



# Seattle Voter

OCTOBER 2011

VOL. 53, No.3

## AUTUMN'S ELECTION

By Julie Anne Kempf, Voter Service Co-Chair

Early autumn weather is a marvel here in the Pacific Northwest, one we mostly keep secret from non-Cascadians. In a city known for a solid nine months of precipitation, ranging from heavy, foggy mist to out-and-out frigid monsoons, this time of year is often a revelation, with the slanting, yellow-gold light of the season's sun dappling the sidewalks and the turning leaves burnishing the landscape with a Midas' touch in dozens of shades of gold. The whole picture easily rivals New England at its best.

After a very chilly summer with few tomatoes, we seem poised for a better autumn.

We need a better season this fall in more ways than one. In the middle of our chilly summer weather, we the people held what was apparently a chilly summer election with a pallid summer turnout. Only 30.65% of the ballots issued were tabulated, according to the numbers provided by the election office in King County. 30.65%. Less than a third of all voters voted in August. Not a great showing for a primary which not only featured the primaries of many important races but also saw the highly contentious Viaduct Replacement Tunnel Project on the ballot in Seattle.

Well, October and sometimes even early November weather around Puget Sound is often a treat. We can only hope that the energy the sunshine brings will carry over to a much better ballot return on November 8.

Here, at the Seattle-King County League offices, we are doing our part to be ready for your election questions. We have prepared balanced ballot issue summaries for you, to be found here in the *Voter* and posted on our website. (Go to [www.seattlelwv.org](http://www.seattlelwv.org).)

Our Voter Information Desk is back up to full staffing and ready to serve you at 206-329-4848. Our Speaker's Bureau is ready to meet your organization's need for someone to explain this year's ballot issues and describe their potential effects. Please reserve a speaker for your event by calling the Voter Information Desk at 206-329-4848.

At our monthly forum (on October 6 at the special time of 7:00 p.m.) we will cover the five state measures, as well as the Seattle Families and Education Levy and the Seattle Transportation Benefit District's proposed \$60 motor vehicle tab fee. We have invited TVW and King County TV to tape and re-broadcast this forum.

We also look forward to co-sponsoring or moderating several candidate forums in Kirkland, Bellevue, and Lake Forest Park in October. If you need a League of Women Voters moderator for your local campaign forum, the number to call is 206-329-4848.

These forums, the ballot issue summaries, and the volunteers and moderators who are going out to speak in our community through the Speakers Bureau represent the educational arm of our organization.

We also have an advocacy piece to our League of Women Voters mission.

The State League Board has chosen to oppose the Liquor Privatization Initiative (I- 1183). The Seattle-King County Board will be studying the two major local issues in Seattle for possible endorsement. Their endorsement decisions will be announced during the first week of October.

Here's hoping for a bumper crop of informed voters in November!

---

# Contents

President’s Message .....	3
Calendar.....	4
Forum Schedule.....	5
Board Briefs.....	6
Committees .....	7
King County Connects	
Announcements	
Political Party and Auction.....	8
[We] Cover the Waterfront.....	9
Now Or Never - Volunteer.....	9
The Computer “Monica Leigh”.....	10
Don’t Come Alone.....	10
League News	
Action Report.....	11
From the Far North.....	13
From Way Down Yonder.....	13
Merge at Freeway Speed.....	13
Voter Service	
Voter Registration and Speakers’ Bureau.....	14
Membership	
Getting Connected.....	15
In Memoriam.....	16
Features	
Vote by Mail Study.....	17
Green Scissors Forum.....	19
Book Review.....	21
October Program:	
General Election Ballot Issues.....	23
Unit Meetings.....	37
Board and Committee Contacts.....	39

---

# Contact Information

President: Judy Bevington  
Voter Editor: Nan Moore

League of Women Voters  
of Seattle-King County  
1620 18th Avenue, Suite 101  
Seattle, WA 98122

Phone: (206) 329-4848  
Fax: (206) 329-1273  
info@seattlelww.org  
www.seattlelww.org

Office Hours:  
Weekdays, 9:00 a.m. – 5:00 p.m.

League of Women Voters of Washington  
4730 University Way NE # 720  
Seattle, WA 98105  
(206) 622-8961  
lwwwa@lwwwa.org  
www.lwwwa.org

League of Women Voters of the United States  
(202) 429-1965  
lww@lww.org  
www.lww.org

Postal Regulations  
The *Seattle Voter* is published monthly  
except June and August.

Published periodicals postage paid at  
Seattle, WA.

Postmaster:  
Send address changes to *Seattle Voter*:  
1620 18th Ave, Suite 101  
Seattle, WA 98122  
Seattle Voter (USPS 052210)

## Connecting with Judy

**B**EYOND SPIN, our theme for our October political party and auction, evokes different images for different people. I think of the 1950s and '60s Madison Avenue ads appearing on that new medium—television. “Spin doctors” made life necessities of new products ranging from soft drinks to vacuum cleaners. In the last decade, it has meant to me the surge of spin doctors and “opinionators” who hold forth on TV, radio, and blogs. Their overwhelming presence makes it hard to differentiate fact from fiction, reasoned arguments from cant, and truth from dogma. There are serious analysts out there, but style and rhetoric often trump substance and fact.



Judy Bevington

Our primary mission in the League is to provide studied, reasoned, factual information. When we have broad agreement and established positions on an issue, we can advocate for relevant policy and government action. We play a valuable, even vital, function by providing non-partisan, issue-oriented information. We aim to be BEYOND SPIN and must continue to assure that we are. In our studies, discussion groups, and forums we must have input from a variety of points of view. Where views are ill-informed, we need to respond with facts and reason and demand the same in return.

In these fragile economic times, when our county is often almost evenly divided on many major issues, we need to get beyond rhetoric and find bipartisan solutions. We need to listen to experts on both sides of the divide. For example, while I think that a depressed economy needs

stimulation and that social safety nets and regulations are necessary to deal with the shortcomings of our economic system, I know that I need to understand more about the needs of a healthy economy and business climate which are essentials for job growth and sources of funds for public goods. When is opposition to taxation and regulation merely blatant self-interest and when is it based on knowledge of what makes an economy healthy? We miss important information if we hear about only one theory of economics or merely paste labels on those with whom we disagree.

Our speaker at the Political Party , Stephanie Coontz, has some thought-provoking ideas about “spin.” She has been quoted as saying, “Leave it to Beaver was not a documentary.” The Cleaver family image has been used to characterize a whole era; it misses much of the reality.

Let’s consider how we can obtain essential expert opinion and in turn provide information and advocacy for our values and remain BEYOND SPIN.

Judy Bevington, President  
League of Women Voters of Seattle-King County

# October/November

Sunday	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
						October 1 Board Meeting 9:00 a.m.
2	3 Voter Deadline	4	5	6 GTKL Gathering 6:00 p.m. Forum: General Election Ballot Issues 7:00 p.m.	7	8
9	10 International Relations Committee 12:45 p.m.	11	12	13	14	15
16	17	18 Transportation Committee 10:00 a.m.	19	20	21	22 Immigration Committee 7:00 p.m.
23 Political Party and Auction 4:30 p.m.	24	25 Land Use/Central Waterfront Committee 10:00 a.m.	26	27	28	29 Economics and Taxation Committee 9:00 a.m.
30	31	November 1 Forum: National Education Study 7:00 p.m.	2	3 Discussion Leader Briefing 6:30 p.m.	4	5 Board Meeting 9:00 a.m.

## OCTOBER

Board Meeting  
Saturday, October 1  
9:00 a.m.-noon  
League Office

Voter Deadline  
Monday, October 3

Get to Know League  
Gathering  
Thursday, October 6  
6:00 p.m.  
Seattle First Baptist Church

Forum: Ballot Issues-General  
Election  
Thursday, October 6  
7:00 p.m.  
Seattle First Baptist Church

International Relations  
Committee  
Monday, October 10  
12:45-2:45 p.m.  
League Office

Transportation Committee  
Tuesday, October 18  
10:00 a.m. - noon  
League Office

Immigration Committee  
Saturday, October 22  
7:00-9:00 p.m.  
5929 Beach Dr. SW

Political Party and Auction  
Sunday, October 23  
4:30 p.m.  
Red Lion Hotel on Fifth

Land Use/Central Waterfront  
Committee  
Tuesday, October 25  
10:00 a.m.-noon  
League Office

Economics and Taxation  
Committee  
Saturday, October 29  
9:00 a.m.  
909 E. Newton #D-9

## NOVEMBER

Forum: National Education  
Study  
Tuesday, November 1  
7:00 p.m.  
Town Hall Downstairs

Discussion Leader Briefing  
Thursday, November 3  
6:30 p.m.  
League Office

Board Meeting  
Saturday, November 5  
9:00 a.m.-noon  
League Office

Voter Deadline  
Monday, November 7

## Forum Schedule

**October 6** - Ballot Issues—General Election  
**November 1** - The Role of the Federal Government in Public Education  
**January 5** - Program Planning  
**February 2** - National Privatization Study  
**March 1** - Local Teachers Study  
**April 5** - The Seattle Central Waterfront Plan  
**May 3** - All Mail Voting

The League of Women Voters of Seattle-King County (LWVS-KC) presents a public forum each month (except December) between August and May, generally on the first Thursday of the month at 7:30 p.m. The expert speakers at each forum focus on a topic chosen by the Board with advice from the members. We also provide information on the topic in the *Voter*. Those topics are then discussed at unit meetings during the following weeks; unit meetings are open to all. See the list of units at the end of this *Voter* for a discussion in your neighborhood.

Most forums are held at the Seattle First Baptist Church, but occasionally they are scheduled in other locations and times. Because of the broad community interest in public education, we are holding the November forum, “The Role of Federal Government in Public Education,” at Town Hall Downstairs. This forum will be held on November 1, the first Tuesday of the month, rather than on Thursday. The briefing for discussion leaders will be held in the League office at 6:30 p.m. on Thursday, November 3. The schedule of upcoming forums for 2011-2012 appears above; check your *Voter* or the LWVS-KC website ([seattlelwv.org](http://seattlelwv.org)) each month for up-to-date information.

### Diversity Policy

The League of Women Voters of Seattle-King County (LWVS-KC), in both its values and practices, affirms its beliefs and commitment to diversity and pluralism, which means there shall be no barriers to participation in any activity of the League on the basis of gender, race, creed, age, sexual orientation, national origin, or disability.

LWVS-KC recognizes that diverse perspectives are important and necessary for responsible and representative decision-making. LWVS-KC subscribes to the belief that diversity and pluralism are fundamental to the values it upholds and that this inclusiveness enhances the organization’s ability to respond more effectively to changing conditions and needs.

LWVS-KC affirms its commitment to reflecting the diversity of Americans in its membership, board, staff, and programs.

## Board Briefs by Joanna Cullen, Secretary

---

*The League of Women Voters of Seattle-King County met on Saturday morning September 10th. This is a summary of their work.*

The Board is reorganizing the membership portfolio. Publicity activities are also being reorganized as Jean Carlson, who has been overseeing those activities, is on a leave of absence.

Good news—the office phones and computers are working again. Members can now reach us and we can reach them.

The details of finalizing the merger of the Seattle League and South County are nearly completed. Just a few items remain to be cleared up at the state level, and work (led by Mary Ehlers) to align the positions of the two leagues is still under way.

Our first forum of the year, an update on the census information, was well-attended and received. Kudos to Jeannette Johnson, Program Chair. The League has also been receiving a greater than usual number of requests for moderators. Reports are that our moderators do a great job and that we are a trusted organization. Dana Twight and Ellen Barton have been busy contributing to this activity.

Due to the various changes that have occurred over time in voter registration, the number of registrations per effort has changed. We covered several events this summer, and while we were well received by the organizers, the number of registrations has significantly declined. Our presence at many of these events may offer benefits beyond just the numbers gathered. It gives the League visibility and presents opportunities for us to educate others about the League and about voting. However, the Board will have to consider the goals of this activity and the best use of our volunteers' time.

