October 2 Forum: Controversial issues on the November ballot  
By Sarah Luthens, Voter Service Chair

The League’s upcoming forum on Thursday evening, October 2, promises to be a fascinating, lively experience that will feature pro and con speakers on several ballot measures. The forum will start a half-hour earlier than usual, at 7:00 p.m., in order to cover as many issues as possible.

The forum will open with the proposed Death with Dignity law, a controversial statewide issue. Should Washington State emulate Oregon’s law, which allows terminally ill patients access to life-ending medications for self-administration? Social worker Arline Hinckley (pro) and nurse Eileen Geller (con) will present differing perspectives on Initiative 1000.

The Mass Transit Now Proposition One, involving Sound Transit service, is another contentious issue. Speaking in favor will be Mike O’Brien, President of the Sierra Club Cascade Chapter, representing over 28,000 members. Speaking to the con perspective at the League forum will be Emory Bundy. He served as staff director at the Bullitt Foundation for many years, and he worked as director of public affairs at King Broadcasting in Seattle from 1969-1983.

Political activist Tim Eyman will be speaking on two topics at the forum. He will speak in favor of Initiative 985, regarding transportation resources. Mr. Eyman will also speak in opposition to King County Charter Amendment No. 7, which would require a higher number of signatures for initiatives to amend the King County charter. King County Charter Review Commissioner Tara Jo Heinecke will be presenting the pro side of this question.

Should the King County Elections Director be an elected office? The pro side of this issue will be presented by King County Council member Reagan Dunn. The opposition speaker had not been confirmed by press time.

Three other key issues that will be addressed at the forum are whether the King County Council and other offices should be nonpartisan (King County Charter Amendment No. 8), the Pike Place Market Levy and the Seattle Parks levy. Speakers will include attorney David McDonald, Joe Fain, Christal Wood, and former Seattle City Councilmember Peter Steinbrueck.

There will be a total of eight King County charter amendments on the ballot. Because of time limitations, the forum will not be able to cover all of these measures, but League members are encouraged to carefully review each of the proposed charter amendment topics. In addition to those referenced above, topics include:

- the power and composition of regional committees
- strengthening non-discrimination protections
- whether the county council should have the power to establish additional qualifications for various elected offices
- which branch of government and personnel should establish the economic forecasts which the county budget is based upon
- budget timelines.

More information on the proposed amendments to the King County Charter can be found at: kingcounty.gov/elections/elections/200811/measures.aspx and metrokc.gov/exec/charter/pdf/crc_final-report.pdf.
President’s Message

The Seattle League gets many requests for election issue speakers and voter registrars. These two activities are the core of the Voter Service for our League. Most years are busy during the last six weeks before the November general election. This year, with the heightened interest in this historic Presidential election, we have a calendar full of Voter Service commitments. Last week, our new office specialist Lindsay Cummings and I held a voter registration session at a Seattle Housing facility that stood out among the rest and has left me uneasy with our system. The building was a “clean and sober facility” which integrates alcohol treatment and support with housing. The experience for me was indeed sobering. We assisted with one change of address and then spent the next hour listening as men and women drifted into the room and related stories of old mistakes, angry/youthful rebellion, gang and drug influenced crimes and asked tentatively and hopefully if we could register them to vote in this important election with their past felony conviction. We could not, we could only give them an American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) brochure on the subject. In Washington felons must have their rights restored, and this often requires legal assistance. The ACLU has a program to assist these citizens regain their rights after completing their sentences and has worked to reform Washington State’s particularly stringent felon voting right restoration requirements. The League considers this as an issue of disenfranchisement, specifically when a citizen has completed a sentence with probation but is required to pay court costs and reparation fees before regaining the right to vote. Think about it, does someone declaring bankruptcy need to pay debtors before voting? The League believes this is akin to paying to vote. The ACLU has convened a group to look into remedies for this clear voting rights issue and the League is pleased to be part of that group.

The League also takes action at this time of the year by announcing our positions on ballot issues. Our board attended a lively ballot issue briefing where campaign representatives presented the pro and con arguments for the many state and local issues on the November ballot. Traditionally we do not take a position on statewide issues, especially if the State league has not taken a position. However, our board felt the I-1000 Death with Dignity Initiative warranted further discussion. Several on our board believed supporting this initiative was clearly a League responsibility supported by positions of privacy, woman’s health and freedom of choice. There was serious discussion on this initiative’s pros and cons. In the end, the board decided that although there were strong League positions supporting personal choice, we could not take a position on I-1000 because we have not made a serious study of health and aging, nor do we have positions from those areas to support a decision. We will work to develop a Seattle Health Care Committee and develop a study of aging to present at the Annual meeting in June. We urge you to study this initiative yourselves when making your own informed decision.

Denise D. Smith

Mission Statement

The League of Women Voters of Seattle, a nonpartisan political organization, encourages informed and active participation in government, works to increase understanding of major public policy issues and influences public policy through education and advocacy.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>October 1</td>
<td>Drainage Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Washington, Oct. 1, 8, and 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1:00 – 3:00 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>League office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 2</td>
<td>New Members Dinner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thursday, October 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5:30 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Seattle First Baptist Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 3</td>
<td>Forum: Ballot Issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thursday, October 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7:00 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Seattle First Baptist Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 3</td>
<td>Vice Presidential Debate Viewing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Friday, October 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Seattle League Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 4</td>
<td>Board Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Saturday, October 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9:00 a.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>League Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 6</td>
<td>November Voter deadline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Monday, October 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 6</td>
<td>International Relations Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Monday, October 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12:45 – 2:45 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>League office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 6</td>
<td>Issaquah Ballot Issues Forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Monday, October 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6:30 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KCLS Service Center Issaquah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 14</td>
<td>Civics Education Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tuesday, October 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4:00 – 6:00 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>League Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 14</td>
<td>Social Justice Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tuesday, October 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5:30 – 7:00 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>League Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 15</td>
<td>Immigration Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wednesday, October 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10:00 a.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3525 SW Seola Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 18</td>
<td>Global Climate Change Forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Saturday, October 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9:00 a.m. – 12:30 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mukilteo Hall, Edmonds Community College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 21</td>
<td>Transportation Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tuesday, October 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10:00 a.m. – 12:30 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>League Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 26</td>
<td>Mercer Island Candidates Forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tuesday, October 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7:00 p.m. – 9:00 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Islander Middle School, MI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 26</td>
<td>Economics and Taxation Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Saturday, October 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9:00 a.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>909 E. Newton # D9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 1</td>
<td>Board Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Saturday, November 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9 a.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 2</td>
<td>Seattle Voter deadline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wednesday, November 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 4</td>
<td>Election Day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Friday, November 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 5</td>
<td>Forum: Early Childhood Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thursday, November 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7:30 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 9</td>
<td>Global Climate Change Forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Monday, November 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9:00 a.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 15</td>
<td>LWVWA Action Workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Saturday, November 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9 a.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 26</td>
<td>32nd Annual Political Party and Auction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sunday, November 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4:30 – 8:30 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brockey Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South Seattle Community College</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please Note: Because of the large number of ballot issues to be presented, the October 2 forum will begin at 7:00 rather than 7:30.
September Board Briefs

Membership
The LWVS has 832 members. Even though the membership approved an increase in dues at May’s annual meeting, Kitty Mahon reported that a significant number of people have been sending in additional contributions with their dues renewals.

The new member dinner is October 2 at 5:30, before the ballot issues forum. Invitations have been sent out, and there is usually a good turnout for this event. Unfortunately, the vice-presidential debate has been scheduled for the same evening. We cannot reschedule the forum or dinner, but we will encourage people to record the debate and watch it later.

Denise will organize a viewing at the office.

Units
Unit leaders enthusiastically kicked off the new League year with a meeting in August to discuss their responsibilities.

Civics Education
The League-sponsored Newspaper in Education series on electing a president has begun again now that school is back in session. Six installments will appear each Wednesday in The Seattle Times Newspaper. Area classrooms receive these materials free.

Voter Service
The Board applauded Sarah Luthens, Voter Service chair, for producing a very successful ballot issues briefing for Board members in August.

Observer Corps
The Observer Corps is still recruiting volunteers and may be able to find some U.W. students from the Carlson Center who can fulfill their requirement for service with a civic organization.

Outreach
Board members signed up to attend outreach events in which we support other groups in the community. Among those scheduling events this month were First Place School, Powerful Voices, El Centro de la Raza and Faces East. At our next meeting we will discuss what groups and events we should support by attending events and donating money.

Strategic Planning
The Board’s strategic planning meeting in August resulted in a list of goals for the organization for the next three years. We will discuss our progress on achieving these goals at each Board meeting.

Fund Development
Auction invitations have been sent out. The event will be held at South Seattle Community College. September 24 is the deadline for procurements for the catalog. Sign up by October 16 for the best price on tickets. Meanwhile, the Board is also thinking about new ways to fund the League’s activities.

Ballot Issues
The Board discussed ballot issues and voted to endorse the Seattle Proposition I – Pike Place Market, Bellevue Parks Tax Levy, Sammamish Parks Bond and Levy Lid Lift, and King County Charter amendments on Qualifications and Nondiscrimination. The Board voted not to take a position on King County I-26, Nonpartisan Offices or the Seattle Parks Levy. The Board will have further discussion of ballot issues at its October meeting.
Committee Meetings

Drainage Committee
Dates: Wednesday, Oct. 1, 8, and 15
Time: 1:00 – 3:00 p.m.
Place: League Office

DRAINAGE IS MORE EXCITING THAN IT SOUNDS!
Four members of the Drainage Committee spent an incredible Saturday afternoon on a boat touring the Duwamish River, the Elliott Bay waterfront, the Magnolia Bluff area, the Ballard Locks, and Lake Union.

The trip was organized by the Department of Planning and Development (DPD), which is in the process of revising Seattle’s Shoreline Master Program.

Excellent presentations throughout the trip were given by historian Lorraine McConaghy of MOHAI, Maggie Glowacki of DPD, who educated the group on the needs of salmon, and Judith Noble of Seattle Public Utilities (SPU), who continually explained the many interests at stake and the policy choices which must be made.

Although the Drainage Committee is not following the Seattle Shoreline Master Plan as a committee, the information was very relevant.

Several years ago, when this study was first initiated, there was a tremendous amount of interest in daylighting streams and improving their flow. Several million dollars and much community effort have now been spent on stream improvement, and they are widely regarded as having enhanced their communities, but the mortality rate of the salmon which swim up the streams indicates that the work of the Drainage Committee is important.

Civics Education Committee
Date: Tuesday, October 14
Time: 4:00 – 6:00 p.m.
Place: League Office

New members are always welcomed and needed. For further information, please contact Jaclyn Wall at 206-329-4848.

Immigration Committee
Date: Wednesday, October 15
Time: 10:00 a.m.
Place: 3525 SW Seola Lane

The immigration committee will meet at the home of Eleanor Laxdall. You may call her at 206-329-4848 if you need directions. New members are welcome; the committee will be discussing plans for the future.

International Relations Committee
Date: Monday, October 6
Time: 12:45 – 2:45 p.m.
Place: League Office

Newcomers are welcome as we begin to plan our activities for the year ahead! Email Ellen Berg or Peggy Saari for more information: ellenzberg@msn.com, peggysaari@comcast.net.

Land Use Committee
For information about the October meeting, please contact Karen Kane at 206-329-4848.

Social Justice Committee
Date: Tuesday, October 14
Time: 5:30 – 7:00 p.m.
Place: League Office

League members are invited to participate in the Social Justice Committee. At our October meeting, we’ll discuss the King County Executive’s proposed budget and develop testimony for League representatives to provide at upcoming public hearings.

Contact Vanessa Power (vspower@stoel.com) for more information.

Transportation Committee
Date: Tuesday, October 21
Time: 10:00 a.m. – 12:30 p.m.
Place: League Office

The committee will review some of the materials prepared for the Stakeholders’ Viaduct Committee. The early presentations to this committee included a wealth of material about traffic patterns in the area and many recommendations for better traffic management. All who are interested are invited.

Economics and Taxation Committee
Date: Saturday, October 25
Time: 9:00 a.m.
Place: 909 E. Newton # D9

For more information, please call Nora Leech at 206-329-4848.
Announcements

The Immigration Game

The Immigration Game is a board game developed by Northwest Federation of Community Organizations to represent the experience of immigrants to this country attempting to achieve citizenship. At the September 4 immigration forum, attendees had the opportunity to try out this game. Players each took on the identity of an individual immigrant. Depending on their status, they were directed either to the “limbo loop” of the undocumented immigrant, or the more direct path to citizenship. Even those on the second path could find themselves moved to the first in certain circumstances, and those who started out undocumented found that they were indeed in limbo, trying to make it from day to day and making no perceptible progress toward the goal of permanent residence or citizenship. Along the way, players encountered situations experienced by actual immigrants, illuminated by their own voices.

The Immigration Game can be played by up to six people. We will have two copies of this game available to be checked out from the LVWS office; call 206-329-4848 to reserve one or both. The game is an excellent tool to educate players about the realities of the immigration experience today. You might consider using it as an activity for a December unit meeting.

Legislative Candidate Forum on Early Childhood Education and School Readiness

Thursday, October 9
Continental Breakfast 7:00 a.m.
Legislative Forum
7:30 – 9:00 a.m.
Mercer View Community Center
8236 SE 24th St.
Mercer Island, WA 98040

Sponsored By FACES East
(Families and Children Early Support)

For more information, contact Alex O’Reilly or Judy Manchester at 206-329-4848.

Vice Presidential Debate Viewing

Seattle League Office
Friday, October 3
10:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.

Because the upcoming debate between the candidates for Vice President conflicts with our New Members Dinner and Ballot Issues Forum, we have scheduled a viewing of the debate at the League office the morning of October 3. We do hope that members can join us, or make other arrangements for watching the debate, as our league events promise to be well worth attending. Our forum schedule is set ahead of time and we were unable to alter it; unfortunately the debate planners failed to consult us!

