Ballot Measure Argument Rebuttal Submission Form

If both an argument in favor of and against a measure have been selected for publication in the voter information pamphlet, a rebuttal to the argument in favor of or the argument against the measure may be submitted as outlined in this form.

The author of the argument in favor of the measure may prepare and submit a rebuttal argument to the argument against the measure or may authorize in writing any other person or persons to prepare, submit, or sign the rebuttal argument. Likewise, the author of the argument against the measure may prepare and submit a rebuttal argument to the argument in favor of the measure or may authorize in writing any other person or persons to prepare, submit, or sign the rebuttal argument.

A rebuttal argument shall not be accepted unless accompanied by this completed form, which shall contain the printed name(s) and signature(s) of the person(s) submitting it or, if submitted on behalf of a bona fide association of citizens/organization, the name of the association/organization and the printed name and signature of at least one of its principal officers.

Word count limit for Rebuttal Arguments = 250

The rebuttal arguments shall be submitted to the elections official conducting the election no later than ____________.

These rules apply to all rebuttal arguments unless a rebuttal argument is otherwise provided by law.

Ballot Measure for the to be held on ____________.

☒ Rebuttal to Argument in Favor of Measure ☐ Rebuttal to Argument Against Measure

Signed by Exact Same Individual(s) as Argument Already Selected for the Voter Information Pamphlet

If you are submitting a rebuttal argument and the individual(s) signing the rebuttal argument are the same as the individual(s) signing the original Ballot Measure Primary Argument Submission Form, check the following box and complete the back side of this form.

☒ Rebuttal Argument Is Signed by Same Individual(s) as Argument Already Selected For the Voter Information Packet

Submitted by Different Individual(s) as the Opposing Primary Argument

If the rebuttal argument is signed by anyone different than the signer(s) of the Ballot Measure Primary Argument Submission Form already submitted—including whether there is only one different individual or whether there are up to five new individuals—you must complete the section below, complete the back side of this form, and attach to this form the written authorization by the author that indicates: (i) your name(s); and (ii) the author’s name, contact information, statement of authorization, and signature.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contact Person:</th>
<th>Phone:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mailing Address:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fax:</td>
<td>Email:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please complete the reverse side of this form.
Authorization Form
Change in Preparer, Submitter, or Signer of Rebuttal Arguments

PLEASE ONLY COMPLETE SECTIONS THAT ARE APPLICABLE

Authorization must be provided by the original author(s) of the primary argument(s) in favor of or against the specified measure, when a different person(s) will prepare, submit or sign the rebuttal argument. California Elections Code §9167, §9317, §9504.

The undersigned author(s) hereby authorize(s) the following individual(s) (up to five) to sign prepare, or submit (whichever is applicable) the rebuttal argument to the primary argument in favor of/against Measure _____ for the election to be held on ________

(date of election)

I. NEW SIGNER(S):

Name of Rebuttal Argument Signer: ____________________________

Name of Rebuttal Argument Signer: ____________________________

Name of Rebuttal Argument Signer: ____________________________

Name of Rebuttal Argument Signer: ____________________________

Name of Rebuttal Argument Signer: ____________________________

II. NEW PREPARER(S):

Name of Rebuttal Argument Preparer: __________________________

Name of Rebuttal Argument Preparer: __________________________

III. NEW SUBMITTER(S):

Name of Rebuttal Argument Submitter: __________________________

Name of Rebuttal Argument Submitter: __________________________

NAME(S) & SIGNATURE(S) OF PRIMARY ARGUMENT AUTHOR(S):

Printed Name and Signature of Author: __________________________

Date: 12-27-2016

Date
Rebuttal Argument Signers Form

No more than five signatures shall appear with any argument. If more than five signatures are submitted, the first five listed shall be printed.

Names and titles listed will be printed in the order that they are listed below.

If the signers are part of a bona fide association/organization, for each such signing individual(s), the title under the signer’s name shall list the name of that bona fide association/organization and may include their position within that association/organization.

By signing below, the undersigned state that they have read the argument and believe it not to be false or misleading.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Name:</th>
<th>Title:</th>
<th>Governing Body of San Mateo County, a School District, or a Special District</th>
<th>Member of the Governing Body of San Mateo County, a School District, or a Special District</th>
<th>Bona Fide Association of Citizens/Organization</th>
<th>Individual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>John J. Jack Hickey</td>
<td>Member, Libertarian Party San Mateo County</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Email:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Address:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Signature:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Harland Harrison</td>
<td>Chair, Libertarian Party of San Mateo County, CA</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Email:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Address:</td>
<td>Belmont, CA 94002</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Signature:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Date: 12-27-2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Phone:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Address:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Signature:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Date:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Submit a second form (this side only) for alternate signers attached to this form and the argument.
In May 2016, voters defeated TWO parcel taxes. Only 22.5% of registered voters supported Measure A. Only 20% supported Measure C.

Existing parcel taxes providing 15% of district funding, and generous contributions from MPAEF and PTO’s, have created schools which go far beyond basics. Bonded indebtedness of $131,000,000 approved by voters has added to the grandiosity of MPCSD schools. Voters do not need to raise taxes because the District is already collecting far more than necessary to provide more than basic education.

The state has an obligation to provide equal education to everybody. MPCSD tells voters they can have better schools than their neighbors if they increase taxes. This is wrong. Every child is entitled to equal education no matter what school the government forces her to go to. Eventually, the state must adjust funding to approach equality. Because MPCSD could stop the tax, they claim the state cannot take money away.

A NO vote allows one existing tax to expire, still leaving $684 in parcel taxes having NO expiration date. Proponents claim a $5,000,000 budget deficit will result. Wrong! The district has plans to prevent that from happening.

Proponents claim this tax will be subject to “oversight”. But their similar bond oversight committee has 4 VACANCIES out of 7 members!

Political consultants hired by the district, crafted ballot language to elicit voter approval. The phrase “replace its expiring parcel tax at the new rate of $360…” recommended by those consultants, DELIBERATELY hide $153 increase!

Vote NO on Measure X!