The International Relations Committee recognizes that it may be helpful to have some of the League positions in mind as we evaluate candidates running for public office in the upcoming election. We therefore offer this information as a valuable resource for your consideration. Please remember that the presidential foreign policy debate will be held October 22 from 6:00-7:30 p.m. PDT.

What follows are excerpts from five policy positions under the heading “International Relations” adopted by the League of Women Voters of the United States (LWVUS). The full text, along with brief accounts of the League’s history writing, updating, and using the positions is found in the League publication Impact on Issues: 2010-2012. For ease of reading and space, ellipses to indicate omitted text are not included.

**United Nations**
The LWVUS supports a strong, effective United Nations and endorses the full and active participation of the United States in the UN system. The League supports UN efforts to:
- Promote international peace and security;
- Advance the social and economic well-being of the world’s people;
- Ensure respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms;
- Foster trust and cooperation among nations by encouraging adherence to conventions, treaties, and other international agreements;
- Protect the integrity of the world’s environment;
- Achieve the full and equal participation of women in all aspects of civil and political life.

The United Nations should be an important component of U.S. foreign policy. The United States should work actively and constructively within the UN system [and] should not place conditions on its participation in the United Nations, except in cases such as flagrant violations of the Charter. The United States should meet its financial obligations to the UN on time, in full, and without conditions.

**Trade**
The [LWVUS] supports a liberal U.S. trade policy aimed at reducing trade barriers and expanding international trade. Such a policy helps foster international cooperation, democratic values, and economic prosperity at home and abroad as well as benefiting consumers through lowered prices, expanded choice, and improved products and (continued on page 18)
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Connecting with Judy

VOTER SERVICE AND ADVOCACY

Yes, we CAN walk and chew gum at the same time. While we are busy providing information for the November 6 general election, we have also been engaged with another aspect of our mission—action and advocacy.

For the primary election, we provided summaries of three ballot issues. This is part of our Voter Service, non-partisan efforts. After consideration of the issues, the Board endorsed both the King County levy to construct a new, more humane juvenile justice center and the Seattle levy for the support of the library. Our letter to the editor supporting these levies was printed in the Seattle Times. I’m proud that our advocacy was part of the conversation. This is an example of our role as advocates of issues on which the board believes we have relevant, adequate, established positions.

For the general election, we are providing ballot issue summaries on the Seattle seawall bond issue and the King County AFIS (automated fingerprint identification system) as well as state issues. We will be holding two forums on ballot issues. On October 4th we will cover six state issues – marriage equality, charter schools and four more esoteric issues. We will also include the Seattle seawall levy which the Board decided to endorse at our September 8 meeting. On October 9 we will move to Seattle University for our “crime night.” We will address the marijuana and fingerprint issues as well as the candidates for sheriff.

I’m also proud of two other actions that we have been engaged in. Washington State Parks has been asked to become self-supporting and to operate without general fund monies. We think this is a prime example of privatization of a public good. We wrote a letter to State Parks, and with great cooperation from LWVWA wrote testimony that I presented at the Washington State Parks Commission meeting in Wenatchee. We called for substantial public funding of state parks and avoidance of the commercialization of the parks. It will be up to the legislature to find some funding. Ask candidates running for office whether they support public funding of parks and encourage them to do so. Thanks especially to Cynthia Howe, from our League, and Linnea Hirst and Raelene Gold, from State League, for their work on this issue.

We are working to improve the fate of unused prescription drugs. This is both a human health and water quality issue. There has been difficulty getting legislation passed at the state level, but the King County Health Department has decided to take this on. The State League lobbyist and Elizabeth Davis, a long-time League environmentalist, sought Seattle-King County LWV representation on a coalition providing input into the new policies. We signed a fine letter from this coalition outlining desirable policies. Our long-time leaguer with expertise in the health field, Helen St. John, has agreed to represent us on this coalition. I think we can be certain that the harm from these drugs will be lessened.

Please go to our website or see my column from last month to find resources to help you vote, such as VOTE411.org. Also, study the ballot issues in this Voter and attend the October forums. Attend a unit meeting where you can discuss the issues and be better prepared to cast an informed vote. And watch us doing Voter Service and Advocacy. Like walking and chewing gum, we can do both.

Judy Bevington, President
League of Women Voters of Seattle-King County
## 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>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Board Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>League Drinks 5:30pm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Forum: Ballot Issues 7:00pm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Transportation Committee Meeting 10:00am</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Nov. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELECTION DAY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Financial Reform Luncheon 11:30am - 2:00pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Units meet during shaded period)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### OCTOBER

**International Relations Committee**
- **Monday, October 1**
  - 12:45p.m.
  - League Office

**League Drinks**
- **Thursday, October 4**
  - 5:30p.m.
  - Jimmy's
  - 1100 Broadway, Seattle

**Ballot Issues Forum**
- **Thursday, October 4**
  - 7:00p.m.
  - Seattle First Baptist Church
  - 1111 Harvard Ave, Seattle

**Board Meeting**
- **Saturday, October 6**
  - 9:00a.m.
  - League Office

**Voter Deadline**
- **Monday, October 8**

**Ballot Issues Forum**
- **Tuesday, October 9**
  - 7:00p.m.
  - Wyckoff Auditorium
  - Seattle University
  - 12th & Columbia

**Transportation Committee**
- **Tuesday, October 16**
  - 10:00a.m.
  - League Office

**Economics and Taxation Committee Meeting**
- **Saturday, October 27**
  - 9:00a.m.
  - 909 E Newton, Unit D

**Board Meeting**
- **Saturday, November 3**
  - 9:00a.m.
  - League Office

**Financial Reform at the Crossroads**
- **Saturday, November 10**
  - 11:30 a.m. to 2:00 p.m.
  - Town Hall, Downstairs
  - 8th and Seneca
The League of Women Voters of Seattle-King County (LWVS-KC) presents a public forum most months between September 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 and times. The tentative schedule of upcoming forums for 2012-2013 appears at left; check your Voter each month or the LWVS-KC website, seattlelwv.org, for up-to-date information.

This month there will be two forums. The first will be on Thursday, October 4, at 7:00 p.m. at the First Baptist Church, 1111 Harvard Avenue, Seattle. Our topic is “Ballot Issues” and speakers will address the following ballot issues on this night: same-sex marriage, the seawall bond, charter schools, taxation, and four other resolutions. On Tuesday, October 9, we will continue the discussion in Wyckoff Auditorium at Seattle University, where speakers will take up the topics of marijuana legalization and the AFIS fingerprinting levy and candidates for sheriff will address the gathering.

Board Briefs by Joanna Cullen

*The Board of the League of Women Voters of Seattle-King County met on Saturday, September 8, 2012. This is a summary of their work.*

Unit Coordinator Lindsay Cummings reported that the Unit Leaders’ meeting and dinner provided a great opportunity for her to get to know the local units and for them to meet and get to know her and some of the other Board members. There will be further discussion of needed support for individual units. Lindsay also reported that the League Drinks group that meets before the forums is fun and continues to grow. She will also be reporting on her experience with the Member Leadership Development program which is sponsored by the LWVUS.

Development Chair Ginna Owens reported on the planned luncheon event for November 10, which replaces the event originally planned for November 11, and gave a breakdown of projected costs and expenses. She will need to fill 25 tables of 8 guests. Board and member participation will be required to make this a success. Mary Jo Vigil will work to obtain sponsorships for the event. The Economics and Taxation Committee will be helping to plan the program which will address needed finance reform.

Voter Services Co-Chairs Cyndi Woods and Julie Kempf reported that this is a very busy time. Cyndi requested further volunteers for the Speakers’ Bureau and Julie Kempf was still gathering information for the ballot summaries that the League produces for every election. Beatrice Crane, Joanna Cullen, and Janet Winans were appointed to the reading committee for the ballot summaries. The Board also made the decision...
to return a small voter registration grant that we received from LWVUS. The required reporting activities were inconsistent with our past practice of not collecting information from the registration forms. This, along with the very time consuming process required for reporting activities led the Board to vote to refuse the grant. This should free up some time for Cyndi Woods to devote to some important local activities. She could especially use some volunteers from the Eastside to help with a high school voter registration drive.

Two forums are planned. The first will include Charter Schools (I-1240), Marriage Equality (R-74), Tax Increase Requirements (I-1185), the Seattle Seawall Levy, and four other statewide measures. The second will include candidates for King County Sheriff, Marijuana Legalization (I-502), and King County AFIS (fingerprint system) Levy.

The League is again partnering with the Seattle Times and its Newspapers in Education program to present League-produced civics education materials on the 2012 presidential election. It will run biweekly, Tuesday and Thursday, beginning September 25 and ending October 18. In 2008, this program reached tens of thousands of students, and thanks to additional financial support from the LWVWA it will be available again.

Members congratulated Action Chair Ellen Barton, Program Chair Karen Adair, and the Social Justice Committee on the successful and engaging forum held at Town Hall on drug policy. Beatrice Crane reported that the compilation reports for the LWVWA Conservation District Study will be ready well before the deadline.

The Board noted that the LWVS-KC office lease is up at the end of July 2013 and that a decision regarding renewing or finding new space will have to be made.

The Board confirmed logistics of communications with each other and the membership. A weekly Constant Contact e-mail is sent to all members.

The League also signed on to become a co-sponsor of the United Nations Association “In a Just World” event on October 23.

The Board endorsed a “yes” vote on the City of Seattle Proposition 1, General Obligation Bonds - $290,000,000 (Alaskan Way Seawall). All agreed that Seattle’s deteriorating seawall is critical for public safety as well as transportation and the economic well-being of the entire area.

---

Mission Statement

The League of Women Voters of Seattle-King County, 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.
Committees

All-Mail Ballot Study Committee
The committee is not meeting during our busy election season but we are still looking for interested people to join the team! To include the presidential year data, we will be reporting in April 2013. For more info, leave a message at the Seattle League office 206-329-4848, or please contact chair Julie Anne Kempf via email at: julie@kempf.com.

Economics and Taxation Committee
DATE: SATURDAY, OCTOBER 27
TIME: 9:00 A.M. - NOON
PLACE: 909 E NEWTON, #D-9

Education Committee
The committee is not meeting at the moment as some members work on the Newspapers in Education “E lecting the President” series for classroom use this fall and others are working on the opposition to the charter schools initiative. The committee is looking for interested new members to join the group.

International Relations Committee
DATE: MONDAY, OCTOBER 1
TIME: 12:45 P.M. - 2:45 P.M.
PLACE: LEAGUE OFFICE

Land Use/ Waterfront Committee
The committee is on a brief hiatus while awaiting the outcome of the seawall levy.

Transportation Committee
DATE: TUESDAY, OCTOBER 16
TIME: 10:00 A.M. - NOON
PLACE: LEAGUE OFFICE

Social Justice committee
TO BE ANNOUNCED

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

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

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

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

**VOTE411.org**

Check out the League of Women Voters Education Fund website, VOTE411.org, for invaluable information on elections throughout the United States, including county-by-county resources that will help you answer many questions. You'll find a local election office finder, a voter registration tool, information about candidates and ballot measures, a printable personalized sample ballot, and much more. Note: not all states or local areas are participating.

Pass the word about VOTE411 to your friends, relatives, co-workers, neighbors, and anyone else you meet who needs voter information.

