IS IT TIME FOR MARIJUANA LEGALIZATION?

By Ellen Barton, Action Chair

In 1991 the League of Women Voters of Seattle (LWV Seattle) studied drug abuse and developed a position that supported measures to expand drug abuse prevention education and treatment programs. In 2000 the King County Bar Association began the Drug Policy Project, a unique partnership of lawyers, doctors, scholars, other professionals, and citizen groups. The LWV Seattle participated on the Drug Policy steering committee as publications were researched and published.

The first publication, “Is It Time to End the War on Drugs?” was summarized and printed in the LWV Seattle September 2003 Voter, and is reprinted in this edition with updated statistics. The Drug Policy Project promotes a public health approach to drug abuse, stressing a shift of resources to research, education, prevention, and treatment as an alternative to the continued use of criminal sanctions.

The 2005 Convention of the LWV of Washington adopted by concurrence the LWV Seattle position on Drug Abuse and the State League will be supporting legislative efforts that support the public health approach to the problem of drug abuse. At the 2012 Convention, The LWVUS adopted a position opposing mandatory minimum sentences for drug offenses.

As you may already know, marijuana legalization (I-502) is on the November ballot. So, the time has come to have a conversation about this topic. The information provided in this Voter and at the September Forum will help you to begin that conversation.

Pete Holmes, the Seattle City Attorney, calls for the legalization, taxation, and regulation of marijuana for adult recreational use. He does so for the following three reasons: (1) Marijuana, like alcohol, should be treated as a public health issue; (2) prohibition has not been consistently enforced; and (3) legalization would enhance the perceived legitimacy of the law in general.

Roger Roffman, professor emeritus of social work at the University of Washington, who treats marijuana dependence, agrees that marijuana should be legalized. He believes that it is possible to implement a policy that protects children by using what has been learned from preventive models for tobacco and alcohol. Advertising should be strictly regulated and the price should be high enough to discourage use by minors. Tax revenue from marijuana should be used for prevention, education, and treatment programs.

John McKay, Seattle University law professor and former U.S. Attorney, believes that the criminalization of marijuana has failed utterly. The law ignores societal realities and is unenforceable. He also points out that money from the U.S. marijuana black market enriches Mexican and international drug cartels.

In an article commissioned by the American Civil Liberties Union, two University of Washington researchers explored the societal costs associated with marijuana prohibition and the likely results of legalization. Katherine Beckett and Steve Herbert had three major conclusions. First, they
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Connecting with Judy

The election is coming. The election is coming. Get your resources here!

**We just met the challenge of the new early, August 7, primary election.**

We registered voters, wrote ballot issue summaries, and presented information at Speakers Bureau engagements. We held a forum for two legislative districts and moderated a forum in Renton regarding the siting of their library. The State League with KCTS held three televised candidate forums--one for Secretary of State, the others for the 1st Congressional District and the Washington State Supreme Court. So far this year, we’ve distributed almost 45,000 TRY’s (“They Represent You”), a brochure that provides voters with information to contact their elected officials.

*Primary Election results on the issues we endorsed were:* The Seattle Library levy was approved and so was the levy for the King County Juvenile Justice Center.

**Now it is time to start thinking about the main attraction, the General Election, on November 6.** This is a good time to remind ourselves of League’s non-partisan policy. We do not support candidates or parties, but we do take action on issues we have studied and taken positions on. We provide information on issues and encourage individuals to become informed and to vote based on their own conclusions, whether we have taken positions or not.

**We have voter resources.** We are pretty much your one-stop shopping center for election information. Click onto our website, Seattlelwv.org, to access information from local, state, and national levels of League, as well as information from a variety of organizations and government agencies. Because of redistricting, many of us find ourselves in new legislative and congressional districts. You can find a link to the boundaries of yours on our website. We have links to the King County Elections Office and the Secretary of State Office. We also include additional, helpful resources on the inside back cover of the TRY brochure.

VOTE411.org is a great new tool provided by State League, where you can find out about candidates and issues where you live. www.flackchecker.org allows you to check the veracity of campaign ads.

Our newsletter, *The Voter*, contains information such as ballot issue summaries and articles about issues such as the Central Waterfront and drug policies. You can find *The Voter* on our website.

We have (almost) monthly forums on governmental topics. We will feature topics related to the election--- drug policies in September and ballot issues in October. See *The Voter* or our website for forum dates. We hold unit discussions on the topics written about in *The Voter* and addressed by experts at the forums. You can locate the unit nearest you in *The Voter* or by calling our CIS (Citizens Information Service) desk at 206-239-4848.

We supply moderators for forums for which local groups do the logistics. These moderators assure that forums are fair and balanced. We also provide speakers to groups on governmental and ballot issues. Call the office to arrange a speaker.

League is sponsoring a series of articles on presidential elections in the *Seattle Times*. Look for them on Tuesdays and Thursdays from September 25 to October 18. They will be valuable both for students and adults.

And most basically, we register people to VOTE.

*(continued on p. 6)*
### September

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sunday</th>
<th>Monday</th>
<th>Tuesday</th>
<th>Wednesday</th>
<th>Thursday</th>
<th>Friday</th>
<th>Saturday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>September 28</td>
<td><strong>Unit Leader Meeting</strong></td>
<td><strong>League Drinks</strong></td>
<td><strong>Voter Deadline</strong></td>
<td><strong>International Relations Committee Meeting</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7:00 p.m.</td>
<td><strong>League Drinks</strong></td>
<td><strong>Forum: Drug Policy Reform</strong></td>
<td><strong>League Drinks</strong></td>
<td>12:45 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Labor Day Holiday</strong></td>
<td><strong>Board Meeting</strong></td>
<td><strong>League Drinks</strong></td>
<td><strong>Voter Deadline</strong></td>
<td><strong>Board Meeting</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Economics and Taxation Committee Meeting</strong></td>
<td><strong>Transportation Committee Meeting</strong></td>
<td><strong>International Relations Committee Meeting</strong></td>
<td><strong>League Drinks</strong></td>
<td>6:00 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Drug Policy Forum</strong></td>
<td><strong>Board Meeting</strong></td>
<td><strong>League Drinks</strong></td>
<td><strong>Voter Deadline</strong></td>
<td><strong>League Drinks</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7:00 p.m.</td>
<td><strong>League Drinks</strong></td>
<td>6:00 p.m.</td>
<td>Monday, September 10</td>
<td>6:00 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Downstairs at Town Hall</strong></td>
<td><strong>League Office</strong></td>
<td><strong>League Drinks</strong></td>
<td><strong>Ballot Issues Forum</strong></td>
<td><strong>League Office</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>League Office</strong></td>
<td><strong>League Office</strong></td>
<td><strong>League Office</strong></td>
<td><strong>League Office</strong></td>
<td><strong>League Office</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Units meet during shaded period)

**SEPTEMBER**

**Unit Leader Meeting**
Tuesday, August 28
7:00 p.m.
League Office

**Economics and Taxation Committee Meeting**
Saturday, September 1
9:00 a.m.
909 E Newton, Unit D

**Drug Policy Forum**
Thursday, September 6
7:00 p.m.
Downstairs at Town Hall

**Board Meeting**
Saturday, September 8
9:00 a.m.
League Office

**International Relations Committee Meeting**
Monday, September 10
12:45 p.m.
League Office

**Transportation Committee Meeting**
Tuesday, September 18
10:00 a.m.
League Office

**Voter Deadline**
Monday, September 10

**League Drinks**
Thursday, September 6
6:00 p.m.

**League Drinks**
Thursday, October 4
6:00 p.m.

**Ballot Issues Forum**
Thursday, October 4
7:00 p.m.
Seattle First Baptist Church
Forum Schedule

September 6 - Drug Policy Reform
October 4 - Ballot Issues
November 1 - Economic Issues
December 6 - No Forum
January 3 - Action/Program Planning
February 7 - Energy Concerns in WA
March 7 - Women’s Issues
April 4 - Campaign Finance Reform
May 4 - All-Mail Voting

The League of Women Voters of Seattle-King County (LWVS-KC) presents a public forum each month 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. Because of the broad community interest in drug policy issues, we are holding the September forum at the Town Hall Downstairs at 7:00 p.m. The tentative schedule of upcoming forums for 2012-2013 appears at left; check your Voter each month or the LWVS-KC website, seattlelwv.org, for up-to-date information.

Board Briefs by Judy Bevington

The Board of the League of Women Voters of Seattle-King County did not hold a regular meeting in July but held a short meeting on August 11 in conjunction with the board retreat. The Education Fund Board met on July 17.

New Officers

At the August meeting the Board confirmed the appointment of Karen Adair. She will share the Program Chair portfolio with Beatrice Crane. Beatrice will focus on Publications and Studies and Karen will focus on coordinating program activities such as forums. Karen brings experience, wisdom, and a practical and collegial approach to the Board.

The Education Fund had its first meeting and elected Boots Winterstein to be President and Carol Burton to be secretary. Other members are Treasurer Laraine Volkman, Lisa Unsoeld-Chang, and Ellyn Swanson. Julie Anne Kempf (Voter Services), Beatrice Crane (Program), Ginna Owens (Development), and Judy Bevington (President) are ex officio Board members. This is a great board for tackling the task of fund-raising through the tax deductible arm of the League.
President’s Message (cont’d from p. 3)

We have a link for online registration. Note that the last day to mail in or email voter registrations and transfers is October 8 and the last day for in-person registration for voters not currently registered in the state is October 29. To register in person between October 8 and 29, go to your local county elections office. In King County that is at 919 SW Grady Way in Renton.

Our TRY brochures are available for your use in contacting elected officials. Again, just call the office. You should always have a TRY near your telephone or computer.

We send out weekly Constant Contacts, an email communication that goes out to all members and interested parties. We announce information such as upcoming forums, action possibilities, and endorsements this way. Be sure to check your emails to keep connected.

We are reactivating our Observer Corps. This is a great way to get up close and personal with your local government. Attending library board meetings, local government council meetings, and committee meetings dealing with issues such as the central waterfront can help you become an expert on local issues, whether on the ballot or otherwise. The more we become involved and knowledgeable, the better the outcome of elections. Join us. Become informed, act, and VOTE to help us make democracy work.

Judy Bevington, 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 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

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

Economics and Taxation Committee
DATE: SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 1
TIME: 9:00 A.M. - NOON
PLACE: 909 E NEWTON, #D-9

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

International Relations Committee
DATE: MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 10
TIME: 12:45 P.M. - 2:45 P.M.
PLACE: LEAGUE OFFICE

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

Transportation Committee
DATE: TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 18
TIME: 10:00 A.M. - NOON
PLACE: LEAGUE OFFICE

Every third Tuesday between September 18 and next June 18, the Transportation Committee will be working to gain a much better understanding of the many ways the public is allowed to take FREIGHT for granted. The committee intends to learn the impact that trucks, large and small, and their cargo have on roads and the community so that it can contribute to the important decisions that certainly will be made as the region confronts the multiple demands for road space and funding. The September speaker will be Sean Ardussi, Senior Planner, Puget Sound Regional Council. He will provide an overview of the current breadth of freight transportation issues. Other speakers will add specifics to his general information from the various perspectives of the Ports of Seattle and Tacoma, shipping businesses, truck drivers, receiving businesses, political decision makers and transportation planning agents.

