



The Voter

A Publication of the League of Women Voters of Seattle-King County

OCTOBER 2013

VOL. 55, No.3

Election Fever

by Allison Feher

Why do they call them off-year elections? We're definitely on here at the League. With the hundreds of local races on the ballot, volunteers have been hard at work researching information about the offices, composing questions, and assisting candidates to make our Vote411.org website a truly in-depth resource for all voters. Those same volunteers and many more have been on the phone, contacting campaigns, and making the arrangements for eight plus forums. We've researched and written summaries for 13 of the ballot measures that most of King County will be seeing on the ballot. These include the state-wide measures on labeling for GMO foods and the initiative on the initiative process, 5 advisory votes on state taxes, the county EMS levy and a proposal regarding the public defender's office. These summaries and more are on pages 15 to 40. There are 10 additional measures relating to parks, fire districts, etc., that some of you may be voting on as well. The voter services team is going all hours of the day and we're not always able to fill all the requests for assistance we're getting. Come help us out!

The action team is able to squeeze in some shuteye but nonetheless is keeping busy reviewing League positions and deciding how League should respond to the various ballot measures. We are heartily endorsing the proposal that would bring back public financing to Seattle City Council races. (Read more about our endorsements and the endorsement process on pages 3 and 8). And action doesn't stop there; we're signature gathering

for Initiative 594 – an initiative to the legislature that would require background checks for all gun sales. Just don't forget, when we're doing our voter education work (forums, voter registration drives), we don't talk about the League's stance on any particular measure nor do we circulate initiative petitions or collect signatures. We want to avoid any appearance of bias in order to maintain the trust we've gained over the years.

But do help get out the vote! During the last two off-year elections, turnout was only slightly above 50%. We need to do better. Talk about the election with friends, neighbors, and the checker at the grocery store. Bring people to the forums - check the back cover and page 9 for more information. Share with them all the good resources we talked about in last month's edition of *The Voter*. Remind (nag?) everyone you see to vote - wear an "I voted" sticker every day from October 18 to November 5.

And just in case you need to update your voter registration, you have until Monday, October 7 to go online or mail in a new form.

Save the Date!
 Saturday, November 9
*The Other Side of Carbon Emissions:
 Ocean Acidification and the Salish Sea*
Luncheon Fundraiser

Contents

President's Message 3

Calendar 4

Forum Schedule..... 5

Board Briefs..... 5

Committees..... 7

King County Connects

 Endorsements 8

 Election Forums..... 9

Membership News

 National MLD program 10

 In Memoriam 10

Features

 Econ/Tax Committee Report..... 11

 Book Review 12

 Transport. Committee Report..... 13

 Waterfront Development Update..... 14

Ballot Measure Summaries..... 15

 Initiative 517 - Initiatives..... 16

 Initiative 522 - GMO 19

 Advisory Votes 21

 King Cty - Public Defender 24

 King County - EMS Levy 25

 Seattle - Districting 26

 Seattle - Public Financing 28

 SeaTac - Minimum Wage..... 29

 Federal Way - Initiatives 31

Unit Meetings..... 33

Board and Committee Contacts 35

Contact Information

President: Ellen Barton
Voter Editor: Margaret Baker

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

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

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

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

League of Women Voters of the United States
202-429-1965
lwv@lwv.org
www.lwv.org

Postal Regulations

The Voter is published monthly
except June and August by the League of
Women Voters of Seattle - King County,
1620 18th Ave, #101, Seattle, WA 98122.

Periodicals postage paid at
Seattle, WA.

Postmaster:
Send address changes to *The Voter*:

1620 18th Ave, Suite 101
Seattle, WA 98122
The Voter (ISSN 0888-8841)

Connecting with the Leadership

Musings on Process:

I knew that being the President of the largest local league in the country was going to be a challenge, but I hoped that I was up to it and if I wasn't, I hoped that I could fake it. Well, so far, so good. Working with volunteers is always a challenge and working with such dynamic, intelligent volunteers with strongly held opinions, is even more so. As you already know, I am trying to accomplish this task while working nearly full time as an attorney in a small law firm. I am learning a lot and having a good time too.

Let's talk about how it has gone so far. The Board has met twice. The first time in August we began a strategic planning process. While I don't think we will ever be finished with that process, we were able to make significant progress. As I reported last month, we decided where to focus our efforts. During our second meeting in September we made endorsement decisions on the two Seattle issues for the November ballot (Seattle Prop 1 and Charter Amendment 19). The decisions are published elsewhere in this issue. What I wanted to mention here is how well the process went. For those who do not know or haven't been aware, the endorsement process has been contentious in the past. While Judy Bevington was president we adopted a procedure to be followed which we have adapted as we learned what works and what doesn't. I have had lots of suggestions about how to make it better, and we will continue to tweak it as we go. At present, our procedure is as follows: Initially, we follow what is going on politically and what measures are likely to make it to the ballot. Then the Action Chair (Janet Winans) and I make a decision about which measures impact League positions and should be considered for endorsement. Sometimes that decision is made by the Board as a whole. Sometimes we are asked by a



committee to consider making an endorsement decision. Next, we request input from members and from the community who may be interested in the issue. We review information provided by all sides of the issue. We may or may not invite speakers to the endorsement meeting, depending on how complicated the issue is. We then make our decision at the Board meeting, after considering all the materials, any comments by speakers and by fellow Board members. Endorsement decisions must be based upon our positions (local, state or national) and not upon personal opinions. The vote on whether to endorse or to oppose must be by a "2/3rd plus 1" majority to ensure that the final decision is strongly supported.

While some of you may not agree with our decisions, I hope that you appreciate that we make our best efforts to consider all sides and make a decision that is most consistent with League positions. At our meeting on October 5, the Board will be making endorsement decisions on the SeaTac wage initiative and the King County Charter Amendment 1 creating an office of public defense. Please forward any information you believe the Board should consider to info@seattletlelv.org.

Update on Program Planning:

We are going to try something new with program planning for next year. Instead of the forum in January, we will be asking members to spend some time in December at their unit meetings discussing what topics/issues/studies you would like to work on, learn more about, or take action on during the 2014-15 program planning year. Your responses will be compiled and during the January unit meetings, we will ask you to discuss and vote on your favorites.

continued on page 6

October

Sunday	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
		October 1	2	3 League Drinks 6:00 p.m. Forum: Ballot Measures 7:30 p.m.	4	5 Board Meeting 9:00 a.m.
6	7 Int'l Relations Committee 12:45 p.m. Voter Deadline	8	9	10	11	12
13	14	15	16	17	18	19
20	21	22	23	24 Education Committee 10:00 a.m.	25	26 Economics & Tax Cmte. 9:30 a.m. LWVWA Action Workshop
27	28	29 Transportation Committee 10:00 a.m.	30	31	November 1	2 Board Meeting 9:00 a.m. LWVWA Action Workshop
3	4 Int'l Relations Committee 12:45 p.m. Voter Deadline	5 ELECTION DAY	6	7	8	9 FALL EVENT

Units meet during shaded period

OCTOBER

League Drinks
Thursday, October 3
6:00 p.m.
Jimmy's on Broadway

Forum: Ballot Measures
Thursday, October 3
7:30 p.m.
Seattle First Baptist Church

Board Meeting
Saturday, October 5
9:00 a.m.
League Office

International Relations
Committee
Monday, October 7
12:45-2:45 p.m.
League Office

The Voter Deadline
Monday, October 7

Education Committee
Thursday, October 24
10:00 a.m.
League Office

Economics & Taxation Comm.
Saturday, October 26
9:30 a.m.
909 E. Newton, # D-9, Seattle

LWVWA Action Workshop
in Ellensburg
Saturday, October 26

Transportation Committee
Tuesday, October 29
10:00 a.m.
League Office

NOVEMBER

Board Meeting
Saturday, November 2
9:00 a.m.
League Office

LWVWA Action Workshop
in Ellensburg
Saturday November 2

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

Forum Schedule

<p>October 3 - General Election</p> <p>November 9* - see note below</p> <p>December 6 - No Forum</p> <p>January 9 - TBA</p> <p>February 6 - Gun Security</p> <p>March 6 - Women's Issues</p> <p>April 3 - Nat'l Agriculture Update</p> <p>May 1 - TBA</p>

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 2013-2014 appears at left; check *The Voter* each month or the LWVS-KC website, seattlelwv.org, for up-to-date information.

**We are doing a Saturday luncheon instead of the Thursday forum in November. Terrie Klinger, Barer Professor of Sustainability Science, UW School of Marine and Environmental Affairs and Co-Director of the UW Center on Ocean Acidification will present The Other Side of Carbon Emissions: Ocean Acidification and the Future of the Salish Sea. Saturday, November 9 at 11:30a.m., Downstairs at Town Hall. Check the website for updates and additional information.*

Board Briefs by Amanda Clark, Secretary

The League of Women Voters of Seattle-King County Board met on Saturday, September 7, 2013. This is a summary of their work.

Treasurer's Report

Cindy Piennett did an overview of the budget; it is early in the fiscal year but current numbers are on track with expectations.

The Board approved a motion to show the Bridge to the Future Fund as "unrestricted" on the books rather than "restricted." There is no record of that fund ever being restricted to particular activities or spending and therefore should be classified as unrestricted for accounting purposes.

Endorsements

The Board considered endorsing two ballot measures, Seattle Proposition 1, for public financing of City Council elections, and City Charter Amendment No. 19, which mandates

electing 7 City Council members by district and 2 members at large.

The board voted to endorse Prop 1 but took no position on Charter Amendment 19.

The board will discuss the City of SeaTac's proposal for a \$15/hr. minimum wage and a charter amendment to make the King County public defender's office part of county government at the next meeting.

Program Information

A number of election forums are planned around the area: Lake Forest Park, Mercer Island and Medina, as well as many in Seattle.

Planning for a November fundraising event is continuing.

Connecting with Leadership cont'd.