Global Climate Change Forum

Saturday, October 18
9:00 a.m. – 12:30 p.m.
Mukilteo Hall
Edmonds Community College
Edmonds, WA

This public forum will feature two panels of speakers, the first addressing commitments that citizens and businesses need to make to effect needed change, and the second addressing the corresponding planning steps that governments must take. Sponsored by the Snohomish County LWV with partial funding from Oxfam of America and the League of Women Voters Education Fund.

Speakers: Richard H. Gammon (University of Washington, Oceanography Dept.), Janice Adair (Washington State Dept. of Ecology), Todd Morrow (Community Transit), Aaron Adelstein (Master Builders Association of King and Snohomish Counties), Gabrielle Roesch (Washington State University, Carbon Masters Program), Tom Murdoch (Adopt-A-Stream Foundation), Tim Trohimovich (Futurewise), Rita Smith (Waste Management), Craig Collar (Snohomish County PUD),
Mercer Island Voters Forum

Sponsored by Mercer Island Unit of LWVS and Mercer Island Reporter

Tuesday, October 21
7:00 – 7:30 p.m.  Reception
7:30 – 9:00 p.m.  Forum
Islander Middle School
8225 SE 72nd
Mercer Island

This forum will feature local candidates as well as pro and con speakers on the Mercer Island Parks Levy.

CIS Volunteers Wanted!

Do you like to talk on the phone? Want to see what goes on in the Seattle League? Be on the forefront of this year’s elections? Come join us on the CIS (Citizen Information Service) desk! We will train you on the ways of the League and how to respond to questions from the public. We currently have an opening for a three-hour afternoon shift on Wednesdays, and always welcome substitutes whom we can call on as-needed basis. Come join the fun!

Call or email Cynthia Howe at: 206-329-4848; howe.john@comcast.net.

Issaquah Ballot Issues Forum

Monday, October 6
6:30 p.m.
KCLS Service Center
960 Newport Way NW

The Issaquah Day and Evening Units will combine to host a Ballot Issues Forum on local parks and fire district issues, Sound Transit and King County Charter Amendments. This is the first League ballot issues forum held in Issaquah and an opportunity to acquaint Issaquah, Sammamish and East Bellevue residents with the Voter Service work of the League. It is open to the public.

CALLING EASTSIDE COOKS!

The LWVWA Action Workshop will be held November 15th at St. Andrews Lutheran Church in Bellevue. As in previous years, Eastsiders will provide lunch for the attendees. We need YOU to call Lee Carpenter at 206-329-4848 and tell her you will make a great salad and bring it on that Saturday.

Besides hearing some excellent speakers, there is another reason to come to the Workshop: Joan Holiday will be coming with her fantastic breads, breakfast pastries, and cookies! Come early and get first choice of the goodies.

Introducing Lindsay

Lindsay Cummings, our new Office Specialist, began her new job on August 18 (about 24 hours after moving to Seattle), and loves it so far!

She hails from Missoula where she attended the University of Montana and graduated with a BA in environmental studies and geography in 2007. Lindsay has been working with various nonprofits for six years, including the Rocky Mountain Elk Foundation and Big Brothers Big Sisters. She enjoys reading, writing, hiking, being outside, familiarizing herself with Washington state politics, and exploring her new Seattle habitat.

Lindsay has always been passionate about maintaining healthy democracy, and has often turned to the League of Women Voters for guidance on issues. Over the past few weeks Lindsay has been learning how to monitor elections, register new voters, and help out generally in the office with whatever needs to be done!

She’s very excited about this position. She thanks those she’s already met for being so warm and welcoming, and is looking forward to meeting everyone else!
Strategic Planning Retreat Outcomes
by Jaclyn Wall

There are many challenges and opportunities facing the League of Women Voters of Seattle (LWVS) today and during the next few years. This is a critical time to evaluate our effectiveness now and to consider where we want the League to be in three years. On August 23, a lovely summer Saturday, about a dozen members of LWVS spent the day developing the initial document toward the creation of a three year strategic plan for our League. Board member Dr. Doreen Cato led the committee of Board members who designed the Strategic Planning Retreat. Lively discussion occurred throughout the day, beginning with the creation of a timeline noting when each person had first become aware of the League of Women Voters.

The first stage of the planning process was to create a vision statement—a description of the desired outcome that inspires, energizes and helps create a mental model of how we want the organization to evolve. The next step was to define four key areas for the Seattle League to focus on—Advocacy, Education, Cultural Competency and Membership.

Once these areas had been identified, two breakout groups listed needs, ideas to explore and issues to work on within each area. We then developed specific goals for each of the next three years. Many of the items were put on the 2011 list, but that doesn’t mean no action will occur until then. Work must be done now to more clearly define the vision statement and to plan activities for 2009, 2010 and 2011. If we begin with the end in mind—where the League wants to be in 2011—then we can identify what needs to be done in each year to achieve the 2011 goals.

The strategic planning process will continue, with meeting times still to be determined. This is an exciting project that will have an impact on the LWVS for many years to come. We welcome LWVS members who would like to participate in creating our strategic plan. If you are interested, please contact President Denise Smith at president@seattlelwv.org, or call the office at (206) 329-4848.
It’s Now or Never
By Victoria Bennett, Fund Development Chair

We just have a few more weeks until the political party and auction. This is our lead fundraiser — make it a success! There’s still time to generate enthusiasm. Talk to potential guests about coming. See if you can identify a new sponsor. It will make a difference to both the auction proceeds and the League’s visibility.

We’ve already had a lot of mailings for the auction, contacting members about being table captains; sending out procurement letters to businesses, units and members; reminding people with “Save the Date” cards; communicating with all the politicians and candidates in the north half of King County; and mailing the actual invitations. A huge thank you goes to all those who have joined our mailing parties: Jeannine Anderson, Nadine Baker, Ann Bowden, Maureen Carroll, Lynn Felsinger, Mickey Horwitz, Judi Jones, Eleanor Laxdall, Kitty Mahon, JoAnne McGaw, Vivian McLean, Harriett Morton, Alice Moss, Barbara O’Steen, Janet Perry, Lyn Reynolds, Angela Robinson, Hazel Schiffer, Denise Smith, Olive Spannaus, Peggy Tlapak and Ethel Williams.

If you want to join the fun of the auction without officially attending, you can be a volunteer the day of the auction. You can help some of the units with their jobs or take on another volunteer slot.

What are some of the jobs on offer?
- Auction set up
- Candidate sign hanging
- Making a yummy dessert for ten to bring to the auction
- Registration of candidates
- Registration of guests
- Greeting politicians and guests – you can bring a child or grandchild to help you with this task
- Raffle ticket vending
- Spotting bidders
- Running to take various items from one place to another
- Filing certificates after a winning bid is received
- Ensuring we leave the rooms at the Brockey Center in good shape at the end of the evening

Let us know at funddevelopment@seattlelwv.org or at (206) 329-4848 if you’d like to help. Together, we can soar!

Our sponsors are tops!
Thank you to:
Ruby Chow sponsor
Stephanie Elwood
Shirley Chisholm sponsors
Kitty and Michael Mahon
Harriett and John Morton
Joan K. Thomas
Bertha Landes sponsors
Cathy Allen and Jean Godden
Denise and Bruce Smith
Betty and Jay Sullivan
Patsy Takemoto Mink sponsor
First Place School

32nd Annual Political Party and Auction
Sunday, October 26, 2008
DOORS OPEN AT 4:30
Brockey Conference Center
South Seattle Community College
6000 16th Avenue SW
Seattle, WA 98106
How the League Takes Positions  by Denise Smith

Every election season the League of Women Voters of Seattle (LWVS) studies the ballot issues before the voters, and the board deliberates whether or not to take a position on each issue and what that position will be. The board makes these decisions guided by a longstanding process consistent with League principles and positions.

The League of Women Voters of the United States (LWVUS) considers national issues using League principles and national positions; the League of Women Voters of Washington (LWVWA) considers state issues using League principles, national and state positions, and local leagues consider local issues using League principles, national, state, regional and local positions. The League speaks with one voice, and although local Leagues may work simultaneously on local, state and national issues, actions must be consistent with the positions taken by the state and national leagues. Local positions are not used to justify positions on national or state issues. Local Leagues may act on state issues using state or national positions, but should do so under the auspices of the state League. The LWVUS board must authorize all League action at the national level. League members are always free to speak as individuals on issues as long as they do not give any impression they are speaking for the League.

The League principles are listed in Impact on Issues, the LWVUS publication which presents the National Positions; on the inside cover of the LWVWA publication Program in Action; and along with the LWVS positions published each year in the Seattle Voter. The principles are concepts of government which, according to Article XII of the LWVUS bylaws, are "a basis for taking action at the national, state and local level."

League positions are developed by study of an issue and consensus—an overall sense of the group rather than majority opinion or unanimity—reached after informed deliberation. Local League boards use the consensus from each local unit to formulate positions that reflect the League’s view of local issues being studied. New positions are then announced to the membership and can be used to support League action, but must be confirmed by the membership at the annual meeting. State and national League boards formulate positions at their respective levels by the same process.

On occasion, local Leagues adopt positions by concurring with a position from another League. In these cases, League members are provided with the background material, pros and cons of the issues and recommendations of the other League, and members are given an opportunity to agree with the position reached. The League maintains its longstanding and respected voice for objectivity by adhering to League process.

King County Bar Association Drug Policy Project Report  by Jan O’Connor

The King County Bar Association (KCBA) Drug Policy Project has been working for several years on reforming drug policy. Now the KCBA Drug Policy Project is establishing a new committee called the Families and Children Committee. Early meetings have brought together a variety of interests, including educators, service providers, and representatives of the justice system. These meetings have included short presentations from attendees describing their roles and their frustrations in trying to help families and their children. At the August meeting, attendees broke into interest groups and tried to prioritize the actions which would be most helpful in their areas. The committee leadership will attempt to sort out some starting points from all the ideas presented. Seattle League of Women Voters members Denise Smith, Peggy Saari and Jan O’Connor regularly attend these meetings.

Former Washington Supreme Court Justice Bobbe Bridge, the honorary chair of this year’s LWVS auction, has been involved with similar efforts. She retired from the court last year to head a nonprofit, the Center for Children and Youth Justice, which works on juvenile justice reform.
**November 4 General Election Ballot Issues and League Positions as of September 19, 2008**

### State Ballot Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initiative 1029 – Long-Term Care Services&lt;br&gt;&lt;www.yeson1029.org, <a href="http://www.communitycarecoalitionwa.org%3E">www.communitycarecoalitionwa.org&gt;</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>League Positions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The League of Women Voters of Washington opposes I-985 <a href="http://www.lwvwa.org">www.lwvwa.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The League of Women Voters of Washington supports I-1029</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Regional Ballot Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>League Positions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The League of Women Voters of Seattle supports Proposition 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### King County Ballot Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amendment No.</th>
<th>League Positions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Elected Elections Director&lt;br&gt;&lt;The League of Women Voters of Seattle opposes electing the Elections Director</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Prohibiting Discrimination&lt;br&gt;&lt;The League of Women Voters of Seattle supports the Nondiscrimination Charter Amendment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Regional Committees&lt;br&gt;No position</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Additional Qualifications for Elected Officials&lt;br&gt;The League of Women Voters of Seattle supports the Qualifications Charter Amendment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Establishing Forecast Council and Office of Economic and Financial Analysis&lt;br&gt;No position</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Budget Deadlines&lt;br&gt;No position</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Charter Amendments by Citizen Initiative&lt;br&gt;No position</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Nonpartisan Elections&lt;br&gt;No position</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### City of Seattle Ballot Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposition 1—Pike Place Market Levy&lt;br&gt;The League of Women Voters of Seattle supports Proposition 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposition 2—Parks Levy&lt;br&gt;No position</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### City of Sammamish Ballot Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposition 1—Park, Recreation and Athletic Facilities Bonds&lt;br&gt;The League of Women Voters of Seattle supports Proposition 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposition 2—Levy Lid Lift for Park Programs and Operations&lt;br&gt;The League of Women Voters of Seattle supports Proposition 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### City of Bellevue Ballot Issue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposition 1—Levy for City Parks and Natural Areas&lt;br&gt;The League of Women Voters of Seattle supports the Bellevue Parks Tax Levy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### City of Mercer Island Ballot Issue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mercer Island Parks Levy&lt;br&gt;No position</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
At the Alliance of People with disAbilities, we want to make sure everyone’s voice is heard in the election this November. Put us to work getting your members ready to vote!

Accessible voting machines are available now which make it easier for people of all abilities to participate in elections! These easy-to-use machines provide many people the opportunity to cast independent, secret ballots for the first time ever.

The Alliance is engaged in a campaign to increase community awareness of the availability of the accessible voting machines and to give your constituency hands-on practice voting before Election Day. We hope to have the opportunity to work with you to make that happen!

The Accessible Voting Units (AVUs) make voting enjoyable and memorable with features such as:

- Easy to read, large and high contrast text ballots
- Audio ballot options in English and Chinese
- Tactile pieces to assist blind voters

The Alliance will give your members, clients, program participants, staff, and other contacts hands-on experience voting at your agency’s upcoming event or meeting. We can contribute a story about the machines to your agency’s newsletter or website. Or we could set up the machine in your office on a pre-publicized date for a certain period of time to allow people to try the machine at their leisure. We will register people to vote and have registration forms available in Braille, Chinese, Spanish, English and five other languages. We will provide your constituents with valuable tips to ensure their Election Day voting experience is pleasant and goes smoothly.

Deb Blakeslee, Alliance’s Disability Vote Project Coordinator, will be following up with disability organizations and other non-profits and community groups between now and Election Day to discuss how we can work together. We welcome your ideas and look forward to speaking with you! Deb may be reached at 206-633-6623 or by replying to this message.

