



League of Women Voters

Glendale/Burbank

President's Message

Monica Marquez

October 2005

Calendar

Saturday
October 8

League Speakers tape Pros & Cons at Burbank City Hall

The presentation of non-partisan information will be rebroadcast on Burbank TV until Election Day

Sunday
October 23

Meeting of the Local Election Systems Study

Home of Tom and Chris Carson
6:00 pm

Monday
October 24

Last Day to Register to Vote for the Special Election

Tuesday
November 8
Special Election

Saturday
November 19
County League Day
Land Use in Los Angeles County

What Will Our Future Look Like?

Buena Vista Branch Library
Burbank
300 N Buena Vista
Burbank
10 am to noon

Thursday
December 15
Wassail Bowl

Look for your invitation

THE GLENDALE/BURBANK LEAGUE has embarked on a year long study of local election systems. As part of that study, on September 15, we held a forum about election systems in Glendale and Burbank. Featured speakers were Ardashes "Ardy" Kassakhian, Glendale city clerk, Margarita Campos, Burbank city clerk, Doris Twedt, former Glendale city clerk, and Michael Allen, mathematics professor, Glendale City College. League member Tom Carson moderated the forum.

Kassakhian spoke about overcoming voter apathy. Campos gave a presentation on the advantages and disadvantages of Burbank's all mail election system. Twedt covered the election differences between charter cities and general law cities, and Allen spoke about alternative election systems. The Buena Vista Library Community room was packed with interested community members and students from a Glendale high school government class. It was an extremely interesting and informative evening.

Now we are turning our energy toward the upcoming November 8 Special Election. Our mission is to get complete, accurate, and nonpartisan information to the Glendale and Burbank communities. To that end, we've ordered 2500 copies of the League of Women Voters Education Fund publication Pros and Cons. Among other places, we'll be distributing them to the public libraries in Glendale and Burbank. Pros and Cons analyzes each of the eight propositions on the ballot, and gives the arguments for and against. We've also ordered 750 copies of another publication called Easy Voter Guide, a collaboration of the California State Library, California Secretary of State's office, and the League of Women Voters Education Fund. Easy Voter is keyed to voters for whom English is a second language and high school students. We ordered copies in English, Spanish and Korean.

This edition of the Voter is devoted to election related information. You will find Pros and Cons, Vote with the League and articles on two of the most complex propositions. For more detailed information on the propositions, visit our website <http://www.gb.ca.lwvnet.org>. You can also link to Smart Voter for complete ballot information. And be sure to tell all your family, friends, neighbors and co-workers -Vote on November 8!

NOT ALL CHANGE IS REFORM Vote NO on Proposition 76!

Calls for reform of California's system of state and local finance have come from every corner with growing intensity for a number of years. Commissions have issued reports, ballot measures have been put to the voters, some succeeding, but the failures of the system seem only to have multiplied.

Now, on the November special election ballot, voters are faced with Proposition 76, a measure masquerading as reform that not only fails to address the problems of our finance system but adds new contradictions and proposes a radical shift in the traditional balance of power between a governor and the legislature. The League of Women Voters of California urges a NO vote on Proposition 76.

The League has always maintained that responsible government means attending to the general welfare of its citizens in a fair and reasonable manner, but there is no vision in Proposition 76 of meeting citizens' legitimate needs in a positive way. Instead, the "purpose and intent" of the measure are defined simply as producing budgets that reduce the "pressure for tax increases" and are "balanced by reductions in spending."

Cutbacks in state funding, however, have forced schools and local governments, faced with citizen complaints about reduced services, to resort to a variety of local property taxes, fees and sales taxes, which cannot be tailored to considerations of equity or ability to pay. Proposition 76 promises even more such hard choices. It would reduce the long-term Proposition 98 spending guarantee for schools by \$4 billion a year, which translates to nearly \$600 per student in K-12. In addition, under Proposition 76, a governor could cut school funding with no requirement for future restoration of lost funding.