Studies:

Over the past several years, part of the difficulty with the endorsement process has been the number of levies the various governmental entities have imposed on the people of King County and Seattle. We all love our parks, our libraries, and our preschools and hope that better facilities will make juvenile justice live up to its name. However, imposing more and more taxes in the form of property tax levies does not seem to be the best method of funding these important and necessary governmental systems. The primary objection made to these levies is that the money should come from the general fund. It seems that these levies have proliferated over the past ten years. Although arguably many were required

during the recession, will they go away once the economy fully recovers or are they here to stay? League positions are generally against the use of operations levies. Are those positions outdated? Is this the brave new world of funding of necessary governmental functions that we must learn to live with? Should the League positions on operations levies be updated? If anyone is interested in thinking, talking, or learning more on this subject, consider coming to the Economics & Taxation Committee meetings. The date and time is noted elsewhere in this publication.

Did I mention I was having fun?

Ellen Barton
President

Diversity Policy

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

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

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



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

Meetings can be subject to last minute changes. Contact the committee chair or call the LWVS-KC Office at 206-329-4848 to confirm.

Economics And Taxation Committee

DATE: Saturday, October 26

TIME: 9:30 a.m.

PLACE: 909 E. Newton #D-9, Seattle

Education Committee

DATE: Thursday, October 24

TIME: 10:00 a.m.

LOCATION: League Office

International Relations Committee

DATE: Monday, October 7

TIME: 12:45 – 2:45 p.m.

PLACE: League Office

Our focus is China foreign policy.

Transportation Committee

DATE: Tuesday, October 29

TIME: 10:00 – 12:00

PLACE: League Office

Subject: Engaging the Legislature

Speaker: TBA

We encourage participation by all interested members in our committees. It's a great opportunity to meet and talk to community leaders, stakeholder organizations, and experts where you can have direct input on local issues that affect you.

Don't see a committee that covers your issue? Call the office and let us know. Sometimes people are working in a more informal manner without regularly scheduled meetings. If not, we may be able to help connect you with like-minded people to start your own.

Action Workshops are Coming!

The annual workshops offered by LWVWA to help learn about being an effective advocate have been scheduled. There will be three this year:

Saturday, Oct. 26 - Action Workshop in Ellensburg hosted by LWV Yakima County

Saturday, Nov. 2 - Action Workshop in Everett hosted by LWV Snohomish County

Saturday, Dec. 7 - Action Workshop in Puyallup hosted by LWV Tacoma-Pierce County

Watch for more details on the state League website, www.lwvwa.org, and in the weekly emails.

King County Connects — Announcements



BALLOT MEASURE ENDORSEMENTS FOR THE NOVEMBER 5TH ELECTION

Support Public Financing — No position on Districted Elections

The Board of Directors of the League of Women Voters of Seattle-King County has voted to endorse Seattle Proposition 1, Public Funding of City Council Campaigns, based upon longstanding positions of the League. The Seattle-King County LWV considers this proposed change to City election law to be a worthy step toward maximizing citizen participation, limiting the amount spent on campaigns, and encouraging better access to the ballot for candidates, and open, fair elections.

The Board voted to take no position on proposed Seattle Charter Amendment 19 changing the election of Seattle City Council members from all at-large to a hybrid of 7 elected by district and 2 at-large members.

The League position on city council elections, adopted in 1975, states, "Council members should not be elected exclusively by district." This position requires neither support for nor opposition to the proposed amendment. The Board considered and was unable to reach consensus on the following two questions: "What are the problems essential to the citizens of this city that require changing the way its council members are elected?" And, "Do those problems warrant this change at this time?" Therefore, the Board voted to take no position.

On October 5, 2013, the Board will be considering the proposed Charter Amendment to make the public defenders office part of King County government and the SeaTac minimum wage proposal that will also be on the November ballot.

LWVWA Not Taking Positions on I-517 and I-522

This election season the Board of the League of Women Voters of Washington determined we could neither support nor oppose the initiatives on the statewide ballot because we have no positions that cover those areas closely enough. I-522, the initiative to require labeling on products that include GMO's, is an issue that is being studied at the LWVUS level and our existing open government positions do not cover labeling.

As to I-517, the Initiative about Initiatives, the Board felt that our positions supporting initiative processes could lead to a support decision, but our position on upholding the constitution and free speech rights would militate against the initiative. Neither position was completely on point and so the Board felt that no position should be taken.

ELECTION FORUMS



In addition to our first Thursday forum on the ballot measures, we are also sponsoring several other forums around King County.

Seattle Mayoral Candidates Forum

Monday, September 30 at 6:30 p.m.
Cornish Playhouse Lobby at Seattle Center
(formerly Intiman Theater)
201 Mercer St, Seattle
Co-sponsored with Allied Arts

General Election Ballot Issues Forum

Thursday, October 3 at 7:30 p.m.
Seattle First Baptist Church
1111 Harvard Ave, Seattle

Candidate Forums

Monday, October 7th and 14th at 7:30 p.m.
Horizon House
900 University St, Seattle

Note: Co-sponsored by the First Hill Unit of the League and the Public Affairs Committee of Horizon House. Open to Horizon House residents and League members. If you are not a resident, please rsvp to Joan Lawson, joanvlawson@gmail.com.

Lake Forest Park City Council Candidates

Tuesday, October 1 at 7:00 p.m.
Third Place Commons, Lake Forest Park

Mercer Island City Council Candidates Forum

Tuesday, October 8 at 7:30 p.m.
Mercer Island Middle School

Medina City Council Candidates Forum

Wednesday, October 16 at 7:00 p.m.
Overlake Golf & Country Club

Because we can't do them all but we want people to be able to know about and attend forums in their area, the calendar on the League website is also listing nonpartisan candidate forums that are open to the public. If you know about one and it is not listed - please let us know!

Getting Connected Membership News

Meet a Shur Fellow: Nancy Eitreim

Many of you already know Nancy, but National League is putting the spotlight on her this week in the enewsletter. Here's what they had to say: The Ruth S. Shur Fellows team is comprised of 28 dynamic and dedicated volunteers from across the country who were selected from a pool of candidates to support state coaching teams in mentoring local Leagues in recruiting and engaging members and the community to make our democracy strong and vibrant. Nancy joined the Seattle LWV in 1975 and was elected to the Board in 1977 during the pre-electronic era. During the next 20+ years she held both on and off board offices, chaired Housing, Women, and Social Justice committees and coordinated action on various issues of concern to the public. Her passions are making voting easy and ac-

cessible, working for universal registration, and providing clear and accessible information on the issues of the day.

She served four years as the LWVS president (2003-2007) and one term on the LWVUS Board (2008-2010). Professionally, she was a public affairs special project coordinator for KING 5 TV, development director for several nonprofits, and a deputy probation officer in Alameda County, California. She is president of the Southeast Seattle Senior Foundation that owns and manages 125 units of affordable nonprofit senior housing. Nancy is married, has two adult children, and two young grandsons who fill her spare time with fun and adventure. Nancy is using her wealth of League experience to strengthen Leagues in Michigan and New Mexico.

In memoriam: Irene Peyton (1926 - 2013)

Irene Rose (Melnick) Peyton, an active member of the League of Women Voters for nearly half a century, died at the age of 87 in Kent on July 1, 2013. Irene's involvement with League began in Alaska, soon after it entered the Union as the 49th State. In Fairbanks, she and fellow Seattle-KC League member Mary Slotnick helped organize the Tanana Valley League of Women Voters. Irene also served on the charter committee for the Alaska State League, and she remained active in League affairs all her life. In 1987, she was honored as an Outstanding Member for her 27 years of service to the community. The same year, Irene was honored by the Alaska Legislature for her dedication to the public process, which included service on the Alaska Select Committee on Legislative Ethics.

They married in 1960 and later moved to Fairbanks, where Leonard helped start the Institute of Arctic Biology at the University of Alaska, and Irene became involved in many community groups.

When the couple relocated to the Seattle area in 2005, to be closer to their children and grandchildren, Irene joined the King County South League, and she remained active in it until close to the end of her life.

"She was a good neighbor, a very good neighbor," said Mary Slotnick, now 96, recalling the years when the Peytons lived across the road on Red Fox Drive in Fairbanks. Irene Peyton was indeed a good neighbor, not only to the Slotnick family but to the communities she lived in.

Born in Brockton, Massachusetts, in 1926, Irene worked in the shipyards of Bremerton, Washington, during World War II. Looking for adventure, she moved in 1956 to Anchorage, where she met her future husband, Leonard Peyton.

The family is planning a memorial service Oct. 5, 2013, at the Burien Community Center (Shorewood Room), 14700 6th Ave SW, from 2:00 - 3:00 p.m.

Features

NEWS FROM THE ECONOMICS & TAXATION COMMITTEE

BY JEANETTE JOHNSON

This is the third in a series of articles about America's growing economic inequality crisis and what we can do about it based on Timothy Noah's book, The Great Divergence.

The past two months I looked at how America's economic inequality crisis has grown worse since 1979 and began to examine some of the possible reasons for this. This month I look at two other possible causes: immigration and technology.

Immigration The Immigration and Nationality Act of 1965 eased immigration restrictions in the U.S. and was the catalyst for the upsurge in immigration that began in the late 1960s. Over the years, this has culminated in a foreign-born population today of about 13% compared to about 5% in 1965. Some have pointed to this influx as a contributing factor in lowering wages and an important factor underpinning the increase in economic inequality. But the best evidence is that the impact of immigration on income inequality has been limited.

The most authoritative study was done by George Borjas and Lawrence Katz of Harvard, who specifically looked at immigration from Mexico. According to Borjas and Katz, "between 1980 and 2000 Mexican immigration reduced the income of native-born high school dropouts ('who roughly correspond to the poorest tenth of the workforce') by 7.4 percent," or about 0.4% per year. The conclusion from this study was that immigration from Mexico has not significantly impacted overall economic inequality in the U.S., even though it has had some impact on the wages of native-born high school dropouts.

Technology One popular explanation for the rise in inequality is that it is due to technology.

The story goes that technology has eliminated many middle-class jobs and replaced them with lower-wage service jobs. At the same time, the number of jobs has increased for highly-educated, computer-savvy workers.

Thus, computerization has created "a polarization of employment," with job growth concentrated in both the highest- and lowest-paid occupations, while jobs in the middle have declined. (David Autor and David Dorn, New York Times, August 24, 2013.)

The notion that technology caused the rise in income inequality raises a number of questions. For one, it doesn't explain why job polarization is so much worse in the U.S. than in other advanced industrialized democracies. Nor can it explain why income inequality began well before the current computer age. It's important to keep in mind also that technological advances requiring increasingly skilled workers have been a dominant characteristic throughout the twentieth century without resulting in an increase in inequality. So, what seems to be different this time?

