A TALE OF TWO FORUMS

Once again we face a ballot crowded with initiatives, constitutional amendments, charter amendments and more, many of which have financial impacts that are particularly important to understand given the challenging economic times we face.

With at least 13 measures for all King County residents to consider, we will be holding two separate forums to allow more time to present them. On our regular first Thursday event (October 7 at 7:30 p.m.) we will cover the two liquor initiatives, 1100 and 1105, as well as the King County Charter Amendments and County Sales Tax Proposition 1.

At our second forum, scheduled for Wednesday, October 13 at 7:00 p.m., we will cover all the remaining state initiatives. We will be holding this event in Bellevue at the St. Andrew's Lutheran Church, and it will be rebroadcast by TVW.

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

However, we also advocate on the issues. The League of Women Voters of Washington endorsed Initiative 1098 even before signatures were gathered, based on our long-standing position favoring a state income tax. The League has also taken a position on some of the other issues on the ballot (see page 14-15 for more information). Advocacy based on study and consensus of the membership is a big part of who we are, and we are a trusted resource in this as well.

GET TO KNOW LEAGUE DINNER

5:30 pm, October 7
Seattle First Baptist Church
Before the Ballot Issues Forum
Invite a Friend — RSVP to the office (206-329-4848)

OCTOBER 17TH GALA

Keynote speaker: Eric Liu, co-author of True Patriot and former White House Deputy Domestic Policy Advisor
President’s Message

The general election is right around the corner, and the ballot is crowded this year with lots of issues as well as candidates. As usual, we have put together a number of forums—in fact we’re doing two issue forums rather than one to allow time for more meaningful presentations. If you can’t attend, look for them online or rebroadcast on King County TV or TVW. Our volunteers have also written some great summaries to help us understand a number of challenging proposals. Please share these great efforts with your “social networks” via email, linking to the website, or good old-fashioned regular mail.

We have a special opportunity to do more than educate this fall. We have a chance to advocate on an issue we have been fighting for since 1959—the state income tax. For years we have argued that Washington’s tax structure is regressive and unfairly burdens lower income individuals. For the first time in years, we have a real shot at making a fundamental improvement in our system: Initiative 1098. Getting it on the ballot was only part of the battle, though. We need you to get the word out, volunteer with the Yes on 1098 campaign, post signs in support of the measure and share information with everyone you can think of! There’s a great two page FAQ sheet inside this Voter; copy it from the website and email it to your entire address book. Don’t let all the work we’ve put in so far fall short of the goal. Help people understand the true effects of this proposal and what it will mean for all of us, long term.

The League has also taken positions on several of the other measures on the ballot; see inside for more details. Help us get the word out on those as well!

And finally, don’t forget about our Gala fundraising event on October 17. Keynote speaker Eric Liu is an inspiring author and former White House deputy domestic policy advisor. We will also hear from national League of Women Voters Vice President Judy Davis. It promises to be a great event. Hope to see you there!

Sincerely,

[Signature]

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.

The League of Women Voters of Seattle serves the greater Seattle area, including the cities of north King County as well as east King County from Bothell to Bellevue.
# October/November

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sunday</th>
<th>Monday</th>
<th>Tuesday</th>
<th>Wednesday</th>
<th>Thursday</th>
<th>Friday</th>
<th>Saturday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Voter Deadline/ Internat’l Rel. Comm. 12-45 p.m./ Ballot Issues Presentation 7:30 p.m.</td>
<td>Northshore Ballot Issues Forum 1:00 p.m.</td>
<td>GTKLD 5:30 p.m. LWVS Forum: Ballot Issues (Liquor and Local) 7:30 p.m.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reclaimed Water Committee 1:00 p.m.</td>
<td>LWVS Forum: Ballot Issues (State) 7:00 p.m.</td>
<td>Teacher Study Committee 4:00 p.m./ Social Justice Committee 7:00 p.m.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher Study Committee 4:00 p.m./ Horizon House Candidate Forum 7:30 p.m.</td>
<td>Transportation Committee 10:00 a.m.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>November 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Forum: Action and Advocacy 7:30 p.m.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LWVWA Action Workshop - Bellevue 9:30 a.m.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## OCTOBER

**Board Meeting**
- Saturday, October 2
- 9:00 a.m.
- League Office

**Voter Deadline**
- Monday, October 4

**International Relations Committee**
- Monday, October 4
- 12:45-2:45 p.m.
- League Office

**Ballot Issues Presentation**
- Monday, October 4
- 7:30-9:00 p.m.
- Horizon House

**Ballot Issues Forum**
- Tuesday, October 5
- 1:00 p.m.

**Northshore Senior Center, Bothell**
- Get to Know League Dinner
  - Thursday, October 7
  - 5:30 p.m.
  - Seattle First Baptist Church

**LWVS Forum: Ballot Issues (Liquor and Local)**
- Thursday, October 7
- 7:30 p.m.
- Seattle First Baptist Church

**Reclaimed Water Committee**
- Monday, October 11
- 1:00–3:00 p.m.
- League Office

**LWVS Forum: Ballot Issues (State)**
- Wednesday, October 13
- 7:00 p.m.

**Bellevue**
- **Teacher Study Committee**
  - Thursday, October 14
  - 4:00–6:00 p.m.
  - League Office

**Social Justice Committee**
- Thursday, October 14
- 7:00–8:30 p.m.
- League Office

**LWVUS Workshop**
- Saturday, October 16
- 10:00–2:00 p.m.
- League Office

**90th Anniversary Dinner**
- Sunday, October 17
- 5:00 p.m.
- Red Lion Hotel

**Teacher Study Committee**
- Monday, October 18
- 4:00–6:00 p.m.
- League Office

**Candidate Forum**
- Monday, October 18
- 7:30–9:00 p.m.
- Horizon House

**Transportation Committee**
- Tuesday, October 19
- 10:00 a.m.
- League Office

**LWVWA Action Workshop**
- Saturday, October 23
- Kennewick
  - 9:30 a.m.

**Economics and Taxation Committee**
- Saturday, October 30
- 9:00 a.m.
- 909 E Newton, #D-9
The League of Women Voters of Seattle (LWVS) presents a public forum each month between August and May, generally on the first Thursday of the month at 7:30 p.m. Most forums are held at the Seattle First Baptist Church, but occasionally they are scheduled in other locations, including at least one on the eastside. The tentative schedule of upcoming forums for 2010-2011 appears below; check your Voter or the LWVS website, seattlelwv.org, each month for up-to-date information.

LWVS traditionally holds a ballot issue forum in October. This year, because there will be so many issues on the ballot, there will be two ballot issue forums. The first will cover local issues and the state liquor initiatives; it will be held as usual on the first Thursday at the First Baptist Church, and will be preceded by the Get to Know League Supper. The second will cover all other state issues, and will take place at St. Andrews Church in Bellevue on Wednesday, October 13 (see directions on p. 10).

---

**Forum Schedule**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>October 7</td>
<td>Ballot Issues—Liquor and Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 13</td>
<td>Ballot Issues—State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 4</td>
<td>Action and Advocacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 2</td>
<td>Arms Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 6</td>
<td>Program Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 3</td>
<td>Reclaimed Water—tentative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 3</td>
<td>Women’s Issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 7</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 4</td>
<td>Education—tentative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**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.
August Board Briefs  By Joanna Cullen, Secretary

Due to the Labor Day holiday, the League of Women Voters of Seattle (LWVS) Board met on Saturday morning, August 28, 2010, rather than the usual first Saturday of September. Members thanked Kathy Sakahara for opening her home for the Board retreat on July 25 and also bade farewell to Sheria Rosenthal, who is moving to Hawaii.

Treasurer: A motion was approved to finalize the process of moving the League’s banking business to Pacific Continental.

Action Committee: A ballot issue briefing for board members was scheduled for the evening of September 21, and we were reminded that our position on state ballot issues always reflects the one taken by the League of Women Voters of Washington (LWVWA), while the positions on King County ballot issues are determined by both the Seattle and South County Leagues. We may decide on local issues that involve Seattle voters only.* LWVWA has posted the positions for state-wide issues on its website, http://www.lwvwa.org/index.html.

A League Board representative has been working with the Ballot Initiative Project to examine various possibilities to improve the initiative process in this state.

Voter Services: The Board decided that the number of ballot issues for the November election necessitates two forums. The first, on October 7, will cover the local initiatives and the two state-wide initiatives regarding laws on sales of liquor in Washington State (I-1100 and I-1105.) The second forum will cover the remaining state-wide initiatives. The Seattle and Snohomish County Leagues are collaborating on a forum at the Northshore Senior Center for the state legislative races that straddle county and city boundaries.

The Board approved the formation of an Electronic Communications Committee.

Fundraising: All Board members were encouraged to identify possible sponsors, table captains and attendees for upcoming gala on October 17. Sponsorships received by October 1 will be recognized in the invitation, and those received later will be recognized at the event. Materials to solicit donors will be emailed to the Board.

Membership: LWVS plans to contact the national LWV in order to receive the promised information on the donors to the national League who live in this area.

The League received a thank you from the Seattle Storm for our support this year. We plan to follow up for other possible cooperative efforts between the League and the Storm.

*Voters in our local League’s coverage area.
Committees

INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS COMMITTEE  
**DATE:** Monday, October 4  
**TIME:** 12:45 – 2:45 p.m.  
**PLACE:** League Office  

The I-R committee has responsibility for the December forum, at which Ambassador Thomas Graham will give us an update on arms control; this is a critical meeting for planning that forum. All are welcome. For more information, contact Ellen Berg at ellenzberg@msn.com or (206) 329-4848.

LWVS SEATTLE RECLAIMED WATER REVIEW COMMITTEE  
**DATE:** Monday, October 11  
**TIME:** 1:00 – 3:00 p.m.  
**PLACE:** League Office  

Heather Trim of People for Puget Sound will speak to the committee on the issues of reclaimed water in relation to water quality, water quantity and Puget Sound. She will address water quality in Puget Sound as a driver to implement a reclaimed water program, and water quality issues with reclaimed water. For more information, contact Denise Smith at isaquahsmith@msn.com or (206) 329-4848.

TEACHER STUDY COMMITTEE  
**DATE:** Thursday, October 14  
**TIME:** 4:00 – 6:00 p.m.  
**PLACE:** League Office  
**TOPIC:** LOCAL DISTRICT POLICIES

For more information, please contact committee chair Lucy Gaskill-Gaddis at terrylucy2u@comcast.net.

SOCIAL JUSTICE COMMITTEE  
**DATE:** Thursday, October 14  
**TIME:** 7:00 – 8:30 p.m.  
**PLACE:** League Office  

The Social Justice Committee would like to extend an invitation to all League members to join us for our next meeting.

The Social Justice Committee has focused on issues ranging from homelessness and affordable housing; the impact of government revenue streams and policies on the provision of health and human services; and how current governmental/criminal justice policies have impacted decisions relating to the need to build a new city/county jail; to voting rights and marriage equity.

The committee is currently working on a study to explore the impact of funding and government policies on mental health service delivery in Seattle and King County.

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE  
**DATE:** Tuesday, October 19  
**TIME:** 10:00 a.m.  
**PLACE:** League Office  

Our speaker will be Cary Moon, chair of the People’s Waterfront Coalition. Cary has been actively involved in recent decisions involving the viaduct and the current plan for developing the waterfront. She will focus on her views of the decision making process. All are welcome.

Our September speaker was Knute Berger, one of the founders and contributors to Crosscut.com, the author of Pugetopolis, and a long time participant in the kinds of political process that Seattle is so famous for. A report on his talk will be in the October Voter.

The Transportation Committee has members from King, Kitsap, Snohomish and Pierce counties. We are committed to understanding the relationship between transportation needs, priorities, decision making, funding, and implementation throughout the Puget Sound region. Our goal is to provide informed comments and recommendations about transportation issues to the League. Please forward any questions you have for any of our speakers to janetwinans@earthlink.net. We welcome visitors and potential new members to all of our meetings.

ECONOMICS AND TAXATION COMMITTEE  
**DATE:** Saturday, October 30  
**TIME:** 9:00 a.m.  
**PLACE:** 909 E. Newton St., D-9  

For more information, please call Vicky Downs at (206) 329-4848.

CIVICS EDUCATION COMMITTEE  
Please contact Dana Twight at (206) 329-4848 for meeting details.
Announcements

HELP WANTED
VOLUNTEERS NEEDED TO ROLL OUT THE WELCOME MAT AT
THE GET TO KNOW LEAGUE SUPPER

The Get to Know League Dinner, held at 5:30 p.m. on October 7, before the first Ballot Issues Forum, will be the first contact for new and prospective members with League. If you can help with set up, act as a table captain, bring flowers, be a greeter, bake lasagna, or help roll out the welcome mat in any way, please contact Kelly Powers at membership.seattlelwv@gmail.com, or call the CIS desk at (206) 329-4848 and leave a message.

NOTE We will have use of the church kitchen ovens and sink, but we will heat, serve and clean up ourselves.

Here’s what we need:
- Set up (arrive 30-45 minutes early)
- Flowers
- Punch/ice/bowl/ladle/water pitchers
- Vegetable lasagna for 10
- Meat lasagna for 10
- Vegetable salad for 10
- Fruit salad for 10
- Other salad for 10
- Rolls and butter (2 dozen)
- Buffet table supervisors
- Clean up (stay 30 minutes after)

Thank you for considering!