The Development Committee reported a successful first-time pledge drive.

Our efforts to “partner” with others for events has been reflected in a number of co-sponsoring opportunities with City-Club this year.

Our Transportation Committee and Action Committee were able to work along with other groups to mobilize for the successful passage of the Congestion Reduction Fee by the King County Council.

The Development Committee is currently focused on ensuring that the October political party event is successful. Planning is going well and invitations are out. The emphasis now is on soliciting sponsorships and auction items and filling tables. *The Stranger* and KIRO 7 are media sponsors this year.

Beatrice Crane, Janet Winans, and Joanna Cullen were appointed to the compilation committee for the National education study.

Kati Ortiz, Janet Winans, and Linda Brown were appointed to the reading committee for the upcoming local study on teachers.

The Board is continuing to review the new endorsement procedures with the understanding that it is not necessary to take a position on all local issues.

---

## Committees

---

### **ECONOMICS AND TAXATION COMMITTEE**

DATE: SATURDAY, OCTOBER 29

TIME: 9:00 A.M.

PLACE: 909 E. NEWTON #D9

RSVP: LWVSEATTLENORA@YAHOO.COM

### **EDUCATION COMMITTEE**

The Education Committee is currently completing work on the study “Fostering Teacher Effectiveness: No Easy Answers.” It is not holding regularly scheduled meetings at this time. Upon completion of the study, the Education Committee will resume its regular mission and announce a monthly meeting time.

### **IMMIGRATION COMMITTEE**

DATE: SATURDAY, OCTOBER 22

TIME: 7:00 – 9:00 P.M.

PLACE: 5929 BEACH DRIVE SW. FOR DIRECTIONS

CALL 206-329-4848

The Committee is reading and discussing the book *Moving Millions*, by Jeffrey Kaye, a look at global forces that affect the movement of people in all areas of the globe. We invite all to join us. It is not necessary to have read the book nor need you be a member of the committee.

### **INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS COMMITTEE**

DATE: MONDAY, OCTOBER 10

TIME: 12:45 – 2:45 P.M.

PLACE: LEAGUE OFFICE

The IR committee will be considering topics and issues to focus our discussions and guide our plans for outreach activities during the year. Come join us!

There is no required reading for the coming meeting but we will refer to the (short) book *A Letter to America*, by David Boren. For further information contact Rebecca Castilleja, Chair, at [telbalto@yahoo.com](mailto:telbalto@yahoo.com).

### **LAND USE/CENTRAL WATERFRONT COMMITTEES**

DATE: TUESDAY, OCTOBER 25

TIME: 10 A.M. – NOON

PLACE: LEAGUE OFFICE

The meeting will focus on the waterfront as it is. Speakers are scheduled from the Department of Transportation and the Department of Planning and Development. Future meetings will focus on the plan that is being developed for the waterfront and the many issues related to such a project.

### **TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE**

DATE: TUESDAY, OCTOBER 18

TIME: 10 A.M. – NOON

PLACE: LEAGUE OFFICE

Speaker to be announced. For information contact Janet Winans, Chair, [janetwinans@earthlink.net](mailto:janetwinans@earthlink.net).

**We encourage participation in our issue committees. Often there are excellent speakers who provide informative presentations.**

# King County Connects - Announcements

*The League of Women Voters of Seattle-King County  
invites you and your guests to a gala evening*

**THE 35TH ANNUAL POLITICAL PARTY & AUCTION**

## **BEYOND SPIN**

Sunday, October 23, 2011

Complimentary Champagne 4:30 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.

Red Lion Hotel on Fifth Avenue  
1415 Fifth Avenue • Seattle



Senator Patty Murray, 2011 Honorary  
Chair of the LWVS-KC Political Party.

*Why **Beyond Spin**? We are concerned about the state of our national and local discourse. The mission of LWV is critically important today when fiction is often presented as fact. More than ever voters need accurate information that is BEYOND SPIN!*

Emcee: Monique Ming Laven, KIRO 7 Eyewitness News

Please join us to celebrate and support the League of Women Voters – always Beyond Spin!

This year's event will feature:



Stephanie Coontz

- A casual silent auction during the social hour and a fun but short live auction.
- The presentation of our first annual Making Democracy Work Awards to recognize individuals and organizations that are creating positive change in our community.
- A chance to see old friends, make new ones, and rub elbows with community leaders, elected officials, and candidates for office.
- AND LAST, BUT NOT LEAST, a sure-to-raise-the-roof keynote from Stephanie Coontz, nationally recognized expert on the facts of life for women, families, and marriage. More on Stephanie Coontz may be found at: <http://seattlelwv.org/node/1102>.

We are proud to announce our media sponsors:



## **[WE] COVER THE WATERFRONT**

The Seattle Waterfront has been the subject of intense public debate and political interest for several years. Major motivation for this interest is the questionable safety of the viaduct and the seawall. A stakeholders' group met to evaluate the use of the viaduct, review its condition, look at alternatives, and then make recommendations. At the end of the process, when the group had decided that the current viaduct should come down and that a surface alternative should be considered, the governor, the county executive, and the mayor came to the group with a proposal for a bored tunnel. After much discussion and a public vote, work will begin on the tunnel.

In the meantime, a Citizens' Waterfront Committee has been established and has been working. Guidelines have been established and a lead designer hired. He is James Corner, best known for his work on the Highline Project in New York. He has made several public presentations in Seattle. His plans are challenging but represent a major effort to connect the city with the waterfront. There are many things to consider in developing such a plan. How is it managed or governed? How is it funded? How is the area managed during the construction process?

Join us on the Land Use/Waterfront Committee as we work through these issues.

## **IT'S NOW OR NEVER**

Just a few weeks remain before the League of Women Voters of Seattle-King County political party and auction. This is our most important fundraiser. Without significant income from this event we are not able to pursue our mission and work towards the goals we all share. The success of this effort depends on help from many people, both before and during the event. It depends on YOU! We want your ideas, your hands, your voices, your auction items, and especially your you-know-what in a seat at a table.

What do you want to give?

- Be a table captain. Get a few friends, co-workers, or other members to join your table.
- Share your ideas: Be creative! Who outside the League would be interested in this event? Who would be like to be seen as a sponsor? Who might donate an unusual experience to the auction?
- Use your voice: Make calls from home to potential sponsors, auction donors, and

guests. We will give you the list and talking points.

- Solicit auction items in your neighborhood shops or pick up local items that have been donated.

We have many opportunities for you to help with set up, registration, etc., on the day and evening of the party. This year we are also arranging for elected officials and candidates to be paired with a host from their area who will introduce them to League leadership, VIPs, and others from their district. If you are willing to serve as host, please let us know. We want to make sure that every League member, guest, and invited official is treated warmly and has an opportunity to talk with key individuals. This will help make the event successful both socially and financially.

We have a great Volunteer Manager, Judy Ostrow, waiting to hear from you. Please contact Judy at 206-329-4848 or [2jostrow@comcast.net](mailto:2jostrow@comcast.net) and tell her you want to be a part of the fun.

### THE COMPUTER “MONICA LEIGH”

Judy opened the mail to find a check from Monica Leigh in memory of our dead computer. This ameliorated Judy's grief considerably.

The Board suggested she name the computer in honor of Monica. So done!

Want your name on a server, monitor, or phone CPU?

### **DON'T COME ALONE** BY GINNA OWENS

Bring neighbors and friends and colleagues to **LWV Points of Entry**.

We invite you to join us in **Managing for More**—a project designed to ensure that the League of Women Voters of Seattle-King County “stays in the black.” There is no magic wand to help us maintain financial solvency, but we do have a basic membership corps of 600+ men and women who care about Making Democracy Work. If each of us steps forward to share our league passion with others, the results will tumble in. Membership will increase and so will our coffers. Managing for More friends as well as funds.

#### **What's a Point of Entry?**

A Point of Entry is a sizzling, succinct introduction to the league—at the basic level. It contains enough facts and emotion to make a lasting impact. It's a forum. It's a unit meeting. It's a study group or action committee. It's the October 23rd BEYOND SPIN Auction and Political Party at the Red Lion. The content of each of these Points of Entry plus your friendly give and take with your guests can make a world of difference to the future of the Seattle-King County League.

**Consider this:** In order to pay our bills this fiscal year, we must generate more than \$160,000 beyond membership dues. We're counting on a minimum net of \$40,000 from the big October event. If each unit and each study group guarantees at least one table that includes at least four non-league members, we should be able to do it. FYI: Here's the email invitation I sent to my non-League friends.

Dear Friends, I hope you'll save the late afternoon and evening on Sunday, October 23,

2011 to attend the League of Women Voters big fundraiser at the Red Lion in downtown Seattle. And sit at my table, of course.

Actually, I hope you'll save both the date and \$91 for the ticket.

We have a dynamite speaker in Stephanie Coontz, author of *The Way We Never Were* and a bunch of other great books and essays about the role(s) of women...fiction and fact. Fittingly, we've named the event BEYOND SPIN. I'll send the official information after everything's up on our web site so you can make your reservation.

For now, I'll attach the LWV Facts 101\* in case you want to remember how much you love this 91-year-old organization that's been doing hands on work to make this democracy viable for all of us. This is a very today issue: Can we restore sanity to our political process before our democracy is jeopardized? The League of Women Voters believes that sensible, responsible civil discourse and action based on substance rather than partisanship is essential. Democracy works through informed participation in government.

You can help us grow our ability to reach out and find more natural allies, more residents of King County who care about restoring sanity to our political process before our democracy is jeopardized. **DON'T COME ALONE.** Get in touch with friends and colleagues, bring them to the next forum, and most significantly, invite them to join you at the October 23rd BEYOND SPIN event at the Red Lion on Fifth.

\*LWV Facts 101 may be viewed on the League website; go to <http://www.seattlelwv.org>.

# King County Connects - League News

## ACTION REPORT

BY LINDA BROWN, ACTION CHAIR

Among the most important functions of the League of Women Voters (LWV) is that of translating our knowledge of issues and our commitment to civic engagement into appropriate actions—actions that follow through on League positions on important public issues and demonstrate League concern and leadership on matters that are important to the community. Proposals and requests for action by the League may come from several sources, including standing and study committees, the Board, and individual members. Developing a clear action process is a Board priority for this fall; the Board reviewed a draft action protocol at its retreat in August. The protocol is presented here for review and member input.

## PROPOSED LWVS-KC ACTION PROTOCOL

**Goals:** Clearly define a process by which League committees or members may bring a request for action forward for consideration. Ensure action consistent with LWV values, policies, and positions.

**Challenge:** Develop a process that is deliberate yet nimble enough to ensure timely action.

**Who Approves Action Requests:**

- Decision by president with action chair
- Decision by executive committee
- Decision by full Board (Controversial issues should go to full Board.)

**Process for Approval:** The goal for the approval process is to allow the League to respond to action requests in the most timely way possible. For the

rare, immediately time-sensitive issues, decisions will be made by the president and action chair. Most requests will be reviewed by the executive committee for a decision either to approve or to take to the full Board for approval. The full Board will be kept informed by either the president or the action chair of requests for action and the decisions that are made.

**Criteria for Action Decisions:**

- Committee support
- League priority
- League positions that support the action
- Scope of the issue (local or state)
- Potential of the action to make a difference

**Kinds of Action**

- Full scale public support or opposition
  - Draft and deliver testimony on the issue
  - Letters to the editor
  - Op-ed article
  - Other advocacy (e.g., membership alerts, informational meetings, etc.)
  - Collaborate with other organizations to support or oppose the issue
- Further analysis of issue
  - Initiate a League study of the issue
  - Refer to relevant committee for further study
  - League observer at events relevant to the issue
  - Collaborate with other organizations to study the issue
  - Informational forum or other presentation for members on the issue

**Action Protocol**

1. Committee chair (or individual League member) presents a request for action to the action chair.

2. Request for action should include:
  - a. Statement of proposed action
  - b. Statement of committee support with opposing views if they exist among members. Committee chair should ensure all views are presented.
  - c. Description of how the issue and proposed action reflects League priorities
  - d. League position(s) that support the action
  - e. Scope of the issue and potential of action to make a difference
3. Action chair takes request to president with recommendation.
4. Decision about where request should be approved
5. Board members informed about the request for action
6. Decision and feedback to committee or individual

If you have any comments, suggestions, or questions, please contact Linda Brown at [brownlj@comcast.net](mailto:brownlj@comcast.net).