Please join the committee with your own questions and expertise.

Social Justice Committee
TO BE ANNOUNCED
Saturday morning meetings do not seem to be working for the group and we are looking to change to something that works better. Now that the drug policy forum is complete, we need to set a work plan for the coming year. If you are interested and would like to attend, please let Jayne Freitag (mjafreitag@comcast.net) know what would be a good alternative for you!

We encourage participation by all in our issue committees. Often there are excellent speakers who provide informative presentations.
SAVE THE DATE:
November 11, 2012 at the Westin Hotel Seattle
IT’S THE MONEY, HONEY
The LWV Annual Gala; 5:30p.m. – 9:00p.m.

Keynote speaker, Jon Talton, financial columnist for the Seattle Times, provides thoughtful analysis of the economic and financial issues of the day as he assesses the election results and how they pertain to economic recovery. What are the options? What’s a working framework for more jobs, adequate government services, plus the safety net we support? Who was elected; what do they propose?

Plan to attend the LWV 2012 Making Democracy Work Political Party.

2012 “Electing the President” Series

It was timely, engaging, and fit my “audience” perfectly. I teach 9th grade, and it seems this is the grade when political awareness surfaces. (survey response from 2008)

Once again we will be partnering with the Seattle Times and the Newspapers in Education program to present civics education materials on the presidential election. This highly popular program reached tens of thousands of students in 2008 and we are delighted to be presenting it again with additional financial support from the League of Women Voters of Washington. The eight installment series is designed around materials provided by the League of Women Voters. This series will run biweekly, Tuesday and Thursday, beginning the week of 9/25/12 and ending the week of 10/18/12.

Thank you to League members Kelly Powers, Beatrice Crane, and Becky Cox and to Diane Brady of the Seattle Times for making this project happen.
Leadership Circle Founders’ Brunch

On a lovely Saturday, in this lovely summer, at the lovely home of Vicky Downs, a group of lovely League members gathered to celebrate the LWV Leadership Circle Founders’ Brunch. Mimosas were followed by a delicious lunch catered by League member Linette Bixby and her friend Susan Tameishi.

After welcoming remarks, League President Judy Bevington unveiled the Founders’ plaque which includes the names of all 21 original members inscribed on both sides of the Leadership Circle logo designed by Lily Reid. The plaque is now prominently displayed in the League office, at 1620 18th Ave.

Candis Litsey told the group why she was motivated to make a major pledge to the future of the League of Women Voters of Seattle–King County. Cyndi Woods described important League functions in pursuit of its goals to inform citizens and strengthen the tenets of democracy. Judy emphasized the freedom the pledge program provides for both short term and long range planning, stressing the fact that these funds allow us to spend more time on the League’s core functions and less on fund raising.

Seventeen new pledges were received, and seven of the original founders extended their pledge for an additional year or increased their giving amount. The three/four year fund now amounts to more than $85,000 as new pledges continue to arrive in the League office.

New members include: Ellen Barton, Kris Bushley, Jean Carlson, Pat Cleary, Elizabeth Davis, Carol Goldenberg, Monica Leigh, Michele Lucien Erickson, Sally Mackle, Lois North, Ginna Owens, Dorothy Sale, Lucy Steers, Jane Stevens, Mary Jo Vigil, Laura Weese, and Boots Winterstein.

Thank you to this group of extraordinary League leaders.

Ginna Owens, Development Chair
Action

League Walks

The League of Women Voters team may not have had the most creative team name - that honor went to team “Keep Your Mitts Off My Lady Bits” - but five of us spent part of Sunday, the 12th of August, walking around Seward Park as part of Naral’s 5K “Run for your Rights.” It was a hot, sunny day so team mascot Jet had to stay home but the rest of us enjoyed chatting with like-minded people and taking in the views around Lake Washington. Joining me were my mom, friend Joan, Beatrice Crane and Raelene Gold. We hope to make a League team part of other events around the Sound; let me know if you’d like to be on the regular list. It’s a fun and easy way to do outreach and help the League connect with other organizations in our community.

— submitted by Allison Feher, Administrative Manager

League Talks

Local and State League joined forces to respond to the controversial plan to make State parks self-sustaining. Our privatization positions apply to this situation where more private and commercial uses of parks are being considered. Raelene Gold and Cynthia Howe, who had drafted the testimony, and Judy Bevington crossed the mountains to Wenatchee where a hearing of the State Parks Commission was being held. Judy delivered the testimony and the League presence was well received. Our statement included:

“We strongly believe that the Legislature has a responsibility to provide substantial public funds to support state parks. These are public assets, critical to the well-being of the people, current and future, of Washington State. We ask that you work to see that they remain so.”
Why the League of Women Voters of WA Opposes I-1240, Public Charter Schools

- Private boards selected by corporations rather than publicly elected by citizens will govern charter schools. Voters will lose their right to elect (or unelect) representatives to oversee the spending of their taxes.

- Charter schools will be exempt from state statutes and rules applicable to school districts and boards, creating a separate and unequal school system even though Article IX of the Washington state Constitution requires a general and uniform system of common schools.

- Charter schools will drain much needed dollars from existing public school districts where the majority of our students are educated.

- A new, unelected state commission would be created to authorize and oversee charter schools rather than the constitutionally mandated and publicly elected Superintendent of Public Instruction.

- An existing public school could be converted to a charter school by a majority vote of teachers or of parents. The school district would lose the state funding but be required to provide the existing facility rent-free, be responsible for repairs and upgrades, and be required to allocate levy moneys to the converted charter school.

- Although proponents of the Initiative promise “at risk” students and those from low-performing schools will be served by charter schools, nothing in the Initiative requires it. Yet charter schools will drain much needed dollars from existing public schools.

- Research conducted by Stanford University and others shows that overall charter schools do not perform better than public schools, and nearly 40% of them do worse.

- The state supreme court has ruled in McCleary v. State that Washington is failing to provide ample funding for the basic education required by the Legislature (HB 2261). Let’s work toward full funding for all students in all schools rather than be distracted by charter schools that would only serve a limited number of students chosen by lottery.

Catherine Ahl  
Education Chair, LWVWA  
cathahl@hotmail.com  
360-697-7924

Local League member Joanna Cullen is coordinating with the state League on the campaign to defeat this initiative. Please contact her at jfoxcullen@gmail.com or 206-329-8514 to help. Contacting Joanna will put you on the list to be notified of upcoming meetings and work.
League in the News

The League of Women Voters is mentioned several times a day in the news around the nation. One example that leads back to our door is the lead article in the July 30 edition of “Nation of Change” magazine on Privatization. The conclusion section references the League, provides a link directly to the position on the national League website, and then quotes a portion of our position! This is a result of the national Privatization Study initiated by our own Nora Leech. You can view it online at: http://www.nationofchange.org/privatization-big-joke-isn-t-funny-1343656123

Locally, the Seattle-King County League had a letter to the editor published in the Seattle Times. The letter expressed our support of the Children and Family Services Facility and the Seattle Public Library levies and our reservations regarding the financing of the latter. The letter is available online at: http://seattletimes.nwsource.com/html/northwestvoices/2018768046_librarytaxlet26.html

Update on Voting Systems

Local League member Sam Sharf has been a watchdog on the issue of voting systems and technologies for many years. He submitted the following to help interested members access good information on the status and advisability of online voting.

Check out this recent report from the Verified Voting Foundation, Common Cause, and Rutgers Law School which contains a state-by-state examination of voting systems, “Counting Votes 2012: A State by State Look at Voting Technology Preparedness.” The report contains a wealth of information, as well as some excellent recommendations for improvements and can be downloaded from http://www.countingvotes.org.
Voter Service

Voter Registration--
We have been busy with voter registration this summer. Given that this is a presidential election year, we are receiving an unusually high number of requests for help in registering voters. We've held two training sessions and have a dozen people all ready to support this important effort in the up-coming election season. Note that we can also arrange one-on-one training if someone would like to help with voter registration. Contact us at the office and we'll set up a time that works.

We again had a table at the Juneteenth festival at Pratt Park in June--thanks to Candis Litsey, Kiku Hayashi, and Kati Ortiz. And we registered new citizens at the 4th of July Naturalization ceremony at Seattle Center. It is so rewarding to see the smiles on the faces of these new citizens as they turn in their completed registration forms knowing that they will be able to exercise their rights as voting citizens. Thank you, Pat Cleary, Joanna Cullen, and Jan Orlando along with our King County Elections Office.

We have some new approaches to voter registration in the works as well. After receiving a request from a King County Library System librarian, we have scheduled volunteers to register voters at the Federal Way library at least twice a week through August and September--these voters will be able to vote in the General Election in November. The former South King County League (which is now part of our League) jumped in to provide a rotation of volunteers for this unique opportunity--thank you, Mary Ehlers and Cindy Piennett for making this happen.

We are also collaborating with a clinic near our office, part of the Country Doctor Health Centers. They now have a table set up in the clinic where patients can register to vote, either online or by paper, while they wait to see the doctors. Our very own Allison Feher has organized this innovative method for registering new voters.

September 25 is National Voter Registration Day. Be sure to ask your friends, family members, and co-workers if their registration is current.

Speakers Bureau--
The Speakers Bureau season is in full swing. We have had a lot of calls coming in from groups that want to hear the League’s non-partisan and unbiased presentation of the ballot measures. I've been coordinating these requests for a couple of years now and I just love to hear how much people appreciate what we do in League--no one else does what we do in this arena.

If you're interested in being a member of our Speakers Bureau corps or if you'd like to schedule one of our Speakers Bureau volunteers to address your group, call the office and leave a message for me. I'd love to talk with you about up-coming opportunities.

Cyndi Woods
Voter Services Co-chair
Observer Corps Update

The League has, since its inception, encouraged members to attend meetings of the supervisory boards of public jurisdictions that interest them and to share their observations. Last year, the Board renewed its support of the Observer Corps and you are all encouraged to join the action.

* Select an elected entity that you would like to observe. The TRY brochure is a good place to begin looking for information. If you already attend one of these meetings, send a note or email to the League office. Include a report on transactions you have observed, if you wish.
* Telephone the entity or go online to its website to find out when and where meetings or hearings are held.
* Enlist a friend for company.
* Wear a League of Women Voters badge (if you don’t already have one, the office has large blue ones that really make a statement).
* Attend the meeting.
* Observe. Do not comment on issues before the body.
* Email or mail a report on what you saw and heard to info@seattlelwv.org or LWVS-KC, 1620 18th Avenue, Suite 101, Seattle, WA 98122.
* Share your information with your unit, appropriate League committees, the Observer Corps committee, and friends.