Harvard economists Claudia Goldin and Lawrence Katz say the difference today is that the supply of educated Americans is no longer keeping up with the demand for skilled workers. High school graduation rates have leveled off at 75%, and, while college attendance rates continue to climb, college graduation rates have slowed. This slowdown in educational attainment appears to be a "uniquely American" trend among industrialized democracies, according to Noah.

Faced with the crunch for more highly-skilled workers, American employers have been willing to pay a wage premium to those with the requisite education. For college graduates the wage premium has nearly doubled since 1980, while the median salary for a male high school graduate who did not go on to college has significantly declined.

BOOK REVIEW by Vicky Downs

THE METROPOLITAN REVOLUTION: HOW CITIES AND METROS ARE FIXING OUR BROKEN POLITICS AND FRAGILE ECONOMY by Bruce Katz and Jennifer Bradley

My copy of this book arrived on July 27, 2013, the very day Thomas Friedman's column "I Want to Be a Mayor" appeared in the *New York Times*. The column sums up the book by pointing out that "cities are generating crucial economic growth."

Katz and Bradley say that with the federal government in DC stymied by polarized groups and a general lack of funds, cities and adjacent towns offer the US "its best chance to revive its national economy, reboot its national competitiveness and restore purpose to its politics and civility to its commons."

How are cities doing this? The authors provide four very different examples. The first shows how, in 15 months following the 2008 financial disaster, Mayor Bloomberg's "New York City lost 36,000 jobs from the financial sector alone." The tax revenue shrank precipitously and the mayor understood he needed to take aggressive steps to diversify and rebalance the city's economy.

He gathered a group of people with a wide variety of expertise to figure out where the city was weak, and how to make that section stronger. It became apparent the city needed a particular kind of engineering: one with an entrepreneurial bent.

A little over a year later, the city announced the Cornell-Technion group "had won the right to build a new graduate school on Roosevelt Island in the East River." This institute will put "technology in the service of commerce...and the university program will be geared to helping start-up businesses in the city." New York City is on its way to full economic recovery.

Other cities are taking different approaches. Denver needed a new airport some years ago

and to build one was forced to expand its tax base to include surrounding cities and towns. Denver's mayors realized they needed to help "disparate suburban communities [to come to see themselves] as part of something larger and stronger." It helped when one mayor (now Colorado's governor) visited each surrounding town to see and appreciate what each had to offer.

The authors show how Denver's suburban towns learned about each other, and in time, instead of seeing each other as "competition", they understood they were team members and needed to support each other. They could see that Denver's amenities such as "zoos, museums and performing arts centers..." helped the entire region. Small taxes for "the construction of a baseball stadium in downtown Denver" paid off for everyone.

Amazingly, Katz and Bradley see hopeful signs in places such as Detroit and Houston, Texas! Unlike politicians in the federal government, city politicians find local identity is more important than party affiliation because they have to focus on the health of the city they live in: the waterfront, education, local jobs, etc.

I learned that density is important. Many companies are now moving into cities where workers can connect with people from diverse backgrounds and diverse experiences. If someone with a great idea can talk with another "idea person" in the same building or in a building next door, he will do so. If he has to travel a mile away, he won't.

Reaching out globally is also useful. It helps if a city has at least one economic sector that is world class. For example, if it has great performing arts, tourists and money will come from all over the world. If the city has connections over-

seas, it can use those to sell world-class goods and services to a larger market.

This is a down-to-earth book and probably the most uplifting one about economic well being I have read in years. I recommend it to anyone who cares about the city she lives in!

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

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE

AGENDA: PLANNING FOR 2013-14

BY JANET WINANS

We ended our “Committee Year” in June poised for action because of what we learned from our FREIGHT 101 speakers about the need to extend the critical freight corridors in King County – SRs 167 and 509. We began by communicating with the on-going legislative process. We attended local meetings of coalitions, such as the Seattle Chamber of Commerce lobby team, and hearings held by King County Councilman Larry Phillips and Governor Inslee. We joined the LWVWA lobby team to send letters to legislators recommending passage of the House Transportation Bill and its approval by the Senate. The Senate did not accept the new revenues included in the House bill and the extended sessions ended with a bill that maintains the status quo. That includes no authorization for King County to request citizens’ approval of new revenue to fund necessary Metro Transit services, no funds to extend SRs 167 or 509, a refusal to join Oregon and USDOT to build a new bridge across the Columbia River, and no new funding to complete any of the underfunded projects underway, such as the 520 bridge.

During our discussion at our August meeting, the committee agreed that this committee year we will learn to better engage the legislative

process, before the 2014 session begins. We can call it: LEARNING THE LEGISLATURE 101. Our fall speakers will be legislative aides to the House and Senate Transportation Committee Chairs. Our questions to them will include: Where does the information about transportation needs that leads to legislation begin? How do the committee members learn to understand those needs? How do the House and Senate differ in prioritizing those needs? What are the important outside organizations that can influence the process? Where do the various government agencies with transportation needs fit into the legislative priorities? How can citizens best engage that process?

To begin our year’s emphasis on legislative issues, our September meeting will be attending the Senate Co-Chairs traveling “listening” tour with its goal of finding a way out of the failed budget from the 2013 legislative session. That meeting is fortuitously scheduled for the evening of our third Tuesday meeting, September 17 in Bellevue.

In addition to our Puget Sound Regional meetings, some of us will attend the LWVWA Action Workshops in Yakima, Everett, and Tacoma in order to talk with members in those areas of the state.

We will be planning a forum for later in the year with speakers who will address the best ways to engage the 2014 Legislative Session.



WHAT'S HAPPENING ON THE WATERFRONT?

by Charles and Nancy Bagley

In April 2012 “Making Plans for the Seattle Central Waterfront” was the topic of an update in *The Voter* and a public forum, ably written and organized by Jan O'Connor. Sadly, Jan died in May 2013. For League members who want to continue to follow waterfront development plans and carry on Jan's valiant efforts to inform and involve the public, we offer a quick summary of what has happened to date. There are four projects:

Viaduct Replacement – Tunnel drilling started, went 24 feet, and then stopped because of a labor dispute. The viaduct is due for removal by January 2016.

Seawall Rebuilding will be in 2 phases. The first part from S. Washington St. to Virginia St., funded by a \$240 million bond, has just started. Completion is planned for 2016. This will include creating a beach at the S. Washington St. shore. Beach details are not finished. The second part from Virginia north to Broad St. has no time line or funding.

Alaskan Way road/bike/pedestrian plans are set, but details of amenities (trees, planters, art, allowable concessions, etc.) are not final. Throughout, there are 2-way bike lanes, pedestrian walks of varying width, and extensive planters and trees. Traffic lanes will be: From S. King to Yesler – 7 to 8 lanes (4 for cars, 2 for transit only, 1 to 2 for ferry loading); From Yesler to Madison – 6 lanes (4 for cars, 2 ferry); From Madison to Pine – 6 lanes (4 for cars, 2 parking). North of Pine, the main traffic swings uphill in the viaduct route to Blanchard, where north bound traffic goes onto Western, and south bound vehicles enter via Elliott, as at present. Also at Pine local waterfront traffic splits off and continues north to Broad. From the Market at Pine a large pedestrian “Overlook Walk” will cross the railroad and Alaskan Way to reach the waterfront at Pike

St. There is no plan at present to use the trolley cars.

Public Piers at Union (now Waterfront Park) and 62/63 will become parks. Plans currently call for fountains, water access, roller skating, grandstands, art, and a swimming pool on a barge. These designs are not yet final.

Funding for all (except tunnel) projects totals \$1075 million, of which \$250 million is expected from a Local Improvement District (LID), consisting of landowners downtown who will see their land value rise as a result of the viaduct removal and waterfront improvements. No LID has yet been formed. The City Council is studying who will benefit from the improvements and then will need 60% of owners to approve in order to proceed with a one-time assessment. If owners fail to approve the LID, there is no contingency plan to replace those funds, and many of the street and park projects would have to be cancelled.

What you can do: Major projects need an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), which begins with a “scoping” to determine what factors need to be evaluated. The Public Piers EIS scoping deadline is late October (date not set). But after that time, city planners are open to any comments you want to make about the design features and amenities you like, don't like, or wish to add. This is OUR chance to create a great Seattle Waterfront. These comments will probably be accepted through 2014.

Learn more at waterfrontseattle.org; look at the yellow list on the left of the screen. See especially the “Q2 2013 Report,” and for the piers, the “Waterfront Design Summary, July 2012,” pages 34 – 38. Send comments to UplandEISscoping@waterfrontseattle.org or write to Peter E. Hahn, Department of Transportation, c/o Mark Mazzola, Environmental Manager, PO Box 34996, Seattle, WA 98124-4996. If you would like to help the League monitor the progress of waterfront projects, please contact the office.



The League of Women Voters of Seattle-King County

Summaries of Ballot Issues

November 5, 2013 General Election

Ballot Issues Committee

Julie Anne Kempf, chair

Research, Drafting, and Editing:

Mary Burki, Mary Ehlers, Allison Feher, Jeanette Johnson, Julie Anne Kempf,
Ann Murphy (LWV Spokane), R. Peggy Smith (LWV Thurston),
Betty Sullivan, Laura Weese

Reading Committee:

Beatrice Crane, Amanda Clark, Joanna Cullen, Cyndi Woods

The League of Women Voters of Seattle-King County has made every effort to present objective, nonpartisan information about the November 5, 2013 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.

**Information is current as of 9/23/2013*

**WASHINGTON STATE INITIATIVE 517 -
INITIATIVE AND REFERENDUM MEASURES**

Ballot Title:

This measure would set penalties for interfering with or retaliating against signature-gatherers and petition-signers; require that all measures receiving sufficient signatures appear on the ballot; and extend time for gathering initiative petition signatures.

Should this measure be enacted into law?

Yes No

THE LAW AS IT IS NOW:

Background: What is an Initiative? An initiative is a way for the citizens of a state, rather than the legislature, to enact a new law. An initiative may be to the people, or to the legislature. In an initiative to the people, the people vote on the measure at the general election of the year in which it was submitted. In an initiative to the legislature, if the legislature chooses not to enact the proposed law in the next legislative session, the question is put to the voters at the next general election. A simple majority of the voters can approve either form of initiative.