---

2012 “Electing the President” Series

Watch for the Seattle Times series presenting civics education materials on the presidential election. The League of Women Voters of Washington has provided some financial support for the eight-installment series which is designed around materials provided by the League. The series began on September 25 and runs on Tuesdays and Thursdays until October 18. Be sure to share this information with any first-time voters you may know!

Thank you to League members Kelly Powers, Beatrice Crane, and Becky Cox and to Diane Brady of the Seattle Times for making this project happen.
A huge conflict interrupted our plans for a November 11 fund raising event. Not easily defeated, we went back to the drawing board and invite you to join us at Town Hall on Saturday, November 10 for another offering in the LWV’s popular Hot Topic Luncheon Series.

Digging Out from 2008
WHAT’S NEXT!

The LWV of Seattle-King County Presents Its
Making Democracy Work Luncheon

Financial Reform at the Crossroads

11:30 - 2:00, Saturday, November 10, 2012 -- Town Hall Downstairs

featuring a keynote address by
Edward M. Young, former Managing Director, Moody Investors Services

And presentation of
2012 Making Democracy Work Awards for Public Leadership and Youth Achievement.

Registration, Raffle, and Mimosa reception begins at 11:30. Be there or be square: Invite nine friends and be a Table Captain.

Tickets are priced at $75, and can be purchased on-line at www.seattlelwv.org. Purchase a table of ten for $700. Various sponsor levels are also available. Checks should be made payable to LWVS-KC and mailed to 1620 18th Ave #101, Seattle, WA 98122.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual and elected official sponsorships</th>
<th>Business and corporate sponsorships</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(In addition to grateful recognition from the LWVS-KC, all sponsors receive one seat for each $500 donation)
Action

Local Ballot Measures

The Seattle Seawall Bond Measure: SUPPORT

The Board of the League of Women Voters of Seattle-King County, at an endorsement meeting September 8, voted to support the bond levy for the Alaskan Way Seawall project. This authorizes the City to issue general obligation bonds to pay a portion of the costs related to the design, construction, renovation, improvement, and replacement of the seawall and associated public infrastructure.

Our Central Waterfront Committee Chair Jan O’Connor recommended passage and the Board voted unanimously to support the project based on an array of supportive local League positions, including those related to economic development, land use, funding mechanisms for capital improvement projects, health and safety, and natural resources. For instance, we support measures to enhance the economy, including improving the transportation and infrastructure systems, as well as using general obligation bonds to fund long-term capital improvements.

The King County AFIS Levy: The League is not taking a position on this measure.

State Ballot Measures

Referendum 74: APPROVE

Initiative 1185: OPPOSE

Initiative 1240: OPPOSE

The state League has not taken a position on the remaining ballot measures.
Dear Council Members,

The League of Women Voters of Seattle-King County is in favor of the two proposals for limiting campaign finance expenditures. Our democratic processes are being undermined by the undue influence of money on campaigns. These proposals would help Seattle to level the playing field in our local elections. Limiting the time period for soliciting or accepting campaign contributions, and capping the amount of surplus rollover are both steps in the right direction. Separating policy-making from fund-raising and limiting the advantage of incumbency are benefits.

The League believes that the methods of financing political campaigns should ensure the public’s right to know, combat corruption and undue influence, enable candidates to compete more equitably for public office and allow maximum citizen participation in the political process. Please support these two regulatory changes presented by the Seattle Ethics and Elections Commission.

Sincerely,

Judy Bevington,
President
Voter Service

Voter Registration--
I can sure tell it’s a presidential election year. We are helping register voters in a myriad of ways this year. We’re supporting high school seniors in Seattle and Bellevue who are trying to make sure all eligible students in their schools are registered in time to vote this November. We continue to register library patrons in Federal Way and support two local community health clinics that have voter registration corners set up in the waiting rooms. We are also visiting a number of community groups who have asked us to help them register voters.

I thank all the volunteers who are so willing to get out in the community and go to the schools to register voters.

Speakers Bureau--
I repeat, I can sure tell it’s a presidential election year! Our Speakers Bureau volunteers are going out to all corners of the county to describe the up-coming ballot measures. We’re also providing moderators for local candidate forums in many different neighborhoods.

The League is trusted to provide unbiased information and help voters discuss issues from all sides respectfully. Voters are so appreciative of this voter service work we do. I hear over and over again how much voters value our ballot measures information.

If you’re interested in volunteering in any of these areas, give a call to the office and leave a message for me. I’d love to hear from you.

Cyndi Woods
Voter Services Co-chair

A huge Thank You to Cyndi Woods, Julie Anne Kempf, and all our great voter services volunteers!

This election season has been frenetic with tons of calls and requests fielded by our CIS (reception) desk volunteers. During the two months of September and October alone we are scheduled for over 30 voter registration, speakers bureau, and/or forum events. It takes a lot of grace and skill to respond to, schedule, coordinate, and fill all these requests. Kudos to all who are participating.
Forums and more Forums!

In addition to our annual ballot issues forum on the first Thursday of October, we’re holding a second one the following Tuesday because there’s just so much to cover. For details, check the President’s Message on page 3 or the back cover.

Other opportunities to learn about candidates and the issues this fall include a series of debates organized by the state League in cooperation with KCTS 9. They are airing at 1:00 p.m. and the current schedule is:

- I-502 (Marijuana) and Secretary of State: Monday, October 1
- I-1240 (Charter Schools): Monday, October 15
- 1st/6th/10th Congressional Districts: Monday, October 22

but be sure to check online as things can change. You can also watch past debates on the KCTS 9 website: www.kcts9.org.

- R-74 (Same-Sex Marriage) and I-1185 (Taxes)
- Lieutenant Governor
- Washington Secretary of State
- Washington Supreme Court

League member Kim Peterson has been helping the Sunset Hill Community Association organize a Candidates Forum for the 36th Legislative District. Position 1: Reuven Carlyle and Leslie Klein. Position 2: Noel Frame and Gael Tarleton. The event is open to the public.

Tuesday, Oct 23 at 7 p.m. - 9 p.m.
Sunset Hill Community Association
3003 NW 66th St
Seattle, WA 98117
SHCA contact: info@sunsethillcommunity.org; 206-784-2927

There’s also a possible 46th Legislative District candidates forum being planned by the Lake Forest Park unit. Check the office or the website for more information.
HELP RECRUIT NEW MEMBERS

You, our members, are our best sales people when it comes to getting new members to join the League. Believe it or not, some people think you have to be invited to join! You know that’s not true, but it’s still one of the best ways to get someone to sign up. Now is the perfect time to showcase all the good work they can be a part of. Tout the candidate forums we put on, the voter registration and information we provide, and the ballot issues research we do. Members learn a lot about the political process and you don’t have to be an expert to join; it’s being in League that turns you into one!

NEW MEMBERS

We are delighted to welcome several new members in recent months. Some of our new members are shy and prefer not to give a bio, and sometimes it takes a couple of months to get it to print, but if we’ve left you out please accept our apologies and let us know!

Barbara Miller, retired attorney, is ready to “get back in the game” and looks to the League of Women Voters for interaction with others on issues of mutual concern. She hopes to contribute to a forum for educating youth and adults on social and political issues.

Barbara received her B.A. in Justice, Morality, and Constitutional Democracy from the James Madison College at Michigan State University. She continued her studies earning a J.D. from Gonzaga University School of Law. Barbara has been a volunteer with the Seattle Cancer Care Alliance and served on the board of Genesis House, a residential substance abuse treatment facility. She has a passionate interest in civics education.

Lisa Unsoeld-Chang relocated to Seattle in 2007 from Austin, Texas, to join a larger community that valued the environment, civil discourse, and social justice. A professional development officer by trade, she hopes to lend her voice and experience to raising the profile of the League of Women Voters. New though she is, Lisa has already been elected to serve on the board of the LWV Seattle-King County Education Fund.

Cindy Gutierrez Sjblom, born in Toppenish, Washington, was the first in her large family to go to college. She graduated from the University of Washington with a degree in political science and went on to earn an MA in psychology from Antioch. Cindy said she was inspired to pursue graduate studies after attending graduation ceremonies for her friend Celia Kennedy, friend of League member Laura Weese. Another important mentor is her aunt, Phyllis Gutierrez Kenney, who has served many years in the state legislature.

Cindy says with enthusiasm that she is a grassroots activist who puts her word processor to work communicating with people in leadership positions on causes she is passionate about. She also works with the National Hispanic Media Coalition to fight racism.

Cindy works with her husband in the real estate business. She is very proud of her sons Patrick, who just finished film school and will begin an internship in Los Angeles, and his younger brother Ricky, who is on a national pro golf tour that feeds promising youngsters into the PGA.

After earning a BA in English from Northwestern University, Amanda Clark became a textbook editor for Scott Foresman and later a technical editor for Microsoft. She has been a community activist on school funding and neighborhood issues. She chaired Friends of Burbank Park on Mercer Island.

Amanda has friends who have been League members and knows she can look forward to study and analysis of local and national political, environmental, and educational issues. She thinks she may be able to offer her skills at editing and desktop publishing to further League’s goals.

Eunice H. Nammacher taught in Seattle Public Schools from 1962 through 1999 and still works part time as a tester for student placement. She says she has strong opinions about education, especially regarding the value of smaller schools.

Eunice, a watercolor artist, works out of a Georgetown studio and has a business, Water Color Creations. She travels to Europe each year to paint and visit a daughter who lives in England. Another grown daughter was
adopted from Korea when she was seven months old. Eunice is interested in politics and reads prodigiously, especially history. She also belongs to a book group. She looks to the League to expand her knowledge of current events.

Canadian by birth and upbringing, **Alene Morris** says she is now an American citizen with a “Canadian attitude.”

Alene graduated from St. Olaf College in Minnesota, going on to teach music in the schools. She married a Lutheran clergyman and they and their four children served in parishes in the United States before going to Borneo to work with the Chinese Church.

After returning to the United States, Alene earned a Master of Arts degree in Counseling. She became Assistant Dean of Women at the University of Washington and then became co-founder of the Women’s Center at UW. After leaving UW, she established the Individual Development Center on Capitol Hill.

Alene admits to being beyond the usual age of retirement but she still enjoys working in counseling with individuals. For 35 years she has been an advocate for women in leadership on the local and national level.

**Elyse Hope** is a Portland native currently in graduate school at the University of Washington, where she is pursuing a PhD in genetics. As an undergraduate, she was a poll worker for the 2008 general election and says she really enjoyed the experience of helping people vote no matter what their backgrounds or beliefs. She is excited to join with the League of Women Voters to help get out the vote in Washington. As a volunteer, she does predominantly science outreach with grade school children and works as a judge for local science fairs. Though she is very committed to the importance of science education, she is finding there are many wonderful opportunities for outreach in all areas in Seattle. She is looking forward to finding more such opportunities with the League.

---

**In Memoriam**

Craig Salins, executive director of Washington Public Campaigns since 2006, passed away on August 25, 2012. The League has worked with Craig and WPC on campaign finance issues for many years. The following is from the organization’s website:

Craig has been a passionate advocate for just causes for all of his adult life, and a larger-than-life presence in the movement for enhanced democracy in which we are all engaged. Washington Public Campaigns benefited greatly from his leadership, passion, energy and commitment. He has enriched the lives of many – and will be sorely missed by all who knew him.