**ALL ABOUT VOTING:**  
**AMENDMENTS TO THE**  
**CONSTITUTION OF**  
**THE UNITED STATES**

AMENDMENT XV

*Passed by Congress February 26, 1869. Ratified  
February 3, 1870.*

Section 1. The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude--

Section 2. The Congress shall have the power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

AMENDMENT XIX

*Passed by Congress June 4, 1919. Ratified  
August 18, 1920.*

The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex.

Congress shall have the power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

AMENDMENT XXIV

*Passed by Congress August 27, 1962. Ratified  
January 23, 1964.*

Section 1. The right of citizens of the United States to vote in any primary or other election for President or Vice President, for electors for President or Vice President, or for Senator or Representative in Congress, shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or any State by reason of failure to pay poll tax or other tax.

Section 2. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

AMENDMENT XXVI

*Passed by Congress March 23, 1971. Ratified  
July 1, 1971.*

Note: Amendment 14, section 2, of the Constitution was modified by section 1 of the 26th amendment.

Section 1. The right of citizens of the United States, who are eighteen years of age or older, to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of age.

Section 2. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

## NEWS FROM THE FAR NORTH

BY CYNDI WOODS, VOTER SERVICE  
CO-CHAIR

Voter Services connected with our partners in “The Far North” on August 28 up in the wilds of Bothell. LWVS-KC and LWV Snohomish County shared a table at the Bothell Riverfest expo.

Together we helped people register to vote and change their registration addresses and explained how the League works. We helped educate some voters about our all mail-in ballots and how our county elections officials verify voters’ signatures on ballots. Several people commented that they miss the precinct polling places and the opportunity they provided them to visit with their neighbors each election day.

Did you know that Bothell is an unusual city in that it is situated in both King and Snohomish counties? It was fun to ask people visiting our table which county they vote in. According to our unofficial census, about half the people we met that day vote in King County and about half in Snohomish County.

It was also nice to share stories with our sister league president, Michelle Valentine. Michelle described how Snohomish County League marched in parades last year to celebrate the League’s 90th anniversary—a great way to get visibility in the Snohomish County community.

## NEWS FROM WAY DOWN YONDER

BY CINDY PIENNETT, CO-UNIT LEADER  
SOUTHWEST KING COUNTY

The two new units in the south end of the county will have held their first unit meetings as part of the Seattle-King County League on September 13 in Enumclaw and on September 21 in Federal Way. Check the *Voter* each month for meeting times for these units. Please come and join us.

Also, on September 14th, the former King County South league will have held a farewell picnic potluck at the home of Miriam Helgeland, our fine long-standing member. Our office in Burien closed in

mid-September.

Already two of our members, Mary Ehlers and Pat McCann, have been participating as new board members in the merged league, and several Leaguers from south county were able to attend the excellent Census Update forum.

We are ready to roll into the Seattle-King County League!

## MERGE AT FREEWAY SPEED

BY BECKY COX

That could be the mantra as King County South becomes part of Seattle-King County.

Our major project was closing the office that King County South maintained for about 35 years. We started in an upstairs office in Burien, moved to a storefront in Kent, moved to space in an empty school, and then moved to what was Interwest Bank in Burien. We settled there for about 10 years and were summarily booted out when Wells Fargo took over the bank. (We were determined to be a “security risk.”) Our final move was to space in the building owned by the Northwest Chapter of Paralyzed Veterans of America. They were fantastic landlords and they are sad we have left.

One of our relics that traveled to each office was a HUGE L-shaped counter that a business donated to our first office. The sons of one our members helped move the monster every time. When we made our move to Interwest Bank, the boys were older and they said, “No more.” When Wells Fargo asked us to leave, they found themselves with a new piece of furniture!

All our “stuff” traveled with us over the years—there never seemed time to properly sort things out. The time arrived to dispose of non-essential things. An historical record of studies and key financial information will remain with Seattle-King County.

Merge with Seattle at freeway speed!

## Voter Service

### VOTER SERVICE—VOTER REGISTRATION & SPEAKERS' BUREAU

BY CYNDI WOODS, VOTER SERVICE CO-CHAIR

The peak season for Voter Service is up and running at full speed. Over the summer we helped voters register at the Juneteenth celebration in Pratt Park, close to our League office. On the 4th of July we cooperated with King County Elections to register over 50 new citizens following the naturalization ceremony at Seattle Center. These new citizens make us appreciate yet again how fortunate we are to have the vote.

LWVS-KC returned to Bumbershoot this year to register voters at the King County Elections booth. And we've responded to requests from retirement homes and rehabilitation centers to help people with voter registration and reviewing ballot measures.

Our voter registration volunteers are fantastic. We couldn't support this effort without their help. Heartfelt thanks to Ellen Barton, Andrea Carey, Lee Carpenter, Beatrice Crane, Joanna Cullen, Lindsay Cummings, Candis Litsey, Jan Orlando, Dana Twight, and Tom and JoAnne Way.

Late September and October are the high season for our Speakers' Bureau (SB). We've had many requests for moderators at candidate forums and town hall panel discussions across King County. In addition, a number of requests have come in for speakers to reach out to community groups to explain the ballot measures to be voted on in the November general election. Our SB volunteers are busy helping voters make informed choices.

Since Kirkland recently annexed a large population, folks who have never voted in Kirkland city council or mayoral races before, we'll be supporting them with moderators and ballot measures speakers as they vote in their first city election.

Many, many thanks to all our SB volunteers--we'll be able to catch our breath again come November 8th.

#### AUCTION DONATIONS HIGHLIGHTS:

Cabin on Decatur Island  
 December weekend in Vancouver, B.C.  
 Ocean View Cabin at Pacific Beach  
 Thai Dinner for 6  
*Hey, please don't drool on the Voter!*  
 Birding in King County  
 Birding on San Juan Island  
 Lunch with Sheriff Rahr  
 Dick's Gift cards  
 Rustic bread for a year  
 Diamond necklace  
 Bags of books  
 Cookbooks  
 Massage  
 Dinner for two in Dayton  
 Nancy Rust's oral history book  
 Gift card from Ivars  
 \$100 certificate for Vios  
 Original drawings

Many more are coming in every day.

---

## Getting Connected by Dana Twight, Membership Chair

---

### MEET OUR NEW LEAGUE MEMBERS

**O**ur new members are highly educated and share an interest in belonging to a group that focuses on unbiased discussions following study of current topics and political issues. Some of them joined to be advocates on behalf of education and social issues because they were impressed with our positions on these topics.

Phyllis Runyon is a speech-language pathologist who, in addition to being active in her field, has broadened her focus to serve on the board of the Washington Education Association and as president of the Issaquah Education Association. She heard of League through a friend and is serving already on the Education Committee and participating in League's teacher study!

Jay Donald Ostrow is a retired physician and medical researcher with an interest in the social and economic aspects of medical care. When he's not on sabbaticals in Britain, Germany, or the Netherlands, you may see him bird watching with the Audubon Society or choral singing. While not a previous member, he certainly should get some credit in League standings as he has accompanied his wife, Judy Ostrow (a State Board member), to many meetings!

Helen Donnelly Goehring's thirty-year career has been in public relations and development in nonprofits. Most recently she served as development director of Horizon House. She heard of League through friends and has skills in writing, public speaking, and advocacy, all of which should fit nicely with League goals.

Enid M. Havens is a retired elementary school teacher who is rejoining the League. Her interests include gardening, water coloring, reading, writing, and music. She is a voting member of the White Center Library Guild, member of Fauntleroy UCC, and past chair of "Global Peace and Justice Task Force." She finds "the forums most helpful and the units were an opportunity to study and reach group consensus."

Welcome back, Enid!

Phyllis Leiendecker comes to us with strong credentials. At 91, she likes to read about world affairs and politics. Most importantly, she has reared a daughter who is a member of LWV and who wants her mother to continue to be an informed, involved voter. They both hope that the League will provide an important link. Phyllis has been a member of an Orthopedic Guild and is retired.

Margaret Baker is a retired U.S. government attorney who specialized in federal personnel law. She was previously a member of League in Northern Virginia. Since her retirement, she has volunteered for United Way of King County and ushered for ARTSWEST in West Seattle. She has a special interest in publications and has produced a neighborhood newsletter. Margaret is looking forward to well written study guides and lively discussions with interesting, involved people.

Mia Katherine Boyles's occupation is "Producer." Her wide-ranging interests include international affairs and whole systems design. She is also a filmmaker, philosopher, artist, and musician. In addition, she still has time for environmental education, teaching yoga, and membership in Women in Film and in the Puget Sound Grantwriters' Association. She is interested in international affairs and hopes to connect with other women who will participate in "proactive" discussion.

Charlotte Nelson is a retired teacher and UW education advisor. Her degrees are in French, history, and educational psychology. Her active retirement has involved the Episcopal Church, volunteering for book and rummage sales, and Operation Nightwatch. She hopes to become better educated in world issues so that she might gain understanding and increase her participation in politics.

When you see one of these new members at your unit, a forum, or our fall event, please don't hesitate to introduce yourself! We have more new members to

include in the next *Voter!*

Thank you to Karen McFadden and Pat Loschen—both on the Membership Committee—for interviewing these new members.

## *In Memoriam*

### **JEAN TAYLOR HUESTON — 1918 - 2011**

**O**n July 28, 2011, the League of Women Voters of Seattle-King County lost a 50-year member—one who had served many terms on the Board of Directors of the South King County League—when Jean Hueston passed gently away in her sleep.

Jean would have been ninety-three this November, and from her tidy bedroom in a charming hospice residence in Spanaway Lake she continued her advocacy on behalf of children, women, and families right up until she was too frail to leave her bed in the last days. Even then, she was alert and interested in the current local news and excited to hear new information, such as news of our Seattle-King County League merger.

Jean was a tireless advocate, mentor, networker, and friend. She was also a planner; she liked to be ready for the next challenge coming down the pike. At her memorial service, Jean's pastor drew a huge laugh when he shared with us that Jean herself had planned most of her own funeral—the music and songs, the readings, and the order of service! This came as no surprise to those of us who had worked with Jean throughout the years. She wanted things done right and was never one to avoid any work that came her way.

It can be easy to give generously to charity when one has had good fortune financially—a lucrative job, great investments, a lucky break. Jean had none of these advantages. Indeed, truth be told, the financial side of life had not treated her kindly and she lived very modestly in her later years. Yet she always set aside a few dollars for every charity or organization that was

doing good works, in her opinion. She contributed, and she urged others to contribute, not only of their money but also of their time.

And if you had some time, Jean had a task, job, or club for you! Jean enjoyed organizational matchmaking in South King County. She kept copious lists of people and contacts in the days when lists meant boxes and boxes of file cards, and she embraced personal computer technology for her lists as early as she was able to afford to do so. She protected personal information on her lists while cheerfully matchmaking friends, colleagues, union brothers and sisters, and political allies with benevolent clubs, jobs, churches, poll worker appointments, campaigns, community groups, drives for the needy, and many, many other activities.

Jean had moved to Des Moines from Oakland (and earlier Missouri) in 1950. Jean's sixty years of work in our community was honored when a floor of the new King County office tower, the Chinook Building, was named after her. The fifth floor of that structure is now the Jean Hueston Floor. Fittingly, Community Services is housed on the fifth floor.

The last legislative session that Jean was able to attend in person was in 2010. Too weak to walk from legislator's office to legislator's office to lobby, she parked herself and her walker inside the elevator nearest the house chamber—the elevator that all state representatives had to take on their way to the chamber to vote unless they chose to climb three flights of stairs. The true meaning of the political phrase “elevator speech” became abundantly clear to the legislators as this frail woman leaning on her walker lobbied them ferociously during their rides up and down about the urgency of remembering the most vulnerable in our society in a budget scarred with drastic cuts.