SPEAKERS BUREAU

The League of Women Voters is well known as THE source of factual, nonpartisan information about pending election issues and candidates. We provide speakers to various organizations in our geographical service area upon request. We have a great cadre of volunteers trained on both the issues and effective speaking. If you’d like to join our volunteers, please contact the office at (206) 329-4848.

VOLUNTEER ON THE CIS DESK

A new year has begun with an exciting mid-term election ahead. Do you want to be part of the action at the League? The Citizen Information Service (CIS) desk is looking for a volunteer to staff the phones for three hours on Friday afternoons. It is a fun way to get to know firsthand what is going on at the League and to get acquainted with the people who are involved. Come join us! We will train you. Call or email Cynthia Howe if you are interested; (206) 329-4848 or howe.john@comcast.net.
**AREA ELECTION FORUMS**

**Ballot Issues Presentation**
Date: Monday, October 4  
Time: 7:30–9:00 p.m.  
Place: Horizon House, 900 University St., Seattle  
Ballot Issues presented by the League of Women Voters of Seattle (LWVS) Speakers Bureau.

**Ballot Issues Forum**
Date: Tuesday, October 5  
Time: 1:00 p.m.  
Place: Northshore Senior Center, 10201 E. Riverside Drive, Bothell  
Sponsors: LWVS and the League of Women Voters of Snohomish County.

**LWVS Ballot Issues Forum #1**
Date: Thursday, October 7  
Time: 7:30 p.m.  
Place: Seattle First Baptist Church  
This is the first of two ballot issues forums presented by LWVS this month. It will focus on local issues and the two state liquor initiatives, I-1100 and I-1105.

**Mercer Island Candidate Forum: 41st Legislative District Candidates**
Date: Thursday, October 14  
Time: 7:00 – 7:30 p.m. — Reception  
7:30 – 9:00 p.m. — Moderated Forum  
Place: Islander Middle School  
8225 SE 72nd Ave.  
Mercer Island  
Moderator: Dave Ross, KIRO

**LWVS Ballot Issues Forum #2**
Date: Wednesday, October 13  
Time: 7:00 p.m.  
Place: St. Andrew’s Lutheran Church, Bellevue  
This is the second LWVS ballot issues forum. It will feature state ballot issues, with the exception of the liquor initiatives presented at the previous forum.

**Candidate Forum**
Date: Monday, October 18  
Time: 7:30 – 9:00 p.m.  
Place: Horizon House  
Legislative and Congressional candidates will speak.

**WOMEN UNBOUND: CELEBRATE THE LEGACY**

**DATE:** Saturday, November 6  
**TIME:** 6:00 – 10:00 p.m.  
**PLACE:** Sheraton Seattle, 1400 6th Avenue Metropolitan Ballroom

The University of Washington Women’s Center will host a Gala celebrating the 100th anniversary of Washington women’s suffrage and honoring 100 women in our state who have been the first in their field. For more information, go to depts.washington.edu/womenctr/ or call (206) 685-1090.
DIRECTIONS TO ST. ANDREW’S CHURCH

The League of Women Voters of Seattle has scheduled its second Ballot Issues forum, featuring state issues, at St. Andrew’s Lutheran Church in Bellevue. St. Andrew’s will also be the location for the League of Women Voters of Washington Action Workshop on November 6. Directions to St. Andrew’s Church follow:

FROM I-405 (NORTH OR SOUTH BOUND) — Take exit 11 onto I-90 Eastbound (Spokane). Then take exit 11-B, 148th St. (Bellevue Community College). Go North on 148th to stop light at SE 28th. The church is on the NE corner.

FROM EASTBOUND I-90 — Take exit 11-B, 148th St. (Bellevue Community College). Go North on 148th to stop light at SE 28th. The church is on the NE corner.

FROM WESTBOUND I-90 — Take 156th St. exit. Turn left at light, go to 148th. Turn right (north) onto 148th and go to stop light at SE 28th. The church is on the NE corner.
YOU ARE INVITED TO JOIN AN INFORMAL WORKSHOP
WITH LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF THE UNITED STATES (LWVUS)
VICE PRESIDENT JUDY DAVIS.

**LWV: A 360 Degree View – Integrating League’s programs and addressing challenges of leadership.**

**DATE:** SATURDAY, OCTOBER 16  
**TIME:** 10: A.M. – 2:00 P.M.  
**PLACE:** LEAGUE OFFICE

Do you think about getting more active? Learning about how the League works? Do you think about joining the board?

Enjoy a couple of hours with a skilled facilitator with lots of experience working with Leagues. $10 for lunch and snacks!! For reservations, please email info@seattlelwv.org or call (206) 329-4848. If you have questions, please contact Nancy Eitreim at (206) 329-4848 or nancye@speakeasy.net.

Judy Davis is serving her third term on the LWVUS Board. She chairs the Development Committee. In addition, she leads LWV organization and leadership trainings throughout the country and in many foreign countries. We welcome Judy to Washington and Seattle for the first time. Judy currently resides in Memphis, Tennessee.

---

**League News**

**Celebrate Ninety Years of the League of Women Voters!**

**Date:** Sunday, October 17  
**Time:**  
5:00 p.m. — Reception  
6:00 p.m. — Dinner & Program  
**Place:** Red Lion Hotel, 1415 Fifth Ave, Seattle

Please join us for this important LWV fundraising event!

Learn about the League and help support our mission while having fun celebrating all we’ve done and how far we’ve come.

You can register online at www.seattlelwv.org, or call the office at (206) 329-4848. Thank you to our sponsors.

**Keynote Speaker:** Eric Liu, co-author of *True Patriot* and former White House Deputy Domestic Policy Advisor.
TRANSPORTATION IN SEATTLE: RECENT ACTION AND CURRENT ISSUES

By Janet Winans, Transportation Committee

The speakers at the August meeting of the Transportation Committee were Peter Hahn, Director, Seattle Dept of Transportation (SDOT), and Charles Bookman, Director, SDOT Traffic. They spoke about recent projects, future plans and funding issues.

In 2006, Seattle voters passed the “Bridging the Gap” levy (BtG) to provide funds to confront the backlog of crucial and neglected repairs and upgrades to Seattle's roads, bridges and other transportation infrastructure. Other transportation costs were included in the city’s general fund budget, financed by sales, property and other ongoing tax revenues. With the recession, these sources have not produced the expected funds, while because of their separate taxing process the BtG funds have held steady. Unlike some cities that have used such special funding to cover the losses in their general funds, Seattle has followed through as promised, beginning with a detailed study that actually visited every intersection in the city, and has prioritized its projects so that they “provide equitable service to all Seattle residents...especially] regional and commercial streets that have traditionally prioritized autos and that have high transit use.” Preparing the downtown and other affected areas for the replacement of the Alaskan Way Viaduct has also been a focus of attention.

Now, almost every street in the downtown area has a new surface which should last 40 years. The off ramp from Spokane Street is open. High-tech traffic flow and “E-park” information from six downtown garages is available to drivers. (Studies have shown that a large percentage of downtown traffic is caused by drivers cruising for the best and cheapest parking space.)

Traffic flow has been improved and bike use increased by 15% on Nickerson by “Road Diet” striping. The four lanes between the Fremont Bridge and the approach to the Ballard Bridge have been striped to produce two traffic flow lanes with a center turning lane, turnout spaces for buses and marked lanes for bicycles at the edge of the traffic lane. Freight operators, who were very opposed to the new striping idea, have expressed surprise and satisfaction at how it is working. A plan for a similar process at 125th NE is currently facing opposition.

The next phase for BtG funds will be neighborhoods: resurfacing streets, installing sidewalks and addressing traffic flow to improve safety for pedestrians and bikes.

The crisis caused by falling sales taxes, gasoline consumption taxes and other sources of general fund revenues has had a major impact on transit funding, leading to competition for funds between Seattle, suburban cities including Bellevue, and unincorporated King County. Peter Hahn recommended the Municipal League’s recent study of Metro Transit as the best source of information about this issue.

Regardless of the recession, gasoline consumption is decreasing and will continue to decrease as drivers continue to make choices for energy-efficient vehicles and lifestyles. Transportation has to have new sources of revenue. One idea being discussed is the option of forming a “Transportation Benefit District,” (TBD). In 1988, the legislature provided the option for cities and counties to form a TBD that will allow city councils to approve a $20 vehicle license fee (VLF); they can ask for voter approval for VHFs up to $100.

Mayor McGinn was a member of the citizens committee that advocated for the BtG levy and for the priorities that it funds. His philosophy is that driving in the city is an “old paradigm.” The major state projects of the 520 bridge and the Alaskan Way Viaduct cost overruns are ongoing issues relating to that philosophy. The proposed tunnel is now expected to be angled further east than the current structure, with its north portal at Harrison St. According to Hahn, the tunnel will be a north/south corridor for drivers from Magnolia and Queen Anne. Trucks carrying hazardous material will not be allowed. It is expected that there will be a significant toll to use the tunnel.
Local League Positions on Ballot Measures:

Seattle School District 1 Proposition 1: No Position

The League of Women Voters of Seattle endorsed the February 2010 Seattle Public Schools Levies and at the time expressed concerns about authentic engagement with the community and the continuing lack of adequate state funding. With the 2010 audit results this summer, we are additionally concerned about accountability to the voters and responsible, transparent use of the Seattle Public School’s resources for the benefit of children in the classroom. While our positions state that “all levels of government are responsible for schools” we also “oppose the use of special levies and private funding for basic services, operation and maintenance.” It is for these reasons that we are taking no position on the current levy.

Positions on the proposed King County measures and Shoreline Proposition one are currently under consideration.

Download the following and post it in visible locations!

League of Women Voters Say YES On I-1098

www.lwvwa.org; scroll down the home page and click on the “League of Women Voters Say Yes on I-1098” link.
League of Women Voters of Washington’s
Positions on the Statewide Ballot Measures for the November 2, 2010 General Election

The League of Women Voters of Washington Board of Directors has voted to support the following:

**Referendum Bill 52**: Engrossed House Bill 2561 passed the 2010 legislature and was signed by Governor Gregoire. The bill was named the Jobs Act. The bill provides for state general obligation bonds of up to $505 million to fund energy efficiency projects in the state’s K-12 schools and higher education facilities. The bonds would be funded by extending the current state tax on bottled water beyond its current expiration date of 2013. Because this bonding amount exceeds the state’s current debt limit, the bill must be submitted to the state’s voters.

*The national League’s positions on Natural Resources, particularly those related to global climate change, together with the extensive work the national League has done in support of national climate change legislation, are the basis for League to support Referendum 52. LWVWA supported EHB 2561 in the 2010 legislative session.*

**Initiative 1098**: concerns establishing a state income tax and reducing other taxes. This measure would tax “adjusted gross income” above $200,000 (individuals) and $400,000 (joint-filers), reduce state property tax levies, reduce certain business and occupation taxes, and direct any increased revenues to education and health.

*League of Women Voters of Washington position on tax structure states: Inequities in the distribution of the tax burden should be removed. Ability to pay is an important criterion. Flexibility and recognition of changing times and needs is important in tax policy. Income should be part of the tax base preferably through a graduated net income tax.*

The League of Women Voters of Washington Board of Directors has voted to oppose the following:

**Initiative 1053**: concerns tax and fee increases imposed by state government. This measure would restate existing statutory requirements that legislative actions raising taxes must be approved by two-thirds legislative majorities or receive voter approval, and that new or increased fees require majority legislative approval.

*National League position includes that government must have the knowledge, resources and power to make decisions that meet citizens needs and reconcile conflicting interests and priorities, and it must be able to function in an efficient manner with a minimum of conflict, wasted time and duplication of effort.*

**Initiative Measure No. 1100** concerns liquor (beer, wine and spirits). This measure would close state liquor stores; authorize sale, distribution, and importation of spirits by private parties; and repeal certain requirements that govern the business operations of beer and wine distributors and producers.
According to the Office of Financial Management, I-1100 would lower state revenue approximately $25 million per year through the privatization of liquor.

**Initiative Measure No. 1105** concerns liquor (beer, wine and spirits). This measure would close all state liquor stores and license private parties to sell or distribute spirits. It would revise laws concerning regulation, taxation and government revenues from distribution and sale of spirits.

According to the Office of Financial Management, I-1105 would lower state revenue approximately $100 million per year through the privatization of liquor.

**Initiative 1107** concerns reversing certain 2010 amendments to state tax laws. This measure would end sales tax on candy; end temporary sales tax on some bottled water; end temporary excise taxes on carbonated beverages; and reduce tax rates for certain food processors.

According to the Office of Financial Management, I-1107 would lower state tax revenue by 55 million in the current fiscal year and $218 million in the upcoming biennium by removing the tax on candy & gum, bottled water, soda and reinstating tax loopholes.

*League believes all initiatives proposed should “require how revenue losses or budget increases might be covered, either through program cuts or increases in revenue sources.”* (League position on Initiatives, IR-4)

The League of Women Voters of Washington Board of Directors has voted to **take no position** on the following:

**Initiative 1082** concerns industrial insurance. This measure would authorize employers to purchase private industrial insurance beginning July 1, 2012; direct the legislature to enact conforming legislation by March 1, 2012; and eliminate the worker-paid share of medical-benefit premiums.

**Engrossed Substitute House Joint Resolution 4220.** The legislature has proposed a constitutional amendment on denying bail for persons charged with certain criminal offenses. This amendment would authorize courts to deny bail for offenses punishable by the possibility of life in prison, on clear and convincing evidence of a propensity for violence that would likely endanger persons.