Good luck and let us hear from you!

Why would one want to do this?

- This demonstrates your interest in and support for the effort being expended on your behalf by the members of the board, council, commission, or other entity you are observing.
- It will bring you up to date on matters that could affect you.
- It can bring you into direct contact with policy makers.
- You may find out about urgent matters before they become public.
- You will be in a position to alert the League, its committees, and your friends and relatives about what is going on.
- It is a vital, patriotic thing to do.
- It reminds people that League exists and that we care about what is happening in their jurisdiction.

To quote Red Green of “The Red Green Show” on KBTC-TV (PBS), “We’re pulling’ for you - we’re all in this together.” Indeed.

Pat McCann, Chair of the Observer Corps
Getting Connected Membership News

Non-partisan Sell

Many voters want unbiased, “just the facts” information. The next time you hear people complaining about the difficulty of finding good information about the issues, suggest that they join the league. Tout the candidate forums we put on, the studies we perform, and the ballot issues research we do. Members learn a lot about the political process and have a myriad number of ways to become involved in making our community a better place. Would they like to make a difference? Send them our way!

Generosity Helps League

In the past few months, several members have stepped up to the plate to contribute to the League’s well being. We thank Carolyn Baker, Marjorie Boetter, Bobbe Bridge, Barbara Cornwall, Karen Duval, Jean Godden, Kathy Jorgensen, Piper Henry-Keller and Larry Keller, Lois Kutscha, Karen Lunder, Alice Peterson, Tony Romano, Ann Widditsch and Karla Wight for sending us a contribution. Bobbe Bridge also remembered Jocelyn Marchisio with a contribution; Jocelyn would approve.

A number of members have chosen to raise the level of their memberships. We are grateful to contributing members Bobbe Bridge, Anne Conn, Lee Van Divort, Ruth Kagi, Teresa Lutterman, Jane Shafer and Robi Zocher as well as booster members Katie Bethell, Marsha Cleveland, Beatrice Crane, Christine DiStefano, Mrs. Phil Duryee, Mary Ehlers, Hilke Faber, Eleanor Fordyce, Steven Gilbert, Diana Henderson, Irene Hill, Linnea Hirst, Jeannette Johnson, Kathy Jorgensen, Rebecca Kenison, Virginia Leland, Roberta Martin, Sue Mecklenburg, Don Ostrow, Judy Ostrow, Sari Schneider, Nancy Smith, Lou Templeton, Laraine Volkman and Ethel Williams. You are helping us to provide memberships to those in need as well as contributing to the financial solvency of the League. Thank you, thank you, thank you!

Helping Hands

Amanda Berry, Gary Bevington, Carol Goldenberg and Candis Litsey are part of the membership committee. Between them, they file, enter data, provide information from the database to Board members and chairs, keep our membership records current at the local, state and national levels, call new members, write the short biographies that appear in the Voter, and answer inquiries. They are a wonderful team. We are so lucky to have them volunteering for us!

New Members

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

Michelle Haffner moved to the Seattle area with a brand new B.S. in architecture from the University of Illinois to take a job at the Boeing Company. She later worked as a computer programmer at Microsoft, VISIO and EDS. She is currently self-employed as a consultant. Michelle’s volunteer activities in the community include PTA Board, Humane Society of King County, Boy Scouts, Friends of Issaquah Library (newsletter), and Municipal League candidate evaluation committee. Her shared skills include computer data bases and custom applications.

Michelle says she has always known about the League of Women Voters and is interested in many of League’s issues. She looks forward to discussion and information on current events.

Amy Godes says she was born, bred and educated in New York City, having attended Julia Richmond High School, Hunter College (BS), City College of New York (MS) and the Alfred Adler Institute (Psychoanalysis and Family therapy). While working as a guidance counselor at Martin Luther King High School, she developed a private practice as a psychotherapist which she maintained until her retirement in 2010. Mother of two wonderful daughters, she lost her youngest to ALS in 1994.

Amy and her husband, Roy (great guitarist and folk singer) moved to Woodstock, New York, in 1983, keeping the Manhattan apartment for an exciting life
of community involvement, music, art, and theater. Amy founded a group called Staying in Place, an aging in place organization, which she reluctantly left to come to Seattle in 2011. Amy was active in the Woodstock Senior Recreation Committee, Woodstock Friends of the Library, Kingston Music Society, AAUW, ACLU, LWV and Physicians for Social Responsibility.

With the death of her husband, Amy moved to Seattle to be near her physician daughter and granddaughter. At University House she is making new friends and enjoying the League unit that meets there.

Proud of her heritage as the daughter of emigrants from the Ukraine and her Pittsburgh childhood during the Depression and World War II, Olga Stewart says, “My background made me what I am - aware of civil rights and an activist.” A graduate of the University of Pittsburgh with an MA in psychology, Olga moved to Seattle in 1960 to work at the YWCA at the University of Washington. It was an exciting 10 years working with students throughout the civil rights movement and the Vietnam War. She remembers walking down the freeway in protest. Later, Olga became director of the Central Seattle Community Council Federation which played a big role in getting I-90 tunneled under Mount Baker instead of through it. In another career move, she worked as Director of Conferences and Institutes for UW Continuing Education.

Still more to come - Olga took early retirement and went to modeling school. She worked as a model for Nordstrom, cruise ships, and television ads. For more than 40 years Olga lived with her husband Art in Madrona. She is now an active resident of Horizon House where she is a member of the largest unit in the League of Women Voters of Seattle- King County.

Thanks to Horizon House for biographical information.

In Memoriam

The Summer Voter briefly noted the passing in recent months of several distinguished League members. In the interim, we have gathered some details on the lives of these women and their impressive legacies.

Margaret Ceis was a lifelong activist who worked diligently on a variety of civil rights and neighborhood causes, of which the League was just one. She was an early supporter of school desegregation and fair housing and became the first woman to chair Seattle’s Human Rights Commission. Back in the 1960’s she worked to revive the 34th District Democrats organization, later serving as its chair. Over the years, she also chaired the Seattle Housing Authority, the Harborview Medical Center Board of Trustees, and the Seattle Board of Park Commissioners. At the neighborhood level, she was a tireless supporter of civic and arts projects in West Seattle, including the West Seattle Food Bank and Arts West.

As a 50-year member of the League, Margaret always gave generously of her time and money. She and her husband Phil helped to remodel the old 18th Avenue office of the League, building the bookcases that we still use as room dividers. Margaret was 86 when she died last May 23.

Volunteers who worked on the League’s annual Political Party and Auction will remember Gertrude (Trudy) Brown as a regular member of that committee, but other members will laud her hard work on the state LWV board where, among other things, she worked on simplifying and clarifying ballot issues for publication.

Most of Trudy’s professional career was spent in Alaska where she taught high school. After retiring and moving to Seattle with her husband Stephen, she continued teaching literacy on a volunteer basis to non-native English speakers. She also became an accomplished painter with the Women’s University Group. Trudy was only 73 when she died on May 12.
Our belated remembrance of Alice Ostendorff notes that she died on February 28 at the age of 94. She was a native of Seattle and graduate of Queen Anne High School but spent her summers on her parents’ farm in Alberta, Canada. She maintained those Canadian connections throughout her life and became a worldwide traveler. In 1964 she and her husband Fred took a nine-month trip around the world. Later in her seventies, she traveled twice to Kenya to visit two families that she and Fred had supported for many years.

The League lost one of its most energetic and dedicated members when Jocelyn H. Marchisio died on June 12 in Bellingham at age 90. Her memorial service in late July was filled with many friends from the League, many of whom worked with her when she was president of the State League for two terms and came to acknowledge her incredible legacy, not only to the League but to a wide variety of other organizations as well.

Although she proudly reported that she never held a paying job, she worked full time for, besides the League, Planned Parenthood (Board of Directors), Municipal League of King County, King County Committee on Law Enforcement, Washington State Public Disclosure Commission, Group Health Cooperative Governance and Appeals Committees, Washington Council of International Trades, and Eastside Regional Council. She was especially passionate about women’s reproductive rights, public disclosure of campaign financing, and voting rights.

Nancy Miller, another past president of the League, died May 30. Born in Seattle in 1934, Nancy became an accomplished climber and skier at an early age and remained an avid outdoor enthusiast for her entire life. In fact, she was member 231 of REI, which her father had helped to found. She would later serve on the REI board from 1978-85, two of those years as chair from 1981-83. She also served on the board of the Seattle Mountaineers. She and her husband Tom and their children spent considerable time hiking, skiing, and backpacking throughout the Northwest and traveling internationally.

At age 39 Nancy entered law school at the U. of Washington and earned her J.D. in 1976. She later worked for Stoel Rives until she retired in 1995, although she continued to work part-time for the Washington State Bar Association.

Besides her work with the League, Church Women United, American Association of University Women, Friends of the Library, Great Decisions Study Group, Eastern Star and other organizations, Dorothy Jane Youtz will always be remembered for her big hats, one to match whatever outfit she was wearing. At the League she was frequently at the microphone at the annual meetings and at convention. She was a lifelong advocate for women’s rights, voting rights, and literacy. She was 93 when she died on April 25.

These are short and incomplete remembrances of some remarkable women and can’t begin to measure the true impact they had on our society. We mourn the loss of each of them and offer condolences to their families and loved ones.
BOOK REVIEW by Vicky Downs

The New Jim Crow: Mass Incarceration in the Age of Colorblindness
by Michelle Alexander

Leaguer Carolyn Hale strongly recommended this book by civil rights lawyer Michelle Alexander and kindly loaned me her copy. Though I knew that Jim Crow was an informal name for a system of racial segregation in the Southern states, I did not know the term dated from a minstrel show. Nor did I know Jim Crow laws were intended to replace the “black codes” adopted after the Civil War to “control the freedmen.” White farmers and plantation owners believed they could not survive without Negro labor and something needed to be done.

Nine states soon adopted vagrancy laws, which made it a criminal offense not to work, and those laws applied only to blacks. Any black male who didn’t have “written proof of a job” was considered a vagrant and could be convicted. Once jailed, such men were “hired out for little or no pay [to] plantation owners and private companies.”

Federal civil rights legislation overturned the black codes, but segregation laws intended to drive a wedge between poor whites and blacks followed, and a caste system was soon in place. Whites saw the new racial order, “Jim Crow,” as a “return to sanity” and a “permanent system” in the South for controlling blacks.

Fast-forward to the 1980s to see several events that negatively affected the poor, especially black and brown people. President Reagan focused attention on “welfare queens” and criminal “predators,” codes for poor blacks or Latinos and a major theme in his campaign. At about the same time, low-skill manufacturing jobs moved overseas, profoundly impacting the less well-educated, especially African Americans. In 1985 crack cocaine hit the streets. Crack is chemically almost identical to powder cocaine, which is used mostly by whites, but gives a faster, more intense though shorter-lasting high. It can be sold in small doses, making it affordable by the poor.