The Washington State constitution guarantees the right to public initiatives and referenda. There are two requirements to getting an initiative or referendum on the ballot. First, the sponsor must file a proposed initiative with the Secretary of State, who assigns it a number. Then, after the Secretary of State accepts the filing, supporters must gather a certain number of validated signatures of voters registered in Washington State. The required number of signatures is based on the number of votes cast in the most recent gubernatorial election.

Under current law, an initiative to the people can be filed ten months before the election in which it would appear on the ballot, or the first week in January for the next November election. An initiative to the legislature can be filed with the Secretary of State ten months before the legislature's next regular session, or during the sec-

ond week of March the year prior to the session. Most initiatives in Washington State are statewide, but some cities and counties, depending on the population and type of local government, are also permitted to place local initiatives on the ballot.

Background: Petitions and Gathering Signatures:

To have an initiative placed on the ballot, the initiative sponsor must submit petitions to the Secretary of State with the required number of valid signatures. Each petition must have clearly printed on it the full text of the proposed law and a statement that the signer is personally and truthfully signing the petition, is providing correct information, and has signed only once, with a line for each signer's printed name, signature, and address where registered to vote. The petition circulator also must sign the petition, swearing that to the best of his or her knowledge, voters signed the petition freely and without compensation and the information provided by the signers is true and correct, and acknowledging that forging a signature or paying for signatures is illegal.

Background: Local Initiatives

Unlike statewide initiatives, which automatically appear on the ballot if they meet the signature requirements, local initiatives can sometimes be prevented from being placed on the ballot. In some jurisdictions, it is the local legislative body that formally places the measure of the ballot, and it may be required only to place it on the ballot at some future date, not necessarily the next election. Or the body may challenge the legality of the measure, and can prevent it from appearing on the ballot if it is determined to be illegal or unenforceable.

Background: Current Law Regarding Harassment of Signature Gatherers:

Those gathering signatures for petitions and those signing petitions receive the same protection from ha-

rassment or assault as anyone else, but no further protection. Harassment includes threats to cause bodily injury, damage a person's property, or in any way harm the threatened person's physical or mental health or safety. Washington law also prohibits assaulting another person with unlawful force and the intent to inflict bodily harm, regardless of whether bodily harm occurs; stalking, which is intentionally and repeatedly harassing or repeatedly following a person with intent to frighten, intimidate, or harass the person, or with knowledge that the person is afraid, intimidated, or harassed; and disorderly conduct, defined as using abusive language and thereby creating a risk of assault, intentionally disrupting any lawful assembly, or obstructing vehicular or pedestrian traffic without lawful authority.

What this measure will do:

This measure would do three things:

1. It would increase the time allotted for gathering petition signatures.
2. It would require any measure that received the required number of signatures to be placed on the ballot at the next election.
3. It would make interfering with signature gathering illegal.

This measure would increase the time allotted for gathering petition signatures by up to six months. Proposed initiative measures for a statewide vote of the people could be filed with the Secretary of State starting 16 months before the election at which the voters would consider the measure, rather than the current 10 months. Proposed referenda to the legislature could be filed starting 16 months, rather than 10 months, prior to the legislature's next regular session at which the measure would be considered.

This measure would require that any statewide or local initiative that received the required number of signatures in the allotted timeframe be submitted to a vote of the people. This vote would occur at the next scheduled election, regardless of any pending litigation or other procedural issues.

Local government officials would be required to submit the initiative to a vote regardless of the timing or subject matter of the initiative measure.

This measure would provide that interfering with signature gathering for a state or local initiative or referendum is illegal. Interfering with a person trying to sign a petition, stalking a person who signs a petition, or stalking or retaliating against a person who gathers petition signatures would constitute the misdemeanor of disorderly conduct. Such conduct would be subject to the civil anti-harassment procedures available under Washington law (RCW 10.14) and civil penalties. Interfering with petition signing and signature gathering would include direct physical and verbal abuse, as well as blocking or intimidating, or maintaining an intimidating presence within twenty-five feet of, a petition signer or signature gatherer. Initiative or referendum petition signing and signature gathering would be legally protected on public sidewalks and walkways and all sidewalks and walkways that carry pedestrians, including those in front of entrances and exits to stores, and inside or outside public buildings.

How much will this measure cost?

Initiative 517 (I-517) makes changes to the state and local government initiative process, but it has no revenue, expenditure or cost impact on state government. There is no revenue impact on local governments from I-517. However, local governments may experience increased law enforcement costs related to the provision that interfering with signature gathering is illegal. There are no data to estimate the annual number of law enforcement actions that may occur from this portion of the initiative, and therefore the fiscal impact on counties and cities cannot be determined. The increased cost to local government due to elections which must be held, even if the underlying provision of the petition is illegal, is approximately \$1.50 per registered voter, per jurisdiction, per election held under this initiative.

Those in favor of “APPROVE” on I-517 say:

I-517 is necessary to protect voters who want to sign petitions. Opponents of initiatives too often use harassment to prevent citizens from signing. I-517 establishes penalties to discourage such behavior.

I-517 would enable the people to vote on qualified initiatives. In recent years, more than 16 citizen-sponsored initiatives were blocked from a public vote by lawsuits filed by powerful special interests even though local citizens followed all the rules. I-517 requires measures to go on the ballot regardless of pending litigation.

More time to gather signatures would allow more grassroots groups to compete. Since 1912, the number of required signatures has increased while the timeframe for collecting signatures has stayed the same. As a result, initiatives sponsored by big business, big labor, and the rich are increasingly the only ones qualifying for the ballot. Almost all other initiative states allow a year or more to collect signatures; I-517 matches the national average. Even opponents of I-517 agree that it would make the initiative process less expensive.

The courts have said that petitioning at places open to the public is guaranteed under the First Amendment. I-517 would protect citizens as they exercise their free speech rights by signing petitions. It would also guarantee the right to public initiatives provided in the Washington State Constitution. Without I-517, initiative opponents are free to prevent citizens from expressing themselves and voting on issues they care about.

Those in favor of “REJECT” on I-517 say:

Former Secretary of State Sam Reed said that most complaints received in his office were from citizens and businesses who were being harassed by aggressive signature gatherers. Laws already exist to protect peaceful signature gatherers from harm.

I-517 would greatly increase election costs. A provision in I-517 requires cities and counties to put local initiatives on the ballot even if they're illegal or invalid, wasting taxpayer dollars on unnecessary elections.

The sponsor of I-517 is Tim Eyman, a full-time professional initiative proponent who makes money from gathering signatures and promoting initiative measures. He stands to benefit under I-517, which makes it easier and cheaper for anyone to qualify future initiatives to the ballot, enabling a professional greatly to increase his profits.

I-517 would make petitioning more intrusive, because it allows out of state petitioners to be active in Washington year-round – both inside and outside public buildings. Petitioners could go inside sports stadiums, public libraries, and even public school events to ask Washingtonians to sign petitions.

I-517 violates Washingtonians' constitutionally guaranteed property rights, preventing property owners from having control over signature gathering on their property, although courts have ruled that petitioners must respect private property rights when collecting signatures. Under I-517, law enforcement would be directed to vigorously protect petitioners collecting within a twenty-five foot zone. Business owners could not stop aggressive petitioners from blocking and harassing customers who are trying to enter or exit a store.

**WASHINGTON STATE INITIATIVE 522 -
LABELING OF GENETICALLY-ENGINEERED FOODS**
Ballot Title:

This measure would require most raw agricultural commodities, processed foods, and seeds and seed stocks, if produced using genetic engineering, as defined, to be labeled as genetically engineered when offered for retail sale.

Should this measure be enacted into law?

Yes No

What this measure will do:

If I-522 is approved, genetically engineered raw agricultural products and processed foods will have to be labeled beginning July 1, 2015.

There are exemptions that include:

- Food sold in restaurants
- Alcoholic beverages
- Certified organic food (which by law can not contain any deliberately added genetically engineered ingredients)
- Meat from animals that ate genetically engineered feed
- Food produced with processing aids or enzymes, if those are its only genetically engineered ingredients.

Until July 1, 2019, there is an exemption for processed food where the ingredients are 0.9% or less of the total weight.

Genetically engineered seeds sold at retail would be labeled.

Retailers, farmers, and anyone else in the food business could be protected from liability if they have statements from either suppliers or independent testing saying ingredients are not genetically engineered.

The Department of Health (DOH) has enforcement authority to impose civil penalties of up to \$1,000 per day. DOH has limited rulemaking authority in that it cannot create any exemptions beyond those stated in the act. Enforcement may also occur through private enforcement actions in the public interest.

How much will this measure cost?

Costs to Washington State include the initial expense of developing a program to regulate labeling

of genetically modified food offered for retail sale, as well as subsequent implementation and enforcement costs. The exact costs cannot be forecast accurately at this point. The Washington state consumer may expect to see an increase in food costs as manufacturers, distributors and retailers implement the mandatory verifications and documentation required for all foods deemed genetically modified.

Quick facts about GMOs and Labeling:

Mandatory labeling of genetically engineered (GE) foods in the United States has been proposed, but not enacted, at the national, state, and local levels. Bills requiring mandatory labeling have been introduced in Congress and in the Colorado legislature, and there have also been attempts to place citizens' initiatives on statewide and local Colorado ballots. Maine and Connecticut have passed laws requiring labeling, however, their laws' enactment are dependent upon more states participating. Japan and the European Union, nations to whom the US exports substantial amounts of food products, currently require genetically engineered foods to be labeled.

Those in favor of labeling emphasize consumers' right to know what's in their food. Opponents of labeling point out the expense and logistical difficulties of labeling, and the fact that no significant differences have been found between GE and conventional foods.

Implementation of mandatory labeling will require resolution of several complex technical issues.

Whether or not to require labeling of genetically engineered (GE) foods is a key issue in the ongoing debate over the risks and benefits of food crops produced using biotechnology.

Background: Genetic Engineering

What does genetic engineering mean? It is targeted manipulation of a plant's DNA to modify specific traits. It can involve adding genes from the same species or another species. In the past 10,000 years, genetic modification was achieved through selective breeding for specific traits. Today, this modification can occur very rapidly in the laboratory.