Thanks!
Gladys Springborn
Interim Co-Director
Alliance of People with disAbilities

OUR MISSION

People with disAbilities advocating for equality and choice!
Your vote matters for people with disAbilities. Are you registered?
MEMBERSHIP REPORT
By Kitty Mahon, Membership Chair

INVITATION TO GET TO KNOW LEAGUE DINNER

Newcomers: If you are new or relatively new to the League or would just like to learn more about us, please come be our guest at a Get to Know League dinner, to be held on Thursday, October 2, 2008 at 5:30 p.m. The dinner will be held prior to the 7:00 p.m** ballot issues discussion and forum at Seattle First Baptist Church, 1111 Harvard Avenue, Seattle.

** Please note the change in time.

League members: If you would like to contribute your favorite lasagna or share your League story, your participation is also welcome. The Get to Know League dinner is the first contact for many new members and involves many volunteers. If you can help with set up, act as a table captain, bring flowers, be a greeter, bake cookies or help in any other way, please contact Kitty Mahon at membership@seattlelwv.org, or call the CIS desk at (206) 329-4848 and leave a message for Kitty.

THANK YOU TO OUR MEMBER DONORS

Our members continue their generosity, despite the recent increase in dues (and soaring gasoline prices). The donations arrive with notes of encouragement and support for our programs and to underwrite the scholarships for those who cannot afford to join. These are wonderful contributions of support for League by many who also donate their time and energy. Thank you one and all.

Renewing at the contributing member level are Jayne Freitag-Koontz and Ellyn Swanson. Donations are also acknowledged from Rosealma Smith, Joan Peterson, Betsy Greene, Nancy and Charles Bagley, Beatrice Crane, Patricia de la Fuente, Trudy Stack, Charlotte Kanemori, Margaret Ceis, Peggy and Jack Saari, Lael Braymer, Bobbie Westfall, Lucy Gaskill-Gaddis, Virginia Leland, Deborah Jacobs, Michelle Meith, Edna Dam, Charlene McKenzie and Nancy Miller.

LEAGUE ACTIVITY AND RECRUITMENT OPPORTUNITY

From Marcia Merrins, LWVUS Board Member

Voter Service activities are membership opportunities. Now is the time to take advantage of your community’s interest in the political arena. In a recent Leader’s Update, one of the activities mentioned was a Debate Watching Party. What a great idea! All the tools you need are right in one place. Think of it as a political super bowl party!

Go to the LWV home page www.lwv.org and click on PROJECTS. When the window drops down, click on VOTER INFORMATION. You will find:

- Tips for Debate Watching Party Hosts
- LWV Debate Watching Party Media Advisory Template
- Sign-in Sheet
- LWV Debate Watching Party Recipes & Playlist
- LWV Debate Discussion Guide
- Printable Debate Watcher’s Notebook
- Printable Get Out the Vote Postcards

Additionally, invite friends and neighbors to join you in a ballot review session. The bipartisan nature of the League makes this an ideal time to review the issues and positions, especially following our October 2 forum on the ballot issues.

Diversity Policy

The League of Women Voters of Seattle (LWVS), 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 recognizes that diverse perspectives are important and necessary for responsible and representative decision-making. LWVS 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 affirms its commitment to reflecting the diversity of Americans in its membership, board, staff and programs.
Welcome New Members

A very warm welcome to these new and transferring members of the League of Women Voters of Seattle.

**Lindsay Cummings**

Our new office specialist!! Lindsay moved to Seattle from Montana to apply for and accept this critical position. Already she has shown us that she is a can-do person and is very responsive to requests for help with projects in the League office. Lindsay has a BA in environmental studies from the University of Montana and followed that up with six years’ experience with various non-profits in Montana. She has been a member of various conservation groups and the ACLU. Among her talents and abilities she includes writing and editing, “decent” computer skills and intermediate Spanish and French. Lindsay has been aware of the League and has consulted our positions even before she began voting at age 18. She looks forward to enjoying voting and advocacy resources and some guidance and opportunities to focus her political volunteer work (all as she continues to develop her professional work). We’re glad to have Lindsay with us.

**Sheila Hoff**

Now living in Redmond, Sheila is a transferring member from the League of Women Voters of California, the Palos Verdes Peninsula local League, where she was a member since 1967. Her professional background is in teaching; she has a BA in general education. She served on the California State Board as a program director for reproductive choice for the last 11 years. She also chaired the county board for health care. She was spent the last 12 years as Vice Chair and Leg Chair of Health Care for All California. In addition to her strong health care interests, Sheila served as a member of the Democratic Central Committee, and was a Democratic party delegate to both the national and California conventions. Sheila brings a wealth of experience with the League as study chair, observer/advocacy chair, speakers bureau and board roles.

---

**THE NATIONAL BEAT**

**LEAGUE OPPOSES COAL-FIRED POWER PLANTS**

The League of Women Voters of the United States (LWVUS) has called for a moratorium on new construction of coal-fired electric power plants.

“Global warming is happening now,” said national League President Mary G. Wilson in a press release on August 7. “If we wait for federal action from our congressional leaders, it will be too late. We must take immediate and aggressive action to halt climate change,” she said. Wilson pledged to be active in opposing the building of these plants, which have a long lifespan. She pointed out that there is no environmentally sound use of coal. Instead, she recommended focusing on clean energy alternatives, such as wind and solar, which can also contribute to economic growth.

The League carefully examined many facets of energy policy before taking its position. “We support strong action in Congress to stop global climate change, but the planet can’t wait,” Wilson concluded.

The following fact sheet on the moratorium is reprinted from the LWVUS website, LWV.org.
Moratorium on New Coal-Fired Electric Power Plants
Is Imperative to Address Global Warming

Global warming is happening, and its impacts are already being felt today.
Evidence includes disappearing glaciers, increasingly severe heat waves and droughts in some areas, intensifying hurricanes and floods in others, and more wildfires. If left unchecked, the effects could be catastrophic: millions of people displaced as rising sea levels flood coastal areas; many regions devastated by reduced crop yields and shortages of drinking water; human health threatened by the spread of malaria and other vector-borne diseases; many plant and animal species at risk of extinction.

Coal is the single largest source of global warming pollution in the U.S.
A thickening "blanket" of carbon dioxide (CO2) and other greenhouse gases (GHGs) in the atmosphere is trapping solar heat and warming the earth's surface. Most of the CO2 comes from burning fossil fuels. Coal is the most carbon-intensive fossil fuel, producing more CO2 per million Btus of energy than burning oil or gas. Coal-fired power plants are responsible for 33 percent of CO2 emissions in the U.S.

Restricting CO2 emissions from coal-fired power plants is imperative.
The League of Women Voters is calling for a ten-year moratorium on the new construction of coal-fired electric power plants. This will allow the coal and power industries more time to test carbon capture and storage (CCS) technologies and to determine whether the long-term storage of CO2 is feasible and safe. The League will work at all levels to help policy makers and the public understand that investing in climate-friendly energy technologies is essential if we are to avoid irreversible damage to our planet.

We cannot afford to wait any longer to cut greenhouse gas emissions.
The global climate is changing faster than was predicted just a few years ago, and what we do in the next two to three years will determine our future. Power plants have a lifetime of 50 years or more. Building new conventional coal-fired plants today will commit us to decades of unnecessary carbon emissions and foreclose the possibility of preventing dangerous global warming.

Energy efficiency and renewable energy can meet our electrical needs.
A combination of energy conservation, greater efficiency in the use of electricity, and increased development and use of renewable energy can ensure that there is enough electricity to support continued economic growth without building a new generation of CO2-emitting power plants. The California experience shows that this strategy works. Through a variety of efficiency initiatives, California has held per capita electrical consumption essentially constant since 1975 while maintaining a robust economy.

The U.S. must lead with strong action.
As the world's largest economy and largest per capita emitter of global warming pollution, the U.S. must provide leadership in international efforts to reduce GHG emissions. Aggressive action in this country will help influence China, India and other rapidly developing nations to take steps to control their own emissions. Moreover, by developing and sharing clean-energy technologies, the U.S. can help these developing countries leapfrog over the fossil-fuel-based model of development practiced here and take a more sustainable growth path.
Amity Shlaes, a syndicated columnist for Bloomberg, also writes for The Wall Street Journal, The New Yorker and many other magazines. Her book The Forgotten Man analyzes the Great Depression and provides new insights, showing us how the culture and ideas commonly held in that era affected efforts to improve America’s economy. People wanted to work, and many programs to provide jobs helped millions. However, there was a downside when companies could not compete with the government.

The “forgotten man” of the title is a concept that changes from Hoover’s and FDR’s picture of the man who can’t find work and has no money, to Yale professor William Sumner’s view of the person who wants to make it on his own, but loses out because government intervention favors special interests, whether the unemployed, businessmen or others. Shlaes shows that to justify helping one group, “the administration found it had to make a scapegoat of another.” This eventually led a pragmatic FDR to bring together “forgotten” folks such as blacks, labor and those who were looking for work.

Stories that I found especially interesting included the Schecter brothers, kosher butchers from Brooklyn, who found that the National Recovery Act (NRA) policies regarding chickens suddenly made their sales “illegal.” The brothers fought against the NRA all the way to the Supreme Court, and won. Another story is that of Wendell Wilkie, who found that government projects such as dam building to create and sell energy made it difficult for private companies to compete. If the government could give you electricity at a very reduced price, why would anyone want “private” energy?

Shlaes is adamant that in 1933 Roosevelt did the right thing when he immediately started one experimental program after another. Of course not all of them worked perfectly, but the sense of “doing something” provided everyone with a sense of hope. In time, some programs were changed, some dropped and others added. Throughout the more than ten years of the depression, FDR sought advice from economic experts of the time, including Great Britain’s Keynes. Though all the advice was well intended, it became clear that government intervention could and did sometimes make problems more difficult.

I found parallels in today’s world; whether dealing with problems of the economy, global warming, education or health care, it is likely that solutions of the current era will provide only partial success. Just as programs in FDR’s era were not perfect and needed adjustments, legislation addressing today’s issues will probably require tweaking and compromises.

I enjoyed reading this book; it provides insights into the national economy of the 1930s that feels familiar because Shlaes writes about a time our families lived through. It is a lively read, thanks to the author’s ability to show programs and policies in terms of individuals with whom we can identify. For thoughts on today’s economic issues, her clear, sensible writing can be found in her economics columns, which occasionally appear in the Seattle Post Intelligencer.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit Meetings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Monday, October 6, 2008</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Southend**  
Sam Scharff | webcats@speakeasy.net | 7:30 p.m. | Lila Bulen  
3716 Cascadia Ave S |
| **Issaquah Evening**  
Ann Thornton | alphéaann@aol.com | 6:30 p.m. | King County Library System Service Center  
960 Newport Way NW, Issaquah |
| **Kirkland/Redmond**  
Patti Catalano | pattimusic@comcast.net | 7:00 p.m. | Starbucks in Houghton  
6733 108th AVE NE, Kirkland |
| **Capitol Hill/Montlake**  
Jan O’Connor | oconnor.js@gmail.com | 7:15 p.m. | Anita Warmflash  
Panorama House  
1100 University St. Apt. 9J |
| **Wednesday, October 8, 2008** |
| **View Ridge**  
Nan Moore | | 12:45 p.m. | Gail Winberg  
6004 NE 60th ST |
| **Magnolia/Queen Anne/Ballard Eve**  
Bettina Hosler | glencoe1985@aol.com | 7:30 p.m. | Bettina Hosler  
9516 2nd Ave NW |
| **Thursday, October 9, 2008** |
| **Mercer Island**  
Martha Jordan | marty4lwv@yahoo.com | 9:15 a.m. | Mercer Island Presbyterian Church  
3605 84th Ave SE  
Mercer Island 98040 |
| **Issaquah**  
Margaret Austin | Margaret.Austin@comcast.net | 10:00 a.m. | Issaquah City Hall & Police  
130 E. Sunset Way  
Coho Room (upstairs) |
| **Shoreline**  
Juliet Beard | juliet@windermerere.com | 4:30 p.m. | Richmond Beach Congregational Church  
NW 195th St and 15th Ave NW |
| **North Central**  
Jan Orlando | orlanre@aol.com | 7:30 p.m. | Gail Shurgot  
6536 31st Ave NE |
| **University House – Wallingford**  
Mary Siothic | mhsotnick@comcast.net | 10:30 a.m. | University House  
4400 Stone Way N |
| **Monday, October 13, 2008** |
| **First Hill**  
Jeannette Kahlenberg | kahlenb@gmail.com | 10:00 a.m. | Mary Margaret Pruitt  
Horizon House, 900 University St  
Sky Lounge |
| **Capitol Hill/Montlake**  
Jan O’Connor | oconnor.js@gmail.com | 7:15 p.m. | Linnea Hirst  
1502 E. McGraw |
| **Tuesday, October 14, 2008** |
| **Bellevue**  
Bonnie Rimawi | bonnierim@aol.com | 10:00 a.m. | Bellevue Library  
Room 6 |
| **West Seattle Day**  
Lucy Gaskill-Gaddis | terrylucy2u@comcast.net | 12:30 p.m. | Anne Bowden  
The Kenney  
7125 Fauntleroy SW |
| **West Seattle Eve**  
Barbara O’Sheen | | 7:00 p.m. | Boots Winterstein  
8108 11th Ave. SW |
| **North End Aft.**  
Helen St. John | | 12:30 p.m. | Cora Lee Doty  
2133 N. 115 th St |
| **Saturday, October 18, 2008** |
| **Ballard/Queen Anne/Magnolia Day**  
Joan Peterson | | 10:00 a.m. | Magnolia Library Meeting Rm  
2801 34th Ave W |
| **Tuesday, October 28th, 2008** |
| **Pioneer Square**  
Kathleen Randall | kathleen8@gmail.com | 5:45 p.m. | Zeitgeist Coffee  
174 So. Jackson St |
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The League of Women Voters of Seattle has made every effort to present objective, nonpartisan information about the November 4, 2008 General Election ballot measures, with no attempt to influence voters or evaluate arguments advanced by proponent or opponents, other than to ensure that arguments have a factual basis. League volunteers research and analyze each measure, work with ballot issue proponents and opponents and obtain information from a variety of sources. The League encourages voters to read the official Voters Pamphlet, newspapers and other sources of election information.
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Washington State Initiative Measure No. 1000—
Death with Dignity

OFFICIAL BALLOT TITLE: “This measure would permit terminally ill, competent, adult Washington residents, who are medically predicted to have six months or less to live, to request and self-administer lethal medication prescribed by a physician. Should this measure be enacted into law?” □ Yes □ No

BACKGROUND
Under current Washington State law (the Washington Natural Death Act) a person may direct life-supporting treatment to be withheld or withdrawn, but a terminally ill person cannot ask a doctor for a prescription for a lethal dose of medication. This measure resembles Oregon’s landmark Death with Dignity Act (1994), which has been in effect since 1997 (and twice upheld by the US Supreme Court).