A public gathering will take place
Wednesday, October 3 • 7:00-9:00 pm
Phinney Neighborhood Association
6532 Phinney Ave N. • Seattle 98103

Favorite stories about Craig will be shared (bring yours). Light appetizers and desserts will be served (bring your favorite to share). The evening will include a video memorializing Craig’s life and music by the Seattle Peace Chorus, of which Craig had been a member.
BOOK REVIEW by Vicky Downs

*The Righteous Mind: Why Good People Are Divided By Politics and Religion* by Jonathan Haidt

When Bill Moyers interviewed Jonathan Haidt, I learned there are underlying ways in which we think about liberals and conservatives, atheism and religion, good and evil. I discovered something about myself as well, so knew I had to read this enlightening and insight-filled book.

The book is divided into three major parts. The first explains persuasively that we humans make most moral and political decisions intuitively, well before we are ready to reason why we have done so. In fact, we usually use reason to justify our intuitively derived decisions! From childhood we’ve known harm is wrong, because we hated being harmed. That leads us to see that harming others is wrong and in time we “learn to understand fairness and eventually justice.” Many people feel more strongly about fairness and harm than other moral values, but, argues Haidt, the moral domain varies by culture.

I should have guessed that Western educated cultures tend to be more individualistic and focus on individual morality, which leads to a greater focus on fairness and caring for those who are “at the bottom” or oppressed. In marked contrast, some in the West and the majority of other cultures focus more on group behavior and therefore on relationships. This is shown in others’ far greater concern for such things as loyalty, authority, and sanctity.

Though we all have some appreciation for loyalty, authority, and sanctity, western and educated liberals tend to value them less than others. Loyalty is shown by forming a cohesive coalition, frequently in the family itself, but also in a church, union, or club. Such groups cohere strongly against perceived threats, and they rage at those they see as traitors. Authority is shown by giving obedience or deference to a leader or boss and such a leader is considered beneficial and necessary to the group. Sanctity makes it possible to “regard some things as untouchable” either because it is bad/polluted or because it is so hallowed we want to protect it. This is why some people revere objects such as flags, crosses, and head coverings, and principles such as liberty, fraternity, and equality. If someone desecrates “one of the sacred pillars supporting the community [conventional marriage, for example], the reaction is sure to be swift, emotional, collective, and punitive.”

Part III shows that our sense of morality binds us to others who feel as we do, but it also can blind us to the morals and values of others. In this section, Haidt points to the fact that we humans have a dual nature. We are like monkeys, which live for themselves. At the same time, we are like bees in a hive that will do anything to protect communal well being as we “also long to be part of something larger and nobler than ourselves.” Many of us remember that, when we watched the towers coming down on September 11, we suddenly felt utterly American: we were ready to do anything to preserve our country and our people. Some, who had never done so before, went out to give blood to the Red Cross, for example. In doing so they showed their instincts to protect their American “hive.”

In the final chapter, Haidt shows how and why we are more likely to belong to one political team than another. For example, we begin at an early age to show attitudes and differences that can be changed or developed by our environment. He demonstrates that, as we grow in a family and community, “team memberships [blind] us to the motives and morals of [our] opponents even though in some ways we need them.” I found him convincing in his efforts to show that liberals and conservatives in America are like “yin and yang” and are necessary elements for political life.

I also learned the power and importance of listening and trying to understand deeply those with whom I differ. Only in understanding first are we ever likely to develop trust, much less begin to change the deep intuitions of those who differ from us.

Haidt offers some practical ideas to help meliorate the current polarized political scene in America. One is to hold open primaries to encourage people outside a party’s base to nominate moderate candidates.
Another is to offer instant runoffs to ensure that candidates benefit by broadening their appeal. He also recommends that members of Congress live in the DC area so that they socialize more with their opponents.

This is an intellectually stimulating book, which provides the reader with a way to understand himself and others, along with a deeper understanding of the political landscape.

_The opinions in this review are personal and do not represent those of the LWV._
The League believes that U.S. trade policy should be based on the long-term public interest, not on special interests, and should advance the achievement of other important policy goals, including:

- Improvement of basic living standards worldwide; reduction of inequalities within and among nations;
- Protection of the environment and global natural resources;
- Respect for human, labor, religious and political rights;
- Improvement of labor conditions around the world.

The League endorses the worldwide systematic reduction of tariffs, subsidies, and quotas. The League believes that trade agreements should be negotiated multilaterally in the broadest possible international forum [and] that the U.S. trade policy-making process should be open, transparent, and efficient. The League supports measures to address the adverse impact of international trade on domestic workers, firms and industries. Training, education and safety net programs should be made easily available to dislocated workers. Portability of health care coverage, pension rights and other fringe benefits should also be assured.

U.S. Relations With Developing Countries
The LWVUS believes that U.S. interests in developing countries should reflect the reality of global interdependence. Paramount among these interests are reducing the risk of military conflict, promoting the sound management of global resources, protecting human rights, stimulating economic growth, and improving the quality of life in developing countries. U.S. policies toward developing countries should not be based on maintaining U.S. preeminence.

The LWVUS strongly believes that development assistance, which is designed to meet the long-term social and economic needs of developing countries, is the most effective means of promoting legitimate U.S. interests. Military assistance and direct military involvement are not appropriate means to further the League’s stated paramount interests in developing countries. [This] demand[s] U.S. policies that help developing countries reach self-sustaining economic growth and an improved quality of life. The development effort should be one of a partnership between developed and developing countries. Development programs should be long-range, adequately financed, [and] effectively coordinated and administered.

Arms Control
The LWVUS believes that arms control measures are essential to reduce the risk of war and increase global stability. Toward that end, the U.S. government should give the highest level of importance to arms control efforts that:

- Limit or reduce the quantity of weapons;
- Limit proliferation and prohibit first use of nuclear weapons;
- Prohibit first use and possession of chemical, biological and radiological weapons;
- Prohibit explosive testing of nuclear weapons;
- Reduce tensions in order to prevent situations in which weapons might be used.

As a goal of international negotiations, the League supports the worldwide elimination of nuclear weapons. The LWV recognizes that peace in an interdependent world is a product of cooperation among nations and therefore strongly favors multilateral negotiations. Leadership by the United States in advancing arms control measures is encouraged. The League does not support tying progress in arms control to other issues [as it] is too important in and of itself and too crucial to all nations. The League’s pursuit of bans on the possession or use of weapons may apply to existing weapons or those not yet developed.

Military Policy and Defense Spending
The LWVUS believes that the U.S. government should seek to protect its interests at home and abroad through the use of nonmilitary measures, including diplomacy, mediation, and multilateral cooperation. These measures reflect the importance that the League attaches to U.S. efforts to strengthen
international organizations, reduce tensions among nations and minimize the risk of conflict worldwide. The League believes that military force should be viewed as a tool of last resort.

The League believes that defense spending should be examined in the same way as spending for other national needs. Preference should be given to operations and maintenance expenditures and military pay as opposed to research and development, procurement of new weapons, and construction of military facilities. In summary, the League believes that national security has many dimensions. Key elements include the country's ability to implement social and environmental programs and to maintain cooperative relationships with other nations. Other important components are effective political leadership and a strong economy.

Two other policy areas which are addressed under other headings, but which are germane to international relations, are immigration and global climate change.

**Immigration**

[The LWVUS] believes that immigration policies should promote reunification of immediate families; meet the economic, business and employment needs of the United States; and be responsive to those facing political persecution or humanitarian crises. Provision should also be made for qualified persons to enter the United States on student visas. The League supports federal immigration law that provides an efficient, expeditious system for legal entry of immigrants into the United States. To complement these goals the League supports federal policies to improve economies, education, job opportunities and living conditions in nations with large emigrating populations.

In achieving overall policy goals, the League supports a system for unauthorized immigrants to earn legal status, including citizenship, by paying taxes, learning English, studying civics, and meeting other relevant criteria. While policy reforms, including a path to legal status, remain unachieved, the League does not support deporting unauthorized immigrants who have no history of criminal activity.

**Natural Resource Management**

The LWVUS does not have a position on global climate change per se, but has used the following position to support taking action on the issue.

Resource management decisions must be based on a thorough assessment of population growth and of current and future needs. The inherent characteristics and carrying capacity of each area's natural resources must be considered in the planning process. Policy makers must take into account the ramifications of their decisions on the nation as a whole as well as on other nations.

The League believes that protection and management of natural resources are responsibilities shared by all levels of government. The League supports comprehensive long-range planning and believes that wise decision making requires:

- Adequate data and a framework within which alternatives may be weighed;
- Regional, interregional and/or international cooperation when appropriate.

These two points among many listed seem particularly relevant to international climate concerns. We hope this review will be useful to you as you consider the candidates on the ballot.

*The LWVWA International Relations Committee*

*For the full text of these positions, go to http://www.lwv.org/content/impact-issues*
NOTE TO UNIT & DISCUSSION LEADERS: There will be no discussion leaders’ briefing, but the speakers at both forums will provide additional information that will contribute to meaningful unit discussion. Please plan to attend and encourage your fellow unit members to join you!

Parking at Seattle University for the forum on Tuesday October 9 is available in the pay lot off 12th Ave at Marion. There is also street parking in the neighborhood.

Unit Meeting:

Welcome and Introductions

Unit Business
Announcements: Make plans to attend the fall fundraiser on November 10. Note that there will not be a forum in November but we will have readings in the Voter on financial issues to go with our topic for the month: Digging out from 2008: What Next?

Ballot Measures

Statewide:
Referendum 74: Marriage for Same-Sex Couples
Initiative 502: Marijuana Legalization
Initiative 1185: 2/3 Vote Requirement for Tax Increases
Initiative 1240: Charter Schools
ESJR 8221 Constitutional Amendment re: Debt Limit
SJR 8223 Constitutional Amendment re: Investment of UW and WSU state funds
Advisory Vote 1: Increase in B&O tax on certain financial institutions
Advisory Vote 2: Continuation of a petroleum products tax

Local:
King County AFIS levy renewal
Seattle Seawall bond levy

There are no set discussion questions but we anticipate these measures will provoke some lively conversation at the unit meetings! Discussion of the above is open according to the unit’s wishes and no recordings are expected.
League of Women Voters of Seattle-King County

Summaries of Ballot Issues

General Election

November 6, 2012

The League of Women Voters of Seattle-King County has made every effort to present objective, nonpartisan information about the November 6, 2012 general election ballot measures, with no attempt to influence voters or evaluate arguments advanced by proponents or opponents, other than to ensure that arguments have a factual basis. League volunteers research and analyze each measure, work with ballot issue proponents and opponents and obtain information from a variety of sources. The League encourages voters to read the official Voters Pamphlet, newspapers and other sources of election information. All information is current as of publication on 9/19/12.
Washington State Referendum 74:
Concerns Marriage for Same-Sex Couples

OFFICIAL BALLOT TITLE:
The legislature passed Engrossed Substitute Senate Bill 6239 concerning marriage for same-sex couples, modified domestic-partnership law and religious freedom, and voters have filed a sufficient referendum petition on this bill.

This bill would allow same-sex couples to marry, preserve domestic partnerships only for seniors, and preserve the right of clergy or religious organizations to refuse to perform, recognize, or accommodate any marriage ceremony.