Proposition 76 would add a new state spending limit on top of the existing one. The new limit would apply to spending from special funds, as well as the General Fund, and to spending supported by fees and voter-approved taxes. Thus, some special taxes or fees might still be collected but not spent for their

intended purposes if total revenues exceeded the spending limit. Examples include Proposition 72's tax for public safety programs or Proposition 10's tobacco tax for early childhood programs, as well as fees paid by students in the state university system. Any excess revenues would be shifted instead to a budget reserve, school or transportation construction, or debt repayment.

The spending limit would be calculated by taking the amount spent in the prior year and adjusting it by the average annual percentage growth in both General Fund and special fund revenues for the three prior years. This formula runs counter to both the budget cycle and the business cycle, and could have the perverse effect of allowing spending to increase in an economic downturn but holding spending down when the economy, and thus revenue, improves.

The shift of power to the governor in Proposition 76 is a serious erosion of our democratic system of checks and balances. It would give a governor the power to declare a "fiscal emergency" and then to cut spending any time revenues fall 1.5 percent below forecast levels (forecasts being just educated guesses, not actual revenues) or if the governor estimates that the state is likely to be required to spend more than half of its reserve account to meet budget obligations. The legislature would have a limited time to solve the problem, by the same two-thirds vote that now hangs up the budget. If there is no legislative solution, a governor could make cuts without legislative approval.

Perhaps the most striking thing about this proposition is the lack of concern about its potential impact on the public or of a vision of where California should be heading in the future. California is the fifth or sixth largest economy in the world. It got there in part because its leaders and its citizens agreed to pay for an educational system and an infrastructure that could support such an economy and allow the state to care for its citizens. We believe that is still what Californians want. Proposition 76 would steer California away from that goal.

Real Redistricting Reform? Not Proposition 77

For eight months this year, the League of Women Voters of California and other nonpartisan citizens' groups lobbied the legislature and Governor to propose substantive redistricting reform. Citizens throughout our state were disturbed by the redistricting plan drawn by the legislature in 2001. Voters rightly viewed this plan as a bipartisan gerrymander to protect incumbents of both major parties.

The League and its partners spent many hours educating the legislature and governor as well as the public about the components of a good redistricting process. We worked with legislators in both parties, and there were good faith efforts on both sides of the aisle to find a reasonable solution. Unfortunately, even with intense last-minute negotiations between the Governor and legislature, it all came to naught and we were unable to achieve our goal.

After thoughtful discussion, the LWVC board decided to oppose the only remaining proposal, Proposition 77, an initiative constitutional amendment on the November ballot. Reluctantly we concluded that the measure's provisions do not meet the League's criteria for substantive, effective redistricting reform. We identified four areas of serious concern.

The nature of the panel. Proposition 77 would remove the power of redistricting from the state legislature and invest it in a panel of three retired judges. Potential panelists would be nominated by the leaders of the legislature from a pool of retired judges willing to serve, and three would be selected by random drawing. The League position is that redistricting power should be vested in an independent commission which reflects the diversity of California. The proposed pool—retired judges—does not in any way reflect the diversity of California today. Whole segments of our population would be shut out of representation on the panel, and the panel would not have even one ordinary citizen. And the method of nomination, solely by the political leadership of both parties, contains an opportunity for their continued control of the process, albeit at a distance.

The timing of the redistricting. Redistricting is done once every ten years, just after the national census, so that the districts can be based on the state's actual population distribution. Proposition 77 would require a special, mid-decade redistricting to take place immediately upon passage. Census data at least six years old

would be used, ignoring three million more people in California than there were in 2000. How can we create districts that accurately and fairly reflect our diverse population and its myriad interests when we do not have accurate information about how those new Californians are distributed? In addition, this mid-decade redistricting could set a bad precedent for the future. Disgruntled groups might try to force redistricting through the initiative process any time they are unhappy with the legislative process in Sacramento or Washington. Finally, county elections officials have pointed out the difficulty of accommodating a redistricting before the 2006 elections. If the time frame must be shortened, opportunities for public input may be badly compromised.