Jean was a mentor, a teacher, an inspiration, and a friend. She will be missed.

## Features

### WHAT ARE THE REAL COSTS, BENEFITS, AND EFFECTS OF VOTE BY MAIL VS. TRADITIONAL POLL VOTING OR A COMBINED SYSTEM?

BY JULIE ANNE KEMPF

At the Annual Meeting in May 2011, the League of Women Voters of Seattle approved a one and one half year study submitted by Julie Anne Kempf, Dana Twight, and Cyndi Goddard-Woods called "Vote by Mail Costs, Benefits, and Effects." It will explore the direct costs, benefits, effects, accuracy, and transparency of a 100% vote by mail balloting system, a traditional at-the-polls balloting system, and finally a combination of voluntary vote by mail (for those who desire to receive their ballot by mail) and a traditional poll site-based balloting system (for the rest of the voting population).

The study will use the election administration criteria established by the SARA Resolution at the LWVUS convention in 2005, including the principle of transparency as added at convention in 2010. The new "SARAT" principles are: Security, Accuracy, Recountability, Accessibility, and Transparency.

Since the study was accepted, the Board is considering adding a late spring/early summer 2012 forum and unit discussion. We have also learned that the San Francisco chapter of the League is currently undertaking a very similar study for their area, as California's voluntary Vote by Mail (VBM) population is growing and some counties are considering converting to all VBM. Also, since the annual meeting, longtime Seattle election reform advocate Janet Anderson has joined the study leadership team.

Although the study will be undertaken by the newly merged LWV Seattle-King County, portions of the study will examine election data from all of Washington and parts of Oregon and California. We have already made contact

with the San Francisco League; we hope to share insights, resources, and research opportunities, while still building distinct and separate studies relevant to our own geographical and political boundaries.

Why now? The time is right to examine VBM in greater depth. In the past legislative session, Washington became the second state (after Oregon) to mandate the conduct of all of its elections entirely by mail. Enough time has passed with statistically significant numbers of voters voting by mail in our state under our no-question, permanent-absentee-ballot-upon-request laws that meaningful study can be undertaken.

The primary reasons that jurisdictions in Washington and Oregon have provided for the change to 100% Vote-by-Mail is that Vote-by-Mail is very cost-effective and convenient to the voter. Voter convenience, in turn, is assumed to encourage higher voter turnout. However, no studies, papers, or analyses from credible sources exist to support or disprove any of these claims.

There does exist a dearth of hard, unbiased facts and studies of the effects of VBM, and a lot of speculation, both positive and negative, surrounding the topic. With the exception of one small study in California comparing the behavior of a handful of permanent VBM counties to similarly situated combined system counties in voter turnout over a four year period, there have been no significant studies whatsoever nationally to determine if voter turnout is permanently affected by changing the voting method to vote by mail. *[Since this study was proposed, a brief analysis was published in early September*

*2011 by King County Government Accountability Committee staff which indicated that VBM had no impact on voter turnout. JAK]*

This study will also provide good information concerning the costs in dollars of each of the ballot delivery systems, as well as other important factors: the effects on voter behavior; the occurrence of voter disenfranchisement; the accuracy of the overall count in each system; and the transparency of the mail ballot accounting process.

The study will rely on such raw data analysis and interviews as are needed to provide the answers to the main four questions in the objectives. We will prepare a series of articles for the *Voter* discussing these topics in depth and we will present what we have learned to unit meetings for further discussion. Eventually, we plan to put on at least one public forum.

The study will have the following major objectives:

- To understand the true and accurate benefits and effects of 100% Vote-by-Mail, vs. the true monetary costs to counties and the state of 100% Vote-by-Mail balloting, of traditional poll balloting, and of a system which combines poll balloting as the norm with unrestricted choice of Vote-by-Mail for anyone who desires to vote by mail. Is Vote-by-Mail more expensive, less expensive, or do the various costs and savings offset each other?
- To determine the relative effect on voter turnout of 100% Vote-by-Mail. Does Vote-by-Mail encourage sustained higher voter turnout levels?
- To determine the “effort to vote” impact on voters across the board under 100% Vote-by-Mail. Is Vote-by-Mail easier, harder, or equivalent in effort for those who would not have chosen a vote by mail ballot, but rather would have chosen to go to the polls under the combined system?

- To examine, through canvass numbers and via personal interviews with voters, any disenfranchisement effect due to means of ballot delivery.

- To determine the number or percentage of uncanvassable/uncountable ballots inherent in each system and the effects, if any, on the accuracy of the overall count.

- To evaluate the transparency of the process. In other words, to determine if information about the ballot processing during and after canvass is easier, the same, or more complicated for the general public to obtain and understand.

We will endeavor to determine what recommendations the LWV can make, if any, to election officials and the public as more states consider changes to their ballot delivery process as a part of their overall voting systems.

Once the study is completed, the membership will be able to discuss and formulate a position for advocacy, and we can begin educating and lobbying for specific reforms. The plan is to be able to lobby by 2013 (a long session) so that reforms (if needed) could be in place in time for the 2014 even-year state elections.

The projected budget, over two years, is \$680.00. A complete breakout is available at the League office. We will actively raise funds to cover our expenses, so as not to impact the LWV adopted budget.

You can get involved! If you have thoughts on any of these issues, or would like to join the study team in any way, we'd be happy to hear from you. Please send your ideas to the Mail Ballot Study Team, [mailballotstudy@seattlelwv.org](mailto:mailballotstudy@seattlelwv.org), or call the League of Women Voters of Seattle-King County and leave a message for the study team at 206-329-4848.

## WHAT I LEARNED AT THE GREEN SCISSORS FORUM

BY JANET WINANS

**G**reen Scissors is a diverse coalition of environmental, taxpayer, free market, and consumer groups working together to highlight and end wasteful and environmentally harmful federal spending. “Green Scissors” is a registered trademark of Friends of the Earth, one of four non-profit organizations in the coalition. Friends of the Earth, Public Citizen, Taxpayers for Common Sense, and the Heartland Institute have joined together to produce their annual report, Green Scissors 2011. They intend this report to serve as a guide for beginning the conversation on how to prioritize, identify, and cut various programs and tax breaks so that taxpayers, consumers, and the environment will benefit. Using data from government resources, primarily the Joint Committee on Taxation, the Government Accountability Office, and the Office of Management and Budget, their report identifies more than \$380 billion in wasteful government subsidies that are damaging to the environment and economically harmful to taxpayers. Their report is available at [www.greenscissors.com](http://www.greenscissors.com).

The forum held August 29th at Town Hall in Seattle, moderated by Ellen Barton from the League of Women Voters of Seattle-King County, was the kind of conversation the Green Scissors Coalition intended to stimulate. Using the very serious impetus of the congressional “super committee” that will be deciding how to cut \$1.5 trillion from the federal budget between now and Thanksgiving, four speakers addressed their priorities for what should be eliminated, what should be kept secure, and how their philosophies fit with their choices. The speakers were Ryan Alexander, President, Taxpayers for Common Sense ([www.taxpayer.net](http://www.taxpayer.net)), Paul Guppy, Vice President for Research, Washington Policy Center ([www.washingtonpolicy.org](http://www.washingtonpolicy.org)), Andy Nicholas, Policy Analyst, Washington Center on Budget and Policy Priorities ([www.budgetandpolicy.org](http://www.budgetandpolicy.org)), and Ross Macfarlane, Senior Advisor, Business Partnerships at Climate Solutions ([climatesolutions.org](http://climatesolutions.org)).

Ms. Barton was remarkably well prepared to lead the conversation these speakers began with those in the

audience. Because she understood the perspectives of each of them she was able to direct her questions to each participant’s particular interest. Ms. Alexander served as spokesperson for the report. The items in their \$380 billion target issues were agreed to by consensus among a coalition of people who range from very dedicated environmentalists to equally dedicated advocates for the free market. She emphasized that their focus is *wasteful government spending that is harmful to the environment*. The report considers energy, agriculture, transportation, and land and water and describes particular programs that both harm the environment and waste taxpayer dollars.

The other three speakers were not participants in the consensus process, but their interests reflected the interests of the coalition members. Mr. Guppy emphasized wastefulness in government. He believes we can solve the problem of “big money” lobbying Congress by limiting the power of Congress to have any control over issues that lobbyists would want to influence. He and Andy Nicholas expressed very opposite philosophies. Mr. Nicholas explained his perspective by stating that our greatest problem is not deficits, it is the failure of the economy to create jobs. Our greatest danger, he said, is that by focusing on cutting programs that he considers essential, we will cripple our country in the future. Mr. Macfarlane is an advocate for addressing the critical needs of the country’s failing infrastructure, the environmental damage that our use of fossil fuels is inflicting, and the unfair advantage that those very fossil fuel industries have over all others. He strongly urged that it is appropriate and necessary for the federal government to invest in essential infrastructure as well as in research in alternative energy and in the production systems that research will create.

Green Scissors 2011 is well worth reading ([www.greenscissors.com](http://www.greenscissors.com)). To give a sense of how diverse and inclusive they are, here is a sampling of the recommended cuts. The list of “Selected conventional fossil fuel subsidies” ranges from “Last in, First Out Accounting” (a method that uses the cost of the most recent shipment of widgets into the company [rather

than the earliest shipment] when calculating profit on sales) at \$30 billion to the more understandable “Domestic Manufacturing Tax Deduction for Oil and Gas Companies,” nearly \$7 billion, and “Natural Gas Gathering Lines,” \$5 million. Their total for fossil fuel subsidies is \$61 billion and for nuclear subsidies, almost \$50 billion. Among proposed cuts to alternative energy subsidies is the “Loan Guarantee Program” (\$51 billion) and the “Tax Credit and Deduction for Clean-Fuel Burning Vehicles” (\$1.6 billion). This last is meant to aid American automobile manufacturers’ alternative fuel vehicles as they compete with the more efficient Prius. The total of proposed cuts for alternative energy subsidies (all of which the group considers wasteful and harmful) is nearly \$96 billion. The agricultural industry subsidies selected by Green Scissors total almost \$57 billion. They name specific transportation programs and projects over 2012-2016 that total more than \$106 billion. The list includes the Columbia River Crossing between Vancouver and Portland (\$3.6 billion). The land and water subsidies selected range from a “Special Tax Treatment for Timber Gain” (\$2.2 billion) to the “Inland Waterways Users Board” (\$2 million) and many other Corps of Engineers projects. Their total is \$15 billion.

Of course, every one of these items has a team of lobbyists fighting to maintain these long entrenched accesses to the revenue stream of the United States government. And it was this issue of the federal resource revenue stream that I felt I learned most about as I listened to the four advocates. The debate surrounding the congressional super committee is not really about deficits or even about spending. The debate is about the conflicting beliefs about “government” that Mr. Guppy and Mr. Nicholas seemed to represent.

The twelve specially selected legislators are assigned a remarkable task. These twelve people are poised to create a template for our future. They have the opportunity to consider just who should have the first and best access to the vast resources available from both the earth itself and the people who live on it in this country. The \$380 billion identified in the Green Scissors 2011 report are a collection of legislated privileged accesses to public resources dating, at least, from the 1872 Mining Law. That law gives away, in

perpetuity, precious metals on federal land for free to the mine owners who claim them. Should, indeed could those long held, profit and wealth producing privileges be examined so that congress can assign a different price for the value of the resources so as to benefit their entire constituencies at the expense of those who claim the right to those resources now? Should the government continue to provide the interstitial structures, from roads and bridges to public schools, public health, and transforming research funding that could, even, decrease the wealth generated from exploiting fossil fuels? If so, where should the funding for such things come from?

And the final question that all of us must consider: Just how do we engage this process so that OUR interests can be represented?