Should this bill be: [ ] Approved [ ] Rejected

THE LAW AS IT IS NOW:
Washington law currently states that marriage is a civil contract between a male and a female who are both at least 18 years old and otherwise capable of marrying. The law prohibits marriage if the parties to the marriage are of the same sex or are close relatives, or if a party to the marriage is already married to somebody else. A marriage is void in Washington if one of the parties is under age 17, unless a superior court judge waives the age requirement based on a showing of necessity. A marriage entered into in another state or jurisdiction is recognized as valid unless Washington law would have prohibited the marriage if it had been performed here.

The state also currently maintains a register of domestic partners. Two individuals of the same sex may enter into a state-registered domestic partnership; a man and a woman may also enter into a domestic partnership if at least one of them is over 62 years old. The other requirements for entering a domestic partnership are that the couple share a residence, are both at least eighteen years old, and are not closely related. Neither partner can be married or in a domestic partnership with anyone else.

The Washington Law Against Discrimination prohibits discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation.

WHAT THIS MEASURE WILL DO:
If approved, this measure would allow same-sex couples to marry in the same way as man-woman couples. Other prohibitions on marriage, such as those based on age, being closely related, and already being married to somebody else would still apply. This measure would also recognize, as valid in Washington, marriages between same-sex couples entered into and recognized as valid in another state or jurisdiction.

This measure provides that clergy are not required to perform or recognize any marriage ceremony.

No religious organization or religiously-affiliated educational institution would be required to provide accommodations, facilities, privileges, services, or goods related to the performance of a marriage. Clergy, religious organizations, and religiously-affiliated educational institutions would be protected from lawsuits under the Washington Law Against Discrimination, based on a refusal to perform or recognize any marriage or to provide facilities, services, or goods for a same-sex wedding.

After June 30, 2014, state-registered domestic partnerships would be available only to couples in which one partner is at least 62 years old; existing domestic partnerships where both partners are younger than 62 years of age must either convert to a marriage or dissolve their domestic partnership.

HOW MUCH WILL THIS MEASURE COST?
Fewer state domestic partnership filings and a corresponding increase in marriage licenses are estimated to decrease state revenue by $81,000 and increase county revenue by $128,000 over five fiscal years. This is a net increase of fees collected statewide of less than $10,000 per year.
Supporters of marriage equality argue that Washington State should allow the freedom for everyone, regardless of sexual orientation, to marry. Supporters further state that this law would allow caring and committed same-sex couples to be legally married. Committed same-sex couples are neighbors, friends and family, and co-workers. People should have the freedom to marry and build their lives together without government interference. Supporters argue it’s not for the state to judge or to deny them that opportunity.

Those in favor of changing current marriage law feel that Washington State should treat everyone the same. Most people want the freedom to marry whomever they choose. Committed same-sex couples hope to marry for similar reasons as man-woman couples: to share and build a life together, to be there for each other, in good times and bad, in sickness and in health, and to vow before family and friends to be together forever.

Lastly, supporters point out that this law would protect religious freedom for all. This law guarantees religious freedom and won’t change how each religion defines marriage. This law protects the rights of clergy, churches, and religious organizations that don’t perform or recognize same-sex marriages. Religious organizations and clergy would not be forced to do so or to provide goods or services supporting a gay marriage ceremony.

Opponents of same-sex marriage argue that marriage is more than a commitment between two loving people. Marriage was created to benefit children. Traditional marriage promotes child well-being because children need both a mother and a father. Children do best when raised by their married parents.

Opponents point out that the new marriage law passed by legislators (R-74) did not just enact same-sex marriage – it redefined marriage for all, stripping it of its essential man/woman nature. Washington same-sex couples already enjoy full legal equality under our “everything but marriage” law that allows same-sex domestic partnerships. The new marriage legislation did not provide any new legal rights for gay couples.

Some opponents believe that God’s creation of marriage as the union of one man and one woman is the foundation of society and has served society well for thousands of years. They claim that people who disagree with this new definition could find themselves facing sanctions, as has occurred elsewhere.

Opponents state that gays and lesbians are entitled to respect and the ability to live as they choose, but the state of Washington should not redefine marriage. Being opposed to same-sex marriage doesn’t mean you dislike gays and lesbians. It means you support traditional marriage.

**Organizations and Well-Known People Supporting R-74**
Jeff Bezos, founder of Amazon.com; MacKenzie Bezos, businesswoman & philanthropist; Chris Boerger, Bishop, Northwest Washington Synod, Evangelical Lutheran Church; Ed Murray, State Senator, D-43; Jamie Pedersen, State Representative, D-43; Maureen Walsh, State Representative, R-9

**Organizations and Well-Known People Opposing R-74**
Joseph Backholm, President, Preserve Marriage Washington; Joe Fuiten, Senior Pastor, Cedar Park Church; Matt Shea, State Representative, District 4
Washington State Initiative 502:
Concerns Legalization, Regulation, and Taxation of Marijuana

OFFICIAL BALLOT TITLE:

Initiative Measure No. 502 concerns marijuana.

This measure would license and regulate marijuana production, distribution, and possession for persons over 21; remove state law criminal and civil penalties for activities that it authorizes; tax marijuana sales; and earmark marijuana-related revenues.

Should this measure be enacted into law? [ ] Yes [ ] No

THE LAW AS IT IS NOW:

It is a crime under both Washington and federal law to grow, distribute, or possess marijuana, or to involve a minor in a marijuana-related offense. There is an exception in Washington state law for researching, growing, or using medical marijuana, under certain conditions.

State law generally makes these crimes felonies; however, people who possess 40 grams or less of marijuana commit a misdemeanor. It is also a misdemeanor to make, possess, or deliver any paraphernalia used to grow, store, conceal, or use marijuana. Minors who grow, distribute, or possess marijuana can be punished through juvenile court.

Washington law also makes it illegal to drive under the influence of intoxicating alcohol or any drug, whether over-the-counter, prescription, or illicit. Every person who drives in Washington has, by virtue of driving on Washington roads, consented to a test to find out whether he or she has alcohol or any drug in his or her blood. These tests can be used in criminal trials and in proceedings to suspend, revoke, or deny a driver’s license. The state can also suspend, revoke, or deny the driver’s license of a person who refuses the test.

Like state law, federal law also makes it a crime to grow, distribute, or possess marijuana. People also commit a federal crime if they provide places for growing, distributing, or storing marijuana. It is also a federal crime to use a telephone to buy or sell marijuana. Federal law makes all of these crimes felonies, except that it makes possessing marijuana a misdemeanor. Like state law, federal law allows limited use of marijuana for medical research. Federal law does not allow medical use of marijuana. State law cannot modify the federal laws that make it a crime to grow, distribute, or possess marijuana.

WHAT THIS MEASURE WILL DO:

For persons over age 21, this measure would remove from state law criminal and civil prohibitions on growing, manufacturing, distributing, and possessing marijuana consistent with a state marijuana licensing and regulatory system. With a license, people could grow and sell marijuana to the public. People could only buy limited amounts of marijuana at a time, and possession of marijuana by people over age 21 in amounts that do not exceed that limit would not violate state law.

A license to produce marijuana would make it legal under state law to grow marijuana. A license to process marijuana would make it legal under state law to process and package or make products containing marijuana. Licensed producers and processors could sell marijuana at wholesale to marijuana retail stores, but could not sell marijuana at retail directly to consumers. Licensed retailers could sell marijuana and products containing marijuana to consumers at retail. Licensed retailers could also sell paraphernalia used to store or use marijuana.

Retail stores selling marijuana could not be placed within 1,000 feet of any school, playground, recreation center, child care center, park, transit center, library, or game arcade. Producers and processors could not have any financial interest in any licensed marijuana retail operation. Marijuana stores could not sell any
products other than marijuana and items used to store or use marijuana. The state could deny, suspend, or cancel licenses. Local governments could submit objections for the state to consider in determining whether to grant or renew a license. The state could inspect the premises of any license holder. The state could adopt further rules to implement this measure.

It would still be a state law crime for a person under age 21 to grow, sell, or possess marijuana, just as it is for alcohol. It also would remain illegal under state law for any person or store to sell marijuana or products containing marijuana to people under 21. Marijuana retailers would be regulated in much the same way that alcoholic beverage retailers are now. Licensed marijuana retailers could not allow people under age 21 on their premises, and would have to post signs forbidding minors. It would be illegal to open or use marijuana in a public place. Advertising of marijuana would be limited and must be 1,000 feet away from schools.

Sales of marijuana would be taxed like cigarettes and alcohol. Marijuana excise taxes, in the amount of 25% of the selling price, would be collected on all sales of marijuana, at each level of production and sale. State and local sales taxes would also apply to retail sales of marijuana. The measure directs the state to spend designated amounts from the marijuana excise taxes, license fees, and other marijuana revenue for administration, substance abuse education, and other public health programs targeted at marijuana use. The remaining 18.25% would be distributed to the state general fund.

This measure would also amend the law that prohibits driving under the influence. It would specifically prohibit driving under the influence of marijuana. Consent to testing to determine whether a driver’s blood contains alcohol or any drug would specifically apply to marijuana as well. State laws regarding driving that currently apply to alcohol intoxication would now apply to marijuana intoxication, as well. For persons under 21, any level of the active ingredient of marijuana would be prohibited.

Federal marijuana laws could still be in effect.

HOW MUCH WILL THIS MEASURE COST?

Fiscal Impact through Fiscal Year 2017: Initiative 502 would license and regulate marijuana production and distribution; tax marijuana sales; earmark marijuana-related revenues; and specifically prohibit driving under the influence of marijuana. The total fiscal impact on state and local government revenues is hard to predict, as federal enforcement would be uncertain. However, the initiative’s provisions related to driving under the influence of marijuana, which are not affected by federal criminal law enforcement, are estimated to generate known state revenue of $4.3 million and known state agency costs of $2.75 million over five fiscal years, with a net gain of $1.55 million in funds to enforce driving under the influence laws in Washington State.

The initiative creates a closed, highly regulated industry that does not currently exist anywhere. Unlike other agricultural commodities, production would be solely for in-state consumption. In addition, the licensing and regulation provisions of the initiative could potentially help federal criminal law enforcement activities by identifying marijuana producers, processors, and retailers. These features may prevent the development of a functioning marijuana market. Consequently, the total amount of revenue generated to state and local government could be as low as zero. Assuming a fully functioning marijuana market and low federal enforcement, estimated total new excise tax revenue generated to the state could be as high as $1.9 billion over five fiscal years.
Arguments in favor of voting “YES” on I-502:

Current marijuana laws have failed. Prohibition did not work in 1920’s for alcohol, and prohibition of marijuana is not working either. It’s time for a new approach.

Initiative 502 frees police to focus on violent crimes such as assault, rape, armed robbery, and murder. Treating adult marijuana use as a crime costs Washington State millions in tax dollars and ties up police, courts, and jail space. Scarce public safety dollars should be focused on real public safety threats.

Initiative 502 provides billions in new revenue for Washington State. Regulating and taxing marijuana could generate more than a billion dollars annually in new revenue for state and local government. New funding will go to health care, research, drug abuse prevention in youth and adults, as well as stay-in-school programs for at-risk youth.

Initiative 502 takes away profits and funding from organized crime. Marijuana prohibition has wasted billions of American taxpayer dollars and has made our communities less safe. Just as when the USA repealed alcohol prohibition, our society needs to take the marijuana profits out of the hands of violent organized criminals and cartels.