In 1986 the media frenzy over drugs focused intensely on the crack form of cocaine. When politicians wanted to be seen as tough on crime, it was easier to focus on crack in the black parts of town rather than on powdered cocaine used by whites, often in the suburbs. Soon vast numbers were thrown into jail, and by 2000 over two million, mostly blacks, were behind bars and the new Jim Crow was born.

Alexander shows how the system of mass incarceration was fueled by the “War on Drugs,” which focused on young black males in particular, who carried small amounts of the drug in their pockets. Meanwhile, the majority of drug “kingpins” in charge of selling the drugs were not charged with serious offenses.

I was sobered by Alexander’s description of routine police “sweeps” through interstate buses or the poorer sections of a city, leading to a handful of arrests, almost always black males. Another technique was to ask a terrified young black to “volunteer” to open his backpack or empty his pockets.

During this time, a University of Washington study found the Seattle Police used “untrue stereotypes about crack markets, crack dealers, and crack babies - not facts - [which drove] discretionary decision-making by the Seattle Police Department.” “Seattle residents [mostly] report suspected narcotics [inside residences] but police devoted their resources to open-air drug markets” that were much less likely to be identified in citizen complaints. The result? Black dealers were far more likely to be arrested than whites.

“The nature of the criminal justice system [is no longer focused on prevention and punishment of crime, but
on management and control of the dispossessed,” with the drug war as the system of control. In Illinois in 1992, 992 black men received college degrees, while 7,000 black men were released from prison. This high instance of incarceration provides a picture of the new Jim Crow caste system.

Alexander quotes James Baldwin who wrote that Americans “have destroyed and are destroying hundreds of thousands of lives and do not know it and do not want to know it.”

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

BOOK REVIEW by Charles Bagley

Class Warfare: Inside the Fight to Fix America’s Schools by Steven Brill

This book is a 400+ page screed to promote charter schools. It makes no pretense of being objective or even-handed. Within the first dozen or so pages, journalist Steven Brill shows who the heroes are — independent-thinking businessmen, billionaire philanthropists, a rare politician, and even a few teachers. And the villains — the teachers unions, the National Education Association, United Federation of Teachers and especially the American Federation of Teachers (AFT), as well as bureaucracy, and politicians corrupted by their reliance on the unions for reelection. Brill loves Teach for America.

The book reads like a thriller novel. The very short chapters introduce one hero/heroine after another, each fighting against a union, against their school administrations, against the ignorance of the unenlightened public, and against legislators, in order to liberate students into charter schools. Many of these heroes are well-known, others little heard of. Each character succeeds, mostly, and Brill does not write about the failures. In alternate chapters, the unions strike back to block change, always labeled “reform,” by invoking contract rules, stalling, and going to their friends in the legislature.

About half or more of the book is devoted to New York City schools, where Mayor Michael Bloomberg and Chancellor Joel Klein struggle to improve schools by introducing the use of teacher evaluations to determine teacher retention and placement. AFT president Randi Weingarten, who is the chief villain of the book, opposes this measure. While some of the practices written into the NYC schools contract with the union seem abusive, Brill fails to note that these abuses involve only about 1% of the 80,000+ NYC teachers. The union is always at fault, though nowhere does he blame the school administrators who approved this contract. Surprisingly, near the end of the book Weingarten comes in for some kind words.

Most striking in this book is the total lack of statistics on the effectiveness of charter schools. Charter schools are simply assumed to be superior in improving student test scores. The Knowledge Is Power Program (KIPP) charter school system of some 100 schools nationwide is twice mentioned (pages 166, 303) as being especially effective, yet no data is given.

In fact, numerous studies have compared the effectiveness of charter schools with that of nearby public schools. The largest by far is the June 2009 CREDO study from Stanford, which looked at 2403 charter schools, about half of all those in the country. This study found that the average charter school was slightly inferior. It also found that, where significant differences existed, the charter schools were twice as likely to be worse (37%) as to be better (17%), compared to nearby public schools. Brill mentions the CREDO study only as “a national study showing that charter schools were an even mix of successes and failures,” but apparently fails to realize that this statement undermines his whole case for charter schools.

There have been several other, smaller studies of charter schools and in none were they found as a whole to be superior.

Though Brill lauds the KIPP schools, he fails to cite the March 2011 study by Western Michigan University education professor Gary Miron, “What Makes KIPP Work?” that found that KIPP’s alleged success could be due in large part to selecting better students to enter the schools, avoiding children who are English language learners or have special needs. Miron also points out that poor students have a higher dropout rate, which thus makes the scores of the remaining students average out higher. Also KIPP schools received 39% of their entire program funding...
from private gifts and donations, obviously impossible to replicate on a large scale. KIPP disputes these findings, citing non-public data that it had previously refused to give to Miron. Although Brill covers events up to his May 2011 publication date, he fails to even footnote the Miron study, which was extensively reported in the education literature and the press.

Suddenly, in the final chapter, the thriller novel is over. The chapter is, rather, a thoughtful review of the reality: charter schools cannot be “scaled up” to whole states or the country.

There are 3,000,000 teachers in K-12 in America. There aren’t enough Teach for America graduates annually. It would take years to replace a significant number of allegedly “poor” teachers with new, inspired ones at the current rate of graduation from the nation’s colleges. There certainly won’t be private and foundation money sufficient to replicate KIPP-like schools nationally. Brill acknowledges that teacher unions can be good. He also suggests that schools might have to raise salaries to attract into teaching enough good candidates from the upper third of college classes. He mentions first year salaries of $65,000, with a possible top of the scale of $150,000. Thus, not charter schools, but a sustained level of greater school funding may be the answer!

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

**Waterfront Update**

*On August 14, the Seattle City Council unanimously adopted Resolution #31399 relating to the Central Waterfront Concept Design and Framework Plan and the Central Waterfront Committee’s Strategic Plan and recommendations; and addressing the funding plan for the Waterfront Improvement Program including the formation of a local improvement district, partnerships with the Pike Place Market and Seattle Aquarium, formation of a Friends of Seattle Waterfront non-profit organization, and initial steps for implementation. The mayor is expected to concur. Jan O’Connor, Chair of the Central Waterfront committee of the LWV of Seattle-King County, has followed the planning process leading to this action.*

**The Waterfront - Summing it up**

By Jan O’Connor

The article “Making Plans for the Waterfront” appeared in the Seattle-King County League’s April 2012 *Voter*, and was the subject of the April forum and unit discussions. The article was prepared because the decision had been made to remove the viaduct and bore a tunnel from roughly north of the Seattle Center to Pioneer Square.

The city of Seattle had been anticipating changes on the waterfront for some time and had engaged in several preliminary planning activities in recent years. Following a two-year study of the viaduct and its future by the city and relevant transportation agencies, the city established the Central Waterfront Committee. The public view of this work was through the Framework Committee. The League has had an active transportation committee for many years and has followed the work of the Puget Sound Regional Committee, where regional transportation planning is centered, as well as the many transportation issues which have come before the public. The League has also been active in downtown zoning and planning issues. Although not officially represented on the Framework Committee, observers were welcome and League members regularly attended the meetings.

Although repairing the viaduct had many supporters, others believed that this would not be a good move. The concrete in the current viaduct has a much shorter life expectancy than new concrete. Repairing the current viaduct would not result in a roadway that meets current safety standards and would be costly.

As the deliberations of the Framework Committee came to an end with recommendations for upgrading the surface route, the governor, county executive, and mayor announced plans for the tunnel. When I asked a representative from the State Department of Transportation, who was making a presentation to the city council, how the department could come up with a tunnel plan so quickly, he reported that, throughout deliberations of the Framework Committee, the state was continually approached by some members of the
committee who were afraid that the group would not support building a new viaduct and wanted an alternative to repairing the existing roadway.

When the plans for the viaduct removal and the digging of the tunnel, basically State projects, were adopted, they included numerous stipulations as to who was responsible for what costs. The city and State arrived at an agreement as to what responsibilities each would bear. The city is responsible for utility changes and that work has been proceeding. An additional major city responsibility was to prepare for the development of a promenade along the waterfront.

When you follow the planning of such projects, you begin to see how complex the funding and coordination of project elements are. Funding may be available through numerous special grants and budget sources. Work has been going on at the south end of the waterfront and Spokane Street to prepare for the removal/replacement of the viaduct. That work was deemed necessary regardless of the decisions related to the existing viaduct. After the voter-approved adoption of the tunnel, additional construction had to be carried out adjacent to Pioneer Square to prepare an exit/entrance for the tunnel.

Some earlier plans for replacing the viaduct included variations of tunnels, including structures that would have incorporated or replaced the seawall which would have become a state responsibility. The seawall is now a city responsibility. Efforts have been made to get assistance from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, but they have been unsuccessful.

It was clear that the removal of the viaduct would leave a broad street, still a state highway and to remain so, and the city was charged with using some of the space to develop a promenade. The city then established the Central Waterfront Committee which reaffirmed the guiding principles for waterfront planning. Those guiding principles were:

1. Create a waterfront for all.
2. Put the shoreline and innovative, sustainable design at the forefront.
3. Reconnect the city to its waterfront.
4. Embrace and celebrate Seattle’s past, present, and future.
5. Improve access and mobility.
6. Create a bold vision that is adaptable over time.
7. Develop consistent leadership from concept to construction to operations.

League of Women Voters members who studied the history of the waterfront and the proposed plan were supportive of these guiding principles. Most League members regularly visit the waterfront, arriving there by foot or car. They participate in a wide range of activities, such as shopping, eating, sightseeing, or special events. They believe that easier well-marked access and more places to sit down and enjoy the view are important.

The city’s Central Waterfront Committee, chaired by Maggie Walker and Charlie Royer, met to study how such projects were managed in other cities and to review the work of its subcommittees. Those subcommittees were: Design Oversight, Long-Term Stewardship, Outreach & Public Engagement, and Finance & Partnership. One of the early tasks of the group was to select a design consultant and, as a result of that process, the James Corner firm was selected. He has received a lot of publicity for his Highline project in New York. He and his associates have worked throughout the year to present an exciting vision to the public and worked with local constituencies to resolve local issues.

Possible sources of funds for the Waterfront Plan include a bond measure which would tax the residents of the city, a local improvement district (LID) which would levy a charge on property benefiting from the removal of the viaduct, private philanthropy, income earned from facilities on the waterfront, and the general city budget. The Finance & Partnership Subcommittee recommended the bond measure and an LID. Work is under way on the LID proposal but it is extremely complicated since levels of benefit must be determined and the proposal must be approved by the property owners. Although no major changes in zoning are anticipated, those buildings near the south end of the viaduct, with their backs to the viaduct parking area, will surely rise in value as the viaduct is removed.