Many genetically engineered crops were designed to resist either herbicides, insect pests or both. Others have been developed to add nutrients to combat malnutrition or famine. Some seeds have been designed to counteract environmental effects such as drought, wind and weather. Others have been engineered simply to make them more commercially attractive. There are many, many different kinds and outcomes of genetic engineering and one description does not apply to all.

Although in numerous studies, there have not been any proven health risks shown to humans consum-

ing GMO foods, there are indications that there may be substantial risks to the environment from unintended consequences of introducing GMOs into the ecosystem, or from increased herbicide use caused by herbicide-resistant species.

The most common GE crops in the United States are soybean, corn, cotton, and canola. Because many processed food products contain soybean or corn ingredients (e.g., high fructose corn syrup or soy protein), it's estimated that 60 to 70 percent of processed foods in grocery stores include at least one GE ingredient.

Those in favor of "APPROVE" on I-522 say:

It is fundamental to our democracy that consumers have a right to information so that they can make informed choices.

This bill will facilitate our sharing in the global economy, as Japan and many European nations require labeling of Genetically Modified Organism (GMO) foods. If GMOs penetrate the conventional market, wheat, for example, will not be saleable overseas. Washington has a \$15 billion export market.

GMO-based foods have allergenic risks and scientific uncertainty in their molecular characterization, both of which would make it very difficult even to identify an unexpected health effect without GMO labeling. There are cancer concerns and people should be able to choose to avoid any potential carcinogen. There are major human health risks that companies have not disclosed in the past.

There is a conflict of interest in the Food and Drug Administration (FDA). The FDA does not undertake independent testing, but rather the industry voluntarily and confidentially tests the safety of its own products.

Organic labeling is no substitute for GMO-free. The organic industry is threatened with GMO contamination. GMO crops ultimately increase the use of pesticides.

The first amendment protects the free flow of information. The weight of legal authority, including the commerce clause and the supremacy clause, is on the side of requiring labeling.

Those in favor of "REJECT" on I-522 say:

Consumer curiosity is not the same as a substantial governmental interest. Any regulation should be, if at all, on the federal level; otherwise we have a patchwork quilt of regulations which makes compliance very difficult and drives up food costs, which disproportionately affects the poor. Requiring a completely separate food-delivery system for GMO products in one state alone would be very expensive.

Changes made to food using genetic engineering are not substantially different from changes that occur when plants and animals are selectively bred by conventional means. The process simply requires less time. The National Academy of Sciences has found no evidence of ill health effects and millions of people have eaten genetically modified foods for 20 years.

Labeling does not help Washington consumers make informed decisions about their health, the safety of their food, or its nutritional value. Indeed, by requiring a singular broad label, labeling may create the false assumption that all genetically engineered crops have the same risks and provide the same benefits.

Consumers have the choice to buy certified organic foods already. There is a necessity to feed the world's population and GMO food can help do this.

The weight of legal authority – in particular, the first amendment and the commerce clause – is on the side of not labeling GMO foods. GMO legislation would likely be rendered unenforceable by the courts.

BACKGROUND: ADVISORY VOTES

A provision of the 2007 Initiative 960 requires the placement of these 5 advisory votes on the ballot. Under that approved measure, some parts of which were later repealed, a vote was to be conducted to let voters say whether they agreed with the action of elected state officials regarding proposed tax increases or elimination of tax exemptions. Note: Numbering is continued year-to-year, Votes No. 1 & 2 were on the ballot last fall.

Advisory votes are NONBINDING; these bills will continue in effect unless the legislature takes action on them in a future session of the legislature.

WASHINGTON STATE 2013 ADVISORY VOTE NO. 3 (Substitute Senate Bill 5444)**Ballot Title:**

The legislature eliminated, without a vote of the people, a leasehold excise tax credit for taxpayers who lease publicly-owned property, costing approximately \$2,000,000 in the first ten years, for government spending.

This tax increase should be:

Repealed Maintained

Background: Publicly owned property is not subject to property tax. Instead, prior to this bill, people who leased publicly owned property paid a “leasehold excise tax,” based on the assessed property value. This required an assessor to determine the value of this publicly owned property. If the leasehold excise tax was greater than the property tax would have been, the leaseholder could take a tax credit for any amount that the excise tax exceeded the property tax that would be paid if the property were privately owned.

This bill, which was overwhelmingly approved by the legislature, accomplishes two things: 1) it does away with the credit and instead bases the leaseholder’s tax on the actual rent or an approved taxable rent calculation, and 2) it eliminates the required appraisal by an assessor unless the property is to be sold.

WASHINGTON STATE 2013 ADVISORY VOTE NO. 4 (Senate Bill 5627)**Ballot Title:**

The legislature imposed, without a vote of the people, an aircraft excise tax on commuter air

carriers in lieu of property tax, costing approximately \$500,000 in its first ten years, for government spending.

This tax increase should be:

Repealed Maintained

Background: Currently there are three separately owned airplane operations in Washington that meet the federal definition of a commuter air carrier—carrying passengers on at least five scheduled round trips per week, with the details of time, date, and route being part of a published schedule. One of these companies is located primarily on private property and, because of this, is excluded from the definition of an airplane company.

Aircraft subject to the state aircraft excise tax are exempt from paying personal property tax. The aircraft excise tax varies by the type of aircraft and ranges from \$20 for a home-built aircraft up to \$125 for a turbojet, multi-engine, fixed-wing plane. Ninety percent of the receipts will go to the General Fund, and the rest to the Aeronautics Account.

Under current law, commercial aircraft engaged principally in commercial flying that constitutes interstate or foreign commerce are subject to Washington State personal property taxes and not the aircraft excise tax.

WASHINGTON STATE 2013 ADVISORY VOTE NO. 5 (Engrossed Substitute House Bill 1846)**Ballot Title:**

The legislature extended, without a vote of the people, the insurance premium tax to some in-

insurance for pediatric oral services, costing an amount that cannot currently be estimated, for government spending.

This tax increase should be:

Repealed Maintained

Background: The Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (PPACA), which is Federal law, requires states to establish a health benefit exchange through which consumers may compare and purchase individual and small group coverage. Washington established its exchange, Washington Healthplanfinder, in 2011 as a public-private partnership.

Pediatric Oral Coverage: PPACA requires qualified health plans offered in the exchange to cover 10 categories of essential health benefits, one of which is pediatric oral care. But since PPACA allows stand-alone dental coverage to be offered in an Exchange, a health plan need not cover pediatric oral coverage as an integral part of its own plan if such a dental plan exists. A health plan must cover pediatric oral services either as an embedded set of services, through a rider, or as a contracted service. While Washington's Essential Health Benefits benchmark plan does not cover pediatric oral services, rules adopted by the Insurance Commissioner supplement the benchmark plan to include pediatric dental care.

Premium tax: Generally, health insurers must pay a two percent premium tax to the state. The tax is imposed on the total amount of all premiums and prepayments for health care services collected during the preceding calendar year. Amounts received by a health service contractor for dental services are exempt from the premium tax. The law provides that this exemption does not apply to the amounts paid for insurance coverage for pediatric oral services if the services: 1) Are offered by health services contractor, HMO, or life and disability insurer, or 2) Qualify for the minimum essential coverage requirement under PPACA.

How much will this measure generate in revenue?

Section 3 (6)(a) of this bill removes the insurance premium tax exemption for pediatric oral services offered as essential health benefits outside the Washington Health Benefit Exchange. This will result in additional revenue from the insurance premium tax. However, the amount of taxable activity resulting from the pediatric oral health care services benefit cannot be estimated. Consequently, the amount of additional revenues attributed to pediatric oral health services offered as essential health benefits outside the Health Benefit Exchange cannot be calculated.

WASHINGTON STATE 2013 ADVISORY VOTE NO. 6 (Second Engrossed Second Substitute House Bill 1971)

Ballot Title:

The legislature eliminated, without a vote of the people, a retail sales tax exemption for certain telephone and telecommunications services, costing approximately \$397,000,000 in the first ten years, for government spending.

This tax increase should be:

Repealed Maintained

Overview: This bill requires retailers of prepaid wireless telephone service to collect and remit the Enhanced 911 tax, and allows a seller of prepaid wireless to charge an additional five cents per retail transaction to offset the cost of collecting the tax; repeals the taxes funding the Washington Telephone Assistance and Telecommunications Relay Service programs and requires the programs to be funded by State General Fund appropriations; repeals the state and local sales and use tax exemption for local landline service; and establishes a temporary state universal communications services program.

Background: Prior to enactment of this legislation, prepaid wireless (cell phone) purchases were not subject to the Enhanced 911 tax. Also, residential landline telephone services were exempt from the sales and use tax, while non-business communication services such as cell phone services were subject to the tax. Both of these

inequities were struck down by the courts in separate rulings. Rather than create a hole in the state budget by eliminating the sales and use tax for residential cellular customers, the legislature determined that the tax should apply to all equally – landline residential customers as well as cellular residential customers.

Also impacted by this legislation are the Washington Telephone Assistance Program, which provides discounted telephones to low-income residents, and the Telecommunications Relay Service tax used to provide equipment and services to persons with a hearing or speech impairment. In this case, the legislature determined to provide these services through appropriations through the General Fund.

The bill also establishes a temporary Universal Services Fund set to begin on July 1, 2014, and expire on July 1, 2019. Universal service is the long-standing policy of the United States and the State of Washington to enable every American, regardless of location, to have access to affordable high-quality telephone and internet services. The Utilities and Transportation Commission must report back to the legislature by December 1, 2017, as to the adequacy of funding under the program and the potential impacts on carriers and customers when the program terminates.

How much revenue will this measure generate?

The Office of Financial Management estimates the tax will generate \$396,893,000 over ten years from 2014 to 2023.

Washington State Advisory Vote 7 (Engrossed House Bill 2075)

Ballot Title:

The legislature extended, without a vote of the people, the estate tax on certain property transfers and increased rates for estates over \$4,000,000, costing approximately \$478,000,000 in the first ten years, for government spending.

This tax increase should be:

Repealed Maintained

Overview: EHB2075 preserves funding deposited into the education legacy trust account used to support common schools and access to higher education by restoring the application of the Washington estate and transfer tax to certain property transfers; modifying the estate and transfer tax to provide tax relief for certain family-owned businesses; indexing the existing \$2 million deduction for inflation; and increasing the marginal tax rates on estates larger than \$4 million.