Communities of interest would be jeopardized by more than the makeup of the panel and the use of outdated census data. The standards for district lines in Proposition 77 do not provide sufficient safeguards for protecting communities of interest. District lines that respect political boundaries such as cities and counties, without regard to other factors, may well divide ethnic, language or racial groups into several districts, thus diluting their voting strength and negating any real ability to elect representatives who truly understand their needs.

Ratification of a proposed plan. Currently, any redistricting plan is a bill that is enacted into law and then becomes operative for the state. Proposition 77 would require that any proposed redistricting plan be put to a vote of the people, even while it is being used in elections. If the plan is rejected, then the entire process must be repeated until a plan is approved by the voters. By any standard of government effectiveness and efficiency, this is an invitation to chaos. Who would spend the enormous amount of time and money needed to educate the public about the plan? And given the complexity of any plan, even a small interest group could easily spread enough suspicion to cause its defeat at the polls. How many elections would it take before a plan is adopted, not because it is worthy, but out of sheer exhaustion?

It may seem that crafting effective redistricting reform is incredibly complicated. But the League is not easily discouraged. After all, look how long it took women to get the vote! We will continue the fight to give California a redistricting process that works. The first step is the defeat of Proposition 77.



PROS & CONS

STATE BALLOT MEASURERS

www.lwvc.org ■ www.SmartVoter.org

Special Statewide Election, November 8, 2005

PROPOSITION

73

Waiting Period and Parental Notification Before Termination of Minor's Pregnancy.

Initiative Constitutional Amendment.

THE QUESTION

Should the California Constitution be amended to require that the parent or legal guardian of an unemancipated, pregnant minor be notified at least 48 hours before an abortion is performed on the minor?

THE SITUATION

State law allows minors to receive the same type of medical care for a pregnancy as an adult would receive. In 1987, the Legislature amended this law to require that minors obtain the consent of a parent or the court before obtaining an abortion. Due to legal challenges, the law was never implemented and the California Supreme Court struck it down in 1997.

THE PROPOSAL

Proposition 73 amends the California Constitution to prohibit an abortion on an unemancipated

minor until 48 hours after a physician notifies the minor's parent or legal guardian, except in a medical emergency or with a parental waiver. A judicial waiver of notice, based on clear and convincing evidence of the minor's maturity or minor's best interests is permitted. Physicians must report abortions performed on minors and the state shall compile statistics. Monetary damages for violations are authorized. The court must report evidence of abuse by a parent or guardian to the county child protection agency. A minor is allowed to seek help from the court if anyone attempts to coerce her to have an abortion.

FISCAL EFFECT

The Legislative Analyst and the Director of Finance indicate that the net costs of Prop. 73 to state and local governments and to Medi-Cal and other programs are unknown, but are

probably not significant in the context of the total expenditures for these programs.

SUPPORTERS SAY

- Minors need help making important health decisions.
- The 48-hour waiting period ensures that parents have an opportunity to consult with their daughter and explore her options before she makes an irrevocable decision.
- Minors still have the right to obtain or refuse an abortion and judicial waivers are available for special circumstances.

OPPOSITIONS SAY

- Proposition 73 assumes that government can mandate family communication. It can't.
- Scared, pregnant teenagers don't need a judge—they need a counselor. They are

unlikely to go before a judge to request a waiver.

- Vulnerable teenagers who cannot talk to their parents may resort to unsafe, illegal abortions. Parents rightly want to know, but keeping teens safe is more important.

FOR MORE INFORMATION

PRO: YES on 73/Parents' Right to Know and Child Protection (866) 828-8355, www.YESon73.net

CON: Campaign for Teen Safety/No on Prop. 73(916) 669-4802, www.NoOnProposition73.org

PROPOSITION

74

Public School Teachers. Waiting Period for Permanent Status. Dismissal.

