidates after the nomination caucus, and, when the executive committee voted 50 not to do so, each officer voted for his own reasons. Some liked the Republican; Some disliked her; Some felt the prospect of quid pro quo compelling. There were also logistical and bylaws issues at stake. Our discussion at the October meeting made clear that the variety of opinions persists. (Individualists can be so obstinate!)

Archimedes mailing

We voted to fund mailing of some LP National Committee "Archimedes" material to newly registered Libertarians in San Mateo County. Lacy was charged with investigating the possibility of sending to a bigger mailing list, since these particular materials are available at a substantial bargain.

Discussion of additional mailings

We briefly discussed a recruitment mailing to voters of other parties, and approved a reimbursement for some mailing list software. I reported on the response to our petition mailing (on-target for the time elapsed).

Jack on the campaign trail

Jack was unable to attend the meeting because he was at an event related to his school board candidacy. He has been very active on the campaign trail, attending numerous public events, candidate events, and events related to the SMCCCD bond measure, and even appeared on television!

"Our government is now taking so steady a course as to show by what road it will pass to destruction, to wit: by consolidation first, and then corruption, its necessary consequence. The engine of consolidation will be the federal judiciary; the other two branches the corrupting and corrupted instruments.."
--Thomas Jefferson, 1821

Election analysis: spend, spend, spend

by Robert Giedt

Although the largest spending item on the general ballot--Measure A--was narrowly defeated, quite a few other bloated cash measures in city elections managed to worm their way into the system.

In San Mateo, the \$35 million library bond Measure F passed with 72% of the vote cast and is destined to raise the average homeowner's

property tax by around \$50 a year. San Bruno had two major taxes on the ballot and both were successful. Measure I, San Bruno's business tax, will triple the city's minimum business taxes for nearly 75% of the city's businesses and will up the current license fee by up to 25% for the remaining big businesses. The airport tax, Measure J, fires up an airport parking tax of up to 8% at the city's only airport lot. The owners, Skypark, are already suing the city over the tax. Measure G in San Carlos was a tax earmarked for improvements to the city's parks. The tax calls for 10 years of taxes to residents and businesses.

On the positive side, two taxes requiring a 2/3 vote both fell to defeat. Measure C for the Cabrillo Unified School District only received 56% of the vote cast, thereby stopping a \$125 each year for four years parcel tax. Finally, Measure H in Atherton--a whopping \$650 per land parcel tax that was up for renewal--was overwhelmingly defeated.

Next meeting of the LP of San Mateo County:

Thursday, November 18

Hobee's Restaurant ([Directions to Hobee's](#))

1111 Shoreway Road, Belmont; just off Ralston, on the bay side of Highway 101

Dinner and informal discussion: 6:00--7:30pm in the reserved dining room

Business meeting: 7:30--8:45pm in the dining room alcove.