BOOK REVIEW by Vicky Downs

## *Marriage, a History: From Obedience to Intimacy or How Love Conquered Marriage* by Stephanie Coontz

Stephanie Coontz is slated to speak at the League's 35th Political Party and Auction on October 23rd. Having read her book on marriage, I know we're in for a treat!

Coontz says that for millennia, marriages were arranged for social, economic, and political advantage; love had little to do with it. She points out that marriage is the only way to get in-laws and thereby increase "one's family labor force." Marriage also speaks to the needs of the larger group by converting "strangers into relatives" and by extending "cooperative relations beyond the immediate family or small band, by creating far-flung networks of in-laws." In-laws were expected to be a help rather than a hindrance to the larger family group.

The author shows how historical changes affected marriages. For hundreds of generations marriage was the way "most wealth and land changed hands" and "the main vehicle by which leading families expanded their social networks and political influence. It even sealed military alliances and peace treaties." In ancient Athens and Rome, "control over a woman passed from her father to her husband upon marriage." In effect, she was a possession to be used, cared for, and passed on. Christian leaders "agreed with Jewish scholars that it was better to marry than to be preoccupied by lust," but they were less enthusiastic about it. Early Christians were more interested in how to get into heaven after death, and for this reason "celibacy was the ideal." No wonder most of the Christian saints never married!

Until the eighteenth century the old authoritarian view of marriage in which men dominated women was the only accepted view. Gradually the principle that "men and women should be able to choose or refuse a partner" became more accepted in northwestern Europe. Another change developed as guilds required journeymen and apprentices to forego marriage until they "became masters and could be assured of a steady living." This resulted in later marriages, often not until the age of 25 to 28. From the sixteenth through the eighteenth centuries fully a third of European adults were single.

Between the eighteenth century and today, according to Coontz, marriages moved from "yoke mates to soul mates." There were many changes along the way: changes in the laws pertaining to divorce and inheritance; availability of education for both males and females; and changes in medicine and in the control of fertility. These culminated in the "traditional marriage," with men as breadwinners and women as stay-at-home mothers who married for love. In fact, this didn't happen on a wide scale until after World War II. Coontz says that this "traditional marriage" was an anomaly. Until that time many—especially outside the United States—were still marrying for advantage not love.

In recent years the single breadwinner marriage hasn't worked for many people. Today our understanding of gender, the growing numbers of well-educated and ambitious women, and our desire to live a full and happy life mean that we have different views of marriage from what most of us expected in the forties and fifties.

Today marriage is seldom held together by social organizations surrounding a couple but is based on a decision made only by the people involved. It may be more fragile, but if we are looking for mutual respect, friendship, responsibility for our own actions, and love too, then quite possibly the "golden age" of marriage is right now.

This is a wonderful book to dip into; it is filled with fascinating anecdotes, helpful explanations, and good sense. It is well written and, according to the *Washington Post*, was one of the "Ten Best Books" of 2005. More importantly, it helps us understand what we are dealing with in an era when marriage itself is a political issue.

*The opinions in this review are personal and do not represent those of the LWV.*

---

## October Program: General Election Ballot Issues

---

### **Please Join Us at the October General Election Issues Forum**

Date: Thursday, October 6, 2011

Time: 7:00 p.m. – 9:30 p.m.

Place: Seattle First Baptist Church, 1111 Harvard Avenue, Seattle, WA

Please join us for our forum in preparation for the general election on Tuesday, November 8, 2011.

The issues covered at the forum will be the five state issues (three initiatives and two SJR constitutional amendments) and the two City of Seattle area issues (the \$60 motor vehicle tab fee and the families and education levy).

The speakers will be representatives of the pro and con campaigns chosen by the campaigns themselves.

We hope to see you there!

In the following pages you will find descriptions of selected ballot measures prepared by the Voter Service Committee of the League of Women Voters of Seattle–King County.

The material shown in **bold type** at the beginning of each ballot measure is what voters will see on their ballots.

For further assistance with election and voter information, feel free to call the League CIS desk at (206) 329-4848. You may also want to visit the website for King County Elections. Go to [www.kingcounty.gov](http://www.kingcounty.gov), then on the left, under “Services,” choose “Elections.”

---

**[State] Initiative Measure 1125**

**Initiative No. 1125: Controlling and limiting the use of motor vehicle fund revenue and toll revenue.**

**Initiative Measure No. 1125 concerns state expenditures on transportation. This measure would prohibit the use of motor vehicle fund revenue and vehicle toll revenue for non-transportation purposes, and require that road and bridge tolls be set by the legislature and be project-specific.**

**Should this measure be enacted into law? Yes No**

Brief Explanation: Initiative 1125 is a measure to prohibit the use of motor-vehicle-fund revenue for non-transportation purposes and to prevent vehicle-toll revenue from being used for anything whatsoever other than the original project the tolls were enacted to fund. It also requires that road and bridge tolls be set by the Legislature. Its practical effect would be to prohibit tolls from other highway projects from being used on the Highway 520 Bridge or on the Highway 99 tunnel. It would prohibit fuel-tax money from being spent on some mass-transit projects and it would require the Legislature, rather than the State Transportation Commission, to set tolls. It also would prohibit planned variable tolling on Highway 99 and Highway 520. Opponents say that it could discourage investors from buying bonds for Washington transportation projects.

The Effect of the Proposed Measure, if Approved: Initiative Measure No. 1125 would require that toll amounts be set by the legislature by majority vote, rather than by the Transportation Commission, and would make the setting of toll amounts subject to statutes that require preparation of various reports and analyses relating to costs. It would require that tolls be “uniform and consistent” and would not allow variable pricing of tolls. (“Variable priced” tolls typically are higher during periods of traffic congestion and lower at other times of the day or week.) While the measure would leave in place the authority to collect and use tolls for the preservation, maintenance, management, and operation of a facility, it would add provisions that limit the use of some tolls to construction and capital improvement only and that require tolls on future facilities to end after the cost of the project is paid. The measure would require revenue from tolls to be used only for purposes “consistent with” the eighteenth amendment to the state constitution. (That amendment, which was approved in 1944, provides that the [enumerated] revenue must be paid into the state treasury and placed in a special fund to be used exclusively for “highway purposes.”) This measure would also prohibit any revenue in the motor vehicle fund or any toll fund from being transferred to the “general fund or other funds” and used for “non-transportation purposes.” The state treasurer states that bonds secured solely by toll revenue will become prohibitively expensive if the legislature sets tolls, thus eliminating this financing tool for transportation projects.

Fiscal Impact Statement: No fiscal impact is assumed for the Tacoma Narrows Bridge and State Route 167 toll lanes. Fiscal impacts for future toll roads and toll bridges, such as SR520, are unknown and indeterminate. Because the restrictions on future toll revenue, toll expenditures, and toll lanes cannot be quantified, the fiscal impact on state and local governments from these provisions is indeterminate. The measure would restate the existing requirement that tolls must be used on the facility for which they are collected, explicitly referencing the Interstate 90 floating bridge. The measure also would prohibit the state or a state agency from transferring or using “gas-tax-funded or toll-funded lanes on state highways” for “non-highway purposes.”

**Those supporting I-1125 say:** Olympia still doesn’t get it. Four times the voters have approved initiatives requiring two-thirds vote of the Legislature to raise taxes and majority vote to increase fees. Four times. I-1125 closes loopholes they put in I-1053, requiring again that fee increases be decided by elected representatives of the people, not unelected bureaucrats at state agencies. If Olympia is going to force struggling families to pay thousands of dollars per year in burdensome tolls, I-1125 makes sure tolls are

dedicated to the project. And when the project is paid for? The toll goes away. Without I-1125, tolls will continue forever, being raided and diverted during “emergencies.” Tolls aren’t taxes – I-1125 keeps it that way. Our state imposes one of the highest gas taxes in the nation, collecting billions in transportation taxes and fees every year – before double-taxing us with burdensome tolls. I-1125 stops transportation revenue from being diverted to non-transportation purposes. I-1125 reinstates I-1053’s voter approved protections, closes loopholes, and reinforces existing statutory and constitutional protections. Vote yes.

**Those opposing I-1125 say:** At a time when our economy is hurting, 1125 creates transportation gridlock, places projects across Washington at risk, increases congestion, and eliminates thousands of jobs. No state in the country allows legislators to set tolls because investors won’t buy bonds backed by tolls that are subject to legislative politics. A bipartisan supermajority of the legislature already voted to have an independent commission of experts set tolls, but 1125 re-inserts politics into the process. Why have legislators from Bellingham set tolls for projects in Tacoma? Independent experts commissioned by the State Treasurer say 1125 will cause the state to lose billions in toll bond funding for major projects. The 520 Bridge, I-405 expansion, and hundreds of local and rural gas-tax funded projects across the state are threatened. Supporters say 1125 will kill voter-approved light rail across I-90—lawsuits will follow. Tolls are a user fee—people only pay for what they use. That’s fairer than raising taxes on everyone—or diverting limited resources—to fund critical projects. Transportation experts across the state oppose 1125. So do business, labor and environmental leaders. Please vote no.

### [State] Initiative Measure No. 1163

**Initiative Measure No. 1163 concerns long-term care workers and services for elderly and disabled people.**

**This measure would reinstate background checks, training, and other requirements for long-term care workers and providers, if amended in 2011; and address financial accountability and administrative expenses of the long-term in-home care program.**

**Should this measure be enacted into law? Yes No**

Brief Explanation: Initiative 1163, sponsored by the service employees’ union, would reinstate background checks, training, and other requirements for long-term care workers and providers. Proponents argue that the background checks and additional training are needed. Opponents argue that the measure would require the state to pay for a union-sponsored training program. A similar initiative, passed a few years ago, was suspended by the Legislature.

Fiscal Impact Statement: Current law requires increased mandatory training, background checks, and certification for long-term care workers, depending on worker classification, beginning Jan. 1, 2014. Initiative 1163 would require the training, background checks, and certification for long-term care workers to begin Jan. 7, 2012, but delay these requirements for community residential providers until Jan 1, 2016. For the long-term in-home care program, administrative costs are capped and performance audits with additional fraud investigators are required. Over six fiscal years, costs are estimated to increase \$31.3 million and revenue from the federal government and fees is estimated to increase \$18.4 million, leaving \$12.9 million in additional state expenses for the program not currently covered or budgeted.

The Law as it Presently Exists: State law currently requires that long-term care workers receive training.

Additional requirements are scheduled to take effect in the future. Under current law, long-term care workers hired on or after January 1, 2014, will be required to be certified by the state Department of Health as “home care aides” within 150 days of beginning work. To be certified, long-term care workers will need to complete specific training and pass an examination. The requirement that long-term care workers receive 35 hours of basic training will increase to a 75-hour requirement on January 1, 2014. State law requires that the state pay for the training and pay long-term care workers for the time they spend in training. After they are certified, long-term care workers hired after January 1, 2014, will be required to receive 12 hours of continuing training each year. There are reduced requirements for those who provide care only for their own adult children or parents. The state will also be required to offer advanced training to long-term care workers beginning January 1, 2014.

State law also requires that long-term care workers receive criminal background checks. These checks currently look for criminal convictions only in Washington. If the worker has lived in Washington less than three years, then a fingerprint-based check also is conducted through the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI). All long-term care workers hired after January 1, 2014, will be required to receive a fingerprint-based check through the FBI, no matter how long they have lived in Washington.

The Effect of the Proposed Measure, if Approved: Initiative Measure 1163 would move up the date by which the additional training, certification, and background check requirements for long-term care workers take effect. The requirement that long-term care workers receive certification as “home care aides” and receive additional training would apply to all long-term care workers hired on or after January 7, 2012, instead of January 1, 2014. The requirement that long-term care workers receive criminal background checks through the FBI would apply to all long-term care workers hired on or after January 1, 2012, instead of January 1, 2014. Community residential service providers would not be covered by these additional training, certification, and background check requirements until January 1, 2016.

In addition, this measure would require that the state auditor conduct performance audits of the state’s long term in-home care program. The first audit would have to be completed within twelve months after this measure takes effect. The auditor would be required to conduct performance audits “on a biannual basis thereafter.” This measure would also require the state to hire five additional fraud investigators.