While League has no positions that directly address these issues, we do have concerns about both of them.

On **I-1082**, if the federal government does not provide sufficient resources, then the state government must assume that responsibility. There is a question as to whether the state would have the resources if private insurance chose not to cover, and the federal government didn’t sufficiently cover.

On **ESHJR 4220**, we are concerned about modifying constitutional protection to bail without full vetting. This constitutional amendment came about because of a very tragic incident rather than because over time, the legislature considered a problem and sought a solution.
Q & A on I-1098
Published by League of Women Voters of Washington

Q. What would I-1098 do if adopted?

1. Reform our state's outdated tax system by establishing a progressive income tax on the wealthiest 1.2 percent of households.
2. Cut state property taxes for all Washingtonians by 20 percent.
3. Eliminate B&O taxes for 81 percent of small businesses.
4. Establish a trust fund for education, and critical health care programs.
5. The wealthiest households would pay taxes only on income earned above $400,000 a year for couples or $200,000 for individuals.

Q. Washington state schools are already among the best in the nation, aren’t they? Why do they need more new money?

A. Washington state schools formerly were among the best in the nation. But over the past 20 years reduced funding of our schools has changed all that. A comparison with the other states shows we no longer are amongst the best in the nation.

Total money Washington State puts into education – we rank 45th. Student/teacher ratio, classroom size and spending relative to state personal income – we are 47th.

Because of the nation-wide economic situation, the Legacy Trust Fund for our state has already been zeroed out. Without I-1098 we will see the above numbers continue to decline. What kind of an education will your children and grandchild receive in schools with this degree of funding cuts?

Q. What will the 30% of the funds earmarked for health pay for?

A. The health care funds will help fund the state-wide basic health care plan, public health care in counties throughout the state, and long term care for low income seniors and those with disabilities.

Q. Who would get some tax relief with I-1098?

1. Small business - eliminates B&O taxes for more than 375,000 businesses. That’s why it is endorsed by Main Street Alliance, an organization of more than 2,000 small businesses in the state.
2. Property owners - A 20 percent cut in the state property tax. To find out how much you would save go to: www.eoionline.org/tax_reform/I1098.htm and click on calculator.

Q. Will this initiative harm the state economy?

A. Why would that happen? There are only nine states without a full income tax so where would these businesses go? It cost far more to move a business than to have a few of the top executives pay more in taxes.

Q. Won’t I–1098 open the door to a state income tax?

A. Remember, I-1098 taxes only those people who have a taxable income of more than $200,000 a person or $400,000 a couple – income levels after deductions have been taken. The estimate is that fewer than 3% of Washington households fall into this category. The playing field is currently heavily
tilted in their favor. In Washington state, citizens earning less than $20,000 annually pay 17.3% of their income in taxes, whereas those making $537,000 or more pay only 2.8%.

I-1098 imposes only a 5% tax on each dollar over $200,000 (or $400,000 per couple) and 9% of each dollar over $500,000. Thus the wealthy will continue to pay a smaller percentage of income in taxes than the poor – but it does allow them to be better partners in making Washington State a good place to live.

Any income tax has to be approved by the public. The voters have shown no interest in approving a state-wide income tax.

Q. Will I-1098 help wipe out the state’s budget deficit?

A. I-1098 was not designed to wipe out the deficit in our state budget caused by the recent nation-wide financial situation. It was designed to put badly needed funds back into the education and health care portions of the state budget. It is designed to help our children who are the future of our state and help with basic health care needs (which includes childhood vaccinations) in our state, also greatly underfunded. Oregon’s experience has validated this scenario. Recently voters approved a measure to increase taxes on the highest income earners in the state, and in the following budget cycle continued to have a deficit, but a significantly smaller one than it would have been without the new revenue source.

Q. Why should the rich be the only ones to pay?

A. For the past 30 years, the marginal income tax rate for the wealthy has been lowered by up to 40%. Meanwhile tax rates for the poor and the middle class remain about the same while middle class wages have stagnated over the past 30 plus years. It now takes two wage earners just to keep a family in the middle class. At the same time, the incomes of the rich and the very wealthy have increased by 200 to 300%. According to the IRS, the wealthiest 400 Americans’ incomes were an average of $345 million in 2007 but they paid only 16.62 % in income taxes.

In 2007, the top 20% of people had 93% of the total wealth, with the bottom 80% having only 7% of the total wealth. The USA has changed from being one of the most equal societies in terms of wealth during the 1940’s through the 1970’s to become one of the most unequal societies in the industrial and post-industrial world. We cannot maintain our status as a first-world nation if this continues.

It is time for all households to carry a more equal share of providing for the educational and health needs of the residents of our state. This question of fundamental fairness is the reason William Gates, Sr. is a leading proponent of I-1098.

Q. Can an income tax pass the test of being constitutional in Washington State?

A. Many respected constitutional attorneys in the state believe that I-1098 will be constitutional.

Q. How much money will I-1098 raise?

A. It is projected to raise an estimated $1 to $1.7 billion per year.
League of Women Voters of Washington

Action Workshops for 2010

Lobby Team Priority Topics:
Budget Issues: How to save the things we love
Cost $25 per venue per person

Hope to see you there!

Kennewick
October 23, 2010
9:30am to 3pm (Lunch will be served)
Lampson Building
607 E. Columbia Drive, Kennewick, WA

Bellevue
November 6, 2010
9:30am to 2:30pm (Lunch will be served)
St. Andrew’s Lutheran Church
2650 148th Ave SE, Bellevue WA

League of Women Voters of Washington
ACTION WORKSHOP 2010
REGISTRATION
Cost: $25 per venue per person
Lunch Provided

Choose one or both venues:
___Kennewick, October 23, 2010
___Bellevue, November 6, 2010

Name _______________________________________________________________
Tel/email_____________________________________________________________
___VISA  ___M/C
Card # ________________________________________________ Exp. Date _____
___Check enclosed

Mail to: LWVWA, 4730 University Way NE, Suite 720, Seattle WA 98105
Make Checks payable to LWVWA and send to the State League office.
Membership Report by Kelly Powers, Membership Chair

Share the League! Invite People to the Get to Know League Dinner

It’s not too late to invite new, prospective or returning members to the Get to Know League Dinner on Oct 7. Attending the dinner is also helpful for current members who are curious about how the League works, the plans for the upcoming year and ways to get involved.

Guests will have the opportunity to learn about the League from participating members as well as to attend the Ballot Issues forum which follows the dinner. Allison Feher, League of Women Voters of Seattle president, will give an overview of the League. Nan Moore, 1st Vice President and Action Chair, will explain how Leaguers move from studies to neighborhood discussion to positions to action. Other committee chairs will summarize their plans for the upcoming year.

Note to committee chairs—this is a great event for recruiting volunteers for your committees!

So invite a friend, offer a ride and enjoy the free homemade lasagna and salad dinner. To help us plan, please RSVP to the office at (206) 329-4848. Sign up to bring a salad, lasagna, rolls & butter, cookies or flowers as well.

Who to Invite?

Do you know someone who keeps up with the news? Loves to talk about politics? Is concerned about civil discourse? Passionate about a topic the League is studying? Would like to know more? Wants to make a difference but may not know where to start?

Is this person home with the kids or taking care of people and looking for new topics of conversation? Recently retired? In between jobs? Recovering from a life event and looking to turn outward?

New to the area?

Any of these are fine reasons to attend the Get to Know League Dinner and join the League.

Why the League?

The League is so much more than the typical email list organization. You know those organizations. The only time you really hear from them is when you receive an email asking you to sign a petition followed by an ask for money. Those organizations lack the grassroots input and involvement which the League offers. The League is an actual networking organization getting a myriad of things done in our community. Our members influence what we do and how we do it. Our members make it all happen.

In return, League work grows and connects its members. Eleanor Roosevelt is said to have observed that the best volunteers were often League of Women Voters members because we study a wide range of topics in our localities, state and national government and are trained to be active, effective citizens. Surprisingly, history didn’t record her comments on the fantastic lasagna dinners!

Helping New Members find Their Way in the League

As we’re chatting with our guests at the Get to Know League Dinner and potential members we run across in our daily lives, it’s important to remember there are many kinds of League members*

- those that want to “do something”
- those that want to “learn something”
- those that want to “be a part of something”
- those that are merely “curious.”
As we encounter people who might like to join the League or people who approach the League about volunteering, we can engage in conversations to learn more: How involved do they want to be? Are they happy to receive *The Voter* and look up the League endorsements online? How would they like to participate? Are there special skills they’d like to use or develop? What is their ideal size job – tiny, small, medium or large? This can help us guide them to a happy place within the League.

**Membership and Outreach Committee Forming in November**

The Membership and Outreach chairs, myself and Brigitte Ashley respectively, are teaming to host outreach events to recruit new League members and expand visibility in the community. Brigitte held the first Young Leaguer Mixer at the Bar at Palomino downtown and we brainstormed more ideas for future events. If you are interested in reaching out to potential new members and building the League, please join us! Check the November *Voter* for upcoming committee meeting times.

---

**More on League Leader Eleanor Roosevelt**

“In the League, Eleanor Roosevelt was exposed to a wide variety of opinions and passions that she learned to marshal and to mobilize.”

- Professor Allida Black, Project Director of the Eleanor Roosevelt Papers from “Eleanor and the League”

“Eleanor Roosevelt gets back to New York, she meets Esther Lape and Elizabeth Read and Narcissa Vanderlip, who was then president of the League of Women Voters. And she gets very involved with this new circle of friends and with the League of Women Voters. And she becomes political. They remind her of the circle that she left at Allenswood: independent women. They live in Greenwich Village, and they read poetry aloud, they have champagne candle-lit dinners, and they’re carefree, in their private lives, and totally committed to political action. They run a magazine called City, State, and Nation, and Eleanor Roosevelt very quickly becomes editor of that magazine. And she becomes very involved, on a new level, with her own independent political world, which is now a world of women activists.” - Interview with Eleanor Roosevelt biographer, Blanche Wiesen Cook.

PBS’ *American Experience* program *Eleanor’s World*

For more about how Eleanor Roosevelt shaped the League and the League shaped *Eleanor*, go to: www.lwv.org/AM/Template.cfm?Section=90th_Anniversary1
BOOK REVIEW by Vicky Downs

*The Spirit Level: Why Greater Equality Makes Societies Stronger*

By Richard Wilkinson and Kate Pickett

League Sally Mackle introduced this book to the Economics Committee, explaining that a “spirit level” is the British word for a carpenter’s level. Both authors are British, and their research focuses largely on the United States, the United Kingdom and other industrialized countries. The subtitle encompasses two riveting ideas. Based on 30 years of research, the book shows that “almost every modern social problem is more likely to occur in a less equal society.” The problems include ill health, more crime and less trust. These are not due to culture, climate or form of government, but to inequality.

The authors also show that the degree of equality among members of a group is what leads to the healthiest and happiest societies. Whether it’s the index of child well being, obesity, mental illness, or life expectancy, the US and the UK routinely appear at the lower end of the spectrum, whereas Japan and the Scandinavian countries (all far more egalitarian) appear at the better-off end of the continuum.

It seems that inequality gets under the skin. It leads to a rise in anxiety, a lowered sense of self-esteem, growing insecurity and an increase in consumption; it also affects one’s sense of pride, shame and status. With this in mind, it seems to follow that there is also a clear relationship between inequality and a general lack of trust. Inequality and its consequences have been rising in the US since the 1960s, which was when America was as egalitarian as it has ever been.

I found the book convincing, and was interested to note that in the August 21st issue of *The Economist*, an article “On Equality” (p.46) shows that many in the British Parliament are taking this book very seriously indeed. Even Prime Minister David Cameron, a “centrist Conservative” is said to be “impressed by the evidence.”

What is especially interesting to me is the concept that even the wealthy are less satisfied in a highly unequal country such as the US now is. For example, anxiety and psychological problems tend to be high even among those who can pay for long vacations and the best medical help. I was also amazed to realize that high inequality within states such as Texas, Louisiana and California tended to lead to bad outcomes, including general lack of trust, high crime and low status of women, in comparison to more equal states such as New Hampshire, Wisconsin and Utah.

The charts and graphs in this book are helpful in understanding the pervasive effect of inequality on peoples’ lives. It would be worthwhile simply perusing the charts alone in the library, though reading the entire book provides the background for the charts and gives a greater depth of knowledge. It is sobering to see the US as an outlier: the most unequal of the industrialized countries!

Sally Mackle was so impressed by the book that she copied the charts to use when talking to groups about *The Spirit Level*. Roger Neale, Director of The Lifetime Learning Center, says that Sally’s talk at the center last spring was very well received, and he hopes to have her return this fall. She is also available if Seattle League units would like to have her explain the graphs and the book’s basic concepts.

This book carries a big idea: one that is likely to interest all Leaguers!

*The opinions in this review are personal and do not represent those of the LWV.*
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King County Proposition No. 1

BALLOT TITLE: PROPOSITION NO. 1 - Sales and Use Tax for Criminal Justice, Fire Protection, and Other Government Purposes

The Metropolitan King County Council adopted Ordinance 16899 concerning funding for criminal justice, fire protection, and other government purposes. This proposition would authorize King County to fix and impose an additional sales and use tax of 0.2%, split between the county (60%) and cities (40%). At least one-third of all proceeds shall be used for criminal justice or fire protection purposes. County proceeds shall be used for criminal justice purposes, such as police protection, and the replacement of capital facilities for juvenile justice. The duration of the additional sales and use tax will be as provided in section 6 of Ordinance 16899. Should this proposition be:

☐ Approved  ☐ Rejected

BACKGROUND

King County government is experiencing a significant gap between income and services expenditures, with current revenue and cost projections. For budget year 2011, this gap is projected to be $60 million dollars.