Based on successful tobacco-prevention research, Initiative 502 restricts advertising and directs funding to prevention programs. It also directs funding to programs that help keep kids in school and graduating, which benefits the whole state.

Arguments in favor of voting “NO” on I-502:

There are two groups of people urging voters to vote NO on I-502: People who feel that drug abuse, including marijuana, continues to be a major problem and I-502 will make marijuana abuse worse, and people who otherwise support legalization, but feel that I-502 is flawed, and would create laws that risk the incrimination of innocent people.

The people who argue that marijuana should remain illegal, as marijuana abuse is a major public health problem, argue: Legalizing marijuana will greatly increase its availability and lead to more use, abuse, and addiction among adults and youth. Most high school seniors currently report not using marijuana because it is illegal. Marijuana recently surpassed alcohol as the number one reason youth enter substance abuse treatment. I-502 also has the potential to add many more impaired drivers to our roads.

The people who are in favor of marijuana legalization, but who feel I-502 is flawed, argue:

Marijuana possession will still be illegal under federal law. This conflict leaves growers, users, and employees who sell marijuana at risk for federal prosecution and taxes generated by I-502 subject to seizure by federal authorities. Sharing marijuana with another adult would constitute felony delivery.

Also, the proposed DUI blood level test will lead to guaranteed conviction rates of unimpaired drivers, due to an arbitrary limit unsupported by science. With no home growing permitted, and no legal retail system, individuals will be forced into the same black market that promotes violence and crime in our communities.

Organizations and Well-Known People Supporting I-502


Organizations and Well-Known People Opposing I-502

Sensible Washington; Douglas Hiatt, Lawyer; Gilbert Mobley, MD, American Board of Emergency Medicine; Jim Cooper, Substance Abuse Prevention Professional; Steven Freng, Psy.D., MSW, Chemical Dependency Prevention/Treatment Professional; Ramona Leber, Former Mayor City of Longview, Public Safety Advocate
Washington State Initiative 1185:
Minimum majority vote requirements for tax and fee increases

OFFICIAL BALLOT TITLE:
Initiative Measure No. 1185 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

THE LAW AS IT IS NOW:
A Washington State law requires that any action by the legislature that raises taxes may be taken only if approved by at least a two-thirds legislative vote in both the state house of representatives and the senate.
Another Washington State law requires that a state fee may only be imposed or increased in any fiscal year if approved with majority legislative approval in both the state house of representatives and the senate, and also must follow certain accountability procedures specified in the law.
These requirements do not apply to assessments made by agricultural commodity commissions or to the forest products commission.

WHAT THIS MEASURE WILL DO:
This measure would restate the current law regarding tax increases, revising it to state that any action or combination of actions by the legislature that raises taxes may be taken only if it is approved by a two-thirds vote in both the state house of representatives and the senate or receives voter approval.
The measure would restate the current statutory language relating to increases in state fees, revising it to state that a fee may only be imposed or increased in any fiscal year if approved by a simple majority vote in both the state house of representatives and the senate.

HOW MUCH WILL THIS MEASURE COST?
Fiscal Impact through Fiscal Year 2017
Initiative 1185 is estimated to decrease state transportation revenue by discouraging the adding of new tolls on state highways and bridges. The projects on which the collected tolls would have been spent will also be delayed or stopped. The total fiscal impact can not be calculated, but state toll revenue and transportation expenditures are estimated to decrease approximately $23 million to $33 million in fiscal year 2017.

Requiring new legislative approval to impose new fees will also prevent implementation of certain businesses and health care certifications, thereby decreasing state revenue by $2.7 million and decrease state costs by $3.9 million over five fiscal years. There is no fiscal impact on local governments.
Arguments in favor of voting “YES” on I-1185:

Initiative 1185 would require that any tax increase be passed with a two-thirds vote in the legislature or by a direct vote of the people.


Since then the legislature has suspended the two-thirds vote requirement three times. This occurred most recently in 2010, when lawmakers passed a tax increase.

Eighteen states (counting Washington) have enacted some form of supermajority vote requirement for tax increases.

Proponents claim that making new taxes harder to impose strengthens the economic climate and offers the best chance for job growth. I-1185 provides a stable future, giving families and employers the certainty they need to prosper.

Proponents argue that Washington State faces another budget deficit because spending has outpaced revenue. Lawmakers need the tools for budget discipline that I-1185 imposes.

Arguments in favor of voting “NO” on I-1185:

It is informative to follow the funding of I-1185. Public Disclosure Commission reports show most of the million dollars plus spent to put 1185 on the ballot came from large interstate corporations. These corporations would benefit from lower business tax rates in Washington State.

The initiative is written so that under 1185 it only takes a majority vote to give large corporations a special tax exemption – but then requires a two-thirds vote to eliminate that same exemption.

Opponents argue that Washington should learn from the experiences of other states. For example: I-1185 may sound like a way to protect taxpayers, but Colorado passed a similar measure with disastrous results. It cut off funding for schools, roads, and immunizations for kids, and caused so many problems that Colorado’s Republican Governor proposed a measure to suspend it, which voters passed.

A judge recently ruled the core provision of I-1185 is unconstitutional. Why? Our constitution plainly states that legislation passes with a simple majority vote. Other states that now have a two-thirds rule accomplished the change by amending their constitutions, not by changing state law.

Organizations and Well-Known People Supporting I-1185

Tim Eyman, Mukilteo political consultant; Jack Fagan, Spokane veteran and business owner; Suzie Burke, Fremont (Seattle) business owner; The Seattle Times Editorial Board; The Walla Walla Union Herald Editorial Board; The Washington Policy Center

Organizations and Well-Known People Opposing I-1185

The Children’s Alliance; Douglas MacDonald, former Washington State Secretary of Transportation; Don Orange, Vancouver small business owner, chair, Main Street Alliance; Pam Kruse, Pierce County public school teacher; Reuven Carlyle, business owner, public school parent and citizen legislator; Teri Nicholson, Registered Nurse, Spokane; Gerald Reilly, Chair, ElderCare Alliance, Olympia
WASHINGTON STATE INITIATIVE 1240:
Concerns Creation of a Charter School System in Washington State

OFFICIAL BALLOT TITLE:
Initiative Measure No. 1240 concerns creation of a public charter school system.

This measure would authorize up to 40 publicly-funded charter schools open to all students, operated through approved, nonreligious, nonprofit organizations, with government oversight; and modify certain laws applicable to them as public schools.

Should this measure be enacted into law? [ ] Yes [ ] No

THE LAW AS IT IS NOW:
The legislature has provided for the education of children residing in Washington State through the creation of a public school system. Public schools are operated by local school districts under the overall supervision of the state superintendent of public instruction. Children between the ages of 8 and 18 years old must attend public school, subject to certain exceptions including enrolling in private school or receiving home school instruction.

School districts are local government bodies responsible for operating the “common schools” (K-12) in their boundaries. A board of directors is elected by the people of each district to govern the school district. Each local school board hires a Superintendent of Schools and employs teachers, principals, and other staff as needed. Each board is also responsible for the number, type, and locations of schools in its district. Currently, public schools are established by local school district boards and cannot be created by anyone but the school boards. They are mostly funded by the state. State laws require various education programs to be offered by school districts. Examples of state requirements include: student/teacher ratios, special education, student transportation, bilingual instruction, school attendance, compulsory course work, food services for students, and management of school district property. The Education Employment Relations Act (Chapter 41.59 RCW) governs school district employment relations issues. This statute provides for collective bargaining as to wages, hours, and terms of employment.

WHAT THIS MEASURE WILL DO:
This measure would allow the authorization of a limited number of charter schools within the state’s public school system. The measure uses the terms “charter school” and “public charter school” interchangeably, and defines the term as a public school governed by a charter school board and operated according to the terms of a charter contract, which is entered into pursuant to the terms of the measure. The measure would limit the number of charter schools to 40 over a five year period, with no more than eight charter schools established per year.

HOW MUCH WILL THIS MEASURE COST?
Fiscal Impact through 2017: Initiative 1240 is anticipated to move some funding, expenditures, and costs between local public school districts or from local public school districts to charter schools, primarily from movement in student enrollment. The resulting budget impact to local public school districts and on state expenditures is hard to calculate, but not zero, because it is unknown: 1) how charter schools will impact enrollment in the state’s education system, or 2) the extent to which charter schools will receive state funding. Known state agency costs are estimated at just over $3 million over five fiscal years.
Charter schools are independently-managed public schools operated by approved nonprofit organizations. They are free and open to all students, and receive funding based on student enrollment just like traditional public schools.

Under I-1240 public charter schools must meet the same academic standards as traditional public schools, and their teachers must meet the same certification requirements as teachers in other public schools. However, charter schools have more flexibility in determining curriculum, budgets and staffing, and in offering more varied and flexible learning experiences for students.

Washington is one of the few states without public charter schools. I-1240 will allow up to 40 public charter schools to be authorized in Washington over five years, overseen by a state commission or local school board with strict accountability and oversight. I-1240 requires annual performance reviews and an evaluation after five years before additional charter schools could be allowed.

The state’s current public school system isn’t meeting the needs of all students. Although many students do well in traditional public schools, far too many are falling through the cracks and are at risk of dropping out. Allowing public charter schools provides another option which may help these struggling students succeed.

Children and parents in 41 other states have the option of charter schools. Washington children and parents should have the same opportunity.

I-1240, if passed, will create an expensive new system of privately operated – but publicly funded – schools in Washington. Although called charter schools, these will be essentially private schools paid for with tax dollars and governed by private boards.

Charter schools will drain money from existing public schools. At a time when school funding has already been cut dramatically, this state cannot afford this initiative. Money that goes to charter schools will prevent the state from doing what the Washington state Supreme Court has ordered – provide adequate funding for basic public education - so all students have a chance to graduate with a high quality education through high school.

Charter schools will be able to serve only a small fraction of the state’s student population. The state is responsible for providing all students with a quality public education. The effectiveness of charter schools has not been proven. Research conducted by Stanford University and others shows that, overall, charter schools do not perform better than public schools, and nearly 40% of them do worse.

Although proponents of the initiative promise at-risk students and those from low-performing schools will be served by charter schools, nothing in the initiative requires it.

Charter schools can undermine local control. An existing public school could be converted to a charter school by a majority vote of teachers or of parents. The school district would lose the state funding, but be required to provide and maintain the facility rent-free, and to allocate levy monies to the converted charter school. A new, unelected state commission will be created to authorize and oversee charter schools rather than the constitutionally mandated and publicly elected Superintendent of Public Instruction.
Washington State ESJR 8221:
Concerns a Constitutional Amendment regarding Washington's Debt Limit

OFFICIAL BALLOT TITLE:
The Legislature has proposed a constitutional amendment on implementing the Commission on State Debt recommendations regarding Washington's debt limit.

This amendment would, starting July 1, 2014, phase down the debt limit percentage in three steps from nine to eight percent and modify the calculation date, calculation period, and the term “general state revenues.”

Should this constitutional amendment be: [ ] Approved [ ] Rejected

THE CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISION AS IT PRESENTLY EXISTS:
Article VIII, section 1 of the Washington State Constitution establishes a limit on the amount of certain debt the state may assume. It does so by limiting the annual total cost of principal and interest payments the state may agree to pay.