The Long-Term Stewardship Subcommittee recommended the establishment of a non-profit group, Friends of the Waterfront, to coordinate activities on the waterfront and oversee its long-term support and
The Waterfront Plan is separate from the Transportation Plan, which includes firm dates for each step in the process of building the tunnel, removing the viaduct, and constructing a new surface road. Naturally the Waterfront Plan is coordinated with that plan but there is a real effort under way through activities planned on the waterfront and in public presentations to incorporate the public in the vision of the future waterfront.

As a leaguer who attended most of the Framework Committee meetings where the future of the viaduct and many other transportation issues were discussed, I have mixed feelings in regard to the planning process. Much time and money was spent responding to the demands of a small contingent who insisted that the existing viaduct be repaired. The current viaduct is made of concrete which has a limited life expectancy. It does not meet current safety standards for lane width. Bringing it up to standard would have cost a good percentage of what a new viaduct would have cost and its life expectancy would have been limited. Whether the viaduct should be replaced by a new version was another issue. As stated above, some members of the Framework Committee went directly to the state to promote their own point of view. It seems rather unfair that these committee members would bypass the work of the committee by going directly to the State. The tunnel, although under way, is becoming more of an issue because it may not be able to generate the expected revenue.

It is also apparent that some groups have more power than others. The Downtown Association, labor unions, and the Port seem to be particularly powerful. Their views do not always reflect the views of the general public and they are often not as subject to critical evaluation.

The Waterfront Trolley is another issue. The trolley was a favorite and the public expected it to return. Those of us who have followed transportation issues for years know that there is a group lobbying for a more extensive trolley system and they would prefer that the trolley run along First Avenue. I have not heard a good discussion of the value of a trolley that runs along the waterfront versus the First Avenue plan, and public complaints, I think, have delayed the sale of the trolleys to another city.

Parking is also an issue. Biking, walking, and busing are the Seattle way but they are not very useful alternatives for an aging population or for families who travel as a group by car. I have not heard a good discussion of the economics of small parking garages or of better marketing of already available parking space.

When the article about the Strategic Plan and pictures appeared in the newspaper, I received calls expressing concern about the huge buildings which appeared in the background. Those are buildings which exist downtown now. Zoning along the waterfront is tightly controlled and it is unlikely that the owners of current buildings downtown would support towers rising in front of them. There are condominiums along the east edge of Alaskan Way now, north of the Market, barely noticed by the public.

Concern was also expressed that this was just a gentrification project and that we should maintain our Port. However, major commercial activities of the Port have moved south of the central waterfront area being discussed. The Port does not lack space. People are anxious that the waterfront maintain its Seattle look but there are certainly a lot of improvements which can be made along the waterfront which will make it more attractive and accessible to the general public. That is one of the guiding principles.

The report of the Central Waterfront Committee has been submitted to the Seattle City Council for further action. The city council has approved submitting a 30-year bond issue in November which would be used for reconstructing the seawall and rebuilding the public piers (62&63) which have been declared unsafe for major events. Should Seattle residents pay for a new seawall? We will certainly enjoy the benefits and consider ourselves protected from tsunamis that may come our way. The seawall has been described as critical for the public’s health and safety and the redevelopment of Alaskan Way. Concerns about the seawall include vulnerability of the timbers, seismic dangers, rising seawater and environmental issues. The timbers are deteriorating because of the effects of seawater and tiny organisms called gribbles.

Thank you for your interest and participation in this project. I will try to keep you posted on related happenings, including a tour of the waterfront.
found that prohibition does not achieve its stated goals. Marijuana arrests have increased dramatically since 1992 and marijuana accounts for nearly half of all drug arrests. Despite the increased enforcement, however, the price of marijuana has declined at the same time its potency has increased."

Second, the societal costs of prohibition are significant. The resources allocated to arrest, trial, and incarceration or probation are huge. Another researcher, Jeffrey A. Miron, professor of economics at Harvard University, estimated that marijuana legalization would save $7.7 billion per year nationally in enforcement costs. Miron also opined that taxation on marijuana sales would yield from $2.4 to $6.2 billion annually.

Beckett and Herbert also found that marijuana arrests fall disproportionately on African Americans. Further, they concluded that the human toll in lost work, loss of property, loss of jobs or educational opportunities, which cannot be measured, should be considered.

Third, Beckett and Herbert found that decriminalization does not lead to an increase in marijuana use. The researchers evaluated the impact of I-75 adopted by Seattle voters in September, 2003. That initiative mandated that marijuana enforcement be the City's lowest law enforcement priority. The initiative required the appointment of the Marijuana Policy Review Panel (MPRP). The number of Seattle Police Department referrals to the City Attorney was already low prior to the passage of I-75, and remained low afterwards. However, the researchers noted that the passage of I-75 benefitted white users more than black users. So, even as the number of marijuana referrals declined from 2000 to 2006, an increasing percentage of arrestees were black. The MPRP found in its study dated December 4, 2007, that the implementation of I-75 did not increase the use of marijuana among youth and young adults; did not increase crime rates; and had no measurable impact on public health."

In contrast to the above findings, the Northwest HIDTA (High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas) in its fact sheet titled “Facts about Marijuana” sets out some startling statistics on the rise of marijuana use among youths and adults since decriminalization laws have taken effect. NW HIDTA states that 17.4 million Americans are regular users of marijuana, up from 14.4 million in 2007, a 21% increase. The number of youths between the ages of 12-17 who use marijuana has increased from 6.7% in 2007 to 7.4% in 2010. There is a higher prevalence of use in states with medical marijuana laws. The fact sheet also discusses the health consequences of smoking marijuana and its effect on youthful users, including poor grades and increased rates of depression. It also points out an increase of 28% in arrests of drivers impaired by marijuana use from 2008 to 2010."

According to a paper issued by the American Constitution Society for Law and Policy, the drug war has been an abysmal failure. Most Americans, 75% in a 2008 Zogby poll, agree that the war on drugs is a failure. Despite tough drug laws and relentless enforcement, the World Health Organization found in a 2008 study of illegal drug use in 17 countries, that the United States has the highest rate. Surprisingly, marijuana use here is more than double that in the Netherlands: 42.4% vs. 19.8%. Furthermore, our incarceration rate is the world’s highest and approximately one-quarter of those incarcerated are there for drug related offenses. The paper’s author, Alex Kreit, suggests a paradigm shift that focuses on demand reduction, making addicts patients instead of criminals.

In a recent Wall Street Journal Article titled “Rethinking the War on Drugs,” the authors suggest a third way to deal with the complex problem of drugs in our society. They suggest a policy that focuses on the few who abuse drugs rather than on the vast majority who do not. In that way, the problem users can be treated, monitored, and, if necessary, punished.

As is obvious, this is not a topic to be taken lightly. Shall we begin the conversation?
END NOTES


FURTHER READINGS ON DRUG POLICY — online links can be accessed at www.seattlelwv.org

If you would like to read further on this very important issue, the following lists some additional publications and/or websites:


A Summary:  
King County Bar Association Drug Policy Project

Is it Time to End  
The War on Drugs?

An examination of current law and practice in drug abuse prevention, drug addiction treatment and the use of criminal sanctions.

Writing Committee  
Bert Metzger  
Jan O’Connor  
Peggy Saari

Reading Committee  
Norma Shorrock, Chair  
Shirley Harper  
Linda Snider

Note: The original of this report was published in the September 2003 edition of the Seattle Voter. The version printed herein contains some updated statistics, included in the text in brackets. Updated by Beatrice Crane, Program Co-Chair.
NOTE TO UNIT & DISCUSSION LEADERS: There will be no discussion leaders’ briefing, but the speakers at the forum will provide additional information that will contribute to meaningful unit discussion. Please plan to attend!

Discussion Questions:

1. Do you believe that marijuana is more akin to alcohol or to other Schedule I drugs? (Schedule I drugs have a high potential for abuse; no currently acceptable medical use and are not safe for use under medical supervision)

2. Do you believe that the war on drugs should be abandoned?

3. Should marijuana be legalized?

4. How should children be protected if marijuana or other drugs are legalized?
The King County Bar Association established the Drug Policy Project in the fall of 2000 to examine current state and federal drug policies.

The report, “Is It Time to End the War on Drugs?” was published in December of 2001. This summary prepared for League use is based on that report. The information used in the report is based on work done prior to 2001, with a couple of exceptions which are noted. The Bar Association report is well-documented. Specific reports referred to in this summary are referenced. The complete report and references are available at www.kcba.org. The ongoing work of the King County Bar Association Drug Policy Project is described more fully in the [September 2003 Seattle Voter] cover article.

Three policy oriented task forces were established by the Drug Policy Project to carry out the study and this report is a compilation of their work. The task forces were:

1. Task Force on Effective Drug Abuse Prevention
2. Task Force on Drug Addiction Treatment
3. Task Force on the Use of Criminal Sanctions

Introduction

Although the described purpose of the Bar Association report was to examine current state and federal drug policies, the examination includes descriptions, evaluations, and recommendations.

The statutory underpinning of current drug policy in the United States is the Federal Comprehensive Drug Abuse Prevention and Control Act of 1970, known as the Controlled Substances Act. Complementary state legislation, the Uniform Controlled Substances Act, was adopted by the state of Washington in 1971. The Uniform Controlled Substances Act has been adopted by 45 other states. Although the statutes describe prohibited activities in detail, they allow for state discretion in prescribing specific fines and/or sentences, and thus the criminal sanctions for violating those statutes differ between the federal and state levels and among the states.

Although alcohol and nicotine are not covered by the Controlled Substances Act and their use is controlled through other legislative and social means, the authors of the Bar Association report include them because of their greater impact on society. They are also used as a means of comparison. The Prevention Task Force found that any discussion of drug abuse prevention should include alcohol and nicotine.

Effective Drug Abuse Prevention

The issues which arise in discussing drug abuse prevention are several:

First: Drug use, drug abuse, and addiction represent varying levels of use.

Second: Which drugs should be included in drug abuse prevention programs?

The authors of the Bar Association report include alcohol and nicotine in their lists of drugs. Although the use of alcohol and nicotine is restricted in several ways, they are not substances listed under the government’s controlled substances act as are drugs such as marijuana, heroin, cocaine, etc. The authors maintain that alcohol and nicotine affect more citizens than controlled substances and they should be part of any drug abuse prevention program. They also cannot be legally used by minors.

Third: What is the goal of a drug abuse prevention program?

Among scholars and public officials, prevention is a term understood to mean youth-oriented intervention. The goal of a program may be abstinence. This approach is often used when discussing drugs included in the Controlled Substances Act since the use of those drugs is currently illegal. Delay of use might also be a goal since the research indicates that the longer drug use is delayed, the less likely abuse is to occur. Is abstinence a reasonable goal for illegal substances? Is it a reasonable goal when alcohol and nicotine are included in prevention programs?