The sales tax, which is the primary revenue for counties in Washington, is quickly affected by the economy. During economic downturns, the sales tax revenue is decreased as people buy less. Simultaneously, when the economy is in bad shape, more residents rely upon government resources such as health care programs, youth and family services, etc., so county service expenses go up.

The county uses a long-standing budgeting process that uses the previous year’s budget as the starting point, and if a division has not spent all of the previous year’s budget, their starting point is reduced by that much. Instead of encouraging county managers and directors to save wherever possible each year, this process creates a “spend it all” culture, to prevent a reduction of the next year’s budget, and elimination of needed funds.

THE EFFECT OF THE PROPOSITION IF APPROVED

If approved by voters, Proposition No. 1 would authorize King County to impose an additional sales and use tax of two-tenths of one percent (0.2%). Sixty percent (60%) of the tax proceeds would be distributed to the county and 40% would be distributed to cities in King County on a per capita basis.

RCW 82.14.450 requires that one-third of the tax proceeds be spent for criminal justice purposes, fire protection purposes or both. All of the county tax proceeds would be used for criminal justice purposes, defined to be activities that substantially assist the criminal justice system (RCW 82.14.340), and for replacement of capital facilities, including the Alder Wing and Tower of the King County Youth Services Center. City tax proceeds would be used for criminal justice purposes, fire protection purposes, or other general city purposes, as authorized by RCW 82.14.450 and as determined by each city. A report detailing the cities’ use of the tax proceeds would be submitted by the county auditor to the county council no later than July 1, 2013.

As a condition for imposition of the tax in the first three years (2011, 2012, and 2013), at least $9,500,000 must be diverted from the county road fund and appropriated for police protection in the unincorporated area of King County. If this condition is not met, the entire tax will expire on March 31 following the year in which the condition is not met. Unless the tax has expired earlier, one
half of the tax (one-tenth of one percent or 0.1%) will expire on April 1, 2014 and the remainder will expire on April 1, 2031.

**Fiscal Impact Statement:** None formally prepared by the county. The fiscal impact is widely debated between the proponents and opponents. King County does face a $60 million shortfall under the current revenue and cost structure, but the exact cause of the shortfall and effects of increasing the existing sales tax for 20 years with the increased revenue collected funding only public safety is not available.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Those in favor say:</th>
<th>Those against say:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposition 1 is needed to preserve adequate police protection, retain probation officers who monitor dangerous offenders, maintain services for crime victims, and ensure that our courts and prosecutors can keep criminals off the streets.</td>
<td>Supporters of the sales tax increase claim that if you don’t vote for it, vital services will be cut, including sheriff’s deputies, prosecutors and even judges. Supporters say that crime investigations will be scaled way back. These statements by supporters of this tax suggest priorities for county government that raise concerns for taxpayers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King County has already cut $140 million and faces $60 million in new cuts for 2011. Even with Prop 1, more cuts will be made: wages are frozen for many, layoff notices delivered, and a hiring freeze is in place. Proposition 1 doesn’t expand government—it simply avoids deep cuts that threaten public safety and basic services.</td>
<td>If your family’s income drops you cut your lowest priorities first. King County’s income is down 10%, and basic public safety services are the first things publicly targeted for cuts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposition 1 will cost 2 cents on a $10 purchase for 3 years, then will drop to 1 penny on a ten dollar purchase—less than $3/ month for the average household.</td>
<td>The county has not properly managed taxpayer dollars.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Every city and rural area will receive resources for police and emergency services—no matter where you live, you will benefit.</td>
<td>While the rest of the region and nation suffers from a recession, and people are grateful simply to have jobs, county employees have enjoyed sizable benefits and steady raises and COLA increases, even in years when the cost of living has actually gone down, not up, and the state minimum wage, indexed to inflation, has not been adjusted up.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposition 1 will replace dangerously unsafe court and support facilities for youth and families, including foster kids.</td>
<td>County workers don’t have to pay a monthly premium for their health care plan either for themselves, for any member of their family, or for their domestic partners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposition 1 will protect programs for victims of domestic violence and sexual assault—already cut by over 20%.</td>
<td>And county employees are being given compensated time back this year to pay them for last year’s 10-day furlough, which was suppose to be a cost cutting measure. There’s no furlough this year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>King County has raised taxes and fees six times in the last five years with no corresponding increase in services, but residents are getting fewer services from government itself.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>King County should be sent a strong message: Do not use cuts in basic public safety services to frighten people into approving another tax increase, but control the county’s basic spending and budgeting across the board.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**King County Charter Amendment No. 1**

**BALLOT TITLE:** Charter Amendment No. 1 - Amendments to the Preamble

Shall the preamble of the King County Charter be amended to specify the local and regional role of county government and clarify the purposes of county government, as provided in Ordinance No. 16884?

☐ Yes  ☐ No

**THE KING COUNTY CHARTER PREAMBLE AS IT PRESENTLY EXISTS**

The Preamble of the King County Charter is a statement of purpose for the adoption of the Charter. Currently, it states that the purposes of the Charter are to form a more just and orderly government, establish separate legislative and executive branches, insure responsibility and accountability, enable effective citizen participation, preserve a healthy environment, and secure the benefits of home rule and self-government.

**THE EFFECT OF THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT IF APPROVED**

If Charter Amendment No. 1 is adopted, it would add language to the Preamble specifying that insuring responsibility and accountability applies to “local and regional governance and services.” It would also amend the current statement of purpose to “preserve a healthy environment” to read “preserve a healthy rural and urban environment and economy.”

This amendment raises questions about the government’s role in King County’s economy—what is the intent of the words “and economy”?

Specifically, the preamble would be changed to read (underlined phrases added):

We the people of King County Washington, in order to form a more just and orderly government, establish separate legislative and executive branches, insure responsibility and accountability for local and regional county governance and services, enable effective citizen participation, preserve a healthy rural and urban environment and economy and secure the benefits of home rule and self government, in accordance with the Constitution of the State of Washington, do adopt this charter.

**Fiscal Impact Statement:** Not possible to determine long term fiscal impact – impact will be dependent upon whether there are any significant policy changes that stem from this change to the language of the preamble; Short term impact: some minor printing costs to reprint county literature and make copies of the charter available to the public.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Those in favor say:</th>
<th>Those against say:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✐ This amendment more clearly and definitively states the mission and goals of King County government.</td>
<td>✐ Although it appears to be a small change in language, this change to the preamble appears to revise the primary responsibilities of King County government from those stated in the preamble of the original charter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✐ It is consistent with the long-standing policy of providing regional services to the population of the entire county while providing local services to rural residents and encouraging local self-governance in all urban areas.</td>
<td>✐ The reasonable question arises: Why? Why is this change to the preamble necessary?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✐ Rural residents have called upon King County government to affirm its responsibility to providing local services in rural areas.</td>
<td>✐ If the answer is to better serve the needs of rural residents, wouldn’t substantive change in county policy in delivery of services better serve them?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✐ If the answer is to assuage the concerns of rural residents through “window dressing” without substantive policy change, then one has to question as to whether this language change is in the best long term interests of the residents of King County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✐ County voters’ call for change in government services and responsibility should not be met with window dressing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
King County Charter Amendment No. 2

BALLOT TITLE: Charter Amendment No. 2 - Amendment of Section 690 – Campaign Finance

Shall Section 690 of the King County Charter be amended to specify that timely filing of a statement of campaign receipts and expenditures with the Washington State Public Disclosure Commission in accordance with chapter 42.17 RCW satisfies the filing obligations of Section 690 of the King County Charter, as provided in Ordinance No. 16885?

☐ Yes ☐ No

THE KING COUNTY CHARTER AS IT PRESENTLY EXISTS

Section 690 of the King County Charter sets forth campaign contribution and expenditure filing requirements for candidates for county elective office. Currently, Section 690 requires the candidates to file contribution and expenditure statements with the King County elections department within ten days after an election. When filed, the statements become public records. Pursuant to state law, chapter 42.17 RCW, the same information must be filed with the Washington Public Disclosure Commission (“PDC”). The statements are posted on the PDC’s website and are publicly available.

THE EFFECT OF THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT IF APPROVED

If adopted, Charter Amendment No. 2 would eliminate the duplicate filing of campaign contribution and expenditure statements by King County candidates with the King County Election Office. The amendment would provide that timely filing of the statements with the PDC satisfies the filing requirements of Section 690.

Fiscal Impact Statement:  Not possible to determine long term fiscal impact – impact will be dependent upon whether there are any significant policy changes that stem from this change to the language of the preamble; Short term impact: some minor printing costs to re-print county literature and copies of the charter available to the public.
Those in favor say:

- This cost-saving change reduces duplication in government.
- Last year the State Legislature unanimously passed Senate Bill 6243 which allows counties to eliminate this duplicate paperwork and save taxpayer dollars.
- Currently candidates and political committees within King County must file campaign-related reports and statements twice—once with the King County Office of Elections, and a second time with the Public Disclosure Commission (PDC). Under this proposed County Charter amendment, the records would only go to the PDC, saving King County taxpayers money and making our Elections Office more efficient.
- With the internet being a primary source of information today, it is not necessary to have redundant sets of the data in two places. Citizens benefit from reduced costs of government and having campaign information easily available and accessible online from the Public Disclosure Commission on their home computer, at any public library or other computer.

Those against say:

- Historically, candidates in races within the borders of King County have been required to file campaign finance disclosure documents with the state PDC, and also with the County Elections Office. This procedure was implemented to provide a local option for King County residents to monitor local candidates without having to drive to Olympia to access this information.
- Additionally, the King County elections office monitors compliance by those candidates in King County races (not simply races within King County, but County offices) with King County. Having a copy of County office PDC reports filed with King County facilitates expeditious review of compliance by County office candidates.
- The candidates need do no additional work in preparing their statements other than sending a copy to King County Elections. It is not a burdensome requirement for campaigns.
- The internet has become a primary source of information for some voters, but not all. The “digital divide”, where upper middle class and higher income households routinely have computers, but most homes in poverty do not, is very real. Also, a significant portion of the population still prefers not to use the internet as their point of access to public documents. Making information about political campaigns conducted in King County less accessible to those who cannot or do not wish to use a computer, but wish to access the original filings on paper, is a disservice to local voters.
King County Charter Amendment No. 3

BALLOT TITLE: Charter Amendment No. 3 - Amendment of Section 890 and New Section 897 – Collective Bargaining

Shall the King County Charter be amended to allow the King County Sheriff to serve as the county’s collective bargaining agent for all department of public safety issues except for compensation and benefits, which would continue to be bargained by the county executive, as provided in Ordinance No. 16900?

☐ Yes  ☐ No

THE KING COUNTY CHARTER AS IT PRESENTLY EXISTS

Section 890 of the King County Charter designates the county executive as the county’s agent for collective bargaining with county employees covered by the county personnel system. The executive’s authority for collective bargaining covers all issues, including those related to wages, hours, benefits, and working conditions. An agreement reached as a result of negotiations between the executive and employees must be adopted by the county council by ordinance to be effective.

THE EFFECT OF THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT IF APPROVED

If adopted, Charter Amendment No. 3 would designate the King County sheriff as the county’s agent for collective bargaining with department of public safety employees on all issues for these employees except compensation and benefits, which would continue to be bargained by the executive. Currently, the sheriff can provide input, but has no authority over collective bargaining for these employees. An agreement reached as a result of negotiations between the sheriff and employees must be adopted by the county council by ordinance to be effective.

Fiscal Impact Statement:  Not calculated by the county.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Those in favor say:</th>
<th>Those against say:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✷ The sheriff is directly accountable to voters, and the sheriff’s employees should be directly accountable to her.</td>
<td>✷ The current system is simple, and it works well: The county executive negotiates all aspects of public safety labor contracts. This amendment unnecessarily complicates the negotiation process by artificially splitting bargaining authority between the sheriff and the county executive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✷ The sheriffs office is unique in that it is the only county department whose employees have the authority to use force, including occasionally deadly force, during the course of their day to day jobs.</td>
<td>✷ Compensation, benefits, and working conditions are a package deal. The amendment does not define the boundary between working conditions and compensation &amp; benefits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✷ In 1996, King County citizens voted to make the Sheriff an independently elected official with Executive level responsibility for the policies, operations and accountability of the sheriff’s department. The King County Executive is not responsible or accountable for the operations and functioning of the sheriff’s office – the sheriff is.</td>
<td>✷ Defining that boundary could be a difficult problem. At a minimum, it will require collaboration between the sheriff and the county executive—collaboration which may or may not exist.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✷ The Charter leaves the King County Executive with authority to bargain with unions representing sheriff’s office employees. Union contracts include far more than just wages and benefits, which should be equitable for like positions county-wide over all branches. Union contracts also provide for working hours, working conditions, how overtime is approved or denied, how shifts are assigned, how promotions occur, what popular work assignments are made by merit, and which are made by seniority, how discipline is pursued, etc.</td>
<td>✷ And if that collaboration exists, there is no reason why the sheriff cannot have input to the negotiations conducted under the current system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✷ It is inappropriate for someone without law enforcement responsibility outside of the sheriff’s office to have authority over management rights and working conditions of sheriff’s employees without detailed law enforcement knowledge or direct accountability to the voters.</td>
<td>✷ The supporters of this amendment have not explained how this amendment would affect collective bargaining between the county and unions such as the King County Police Officers Guild.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✷ This charter amendment aligns the accountability the voters intended with authority over management rights and working conditions, including matters such as limiting excessive overtime, imposing discipline for misconduct, and making job assignments.</td>
<td>✷ This amendment is about changing collective bargaining.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✷ The county executive would retain bargaining authority over wages and benefits.</td>
<td>✷ Although accountability and authority within the county government will be shifted, the primary question is: how will this amendment affect collective bargaining for public safety labor issues?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✷ This bargains structure has been used effectively for many years in the King County Prosecutor’s Office and Superior/District Courts, as well as the majority of sheriffs’ offices around the state.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✷ This amendment is supported unanimously by the 2008 independent Blue Ribbon Panel on Sheriff’s Office management.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SEATTLE PUBLIC SCHOOLS – Proposition 1

BALLOT TITLE: PROPOSITION NO. 1 - SUPPLEMENTAL OPERATIONS LEVY

The Board of Directors of Seattle School District No. 1 passed Resolution No. 2009/10-15 concerning this proposition for supplemental educational program funding. To partially replace reduced State funding and to improve education throughout Seattle Public Schools this proposition authorizes the District to levy the following supplemental taxes on all taxable property within the District, to help the District meet the educational needs of its approximately 45,507 students:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collection Years</th>
<th>Levy Rate/$1,000 - Assessed Value</th>
<th>Approximate Levy Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>$0.11</td>
<td>$14,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>$0.12</td>
<td>$16,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>$0.12</td>
<td>$17,700,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Should this proposition be approved?  □ Yes  □ No

THE EFFECT OF THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT IF APPROVED:

In this proposition the Seattle School Board requests voter approval of a supplemental operations levy.