WHAT THIS MEASURE WOULD DO
A chapter entitled the Washington Death with Dignity Act would be added to the Revised Code of Washington. The law would allow a person who meets the lawful definition of adult, terminally ill, and competent to obtain a lethal prescription after fulfilling a protocol designed to ensure that the patient is making an informed and voluntary decision.

PROTOCOL
Under this law, a patient would make both an oral request and a written request through a standard form. There must be at least two witnesses to the written request. At least one of those witnesses must be neither a relative, nor entitled to gain anything from the patient’s death nor the owner/operator of the patient’s health facility. An attending physician must state that the patient has a terminal illness (expected to die within six months); that the patient is competent and qualified; and that the patient has knowingly and voluntarily expressed a wish to die.

The patient would have to wait at least 15 days after their first oral request, and at least 48 hours after the written request, before a prescription could be written. Following the first oral request, a consulting physician would be required to confirm the diagnosis/prognosis and patient’s state of mind. Either doctor could refer the patient for psychological/psychiatric counseling. Referral to counseling is not mandatory, but once a referral is made, the prescription could not be issued without determination by the counselor that the patient is not suffering from a psychiatric or psychological disorder or depression that causes impaired judgment.

Before prescribing, the attending physician must recommend prior notification of next of kin and advise that the medication be taken in a private place, in another person’s presence. The attending physician would also be responsible for making sure that the patient is making an informed decision, and knows that he or she may take the request back at any time, and in any manner. The patient would be required to self-administer the medication. The attending physician would list the underlying terminal disease as the cause of death on the patient’s death certificate.
LIABILITY and INSURANCE
Liability for violating the professional standard of care for health care providers would remain the same, but those participating in good faith under this law would be immune from civil or criminal liability or professional disciplinary action. Health care facilities would be free to opt out, or refuse to permit the service on their grounds as a matter of policy. Patient's rights under insurance policies and contracts would be protected. Coercion, forgery, or concealing/destruction of records in order to cause someone’s death would become Class A felonies under this law.

RECORDS
The attending physician would be responsible for keeping adequate records in order to comply with this new law. Records sent to Department of Health would be exempt from public access under the Washington Public Records Act. The State Department of Health would be required to review all records yearly.

HOW MUCH WOULD THIS MEASURE COST?
This measure doesn’t directly request funding.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Those in favor say:</th>
<th>Those against say:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• This would allow a mentally competent, terminally ill adult to voluntarily end extreme suffering at the end of life.</td>
<td>• This measure is an unnecessary option for terminally ill patients. They do not have to fear enduring unbearable pain as physicians can now control pain and anxiety with modern palliative medicines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Death with dignity is not suicide. Many terminally ill patients very much want to live, but are dying from an incurable disease. Suicide is life versus death; death with dignity is death versus death.</td>
<td>• Death with Dignity is considered assisted suicide, which is against the teachings of some religions and it is incompatible with physician’s fundamental role as a healer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• There are many safeguards, including independently witnessed oral and written requests and two waiting periods. Mental state and prognosis must be confirmed by two doctors at minimum.</td>
<td>• The initiative does not have adequate safeguards or monitoring to protect patients, particularly those suffering from mental illness and depression, which may be difficult to diagnose.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• An individual may rescind the request at any time.</td>
<td>• Doctors cannot be sure that a patient has only six months to live.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The doctor must advise terminally ill patients to discuss their decisions with their families, although the law cannot require patients to do so because of doctor-patient confidentiality laws.</td>
<td>• Patients are not required to notify their families.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORGANIZATIONS SUPPORTING I-1000 (Newspapers excluded)</td>
<td>ORGANIZATIONS OPPOSING I-1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Yes On I-1000</td>
<td>• Coalition Against Assisted Suicide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Compassion and Choices of Washington</td>
<td>• The Archdiocese of Seattle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Oregon Death with Dignity PAC</td>
<td>• The Catholic Health Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Humanists of Washington</td>
<td>• American Medical Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Older Women’s League (OWL) of Seattle</td>
<td>• Disability Rights Education and Defense Fund (DREDF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Death with Dignity National Center</td>
<td>• National Spinal Cord Injury Association (NSCIA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Compassion &amp; Choices (national)</td>
<td>• Not Dead Yet (NDY)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• American Medical Women’s Association</td>
<td>• TASH</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Washington State Initiative 1029—Long-Term Care

OFFICIAL BALLOT TITLE: “Initiative No. 1029 concerns long-term care services for the elderly and persons with disabilities. This measure would require long-term care workers to be certified as home care aides based on an examination, with exceptions; increase training and criminal background check requirements; and establish disciplinary standards and procedures. Should this measure be enacted into law?” □ Yes □ No

WHAT THIS MEASURE WILL DO
Beginning January 1, 2010, this initiative would mandate 75 hours (the current requirement is 34 hours) of training in the duties, responsibilities, safety standards, and health precautions required of long-term providers of care for the elderly and persons with disabilities. The long-term worker must complete 5 hours of this training before becoming eligible to work and the remaining 70 hours within 120 days after employment. This course of education would include a written and practical certification examination. The Department of Health would require that any person hired as a long-term care worker for the elderly or persons with disabilities be certified as a home care aide within 150 days from the date of hire.

In addition, each long-term caregiver must undergo federal and state background checks for violations that could reflect on the applicant’s competency to work with the aged and disabled.

HOW MUCH WILL THIS MEASURE COST?
The increased costs of I-1029 would be borne by the state and possibly by the caregivers and contractors — ultimately by patients and families. No clear costs have been set forth by either proponents or opponents. However, a similar proposal in the legislature, HB 2693, was estimated to cost $135 million over five years by the Office of Financial Management. For more information, go to http://apps.leg.wa.gov/billinfo, and type in bill 2693. Fiscal estimate is at the bottom of the page.
**Those in favor say:**

- This measure would improve safety and quality of care for the elderly and persons with disabilities.

- More training leads to improved status and increased wages for long-term care workers, and ultimately to a more reliable pool of employees.

- A reliable pool of trained long-term care workers could encourage more people to receive care in their homes and so decrease the cost of their long-term care.

**Those against say:**

- The new requirements would be burdensome and increase the cost of health care, and would discourage or limit the number of badly-needed health care workers.

- The training requirements are too broad; even family members are required to complete the training if they are paid by the state to provide care.

- The training will not lead to better care in many situations. The proposed curriculum is too narrow and inflexible and doesn't provide the diversity of information needed for the wide variety of special needs clients who receive long-term care.

**ORGANIZATIONS SUPPORTING:**

- WA State long-term Care Ombudsman
- Elderhealth Northwest
- Washington State Fraternal Order of Police
- Washington Association of Churches
- El Centro de la Raza
- SEIU 775
- IBEW Local 91
- Washington Education Association
- League of Women Voters of Washington

**ORGANIZATIONS OPPOSING:**

- Community Care Coalition of Washington
- Home Care Association of Washington
- Developmental Disability Advocates
- Aging Services of Washington
Washington State Initiative 985—Reduce Traffic

OFFICIAL BALLOT TITLE: “Initiative Measure No. 985 concerns transportation. This measure would open high-occupancy vehicle lanes to all traffic during specified hours, require traffic light synchronization, increase roadside assistance funding, and dedicate certain taxes, fines, tolls and other revenues to traffic-flow purposes. Should this measure be enacted into law?” ☐ Yes ☐ No

WHAT THIS MEASURE WILL DO
This measure dedicates a portion of existing vehicle-related revenue to help fund the opening of carpool lanes to everyone during non-peak hours, the synchronization of traffic lights on heavily-traveled arterials and streets, and the oversight responsibilities of the state auditor, as well as to increase funding for emergency roadside assistance.

Creates “Reduce Traffic Congestion Account.” The Reduce Traffic Congestion Account would be created in the state treasury as a sub-account of the Motor Vehicle Fund. Receipts from the 15% of existing State sales and use taxes from the sale of new and used vehicles, charges and revenue from ‘automated safety camera’ infractions, ½ of 1% of the cost of transportation-related public works projects, and tolls would be deposited there. Money in the sub-account could be spent only after appropriation and used only for costs associated with:
- opening of carpool lanes during non-peak hours;
- synchronizing traffic lights;
- emergency roadside assistance;
- the activities of the state auditor—investigation, tracking and reporting of revenues and expenditures, as required by this initiative.

Should the “Reduce Traffic Congestion Account” collect revenues in excess of the cost to fulfill these policies, the extra funds could be used to reduce traffic congestion by expanding road capacity in order to reduce vehicle delay times, and for general purpose uses to improve traffic flow. The measures to improve traffic flow do not include:
- creating, maintaining, or operating bike paths or lanes,
- wildlife crossings,
- landscaping,
- park and ride lots,
- ferries, trolleys, buses,
- monorail, light rail, or heavy rail.

Beginning December 4th, 2008, I-985 would open carpool lanes to everyone during non-peak hours. Carpool lanes, also called high-occupancy vehicle lanes (HOV lanes), express lanes, offramp and onramp bypass lanes, would be open during non-peak hours for use by all traffic on Monday through Friday between 9 a.m. and 3 p.m.; Monday through Thursday from 6 p.m. to 6 a.m.; and from 6 p.m. on Friday through 6 a.m. on Monday. Times when these lanes would be restricted to vehicles carrying two or more persons (with the exception of motorcycles) would be Monday through Friday from 6 a.m. to 9 a.m. and from 3 p.m. to 6 p.m.

Revenue from High-Occupancy Toll Lanes would be restricted to use to cover the costs of construction and operation of the toll lanes only. Tolls would be generated by single-occupant vehicles using the carpool lanes during peak hours. Toll charge revenues exceeding costs to construct and operate toll lanes would be deposited in the Reduce Traffic Congestion Account. A pilot project of high-occupancy toll lanes is currently operating on HOV lanes of State Route 167 within King County.
Requires synchronization of traffic lights on heavily-traveled arterials and streets. All cities and counties would be required to synchronize the traffic lights on heavily-traveled arterials and streets within their jurisdictions to optimize traffic flow. The state auditor would be required to identify and establish performance benchmarks using best practices for traffic light synchronization to optimize traffic flow.

Increases funding for emergency roadside assistance. Governmental entities would receive increased funding for emergency roadside assistance from the dedicated revenue in the Reduce Traffic Congestion Relief Account.

Dedicates revenue from red-light traffic cameras to the Reduce Traffic Congestion Account. Monetary fines and penalties remain as currently in effect. In addition, revenue collected by cities and counties from automated traffic safety cameras would be deposited in the Reduce Traffic Congestion Account created by this act. This revenue currently is deposited in the county's or city's current general fund.

Dedicates revenue previously allocated to public art for transportation projects to the Reduce Traffic Congestion Account. After December 4, 2008 transportation-related public works projects will not dedicate ½ of 1% (.005) to the acquisition of works of art. Instead, after December 4, 2008, there will be a new requirement that ½ of 1% (.005) of the cost of any transportation-related public works project funded with state dollars will be dedicated and deposited in the Reduce Traffic Congestion Account, as described above.

Critical taxpayer protection: prevents politicians from diverting toll revenue to the general fund; tolls on a project get spent on the project. After December 4, 2008, revenues from tolls that exceed the cost of construction, operation, or maintenance of toll facilities (except for Washington State ferry toll facilities) would be deposited in the Reduce Traffic Congestion Account. The state treasurer would keep toll revenues for each toll project in a separate fund, with any excess funds deposited in the Reduce Traffic Congestion Account.

HOW MUCH WILL THIS MEASURE COST?
This measure does not directly request a funding amount, but rather seeks to shift existing revenue. 15% (.15) of state sales and use taxes currently collected on retail sales of new and used vehicles would be dedicated to reducing traffic congestion, and deposited in the Reduce Traffic Congestion Account. Fines and penalties from ‘automated safety cameras’ that cities and counties previously received in their general fund would instead be dedicated to reducing congestion and deposited in the Reduce Traffic Congestion Account. The measure would also remove the current ½ of 1% requirement for public art on transportation projects, and instead would require ½ of 1% of the cost of transportation-related public works projects to be dedicated to reducing congestion and deposited in the Reduce Traffic Congestion Account.
### Those in favor say:

- I-985 is based on State Auditor Brian Sonntag’s performance audit on reducing congestion. Those recommendations should be adopted.

- Rather than raising taxes, I-985 would use taxes and charges we’re already paying to fund its congestion relief policies and traffic flow policies. I-985 would remove the profit motive for cities to put up red-light and speeding cameras.