Fourth: Who should be included in drug abuse prevention programs?
Many prevention programs include all students and provide a generalized overview of drugs. Is this approach effective?

The Prevention Task Force studied the research, policies, and programs designed to prevent drug abuse.

Drug abuse prevention programs, which are usually directed at youth, have had limited success. Early efforts focused on extreme scare tactics which didn’t survive the changing culture of the 60’s and beyond. A 1930’s film, Reefer Madness, featured a young man who became a crazed criminal after one puff of marijuana. In the late 60’s drug education programs in the schools began to focus on the physical and psychological hazards of drug use, but such programs had no measurable impact on drug use. By the late 70’s two theories had emerged. The first was that youth should be exposed to desirable models of behavior – taught the right way to do things. The second was the problem behavior theory in which adolescents were seen as using drugs to fulfill certain needs and to cope with problems. Neither of these approaches has held up well under research.

Drug Abuse Resistance Education (D.A.R.E.) is a well-known and widely implemented project. It is popular because there have been federal funds available for it from the Safe and Drug Free School Act and it doesn’t require much teacher training. The program consists of a series of lectures by police officers to fifth graders. Evaluations have revealed that the program has not reduced drug use and may have led to increased drug use in some areas. The program is now being re-designed. Programs which are guided by counselors with some background in health and include more student interaction and leadership are more successful.

A national survey by the White House Office of National Drug Control Policy reveals that by the senior year in high school, 80% of students have consumed alcohol, 63% have smoked cigarettes, and 49% have used marijuana. [In 2011, according to the Centers for Disease Control, the percentage for cigarettes had dropped to 54.5%; alcohol use (79%) and marijuana use (48.9%) had changed very little.] Findings across the nation indicate that juveniles are experimenting with drugs at younger ages. There is a jump in drug awareness between the ages of twelve and thirteen. The rising use of marijuana during the past decade is attributed to use by the 12-17 year olds. Drug use prevention programs have not eliminated drug use. Why is the success rate so low? The programs are often described as too general, neither target population nor drug specific. It has been suggested that programs which focus on high risk children or on a drug, such as nicotine where the consequences of use are clearly documented would be more effective. The goals of many programs are often not in keeping with the general attitude of the population toward drug use. Their goals equate drug use with drug abuse. It is pointed out that although there is some drug use among a high percentage of youth, very few of them become heavy users or addicts. There is not much evidence that most programs make a long-term difference.

Nevertheless, drug use among adolescents cannot be written off lightly. A recent study indicates that a youth who falls into a life of drug abuse and crime costs $1.7 to $2.3 million dollars and it is estimated that over three million children between the ages of ten and eighteen suffer from addiction.

What are the factors which lead one young person to limited experimentation and another to a life heavily impacted by drugs?

No one risk factor has been targeted as leading to abuse. There are, however, clusters of factors which are relevant: David Hawkins and Richard Catalano at the University of Washington have been leaders in researching risk factors which impact youth.

The risk factors are centered in:

1. Community - The attitude of the community towards drug use and the efforts the community makes to cope with it are important. Research indicates respect for the law varies among communities. It’s easier to get illegal drugs, alcohol, cigarettes, or drugs
in some places than others. Research also indicates that many youth don’t have much attachment to their neighborhood or school. In response, many states are promoting community-wide mobilization as a preventive strategy. This approach requires long-term planning, public investment, and patience.

2. Family – Positive impacts are developed when there are positive pro-social bonds within the family, when healthy norms about drug use are developed and when there is close parental monitoring of rules of conduct within the family.

3. School – In general, drug use does not lead to poor school performance. It is more likely that poor school performance leads to drug use. Early intervention, and participation in clubs, groups, civic activities, and athletics are seen as protective factors. So is participation in music, art, or performing arts programs. These opportunities may be provided by the community, and family, as well as by the school.

4. Individual/Peer - Activities which provide young people with opportunities for creativity, personal expression, commitment to a project, and the strengthening of personal relationships are seen as protective factors.

Research is the foundation for effective prevention programs. Effective research requires adequate funding and the freedom to test a variety of alternatives. Unfortunately, significant funding is still being devoted to abstinence-only programs and to universal programs aimed at youth in general, instead of programs designed for high-risk youth. An investment in research-validated programs to prevent, delay, and reduce the harm from the use of alcohol, tobacco, and other drugs will help to avert the higher costs of drug treatment, criminal justice, and social and health services that would otherwise arise.

In summary

1. Most youth pass through adolescence without adverse effects from drug use. There are no direct cause/effect relationships but early drug use is associated with poor school achievement, poor attendance, dropping out, and anti-social behavior. School problems are likely to develop before drug problems.

2. Drug use should be discouraged but the focus should be on the harm associated with various drugs. The information which youth receive should be accurate and not prescriptive. There is a problem with telling older adolescents how to behave. And although alcohol and nicotine are not featured in the War on Drugs, they should be included in any program designed for youth. Targeted programs and populations get better results than general information programs.

3. Programs designed to help youth succeed socially and academically are more effective than general drug education programs. Prevention resources should be devoted primarily toward programs that build and reinforce social skills particularly for youth presenting a higher risk of problem behavior.

Washington State is a national leader in the effort to design and implement preventive programs for higher-risk youth. The state’s 1994 Violence Prevention Act created the Community Public Health and Safety Networks and directed them to focus on specific at-risk youth behaviors. The State Division of Alcohol and Substance Abuse (DASA) is the primary state agency designated to develop drug abuse prevention strategies. Thirty-two thousand patients were admitted to the DASA program in 1998. [In 2009, DASA merged with the state Mental Health Division to become the Division of Behavioral Health and Recovery.]

Other state-sponsored prevention programs and activities are conducted by the Department of Community, Trade, and Economic Development and the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction.

The University of Washington has been a leader in developing programs for high-risk youth. They have been initiated by the School of Social Work and the School of Nursing.

Task Force of Drug Addiction Treatment

The report of the Drug Addiction Task Force moves us to that population among whom
abuse and addiction are the problem. There is considerable evidence that treatment makes a difference. Treatment leads to less crime and better health.\textsuperscript{10} The costs of incarceration and health care are cut. Addicts who are in treatment suffer from fewer health problems and so do their families. The Rand Corporation, in its report says that every dollar spent on treatment saves $7.46.\textsuperscript{11}

Treatment for addiction is a complex issue. Many street sellers of drugs are addicts who sell to maintain their addiction. Treatment involves establishing a more productive life style which may not be easily done. Other addictions, such as heroin, are so deep-seated that methadone replacement is a practical therapy. Other countries have dealt with the problem by allowing drug use in legal, controlled situations.

In spite of the benefits associated with drug treatment programs, Washington currently lacks the capacity to provide treatment to most of those who need treatment. The failure is especially conspicuous as it applies to people arrested and charged with crimes. A treatment option for a small percentage of those sentenced to terms in Washington prisons was authorized by the Legislature in 1995 in the Drug Offender Sentencing Act (DOSA) for individuals who have been convicted of non-violent felonies, including drug offenses involving only a small amount of a controlled substance and who have never been convicted of a violent or a sex offense. The DOSA program involves a reduced sentence, treatment in prison, and treatment in the community after release. As of December 31, 2000, there were 1507 people participating in the DOSA program. At that time there were 14,921 adults in custody including 3,730 serving time only for drug offenses. [A community based residential treatment option was introduced in 2005. Between fiscal years 2006 and 2008, 507 offenders were admitted to this program. A total of 9,621 offenders were sentenced to prison-based DOSA between fiscal years 1999 and 2008, with a high of 1,631 offenders sentenced in 2002, dropping to 628 in 2008.] Because of budget constraints, the Department of Corrections is only able to provide treatment to offenders sentenced under DOSA who meet the criteria of the Act. Other drug-addicted prisoners receive no treatment at all.

In some counties, drug courts offer a treatment alternative to conventional prosecution. Eligible individuals are offered the option of judicially supervised treatment along with periodic drug testing and sanctions for non-compliance with treatment requirements. There are currently drug courts in 12 of Washington’s 39 counties and in three tribal nations within the state. The largest program is in King County which in the year 2000 had 900 cases referred to it. [As of August 2012, there are adult drug courts in 24 counties, juvenile drug courts in 13 counties, and family treatment centers in 14 counties.\textsuperscript{26} In addition, in 2008 there were eight active tribal drug courts, and two more being planned.\textsuperscript{27}]

Drug addiction is often a factor in family maintenance and custody issues. Treatment is often not readily available to help in the situation and long waits are even encountered when children are addicted. It’s estimated that only about 18% of low-income Washington residents can be served with current resources in the existing budget.\textsuperscript{12}

There are services provided through private providers. Private health insurance plans and health maintenance organizations are required to cover minimum amounts of drug addiction treatment. Research has shown that an investment in drug addiction treatment is cost-effective for insurance companies. Medical costs for the addict as well as for the addict’s family decrease if the addict is in treatment.

Current law does not allow opiate-replacement treatment by private physicians except through a complex process. According to the National Institutes of Health, methadone treatment significantly lowers illicit opiate drug use, reduces illness and death from drug use, reduces crime, and enhances social productivity. The consensus statement calls for broader access to methadone maintenance programs, and recommends that physicians and pharmacies be allowed to dispense methadone.\textsuperscript{13} Counties in Washington have the option of providing methadone clinics within their borders. Only four have done so. Each clinic was limited to serving 350 patients. The 2001
legislative session changed the rules. Counties may no longer refuse to allow clinics within their boundaries and the 350 patient limit has been dropped. There are waiting lists and the attempt to establish more clinics has led to community objections. The state is also being criticized because access to methadone treatment should be available to Medicaid recipients under federal guidelines, but on a statewide basis, it is not.

Washington does have more needle exchange programs than any other state which may be associated with low HIV infection rates among needle users (2-4% in Seattle) in contrast to the 40-60% rate in New York City, Miami, Baltimore, and other big cities. King County was a pioneer in the early 1990s in allowing for needle exchanges which has reduced the rate of injection related HIV transmission to the lowest in the nation.14

Recommendations:

1. A broad spectrum of drug treatment options should be available on request to every Washington resident who wants and needs it.
2. Drug treatment should be complemented by and coordinated with other needed treatment and assistance including mental health treatment.
3. Special efforts should be made to assure that drug treatment, including inpatient treatment, is promptly available to children who need it.
4. Obstacles to the effective use of opiate-replacement therapies should be removed.
5. Needle-replacement programs should be available throughout the state, and referrals to addiction-treatment programs available at needle replacement sites.
6. Drug treatment should be available to individuals in prison.
7. Drug court should be an alternative to trial on criminal charges.
8. Programs to attract and train addiction treatment professionals should be supported and expanded.
9. Research-based investigation and reporting on the effectiveness of various approaches to addiction treatment and related issues should have continued support.
10. The people of Washington should make a commitment to, and have a strategy for the adequate funding of drug addiction treatment.