This supplemental levy will fund textbooks, other instructional materials and professional development in high school science and social studies, middle school language arts, and elementary music. In addition, these funds will support reform efforts to support student achievement and improve teacher performance and leaders for Seattle Public Schools.

The proposed levy will provide supplemental funding to replace, in part, state per pupil funding for basic education. State funding has been reduced by approximately $32 million beginning with the 2009-10 school year. Passage of this proposition would allow the levy of property taxes over a three year period to pay for educational programs aimed at improving educational opportunities for all students.

The supplemental taxes would be levied as follows: $14.5 million in property taxes within Seattle Public Schools District for collection in 2011, $16.0 million in taxes for collection in 2012, and $17.7 million in taxes in 2013. If authorized by the voters and based on current assessed valuation information, estimated levy rates per $1,000 of assessed value would be $0.11 (2011 collection), $0.12 (2012 collection), and $0.12 (2013 collection). The net tax increase on a $500,000 home in 2012 will be $60.
Those in favor say:

- The state has cut more than $32 million from Seattle schools since 2008, and our schools are faced with a $27 million gap for the 2011-2012 school year. With Washington State anticipating additional $4+ billion budget deficits, all signs point to more cuts on the way.
- The legislature authorized school districts to run a levy to help make up for some of these cuts. This three-year $48.2 million levy will partially offset state cuts to education, so Seattle's kids don't get shortchanged.
- This levy helps deliver a basic education to 47,000 Seattle students. Funds from this levy will be used to:
  - Purchase textbooks and basic classroom materials for elementary music, middle school language arts, and high school social studies and science;
  - Support our teachers with increased collaboration time, career ladders, and an updated teacher evaluation process;
  - Reduce the number and severity of cuts to educational programs and services.
- The owner of a $400,000 home will pay about $48 per year* over the next three years to support these critical programs – a small price to support Seattle's kids.
- The school district and the school board are working to address and resolve the audit findings.
- This levy is a lifeline to Seattle Public Schools to offset some of the state funding cuts to education.

Those against say:

- The district says the levy will cover state cuts, but the money is budgeted to staff new projects at headquarters – for schools and programs that suffered cuts.
- This money is actually intended for central projects and headquarters staffing; software and three new central staff positions for a controversial teacher evaluation program; and central administration staffing for textbook adoption, curricular alignment, and teacher coaches. None of it is directly for schools or students.
- While this is proposed as a temporary tax that will need to be renewed in three years if it is to be continued, temporary taxes appear on the ballot in future years as renewals of existing taxes. Renewals have a much higher rate of passage than new taxes.
- The State Auditor recently found the district is out of compliance with state laws, had mismanaged I-728 money, lacked controls on spending, and had "significant deficiencies in controls that adversely affect the District's ability to produce reliable financial statements."
THE SITUATION AT PRESENT:

Since 2001, Shoreline’s property tax levy increase has been limited to 1% a year, while inflation has gone up nearly 3 times as fast, and as a result funding has not kept pace for basic city services. The city of Shoreline has taken steps to reduce costs and assure efficiency, including more than $1 million in budget cuts, staff reductions and elimination of cost-of-living pay raises; however, a budget revenue shortfall persists.

The Effect of the Proposed Amendment if Approved:

If approved, Proposition 1 would maintain current levels of police and emergency services, including neighborhood safety patrols, traffic enforcement in school zones and neighborhoods, east and west-side police store-front programs, school safety officer in Shorewood and Shorecrest High Schools, enforcement of drug and vice laws, and community crime prevention programs. Proposition 1 would preserve safe, well-maintained and accessible parks and trails; playgrounds and play equipment that meet safety standards; playfields, restrooms and the Shoreline pool; and recreation programs for youth, families and seniors. Proposition 1 would continue funding for community services, including the Shoreline senior center and youth programs.

If approved, any increase in the annual levy would not exceed inflation (Seattle region CPI-U) for 2012-2016. Proposition 1 would set the city’s property tax rate below the legal limit of $1.60 at $1.48/$1,000 assessed valuation for collection in 2011 and will use the 2016 levy amount to calculate subsequent levy limits. The typical homeowner would pay an additional average of $9.25 per month to maintain police and emergency protection, parks and recreation, and community services.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Those in favor say:</th>
<th>Those against say:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shoreline, like many cities in our region, is facing financial challenges with its operating budget. Revenue has simply not kept pace with the cost of basic services.</td>
<td>The city’s proposed property tax increase comes at the worst possible time. People are suffering during this economic crisis and even small tax increases can be significant to a family budget.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City officials have made budget cuts, reduced staff, eliminated cost-of-living increases, and reduced reserves by 16% without raising taxes, while maintaining an excellent bond rating. In spite of these efforts, the budget gap is projected to be $14 million over the next 6 years.</td>
<td>Property taxes have the hardest impacts on those who can afford it least. This increase will affect all residents, whether they rent or own. Seniors living on fixed incomes, young families struggling on stagnant wages and local businesses operating on thin margins cannot afford higher property taxes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An 18-member citizen advisory committee researched the most effective ways to address Shoreline’s long-term financial challenges. Based on feedback from Shoreline citizens, they recommend this levy to preserve basic services.</td>
<td>The city has options to cut the budget sensibly, but taxing residents more is not the right option at this time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Today, Shoreline neighborhoods are safe, crime is low, parks and recreation facilities are well-maintained, and a wide variety of people benefit daily from human services programs. Let’s protect this</td>
<td>There are alternatives for protecting city services without increasing taxes. This series of compounding taxes through 2016 does not address the real issue. It represents the city’s failure to manage our government with the existing revenues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For about $9 a month, if approved, the revenue from the tax levied will maintain basic services for Shoreline citizens. These services are greatly needed during this weak economy, and are at risk of being eliminated due to decreased revenue.</td>
<td>The city has also increased compensation to its highest paid administrators by more than 10% between 2007-2009, during a time frame when there has been no increase in the state minimum wage due to no indexed inflation increase in the area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Now is not the time for drastic cuts to basic services that support Shoreline’s families, youth and seniors, including people hit hardest by the recession. Property tax exemptions are available for those most in need.</td>
<td>The revenue from this levy money is not entirely earmarked for the promised services. In the city of Shoreline’s proposed budget, direct services such as the Shoreline Pool and Teen Recreation Program only receive a combined $1.3 million for 2010. By comparison, indirect services such as planning and development are budgeted for $2.4 million, and the Finance Department is budgeted for $4.8 million.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoreline’s per capita property taxes are in the bottom 30% of King County’s largest cities. Over 52% of Shoreline’s operating budget is allocated to police, parks and community services.</td>
<td>Proposition 1 requests a specific rate increase for 2011 only. Future increases are tied to the Seattle Consumer Price Index until 2016, which makes future increases unpredictable.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Washington State Initiative Measure No. 1053

BALLOT TITLE: INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 1053 concerns tax and fee increases imposed by state government.

This measure would restate existing statutory requirements that legislative actions raising taxes must be approved by two-thirds legislative majorities or receive voter approval, and that new or increased fees require majority legislative approval.

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

BACKGROUND: STATE CONSTITUTION, I-601, I-960

Washington State Constitution
The Washington State Constitution, Article II, Section 22 states:
PASSAGE OF BILLS. No bill shall become a law unless on its final passage the vote be taken by yeas and nays, the names of the members voting for and against the same be entered on the journal of each house, and a majority of the members elected to each house be recorded thereon as voting in its favor.

A “majority” is 50% plus one vote. A “supermajority” is a two-thirds majority, or 67%.

Initiative 601
Over the years there have been attempts to limit taxing and spending by the legislature. In 1993, Washington voters passed I-601 to address state taxation and spending measures. This initiative tied spending and revenue growth to the fiscal growth factor that calculated population and the rate of inflation over a moving three-year period. I-601 also called for a two-thirds vote of the legislature to pass any tax bill. At various times, that provision has been amended to allow for a simple majority vote on tax bills, as provided for in the state constitution (see above). The legislature also amended the initiative to allow for the transfer of monies between different funds and to exercise emergency clauses particularly in 2002, as a response to the state's economic recession.

The legislature can modify the terms of an initiative after 24 months of the initiative’s passage.

Initiative 960
I-960 was approved by the voters in November 2007. I-960 requires either a two-thirds legislative vote or voter approval on all tax increases. It also requires advisory votes by the people on tax increases that are not referred to the ballot with a binding vote from either a legislative or citizen referendum. Increases in fees are no longer under the authority of state agencies, but have to be voted on by a simple majority margin in the legislature.

After the expiration of the 24-month period during which the legislature could not modify Initiative 960, the legislature voted and the governor signed ESSB 6130 on February 24, 2010, to temporarily suspend until July 1, 2011 I-960’s two-thirds majority requirement necessary to approve raising taxes and the tax advisory vote provisions.

THE EFFECT OF INITIATIVE 1053

The major features of Initiative 1053 are as follows:
- Initiative 1053 would reverse the action of the 2010 legislature by replacing the current statute regarding tax increases and the state expenditure limit with a new section reading the same as the pre-2010 version of the law.
• The initiative would require either a two-thirds legislative approval in both houses or voter approval for tax increases.

• The referendum power (Article II, section 1(b) of the state constitution) provides that legislation may be referred to the voters for their approval or rejection at a November general election. If this action would result in expenditures in excess of the state expenditure limit, then approval of the voters is required at the next general election.

• A two-thirds vote of each house plus approval by the governor would be needed to declare an emergency for not more than 24 months, in case of a natural disaster.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Those in favor say:</th>
<th>Those against say:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✐ People have the right to submit rules to the legislature. Many of the rules under which the legislature operates call for a two-thirds majority. While the state constitution requires a majority, it does not forbid that a two-thirds supermajority be used.</td>
<td>✐ I-1053 violates majority rule by requiring a two-thirds supermajority to pass tax increases. The state constitution clearly says that a majority, which is 50% plus 1 vote, is required to pass legislation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✐ A $3 billion shortfall is evidence of the need for spending restraint. I-1053 would force the legislature to build consensus, with all good ideas being brought forward and considered.</td>
<td>✐ I-1053 would tend to create an oligarchy (rule by a few). Large corporations could gain control over the state senate, for example, since only 17 senators (34%) could stop any legislation. This gives power to a small minority.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✐ The legislature should have made a serious attempt to reform systems such as IT, printing, ferries, prisons, pensions, boards and commissions, health care, education, and the list goes on. We need to reprioritize spending, as the people have done with their household budgets, and I-1053 can help to start this conversation.</td>
<td>✐ Those supporting I-1053 need to amend the state constitution to assure that a two-thirds majority will not be suspended. This requires a two-thirds vote of both houses and a majority vote of the people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✐ The voters have approved a two-thirds majority three times and have seen it overturned three times. The legislature should have gotten the message that voters want this restraint on spending to be the law.</td>
<td>✐ The normal work of government would be much more difficult under I-1053. Education, social services and health care will suffer. Population growth, education for children, services to the elderly, health care, and the prison system are driving spending.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✐ The legislature suspended I-960 two years after the initiative was approved by a majority of the people.</td>
<td>✐ Legislative gridlock in California shows what 2/3 majority requirement rule can do. California requires two-thirds votes to raise revenue and to approve budgets. California’s infrastructure and quality of life have greatly deteriorated. The state is heavily in debt and is now widely considered to be ungovernable. Chronic underfunding of public services has seriously damaged the state’s business climate.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Washington State Initiative Measure 1082

BALLOT TITLE: INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 1053 concerns industrial insurance

This measure would authorize employers to purchase private industrial insurance beginning July 1, 2012; direct the legislature to enact conforming legislation by March 1, 2012; and eliminate the worker-paid share of medical-benefit premiums.