Background: This measure is a response to a state Supreme Court decision (the *Bracken* decision) regarding Washington State's estate tax laws that enable a married individual with a taxable estate to postpone the payment of taxes until the death of the surviving spouse. The Supreme Court held that property in specific types of trusts passing to heirs after the death of the surviving spouse was not subject to the state's estate tax. Under EHB 2075, those transfers are now subject to state estate tax and the provision applies retroactively to the estates involved. Without this correction, an inequity never intended by the legislature would have been created because unmarried individuals would not have enjoyed similar opportunities to avoid or greatly reduce their potential Washington estate tax liability. Other disparate treatments between certain properties transferred between spouses eligible for the marital deduction would also have been left standing.

EHB 2075 reinstates the legislature's intended meaning when it originally enacted the estate tax by restoring parity between married couples and unmarried individuals, restoring parity among all property eligible for the marital deduction, and preventing the adverse fiscal impacts of the *Bracken* decision.

How much revenue will this measure generate?

The Office of Financial Management estimates the tax will generate \$478,400,000 over the ten years from 2014 to 2023.

**KING COUNTY CHARTER AMENDMENT NO. 1 -
COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC DEFENSE**
Ballot Title:

Shall the King County Charter be amended to create an appointed office of county public defender, a department of public defense, and a public defense advisory board, and require the executive to consult with the county public defender on the executive's bargaining with employees of the department of public defense?

Yes [] No []

Background: It is a long established legal principle in this country that if a criminal defendant cannot afford an attorney, the government will provide one. An "attorney," in this case, means competent counsel who can truly represent the interests of the accused.

Historically in King County, nonprofit corporations have provided public defense counsel to clients through contracts paid by King County. In addition to criminal cases, the county also has provided attorneys for civil commitment and termination of parental rights cases. The nonprofit employees were regarded as independent contractors and so did not receive county benefits. In a recent class action lawsuit, the court ruled that these employees were entitled to benefits. This amendment is part of the process of making the defense attorneys county employees.

What this measure would do:

This proposed amendment to the King County Charter would, if passed by the voters, establish a county Department of Public Defense within the county's executive branch. The department would be responsible for providing counsel and representation to individuals to the extent required under the State and Federal Constitutions. The department would also be responsible for fostering and promoting system improvements, money-saving measures, access to justice, and equity in the criminal justice system.

The department would be managed by the county public defender, who would be appointed by the county executive from a list of candidates recommended by the public defense advisory board, also established by the amendment. The appointment would be subject to confirmation by the county council. The county public defender would serve a four-year term and would be eligible for re-appointment to additional terms.

As well as selecting the county defender, the public defense advisory board would review, advise and report on the department and on matters of equity and social justice. The county council would establish the process for appointment to the board.

What the "Yes" side is saying:

A properly functioning and independent public defense system is paramount to the fundamental principles of our justice system, primarily the concept that if a defendant cannot pay for an attorney, the government should provide one. Public defenders perform a vital role within the justice system by advocating for the rights of all citizens regardless of income.

This amendment is necessary to implement changes to the King County public defense structure resulting from a recent settlement agreement in a class action lawsuit. King County historically has contracted with private, non-profit corporations for the provision of public defense services. Because these corporations were viewed as independent contractors, their employees did not receive the very generous county benefit and retirement package as part of their remuneration for their work.

As a result of the settlement, public defenders became county employees July 1, 2013, requiring restructuring of the public defense system.

This amendment will protect the strengths of King County's nationally recognized public defense system while meeting the requirements of the court settlement.

This amendment will make it possible for King County to continue the tradition of excellence and independence in protecting the civil liberties of its most vulnerable residents.

What the "No" side is saying:

There is no organized opposition to the measure.

**KING COUNTY PROPOSITION NO. 1 – EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES
RENEWAL OF EXISTING REGULAR PROPERTY TAX LEVY**

Ballot Title:

The King County Council passed Ordinance No. 17598 concerning funding for the county-wide Medic One emergency medical services system. This proposition would replace an expiring levy to continue funding of Medic One emergency medical services. It would authorize King County to impose regular property tax levies of \$0.335 or less per thousand dollars of assessed valuation for each of six consecutive years, with collection beginning in 2014, as provided in King County Ordinance No. 17598. Should this proposition be:

Approved [] Rejected []

Background: King County emergency medical services (EMS) forms an integrated, publicly funded partnership (commonly known as Medic One) between the county, cities, hospitals, fire districts and the University of Washington. 1979 marked the passage of the first six-year levy to support county-wide emergency medical service (EMS). Since 1979, the survival rate of those experiencing cardiac arrest has more than tripled in King County. Additional levies have been approved in subsequent years. The various levies have cost between \$.21 and \$.30 per \$1,000 of assessed value.

Though the city of Seattle operates and funds its own Medic One EMS program separately from the county's program, the city's program

is part of the regional delivery system. All revenues collected during the levy period from taxable property located within the city of Seattle would be reimbursed to the city. All remaining revenues collected from this levy would be used to finance King County's Medic One EMS program.

What this measure would do:

This measure would allow King County to levy a regular property tax at a rate of \$.335 or less per one thousand dollars of assessed valuation on all taxable property within the county in order to provide emergency medical services. Based on an assessed value of \$400,000, a property owner would pay no more than \$134 per year. Collection would begin in 2014 and would continue for six years.

Note: This measure requires a 60% Yes vote for passage.

What the "Yes" side is saying:

- Medic One ambulance and paramedic services are an important government service to residents of our region. Every year, Medic One saves hundreds of lives. Last year, over 4,000 dedicated firefighters and paramedics responded to over 172,000 medical 911 calls for help. This calculates out to one call every three minutes in King County.
- The Medic One system serves nearly 2 million people in King County. County res-

idents depend on Medic One to be there when they need it, 24 hours a day, every day. King County Medic One has been recognized as one of the best emergency medical services systems in the world. The cardiac arrest survival rate in King County for the most common type of cardiac arrest is 57% – the highest reported anywhere in the USA and 4-5 times higher than in most other states or even nations.

- The Medic One levy is not a new tax; it's a renewal of a program that provides critical emergency services for all residents of King County. King County voters have supported Medic One by passing levies previously. At the proposed levy rate, the average homeowner will pay approximately \$107 a year for Medic One – less than the average homeowner paid in 2008 for these same services.

What the “No” side is saying:

- Medic One is an important basic service that should be paid for by the taxes already

in the county general fund. There is no reason that a basic service such as emergency aid should not be a top priority, funded before other county services. Special levies should be used to fund the lowest priority items, not the highest priority services.

- The fact that Medic One is constantly being funded by special levies shows poor planning on the part of our county leadership. Money could be saved to fund services such as Medic One if government eliminated services that can be delivered just as efficiently but much more economically by the private sector.
- More delinquent accounts will be added to the Assessor's tax rolls if property taxes continue to rise. Property taxes are too high and going higher because valuations are rising again. Government must find other ways to deliver essential services and finance capital improvements.

CITY OF SEATTLE PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT NO. 19 - CREATING DISTRICTS TO ELECT SEVEN OF NINE SEATTLE CITY COUNCILMEMBERS

Ballot Title:

This measure would require the election of seven City Councilmembers by district and two from the City at-large. Residency must be established 120 days before candidate filing. Every decade a commission would re-draw districts to bring the smallest district's population within one percent of the largest. Councilmembers elected in 2013 and at-large councilmembers elected in 2015 serve 2-year terms. Thereafter, all councilmembers serve 4-year terms with district positions running together and at-large positions two years later.

Should this measure be enacted into law?

Yes [] No []

Background: At the time of the establishment

of a city council in 1869, Seattle elected seven members in at-large elections. In 1884 this was replaced with a ward system of nine members, three each from three districts. Various changes to the ward/district system were made, and by 1907 there were 18 council members. In 1910 the City Charter was amended to abolish wards. This amendment created nine at-large, nonpartisan positions with terms of three years. Since then proposals in 1975, 1995, and 2003 to return to a district system were all defeated. Today nine council members are elected in at-large, nonpartisan elections for 4 year terms. Of the top 50 medium to large cities in the U.S., Seattle and Portland are the only two cities in the U.S. of similar metropolitan area size that have all at-large elections.

Effect of the Measure if Passed:

Charter Amendment 19 would divide the city into seven districts with nearly equal population. The voters within each district would elect one councilmember, who must have been a resident of the district for at least 120 days prior to the election. Two councilmembers would continue to be elected at-large by all voters citywide. The measure would go into effect in 2015, when all of the Seattle City Council would be up for election. The two at-large candidates would be up for two year terms, and the seven district candidates for four year terms. In 2017, the two at-large councilmembers would be elected to four year terms, with the mayor and city attorney also elected that year. In 2019, the seven district councilmembers would be elected to four year terms. From then on, city council elections would be held every two years, alternating between at-large and district elections; all members would be elected to four year terms.

What the “Yes” side is saying:

Seattle is a growing city, and the way councilmembers are elected should match its status as a world class city. Seattle currently elects all nine of its councilmembers at-large, which means they do not represent any specific neighborhood or community. Of the 50 largest cities in the US, Seattle is one of only three which still elect councilmembers entirely at-large. Over 45,000 Seattle voters signed the petition to place Charter Amendment 19 on the November ballot. The amendment would change the way councilmembers are elected. Two councilmembers would still be elected at-large, but the other seven would be elected by geographic district.

This new system would be beneficial to voters, as they would have a councilmember living in, elected by, and responsible for representing their home area. Under this system, each part of the city would have at least one member of the council working hard to make sure it gets a fair share of resources such as parks, community centers, pedestrian improvements, and road maintenance.

Because each district candidate would have fewer voters to reach, this system would also help get big money out of politics without a tax increase. Data collected by University of Washington researchers show that the cost of elections drops by more than half under district elections. Charter Amendment 19 will make it easier for qualified candidates to run – and they’ll pay closer attention to the voters who elect them.

The King County Council, the other local legislative body governing a large area and similar breadth of functions, elects councilmembers by district.

Main points in favor of district elections:

- District elections bring government closer to the people.
- District councilmembers are more sensitive to the concerns and problems of their constituents.
- District elections may improve citizen participation because councilmembers who represent a specific district may be more responsive to their constituency.
- The district representative will be accountable to the area represented. Every area will have a representative looking out for it.
- Campaigns for district elections will be less expensive.