Use of Criminal Sanctions

Since the late 80s and 90s, the approach to controlling the use of drugs has been that of criminal sanctions. The criminal sanctions imposed in Washington for the sale and possession of drugs defined in the Uniform Substances Act are severe. Only the possession of 40 grams of marijuana or less is a misdemeanor. Felony sentencing in Washington is governed by a determinate sentencing system intended to assure that offenders who commit comparable crimes and have comparable criminal histories receive equivalent sentences. The court is guided by a grid of standard range sentences. One axis of the grid represents the seriousness of the crime and the other axis represents the conviction history of the offender. Courts may impose exceptional sentences outside the range but 95% of the sentences related to drugs in Washington fall within the guidelines.

Seriousness Levels and Standard Range Sentences – Selected Felonies15

This chart does not represent the grid established for individual defendants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offense</th>
<th>Seriousness Level</th>
<th>Standard Range*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Methamphetamine Manufacture</td>
<td></td>
<td>5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kidnapping 1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery 1</td>
<td>IX</td>
<td>3 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heroin/</td>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cocaine Delivery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arson 1</td>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drive-by Shooting</td>
<td>VII</td>
<td>1.5 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Assumes no conviction history
* Average sentence
The standard statutory maximum sentence for drug offenses in Washington is ten years, but the statutory maximum is doubled upon the second conviction for a second offense such as heroin or cocaine delivery. Drug offenders have the highest rate of recidivism among all classes of offenders. Many non-violent offenders are serving sentences longer than those convicted of violent crimes. Federal drug offender sentencing is similar except that the type and amount of drug play a larger role.

The relatively long sentences for drug offenses result from amendments made in the 1980s to the controlled substances statutes. At the federal level, minimum sentences were established and conspiring to commit a drug crime was added to the list of offenses. In Washington, the Omnibus Drug Act of 1989 lengthened sentences by raising the seriousness level of cocaine and heroin delivery, adding the two year sentence enhancement for drug offenses in the area of schools, parks, and bus stops, and increasing the penalty for prior offenses. Since the enhancement zones are poorly defined, the possibility of an additional two years is often used to apply pressure on a defendant. (The 2002 Legislature changed Washington’s sentencing guidelines.)

Since 1989, Washington’s prison population has increased by 125%. According to the Department of Corrections, a non-violent drug crime is the most serious charge for about 24% of all prison inmates. Some recent programs already described, DOSA and drug courts have cut some sentencing but the majority of those arrested are not included in the special programs or offered treatment.

A 1999 National Household Survey on Drug Abuse revealed the following figures in answer to the question of use during the past month:\textsuperscript{16}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Substance</th>
<th>Past Month</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol</td>
<td>105 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cigarettes</td>
<td>57 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marijuana</td>
<td>11 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cocaine</td>
<td>1.5 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crack cocaine</td>
<td>413 thousand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heroin</td>
<td>208 thousand</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[As of 2010, the U.S. population had increased 12% from 1999. While the overall use of alcohol went up 4% and the use of marijuana went up 1.5%, the total number of cigarette users increased only slightly and the total number of cocaine and heroin users remained almost unchanged.\textsuperscript{28}]

### Additional Information

- Frequent users of illegal drugs make up less than one percent of the U.S. population compared to alcohol users which during that month included 40% of the population. Figures for Washington were similar except that 56% of Washingtonians used alcohol during the month referred to in the study.
- Patterns of drug use have varied through the years. Figures are hard to arrive at since people are reluctant to admit criminal behavior. Not all users become addicts. It is estimated that about 2.5 million Americans are cocaine/heroin addicts.
- Public costs related to illegal drugs have increased, but most of those increased costs are due to increased law enforcement and the incarceration of drug offenders, not from the medical or social demands arising from the use of drugs. Federal and state budgets for drug control at the time of the study totaled about $35 billion compared to the $10 billions spent in the 1980s.
- Nationwide, 236,000 drug offenders were sent to state prisons in 1998, compared to 19,000 in 1980. Although many arrested for crimes may be drug users, most drug users do not engage in criminal activity except in the use of the drug.\textsuperscript{17}
- Incarcerating drug dealers in an area does not seem to eliminate the activity. New dealers move in. On the other hand, incarcerating burglars in an area reduces burglary.
- Not all drug users become addicts. Taking the criminal approach to drug control and putting users and abusers in the same category leads to the problems we are seeing.

Over the past century the percentage of the population experiencing serious drug addiction has remained very low, just above one percent.
According to RAND’s Peter Reuter, no more than 2.5 million Americans have substantial problems with cocaine and/or heroin addiction – less than one-fifth the number addicted to alcohol. Those with problems are heavily concentrated in urban minority communities. The narrow range of treatment options is especially costly in neighborhoods already suffering from poverty. These communities are also already impacted by the prison terms imposed for non-violent, low-level drug activity.\(^{18}\)

From a local perspective, drug abuse problems can take many forms and result in serious local problems. The Seattle King County Health Department recently released the report of the Heroin Task Force, finding increased heroin use and a rise in heroin-related health costs. In Washington’s rural areas, there has been a proliferation of methamphetamine labs. The production of synthetic drugs generally has become a problem. They can be produced easily, avoiding the usual paths of drug trafficking and enforcement, and are purchased without adequate knowledge of make-up and long term effects.

Despite recent changes, imprisonment is still the fate of almost all convicted drug offenders. Ninety percent of all federal drug offenders still serve time in prison. In Washington, all offenders convicted of drug delivery charges, continue to be incarcerated, irrespective of the amount of drugs involved in any case. Rehabilitative sentences are still only offered to about one quarter of all drug offenders in Washington’s prisons. In summary, the majority of drug offenders in both the state and federal systems still serve long prison terms, most without any drug treatment.

Harm reduction is a term often used in reference to the use of criminal sanctions as a means of controlling drug use. The sanctions currently in place are seen as causing more harm to the individual and society generally than the actual use of a drug by the defendant. Dispensing free needles and methadone are harm reduction strategies. Harm reduction is seen by its critics as a response to the failure to uphold the law and the failure to recognize the destructiveness of illegal drug use.

The War on Drugs has probably created more problems than it has solved but there is no consensus on an alternative policy. The polarization in the drug policy debate between those who would continue the current policy which basically prohibits the use of drugs and maintains that policy through incarceration and those who would legalize the use of drugs has led to few constructive alternatives. The breadth of federal policy limits the states in their efforts to experiment and develop alternative policies.

A set of principles recommended by the Bar Association Drug Project includes:

1. Any public drug policy should result in no more harm than the use of the drug itself.
2. Any public drug policy should address the underlying causes of drug abuse.
3. The state should regulate drugs in a manner that recognizes individual liberties but addresses the need to preserve public health, public safety, and public order.

Drug Policy and Collateral Effects

The collateral effects of current drug policy are wide-ranging. They include the impact on the economies and social structure of countries which produce drugs, the impact of millions of dollars of illegally obtained funds on a society, and the impact of corruption on individuals and governments, locally and internationally.

On a less global scale, drug cases clog the courts, impact communities, and result in the loss of civil rights for offenders. It is estimated that about half the cases in King County courts are drug related. Four thousand two hundred fifty-eight drug cases were filed in King County in the year 2000. Of those, 1,281 were drug delivery cases and 2,607 were drug possession cases. The impact of the incarceration of low-level, non-violent offenders in minority communities has already been noted. The incarceration of minority youth has impacted their communities and handicapped their future productivity.\(^{19}\)

Civil rights are compromised by enforcement activities such as sweeps, searches, and wiretaps.
About three-quarters of federal wiretaps are drug-related. The seizure of property of those charged with drug crimes is another issue. Senate House Bill 1995, enacted by the Washington legislature in 2001 directed that the state bears the burden of proving whether seized assets were derived from illegal drug activity. The bill also provided for the award of attorney’s fees to parties who successfully challenge the government’s forfeiture action. Finally, the bill called for a work group to study further possible changes to Washington’s drug forfeiture statutes.20

Persons convicted of felonies in Washington including drug offenders, lose the right to vote, to hold public office, and to serve as jurors. The possession of small amounts of an illegal drug is a misdemeanor under federal and in most states. It is a felony in Washington but not counted in the Three Strikes and You’re Out law. A great deal of confusion surrounds the process of restoring civil rights after the completion of a sentence and many offenders do not get their rights restored because of unpaid financial obligations. According to the Washington Department of Corrections, over 3,000 offenders were officially “discharged” in 2000 whereby their civil rights were restored; but about 10,000 offenders were “terminated” unable to get their civil rights restored because of unpaid legal financial obligations. A criminal record is often a bar to employment. An amendment to the federal Higher Education Act of 1998 made students convicted of drug offenses ineligible for federal financial aid. Other criminal offenses do not have the same consequence.21

Current Efforts to Reform Drug Policy

As people have become aware of the high cost of incarceration as the response to drug use, an increasing number of jurisdictions have attempted to reform their drug laws.

Changes as the federal level have been limited to giving some assistance for the establishment of local drug courts. Federal law sets the stage. The Western Governor’s Association issued the following policy statement in 2000: The federal government needs to work closely with the states to provide the resources necessary to meet the individual and unique needs of each state rather than approaching the issue in a one-size fits all manner.22 The use of a drug as defined in the 1970 Federal Controlled Substances Act is illegal. This limits the power of local jurisdictions to legalize the use of a drug such as marijuana.

The public and many public officials are concerned over the rising costs of arrest, prosecution, and imprisonment, as well as on communities disproportionately impacted by current policy. The King County Prosecuting Attorney has stated that incarceration itself does little to resolve the harm of individual drug use.23

The Washington State Legislature, in 2002, took several steps to change the state’s approach to punishment as a response to drug use:
1. Sentences for non-violent drug crimes were reduced.
2. Judges were given more discretion.
3. Sentences were oriented towards treatment with funding available.

Major drug policy reforms have taken place in Arizona and California where sanctions for drug law offenses were changed by initiative. Arizona’s Proposition 200, the Drug Medicalization, Prevention and Control Act, was approved in 1996 with 65 percent of the vote. Proposition 200 bars the incarceration of persons convicted of possession of a controlled substance, and instead mandates probation with treatment for the first and second such offenses. With resources made available under Proposition 200, 98.2% of probationers received treatment and 77.5% tested negative for drug use in 1998.

A member of the Arizona judiciary stated that the initiative has done more to reduce crime than any other state program and saved taxpayers money at the same time.

The other significant drug policy reform enacted by initiative was California’s Proposition 36, the Substance Abuse and Crime Prevention Act of 2000, which garnered 61% of the vote. Proposition 36 mandates treatment in lieu
of incarceration for first and second time drug possession offenses. A key feature of the initiative is that upon successful completion of court ordered treatment all criminal charges are dropped. The defendant is released from all penalties resulting from the offense.