Initiative Statute.

THE QUESTION

Should the probationary period for public school teachers be increased from two to five years, and should the process by which school boards can dismiss a teaching employee be modified?

THE SITUATION

Current law establishes the probationary period for teachers as two years, and requires performance evaluations at least once each year for probationary teachers and at least once every two years for teachers with permanent or tenured status.

Current law defines the ten causes for dismissal of a permanent certificated employee, but does not define the term "unsatisfactory performance." In the absence of any statutory definition, many school districts have developed their own definitions which vary from district to district.

THE PROPOSAL

Proposition 74 extends the probationary period for new certificated teachers from two to five complete consecutive school years. It applies to teachers whose probationary period began during or after the 2003-04 fiscal year. By extending the probationary period to five years, teachers would have up to two additional performance evaluations prior to achieving tenure. It also changes the process by which school boards can dismiss a permanent teaching employee for unsatisfactory performance. It defines the meaning of the term "unsatisfactory performance" of a teacher or other certificated employee for the purpose of dismissal as "the receipt by a permanent employee of two consecutive unsatisfactory evaluations."

FISCAL EFFECT

The net effect on school districts' costs for teacher compensation, performance evaluations, and other activities is unknown. The impact would vary significantly by district and depend largely on future personnel actions by individual school districts.

SUPPORTERS SAY

- Proposition 74 is real education reform and ensures that our children have quality teachers.
- California's outdated tenure law makes it almost impossible to replace incompetent teachers.
- It changes tenure eligibility and rewards good teachers while removing problem teachers.

OPPOSITIONS SAY

- Proposition 74 was written without consulting any experts in education law, so it is poorly crafted and contains fatal flaws relative to teacher dismissals and collective bargaining.
- The additional performance evaluations that would be required by this initiative would cost tens of millions of dollars annually.
- Proposition 74 discourages the recruitment and retention of quality teachers.

FOR MORE INFORMATION

PRO: Governor Schwarzenegger's California Recovery Team, (916) 498-9775, www.JoinArnold.com

CON: No on 74, A Coalition of Teachers and School Board Members for Quality Teaching and Learning, (916) 492-1962, www.BetterCA.com

Election Day is Tuesday, November 8, 2005.
Polls are open from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m.

October 24 is the last day to register to vote for the November 8 election.

Absentee Ballot

The last day that your county elections official can accept an application by mail for an absentee ballot is November 1. You may apply in person for an absentee ballot at the office of your county elections official through Election Day. Your completed absentee ballot must be in the hands of your county elections official by 8:00 p.m. on Election Day, November 8, 2005.

New citizen?

If you became a citizen in California after the close of registration on October 24, 2005, you may still register to vote by visiting your county elections office on or between the dates of October 25 and November 1. Bring proof of citizenship with you, and be prepared to declare to the county elections official that you have established residency in California.

Election Information

If you are a registered voter, you will receive a notice of the election that includes the location of your polling place. The notice will also include a sample ballot, an application for an absentee ballot and information about the ballot measures.

PROPOSITION**75****Public Employee Union Dues. Restrictions on Political Contributions. Employee Consent Requirement.****Initiative Statute.****THE QUESTION**

Should public employee unions be required to obtain annual written consent from each member in order to use a portion of that member's dues for political activity?

THE SITUATION

Public employee unions collect dues and/or fees from employees in their employee group—both union members and non-members—in order to represent them in negotiations over salaries, benefits, and working conditions. Some of the dues money collected is used to support candidates and issues that union leaders believe will benefit their members.

THE PROPOSAL

Proposition 75 will require public employee unions to get annual written consent from each member in order to use any of

that member's dues for political activities. It will also require unions to keep certain records, including copies of signed consent forms and to report member political contributions to the Fair Political Practices Commission.

FISCAL EFFECT

State and local governments could incur minor increased costs to implement and enforce the consent requirements of this measure. These could be offset in part by revenues from fines or fees.