- I-985 dedicates existing revenue, less than \( \frac{1}{2} \) of 1\% of the state’s general fund, to pay for its congestion relief policies. That sliver of revenue will make a huge difference. Auditor Sonntag’s transportation experts estimated that adopting all of their recommendations would reduce traffic congestion 15-20\%, providing a $3 billion boost to our state’s economy.

- Tolls on a project should be spent on that project and should not be allowed to be diverted and spent somewhere else. Without such a requirement, tolls could be set artificially high to pay not just for the project, but for any other programs the money is diverted to.

### Those against say:

- Opening carpool lanes at 6 p.m. will make the problem worse. Rush hour congestion in the Puget Sound area can last an additional hour in the evening on some of our most congested corridors, according to the state auditor’s 2007 report. Opening HOV lanes to SOVs in non-peak hours is not necessary, since traffic moves freely during these hours anyway.

- According to the Department of Revenue report, I-985 would take $290 million from the general fund during the next biennium and the rest of the current one. This money could otherwise be spent on K-12 education, one of the primary responsibilities of state government, and health care.

- Traffic light synchronization and roadside assistance are not the real issue. More important is that the money in the Reduce Traffic Congestion Account cannot be spent for public transportation, park and ride lots or bike paths.

- I-985 requires toll fees to be spent only on the project being tolled. Drivers would be able to avoid the toll on the 520 bridge by using I-90, which would remain free of charge, while the 520 bridge is being rebuilt. This would add to the congestion on the I-90 bridge and corridor.

### Organizations Supporting:

- ReduceCongestion.org

### Organizations Opposing:

- Northwest Progressive Institute Advocate
- FUSE Washington
- Transportation Choices Coalition,
- The Sierra Club
- Environment Washington,
- Futurewise.org
- WashPIRG
- Washington Environmental Council
- League of Women Voters of Washington
Sound Transit (A Regional Transit Authority)

Proposition 1 —

Mass Transit Expansion

OFFICIAL BALLOT TITLE:
“The Sound Transit Board passed Resolution No. R2008-11 concerning an expansion of mass transit. This measure would expand and coordinate light-rail, commuter-rail, and (beginning 2009) express bus service, and improve access to transit facilities in King, Pierce and Snohomish Counties, and authorize Sound Transit to impose an additional five-tenths of one percent sales and use tax, and to use existing taxes to fund the local share of the $17.9 billion estimated cost (includes construction, operations, maintenance, interest and inflation), with independent audits, as described in Resolution R2008-11 and the Mass Transit Guide. Should this measure be: □ approved □ rejected?”

WHAT THIS MEASURE WILL DO

This measure proposes to build 36 miles of new light rail, to open in stages over the next fifteen years, starting four years after University Link. Service would extend as far north as Lynnwood, as far south as Federal Way, and as far east as Microsoft campus, serving such major destinations in between as Northgate, Bellevue, and Des Moines.

The measure would fund planning and design work for further extensions throughout the region, including Everett, Tacoma, Issaquah, Redmond, Ballard, West Seattle, Burien, and more.

(Sound Transit’s map of the 15-year proposal, reproduced on the right, may also be found at http://future.soundtransit.org/proposed.aspx.)
HOW MUCH WILL THIS MEASURE COST?
$17.9 billion estimated cost (projected to cost the average person $69 per year). This measure proposes using existing taxes to fund the local share, as well as an additional five-tenths of one percent sales and use tax. The sales taxes go to Sound Transit (itself a municipal corporation) but under the sub-area equity rules the taxes collected in the different sub areas (Snohomish, N King, S King, E King, and Pierce) must be used to benefit the taxpayers in that sub area. This means taxes collected in Seattle will be used to build light rail to Northgate and other projects to benefit Seattle residents. Seattle taxes won’t be used to build light rail in Bellevue, etc. If a sub area collects more taxes than they need it will go into a reserve account to be used in the future. All debt and overhead costs are spread throughout the region on a formula basis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Those in favor say:</th>
<th>Those against say:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• This plan offers an immediate 17% increase in express bus service across all three counties and up to 30% on the highest-demand routes, plus more Sounder commuter trains between Lakewood, Tacoma and Seattle. It includes a 36 mile expansion of fast, efficient light rail service to Snohomish, South King and across Lake Washington. New hybrid buses, clean light rail and efficient commuter rail reduce carbon emissions and address climate change.</td>
<td>• Proposed rail routes are not going where commuters want to go or where the heaviest ridership is. This plan doesn’t complement and support varied and unique neighborhoods or provide equity of benefits across the different communities paying for it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The approximately $69 annual cost of the increase for each adult is around the cost of a single tank of gas at current pump prices.</td>
<td>• This plan costs too much, does too little, takes too long and more than doubles transit’s part of the regressive local sales tax. Prop 1 reauthorizes the regional Sound Transit 1996 0.4% sales tax for ongoing operations and adds an additional temporary 0.5% sales tax for the 2nd phase of Sound Transit. This, added to Metro’s “Transit Now” 0.9% sales tax passed last year, brings the sales tax for transit purposes to 1.8%.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Sound Transit hires independent auditors every year to do financial audits and separate auditors to do performance audits. In addition, the state auditor does regular audits on Sound Transit, which are released publicly.</td>
<td>• Sound Transit has a history of fiscal problems and trouble meeting previous deadlines. This plan doesn’t ensure public funds are spent wisely by using objective and transparent measurements of financial, environmental and social impacts.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• Buses take up lots of street space, particularly in urban areas. Light rail has the capacity to move far more people than buses while taking up far less space.

• We should focus on increasing bus services first, by ending the Link light rail at the initial 14-mile segment, and funding a high quality, upgraded bus rapid transit (BRT) system, and a range of other services, which could include: frequent, all-day, comfortable express and local bus service; HOT (High Occupancy Toll) lanes; vanpools; and other innovative, cost-effective, safe, community-friendly transit options. This would mean more service, more facilities, and more jobs now.

• We should emphasize connections and not competition between transportation authorities, communities and types of transportation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORGANIZATIONS SUPPORTING:</th>
<th>ORGANIZATIONS OPPOSING:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Sound Transit</td>
<td>• NoToProp1.Org</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Sierra Club, Cascade Chapter</td>
<td>• Public Interest Transportation Forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• WA Conservation Voters</td>
<td>• Eastside Transportation Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mass Transit Now</td>
<td>• Washington Traffic Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Transportation Choices Coalition</td>
<td>• Coalition for Effective Transportation Alternatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Futurewise.org</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• League of Women Voters of Seattle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
City of Seattle Proposition 1—Pike Place Market Levy

OFFICIAL BALLOT TITLE: “The City of Seattle’s Proposition 1 concerns increased property taxes for six years for Pike Place Market. If approved, this proposition would fund seismic, safety, energy-saving, and other basic infrastructure improvements at the publicly-owned Pike Place Market, last renovated in the 1970s; all as provided in Ordinance 122737. It would authorize regular property taxes higher than RCW 84.55 limits, allowing collection of up to $12,500,000 in additional taxes in 2009 (up to $73,000,000 over six years). Taxes collected in 2009 would be limited to $2.60 per $1,000 of assessed value, including approximately $0.10 of additional taxes. Should this levy lid lift be approved?” □ Yes □ No.

WHAT THIS MEASURE WILL DO
This proposal would fund repair of the aging infrastructure of the seven buildings comprising the Pike Place Market. The repairs are to the heating, electrical, plumbing systems and the seismic retrofitting of the buildings. The proposal also includes the addition of two new elevators and new restrooms, as well as the repair and possible expansion of the atrium. (Plans are incomplete at this time.)

The proposed levy would last for five years with renovations being done in phases beginning in spring of 2009, ending in 2013.

HOW MUCH WILL THIS MEASURE COST?
Proposition 1 is a proposed levy of $73.6 million dollars. The impact on the average homeowner in Seattle would be from $37 to $43 dollars per year.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Those in favor say:</th>
<th>Those against say:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Pike Place Market is a historic city asset well worth the investment to keep the city core vital.</td>
<td>• This is not affordable given the current economic decline.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The cost to homeowners will not even be noticed due to the retirement of the prior parks levy at the end of this year.</td>
<td>• Although one third of the levy is to be used for central heating throughout the complex, if anything happens to the heating system, all will be affected, not just one building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Some of the improvements bring us more in line with the Federal regulations regarding handicap accessibility in public places.</td>
<td>• Renovations will disrupt the market and may drive people away.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Improvements are necessary to meet the seismic requirements for safety.</td>
<td>• Not all the proposed changes are needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The proposed electrical and heating/cooling plant improvements will be comprehensive and allow for a more cohesive temperature control system throughout the complex of buildings versus the building-by-building system in use now and it will pay for itself over the long term through cost savings.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ORGANIZATIONS SUPPORTING:**
- Pike Place Market Foundation
- Citizens for the Pike Place Market
- Pike Place Capital Renovations Committee
- League of Women Voters of Seattle

**ORGANIZATIONS OPPOSING:**
- None identified
City of Seattle Proposition 2—Parks Levy

**OFFICIAL BALLOT TITLE:** “The City of Seattle’s Proposition 2 concerns increased property taxes for six years for parks purposes. If approved, this proposition would fund acquiring, developing and restoring parks, recreation facilities, cultural facilities, green spaces, playfields, trails, community gardens, and shoreline areas; all as provided in Ordinance 122749. It would authorize regular property taxes higher than RCW 84.55 limits, allowing collection of up to $24,250,000 in additional taxes in 2009 (up to $145,500,000 over six years). Taxes collected in 2009 would be limited to $2.60 per $1,000 of assessed value, including approximately $0.19 of additional taxes. Should this levy lid lift be approved?”

☐ Yes  ☐ No

**BACKGROUND**

In November of 2000, the voters of Seattle approved the Pro Parks Levy, an eight-year levy which provided nearly $200 million for the expansion and improvement of Seattle’s Parks and Green Spaces. Projects identified included capital costs, but not operational costs. Projects were vetted through public review or included in an official city plan. It cost the median property owner $103 annually during the eight-year term of the levy. This levy is expiring.

**WHAT THIS MEASURE WOULD DO**

In addition to park expansion and improvement, this measure will create a 16-member 2008 Parks and Green Spaces Levy Oversight Committee. The funds are to be used for capital acquisition and improvements to numerous sites and projects around the City of Seattle. This measure does not fund operations or maintenance of current sites.

The proposed project list includes the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT/CATEGORY</th>
<th>ALLOCATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Neighborhood Park Acquisition</strong></td>
<td>$24,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 19 urban villages, and two near existing playfield/beach areas in Wedgwood and Beach Drive  
(↑NOTE: funding may be insufficient to complete) |            |
<p>| <strong>Green Space Acquisition</strong>                          | $6,000,000 |
| Arroyos Natural Area, East Duwamish Greenbelt, Duwamish Head Greenbelt, Ravena Woods, Thornton Creek Watershed, West Duwamish Greenbelt | |
| <strong>Neighborhood Parks and Playground Development</strong>    | $11,100,000|
| Capital improvements to existing sites: $1.4 million for Gas Works; $800,000 for Volunteer Park; and 21 others (including Woodland Park) averaging $390,000 each | |
| <strong>Reservoir Park Development</strong>                       | $8,250,000 |
| Maple Leaf ($5,000,000), West Seattle ($3,000,000), Myrtle ($250,000) | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT/CATEGORY</th>
<th>ALLOCATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Skate Park Development</strong> (Judkins, and Roxhill Skatespots)</td>
<td>$1,200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spray Parks</strong> (conversion of Georgetown and 2 other wading pools)</td>
<td>$800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Off-leash Areas</strong> (Queen Anne, Magnolia)</td>
<td>$140,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Major Parks, including:</strong> Northgate Urban Center Park ($2,500,000)</td>
<td>$33,090,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hing Hay Park (acquired with previous levy funds) $3,000,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th ELECT Church Site (acquired with previous levy funds) $800,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crown Hill Elementary conversion ($1,200,000)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedar Park (School District Acquisition) ($500,000)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinook Beach Park ($100,000)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marra Desimone Park ($1,000,000)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camp Long Kitchen Renovation and facility upgrade ($1,000,000)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queen Anne Boulevard improvements ($250,000)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victor Steinbrueck Park (public safety, sight lines, renovation of seating, and former children’s play area) $1,600,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Citywide Parks-Owned Cultural Facilities</strong> Seattle Art Museum ($9,000,000), Langston Hughes ($2,500,000)</td>
<td>$11,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Playfields</strong> (adding synthetic turf at 4 locations)</td>
<td>$10,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Major Neighborhood Parks</strong> Jefferson Park (master plan and skate park) $6,000,000</td>
<td>$10,950,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington Park Arboretum (further implementing master plan) $2,500,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discovery Park (Demolition of former Capehart housing) $1,000,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnuson Park (Shoreline access, bicycle path) $500,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children’s PlayGarden (grading, seeding) $950,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Urban Trail expansion</strong> Burke Gilman Trail (through Ballard) ($3,750,000)</td>
<td>$7,250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Linear park” and trail improvement along the Duwamish ($2,000,000)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First phase of bike trail from Myrtle Edwards Park to Lake Union ($1,500,000)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environment</strong> Forest and Stream Restoration (through partnership with Green Seattle) $3,500,000</td>
<td>$6,600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest and Stream Restoration (Kiwanis Ravine/heron rookery) $600,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Gardens (P-patches on 4 sites, Ballard, Queen Anne, Rainier Valley, West Seattle) $2,000,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoreline Access (street-end development, 10 sites) $6,600,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(*NOTE: funding may be insufficient to complete)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Opportunity Fund

**PROJECT/CATEGORY**: Opportunity Fund (for acquisition/development projects to be determined by neighborhood and community groups)

**ALLOCATION**: $15,000,000

---

### How Much Would This Measure Cost?

This measure asks for approximately $145,500,000 in supplemental property tax revenue over six years, including permission to make investments of levy funds for a projected $498,000 in earnings. The allocations also include approximately $21 million in “inflation adjustments” for development projects. It has been estimated that the average household will pay $84 per year in property taxes should this levy pass. It was the intent of the city council that the total of both Proposition 1 and Proposition 2 should cost the taxpayer less than the expiring Pro parks levy.