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

THE LAW AS IT PRESENTLY EXISTS

The Department of Labor & Industries (L & I) administers industrial insurance to provide medical benefits and compensation to employees who suffer illness, disability, or death from employment-related injuries, without regard to fault. The insurance fund collects insurance premiums paid by employers and employees, each assessed equally.

Every employer covered by the industrial insurance laws must either (1) participate in the program administered by the Department of L & I or (2) qualify as a self-insured employer.

THE EFFECT OF THE PROPOSED MEASURE IF APPROVED

This measure establishes a third option. Employers could purchase industrial insurance from private insurers, who are licensed and regulated by the state. Private insurers would have the same rights and responsibilities as the Department of L & I, and claim decisions by private insurers could be appealed in the same manner as claim decisions by L & I. The entire premium for the medical benefit would be paid by the employer under the third option.

The measure creates an industrial insurance administrative fund and directs appropriations be made to the fund to pay the expenses of the insurance commissioner and the board of industrial insurance appeals. The measure establishes a task force representing the legislature, employers, industrial insurers, and employees. The task force recommends legislation to conform current statutes to the provisions of this measure. The legislature would be required to adopt legislation implementing this measure by March 1, 2012.

Fiscal Impact Statement: Total industrial insurance premiums paid to state to decrease $1.1 billion–$1.43 billion by 2014. State claim costs decrease as claims shift to private insurers. State revenue is estimated to increase $61 million–$75 million over 5 years. Costs are estimated to increase up to $202 million for the state and $47.25 million for local governments over 5 years.
Those in favor say:

- Currently, Labor & industries Insurance (workers’ compensation) is inefficient and unaccountable because it is a government monopoly. It doesn’t have to compete for your tax dollars.
- I-1082 provides more choices by ending L&I’s monopoly and allowing companies to sell workers’ compensation insurance in Washington, with oversight by our legislature and consumer protection regulations. 46 other states have a third private option for workers’ compensation insurance, Washington is one of just four states that do not.
- L&I taxes are going up every year, which is especially burdensome for small businesses during the economic crisis. Competition will help control costs. Even taking into account the requirement of picking up the workers’ share of the tax under the third option, employers know that competition will ultimately save them money.

Those against say:

- I-1082 allows private insurers to set their own rates with virtually no oversight. The insurance industry wrote I-1082 to give themselves exemptions that are not allowed in car, home, life or health insurance.
- I-1082 exempts workers’ compensation insurers from the voter-approved Insurance Fair Conduct Act, with the result that workers’ compensation insurers can wrongfully and intentionally delay and deny legitimate claims for years.
- I-1082 is especially tough on small businesses, which would be left to pay skyrocketing rates after insurance companies have cherry-picked large and less risky businesses.
Washington State Initiative Measure Initiative 1098

BALLOT TITLE: INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 1098 concerns establishing a state income tax and reducing other taxes.

This measure would tax “adjusted gross income” above $200,000 (individuals) and $400,000 (joint filers), reduce state property tax levies, reduce certain business and occupation taxes, and direct any increased revenues to education and health.

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

BALLOT MEASURE SUMMARY

This measure imposes an income tax on high earners as described above. It will cut the state portion of the property tax by 20% and eliminate or reduce the Business and Occupation Tax for 90% of state businesses. Initiative 1098 will establish an education and health services fund. Thirty percent of the net new funds are to be used for health care and seventy percent for education.

Any change in the level or rate of the tax would require a public vote. Regular audits, full disclosure, and monthly reports will be required.

BACKGROUND

History and Context, as excerpted from the bill itself:

“In 1932, more than seventy percent of Washington voters approved an income tax initiative and simultaneously cut property taxes in half. The following year, the state supreme court, in an opinion that ultimately relied on United States supreme court cases that have long since been overruled, treated Washington’s graduated income tax, as then drafted, as a non uniform property tax. This threw the state’s tax system into confusion and led to Washington’s over reliance on high sales taxes and the business and occupations tax. The sales tax is regressive and stunts business growth. The business and occupation tax, which is peculiar to Washington state, discourages investment and encourages many potential employers to take their business elsewhere. The tax established by this initiative is intentionally structured as an excise tax on the receipt of income during a taxable year rather than as a property tax on money as an asset, after it has been received. As an excise tax rather than a property tax, this tax is intended to conform to the legal framework adopted by almost all states, consistent with United States supreme court rulings as they have evolved during the past eight decades. This initiative is also aimed at replicating the voters’ 1932 action to reduce property taxes while installing a much fairer tax system overall and providing more stable funding to enable the state to meet its constitutional duty to provide for the education of all children.”

The Situation as it Presently Exists:

The current major sources of income for government in Washington at the state, county and local level are: The property tax, the business and occupation (B&O) tax, the sales tax, and the gasoline tax (limited to spending on transportation). Each level of government is dependent on certain taxes and limited in the amount of tax it can levy.

Each tax has its strengths and limitations. The sales tax provides over fifty percent of the revenue of the state general fund and lesser amounts for city and county governments. The amount of sales tax collected varies greatly with the state of the economy. It is considered a regressive tax because people with lower incomes spend a larger percentage of their income on goods that are taxed than do higher income people.
The property tax is collected at the county level and dispersed to the governments within the county at a defined or voter approved level. Much of the property tax levy at the local level is approved by local voters for the support of schools and other local needs. About twenty percent of the basic property tax collected locally is dispersed to the state general fund where it is used to fund education throughout the state.

The business and occupation tax is levied on the gross receipts of almost all businesses even though they may not be earning a profit.

Washington is now one of seven states that do not have a state income tax. During the 1930s, when land owners could not pay the property tax on their homes or farms, there was a strong movement to add an income tax at the state level. Such a tax was passed by initiative in 1932. The state supreme court declared it unconstitutional in 1933. Efforts since that time to add the income tax to the state's source of funds have been unsuccessful. Some respected constitutional attorneys believe that if the state supreme court were to revisit the issue today, an income tax would be upheld because precedents used in the earlier ruling have been overturned. Other respected legal minds disagree, and believe that Initiative 1098 will be found unconstitutional even under current precedent, just as the 1932 initiative was.

WHAT WILL BE THE EFFECTS OF INITIATIVE 1098?

Initiative 1098 will raise the small business credit of the B&O tax from $420 to $4800 annually, which would exempt from the B&O tax the smallest 80% of businesses operating in Washington.

The basic state property tax will be reduced by twenty percent. Important note: This is the state portion of the property tax, not the local county, schools and special purpose districts’ share. It is not the taxpayers’ entire property tax bill that will be reduced by 20%, but just the portion going to the State of Washington.

The income tax will be levied on federal adjusted gross income. Employer withholding will begin in 2012 and the first tax return will be due April 15, 2013. For couples, the tax will be five percent of the difference between $400,000 and $1,000,000 (individuals $200,000 to $500,000). For couples with an income over $1,000,000, the tax will be $30,000 plus nine percent of the excess over $1,000,000 (individuals will pay $15,000 plus nine percent over $500,000). These taxes qualify as deductions on the federal income tax returns.

After the income tax is collected, the first responsibility of the trust fund will be to reimburse the general fund for the property tax and B&O receipts it has lost through the proposed changes. After those payments have been made, the balance of the receipts will be used to support education (70 percent) and health care (30 percent). The Office of Fiscal Management estimates that the fund will provide between $1.5 and 2.5 billion annually for education and health care costs.
Those in favor say:

- This carefully studied initiative could help to establish a more balanced and stable tax system in the state of Washington.
- This initiative establishes a fairer tax system, as an income tax is a progressive tax, which takes into account the ability to pay as a percentage of income. A sales tax is charged identically on basic household and living consumer products, regardless of whether the taxpayer is a billionaire or impoverished.
- This initiative will support education and health services that are important for the state's future prosperity. A better educated workforce is an advantage for businesses in the state.
- Property owners will receive a moderate to small tax cut, depending upon their local jurisdiction, and the B&O tax will be eliminated for approximately 80% of Washington's businesses.
- Any changes in the tax rates in Section 501 of the initiative must be approved by a vote of the legislature and of the people, as the initiative is written.

Those against say:

- This initiative could be a first step to a broader income tax, levied on most Washingtonians.
- Some residents feel that if the state tax system is to be overhauled in the interests of fairness and progressiveness, then the income tax should be imposed in a tiered schedule upon all except for those who also are exempt from federal income tax, and that the sales tax should be simultaneously reduced or eliminated.
- This initiative may discourage wealthy people from residing in the state and establishing businesses here; the initiative could thus limit future economic growth.
- A significant number of Washingtonians feel that the state is not spending the taxes it already collects wisely.
- If this measure passes, a simple majority vote of the legislature and the people would allow the implementation of an income tax on much greater numbers of Washington earners. There is no provision to prevent this from happening while the sales tax still exists at a high rate.
Washington State Initiative Measure 1100

BALLOT TITLE: INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 1100 concerns liquor (beer, wine and spirits).

This measure would close state liquor stores; authorize sale, distribution, and importation of spirits by private parties; and repeal certain requirements that govern the business operations of beer and wine distributors and producers.

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

THE LAW AS IT PRESENTLY EXISTS

Currently, spirits (hard liquor) are sold at retail by state liquor stores and state-contract liquor stores. The Washington State Liquor Control Board (WSLCB or “Board”) purchases spirits from manufacturers and suppliers, furnishes spirits to state stores, and sells spirits directly to authorized purchasers. Manufacturers and suppliers may sell only to the Board.

The Board supervises state liquor stores, contract stores, and the state’s distribution operation. The Board regulates alcohol advertising, but does not advertise. The Board sets prices, sets the markup, and taxes. The net proceeds from the markup and tax revenues are distributed to the state, cities, and counties. Private parties may sell and distribute beer and wine. Private beer and wine license holders operate under a “three-tier system” under which there are separate licenses for (1) manufacturing, (2) distributing, and (3) retailing. Retailers are allowed to purchase only from distributors, and distributors only from manufacturers. Distributors and manufacturers adhere to price lists and offer uniform pricing to all.

THE EFFECT OF THE PROPOSED MEASURE IF APPROVED

I-1100 would close all state liquor stores and distribution operations. It would eliminate the proceeds from the Board’s markup on sales at state stores. I-1100 retains existing taxes on spirit sales.

The Board would no longer manage liquor stores, distribute spirits, and set prices. The Board’s authority to regulate advertising would be subject to new limitations. The Board would license private entities to sell spirits at retail, to distribute spirits to retailers, and to manufacture or import spirits in Washington. License holders would pay annual licensing fees. The licensing fees would be used for the costs of administration, for enforcement of licensing laws, and for efforts to reduce abusive consumption of alcohol and underage drinking. A “general liquor distributor’s license” would allow the license holder to distribute beer, wine, and spirits. A licensed distillery or manufacturer could act as a distributor and retailer of its own products.

I-1100 also changes the laws that regulate the importation, distribution, and retail sales of beer and wine. Initiative 1100 would eliminate the existing three-tier system for beer and wine that requires manufacturers to sell only to distributors, and distributors to sell only to retailers. I-1100 repeals the uniform pricing policy requiring each manufacturer to offer beer or wine at a uniform price to distributors and requiring each distributor to offer beer and wine at a uniform price to retailers.

Fiscal Impact Statement: Fiscal impact cannot be precisely estimated because the private market will determine spirits bottle cost and markup. Using a range of assumptions, total state revenues decrease an estimated $76 million–$85 million and total local revenues decrease an estimated $180 million–$192 million, both over five fiscal years. One-time net state revenue gain of $27.8 million is estimated from sale of the state liquor distribution center. One-time state costs are estimated at $38.6 million. Ongoing state costs for tax collection are estimated at $426,000.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Those in favor say:</th>
<th>Those against say:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>➲ As part of a modernization of law concerning beer, wine and liquor, I-1100 ends the state’s monopoly on liquor sales, and opens the market up to grocery stores and other retailers.</td>
<td>➲ I- Initiative 1100 completely deregulates sales and enforcement of hard liquor, beer and wine, threatening public safety and costing taxpayers millions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➲ I-1100 directs the Washington State Liquor Control Board to concentrate on enforcement of liquor laws, such as prohibiting underage drinking, and reducing with the aim of eliminating drunk driving, rather than on marketing distilled spirits. Currently, the state’s dual roles of enforcing alcohol consumption laws and marketing alcohol to residents are in conflict.</td>
<td>➲ Under this scheme the number of hard liquor outlets will explode from 315 to 3,300. Convenience stores, mini-marts, and gas stations — many near schools and in high crime areas — will sell liquor until 2 a.m. More consumption means more drunk driving, underage drinking, alcohol-related health issues and crime.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➲ Washington has the highest liquor taxes in the nation. In addition, the state also charges a profit margin of 51.9 percent on each liter of alcohol it sells. I-1100 will end the monopoly profits that make ours the most expensive liquor in the country. I-1100 would allow retailers to purchase directly from manufacturers rather than accepting additional costs of a middleman.</td>
<td>➲ State sales generate over $350 million annually, providing funding for local schools, health care, police, firefighters, and alcohol and drug abuse prevention. I-1100 will wipe out much of that revenue, resulting in fewer services.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Washington State Initiative Measure 1105

BALLOT TITLE: INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 1105 concerns liquor (beer, wine and spirits).

This measure would close all state liquor stores and license private parties to sell or distribute spirits. It would revise laws concerning regulation, taxation and government revenues from distribution and sale of spirits.