This measure would require the state to limit its administrative expenses so that at least 90% of taxpayer spending on the long-term in-home care program is devoted to direct care. The state would be required to achieve this limitation within two years after this measure takes effect. This measure also provides that if the passage of this act triggers changes to any collective bargaining agreement, then those changes go into effect immediately without the need for legislative approval.

**Those supporting I-1163 say:** All of us want safe, quality care for frail seniors and people with disabilities. In 2008, voters overwhelmingly supported full federal background checks and training for long-term care workers who assist our most vulnerable residents, but Olympia politicians ignored our will. Initiative 1163 restores those common sense protections.

Since 2008, adult family home abuse citations are up 15 percent. Seniors and people with disabilities are highly vulnerable to fraud and abuse. It is irresponsible to entrust their care to people who could have a violent or abusive history. 1163 ensures caregivers receive federal background checks, not the current local check that misses out-of-state crimes.

Home care workers do the same work as nursing home assistants but in more isolated environments with less training. While manicurists complete 600 hours of training, home care workers receive less

than 40 hours. 1163 protects seniors by requiring home care workers to receive comparable training to nursing home assistants.

1163 protects taxpayers: requires annual independent audits, requires full-time fraud investigators, and requires at least 90 percent of funds go to direct care, not state administrative expenses.

As our population ages, we need a qualified workforce to help seniors live with dignity in their own homes. Training and background checks are the first step in creating a stable, professional workforce that earns a living wage, while providing cost effective, safe, quality care. Our elders deserve protection. Vote yes on 1163.

**Those opposing I-1163 say:** Please vote no on Initiative 1163 to preserve services for seniors and disabled citizens. I-1163 has a hidden agenda. Rather than protecting seniors and disabled residents, it takes \$80 million in funding away from direct services to fund a private union training program. Background checks are already required by law in RCW 43.20A.710 and so is basic training. This unfunded initiative soaks taxpayers at the expense of our seniors' care. Please vote no on 1163 to preserve essential services to seniors and the disabled in these painful economic times.

This measure has the wrong priorities. Raising taxes and eliminating services to pay for a costly unfunded initiative is not in our state's or our citizens' best interest. Taxpayer dollars for services for low-income seniors and the disabled should go directly to those needing care, not to a training program run by the state's largest union. Because of budget cuts, many long term care services were greatly reduced or eliminated. Our state does not have money to spend on a special interest training program while cutting essential services to our citizens. It is more important to restore these services than to spend millions on additional training and background checks for home care workers.

I-1163 requires either raising taxes or slashing other services to seniors and the disabled. If passed, the additional training and background checks required by this measure will cost taxpayers \$80 million over the next two years when the state is facing another \$2.8 billion budget deficit. We support appropriate training for home care workers. This misleading measure makes it seem like background checks aren't required for long term care workers, when they are, and that Washington doesn't have mandated training programs for long term care workers, when it does.

It's absurd to raise taxes, or further cut services to pay for additional training and background checks for in-home care workers when they already exist in state law. Protect seniors and the disabled. Vote no.

**For additional information on all statewide measures, please visit the Secretary of State elections page at: [www.sos.wa.gov/elections/default.aspx](http://www.sos.wa.gov/elections/default.aspx), then click on "2011 General Election Online Voters' Guide."**

**[State] Initiative Measure No. 1183**

**Initiative Measure No. 1183 concerns liquor: beer, wine, and spirits (hard liquor). This measure would close state liquor stores and sell their assets; license private parties to sell and distribute spirits; set license fees based on sales; regulate licensees; and change regulation of wine distribution.**

**Should this measure be enacted into law? Yes No**

Brief Description: Initiative 1183 would close state liquor stores and sell their assets; license private parties to sell and distribute spirits; set license fees based on sales; regulate licensees; and change regulation of wine distribution. It would allow competition based on price. It also would set taxes on private liquor sales. Costco was the prime sponsor of the signature-gathering effort.

The Law as it Presently Exists: In Washington, spirits are sold at retail at state-run liquor stores and at “contract liquor stores.” Contract liquor stores are private businesses that sell spirits and other alcoholic beverages under a contract with the state. There are approximately 325 liquor stores total in the state. The Washington State Liquor Control Board (“the Board”) operates the state liquor stores and oversees the contract liquor stores. Among its responsibilities, the Board regulates liquor advertising in the state. The Board, however, cannot advertise liquor sales.

The Board sets the price for spirits sold at all liquor stores based on the wholesale cost of the spirits, taxes, and a markup authorized by statute. The Board also collects the taxes imposed on the retail sale of spirits and collects license fees and penalties. The proceeds received from all of the above are distributed to cities, counties, and the state. Certain revenues are dedicated to funding programs addressing alcohol and drug abuse treatment and prevention. Existing law also requires wine and beer manufacturers and distributors to offer the same price to every buyer. This requirement of uniform pricing prevents manufacturers or distributors from selling wine or beer at discounted prices to customers, such as at quantity discounts. Existing law also requires wine and beer retailers to receive all wine and beer at their retail store and to not take delivery or store wine or beer at a separate warehouse location.

In Washington, manufacturers and suppliers of spirits may sell spirits only to the Board. The Board acts as the sole distributor of spirits sold in the state liquor stores and contract liquor stores, as well as that sold by restaurants and certain other licensed sellers. Existing law allows private parties to sell or distribute alcoholic beverages that are not spirits, such as wine or beer. Wine and beer sellers are licensed by the state. There are different licenses for each of “three tiers” of the wine and beer business: (1) manufacturing, (2) distribution, and (3) retail sales. Existing law regulates the financial relationships and business transactions allowed between manufacturers, distributors, and retailers. While there are some exceptions, retailers are allowed to purchase wine or beer only from distributors. Similarly, distributors are allowed to purchase only from manufacturers, with certain exceptions.

The Effect of the Proposed Measure, if Approved: I-1183 allows private parties to sell and distribute spirits and alters the Liquor Control Board’s powers and duties. It eliminates the Board’s power to operate state liquor stores, to supervise the contract liquor stores, to distribute liquor, and to set the prices of spirits. I-1183 directs the Board to close state liquor stores by June 1, 2012. It directs the Board to sell assets connected with liquor sales and distribution and to sell at auction the right to operate a private liquor store at the location of any existing state liquor store. I-1183 repeals a 2011 law that directed the state to examine the financial benefit of leasing the state liquor distribution facilities to a private party.

Under I-1183, qualifying private parties may obtain licenses to distribute spirits or to sell spirits at retail. I-1183 requires retail stores to participate in training their employees to prevent sales of alcohol to minors and inebriated persons. I-1183 allows local governments and the public to provide input before issuance of a license to sell spirits. I-1183 preserves local government power to zone and regulate the location of liquor stores.

I-1183 would not change the existing taxes on spirits. I-1183 would require spirits retailers and distributors to pay license fees to the state. I-1183 also requires that all persons holding spirits distributor licenses must have paid—when taken together—a total of \$150 million in spirits distributor license fees by March 31, 2013. If the total license fees received from all distributor license holders is less than \$150 million, the Board must collect additional spirits distributor license fees to make up the difference. This additional fee would be allocated among the persons who held a spirits distributor license at any time before March 31, 2013.

I-1183 eliminates the requirement that distributors and manufacturers of wine sell at a uniform price. Under I-1183, a store licensed to sell wine at retail may also obtain an endorsement allowing the store to sell to license holders who sell wine for consumption on the premise. For example, this would allow the store to sell wine to a restaurant that resells the wine by the glass or bottle to its customers.

Fiscal Impact Statement: The fiscal impact cannot be precisely estimated because the private market will determine bottle cost and markup for spirits. Using a range of assumptions, total State General Fund revenues would increase an estimated \$216 million to \$253 million and total local revenues would increase an estimated \$186 million to \$227 million, after Liquor Control Board one-time and ongoing expenses, over six fiscal years. A one-time net state revenue gain of \$28.4 million is estimated from the sale of the state liquor distribution center. One-time debt service costs are \$5.3 million. Ongoing new state costs are estimated at \$158,600 over six fiscal years.

**Additional substantial, detailed discussion of the fiscal impact may be found in your printed *Voter's Pamphlet* published by the State of Washington and your county elections office or on the internet at: <http://www.sos.wa.gov/elections/default.aspx>. Click on "2011 General Election Ballot Measures."**

**Those who support the measure say:** I-1183 gets our state government out of the business of distributing and selling liquor. I-1183 ends Washington's outdated state liquor store monopoly and allows consumers to buy spirits at licensed retail stores, like consumers do in most other states. It allows a limited number of grocery and retail stores to get licenses to sell liquor, if approved by the Liquor Control Board, and prevents liquor sales at gas stations and convenience stores.

I-1183 provides vitally needed new revenues for state and local services. Distributors and stores approved for liquor licenses will pay a percentage of their sales as license fees, generating hundreds of millions of dollars in new revenues for state and local services like education, health care, and public safety. I-1183 strengthens laws governing the sale of liquor. I-1183 doubles penalties for retailers who sell spirits to minors, ensures local input into which grocery and retail stores get liquor licenses, mandates new training programs, and increases compliance requirements for retailers, and dedicates new revenues to increase funding for local police, fire, and emergency services statewide.

I-1183 eliminates outdated wine regulations that currently restrict price competition and wholesale distribution of wine in Washington. This will help small Washington wineries. Yes on I-1183 will create true competition in liquor and wine distribution and sales, strengthen liquor law enforcement, benefit Washington taxpayers and consumers, and generate vitally needed new revenues for state and local services.

**Those who are against I-1183 say:** Last year more than one million Washingtonians voted "no" twice to big box stores and grocery chains selling liquor. Yet despite the clear message we sent, they're back again spending millions to push I-1183. What part of "no" don't they understand? Alcohol already kills more kids than all other drugs combined. Yet I-1183 allows more than four times as many liquor outlets. The Centers for Disease Control recently came out against privatization because it leads to a 48 percent or more increase in problem drinking. That means more underage drinking and crime, overburdening police and first responders. I-1183 is another flawed measure designed to benefit the big chains, not the public. It gives chains an unfair competitive advantage over smaller grocers, while a major loophole written into

the measure will allow mini-marts to sell liquor across much of the state. State stores have one of the best enforcement rates in the country; groceries, gas stations, and mini-marts sell to teenagers one time out of four.

The sponsors of this measure say it increases government revenue. But they do it by creating a new 27 percent tax passed on to consumers. Ask yourself: when was the last time a big corporation spent millions, twice, to try and save us money? Firefighters, first responders, and law enforcement leaders oppose 1183. It's too risky, and too high a price to pay for a little convenience. Vote no on 1183.

### Senate Joint Resolution 8205

#### Removing an Obsolete Requirement for Voting Eligibility from the Constitution

**The legislature has proposed a constitutional amendment on repealing article VI, section 1A, of the Washington Constitution. This amendment would remove an inoperative provision from the state constitution regarding the length of time a voter must reside in Washington to vote for president and vice-president.**

#### Should this constitutional amendment be: **Approved** **Rejected**

Explanatory Statement and The Effect of the Proposed Amendment, if Approved: This measure proposes to amend the state constitution to remove article VI, section 1A, from the state constitution, which requires voters to have lived in Washington State for 60 days to be eligible to cast a ballot for president.

After this provision was added to the Washington State Constitution in 1966, the United States Supreme Court ruled that any requirement that voters live in a particular place longer than 30 days in order to vote is unconstitutional.

The state constitution already requires and would continue to entitle all otherwise-eligible citizens of the United States to vote in Washington State if they have resided in the state, and in their county and precinct, for at least 30 days before the election.

Because the section that would be removed has been previously ruled unconstitutional, and has been superseded by other voting requirements, this portion of the Constitution is already inoperative, and is ignored. Removing this provision would have no real effect on voting in the state of Washington and is simply a "housekeeping" action.