---

### Those in Favor Say:

- We must invest in parks to preserve a legacy for generations to come. Parks are part of our commitment to “green practices” and a sustainable environment.

- This levy will cost the average homeowner less than the expiring levy from 2000.

- Although every list of projects usually leads to some controversy, the projects funded by the Pro Parks Levy have been very popular.

---

### Those Against Say:

- The levy is too expensive, as the city faces a $20 million shortfall next year, and the parks department budget is already a large percentage of the city’s general budget expenditures.

- Levies should not be perpetual. The more we acquire and build, the more we have to spend in the future to maintain.

- The project list is exhaustive, and mixes good projects with wasteful ones.

---

### Organizations Supporting:

- Seattle City Council
- Seattle Parks for All

---

### Organizations Opposing:

- No organizations found
City of Bellevue Proposition 1—Levy for City Parks and Natural Areas

OFFICIAL BALLOT TITLE: “The City Council of the City of Bellevue adopted Ordinance No. 5828 concerning a proposition to replace the expiring 1988 park levy. To protect water quality in Bellevue’s lakes and streams, preserve natural areas, enhance existing parks, and develop trails, this proposition would (1) increase the City’s regular property tax levy by $0.10 to a total authorized rate of $1.31 per $1,000 of assessed value for collection in 2009 and for 19 years thereafter, and (2) increase the levy by $0.02 to $1.33 per $1,000 of assessed valuation in 2009 and thereafter to maintain and operate parks to Bellevue standards. Should this proposition be: ☐ Approved ☐ Rejected?”

WHAT THIS MEASURE WILL DO
The city of Bellevue is asking voters to approve a $40.5 million levy. The proposed levy would increase property taxes by a levy rate of no more than 12 cents per $1000 of assessed value to provide funding for park acquisition and development (10 cents) and for operations and maintenance of those new properties and developments (2 cents). The park acquisition and development portion of the levy will be collected for 20 years; the operations and maintenance (O&M) portion will be ongoing.

HOW MUCH WILL THIS MEASURE COST?
If approved, the city estimates that additional property taxes for a home with a current assessed valuation of $580,000 will be $71 per year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Anticipated Allocation of Levy Proceeds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Purchase of new parkland and natural areas</td>
<td>$10,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop a park on 156th Avenue Southeast in Eastgate</td>
<td>$6,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete the circle at Downtown Park</td>
<td>$5,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop mini-parks and neighborhood parks in Bridle Trails and along West Lake Sammamish Parkway</td>
<td>$5,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park development at Surrey Downs</td>
<td>$3,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports-field improvements, including adding synthetic turf at Wilburton and Newport Hills</td>
<td>$3,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellevue Botanical Garden improvements</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build a new home for the Bellevue Youth Theatre at Crossroads Community Center</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewis Creek Park improvements</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erosion, forest-protection and trail building at Lewis Creek and Coal Creek Natural Area</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$40,500,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Those in favor say:

- Proposition #1 will continue Bellevue’s strong commitment to parks and open space for future generations, and will ensure our parks are maintained at the high standards we have all come to expect.

- This is not a new tax – it’s a continuation of an existing tax at a lower rate and will cost the typical homeowner only $71 per year. Money collected from this tax can only be spent in Bellevue and it will not increase as your property value rises.

- Parks keep us healthy, preserve our environment and increase property values.

Those against say:

- Our elected officials are bypassing their responsibility to fund parks issues from the general fund.

- Our elected officials find money for a multitude of other expenditures, many of them wasteful. They could fund the acquisition and development of parks from the general fund if they stopped spending money on needless items.

ORGANIZATIONS SUPPORTING:

- Bellevue City Council
- Bellevue Parks Yes!
- League of Women Voters of Seattle

ORGANIZATIONS OPPOSING:

- (none known)
City of Mercer Island Proposition 1—
General Obligation Parks and Open Space Bond

OFFICIAL BALLOT TITLE: “The City Council of the City of Mercer Island adopted Ordinance No. 08-07 concerning a parks and open space bond proposition. This proposition authorizes the City to restore and improve Luther Burbank Park, improve existing parks and facilities, upgrade sports fields, develop trails and upgrade swim facilities; to issue its general obligation bonds in the aggregate principal amount not to exceed $12,000,000, maturing within a maximum of 20 years; and to levy property taxes annually in excess of regular property tax levies to repay such bonds. Should this proposition be: ☐ Approved ☐ Rejected?”

WHAT THIS MEASURE WILL DO
The projects for the Bond funds are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Anticipated Allocation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Luther Burbank Park Improvements</td>
<td>$6,252,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ballfield improvements</td>
<td>$4,035,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engstrom Open Space trail</td>
<td>$236,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small dog off-leash area</td>
<td>$316,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trail enhancements</td>
<td>$323,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other swim beach improvements</td>
<td>$788,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Wayte Pool improvements</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

HOW MUCH WILL THIS MEASURE COST?
The City of Mercer Island is asking voters to authorize up to $12 million in general obligation bonds to finance park capital improvements. The bonds would mature in 20 years and be repaid by annual property tax levies at an estimated average of 9.4 cents per $1000 of assessed value.

If approved, the City estimates that for the owner of an average valued Mercer Island home of $1 million, the additional property tax for the Bond will be $94.44 per year.

(The total additional property tax for the two MI measures of will be offset by the expiration of two previously approved and unrelated ballot measures for a net increase of $95.05 for the owner of an average valued Mercer Island home of $1 million.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Those in favor say:</th>
<th>Those against say:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• The improvements in trails and parks will help us meet the increasing recreational needs of all our residents.</td>
<td>• The bond language is vague and does not obligate the construction of particular park projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• New and improved athletic fields will meet the growing demands on their use.</td>
<td>• There is already money available to construct the types of projects mentioned in the bond resolution. The Mercer Island budget has had a $1 million surplus for a number of years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Beach and play ground equipment will be improved for safety and pleasure.</td>
<td>• If a project is too expensive to fit within the budget that project should go before the voters rather than included in a slush fund for the Council to choose.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The improvements are spread throughout the city and will benefit all of us.</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ORGANIZATIONS SUPPORTING:**

• People for Island Parks

**ORGANIZATIONS OPPOSING:**

• Live Within Budget
City of Mercer Island Proposition 2—Levy for Park Operations and Maintenance

OFFICIAL BALLOT TITLE: “The City Council of the City of Mercer Island adopted Ordinance No. 08-08 concerning property taxes to maintain and operate park and recreational facilities. This proposition would increase the City’s regular property tax levy by $900,000 to a total authorized rate of up to $1.25 per $1,000 of assessed valuation for collection in 2009 and increase the levy as allowed by chapter 84.55 RCW for each of the 15 succeeding years to continue operating Luther Burbank Park, improve forest and vegetative health of open spaces, and operate and maintain park and recreation-related facilities and services. Should this proposition be: □ Approved □ Rejected?”

WHAT THIS MEASURE WILL DO
The City of Mercer Island is asking voters to approve a levy in order to provide funding for open space and forest restoration, school-related park and recreation activities and maintenance costs associated with the projects outlined in Proposition 1 listed above. In addition, funds from this levy will replace the 2003 levy, expiring in 2009, which pays for maintenance and operations funds for Luther Burbank Park. The proposed levy will be in effect for 15 years and would increase property taxes by up to 10.2 cents per $1000 of assessed value.

The projects the levy funds are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Anticipated Allocation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Luther Burbank Park maintenance and operations</td>
<td>$370,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space vegetation management</td>
<td>$65,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pioneer Park</td>
<td>$77,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Projects operations and management</td>
<td>$128,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School related park and recreations activities</td>
<td>$260,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

HOW MUCH WILL THIS MEASURE COST?
If approved, the levy will raise $900,000 per year in taxes. The City estimates that for the owner of an average valued Mercer Island home of $1 million, the additional property tax for the Bond will be $113.68 per year. The total additional property tax for both Mercer Island Propositions of $208.12 will be offset by the expiration of two previously approved and unrelated ballot measures ($183.07) for a net increase of $95.05 for the owner of an average valued Mercer Island home of $1 million.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Those in favor say:</th>
<th>Those against say:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Proposition 2 will provide the funding for the future maintenance of both Luther Burbank and the new parks, open space and recreational facilities described in Proposition 1.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• At a time when there is growing environmental awareness and increasing need for recreational and sporting facilities we must maintain the limited assets we have.</td>
<td>• There are funds in the budget to maintain all our parks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORGANIZATIONS SUPPORTING:</th>
<th>ORGANIZATIONS OPPOSING:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Parks for People 7683 SE 27th Apt 269, Mercer Island 98040</td>
<td>• Live Within Budget</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
City of Sammamish Proposition No. 1—
Park, Recreation and Athletic Facilities Bonds

OFFICIAL BALLOT TITLE: The City Council of
the City of Sammamish has passed Ordinance O2008-
234 concerning financing certain park, recreation and
athletic facilities projects. If approved, this proposition
would authorize the City to issue not more than
$19,000,000 of general obligation bonds (maturing
within 20 years or less) for the acquisition, development,
construction and improvement of park, recreation and
athletic facilities, and to annually levy excess property
taxes to pay and retire such bonds, all as provided in the
ordinance. This authorization is conditioned on voter
approval, prior to issuance of such bonds, of a levy lid lift
for funding operations and maintenance expenses. Should
this proposition be approved?” □ Yes □ No

BACKGROUND
This is the first time since its incorporation that the voters in the City of Sammamish have been
asked to vote to raise funds for parks using a general obligation bond.

WHAT THIS MEASURE WILL DO
The following projects will be funded by the bonds:

• Pine Lake Middle School Athletic fields: Includes the development of one field area to
  accommodate two softball fields and one soccer/lacrosse field, including installation of
  synthetic turf and lights and related improvements

• Sammamish Landing – Phase I – Includes development of the waterfront park along Lake
  Sammamish to include picnic areas, canoe pullouts, habitat restoration, docks, limited parking
  and other improvements.

• East Sammamish Park – Phase I – Includes development of a new spray park, playground
  upgrades, development of a new trail to Margaret Mead Elementary School, frontage
  improvements and parking lot expansion.

• Beaver Lake Vicinity Trail – Includes developing a hard and soft surface trail to connect Beaver
  Lake Park and Beaver Lake Preserve along W. Beaver Lake Drive.

• Land Acquisition – Acquisition of land for a new park in northeast Sammamish.

• Recreation Facility – Purchase and development of the existing King County Library site (or
  if deemed not feasible by the Council, then acquisition and development of another suitable
  site) to support a partnership with a local non-profit organization for the provision of
  recreation services with an emphasis on youth and teen programs

Q: What is a BOND Measure?
A: A bond is when the government borrows money
from investors on the bond market, and promises to
pay them back with interest (municipal bonds).

A bond measure is when government is asking voters
for permission to go into debt over normal limits for a specific
project or purpose.
### Categories and Anticipated Allocation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Anticipated Allocation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pine Lake Middle School Athletic Fields</td>
<td>$2,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Sammamish Park, Phase I</td>
<td>$1,800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sammamish Landing, Phase I</td>
<td>$3,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beaver Lake Vicinity Trail</td>
<td>$1,700,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Acquisition, NE Sammamish</td>
<td>$4,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation Facility</td>
<td>$5,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bond Fees</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$19,000,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### HOW MUCH WILL THIS MEASURE COST?

If approved, the City estimates that for the owner of an average valued Sammamish property of $600,000, the additional property tax for the Bond will be $84 per year for the 20 year length of the bond.

### Those in favor say:

- New parks, trails and improved athletic fields mean we can meet the increasing recreational needs of our growing population.
- Purchasing property for a recreation center and partnering with the Boys & Girls Club gives our teens, children and the general community a center for programs and activities.
- Purchasing land in northeast Sammamish for park development is planning for our future.
- These improvements are spread throughout the city and will benefit all of us.

### Those against say:

- Our elected officials should find ways to fund parks issues from the general fund.
- Our current all-weather sports fields, hiking trails, skateboard park, new playgrounds, and improved parks were brought into being by creative partnerships and innovative thinking without requiring the voters to commit to higher property taxes for a twenty year period.

### ORGANIZATIONS SUPPORTING:

- Vote Twice for Samm Parks
- League of Women Voters of Seattle

### ORGANIZATIONS OPPOSING:

- None found
City of Sammamish Proposition No. 2 – Levy Lid Lift for Park Programs and Operations

OFFICIAL BALLOT TITLE: “The City Council has adopted Ordinance O2008-235 concerning funding operations and maintenance of park, recreation and athletic facilities. If approved, this proposition would fund park programs, and operations and maintenance of park, recreation and athletic facilities. It authorizes a 2009 regular levy rate of $0.04/$1,000 above the maximum rate otherwise allowed (approximately $2.05/$1,000 assessed value). The 2009 levy amount will be used to calculate subsequent levy limits, and those amounts will fund operations and maintenance, all as described in the ordinance. This authorization will expire on December 31, 2009 if voters have not approved a bond levy. Should this proposition be: □ Approved  □ Rejected?”

BACKGROUND
This is the first time since its incorporation that the voters in the City of Sammamish have been asked to vote to raise funds for parks using a general obligation bond.

WHAT THIS MEASURE WILL DO
If approved the levy lift will raise 4 cents per thousand of assessed valuation to pay for the programming and operations of the new facilities proposed in Proposition 1.