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

THE LAW AS IT PRESENTLY EXISTS

Currently, spirits (hard liquor) are sold at retail by state liquor stores and state-contract liquor stores. The Washington State Liquor Control Board (WSLCB or “Board”) purchases spirits from manufacturers and suppliers, furnishes spirits to state stores, and sells spirits directly to authorized purchasers. Manufacturers and suppliers may sell only to the Board.

The Board supervises state liquor stores, contract stores, and the state’s distribution operation. The Board regulates advertising, but does not advertise. The Board sets prices, the markup and taxes. The net proceeds from the markup and tax revenues are distributed to the state, cities, and counties.

Private parties may sell and distribute beer and wine. Private beer and wine license holders operate under a “three-tier system” under which there are separate licenses for (1) manufacturing, (2) distributing, and (3) retailing. Retailers are allowed to purchase only from distributors, and distributors only from manufacturers. Distributors and manufacturers adhere to price lists and offer uniform pricing to all.

THE EFFECT OF THE PROPOSED MEASURE IF APPROVED

I-1105 would close all state liquor stores and distribution operations. It would eliminate the proceeds from the markup on sales at state stores. I-1105 would require retailers and distributors to pay the state a percentage of their gross (liquor) sales for five years.

The Board would no longer manage liquor stores, distribute spirits and set prices. The Board would regulate sales and issue licenses allowing private parties to sell or distribute spirits. The Board would issue a “spirits retailer license” to sell at retail. License holders would pay an annual license fee and 6% of their gross annual sales during their first five years. The Board would issue a “spirits distributor license” to buy spirits from manufacturers and suppliers, and to sell to license retailers. Licensed distributors would pay an annual license fee and also 1% of their gross annual sales during their first five years.

Each distributor, and each manufacturer and importer, would be required to adhere to its published price list and to offer uniform pricing to all customers. Quantity discounts would be allowed. I-1105 would establish a three-tier system that separates manufacturing, distributing, and retailing of spirits.

I-1105 would repeal existing taxes on spirits, but would direct the Board to recommend a new tax projected to generate the same annual revenue for state and local governments as the current system of spirits sales and distribution, plus at least an additional $100,000,000 net over the five-year period.
Fiscal Impact Statement: Fiscal impact cannot be precisely estimated because the private market will determine spirits bottle cost and markup. Using a range of assumptions, total state revenues decrease an estimated $486 million–$520 million and total local revenues decrease an estimated $205 million–$210 million, both over five fiscal years. One-time net state revenue gain of $27.8 million is estimated from sale of the state liquor distribution center. One-time state costs are estimated at $39.2 million.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Those in favor say:</th>
<th>Those against say:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I-1105 responsibly privatizes liquor sales the way 32 other states allow the private sector to sell liquor. It will ensure that all taxes are paid and that there is a paper trail documenting all liquor sales. Applicants for retail licenses must be prove they meet certain safety and security standards.</td>
<td>Initiative 1105 will decrease public safety. I-1105 allows the number of stores selling hard liquor to increase from 315 to more than 3,300. Convenience stores, mini-marts, and gas stations — even if near schools or churches or in high crime areas — will sell hard liquor until 2 a.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-1105 will generate at least the same annual revenue for the state and local jurisdictions, as well as an additional $100 million net over the initial five year period.</td>
<td>I-1105 allows the number of stores selling hard liquor to increase from 315 to more than 3,300. More consumption means more drunk driving, more underage drinking, and more crime. Using California’s rate of binge drinking as an example we can expect 40,000 more irresponsible drinkers in our state.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-1105 will allow the Liquor Control Board to focus on preventing underage drinking and overconsumption, and on making sure there isn’t an uncontrolled increase in the number of liquor stores.</td>
<td>I-1105 increases taxes. I-1105 repeals all state liquor taxes and directs the legislature to make up the difference with new taxes. That means more taxes on the middle class.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Washington State Initiative Measure 1107

**AS I-1107 APPEARS ON THE BALLOT: INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 1107**

concerns reversing certain 2010 amendments to state tax laws.

This measure would end sales tax on candy; end temporary sales tax on some bottled water; end temporary excise taxes on carbonated beverages; and reduce tax rates for certain food processors.

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

*Note to Voters: This Initiative contains a clause that relates Initiative 1107 to Referendum 52, as noted below in italics.*

**THE LAW AS IT PRESENTLY EXISTS**

In 2010, the legislature amended state law to charge sales tax on candy and bottled water, which had previously been exempt from the tax as food. Bottled water became subject to the sales tax effective June 1, 2010, and ending July 1, 2013. The legislature also enacted an amendment that the sales tax would continue to apply to bottled water after July 1, 2013, if the voters approve Referendum 52 at the November 2010 general election. See R-52 for more information.

In 2010, the legislature enacted an excise tax on the sale of certain carbonated beverages. The tax took effect July 1, 2010, and expires on July 1, 2013. The tax is calculated at the rate of 2 cents per 12 oz., and is collected once, either at the wholesale or retail level. The tax does not apply to the first ten million dollars of beverages sold in the state by any bottler.

The Business and Occupation Tax (B&O tax) is imposed on various business activities in the state, such as manufacturing, selling, or providing services. The rate of the tax varies, depending upon the type of activity in which the business engages. As a general rule, businesses engaged in manufacturing pay a tax at the rate of 0.484 percent of the value of the products they manufacture. Lower rates apply to some manufacturing activities. In 2010, the legislature amended the B&O tax so that a tax rate of 0.138% applies to the value of the manufactured perishable meat products and the general B&O tax rate of 0.484% applies to the value of the manufactured nonperishable meat products. In 2010, the legislature also granted a B&O tax exemption for manufactured fruit and vegetable products that contain only fruits, vegetables, or both. When the exemption expires on July 1, 2012, manufactured fruit and vegetable products will be taxed at the rate of 0.138% of the value of the manufactured product, rather than at the general rate of 0.484%.

**THE EFFECT OF THE PROPOSED MEASURE IF APPROVED**

The measure repeals the 2010 law applying the sales tax to candy, soda, and bottled water. The measure also repeals the law applying the sales tax to bottled water beginning June 1, 2010, and expiring July 1, 2013, and repeals the 2010 law providing that, if the voters approve Referendum Measure 52, the sales tax would continue after July 1, 2013.

The measure repeals the 2010 law enacting a temporary excise tax on carbonated beverages, and repeals the law that limits to perishable meat products at the 0.138% B&O tax rate. Also, the measure repeals the 2010 law that limits the B&O tax exemption relating to manufacturing fruit and vegetable products, and the law that limits a 0.138% B&O tax rate on manufacturing fruit and vegetable products applicable after the exemption expires in 2012.

**Fiscal Impact Statement:** Over 5 years, the General Fund revenue is reduced by $352 million and state performance audit revenue by $359,000. Revenue for local jurisdictions is reduced by $83
million over 5 years. Taxpayer noncompliance and confusion could result in additional state and local government revenue decreases up to $8.7 million and $1.8 million, respectively, in 2011. State costs to administer the tax revisions are an estimated $98,200 over 5 years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Those in favor say:</th>
<th>Those against say:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✷ I-1107 ends the taxes imposed on bottled water, soda, candy and certain processed foods. These taxes will potentially cost Washington consumers $300 million in higher grocery costs through food item sales taxes over the next three years.</td>
<td>✷ I-1107 removes $300 million worth of potential revenue from the general fund, which funds schools and other basic services. The state constitution names fully funding public schools as the state’s paramount responsibility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✷ A sales tax by its nature is not a progressive tax, and disproportionately affects middle and lower income families, who can least afford higher food bills. This is the fundamental reason the sales tax was removed from food by the legislature originally.</td>
<td>✷ This tax was created by imposing small, mostly temporary sales taxes on non-essential items like bottled water, gum, soda and candy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✷ Although the 2010 law taxing bottled water has an exemption for persons with no other clean water source, there is no exemption for those with questionable water sources, clean but bad-tasting water, or a need to carry sealed clean water for health reasons that do not fall within a serious medical condition.</td>
<td>✷ The taxes on candy and soda were a part of a balanced solution to the economic crisis, which included $4 in cuts for every $1 in new revenue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✷ The taxes collected are not dedicated to specific vital services in crisis due to the current economic situation. They go into the general fund to be spent as other general fund funds.</td>
<td>✷ Repealing these taxes now will mean returning to the legislature to enact more cuts necessary to balance the state budget this biennium</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Washington State Referendum Bill 52

AS R-52 APPEARS ON THE BALLOT: The legislature has passed Engrossed House Bill No. 2561, concerning authorizing and funding bonds for energy efficiency projects in schools.

This bill would authorize bonds to finance construction and repair projects increasing energy efficiency in public schools and higher education buildings, and continue the sales tax on bottled water otherwise expiring in 2013.

Should this bill be: ☐ Approved ☐ Rejected

Note to Voters: Initiative 1107 contains a clause regarding sales tax on bottled water that relates one of Referendum 52’s provisions to the passage or failure of Initiative 1107. For further information, please see the LWV Ballot Summary for Initiative 1107.

THE LAW AS IT PRESENTLY EXISTS

The state constitution limits the amount of money the state can borrow, except for debt approved by the voters.

In 2010, the sales tax was extended to bottled water, which had previously been exempted as a grocery item. In the existing law, the sales tax on bottled water will expire July 1, 2013.

THE EFFECT OF THE PROPOSED MEASURE IF APPROVED

R-52 would extend the sales tax on bottled water beyond July 1, 2013 and approve the state’s issuance of general obligation bonds, up to $505 million, to improve energy efficiency in public schools and in higher education buildings.

Grants to public schools and colleges would be awarded in competitive rounds, with at least 5% of the money awarded to small public school districts with fewer than 1000 students. Each project would be weighted, based on: (a) the availability of non-state money to assist in funding the project; (b) the energy savings to be achieved by the project; and (c) how quickly the project could be ready to proceed. The dollar amounts awarded for each project would be determined in order to fund the maximum number of projects with the greatest energy and cost benefit. Only 85% of projects for which applications are submitted could be funded in each round, until the last round.

This measure amends state law to remove the July 13, 2013 expiration date for the sales tax on purchases of bottled water.

Fiscal Impact Statement: Referendum 52 authorizes the issuance of $505 million in state general obligation bonds. Twenty-nine-year debt service costs are estimated at $937 million, for an average annual state cost of $32.3 million. Other costs are estimated to be $2.2 million annually through 2015. The sales tax on bottled water increases revenues $39.8 million annually and increases local government revenues $14.9 million annually.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Those in favor say:</th>
<th>Those against say:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Our kids deserve safe, healthy learning environments. But too many of our school buildings are aging and dilapidated. Many are riddled with mold, lead, asbestos and other toxins, which may be addressed as part of these projects.</td>
<td>Already, state government’s debt per person is nearly twice the national average. Debt service has grown faster than education spending; R-52 exacerbates the problem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referendum 52 will create $505 million in bonding capacity dedicated to repairing public school and college buildings across the state. Taxpayers will save an estimated $130 million annually in energy costs.</td>
<td>Debt expenses consume 84% more taxpayer dollars now than 12 years ago, reaching $1.8 billion in the 2010 budget. Debt service costs more than the Department of Corrections, the University of Washington, Washington State University or state parks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New improvements mean new jobs. Last year over 105,000 jobs were lost in Washington State. Repairing our aging school buildings will create 30,000 new construction jobs. Every school district will benefit, which will bring new employment opportunities to every community across Washington State.</td>
<td>Although the 2010 law taxing bottled water has an exemption for persons with no other clean water source, there is no exemption for those with questionable water sources, clean but bad-tasting water, or a need to carry sealed clean water for health reasons that do not fall within a serious medical condition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-52 sidesteps constitutional debt limit that protects taxpayers. R-52 authorizes debt outside the Article 8, Section 1 constitutional limit. This is unwise and unnecessary.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Engrossed Substitute House Joint Resolution 4220

BALLOT TITLE: The legislature has proposed a constitutional amendment on denying bail for persons charged with certain criminal offenses.

This amendment would authorize courts to deny bail for offenses punishable by the possibility of life in prison, on clear and convincing evidence of a propensity for violence that would likely endanger persons.

Should this constitutional amendment be: □ Approved   □ Rejected

THE CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISION AS IT PRESENTLY EXISTS:

The constitution currently provides that all persons charged with crimes are entitled to be released pending trial upon posting bail by sufficient sureties. When the charged person posts sufficient bail, he or she is released from custody pending a trial.

The constitutional provision has been implemented by court rules. A court may require bail to support a promise that the person charged will appear for trial, or require bail to assure that the charged person complies with release conditions imposed by the court. The court may impose release conditions where there is a substantial danger that the charged person will commit a violent crime, seek to intimidate witnesses, or otherwise unlawfully interfere with the administration of justice.

The class of cases in which bail currently may be denied under the constitution as it presently exists is capital offenses “when the proof is evident or the presumption is great.” A “capital offense” is an offense for which the death penalty may be imposed if the person charged is convicted. Under court rules, a person charged with a capital offense shall not be released on bail unless the court finds that release conditions will reasonably assure that the accused will appear for trial, will not significantly interfere with the administration of justice, and will not pose a substantial danger to others. In capital cases, the court may detain the charged person for trial, without bail.

THE EFFECT OF THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT IF APPROVED:

The proposed constitutional amendment would authorize courts to deny bail in an additional class of cases—offenses punishable by the possibility of life in prison—where there is a showing by clear and convincing evidence of a propensity for violence that creates a substantial likelihood of danger to the community or any persons. The legislature would have authority to set limitations on the denial of bail in these cases.