When contracting for new debt, the state cannot agree to annual payments of principal and interest that would raise the total yearly payments by the state to more than nine percent of the average of the prior three years of “general state revenues,” as defined by the Constitution.

Article VIII, section 1 defines “general state revenues” to be used in calculating the state debt limit. In general, the term includes all state moneys received in the state treasury that are not dedicated to a specific use, such as roads or schools.

Not all state debt is restricted by this debt limit. For example, bonds payable from the gas tax and motor vehicle license fees are excluded, as are bonds payable from income received from investing the Permanent Common School Fund.

Article VIII, section 1 pledges the full faith, credit, and taxing power of the state to the payment of debt created pursuant to the section.

WHAT THIS AMENDMENT WILL DO:
The amendment would change the calculations for determining how much debt Washington may assume in three ways:

1. It would reduce the percentage rate used in calculating the state debt limit, from 9.0 percent of “general state revenues,” as it is now; to 8.5 percent starting July 1, 2014; to 8.25 percent starting July 1, 2016; and 8.0 percent starting July 1, 2034.

2. Beginning July 1, 2014, the amount of new debt that may be contracted each year would be calculated based on the average of the prior six years of “general state revenues,” rather than the prior three years, as it is currently.

3. The amendment would change the definition of “general state revenues” to include the state property tax, starting July 1, 2014. This change would allow the state property tax to be included in “general state revenues” for the purpose of calculating the debt limit. The state property tax is dedicated by law to the support of common schools. This amendment would not change where the dedicated school funds are spent.

HOW MUCH WILL THIS MEASURE COST?
No fiscal analysis was done by the State, as it is not required by law for a constitutional amendment.
Arguments in favor of voting “APPROVED” on ESJR 8221

Washington’s constitution limits the amount of money the state is allowed to borrow to finance capital investments in schools, college buildings, water, sewer and storm water projects, and other public infrastructure.

Washington’s excellent credit rating means borrowing costs are low. The state does not borrow to pay operating expenses.

The current limit is adequate during prosperous times, but does not allow the state to borrow enough during bad economic times to invest in necessary public projects.

By lowering the constitutional debt limit from nine percent to eight percent of the general state revenues and averaging those revenues over six years, this measure would:

• Stabilize the state’s ability to borrow;
• Gradually reduce the state’s long-term debt burden;
• Lower the share of the operating budget used to pay principal and interest (debt service) on the debt;
• Create more stability for construction projects; and
• Improve the quality of long-term capital planning for education, recreation, and state facilities.

This change would also mean less borrowing when construction costs are high and more capacity to borrow when costs are lower; and it would keep borrowing costs low by protecting Washington’s excellent credit rating.

Good credit allows the state to use taxpayer money for more projects instead of paying higher interest rates.

Organizations and Well-Known People Supporting ESJR 8221

James McIntire, Washington State Treasurer
Hans Dunshee, State Representative, 44th District
Linda Evans Parlette, State Senator, 12th District
Judy Warnick, State Representative, 13th District
Karen Fraser, State Senator, 22nd District

Arguments in favor of voting “REJECTED” on ESJR 8221

This measure increases the costs of infrastructure investments and reduces jobs. It would have unintended bad economic consequences for taxpayers.

Schools, community colleges, universities, skills centers, hospitals, water treatment plants, sewers and many other vital public works projects are funded directly through the state’s capital budget. These projects ensure that Washington has quality facilities to foster economic, job, and educational growth. Allowing the state to tie up money budgeted for infrastructure would allow buildings and other infrastructure to decay, when they should be maintained, and ultimately would increase repair costs after a period of deferred maintenance.

This is a tax shift to local governments. By reducing the state’s capacity to invest in infrastructure, it would shift the burden of funding school construction and other projects to local governments. Local governments pay higher interest rates on their bonds, resulting in increased project costs.

Washington State has an excellent credit rating because its debt level is low and as a result it has been rewarded with record low interest rates. ESJR 8221 would increase the cost of bond financing by shifting construction financing to revenue bonds or local government bonds, which carry much higher interest rates.

Organizations and Well-Known People Opposing ESJR 8221

Marc Jenefsky, AIA, President, American Institute of Architects Washington Council
Bob Hasegawa, State Representative, 11th District
Maralyn Chase, State Senator, 32nd District
Jeff Johnson, President, Washington State Labor Council, AFL-CIO
Dave Myers, Executive Secretary, WA State Building Construction Trades Council
Washington State SJR 8223:

Proposed constitutional amendment on investments by the University of Washington and Washington State University.

OFFICIAL BALLOT TITLE:

The legislature has proposed a constitutional amendment on investments by the University of Washington and Washington State University.

This amendment would create an exception to constitutional restrictions on investing public funds by allowing these universities to invest specified public funds as authorized by the legislature, including in private companies or stock.

Should this constitutional amendment be: [ ] Approved [ ] Rejected

THE CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISION AS IT PRESENTLY EXISTS:

The state constitution generally limits the investment of state funds to government backed securities. In Article VIII, the investment of state funds in the stocks and bonds of private companies, associations, or corporations is prohibited.

Previous constitutional amendments have made exceptions to these restrictions to permit the legislature to authorize investment of certain funds in private stocks and bonds. Funds that currently may be invested in private stocks and bonds include public pension and retirement funds, industrial insurance (workers’ compensation) funds, funds held in trust for persons with developmental disabilities, the permanent common school fund, and permanent higher education funds.

Permanent higher education funds are funds primarily derived from the sale, lease, or management of lands granted by the United States to the State of Washington at statehood for educational purposes.

All investments are managed by the Washington State Investment Board.

WHAT THIS AMENDMENT WILL DO:

If the amendment is adopted, it will create a new exception to the constitutional restrictions on investing public funds. The state constitution would no longer prohibit investment of public monies of the University of Washington and Washington State University in private stocks and bonds.

This would allow the two major state Universities to diversify their investment portfolio, which would potentially raise more money to pay for these universities. The funds potentially eligible for investment include: research funding, patient and medical revenues, parking proceeds, construction proceeds, insurance fund reserves, housing and food service revenues, collected advance tuition, and other similar funds.

The legislature would specify which funds of the universities could be invested and the professionals at the Washington State Investment Board would determine how the funds could be invested.

All investments will continue to be managed by the Washington State Investment Board.

HOW MUCH WILL THIS MEASURE COST?

No fiscal analysis was prepared by the state, as it is not required by law.
Supporters state that the global recession has resulted in historic reductions in funding for public higher education.

Supporters are concerned that these cuts have caused universities to limit the number of classes offered, making it difficult for some students to take the courses they need to graduate.

Further, Washington now ranks 40th nationally in terms of the percentage of residents with a bachelor's degree or more.

Supporters argue that this measure would help Washington students by providing new dollars to our public universities without more tax revenue.

Supporters point out that previously the citizens of Washington amended this section of the State Constitution in order to allow higher return investments of pension and retirement funds and other public funds.

Supporters believe that allowing this type of investment for University of Washington and Washington State University funds is a common sense way to help raise funding for higher education.

Supporters also note that SSB 6468 provides that the only new funds that can be invested this way are public monies “not needed for immediate expenditure” and instructs the two major state universities to develop a set of policies on how these funds are identified and invested.

Lastly, all investments will be managed on behalf of the universities by the highly-regarded professionals at the Washington State Investment Board, which is bound by the highest fiduciary standards.

Opponents are concerned that this constitutional amendment allows for riskier investment of necessary operating funds that should be closely held for the near future and does not set clear boundaries on how much of this public money could be invested in the stock market.

This is a change from what has been allowed in the past and is tied to the recently passed SSB 6468 that allows UW and WSU to declare public money “not needed for immediate expenditure” and instructs the institutions to set policy on how these funds are identified and invested. The legislation does not contain a formula for or cap for determining the amount of monies that could be designated “not needed for immediate expenditure.”

The stock market carries more risk than other types of investments. Opponents cite instances in which the university endowments and pension funds suffered great losses during the financial crisis. Endowments and pension funds are long-term investments that can often ride out down times in the stock market. Endowments are private funds donated for special purposes, and employees contribute to the pension funds for their retirement.

The funds being considered in this amendment are usually designated for operation and program needs and are often a part of the university's cash flow. Short term losses due to a sudden down turn in the stock market could have a negative impact on the funding of the universities’ basic operations and flexibility to respond to short term program needs.

Opponents feel the UW and WSU held on to too much cash during the financial crisis while cutting programs and do not trust the institutions to prioritize their budgets to focus on class offerings while keeping tuition as low as possible and offering grants and scholarships to worthy students.

Opponents say that the proposal does not place enough restriction on how or how much of the potential operations money will be invested and the risk associated with this type of private investment.

### Organizations and Well-Known People Supporting ESJR 8223

Lisa Brown, State Senator, Senate Majority Leader; Larry Seaquist, State Rep., 26th District; Bill Gates, Sr., Attorney and Regent, University of Washington; Scott Carson, Former Executive Vice President of Boeing and Regent, Washington State University

### Organizations and Well-Known People Opposing ESJR 8223

Gerald Barnett, Ph.D.; Maralyn Chase, State Senator, 32nd District; Bob Hasegawa, State Rep., 11th District; Jim McCune, State Rep., 2nd District; Sharon Tomiko Santos, State Rep., 37th District
State Advisory Votes 1 & 2

The following two advisory votes described below are required by Initiative 960 which was passed in 2007. Initiative 960 directs all tax increases, even those that have received a 2/3 majority, to be placed before the voters. Both of these bills received more than a 2/3 majority in the legislature. Because these votes are advisory, the outcome of the vote itself will not determine what happens to the tax; the increases will remain in effect unless and until the legislature takes steps to amend them.

Washington State Advisory Vote 1 (Engrossed Senate Bill 6635):
Voter Review of a Tax Passed by the Legislature

OFFICIAL BALLOT TITLE:
The legislature eliminated, without a vote of the people, a business and occupation (B&O) tax deduction for certain financial institutions’ interest on residential loans, costing $170,000,000 in its first 10 years, for government spending.

This tax increase should be: [ ] Repealed    [ ] Maintained

BACKGROUND:
ESB 6635 was the result of the Joint Legislative Audit and Review Committee’s review of tax preferences. The bill eliminated a deduction, thereby increasing taxes for certain financial institutions. The bill also adjusted exemptions, deductions and tax rates on certain other taxes listed in the chart below, resulting in a net decrease for some businesses. “Certain Financial Institutions” means mortgage originators that do business in more than ten states, and are holding and servicing first or second mortgages on Washington property.

WHAT THIS VOTE WILL DO:
The outcome of this advisory vote will tell the legislature whether the voters think this tax should be repealed (taken off the books) or retained (continue to be collected).