What the “No” side is saying:

Seattle is a world-class city, and deserves the best and the brightest representing us on the council. Yes, running city-wide in a city as large and sophisticated as Seattle is a high bar, and not all candidates can manage to run successfully city-wide. But this can be a good thing, as it weeds out those who are not ready or able to lead on the council of a world-class city.

Currently, all Seattle residents have nine councilmembers representing them, to whom they can reach out for assistance with city issues. Under this proposal, residents would be reduced to having three councilmembers that directly

represent them. Each of the other six would represent another local neighborhood. That's a decrease in access to and representation on the council, not an increase.

Some opponents of Charter Amendment 19 feel that it is the wrong approach to reforming the council, since geographical diversity does not necessarily mean political diversity. Advocates of proportional representation, which would result in a council which better reflects the views of the electorate, feel that this goal can be more easily achieved within the at-large system.

Each district election might cost less, but any group could support a slate of candidates. It would just be cheaper to buy an election. Seattle runs more smoothly and with less corruption than many of the cities with district elections.

Main points in opposition to district elections:

- Council members in an at-large system can be more impartial, rise above the limited

perspective of a single district and concern themselves with the problems of the whole community.

- Vote trading between councilmembers is minimized.
- Better-qualified individuals are elected to the council because the candidate pool is larger. A ward system limits the talent pool of available public servants by instituting a geographic barrier to running for or holding the office.
- Councils elected by district elections may experience more infighting and be less likely to prioritize the good of the city over the good of their district.
- Studies indicate that spending, debt and taxes are substantially higher in cities where district representatives have greater power than in cities where at-large representatives have greater power.

CITY OF SEATTLE PROPOSITION NO. 1 - CREATION OF A SYSTEM OF PUBLICLY FINANCED COUNCIL ELECTION CAMPAIGNS.

Ballot Title:

If approved, this proposition would publicly fund campaigns for Seattle City Council. Candidates who raise 600 individual contributions of at least \$10 qualify for the program. Contributions up to \$50 to qualifying candidates are matched 6 public dollars for every dollar, up to \$210,000. Participating candidates may only spend \$140,000 in the primary and \$245,000 overall, except when an opponent spends more. Approval authorizes six years of additional property taxes, with \$2,000,000 (approximately \$0.0164/\$1000 assessed value) collected in 2014.

Should this proposition be approved?

Yes [] No []

Background: Seattle previously had publicly financed campaigns from 1987 to 1991, as well as in a few earlier years. However, statewide Initiative 134 struck down public financing in 1992. In 2008, a new state law gave local jurisdictions the option to establish public financing of campaigns by a vote of the people. An advisory committee was convened to consider options and develop a proposal; however, with the fiscal crisis the proposal was put on hold until this year. Based on updated information and a recommendation from the Seattle Ethics and Elections Commission (SEEC), the city council put this proposal before the voters.

What this measure would do:

This measure would establish a public financ-

ing of campaigns that have met the test of viability. The test is this: To be eligible for public financing, candidates for city council must obtain at least 600 contributions of at least \$10 each from residents of Seattle and must have an opponent. Once a candidate has qualified, the first \$50 of all donations will be matched 6 to 1, up to a maximum of \$210,000. Public funds must be spent on the campaign and cannot be used to pay the candidate or the candidate's family, reports must be submitted to the SEEC, and any unspent funds must be returned. There are penalties for failure to adhere to the rules on spending. Candidates must not spend more than \$245,000 overall unless greater amounts are spent on an opponent's campaign (including independent expenditures), in which case candidates may raise and spend additional dollars but will not receive additional public funds.

Effect if passed: Candidates for Seattle City Council would receive up to \$210,000 in public funds if they meet the eligibility criteria discussed above. Property owners would pay an additional tax, approximately 16 cents per \$1,000 or \$6.50 per year, based on a \$400,000 average assessed value of a Seattle home. *Note: If proposed Charter Amendment 19 passes, this measure would apply only to the two at-large races and would not apply to the districted races, which cover a smaller territory and have fewer voters.*

What the “Yes” side is saying:

- Public financing enables a wider range of candidates to participate. With public financing, candidates don't need to go to corporate donors, labor, or other “big money” to have enough money to fund a viable campaign; they just need a critical mass of small individual donors. The role and importance of small donors increases.

- Candidates have more time to spend listening to the voters and learning about the issues rather than raising money.
- Public financing restores confidence in our elections; questions about whether an officeholder is being influenced by large money donors go away. This is a step in a good direction and is easily amendable if some part of it, such as the actual number of small donors required, needs to be tweaked.

What the “No” side is saying:

- The large number of individual donors, 600, required to qualify means candidates will actually need to spend more time raising money or use the services of a professional campaign manager or consultant. The average number of individual contributors to Seattle races is about 235, much lower than 600. This will actually bring big money into Seattle council races, not keep it out. (And although the money cannot pay the candidate or their family for their time, the money CAN be spent on political consultants.)
- Public financing means that people will have to contribute, through their property taxes, to candidates they do not support. Participation in politics should be voluntary.
- Seattle already has a diverse group of people on and running for council. The Seattle City Council has consistently had a mix of races, genders, economic status, sexual orientations and political outlook, including members of third parties, representative of the mix in our city. Clearly good candidates are able to attract the supporters that they need to raise the money to run.

**CITY OF SEATAC PROPOSITION NO. 1 -
LABOR STANDARDS FOR CERTAIN EMPLOYERS**

Ballot Title:

This Ordinance requires certain hospitality and transportation employers to pay specified employees a \$15.00 hourly minimum wage, adjusted annually for inflation, and pay sick and safe time of 1 hour per 40 hours worked. Tips shall be retained by workers who performed the services. Employers must offer additional hours to existing part-time employees before hiring from the outside. SeaTac must establish auditing procedures to monitor and ensure compliance. Other labor standards are established.

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

Background: The city of SeaTac is proposing that hospitality and transportation employers operating within the boundaries of the city of SeaTac pay employees a \$15.00 hourly minimum wage, adjusted annually for inflation, and provide other minimum fair labor standards such as a paid safe and sick leave policy, a requirement to use existing part-time workers before hiring additional part-time employees if work is available, and a requirement that employers not collect employees' tips – tips must remain with the employee who received them.

What this measure would do:

This measure would establish a minimum wage of \$15.00, to be adjusted annually for inflation, in the city of Sea- Tac. This would be the highest minimum wage in the nation. The measure would also add some additional working-condition laws for businesses operating in the city of SeaTac, and would require the city of SeaTac to set up governmental mechanisms to enforce this law and the standards it sets.

What the “Yes” side is saying:

- A worker who works a full-time job should be able to live in or near the community in which he or she works. \$15.00 an hour is

a minimum living wage in the SeaTac area. A high tide lifts all boats, and a minimum living wage for these employees will bring about better living and work conditions for all employees in the area.

- Workers need to know that their jobs will be waiting and they will be paid if they must take time off because they are ill. This is especially important in restaurant and transportation jobs, as this protects the public health as well. Nobody wants their meal brought or prepared by someone who is sick.
- This measure ensures that if you tip your skycap or waitress or any other employee at SeaTac Airport for great service, that person will be able to keep the tip.
- This measure requires employers to offer additional available hours to part-time employees already employed before they hire additional help. This is to discourage the hiring of many part-time employees to avoid the payment of benefits, as benefits are often offered only to full-time employees.

What the “No” side is saying:

- Too many people view SeaTac as just an airport, but it's the people, parks and businesses that make the city of SeaTac livable. This measure is not sponsored by residents of SeaTac, but by outside interests trying to make laws in one targeted city.
- Proposition 1 will raise the minimum wage for some airport, hotel and rental car workers, but only one of every ten workers who will receive the new minimum wage actually lives in SeaTac. SeaTac businesses will pay the money, and SeaTac tax dollars will enforce this law, but the money will not necessarily come back into SeaTac's economy.
- The city will have to hire new employees to police businesses to ensure they are living up to the new labor standard. Taxes may

- rise and city programs and services may be cut because the city will have to pay to administer and enforce the new law instead of funding community priorities such as public safety, transportation and parks.
- Small businesses such as restaurants that can't afford to pay the new wage will leave SeaTac, and business revenues to the city will drop. SeaTac residents — especially young people— will have a harder time finding local employment as even more non-SeaTac residents come to the city for these jobs and push out less skilled SeaTac residents.
 - Minimum wage and fair labor laws are better established by state and federal laws rather than a small municipality that may not have the resources to enforce them and oversee them. A small municipality is also more vulnerable to being hurt economically since it is easier for large businesses to relocate just outside the boundaries. Fair compensation beyond state and federal laws should be negotiated between employers and employees.

<p>CITY OF FEDERAL WAY PROPOSITION NO. 1 - ELECTIONS FOR CITIZEN INITIATIVE PETITIONS RESTRICTED TO THE GENERAL ELECTIONS</p>
--

Ballot Title:

Shall the Federal Way Revised Code Section 1.30.160 (2) be amended to restrict the submission of all Citizen Initiative Petitions to the general elections because the voter participation is historically higher at general elections and to avoid the added expense of a special election?

Yes [] No []

What this measure would do:

Under current law, upon receipt of a certified citizen initiative, the City Council may adopt the initiative or a special election must be held on an available election date unless a general election is within 120 days of receipt, and the special election for the initiative may be held at the same time.

The City of Federal Way is proposing that the city code be amended to restrict citizen initiatives from appearing on any ballot but the November general election each year. Thus, citizen initiatives could no longer appear as special elections on any of the spring election ballots, or on the August primary ballot.

If State Initiative 517 is passed, this measure may be in conflict with the provisions of that initiative.

Background: *CAUTION: This measure contains an argument in favor of the measure within the ballot title. Voters should investigate and decide for themselves what the compelling arguments either for or against restricting city initiatives to the general election may be.*

A city must pay for additional election expenses a city measure appears on the ballot when a regularly occurring city election is not scheduled. Cities have regularly occurring elections in the Primary and General of odd-numbered years, when the mayor and council appear on the ballot.

When cities have their special elections at the same time as regular city elections, they can share election costs and save some money.

All elections for a local city initiative are “special” elections, even if they occur in November, and all have some election costs borne by the cities.