Fiscal Impact: No Fiscal Impact

**Those supporting the measure argue:** SJR 8205 fixes conflicting voter residency requirements in the Washington State Constitution. Article VI, Section 1 of the Washington State Constitution allows a U.S. citizen to vote in all elections after they have resided in the state for 30 days. Article VI, Section 1A of the Washington State Constitution requires that a U.S. citizen reside in the state for 60 days before they can vote for president. While the courts have held that the shorter 30 day residency requirement applies to presidential primaries, there is a need to clean up our constitution and make its provisions consistent. SJR 8205 fixes this conflict by removing Section 1A and the conflicting 60 day residency requirement. This clarifies that the shorter 30 day voter residency requirement is the constitutional standard for all elections in the state, including the presidential election. Please vote to "approve" SJR 8205 to ensure that our state constitution is consistent.

**Those opposing the measure argue:** No one consented to write an argument against this ballot measure. This measure simply removes outdated language from the constitution and changes no law currently in effect.

---

### Senate Joint Resolution 8206

**The legislature has proposed a constitutional amendment on the budget stabilization account maintained in the state treasury. This amendment would require the legislature to transfer additional moneys to the budget stabilization account in each fiscal biennium in which the state has received “extraordinary revenue growth,” as defined, with certain limitations.**

**Should this constitutional amendment be: Approved Rejected**

Senate Joint Resolution 8206 – Authorizing and Requiring Additional Transfers to the “Rainy Day” Fund

Brief Explanation: Senate Joint Resolution 8206 would amend the State constitution to require the legislature to transfer additional monies, in addition to those already required, to the budget-stabilization account in each fiscal biennium in which the state has received “extraordinary revenue growth,” as defined, with certain limitations. The Legislature would still have the authority to withdraw funds with a 60% legislative vote.

The Constitutional Provision as it Presently Exists: Article VII, section 12 of the Washington State Constitution requires a budget stabilization account (rainy day fund) to be maintained in the state treasury. By the end of each fiscal year (June 30 of each year), the legislature must transfer to the budget stabilization account an amount equal to one percent of the general state revenues for that fiscal year. The legislature may approve the transfer of additional amounts. “General state revenues” means all state revenues that are not dedicated to a particular purpose, as set forth in the Washington State Constitution.

Article VII, section 12 of the state constitution also authorizes the legislature to withdraw money from the budget stabilization account. The legislature may do so by majority vote in three situations:

- (1) during a fiscal year in which the governor declares a state of emergency in response to a catastrophic event that requires government action to protect life or public safety; or
- (2) in a fiscal year for which the forecasted state employment growth is estimated to be less than one percent.
- (3) In addition, at any time the balance in the budget stabilization account exceeds ten percent of estimated general state revenues for that fiscal year, the legislature by majority vote may transfer the amount in excess of ten percent to the education construction fund.

Other than these three situations, a three-fifths vote (60%) of the legislature is required to withdraw or transfer money from the budget stabilization account. All relevant estimates of employment and revenue are made by the state Economic and Revenue Forecast Council.

The Effect of the Proposed Amendment, if Approved: The proposed amendment to article VII, section 12 of the Washington State Constitution would require additional revenue to be transferred to the budget stabilization account in any two-year budget period in which there has been “extraordinary revenue growth,” with certain limitations.

“Extraordinary revenue growth” is defined by comparison to a baseline consisting of the average two-year percentage growth in general state revenues over the preceding five two-year periods. Any growth

in general state revenue that is more than 133% of the baseline is defined as “extraordinary revenue growth.”

The legislature would be required to transfer three-fourths of that “extraordinary revenue growth” to the budget stabilization account, unless the average employment growth is less than 1%, or the amount to be transferred is greater than the amount already transferred that year. No change would be made to the legislature’s authority to withdraw money from the budget stabilization account.

**No Fiscal Impact Statement created, as none was required by law.**

**Those supporting this measure would argue:** There is overwhelming bipartisan support for strengthening the voter-approved “rainy day fund.” In 2007, SJR 8206, a bipartisan measure, strengthened this fund by requiring that a portion of “extraordinary” revenue—that which exceeds 133% of historical average growth—be saved rather than spent. The Legislature still has the authority to withdraw funds with a 60% vote whenever needed. This measure would require the state to save more money during good times, like the housing boom of several years ago when revenue grew at more than twice the historical average. Saving more of this windfall would have better prepared the state for the downturn that followed. Approving SJR 8206 will help build stronger reserves, leaving the state better prepared for difficult economic times, as well as keep spending at a more sustainable level, limiting expansions based on unexpected or windfall revenue.

**Those against the measure would argue:** In 2007 voters amended the constitution to create a “rainy day fund” as a way to force the legislature to save money for bad times. 1% of general funds go into savings for hard times (currently almost \$300 million). It’s working well. SJR8206 requires more than the 1% that voters approved; it would also require that “extraordinary revenues” go into savings. While it sounds like a good idea to save more, the result is that people pay taxes and get nothing for it except a bigger savings account.

8206 decreases the amount of taxpayer money that can be used for things taxpayers want and need (and paid for) so it can sit in an already existing rainy day fund with plenty of money in it. It means budget cuts become permanent and you aren’t getting the government you paid for.

---

**THE CITY OF SEATTLE PROPOSITION No. 1**
**REGULAR TAX LEVY INCLUDING FAMILIES AND EDUCATION**

**The City of Seattle's Proposition concerns renewing and enhancing Education Support Services to improve academic achievement.**

**This proposition would fund City services, including school readiness, academic achievement in elementary, middle and high school, college/career preparation, and student health and community partnerships as provided in Ordinance 117103. It authorizes regular property taxes above RCW 84.55 limits, allowing additional 2012 collection of up to \$32,101,000 (approximately \$0.27/\$1000 assessed value) and up to \$231,562,000 over seven years. In 2012, total City taxes collected would not exceed \$3.60 per \$1,000 of assessed value.**

**Should this Levy be approved?    Levy, Yes    Levy, No**

Brief explanation: This is a renewal of the special 7-year City of Seattle Families and Education levy that was first passed in November 1990, renewed in 1997 for \$69 million, renewed again in 2004 for \$117 million, and proposed to be renewed for an additional 7-years at \$231 million, if voters approve.

These funds support educational activities not directly in, but peripheral to, classes and in support of early learning, learning-readiness, before and after school activities and care, health, and (from 9th grade onward) college readiness.

History of the Families and Education Levy: Although cities are not customarily involved in funding school districts, Seattle voters passed the first Families and Education Levy in November 1990, the result of a grassroots effort initiating the city's role in education. Under Mayor Norman B. Rice the city held an education summit to bring together more than 2,000 individuals from all sectors of the community, including educators, parents, students, business people, local activists, government employees, and the general public. A clear message emerged from the summit: Seattle residents wanted to be involved in helping the public school system. Helping all children to be "safe, healthy, and ready to learn" became the goal of the 1990 Families and Education Levy, which invested in out-of-classroom services aimed to improve the education of every child.

The Families and Education levy has been re-authorized twice by Seattle voters, for increasingly larger amounts. The bulk of the levy currently is aimed towards the lower-performing southeast section of the school district. The goal is to help children succeed academically and to close the achievement gap. Levy investments would improve outcomes for children of color and low-income children. They would raise the bar for all students by improving graduation rates and academic achievement by focusing investments on strategies tailored to schools and students in need.

Impact on taxpayers: If Seattle voters approve the Families & Education Levy in November, the initiative will provide \$231,562, in student services. Based on an average estimated residential assessed value of \$462,045 in 2012 and of \$567,971 in 2018, the estimated annual cost to the average homeowner will be \$124 in 2012 and \$126 in 2018.

**What supporters are saying:** Our kids deserve your YES vote this November! The Families & Education Levy funds programs that support early learning, school-based health centers, family support, and out-of-school programs. Your "yes" vote will provide continued support for: programs that

improve academic achievement, especially in schools with a high proportion of low-income students; primary health care and mental health services for preschoolers and elementary school students; family support services in elementary schools; summer learning programs and academic and career counseling services; innovative middle school programs proven to boost academic achievement; and students who are entering the lowest performing schools. Our community must support our neighborhood schools so our kids are prepared for college and career. Vote “YES” this November!

**What opponents are saying:** The exposure of the mishandling of the sale of a surplus elementary school site, losing millions of dollars in the process, and the ongoing revelations of more and more financial and administrative boondoggles by the district shows that educational money in Seattle is not being well-managed. Now is not the time for this levy to be renewed for double the previous amount, especially as Seattle residents are struggling in this economy. This proposal is beyond the means of our community without any guarantee of success. This proposal might be more appropriate if scaled down to 2004 levels since wages have not increased, unemployment is at nearly 10%, and property values are falling. Should some children be provided dental care at school when average citizens can't buy dental care for their families so as to be able to afford their property taxes?

### Seattle Transportation Benefit District Proposition No. 1

**The Seattle Transportation Benefit District's Proposition 1 concerns an increased Vehicle License Fee for transportation improvements.**

**If approved, this proposition would fund facilities and services benefitting the City of Seattle, Including: street and bridge repairs and maintenance; transit infrastructure improvements to increase speed, reliability, and access; and pedestrian, bicycle and freight mobility programs as provided for in STBD Resolution No . 5. It would authorize a \$60 increase in the Vehicle License Fee beginning in 2012, allowing collection of approximately \$20.4 million annually for ten years.**

**Should this vehicle license fee be approved?   Vehicle License Fee, Yes   Vehicle License Fee, No**

Brief explanation of measure: If passed by the voters, the Seattle Transportation Benefit District will impose an additional \$60 vehicle tab fee on cars licensed within the city limits of Seattle. This will be added to the \$20 fee that the STBD already collects on each vehicle license annually. This fee will continue to be collected for 10 years; it will expire in the year 2021.

A total of \$20.4 million dollars annually are projected to be collected from this vehicle tab fee. These funds will be used primarily for bicycle and pedestrian improvements, for thirty-four urgent street surface repair projects (very bad splitting and pothole areas), to improve transit speed and efficiency, to add electric trolleys, and for high-capacity transit investments.

What is a Seattle Transportation Benefit District (STBD)? In 1987, the State Legislature created Transportation Benefit Districts (TBDs) as an option for local governments to fund transportation improvements. A TBD is a quasi-municipal corporation and independent taxing district created for the sole purpose of acquiring, constructing, improving, providing, and funding transportation improvements within the district. In 2005 and 2007, the Legislature amended the TBD statute to expand its uses and revenue authority, including the ability to authorize a \$20 annual vehicle license fee (VLF) and up to an additional \$80 of VLF, if approved by voters within the district.

The Seattle Transportation Benefit District was created in September 2010. It comprises all property parcels within the political boundaries of the City of Seattle. The Seattle City Council is the governing board. In September 2010, the TBD board voted to impose the maximum vehicle tab fee (\$20) that it was entitled to without a public vote, under the law.

**What the supporters are saying:** Imagine a city where everyone had the freedom to safely walk, bike, or take transit to get where they need to go. A city where our children can walk or ride their bikes to school, families can cross the street to get to their neighborhood park, older adults can cross the major arterial in their neighborhood to get to the pharmacy, and the neighborhoods are connected with frequent, reliable transit service.

Think about how approving Proposition 1 will give Seattle faster, more reliable transit service; repaired and repaved roads that work better for everyone; and new sidewalks, better crosswalks, and more family-friendly bike infrastructure. This is our moment to create a better transportation future for Seattle.

**What the opponents are saying:** Seattle cannot afford Proposition 1. Put simply, this is a colossally

regressive tax and an enormous burden for low income, working people, small businesses reliant upon vehicles, and people on fixed incomes who are struggling in a tough economy. Even those who are most impoverished, who maintain an older, small value car for work and essential travel, will be hit full force with this huge tab fee increase. A \$300,000 new custom Lamborghini and a rusty 1974 Pinto would be taxed at exactly the same rate.