HOW MUCH WILL THIS MEASURE GENERATE IN REVENUE?
This tax is expected to generate a net increase in revenue of twenty-four million dollars over the course of ten years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Engrossed Senate Bill 6635</th>
<th>Fiscal Years 2012 - 2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B&amp;O Tax: Certain Financial Institutions</td>
<td>$169,512,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B&amp;O Tax: Manufacturers of Agricultural Products</td>
<td>-$21,292,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B&amp;O Tax: Newspapers</td>
<td>$22,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leasehold Excise Tax: Publicly Owned Cargo Cranes and Docks</td>
<td>-$59,586,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Sales Tax: Data Center Server Equipment</td>
<td>-$64,378,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$24,234,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Why doesn’t the cost of the tax increase match the total 10-year cost projection?
The estimated cost of the B&O tax increase is $170 million, rounded to the nearest million as required by I-960. ESB 6635 also decreases other taxes. The $24,234,000 total includes those tax decreases.
Washington State Advisory Vote 2 (Substitute House Bill 2590):  
Voter Review of A Tax Passed by the Legislature

OFFICIAL BALLOT TITLE:
The legislature extended, without a vote of the people, expiration of a tax on possession of petroleum products and reduced the tax rate, costing $24,000,000 in its first ten years, for government spending.

This tax increase should be:  [ ] Repealed  [ ] Maintained

BACKGROUND:
SHB 2590 extends to 2020 a tax that was established in 1989 to fund the Pollution Liability Insurance Agency (PLIA) to provide affordable insurance to property owners with underground petroleum storage tanks. Coverage was extended to include homeowners and others with underground heating oil tanks in 1995. This insurance would not be available or affordable in the private market. Without insurance, property owners with these tanks would most probably not be able to sell their property. The PLIA also provides assistance to those with demonstrated financial hardship in cleaning up their property and upgrading their tanks.

Entities that pay this tax are sellers of petroleum products. The actual tax rate has been reduced from its current level but because it was due to expire in 2013 it is considered an increase.

WHAT THIS VOTE WILL DO:
The outcome of this advisory vote will tell the legislature whether the voters think this tax should be repealed (taken off the books) or retained (continue to be collected).

HOW MUCH WILL THIS MEASURE GENERATE IN REVENUE?
If this tax is maintained, then between the years 2012 – 2021 approximately $24 million will be collected as a tax on petroleum products and deposited into the pollution liability insurance program trust account.

There are no yes or no committees, nor any people speaking for or against either of the State Advisory Measures on Taxes.
King County  Proposition No. 1
Regular Property Tax Levy for Automated Fingerprint Identification System (AFIS) Services
OFFICIAL BALLOT TITLE:
King County Proposition No. 1
Regular Property Tax Levy for Automated Fingerprint Identification System (AFIS) Services
The King County Council has passed Ordinance No. 17381 concerning this proposition for the automated fingerprint identification system (AFIS) levy. This proposition would replace an expiring levy and fund continued operation of the regional AFIS program, which provides enhanced forensic fingerprint and palmprint technology and services to identify criminals and aid in convictions. It would authorize King County to levy an additional property tax of $0.0592 (5.92 cents) per $1,000 of assessed valuation for collection in 2013 and authorize annual increases by the percentage increase in the consumer price index or 1%, whichever is greater, with a maximum increase of 3%, for the five succeeding years. Should this proposition be:
Approved [ ]        Rejected  [ ]

THE SITUATION AS IT IS NOW:
King County operates an Automated Fingerprint Information System. The AFIS program provides criminal fingerprint identification services to all police agencies within the County. This regional approach allows the people of King County to invest in technology and services for their local law enforcement agencies, at a minimal cost to the individual taxpayer. Voters first approved the AFIS levy in 1986, and since then they have renewed the levy four times, for six-year periods. The current six-year levy period expires in December 2012.

WHAT THIS MEASURE WILL DO:
Voters are being asked to renew the property-tax levy which supports the operation of the King County Automated Fingerprint Identification System (AFIS) for another six years.
The levy asks voters to continue the funding of current services, including the new palmprint-matching AFIS installed in 2011. The maintenance levy would also replace an aging and inadequate regional processing lab and continue technology improvements started in the current levy cycle, such as fingerprinting in the courts and remote fingerprinting in the field by officers.
Changes in the current proposal from previous cycles include a reduction of 11 positions through attrition in the King County and Seattle AFIS operations, estimated to save $6.75 million over the life of the levy. The measure also calls for an $11.5 million reserve for the replacement of the latent print processing lab, which is undersized and presents safety issues for staff.

HOW MUCH WILL THIS MEASURE COST?
The proposed renewal levy rate is 5.92 cents per thousand of assessed valuation for the next six-year period of 2013 to 2018 – about $20.72 per year for the owner of a $350,000 home. If approved by voters, the measure would raise $118.9 million to maintain the current level of services and support current technology over the six-year period.
"As a regional crime-fighting tool, AFIS is our ‘CSI-King County,’ bringing new technology to the job of cracking cases and catching criminals,” said King County Executive Dow Constantine, who sent the proposal to the Metropolitan King County Council. “The AFIS program is one that historically stays under budget, and this new proposal creates $6.75 million of new efficiencies over the life of the levy.”

“In my previous position as Kent’s Police Chief and now as King County’s Sheriff, I have seen firsthand the value of the AFIS technology in identifying criminals and helping crack cases that may otherwise never have been solved,” said King County Sheriff Steve Strachan. “The AFIS program is a model for the efficiency of regional services and shared resources.”

"AFIS is our number-one crime-fighting tool in King County, solving more crimes than all other forensic sciences combined," said King County Prosecuting Attorney Dan Satterberg.

On May 25, King County’s regional AFIS program received international accreditation from Forensic Quality Services, which praised the program's commitment to quality management of procedures, training, and competence.

AFIS program historically stays under budget, with savings returned to King County taxpayers through reduced assessments. During the current 2007-2012 levy cycle, the rate was reduced several times, resulting in $18 million less collected than had been approved by voters. No property taxes needed to be collected at all for AFIS in 2006, thanks to reserves built up in the 2000-2005 levy cycle.

There is no organized opposition to the AFIS Levy as of press time.

Dow Constantine, King County Executive; Steve Strachan, King County Sheriff; Dan Satterberg, King County Prosecuting Attorney; Paul D. Ayers, Issaquah Police Chief; Major Mike Johnson, Bellevue Police Investigations Section; Cathy Schrock, Civilian Operations Manager, Federal Way Police Department
City of Seattle Proposition 1:
General Obligation Bonds - $290,000,000 (Alaskan Way seawall)

OFFICIAL BALLOT TITLE:
The City Council of the City of Seattle, Washington, passed Ordinance 123922, concerning funding for the Alaskan Way seawall and associated infrastructure. This proposition would address public safety risks and seismic hazards by authorizing the City to incur costs related to the design, construction, renovation, improvement, and replacement of the Alaskan Way seawall and associated public facilities and infrastructure, including City-owned waterfront piers; issue no more than $290,000,000 of general obligation bonds maturing within 30 years; and levy annual excess property taxes to repay the bonds, all as provided in Ordinance 123922.

Shall this measure be approved? Bonds, yes [ ]     Bonds, no [ ]

THE SITUATION AS IT IS NOW:
The City of Seattle owns the Alaskan Way seawall and Piers 58 and 62/63 on the City central waterfront. The City Council passed and the Mayor approved Ordinance  123922. (A copy of the full text may be found in the mailed paper voter's pamphlet and online at the City of Seattle Ethics and Elections website.) That ordinance includes the following statements about the existing situation of the seawall and piers:

“[T]he existing Alaskan Way seawall is seriously deteriorated due to aging components and materials, and tidal forces of Elliott Bay, and marine borer damage, with approximately 50 percent of the existing wall currently damaged. … [T]he seawall is not designed to withstand earthquakes and there is a one in ten chance in the next ten years of an earthquake leading to liquefaction and seawall failure. … Pier 58 is seismically vulnerable and the structural deficiencies of Piers 62/63 have forced the City to significantly limit activities on the piers in order to protect public safety.”

WHAT THIS MEASURE WILL DO:
If approved by the voters, the City proposes to sell no more than $290,000,000 in bonds to pay for the costs related to the design, construction, renovation, improvement, and replacement of the Alaskan Way seawall. There will also be structural and aesthetic improvements made to public facilities and infrastructure located in the same space as the seawall, including City-owned waterfront piers. All together, the seawall and these items are known as “the Project.” The principal and interest on the bonds (the debt) would be repaid by increased property taxes in excess of normal property tax limits.

The bonds must be issued within ten years of the vote and each bond must mature within thirty years of its sale. One percent of the estimated construction cost of the Project will be spent on public works of art in the Project space, in accordance with Seattle City law. The city also shall seek supplemental, matching, or additional funds to pay all or part of the cost of the Project. If the Project is completed and there are remaining funds from the sale of the bonds, those funds may be used for other waterfront improvements, for infrastructure construction or maintenance, or for the payment of debt service on bonds. Should there not be enough funding from the bonds to complete the Project, the City may delay completion of all or any part of the Project until adequate funding is available or eliminate any part of the Project.

HOW MUCH WILL THIS MEASURE COST?
Property taxes will be raised in excess of regular property tax levies, in such amounts sufficient to pay the principal and interest on the bonds. The annual interest for all $290 million in bonds approved by this measure is estimated to be $19 million per year over a 30-year period, assuming a 5% interest rate. Once the full $290 million in bonds have been sold, the impact to property owners is projected to be approximately $59 annually for a median-value home worth $360,000.
This measure is a critical public safety investment. The three main portions of Seattle’s waterfront seawall range in age from 75 to 96 years old. The seawall is a massive structure of concrete and reinforcing pilings that stretches from the water all the way under Alaskan Way that has allowed Seattle to transform a marshy river delta into a working deep water harbor and buildable land on the streets above.

The seawall has deteriorated to the point where it may completely fail in an earthquake or large storm. This could lead to the collapse of the Alaskan Way surface street, waterfront piers and businesses, the ferry terminal, and Port of Seattle facilities, as well as destabilization of the hill on which rests the central business district. Major utilities including power, sewer and storm water, natural gas, and telecommunications are also at high risk from catastrophic failure of the seawall should a natural disaster occur.

In 1916, Seattle residents built the first section of seawall as an investment in public health and safety and to facilitate growth of a new economy and growing city. A new seawall will not only protect health, safety, and the economy, but allow Seattle and its residents and surrounding metropolitan area to realize the economic and civic potential of the next century.

This measure also helps to fund important maintenance to publicly owned piers that right now are unsafe and unusable. If this maintenance is done while replacing the seawall, the city can save money and make these public spaces usable again.

While this measure is designed to fund the public safety need for a new seawall, the replacement project is the critical first step in a larger vision to revitalize the downtown waterfront. The new seawall will also be designed to improve and protect salmon habitat and the ecology of Elliott Bay and Puget Sound.

As this is a permanent capital expenditure, the benefits of which will be shared by the entire city and metropolitan area, a bond measure is the best and most appropriate funding mechanism.

### Arguments in favor of voting “Yes” on the Seawall Levy

This measure is a critical public safety investment. The three main portions of Seattle’s seawall range in age from 75 to 96 years old. The seawall is a massive structure of concrete and reinforcing pilings that stretches from the water all the way under Alaskan Way that has allowed Seattle to transform a marshy river delta into a working deep water harbor and buildable land on the streets above.

The seawall has deteriorated to the point where it may completely fail in an earthquake or large storm. This could lead to the collapse of the Alaskan Way surface street, waterfront piers and businesses, the ferry terminal, and Port of Seattle facilities, as well as destabilization of the hill on which rests the central business district. Major utilities including power, sewer and storm water, natural gas, and telecommunications are also at high risk from catastrophic failure of the seawall should a natural disaster occur.