SUPPORTERS SAY

- It is unfair for unions to use a member's dues money to support political causes with which the member may not agree.
- In other states where union members are explicitly given the choice of declining to support their union's political activity, many do so.

- This initiative does not prohibit unions from collecting political contributions, but requires that the contributions be voluntary instead of mandatory.

OPPONENTS SAY

- Instead of protecting the rights of teachers, nurses, and firefighters, this measure will make it harder to obtain fair wages, fair hours, and health care.
- Corporations significantly outspend labor prior to elections. Without political activity by unions, voters would not hear both sides of many issues.
- Any requirement that those affected must annually consent to use of their money for political purposes should apply to corporate stockholders as well as to union members.

FOR MORE INFORMATION

PRO: Californians for Paycheck Protection, (916) 927-1512, www.caforpaycheckprotection.com

CON: Alliance for a Better California, (916) 492-1962; www.BetterCA.com

PROPOSITION**76****State Spending and School Funding Limits.****Initiative Constitutional Amendment.****THE QUESTION**

Should the California Constitution be amended to create an additional state spending limit, grant the governor substantial new power to unilaterally reduce state spending, and revise key provisions relating to the minimum funding guarantee for K-12 schools and community colleges?

THE SITUATION

California has faced annual shortfalls in its state budget since 2001-02. These shortfalls followed the economic downturn in 2001 causing state revenues to fall below the level needed to fund the state's spending commitments. Although revenues are growing again, policymakers will need to take action to address a likely state budget shortfall in 2006-07.

THE PROPOSAL

Proposition 76 will add an additional spending limit based on an average of revenue growth in the three prior years. It will grant the Governor substantial new authority to unilaterally reduce state spending during certain fiscal situations. The measure amends key provisions in the California Constitution regarding the minimum funding guarantee for K-12 schools and community colleges. Other provisions make changes relating to transportation funding; loans between state funds; and payments to schools, local governments, and special funds.

FISCAL EFFECT

Creating an additional spending limit and giving new powers to the Governor would likely reduce expenditures that could apply to schools and shift costs to local government. This could result in a smoother pattern of state expenditures over time—especially if reserves are set aside in good times and these funds are then available in bad. Changing school funding formulas would make school and community college funding more subject to policymaker decision and less

affected by a constitutional funding guarantee. The measure could result in a change in the mix of state spending—some programs could receive a larger share and others a smaller one.

SUPPORTERS SAY

- Proposition 76 will reform our budget system and balance the budget without raising taxes.
- It will promote bipartisan cooperation between the Legislature and the Governor.
- Wasteful spending will be eliminated and more money will be provided for roads, health care, and law enforcement without raising taxes.

OPPONENTS SAY

- Proposition 76 will cut school funding by \$4 billion overturning voter-approved funding guarantees.
- The Governor will be given unchecked power over the budget destroying the system of checks and balances.
- Proposition 76 will do nothing to prevent new taxes and it endangers local funding for police, fire and health care.

FOR MORE INFORMATION

PRO: Governor's Coalition to Reform and Rebuild California (916) 498-9775, www.JoinArnold.com

CON: No on 76, Coalition of Educators, Firefighters, School Employees, Health Care Givers and Labor Organizations, (916) 492-1962, www.BetterCA.com

PROPOSITION**77****Redistricting.****Initiative Constitutional Amendment.****THE QUESTION**

Should the California Constitution be amended to change the process of redrawing districts for elected state and federal representatives, transferring the redistricting from the Legislature to a panel of retired judges?

THE SITUATION

After each federal census, the California Constitution requires the Legislature to adjust the districts used to elect members of the State Senate, State Assembly, Board of Equalization and the U.S. House of Representatives. The primary purpose of this process ("redistricting" or "reapportionment") is to establish districts that are "reasonably equal" in population.