Is this the time to substantially raise car fees when King County unemployment is near 9%, the City has lost 40,655 jobs over the last decade, more people are living on fixed or stagnant incomes, older workers are having to tap retirement funds early just to survive, and businesses are leaving Seattle? Last year, Seattle already passed a \$20 tab fee. King County also just passed a \$20 car tab fee for transit, so in 2012 vehicle owners will already pay \$40 per vehicle more than last year. Add in this \$60, and that amount will be \$100. It's time to say "no" and ask the government to live within its means just as working people and families do.

## ASK THE LEAGUE

**Q:** Why are all of these measures called “Proposition No. 1”? How many Proposition Number Ones can there be on one ballot?

**A:** While it may seem like a football cheer run amok,—Number One! Number One!—there can be as many measures entitled “Proposition No. 1” on a single ballot as there are jurisdictions that wish to submit a proposition. Each proposition is that particular jurisdiction’s very own “Proposition No. 1” for that ballot.

\*\*\*\*\*

Local measures within King County on the November ballot that voters within the named jurisdiction(s) will encounter:

City of Carnation Proposition No. 1  
Levy for Criminal Justice Services and Cash Reserve Stabilization

City of Des Moines Proposition No. 1  
Utility Occupation Tax for Des Moines Beach Park and Streets

City of Pacific Proposition No. 1  
Levy Lid Lift for Street Improvements

City of SeaTac Proposition No. 1  
Change in Plan of Government  
(Change from Council-Manager plan to Mayor-Council plan of government)

City of Seattle Proposition No. 1  
Regular Tax Levy Including Families and Education

City of Tukwila Advisory Measure No. 1  
Licensed Card Rooms in the City of Tukwila

North Bend Transportation Benefit District No. 1 - Proposition No. 1  
Sales and Use Tax for Transportation Improvements

Seattle Transportation Benefit District Proposition No. 1  
Increased Vehicle License Fee

Shoreline School District No. 412 Proposition No. 1  
Supplemental Levy to Support Class Size

King County Fire Protection District No. 28 (Enumclaw area) Proposition No. 1  
Increasing Number of Commissioners

Si View Metropolitan Park District Proposition No. 1  
Protection of Current Tax Levy from Pro-rationing

Printable one- and two-page ballot issue summaries, written by League members to help voters better understand these ballot measures, can be found after October 1st on the Seattle-King County League of Women Voters website located at:  
[www.seattlelwv.org](http://www.seattlelwv.org) . Click on “Voter Info” and look for the list of Ballot Issue Summaries.

# Unit Meetings

---

## OCTOBER UNIT INFORMATION

Email	Phone	Time	Location
<b>Monday, October 10</b>			
<b>FIRST HILL — Jeannette Kahlenberg</b>			
kahlenb@gmail.com	206-329-4848	10:00 a.m.	Ann Dittmar Horizon House, Sky Lounge 900 University St., Seattle
<b>CAPITOL HILL/MONTLAKE – Vicky Downs/Zita Cook</b>			
downsvdowns@aol.com	206-329-4848	7:15 p.m.	Linnea Hirst
zzitamcook@comcast.net	206-329-4848		1602 E. McGraw, Seattle 206-329-4848
<b>SOUTHEND — Marian Wolfe/Susan Jones</b>			
hedgwolfe@aol.com	206-329-4848	7:30 p.m.	Mt. Baker Community Clubhouse
susan@monckjones.com	206-329-4848		2811 Mt. Rainier Dr. S, Seattle
<b>Tuesday, October 11</b>			
<b>BELLEVUE – Bonnie Rimawi</b>			
bonnierim@aol.com	206-329-4848	12:15 p.m.	Lake Hills Public Library 15590 Lake Hills Blvd., Bellevue
<b>WEST SEATTLE – Ethel Williams/Amanda Berry</b>			
ethelw1@q.com	206-329-4848	12:30 p.m.	The Kenney
amandaberry@earthlink.net	206-329-4848		7125 Fauntleroy Way SW, Seattle
<b>SOUTHEAST KING COUNTY – Cathy Dormaier</b>			
clcathy@foxinternet.com	206-329-4848	7:00 p.m.	High Point Village
dkdenny@skynetbb.com			1777 High Point Street, Enumclaw
<b>Wednesday, October 12</b>			
<b>VIEW RIDGE – Gail Winberg</b>			
winbergeng@q.com	206-329-4848	12:45 p.m.	Gail Winberg 6004 NE 60th St., Seattle
<b>QUEEN ANNE/MAGNOLIA/BALLARD EVENING – Karen Adair/Elsie Simon</b>			
adairk@seanet.com	206-329-4848	7:30 p.m.	Teddy Geokezas
elsiesimon@comcast.net	206-329-4848		4500 Palatine Ave. N., Seattle 206-329-4848
<b>Thursday, October 13</b>			
<b>NORTH END MORNING – Jo Dawson</b>			
warrenandjo@comcast.net	206-329-4848	10:00 a.m.	Jo Dawson 2148 N. 115th St., Seattle 206-329-4848

**Thursday, October 13****ISSAQUAH DAY – Margaret Austin**

margaret.austin@comcast.net 206-329-4848 10:00 a.m. Issaquah City Hall, Coho Room  
upstairs, 130 E. Sunset Way

**SHORELINE – Juliet Beard**

juliet@windermere.com 206-329-4848 4:30 p.m. Richmond Beach Cong. Church  
NW 195th St & 15th Ave. NW

**NORTH CENTRAL – Jan Orlando**

orlanre@aol.com 206-329-4848 7:30 p.m. Alice Rasp  
4523 5th Ave. NE, Seattle  
206-329-4848

**KIRKLAND/REDMOND – Sheila Hoff**

srhoff123@yahoo.com 206-329-4848 7:00 p.m. Hjordis Foy  
11016 NE 47th Place, Kirkland  
206-329-4848

**Saturday, October 15****BALLARD/MAGNOLIA/QUEEN ANNE DAY – Judy Ostrow**

2jostrow@comcast.net 206-329-4848 10:00 a.m. Judy Ostrow  
3604 NW 60th St., Seattle

**Wednesday, October 19****N. KING COUNTY - Natalie Pascale Boisseau/Samanthe Sheffer**

npboisseau@gmail.com 206-329-4848 9:30 a.m. Third Place Commons Mtg. Room  
singingphoenix@yahoo.com 206-329-4848 Upper level, 17171 Bothell Way NE  
Lake Forest Park

**SOUTHWEST KING COUNTY – Cindy Piennett/Kathy Jorgensen**

cindypiennett@gmail.com 206-329-4848 7:00 p.m. Foundation House, 32290 1st Ave. S  
kjorgensen@juno.com 206-329-4848 Federal Way

**Thursday, October 27****BAYVIEW – Peg Williams**

pwilliams@brc-res.com 206-329-4848 9:30 a.m. Bayview Retirement Community  
4th Floor Solarium, 11 W. Aloha St.

**UNIVERSITY HOUSE/WALLINGFORD**

This unit is in need of a Unit Leader for the Wallingford community. Please contact Membership if you have any questions.

# Board & Committee Contacts

Term	Executive Committee			
2011–2013	<i>President</i>	Judy Bevington	206-329-4848	president@seattlelwv.org
2011–2013	<i>1st V.P. Voter Service</i>	Cyndi Woods	206-329-4848	cyndiwoods@comcast.net
2011–2012	<i>2nd V.P. Outreach</i>	Kelly Powers	206-329-4848	outreach.seattlelwv@gmail.com
2011–2013	<i>3rd V.P. Public Relations</i>	Jean Carlson	206-329-4848	jean.carlson@att.net
2011–2013	<i>4th V.P. Program</i>	Jeanette Johnson	206-329-4848	jeanettejohnson10@msn.com
2011–2013	<i>Treasurer</i>	Kati Ortiz	206-329-4848	treasurer@seattlelwv.org
2010–2012	<i>Secretary</i>	Joanna Cullen	206-329-4848	jfoxcullen@gmail.com
2011–2013	<i>Action</i>	Linda Brown	206-329-4848	brownlj@comcast.net
Term	Directors			
2011–2013	<i>Action Outreach</i>	Ellen Barton	206-329-4848	eeb0825@yahoo.com
2011–2012	<i>King County South</i>	Mary Ehlers	206-329-4848	maryehlers@comcast.net
2010–2012	<i>Voter Service</i>	Julie Anne Kempf	206-329-4848	julie@kempf.com
2011–2012	<i>Eastside</i>	Shari Lundberg	206-329-4848	shari.c.lundberg@gmail.com
2011–2012	<i>King County South</i>	Pat McCann	206-329-4848	thomaspa@nwlinc.com
2011–2012	<i>Development</i>	Ginna Owens	206-329-4848	ginnao@earthlink.net
2010–2012	<i>Event Chair</i>	Kathy Sakahara	206-329-4848	kathysakahara@gmail.com
2011–2013	<i>Membership</i>	Dana Twight	206-329-4848	membership.seattlelwv@gmail.com
2011–2013	<i>Transportation</i>	Janet Winans	206-329-4848	janetwinans@earthlink.net
Term	Education Fund Board			
2011–2013	<i>President</i>	Nancy Eitrem	206-329-4848	nancye@speakeasy.net
2011–2013	<i>Secretary</i>	Laraine Volkman	206-329-4848	laraine.volkman@att.net
2010–2012	<i>Director</i>	Ruth Schroeder	206-329-4848	schrdrcl@comcast.net
2010–2012	<i>Director</i>	Ellyn Swanson	206-329-4848	gusellyn@comcast.net
Term	Nominating Committee			
2011–2012		Karen Adair	206-329-4848	adairk@seanet.com
2011–2012		Astrid Berg	206-329-4848	
2011–2012		Jeanette Kahlenberg	206-329-4848	kahlenb@gmail.com
2011–2012		Boots Winterstein	206-329-4848	paulwinterstein@q.com
Off-Board Positions				
	<i>Unit Coordinator</i>	Linette Bixby	206-329-4848	linettebixby@gmail.com
	<i>CIS Coordinator</i>	Cynthia Howe	206-329-4848	howe.john@comcast.net
	<i>Voter Editor</i>	Nan Moore	206-329-4848	nanvoter@comcast.net
Committees				
	<i>Economics &amp; Taxation</i>	Nora Leech	206-329-4848	LWVseattlenora@yahoo.com
	<i>Education, incl. Teacher Study</i>	Lucy Gaskill-Gaddis	206-329-4848	terrylucy2u@comcast.net
	<i>Immigration</i>	Barbara Reid	206-329-4848	barbereid@yahoo.com
		Barbara Yasui	206-329-4848	daruma52@msn.com
	<i>International Relations</i>	Rebecca Castilleja		telbalto@yahoo.com
	<i>Land Use/Waterfront</i>	Karen Kane	206-329-4848	kanek@iopener.net
		Jan O'Connor	206-329-4848	oconnor.js@gmail.com
	<i>Privatization</i>	Nora Leech	206-329-4848	LWVseattlenora@yahoo.com
	<i>Social Justice</i>	Kathleen Randall	206-329-4848	kathleenr8@gmail.com
	<i>Transportation</i>	Janet Winans	206-329-4848	janetwinans@earthlink.net
	<i>Vote by Mail Study</i>	Julie Anne Kempf	206-329-4848	julie@kempf.com

The League of Women Voters of Seattle  
1620 18th Ave, Suite 101  
Seattle WA 98122

Periodical Postage  
Paid at Seattle

**Moving? Let us know!**

Call the League office at (206) 329-4848 or  
email [info@seattlelwv.org](mailto:info@seattlelwv.org)

## **LWV SEATTLE: OCTOBER FORUM**

### General Election Ballot Issues

**Seattle First Baptist Church**  
1111 Harvard Ave.  
(the corner of Harvard and Seneca)  
Seattle, WA

**Thursday, October 6**  
**7:00 p.m. - Forum**

All forums are open to the public.

*Ballot issues addressed will be:*

- **State Initiatives** 1125, 1163, and 1183
- **Senate Joint Resolutions** 8205 and 8206
- **City of Seattle Proposition** 1
- **Seattle TBD Proposition** 1

Speakers will be representatives of the pro and con campaigns, chosen by the campaigns themselves.