At the time of the King County Bar Association report, it was too early to judge the long term outcome of the changes in policy in Arizona and California. (Current information supports the continuing success of those programs.)

It is apparent in working toward alternative responses to drug use that the proposed changes must fall within the general guidelines of federal law which currently make any controlled substance use illegal. So we continue to see criminal charges brought against users and traffickers, and the punishment modified to include treatment. Modifying the punishments to include treatment may currently be the most realistic course of action. In the long run, criminal sanctions are probably not appropriate and the role of the federal government should be re-evaluated. The legalization of drug use, probably the best course of action, would require a major shift in the public and governmental views on that subject.
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## Unit Meetings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Email</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thursday, September 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ISSAQUAH DAY</strong> – Margaret Austin</td>
<td><a href="mailto:margaret.austin@comcast.net">margaret.austin@comcast.net</a></td>
<td>425-392-5760</td>
<td>10:00 a.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday, September 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FIRST HILL</strong> — Joan Lawson</td>
<td><a href="mailto:joanv.awson@gmail.com">joanv.awson@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>206-382-3147</td>
<td>10:00 a.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CAPITOL HILL/MONTLAKE</strong> — Vicky Downs/Zita Cook</td>
<td><a href="mailto:downsdown@aol.com">downsdown@aol.com</a></td>
<td>206-328-3926</td>
<td>7:15 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SOUTHEND</strong> — Marian Wolfe/Vivian Montoya</td>
<td><a href="mailto:hedgwolfe@aol.com">hedgwolfe@aol.com</a></td>
<td>206-763-9430</td>
<td>7:30 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday, September 11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BELLEVUE/KIRKLAND/REDMOND</strong> — Bonnie Rimawi</td>
<td><a href="mailto:bonnierim@aol.com">bonnierim@aol.com</a></td>
<td>425-820-7127</td>
<td>12:15 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WEST SEATTLE</strong> — Amanda Berry/Ethel Williams</td>
<td><a href="mailto:amandamberry@earthlink.net">amandamberry@earthlink.net</a></td>
<td>206-724-7518</td>
<td>12:30 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SOUTHEAST KING COUNTY</strong> — Cathy Dormaier</td>
<td><a href="mailto:clcathy@foxinternet.com">clcathy@foxinternet.com</a></td>
<td>360-802-6799</td>
<td>7:00 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, September 12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>VIEW RIDGE</strong> — Gail Winberg</td>
<td><a href="mailto:winbergeng@q.com">winbergeng@q.com</a></td>
<td>206-524-7801</td>
<td>12:45 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>QUEEN ANNE/MAGNOLIA/BALLARD EVENING</strong> — Teddy Geokezas</td>
<td><a href="mailto:tgeokezas@msn.com">tgeokezas@msn.com</a></td>
<td>206-782-5036</td>
<td>7:30 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday, September 13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BAYVIEW</strong> – Elizabeth Mark</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:elizabethcmark@gmail.com">elizabethcmark@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>206-691-1074</td>
<td>9:30 a.m.</td>
<td>Bayview Retirement Community 4th Floor Solarium, 11 W. Aloha St. Seattle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNIVERSITY/WALLINGFORD</strong> – Barbara Davis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>206-547-2042</td>
<td>10:00 a.m.</td>
<td>University House 4400 Stone Way N, Seattle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SHORELINE</strong> – Juliet Beard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:juliet@windermere.com">juliet@windermere.com</a></td>
<td>206-715-5531</td>
<td>4:30 p.m.</td>
<td>Richmond Beach Cong. Church NW 195th St &amp;15th Ave. NW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NORTH CENTRAL</strong> – Jan Orlando</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:orlanre@aol.com">orlanre@aol.com</a></td>
<td>206-524-0936</td>
<td>7:30 p.m.</td>
<td>Alice Rasp 4523 5th Ave. NE, Seattle 206-633-1835</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Saturday, September 15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>BALLARD/MAGNOLIA/QUEEN ANNE DAY</strong> – Joan Peterson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:joanmepeterson@hotmail.com">joanmepeterson@hotmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wednesday, September 19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>N. KING COUNTY</strong> – Natalie Pascale Boisseau/Samanthe Sheffer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:npboisseau@gmail.com">npboisseau@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:singingphoenix@yahoo.com">singingphoenix@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SOUTHWEST KING COUNTY** – Mary Ehlers/Kathy Jorgensen
maryehlers@comcast.net | 253-941-1930 | 7:00 p.m. | Foundation House, 32290 1st Ave. S Federal Way |
## Board & Committee Contacts

### Executive Committee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011–2013</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Judy Bevington</td>
<td>206-329-4848</td>
<td><a href="mailto:president@seattlelwv.org">president@seattlelwv.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011–2013</td>
<td>1st V.P. Voter Service</td>
<td>Cyndi Woods</td>
<td>206-329-4848</td>
<td><a href="mailto:cyndiwoods@comcast.net">cyndiwoods@comcast.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012–2013</td>
<td>2nd V.P. Action</td>
<td>Ellen Barton</td>
<td>206-321-7362</td>
<td><a href="mailto:eeb0825@yahoo.com">eeb0825@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012–2014</td>
<td>3rd V.P. Program</td>
<td>Beatrice Crane</td>
<td>206-783-8485</td>
<td><a href="mailto:bscrane@comcast.net">bscrane@comcast.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012–2013</td>
<td>4th V.P. Development</td>
<td>Ginna Owens</td>
<td>206-323-7992</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ginnao@earthlink.net">ginnao@earthlink.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011–2013</td>
<td>Treasurer</td>
<td>Kati Ortiz</td>
<td>206-329-4848</td>
<td><a href="mailto:treasurer@seattlelwv.org">treasurer@seattlelwv.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012–2013</td>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td>Joanna Cullen</td>
<td>206-329-8514</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jfoxculen@gmail.com">jfoxculen@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Directors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012–2014</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td>Karen Adair</td>
<td>206-283-3242</td>
<td><a href="mailto:adairk303@gmail.com">adairk303@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012–2014</td>
<td>Voter Editor</td>
<td>Marge Baker</td>
<td>206-535-7299</td>
<td><a href="mailto:bakemargaret16@yahoo.com">bakemargaret16@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012–2014</td>
<td>Unit Coordinator</td>
<td>Lindsay Cummings</td>
<td>406-546-9314</td>
<td><a href="mailto:lindsaycummings@hotmail.com">lindsaycummings@hotmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012–2013</td>
<td>Membership</td>
<td>Susan Jones</td>
<td>206-725-2902</td>
<td><a href="mailto:susan@monckjones.com">susan@monckjones.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012–2014</td>
<td>Voter Service</td>
<td>Julie Anne Kempf</td>
<td>206-329-4848</td>
<td><a href="mailto:julie@kempf.com">julie@kempf.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011–2014</td>
<td>Development</td>
<td>Mary Jo Vigil</td>
<td>206-318-6939</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mjvigil@starbucks.com">mjvigil@starbucks.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011–2013</td>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>Janet Winans</td>
<td>206-323-4825</td>
<td><a href="mailto:janetwinans@earthlink.net">janetwinans@earthlink.net</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Education Fund Board

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012–2014</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Boots Winterstein</td>
<td>206-762-1362</td>
<td><a href="mailto:paulwinterstein@q.com">paulwinterstein@q.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012–2014</td>
<td>Carol Burton</td>
<td>206-691-1298</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ccburton7@gmail.com">ccburton7@gmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011–2013</td>
<td>Ellyn Swanson</td>
<td>206-722-2820</td>
<td><a href="mailto:gusellyn@comcast.net">gusellyn@comcast.net</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012–2014</td>
<td>Lisa Unsoeld-Chang</td>
<td>206-329-4848</td>
<td><a href="mailto:lisac@seattlelwv.org">lisac@seattlelwv.org</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011–2013</td>
<td>Treasurer</td>
<td>Laraine Volkman</td>
<td>206-281-7944</td>
<td><a href="mailto:laraine.volkman@att.net">laraine.volkman@att.net</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Nominating Committee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011–2012</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>Betty Sullivan</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jaybetty2@msn.com">jaybetty2@msn.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011–2012</td>
<td>Becky Cox</td>
<td><a href="mailto:gccox@nwlink.com">gccox@nwlink.com</a></td>
<td><a href="mailto:carolsamgo@q.com">carolsamgo@q.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011–2012</td>
<td>Carol Goldenberg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011–2012</td>
<td>Kelly Powers</td>
<td><a href="mailto:lwvkellystp@gmail.com">lwvkellystp@gmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011–2012</td>
<td>Laura Weese</td>
<td><a href="mailto:laura899@earthlink.net">laura899@earthlink.net</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Off-Board Positions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Campaign Finance</td>
<td>Jean Carlson</td>
<td>206-774-6649</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jean.carlson@att.net">jean.carlson@att.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KC South Liaison</td>
<td>Mary Ehlers</td>
<td>253-941-1930</td>
<td><a href="mailto:maryehlers@comcast.net">maryehlers@comcast.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIS Coordinator</td>
<td>Cynthia Howe</td>
<td>206-236-0593</td>
<td><a href="mailto:howe.john@comcast.net">howe.john@comcast.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observer Corps</td>
<td>Pat McCann</td>
<td>206-878-2799</td>
<td><a href="mailto:thomaspa@nwlink.com">thomaspa@nwlink.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Committees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee</th>
<th>Chair</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economics &amp; Taxation</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Relations</td>
<td>Rebecca Castilleja</td>
<td>206-328-6330</td>
<td><a href="mailto:telbalto@yahoo.com">telbalto@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Waterfront</td>
<td>Jan O’Connor</td>
<td>206-328-6330</td>
<td><a href="mailto:oconnor.js@gmail.com">oconnor.js@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Justice</td>
<td>Jayne Freitag</td>
<td>425-922-9501</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mjafreitag@comcast.net">mjafreitag@comcast.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>Janet Winans</td>
<td>206-323-4825</td>
<td><a href="mailto:janetwinans@earthlink.net">janetwinans@earthlink.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vote by Mail Study</td>
<td>Julie Anne Kempf</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:julie@kempf.com">julie@kempf.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Committees"
LWV SEATTLE-KING COUNTY:
DRUG POLICY REFORM

Town Hall Downstairs
1119 8th Avenue
(Eighth Avenue and Seneca Street)
Seattle, WA

Thursday, September 6
7:00 p.m. - Forum
No Discussion Leader Briefing

All forums are open to the public.

Speakers:
➢ John McKay, former U.S. Attorney and
  Prof. at Seattle Univ. School of Law
➢ Kim Thorburn, M.D., former Director
  of Spokane Regional Health District
➢ Pat Slack, Cmdr., Snohomish County
  Regional Drug and Gang Task Force

Moderator: ➢ Jonathan Martin, reporter
  for the Seattle Times