In 1916, Seattle residents built the first section of seawall as an investment in public health and safety and to facilitate growth of a new economy and growing city. A new seawall will not only protect health, safety, and the economy, but allow Seattle and its residents and surrounding metropolitan area to realize the economic and civic potential of the next century.

This measure also helps to fund important maintenance to publicly owned piers that right now are unsafe and unusable. If this maintenance is done while replacing the seawall, the city can save money and make these public spaces usable again.

While this measure is designed to fund the public safety need for a new seawall, the replacement project is the critical first step in a larger vision to revitalize the downtown waterfront. The new seawall will also be designed to improve and protect salmon habitat and the ecology of Elliott Bay and Puget Sound.

As this is a permanent capital expenditure, the benefits of which will be shared by the entire city and metropolitan area, a bond measure is the best and most appropriate funding mechanism.

### Supporters of the Seawall Levy

Greater Seattle Chamber of Commerce; King County Labor Council; Charley Royer, former Seattle Mayor; Kenny Stuart, Pres. of Seattle Firefighters Local 27; Seattle Aquarium

### Arguments in favor of voting “No” on the Seawall Levy

The Seattle seawall bond measure is an unfair property tax burden which taxes the entire city to benefit just a few waterfront area property owners.

As proposed, the Elliott Bay seawall would be rebuilt with proceeds from a $290 million bond issue levied against all Seattle property owners.

Over its 30-year life, the cost of the seawall project, taking interest into account, could well exceed one billion dollars. Further, if the seawall is completed at lower cost than the full amount of the bond, the bond funds are not required to be returned to the taxpayers or used to pay down the debt service.

This measure asks Seattle taxpayers to pay for the waterfront improvements of private property owners. Seattle has almost 85 miles of waterfront property of which only 1.5% is bounded by the Seattle central waterfront seawall. The majority of waterfront commercial and residential property owners are responsible for maintaining their own bulkheads and shore lands without any public subsidy.

Many of these privately built and maintained bulkheads also hold back high-volume, principal arterial streets bordering waterways. Examples are Rainier Avenue S. on Lake Washington and Westlake Avenue on Lake Union. Private business owners along these 1.32 miles of Elliott Bay waterfront property should not benefit from what is effectively a public subsidy.

The Seattle Central Business District is the most highly valued real estate in the entire State of Washington. The bond will require all of the city’s property owners to help pay for an improvement that affects only the highly valued waterfront and central business district property.

The fairest, most equitable, and least onerous project financing should come from a Local Improvement District (LID). LIDs have been used for property improvements in Seattle since 1917. A LID ensures that those who receive the benefits pay for the benefits.

### Opponents of the Seawall Levy

Christopher V. Brown, P.E. Committee Chairman
Unit Meetings

League unit meetings (small discussion groups) discuss the topic which corresponds to the monthly forum or study. We encourage League members to join any convenient unit; see list below. The information below is current as of publication. Please check with the unit leader (listed next to the unit name) if you plan to attend and are not a regular attendee; locations may change. Please contact Lindsay Cummings, unit coordinator, if you have information to share with the units as a whole.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit Leader Email</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Location/Host</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Monday, October 8</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FIRST HILL</strong> — Joan Lawson</td>
<td><a href="mailto:joanvlawson@gmail.com">joanvlawson@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>206-382-3147</td>
<td>10:00 a.m. Horizon House, Sky Lounge 900 University St., Seattle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CAPITOL HILL/MONTLAKE</strong> — Vicky Downs/Zita Cook</td>
<td><a href="mailto:downsvidows@aol.com">downsvidows@aol.com</a></td>
<td>206-328-3926</td>
<td>7:30 p.m. Linnea Hirst 1602 E McGraw, Seattle 206-329-4848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:zzitamcook@comcast.net">zzitamcook@comcast.net</a></td>
<td>206-374-0369</td>
<td>7:30 p.m. 1602 E McGraw, Seattle 206-329-4848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SOUTHEND</strong> — Marian Wolfe/Vivian Montoya</td>
<td><a href="mailto:hedgwolfe@aol.com">hedgwolfe@aol.com</a></td>
<td>206-763-9430</td>
<td>7:30 p.m. Mount Baker Community Club 2811 Mt. Rainier Dr. S, Seattle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:montoyaviv@yahoo.com">montoyaviv@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>206-695-2620</td>
<td>7:30 p.m. Mount Baker Community Club 2811 Mt. Rainier Dr. S, Seattle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tuesday, October 9</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WEST SEATTLE</strong> — Amanda Berry/Ethel Williams</td>
<td><a href="mailto:amandamberry@earthlink.net">amandamberry@earthlink.net</a></td>
<td>206-724-7518</td>
<td>12:30 p.m. The Kenney 7125 Fauntleroy Way SW, Seattle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:etheljw1@q.com">etheljw1@q.com</a></td>
<td>206-932-7887</td>
<td>7125 Fauntleroy Way SW, Seattle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SOUTHEAST KING COUNTY</strong> — Cathy Dormaier</td>
<td><a href="mailto:clcathy@foxinternet.com">clcathy@foxinternet.com</a></td>
<td>360-802-6799</td>
<td>7:00 p.m. High Point Village 1777 High Point Street, Enumclaw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wednesday, October 10</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>VIEW RIDGE</strong> — Gail Winberg</td>
<td><a href="mailto:winbergeng@qq.com">winbergeng@qq.com</a></td>
<td>206-524-7801</td>
<td>12:45 p.m. Lynn Ferguson 6422 NE 60th St., Seattle 206-523-0391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>QUEEN ANNE/MAGNOLIA/BALLARD EVENING</strong> — Teddy Geokezas</td>
<td><a href="mailto:tgeoekzas@msn.com">tgeoekzas@msn.com</a></td>
<td>206-782-5036</td>
<td>7:30 p.m. Beatrice Crane 6545 27th Ave. NW, Seattle 206-783-8485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Thursday, October 11</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BAYVIEW</strong> — Elizabeth Mark</td>
<td><a href="mailto:elizabethcmark@gmail.com">elizabethcmark@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>206-691-1074</td>
<td>9:30 a.m. Bayview Retirement Community 4th Floor Solarium, 11 W. Aloha St. Seattle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit Leader Email</td>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Location/Host</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Thursday, October 11</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ISSAQUAH DAY</strong> – Margaret Austin</td>
<td><a href="mailto:margaret.austin@comcast.net">margaret.austin@comcast.net</a></td>
<td>425-392-5760</td>
<td>10:00 a.m. Issaquah City Hall, Coho Room upstairs, 130 E Sunset Way Dorris Martin, 425-746-9960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNIVERSITY/WALLINGFORD</strong> – Barbara Denis</td>
<td>206-547-2042</td>
<td>10:00 a.m.</td>
<td>University House 4400 Stone Way N, Seattle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SHORELINE</strong> – Juliet Beard</td>
<td><a href="mailto:juliet@windermere.com">juliet@windermere.com</a></td>
<td>206-715-5531</td>
<td>4:30 p.m. Richmond Beach Cong. Church NW 195th St. &amp;15th Ave. NW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NORTH CENTRAL</strong> – Jan Orlando</td>
<td><a href="mailto:orlanre@aol.com">orlanre@aol.com</a></td>
<td>206-524-0936</td>
<td>7:30 p.m. Alice Rasp 4523 5th Ave. NE, Seattle 206-633-1835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Friday, October 12</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BELLEVUE/KIRKLAND/REDMOND</strong> – Bonnie Rimawi</td>
<td><a href="mailto:bonnierim@aol.com">bonnierim@aol.com</a></td>
<td>425-820-7127</td>
<td>12:45 p.m. Lake Hills Public Library 15590 Lake Hills Blvd., Bellevue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wednesday, October 17</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N. KING COUNTY</strong> – Natalie Pascale Boisseau/Samanthe Sheffer</td>
<td><a href="mailto:npboisseau@gmail.com">npboisseau@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>206-417-0573</td>
<td>9:00 a.m. Third Place Commons Mtg. Room Upper level, 17171 Bothell Way NE Lake Forest Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SOUTHWEST KING COUNTY</strong> – Mary Ehlers/Kathy Jorgensen</td>
<td><a href="mailto:maryehlers@comcast.net">maryehlers@comcast.net</a></td>
<td>253-941-1930</td>
<td>7:00 p.m. Foundation House, 32290 1st Ave. S Federal Way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Saturday, October 20</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BALLARD/MAGNOLIA/QUEEN ANNE DAY</strong> – Joan Peterson</td>
<td><a href="mailto:joanmepeterson@hotmail.com">joanmepeterson@hotmail.com</a></td>
<td>206-789-7447</td>
<td>10:00 a.m. Ballard Public Library 5614 22nd Ave. NW, Seattle</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Board & Committee Contacts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Executive Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011–2013</td>
<td>President Judy Bevington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011–2013</td>
<td>1st V.P. Voter Service Cyndi Woods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012–2013</td>
<td>2nd V.P. Action Ellen Barton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012–2014</td>
<td>3rd V.P. Program Beatrice Crane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012–2013</td>
<td>4th V.P. Development Ginna Owens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011–2013</td>
<td>Treasurer Kati Ortiz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012–2013</td>
<td>Secretary Joanna Cullen</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Directors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012–2014</td>
<td>Program Karen Adair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012–2014</td>
<td>Voter Editor Marge Baker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012–2014</td>
<td>Unit Coordinator Lindsay Cummings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012–2013</td>
<td>Membership Susan Jones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012–2014</td>
<td>Voter Service Julie Anne Kempf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011–2014</td>
<td>Development Mary Jo Vigil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011–2013</td>
<td>Transportation Janet Winans</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Education Fund Board</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012–2014</td>
<td>President Boots Winterstein</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012–2014</td>
<td>Carol Burton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011–2013</td>
<td>Ellyn Swanson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012–2014</td>
<td>Lisa Unsoeld-Chang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011–2013</td>
<td>Treasurer Laraine Volkman</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Nominating Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011–2012</td>
<td>Chair Betty Sullivan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011–2012</td>
<td>Becky Cox</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011–2012</td>
<td>Carol Goldenberg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011–2012</td>
<td>Kelly Powers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011–2012</td>
<td>Laura Weese</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Off-Board Positions</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Campaign Finance</td>
<td>Jean Carlson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KC South Liaison</td>
<td>Mary Ehlers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIS Coordinator</td>
<td>Cynthia Howe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observer Corps</td>
<td>Pat McCann</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committees</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economics &amp; Taxation</td>
<td>See page 7 for more info TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>See page 7 for more info TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Relations</td>
<td>Rebecca Castilleja</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Waterfront</td>
<td>Jan O’Connor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Justice</td>
<td>Jayne Freitag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>Janet Winans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vote by Mail Study</td>
<td>Julie Anne Kempf</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LWV Seattle-King County:

General Election Ballot Issues Forum

Thursday, October 4
Seattle First Baptist Church
1111 Harvard Ave. (Harvard & Seneca)
Seattle, WA

Tuesday, October 9
Seattle University
Wyckoff Auditorium
Bannan Bldg (11th Ave. & E Columbia St.)
Seattle, WA

All forums are open to the public.

Forums start at 7:00 p.m.

October 4th:
- Marriage Equality, Charter Schools, Seattle Seawall and other state measures

October 9th:
- King County Sheriff’s race, Fingerprint Levy, and the Marijuana Initiative
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