MUCH WILL THIS MEASURE COST?
If approved, the city estimates that the owner of a Sammamish property valued at $600,000 will pay $24 per year, or $2 per month. The levy lift will cover ongoing programming and operations and does not have an expiration date.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Those in favor say:</th>
<th>Those against say:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Ongoing programming and operations of projects listed in Prop 1 will be funded.</td>
<td>• Our elected officials should find ways to fund parks operations from the general fund.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Recreational opportunities for residents will be enhanced.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Property values may rise as public amenities improve and expand.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ORGANIZATIONS SUPPORTING:
• Vote Twice for Samm Parks
• League of Women Voters of Seattle

ORGANIZATIONS OPPOSING:
• None found
King County Charter Amendment 1—Elected Elections Director

OFFICIAL BALLOT TITLE: “Shall the King County Charter be amended to provide that the position of county director of elections be created as a nonpartisan elected office?”

☐ Yes  ☐ No

BACKGROUND:
I-25, calling for an elected King County Elections Director, was submitted to the King County Council last year, but was delayed until now. The county council has since decided not to pass the charter amendment outright, nor offer its own alternative alongside for public vote.

Currently King County Elections is considered a part of the Administrative Services Department of the executive branch. The King County Elections Director is appointed by the county executive and confirmed by the county council, and may be removed by the King county executive at will.

WHAT THIS MEASURE WOULD DO
This measure would make King County Elections its own department of the county’s executive branch, and the King County Elections Director would become a nonpartisan elected seat, beginning February 3, 2009.

HOW MUCH WOULD THIS MEASURE COST?
No direct funding is requested.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Those In Favor Say:</th>
<th>Those Against Say:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Before King County had home rule, the position of elections director was an elected one. Now this position is buried under seven layers of administration/management (versus direct reporting to the executive).</td>
<td>• Our Home Rule Charter was approved in 1967 and modernized King County with an executive and council with oversight, transparency and accountability. With nearly 1 million voters, King County, like Los Angeles and San Diego, has an appointed director to oversee elections.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• There is no “elections certificate” or way for a member of the general public to gain direct experience for this position. This considerably reduces the pool of candidates who would be considered qualified by such criteria for the position of King County Elections Director.</td>
<td>• Elections are appropriate for policymakers, but positions requiring specific experience and professional skills should be appointed. The King County Elections Director needs to be a qualified professional administrator with a full understanding of the technical challenges facing the office in the 21st century.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The current practice of appointing the elections director does not insulate from political influence. This measure empowers citizens with the opportunity to decide the future of their elections management.</td>
<td>• Currently the director is accountable to the elected county executive, and can be immediately replaced for poor job performance. The county council regularly reviews performance through their oversight and review of the budget.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORGANIZATIONS SUPPORTING:</th>
<th>ORGANIZATIONS OPPOSING:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Citizens for Accountable Elections</td>
<td>• The Leagues of Women Voters of Seattle and King County South</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
King County Charter Amendment 2—Prohibiting Discrimination

OFFICIAL BALLOT TITLE: “Shall Section 840 of the King County Charter be amended to add disability, sexual orientation, and gender identity or expression to the prohibited grounds for discrimination in county employment and county contracting, and to limit the prohibition against discrimination in county contracting to contracts with nongovernmental entities, as provided in Ordinance No. 16204?” □ Yes □ No.

BACKGROUND
King County Charter Section 840 “Antidiscrimination,” currently states that there shall be no discrimination in contracting, employment or compensation of county officers or employees “on account of sex, race, color, national origin, religious affiliation, or age except by minimum age and retirement provisions.” Other laws, including the King County Code also prohibit against discriminating on the basis of disability, sexual orientation, or gender identity/expression.

WHAT THIS MEASURE WOULD DO
In addition to grammatical adjustments, this measure would add “disability, sexual orientation, gender identity or expression” to the list of specific forms of discrimination to be prohibited under the King County Charter. The amendment would also add “other nongovernmental entities” to the list of those required to observe these protections when contracting with the county.

HOW MUCH WOULD THIS MEASURE COST?
This measure asks for no direct funding.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Those In Favor Say:</th>
<th>Those Against Say:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Elevating these protections to charter level will reinforce for King County officials and the public that all people are to be treated equally.</td>
<td>• The charter already contains sufficient anti-discrimination mandates, and provides that employment and appointments are to be made on merit and qualifications.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• A charter prohibition will give legal cases against discrimination more weight.</td>
<td>• The grammatical changes being made with this amendment only make this section more confusing to read.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ORGANIZATIONS SUPPORTING:  
• King County Council and Charter Review Committee

ORGANIZATIONS OPPOSING:  
• No organizations found
King County Charter Amendment 3 - Regional Committees

OFFICIAL BALLOT TITLE: “Shall Sections 230.10, 270.20 and 270.30 of the King County Charter be amended to reduce the number of county council members on regional committees, establish a vice chair position on regional committees, authorize the regional policy committee to adopt its own work program, add authority for regional committees to initiate legislation, modify regional committee procedures, and authorize the addition of nonvoting members to the water quality committee, as provided in Ordinance No. 16205?” □ Yes □ No.

BACKGROUND

The King County Charter currently provides for three Regional Committees—one for transit, one for water quality and one for other regional policies and plans. Each regional committee has 12 members, six of whom are county council members (including councilmembers from districts that have unincorporated residents). Six members of each committee, with the exception of the water quality committee, which has representatives from special purpose districts, are local city officials. Cities and towns may appoint two representatives for each allocated committee membership, each with fractional (1/2) voting rights.

Currently, regional committees develop, review, and recommend county-wide policies and plans relating to the subject matter area for which a regional committee has been established. Action to adopt any proposed policy or plan which differs from the committee recommendation requires eight affirmative votes of the Council.

WHAT THIS MEASURE WOULD DO

This charter amendment is described as reducing the number of councilmembers from six to three on regional committees, but it also would reduce the size of the committees from 12 to nine, and increase each councilmember’s vote weight to two votes, so that the number of councilmember votes versus other members would remain the same (1/2). The council would also be able to appoint additional non-voting representatives to water district committees from districts outside the county that receive King County water and sewage services.

Members representing 6-1/2 votes would constitute a quorum of a regional committee. Each committee would have a county councilmember as chair, and a vice chair elected from the committee members who are not county councilmembers.

This measure also grants regional committees the authority to directly initiate legislation (versus plans or policies) and recommend action on ordinances regarding county-wide policies within the subject matter of the committee.
### HOW MUCH WOULD THIS MEASURE COST?
There is no direct funding requested.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Those in favor say:</th>
<th>Those against say:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Reducing the number of county councilmembers on regional committees reduces the demands of time for the council members. Currently, all nine councilmembers wind up serving on two of the three committees.</td>
<td>• The ballot description does not tell the voter that the committee size will shrink and the councilmember voting weight will double. There is a question as to whether there will be fair and adequate representation by surrounding municipalities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Members of the regional committees will be county councilmembers and other elected officials.</td>
<td>• Allowing the committees to directly submit legislation for council approval would be a questionable delegation of legislative power to regional representatives that are not elected to council-wide posts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Authorizing the direct submission of legislation for approval by the Council will improve efficiency.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ORGANIZATIONS SUPPORTING:
- King County Council and Charter Review Committee

### ORGANIZATIONS OPPOSING:
- (No organizations found – individuals only)
King County Charter Amendment 4 – Additional Qualifications for Elected Officials

**OFFICIAL BALLOT TITLE:** “Shall Section 630 of the King County Charter be amended to authorize the county council to establish additional qualifications for separately elected officials who head executive departments, as provided in Ordinance No. 16206?” □ Yes □ No

**BACKGROUND**
Under the current King County Charter, officers appointed by the county executive “shall be appointed on the basis of their abilities, qualifications, integrity and prior experience” concerning the duties of that office (section 340.50) The county council may determine additional qualifications/criteria for the position of sheriff by ordinance.

**WHAT THIS MEASURE WOULD DO**
Aside from changing the term “councilman” to “councilmember” in other parts of this section, this amendment would expand the power of the county council to determine additional criteria/qualifications for elected officials in the executive branch. This would include the county assessor and director of elections (if made an elected position by a separate measure), as well as any future elected position that may be created to head an executive department.

**HOW MUCH WOULD THIS MEASURE COST?**
No direct funding requested.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Those in favor say:</th>
<th>Those against say:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• This measure will increase voter confidence by ensuring that any person filling a position has a minimum skill set necessary for the position.</td>
<td>• Adding qualifications will reduce ballot access to otherwise qualified candidates, and decrease voter choices by limiting the pool of “qualified” candidates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• For some elected positions, such as the sheriff and prosecuting attorney, additional qualifications are necessary to carry out the position.</td>
<td>• Additional qualifications shouldn’t be necessary for policy positions. The intelligence of the voters should be trusted to make the right choice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• If qualifications for each office should be added, it should be done by charter amendment, not by giving the council carte blanche to add them by ordinance.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ORGANIZATIONS SUPPORTING:**
- King County Council and Charter Review Committee

**ORGANIZATIONS OPPOSING:**
(None found - individuals only)
King County Charter Amendment 5 - Economic Forecasting

OFFICIAL BALLOT TITLE: “Shall the King County Charter be amended to require the establishment of a forecast council and an office of economic and financial analysis, as provided in Ordinance No. 16207?” □ Yes □ No

BACKGROUND
The King County Charter currently provides that each governmental agency submits expenditure and projection data to the Executive, who then develops and presents a proposed budget to the Council for approval. The budget currently includes actual expenditures for the past year, estimated expenditures for the current year, and the proposed Capital Improvement Program for the following six years. The expenditures included in the budget for the following year may not exceed the estimated revenues.

WHAT THIS MEASURE WOULD DO
This King County Charter Amendment would establish a forecast council and office of economic and financial analysis. The four-person forecast council would be composed of the executive, two county councilmembers, and a county employee with financial management expertise. Neither the forecast council nor the office of economic and financial analysis would be part of the executive branch.

The forecast council would appoint a chief county economist who would oversee the new office of economic and financial analysis, and approve an annual workplan. County agencies and departments could not submit proposed expenditures for the next fiscal year that exceed the forecast produced by the new department (as approved by the forecast council). The county executive would be required to use the forecast(s) as the basis for the proposed budget, and the county council would also be required to use them for budget amendments.

HOW MUCH WOULD THIS MEASURE COST?
This measure does not ask for direct funding. However, the new department will presumably carry costs for labor and administration.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Those in favor say:</th>
<th>Those against say:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Addition of a commission and office dedicated to economic forecasting will ensure that the budget is based on a projection created by staff with expertise in economic forecasting.</td>
<td>• This measure shifts the projection function away from the agencies, and weakens the executive budgeting power. This has implications for the balance of power between the two branches. The commission and office will be under the purview of the legislative branch. The executive is less autonomous as a member of the commission.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• This system will provide more consistency and predictability to the budgeting process.</td>
<td>• This measure will reduce flexibility in budgeting needed to accommodate shifting policy goals, emergencies, and fluctuating economic trends.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ORGANIZATIONS SUPPORTING:**

- King County Council and Charter Review Committee

**ORGANIZATIONS OPPOSING:**

(None found - individuals only)
King County Charter Amendment 6—
Budget Deadlines

OFFICIAL BALLOT TITLE: “Shall Sections 410 and 420 of the King County Charter be amended to impose deadlines that are twenty days earlier than existing deadlines for county agencies to submit budget information to the county executive and for the county executive to present a proposed budget to the county council, as provided in Ordinance No. 16208?”
☐ Yes  ☐ No

BACKGROUND
One of the major functions of the executive branch of King County government is to present to the council a full proposed budget and budget message. Under current law, the agencies submit budget information to the executive at least 156 days before the end of the fiscal year (mid-October) in preparation for the formation of next budget. The county executive is then to present the council with a complete budget and budget message at least 75 days before the end of each fiscal year (early July). The fiscal year for the county is January through December.

WHAT THIS MEASURE WOULD DO
This is a proposed amendment to the King County Charter which would shift budget submission deadlines back 20 days. The executive’s deadline would move to 95 days before the end of the fiscal year, or late September, and the agencies’ from 135 to 155 days before the end of the fiscal year, or mid-June. The deadline for the Council for adoption of the budget would not change.

HOW MUCH WOULD THIS MEASURE COST?
No direct funding requested.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Those in favor say:</th>
<th>Those against say:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• This will give the legislative branch 20 days more time to finalize the budget, for a total of 65 days for review, in recognition of the increased scope and responsibilities of county government.</td>
<td>• This will give the executive branch 20 days less to develop the proposed budget for presentation to the council, with implications for the balance of power between the two branches of county government.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ORGANIZATIONS SUPPORTING: • King County Council

ORGANIZATIONS OPPOSING: • (None found)
King County Charter Amendment 7—
Charter Amendments by Initiative

OFFICIAL BALLOT TITLE: “Shall King County Charter Section 800 be amended to establish a new process for citizens to directly propose amendments to the King County Charter and to increase the signature threshold for citizen-initiated charter amendments from 10% to 20% of the votes cast in the last election for county executive, as provided in Ordinance No. 16221?” □ Yes □ No

(Note: The ballot title for this King County Charter amendment was modified from its original language by a court challenge. See Dunmire v. King County.)

BACKGROUND
The current King County Charter directs the King County Council to appoint a 15-member Charter Review Committee at least every 15 years, which then makes recommendations for amendments. The council then sends amendments it approves to public vote by ordinance.

King County initiatives to the people have the power to create ordinances when approved by the voters. In order for the people to place an ordinance before the council, an initiative petition must have signatures amounting to at least 10% of the votes cast in the last election for county executive. The county then has the option of A) passing the ordinance as presented; B) placing the petition as a measure for public vote; or C) placing an alternate/amended version alongside the original measure on the ballot.