What the “Yes” side is saying:

- Paying for unnecessary election dates is expensive. This measure would save the city of Federal Way money by requiring that special elections for initiatives be held on the same date as the general election each year.
- Initiatives should be voted on in general elections, when the greatest numbers of voters participate. Per King County, approximately 45% of Federal Way residents are registered voters. In election years 2011, 2009 and 2007, 41% - 45% of registered voters voted in the general election, while 23% - 26% voted in the primary. Initiatives on the general election ballot reach significantly more people.
- The timing of national and local general elections generates more voter interest and greater turnout. Often in August people are on vacation or involved in summer activities and thus less likely to vote in primaries. Important initiatives brought to the public should be held when the greatest number of voters participate. Otherwise fewer voters make key decisions for the greater population.
- General election initiatives make financial sense. The cost/benefit is greater as more people vote in the general election and costs are included in overall election expenses. Adding an initiative to an ongoing election costs much less than adding a separate election for initiatives only. The key is assuring that the largest number of voters weigh in on an issue.

What the “No” side is saying:

- Citizens’ Initiative powers are included in the state constitution and available to local governments specifically so the people can have a “safety valve” in their lawmaking process when they cannot get the city council to address their concerns either in a timely fashion or at all. Limiting when an initiative to the people of Federal Way can appear on a ballot essentially removes a portion of the protection to the people that initiative powers are providing in the first place.
- The proponents seem very concerned with the voter turnout for a non-general election, and in more voters participating in voting on local initiatives. They completely ignored ballot drop-off (races skipped by voters) when calculating the voter participation. In fact, due to ballot drop off in primaries, and more full-ballot participation in spring elections, participation in down ballot measures is about the same for any election date.
- What actually drives up voter participation in proven manner is the voter interest in the measure on the ballot. Overall participation in Federal Way is likely to be driven up by a hot local initiative on the ballot, regardless of the election date – just look at the turnout in Pacific for their recent recall election that was not even on a scheduled election day at all!
- Contrary to how it is worded in the ballot title, an election of a local citizens’ initiative is always called a “special election,” even if it appears on a November ballot, as it is not a regularly occurring election. Being a “special election” in and of itself does not add to the cost of holding an election – what adds to the cost is whether there is already another measure or race on the ballot, which happens more frequently in odd-year primaries, than in even year general elections. As written, this measure is unlikely to save much money at all.

Unit Meetings

(Unit meeting times and locations subject to change; please verify with unit leader.)

Unit Leader email	Phone	Time	Location
Monday, October 7			
FIRST HILL – Joan Lawson			
joanvlawson@gmail.com	206-382-3147	10:00 a.m.	Horizon House, Forum & Social Room 900 University St, Seattle
Tuesday, October 8			
WEST SEATTLE – Amanda Berry and Ethel Williams			
amandamberry@earthlink.net	206-724-7518	1:00 p.m.	The Kenney
etheljewl@q.com	206-932-7887		7125 Fauntleroy Way SW, Seattle
SOUTHEAST KING COUNTY/ENUMCLAW - Cathy Dormaier			
clcathy@skynetbb.com	360-802-6799	11:30 a.m.	Frankie's Pizza (across from Safeway) Highway 410, Enumclaw
Wednesday, October 9			
VIEW RIDGE – Gail Winberg			
winbergeng@q.com	206-524-7801	12:45 p.m.	Brig Bldg. (6344) in Magnuson Park 7400 Sand Point Way, Seattle
<i>Directions: Go into the Park through North entrance at 74th and drive EAST toward water. At the STOP sign, turn LEFT to park in front of the Brig, or RIGHT, for more parking.</i>			
QUEEN ANNE/MAGNOLIA/BALLARD EVENING - Teddy Geokezas			
tgeokezas@msn.com	206-782-5036	7:30 p.m.	Hostess: Jackie Wall 2858 32nd Ave W, Seattle 206-352-5394
Thursday, October 10			
ISSAQUAH DAY – Margaret Austin			
margaret.austin@comcast.net	425-392-5760	10:00 a.m.	ECHO room, Issaquah City Hall 130 E Sunset Way, Issaquah
UNIVERSITY HOUSE/WALLINGFORD – Alice Chew			
achoo92@q.com	206-547-5395	10:00 a.m.	University House, Auditorium 4400 Stone Way N, Seattle

Continued on next page.

(Unit meeting times and locations subject to change; please verify with unit leader.)

Unit Leader email	Phone	Time	Location
-------------------	-------	------	----------

Thursday, October 10 cont'd

NORTH CENTRAL – Jan Orlando

orlanre@aol.com	206-524-0936	7:30 p.m.	Hostess: Gail Shurgot 6536 31st Ave NE, Seattle 206-522-8265
-----------------	--------------	-----------	--

Friday, October 11

BELLEVUE/KIRKLAND/REDMOND - Bonnie Rimawi

bonnierim@aol.com	425-820-7127	12:00 p.m.	The Bellevue Library 1111 110th Ave NE, Bellevue
-------------------	--------------	------------	---

Monday, October 14

CAPITOL HILL/MONTLAKE

	206-329-4848	7:00 p.m.	League Office 1620 18th Ave, Seattle
--	--------------	-----------	---

SOUTHEND - Marian Wolfe and Vivian Montoya

hedgwolfe@aol.com	206-763-9430	7:30 p.m.	Mount Baker Community Club
montoyaviv@yahoo.com	206-695-2620		2811 Mount Rainier Drive S, Seattle

Wednesday, October 16

NORTH KING COUNTY – Toni Potter

antoniapotter@comcast.net	206-365-8949	9:15 a.m.	Third Place Commons Meeting Room 17171 Bothell Way NE, Lake Forest Park
---------------------------	--------------	-----------	--

SOUTHWEST KING COUNTY – Mary Ehlers and Kathy Jorgensen

maryehlers@comcast.net	253-941-1930	7:00 p.m.	Foundation House
kjorgensen@juno.com	253-859-8349		32290 1st Ave S, Federal Way

Saturday, October 19

BALLARD/MAGNOLIA/QUEEN ANNE DAY – Joan Peterson

joanmepeterson@gmail.com	206-789-7447	10:00 a.m.	Hostess: Wendie Berge 3100 W Commodore Way, #306, Seattle 206-283-1190
--------------------------	--------------	------------	--

Board & Committee Contacts

Term Executive Committee

2013-15	<i>President</i>	Ellen Barton	206-329-4848	president@seattlelwv.org
2013-15	<i>1st VP-Action</i>	Janet Winans	206-323-4825	janetwinans@earthlink.net
2012-14	<i>2nd VP-Program</i>	Beatrice Crane	206-783-8485	bscrane@comcast.net
2013-15	<i>Secretary</i>	Amanda Clark	206-236-0517	amandac5@comcast.net
2013-14	<i>Treasurer</i>	Cindy Piennett	206-329-4848	cindypiennett@gmail.com

Term Directors

2012-14	<i>Voter Editor</i>	Marge Baker	206-535-7299	votereditor@seattlelwv.org
2012-14	<i>Program</i>	Carol Burton	206-691-1298	ctburton7@gmail.com
2013-15	<i>Voter Services</i>	Joanna Cullen	206-329-8514	jfoxcullen@gmail.com
2013-15	<i>Social Justice</i>	Jayne Freitag	425-922-9501	mjafreitag@comcast.net
2012-14	<i>Membership</i>	Susan K. Jones	206-725-2902	susan@monckjones.com
2012-14	<i>Voter Services</i>	Julie Anne Kempf	206-329-4848	julie@kempf.com
2013-15	<i>Outreach</i>	Marianne Scholl	206-329-4848	outreach@seattlelwv.org
2012-14	<i>Unit Coordinator</i>	Lindsay Soyer	406-546-9314	lindsaysoyer@gmail.com
2012-14	<i>Development</i>	Lisa Unsoeld-Chang	206-329-4848	lisac@seattlelwv.org
2012-14	<i>Outreach</i>	Mary Jo Vigil	206-318-6939	mjvigil@starbucks.com

Note: All board members listed above, with the exception of the Treasurer, are also members of the Education Fund Board

Term Education Fund Officers

2013-14	<i>President</i>	Ellen Barton	206-329-4848	president@seattlelwv.org
2013-14	<i>1st VP</i>	Lisa Unsoeld-Chang	206-329-4848	lisac@seattlelwv.org
2013-15	<i>Secretary</i>	Amanda Clark	206-236-0517	amandac5@comcast.net
2013-15	<i>Treasurer</i>	Ginna Owens	206-215-1408	ginnao@earthlink.net
2013-14	<i>Director</i>	Pat McCann	206-878-2799	thomaspa@centurylink.net

Term Nominating Committee

2013-14	<i>Chair</i>	Judy Bevington	206-329-4848	judybevington@q.com
2013-14		Judith Hance	206-329-4848	judithhance2@gmail.com
2013-14		Cynthia Howe	206-329-4848	howe.john@comcast.net
2013-14		Lisa Peterson	206-329-4848	

Note: Two members of the board will be appointed to serve on the nominating committee when meetings begin.

Off Board Positions

Campaign Finance	Jean Carlson	206-774-6649	jean.carlson@att.net
KC South Liaison	Mary Ehlers	253-941-1930	maryehlers@comcast.net
CIS Coordinator	Cynthia Howe	206-236-0593	howe.john@comcast.net
Observer Corps	Pat McCann	206-878-2799	thomaspa@centurylink.net

Committees

<i>Economics & Taxation</i>	Jeanette Johnson		jeanettejohnson10@msn.com
<i>Education</i>	Joanna Cullen	206-329-8514	jfoxcullen@gmail.com
<i>International Relations</i>	see page 7		
<i>Social Justice</i>	Jayne Freitag	425-922-9501	mjafreitag@comcast.net
<i>Transportation</i>	Janet Winans	206-323-4825	janetwinans@earthlink.net

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

Periodicals Postage
Paid at Seattle, WA

Moving? Let us know!

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

LWV SEATTLE-KING COUNTY:

General Election Ballot Measures

Thursday, October 3

Seattle First Baptist Church

1111 Harvard Ave (Harvard & Seneca)
Seattle, WA

Statewide Measures:

- Initiative 517 - re: initiative and referendum procedures
- Initiative 522 - re: labeling of GMO foods

Countywide Measures:

- Prop 1 - EMS (Medic One) levy
- Charter Amendment 19 - re: the department of public defense