Fiscal Impact Statement: No significant fiscal impact; No statement required to be prepared by the state.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Those in favor say:</th>
<th>Those against say:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>➡️ The Washington State Constitution currently permits a judge to deny bail only if a suspect is charged</td>
<td>➡️ Our state constitution has served our state well for 120 years, and we should not alter it without</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with a capital offense, i.e. a crime that is punishable by death. The only capital offense currently in</td>
<td>careful consideration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington State law is aggravated murder, although that could be changed by the legislature at a future</td>
<td>➡️ HJR 4220 is hasty and ill-considered, unfairly allowing for the indeterminate detention of individuals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>date.</td>
<td>who may be innocent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➡️ ESHJR 4220 broadens the criteria for denying bail to include persons charged with crimes potentially</td>
<td>➡️ We should not rush to change a fundamental constitutional protection—the right to be presumed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>punishable by life in prison, when the suspect is considered extremely dangerous to public safety.</td>
<td>innocent—in response to a single tragedy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➡️ The amendment does not take away civil liberties such as the right to bail for most suspects, the</td>
<td>➡️ The Washington State Constitution currently permits a judge to deny bail only if a suspect is charged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>right to a speedy trial or the presumption of innocence.</td>
<td>with a capital offense.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➡️ This amendment gives judges the flexibility to keep the potentially most dangerous suspects behind</td>
<td>➡️ However, very high rates of bail may be set for other extremely dangerous criminals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bars while awaiting trial, in order to avoid exposing the public to the potential harm these offenders can</td>
<td>➡️ This is very much a civil rights issue. Individuals charged with but not convicted of crimes usually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cause.</td>
<td>have a chance to post bail before trial. This is an important protection—mistakes happen in our system,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➡️ Judges currently must set bail based only upon flight risk.</td>
<td>and those charged with crimes are often found innocent or convicted of much lesser crimes. An innocent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➡️ Some recent instances of violent crimes committed by persons free on bail awaiting trial might have</td>
<td>person should not be incarcerated for a period of time without access to due process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>been avoided if the judge could have denied bail based on the offender’s potential danger to the</td>
<td>➡️ Our current system already requires judges to consider public safety, criminal activity and flight risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>community.</td>
<td>in setting conditions, and we should improve our system to ensure that judges receive the most</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>complete information to prevent future tragedies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➡️ This amendment goes too far, giving judges the power to detain more innocent people without bail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>purely on speculation that the accused may be dangerous, which is essentially a presumption of guilt.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Senate Joint Resolution 8225

BALLOT TITLE: The legislature has proposed a constitutional amendment concerning the limitation on state debt.

This amendment would require the state to reduce the interest accounted for in calculating the constitutional debt limit, by the amount of federal payments scheduled to be received to offset that interest.

Should this constitutional amendment be: □ Approved □ Rejected

THE CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISION AS IT PRESENTLY EXISTS:

The state constitution sets a limit on the combined total debt the state may assume. The combined total debt cannot exceed an amount for which the payments of principal and interest in any fiscal year exceed nine percent of the average general state revenues for the previous three fiscal years. “General state revenues” are defined to include all money received by the state treasury from any source, with certain exceptions.

THE EFFECT OF THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT IF APPROVED:

The proposed amendment would not change the constitutional debt limit. It would modify the annual calculation used to determine the state’s debt.

The amendment would require the state, in annually calculating the amount required for payment of interest on its general obligation debt, to subtract scheduled federal payments to be received each year against bonds, notes, or other evidences of indebtedness. Under the constitution, the debt the state may issue is based in part on the total amount of the state’s annual principal and interest payments. Therefore, subtraction of federal payments credited against interest on the debt could affect the amount of aggregate debt that the state may incur.

Those in favor say:

- This measure does not change the state’s constitutional debt limit. It would not obligate the state or federal government to more debt.
- This constitutional amendment will reduce the cost to state taxpayers by reducing the net interest rate paid on General Obligation Bonds issued by the state.
- The federal government has changed the way it subsidizes interest rates for bonds issued by state and local governments. This amendment changes the definition of “interest” in our state constitution, to make state General Obligation Bonds eligible for this new federal subsidy. With this amendment, the state’s constitutional debt limit would be calculated by using the “net” interest paid (after federal reimbursement) rather than the current “full” interest amount paid.
- At present, state transportation bonds and local government bonds are eligible for – and are using – this benefit. Last October the state used these bonds to borrow money for transportation projects, and we saved $63 million.
- If our state could do the same with state General Obligation Bonds, it is estimated that Washington State could save taxpayers more than $100 million during the next two years alone.

Those against say:

- The state constitution limits the general obligation debt by restricting the treasurer’s authority to issue bonds exceeding nine percent of the average general state revenue for the preceding three years. The treasurer issues debt limit bonds to finance capital projects and sells bonds twice a year to cover expected payments on construction projects.
- SJR 8225 would amend our constitution to allow the interest calculation on debt used to determine the debt limit, by subtracting federal subsidies.
- If approved, SJR 8225 would allow the treasurer to take on more debt. The state of Washington is in the midst of a budget crisis. Now is not the time to run the risk of over-extending the state’s credit.
- The state’s constitutional debt limit protects the integrity of our economy by preventing the state from borrowing more than it can reasonably pay back. Any changes to this could challenge the integrity of our state’s economy.
- Adding too much debt could have a devastating effect on the rest of Washington’s investments and place enormous financial burdens on taxpayers and their children.
### Unit Meetings

#### OCTOBER UNIT INFORMATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Email</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Monday, Oct. 11</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FIRST HILL</strong> — Jeannette Kahlenberg</td>
<td>10:00 a.m.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:kahlenb@gmail.com">kahlenb@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>(206) 329-4848</td>
<td></td>
<td>Horizon House, 900 University St., Sky Lounge,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mary Margaret Pruitt, hostess</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CAPITOL HILL/MONTLAKE</strong> — Jan O’Connor/Zita Cook</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:oconnor.js@gmail.com">oconnor.js@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>(206) 329-4848</td>
<td>7:15 p.m.</td>
<td>Vicky Downs, 909 E. Newton #D9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tuesday, Oct. 12</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BELLEVUE</strong> — Bonnie Rimawi</td>
<td></td>
<td>10:00 a.m.</td>
<td>Bellevue Public Library, Rm. 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:bonnierim@aol.com">bonnierim@aol.com</a></td>
<td>(206) 329-4848</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WEST SEATTLE DAY</strong> — Ethel Williams/Hazel Schiffer</td>
<td>12:30 p.m.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Kenney Presbyterian Home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:Hazelms@drizzle.com">Hazelms@drizzle.com</a></td>
<td>(206) 329-4848</td>
<td></td>
<td>715 Fauntleroy Way SW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WEST SEATTLE EVE</strong> — Barbara O’Steen</td>
<td></td>
<td>7:00 p.m.</td>
<td>Pat Lane, 2414 Prescott Ave SW,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:barbarajosteen@yahoo.com">barbarajosteen@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>(206) 329-4848</td>
<td></td>
<td>(206) 932-1578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wednesday, Oct. 13</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>VIEW RIDGE</strong> — Gail Winberg</td>
<td></td>
<td>12:45 p.m.</td>
<td>Gail Winberg, 6004 NE 60th St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:winbergeng@q.com">winbergeng@q.com</a></td>
<td>(206) 524-7801</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>QUEEN ANNE/MAGNOLIA/BALLARD EVE.</strong> — Karen Adair</td>
<td>7:30 p.m.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Elsie Simon, 2554 30th West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:adairk@seanet.com">adairk@seanet.com</a></td>
<td>(206) 329-4848</td>
<td></td>
<td>(206) 283-6297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SOUTHWEND</strong> — Marian Wolfe/Susan Jones</td>
<td>7:30 p.m.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Baker Community Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:hedgwolfe@aol.com">hedgwolfe@aol.com</a></td>
<td>(206) 329-4848</td>
<td></td>
<td>2811 Mt. Rainier Drive S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:susan@monckjones.com">susan@monckjones.com</a></td>
<td>(206) 329-4848</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Thursday, Oct. 14</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MERcer ISLAND</strong> — Lucy Copass/Cynthia Howe</td>
<td>9:15 a.m.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mercer Island Presbyterian Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:lucyco@speakeasy.org">lucyco@speakeasy.org</a></td>
<td>(206) 329-4848</td>
<td></td>
<td>3605 84th Ave. SE, Mercer Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:howe.john@comcast.net">howe.john@comcast.net</a></td>
<td>(206) 329-4848</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ISSAQUAH DAY</strong> — Margaret Austin</td>
<td>10:00 a.m.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Issaquah City Hall &amp; Police</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:Margaret.Austin@comcast.net">Margaret.Austin@comcast.net</a></td>
<td>(206) 329-4848</td>
<td></td>
<td>130 E. Sunset Way, Coho Room (Upstairs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNIVERSITY HOUSE</strong> — Charles and Nancy Perkins</td>
<td>10:00 a.m.</td>
<td></td>
<td>University House, 4400 Stone Way North</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:perkwz@msn.com">perkwz@msn.com</a></td>
<td>(206) 329-4848</td>
<td></td>
<td>Auditorium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SHORELINE</strong> — Juliet Beard</td>
<td>4:30 p.m.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Richmond Beach Congregational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:juliet@windermere.com">juliet@windermere.com</a></td>
<td>(206) 329-4848</td>
<td></td>
<td>Church, NW 195th St &amp; 15th Ave NW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Thursday, Oct. 14</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>KIRKLAND/REDMOND</strong> — Sheila Hoff</td>
<td>(206) 329-4848</td>
<td>7:00 p.m.</td>
<td>Liv Grohn, 338 10th Ave., Kirkland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(425) 828-9445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>NORTH CENTRAL</strong> — Jan Orlando</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:orlanre@aol.com">orlanre@aol.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(206) 329-4848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7:30 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5026 36th Ave. NE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Friday, Oct. 15</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BAYVIEW</strong> — Peg Williams</td>
<td>(206) 329-4848</td>
<td>10:00 a.m.</td>
<td>Bayview Retirement Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Saturday, Oct. 16</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BALLARD/MAGNOLIA/QUEEN ANNE DAY</strong> — Kerry Peterson</td>
<td>(206) 329-4848</td>
<td>11:00 a.m.</td>
<td>Magnolia Library, 2801 34th Ave W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wednesday, Oct. 20</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N. KING COUNTY</strong> - Marjorie Hawkes/Raelene Gold</td>
<td>(206) 329-4848</td>
<td>9:30 a.m.</td>
<td>Lake Forest Park, Third Place Books</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:mshawkesis@gmail.com">mshawkesis@gmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:raelene@seanet.com">raelene@seanet.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(206) 329-4848</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17171 NE Bothell Way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NORTH END AFTERNOON</strong> — Helen St. John</td>
<td>(206) 329-4848</td>
<td>12:30 p.m.</td>
<td>Call Helen St. John for location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:hbstjohn@gmail.com">hbstjohn@gmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Board & Committee Contacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Executive Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009–2011</td>
<td>President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1st V.P. Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009–2011</td>
<td>2nd V.P. Membership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009–2011</td>
<td>3rd V.P.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009–2011</td>
<td>4th V.P. Voter Editor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009–2011</td>
<td>Treasurer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010–2012</td>
<td>Secretary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Directors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010–2012</td>
<td>Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010–2012</td>
<td>Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010–2012</td>
<td>Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010–2012</td>
<td>Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010–2012</td>
<td>Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010–2012</td>
<td>Director</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Education Fund Board</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009–2011</td>
<td>Co-President/Treasurer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009–2011</td>
<td>Co-President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009–2011</td>
<td>Secretary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010–2012</td>
<td>Director</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Off-Board Positions**

*CIS Coordinator*  
Cynthia Howe  
(206) 329-4848  
howe.john@comcast.net

**Committees**

*Civics Education*  
Dana Twight  
(206) 329-4848  
dctwight@mac.com

*Economics & Taxation*  
Nora Leech  
(206) 329-4848  
nleech2002@yahoo.com

*Education*  
Lucy Gaskill-Gaddis  
(206) 329-4848  
terrylucy2u@comcast.net

*Social Justice Committee*  
Jayne Freitag  
(206) 329-4848  
mjafreitag@comcast.net

*Kathleen Randall*  
(206) 329-4848  
kathleenr8@gmail.com

*Immigration*  
Barbara Reid  
(206) 329-4848  
barbereid@yahoo.com

*Barbara Yasui*  
(206) 329-4848  
daruma52@msn.com

*International Relations*  
Ellen Berg  
(206) 329-4848  
ellenberg@msn.com

*Land Use*  
Karen Kane  
(206) 329-4848  
kanek@iopener.net

*Reclaimed Water Study Committee*  
Denise Smith  
(206) 329-4848  
issaquahsmith@msn.com

*Transportation*  
Janet Winans  
(206) 329-4848  
janetwinans@earthlink.net
General Election Ballot Issues

Seattle First Baptist Church
1111 Harvard Ave. (Harvard & Seneca) Seattle
Thursday, October 7
7:30 p.m.
- King County Proposition 1 and Charter Amendments
- Seattle School District Proposition 1
- State Initiatives 1100 and 1105

St. Andrew’s Lutheran Church
2650 148th Ave SE Bellevue
Wednesday, October 13
7:00 p.m.
- State Initiatives 1053, 1082, 1098 and 1107
- Referendum 52
- Constitutional Amendment ESHJR 4220

All forums are open to the public.