Also, people’s initiatives may be proposed to amend the county charter. There have been four since 2003:
• I-18: decreased the size of the King County Council from 13 positions to nine (sponsored by the King County Corrections Guild) – approved by voters
• I-24: created the King County Citizen’s Council - approved by the council
• I-25: having King County’s elections officer publicly elected– (on this November’s ballot)
• I-26: making county elected offices nonpartisan (on this November’s ballot)

The Supreme Court case that followed the I-18 campaign resulted in a unanimous ruling that charter amendments by citizen initiative were constitutional and a lawful exercise of the people’s legislative power.

WHAT THIS MEASURE WOULD DO?
This measure would add a new section to the King County Charter distinguishing initiatives that seek a charter amendment, and doubling the signatures required (to 20% of the votes last cast for county executive). The measure would go directly to voters. The council could still choose to place an alternative alongside it.

HOW MUCH WOULD THIS MEASURE COST?
This measure does not request direct funding.
### Those in favor say:

- This will clear up the confusion between the initiative process and the council's charter amendment process.

- This proposal, developed by the Charter Review Commission, enables the charter to be amended when significant numbers of county voters seek a change, but makes the process significantly difficult enough that voters will make amendments sparingly and very thoughtfully.

- Council charter amendments are reviewed by a 15-member appointed review commission.

- The other five Home Rule counties in WA (Clallam, Pierce, Snohomish, San Juan and Whatcom) have signature requirements for Charter Amendments of either 15% or 20%.

### Those against say:

- There is no confusion. The Supreme Court examined this issue and decided that the initiative process was constitutionally guaranteed.

- Requirements for the council to pass a charter amendment are not heightened. There’s no reason why the signature threshold for citizens should be. Since 2003, only 4 initiatives have qualified to amend the charter. The county council has presented 6 of its own on this year’s ballot alone.

- Charter review commissions are hand-picked by the council to make recommendations to them.

- Doubling the requirement for signatures make them nearly impossible to obtain and limits citizen participation in government.

- It took a court case to get the ballot to accurately reflect what this amendment would actually do.

### ORGANIZATIONS SUPPORTING:

- King County Council

### ORGANIZATIONS OPPOSING:
King County Charter Amendment 8 - Nonpartisan Elections

OFFICIAL BALLOT TITLE: “Shall the King County Charter be amended to make the offices of King county executive, King county assessor and King county council nonpartisan, and to establish the nonpartisan selection of districting committee members?” □ Yes □ No

BACKGROUND
This measure was submitted as People’s Initiative 26. The county council had rejected the option to approve the legislation as-is, and instead placed an alternative on the ballot alongside it for the primary, which would have allowed candidates for these positions to specify preference for a specific party or for no party. I-26 won out in the primary, and will be placed on the general election ballot in November for voter approval or rejection.

The current King County Charter refers to the partisan status of parties as well as districts and the nomination process. Candidates who file as “independent” are treated as if they all belonged to one party. Only one such candidate may advance to the general election as the “independent nominee,” and only then upon garnering a plurality of all votes cast. Districts are currently drawn by a districting committee, with four members appointed by the council from the Democratic and Republican parties, and the fifth selected by the other four as the chair. The position of sheriff is currently already nonpartisan.

EFFECT IF PASSED
This amendment would change the positions of county executive, county assessor and county council to nonpartisan rather than partisan offices. The initiative also establishes a nonpartisan districting process.

HOW MUCH WOULD THIS MEASURE COST?
This measure does not require direct funding.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Those in favor say:</th>
<th>Those against say:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• There are implications for party domination of county elected seats, as well as ballot access for candidates.</td>
<td>• Parties serve a useful function in identifying, screening and training candidates. This would be more difficult to achieve if their influence on the partisan process is eliminated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Selection from all candidates rather than being limited to those sponsored/nominated by the two dominant parties improves voter choice.</td>
<td>• Partisan designations help voters identify a candidate’s political philosophy, an important function especially when voters are less informed or have limited time to learn about a candidate prior to voting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Those in favor say:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Those against say:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- There would be more candidates and competition (even from the same party). As things are, county council members often run unopposed, especially in districts that lean toward one party or the other.</td>
<td>- Unlike cities, county government deals with regional issues such as courts, jails, transit and countywide land use policy, which affect citizens throughout the county. Much as in state or national government, party identification helps citizens understand candidates' priorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- A partisan lens on issues often puts pressure on elected officials to move to extremes on issues to respond to the most active voices in their party base rather than work toward the middle in seeking solutions to problems.</td>
<td>- Since 1990 the council has voted on a straight party line only seven times. Partisanship is just not an issue in the functioning of King County government.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- County government deals with many of the same local services that municipal government does: public safety, roads, parks and utilities. These issues are not partisan.</td>
<td>- The council [claims to have] addressed the perception of unfairness that arises when the majority party controls all of the committees by rewriting the policy and allowing minority party members to have committee chair roles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- A nonpartisan County government would be able to build stronger partnerships with city councils, water, sewer, fire, hospital and other districts, all of which are nonpartisan.</td>
<td>- King County government is not broken. The initiative is a solution in search of a problem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Council caucuses and voting blocs sometimes lead to inappropriately partisan positions on issues rather than ensuring representation of true district and constituent interests.</td>
<td>- Candidates who are reluctant to affiliate with a party are free under the current charter to run as independents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The “Top Two” primary system is not yet settled law in Washington. If it should be overturned, the nonpartisan election method would ensure voters continue to have more choices.</td>
<td>- Candidates will only pretend not to be nonpartisan, but will continue to have partisan affiliations (partisanship is a political reality).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The initiative has the overwhelming support of local officials who feel shut out from the county council’s partisan style of policy making.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those in favor say:</td>
<td>Those against say:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| • If opponents state that party designations simply give voters information, what kind of information are they getting? Parties do not take positions on delivery of local services.  

• This measure does not prohibit candidates from discussing their party affiliation if they wish to.  

• Half of the dozen largest counties nationwide have partisan governments. In Washington, most counties have the traditional form of government which requires three partisan commissioners and many independently elected officials. San Juan and Whatcom counties have recently switched to nonpartisan governments. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORGANIZATIONS SUPPORTING:</th>
<th>ORGANIZATIONS OPPOSING:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • Citizens for Independent Government  
  • Municipal League of King County  
  • Seattle Times  
  • Seattle Post-Intelligencer  
  • The Bellevue Reporter  
  • The Enterprise Newspapers  
  • PNW Newspapers  
  • Associated General Contractors of Washington |
| • The Stranger Newspaper Election Board |
ON-LINE RESOURCES

WA State Secretary of State Elections Office
secstate.wa.gov/elections/

King County Elections Office
kingcounty.gov/elections/elections/200811/measures.aspx

City of Seattle Elections
seattle.gov/ethics/elpub/el_home.asp

I-1000 Death with Dignity
Sponsor's Website: www.yeson1000.org
Opposition Website: www.noassistedsuicide.com

I-1029 Long-Term Home Care Workers
Sponsor's Website: www.yeson1029.org
Opposition website: www.communitycarecoalitionwa.org/

I-985 Transportation
Proponent websites:
  • http://www.washingtonpolicy.org/Centers/WashingtonVotes/i985.html
  • www.ReduceCongestion.org
Opponent websites:
  • Northwest Progressive Institute Advocate: www.nwprogressive.org
  • FUSE Washington: www.fusewashington.org
  • Transportation Choices Coalition: www.transportationchoices.org
  • The Sierra Club: www.cascadesierraclub.org
  • Environment Washington: www.environmentwashington.org
  • Futurewise: futurewise.org
  • WashPIRG: www.washpirg.org
  • Washington Environmental Council, www.wecprotects.org
  • http://www.nwprogressive.org/weblog/2008/07/no-on-i-985-more-traffic-measure.html
  • http://www.sightline.org/nooni985

Proposition One Mass Transit/ Sound Transit
Proponent websites:
  • Sound Transit: http://www.soundtransit.org/
  • Mass Transit Now: http://www.masstransitnow.org/
  • Sierra Club, Cascade Chapter: http://cascade.sierraclub.org/node/1891
  • Transportation Choices Coalition: http://www.transportationchoices.org/
  • Futurewise: [http://future.soundtransit.org/proposed.aspx]
Opponent websites:
  • http://effectivetransportation.org/
  • NoToProp1.Org: http://www.notoprop1.org/
  • Public Interest Transportation Forum: http://www.bettertransport.info/pitf/index.htm
  • Eastside Transportation Association: http://www.eastsideta.com/
  • Washington Traffic Institute: http://www.bettertransport.info/rt/truthaboutsoundtransit.htm
  • Coalition for Effective Transportation Alternatives: http://www.effectivetransportation.org/who.shtml

King County Charter Amendments
• King County Press Release: http://www.kingcounty.gov/elections/elections/200811/measures.aspx
• Sponsors of I-26/Nonpartisan County Positions
  www.bettercounty.org
• Sponsors of I-25 Elected Elections Director
  Citizens for Accountable Elections: accountableelections.org/

Bellevue Parks Levy:
Bellevue Parks Yes! bellevueparksyes.org/

Mercer Island Parks
ci.mercer-island.wa.us/Page.asp?NavID=2516
http://www.livewithinbudget.org/index.html

Sammamish Parks
ci.sammamish.wa.us/
http://www.sammparks.com

Information on the League of Women Voters and Positions Taken
Seattle League: www.seattlelwv.org
Washington State League: www.lwwa.org
# Board & Committee Contacts

## Term Executive Committee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Executive Committee</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Email Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007–2009</td>
<td>* President</td>
<td>Denise D. Smith</td>
<td><a href="mailto:president@seattlelwv.org">president@seattlelwv.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008–2009</td>
<td>* 1st V.P. Membership</td>
<td>Kitty Mahon</td>
<td><a href="mailto:membership@seattlelwv.org">membership@seattlelwv.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008–2010</td>
<td>2nd V.P. Program</td>
<td>Nora Leech</td>
<td><a href="mailto:nleech2002@yahoo.com">nleech2002@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008–2010</td>
<td>* 3rd V.P. Voter Service</td>
<td>Sarah Luthens</td>
<td><a href="mailto:voterservice@seattlelwv.org">voterservice@seattlelwv.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007–2009</td>
<td>4th V.P. Action</td>
<td>Jayne Freitag-Koontz</td>
<td><a href="mailto:action@seattlelwv.org">action@seattlelwv.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008–2009</td>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td>Karen Adair</td>
<td><a href="mailto:adairk@scanet.com">adairk@scanet.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008–2010</td>
<td>Treasurer</td>
<td>Allison Feher</td>
<td><a href="mailto:treasurer@seattlelwv.org">treasurer@seattlelwv.org</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Term Directors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Directors</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Email Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008–2010</td>
<td>Outreach</td>
<td>Maria Brusher</td>
<td><a href="mailto:outreach@seattlelwv.org">outreach@seattlelwv.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007–2009</td>
<td>Unit Coordinator</td>
<td>Parti Catalano</td>
<td><a href="mailto:partimusic@comcast.net">partimusic@comcast.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007–2009</td>
<td>Voter Editor</td>
<td>Beatrice Crane</td>
<td><a href="mailto:votereditor@seattlelwv.org">votereditor@seattlelwv.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007–2009</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Doreen Cato</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dca@firstplaceschool.org">dca@firstplaceschool.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007–2009</td>
<td>Civics Education</td>
<td>Jaclyn Wall</td>
<td><a href="mailto:speakingstrategies@hotmail.com">speakingstrategies@hotmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007–2009</td>
<td>Observer Corps</td>
<td>Anita Warmflash</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ansky2@comcast.net">ansky2@comcast.net</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Term Education Fund Board

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Education Fund Board</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Email Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008–2009</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Betty Sullivan</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jaybetty2@msn.com">jaybetty2@msn.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008–2010</td>
<td>Vice President</td>
<td>Dorothy Y. Sale</td>
<td><a href="mailto:saledy@comcast.net">saledy@comcast.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007–2009</td>
<td>Treasurer</td>
<td>Lisa Peterson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008–2010</td>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td>Lucy Gaskill-Gaddis</td>
<td><a href="mailto:terrylucy2u@comcast.net">terrylucy2u@comcast.net</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Off Board Positions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Email Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CIS Coordinator</td>
<td><a href="mailto:howe.john@comcast.net">howe.john@comcast.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund Development</td>
<td><a href="mailto:funddevelopment@seattlelwv.org">funddevelopment@seattlelwv.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology Oversight</td>
<td><a href="mailto:karen@laheyfamily.org">karen@laheyfamily.org</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Committees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committees</th>
<th>Email Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Civics Education</td>
<td><a href="mailto:speakingstrategies@hotmail.com">speakingstrategies@hotmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics &amp; Taxation</td>
<td><a href="mailto:nleech2002@yahoo.com">nleech2002@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td><a href="mailto:terrylucy2u@comcast.net">terrylucy2u@comcast.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Justice Committee</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Vanessa.power@gmail.com">Vanessa.power@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigration Study Co-chair</td>
<td><a href="mailto:anholc@earthlink.net">anholc@earthlink.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigration Study Co-chair</td>
<td><a href="mailto:babereid@yahoo.com">babereid@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Relations</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ellenzberg@msn.com">ellenzberg@msn.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kanek@iopener.net">kanek@iopener.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Resources</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jrahamsa@seattle-ts.org">jrahamsa@seattle-ts.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td><a href="mailto:LWVquilter@comcast.net">LWVquilter@comcast.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port Study</td>
<td><a href="mailto:brownlj@comcast.net">brownlj@comcast.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Privatization Study</td>
<td><a href="mailto:nleech2002@yahoo.com">nleech2002@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Indicates LWVS Board Representative on the Education Fund Board
Moving? Let us know!
Call league office (206) 329-4848 or
email info@seattlelwv.org

Next Forum: Ballot Issues

Thursday, October 2, 2008
7:00 p.m.

Seattle First Baptist Church
1111 Harvard Ave.
Seattle, WA 98122
( Harvard & Seneca )

Pro and con speakers for the ballot issues will present their positions.