THE PROPOSAL

Proposition 77 will establish a three-member panel of retired judges, selected by legislative leaders, to develop the redistricting plan. It establishes requirements regarding the drawing of districts, but the panel could not consider information related to political party affiliations and other specified matters. A redistricting plan will be developed for use at the primary and general elections immediately following the measure's approval, and then following each future federal census. The measure establishes a process for the panel, including holding public hearings. If a plan is unanimously approved, it will be used for the next primary and general elections, but then placed on the general election ballot for the voters to consider. If voters approve the plan, it will be used until after the next census. If voters reject the plan, the process will have to be repeated.

FISCAL EFFECT

The one-time costs for implementing a redistricting plan are estimated at \$1.5 million for the state and \$1 million for county governments. There are potential savings for future redistricting, but this would depend on decisions by the voters.

SUPPORTERS SAY

- Yes on Proposition 77 guarantees fair districts and competitive elections.
- It ensures that voters—not politicians—have the final say on voting districts.
- Proposition 77 holds politicians accountable to their constituents, not just to campaign contributors.

OPPONENTS SAY

- Proposition 77 will not result in reform, as the politicians will be the ones selecting the judges who redraw the districts. Politicians will not be any more accountable.
- If voters reject redistricting plans, the process starts over, costing taxpayers millions.
- This plan has been rushed onto a special election ballot to require a new redistricting five years earlier than normal.

FOR MORE INFORMATION

PRO: Edward J. "Ted" Costa, People's Advocate, (916)482-6175, www.FairDistrictsNow.com

CON: Californians for Fair Representation—No on 77 (916) 448-7724, www.NoOnProposition77.com

In order to vote in the November 8 election, you must:

- ☞ Be a United States citizen and a resident of California
- ☞ Be at least 18 years old by the date of the election
- ☞ Be registered to vote
- ☞ Not be in prison or on parole for a felony conviction
- ☞ Not have been judged mentally incompetent to vote by a court

When do you need to re-register to vote?

- ☞ When you move
- ☞ When you change your name
- ☞ When you change your political party affiliation

PROPOSITION

78

Discounts on Prescription Drugs.

Initiative Statute.

THE QUESTION

Should the state adopt a new discount drug program for California residents with an income at or below 300 percent of the federal poverty level?

THE SITUATION

California law currently provides affordable prescription drugs for low- and moderate-income individuals eligible for Medi-Cal or the Healthy Families program. Beginning in 2006, the federal government will provide discounted prescription drug coverage for persons enrolled in Medicare. Various other state and federal programs provide funds to pay part or all of the cost of drugs for specific individuals. In addition, many Californians receive prescription drug coverage through insurance paid for by the individual or provided by their employer.

THE PROPOSAL

Californians with low and mid-level incomes (up to \$29,000 for an individual or \$58,000 for a family of four) will be able to purchase prescription drugs at reduced prices. It will be funded through rebates from participating drug manu-

facturers negotiated by the California Department of Health Services. Participation in the program will cost \$15 annually and will not be open to those who receive drug coverage from other sources. The program will be administered by the California Department of Health Services which could contract with a private vendor for assistance. Drug companies and pharmacies will not be required to participate.

FISCAL EFFECT

One-time and ongoing state costs for administration and outreach activities could potentially be in the millions to low tens of millions of dollars annually. A significant share of these costs would probably be covered by the state General Fund. There could be state costs to cover the funding gap between the time when drug rebates are collected by the state and when the state pays funds to pharmacies for drug discounts provided to consumers. Any such costs not covered through advance rebate payments from drug makers would be borne by the General Fund. There could be unknown savings for state and county health programs due to the availability of drug discounts.

SUPPORTERS SAY

- Proposition 78 will increase the affordability and access of prescription medications for qualified low- and middle- income participants thereby improving healthcare quality and lowering costs.
This program will be integrated with other discount prescription drug programs so purchasers will get the lowest available cost for prescriptions.
The competing proposition is legally flawed and may never be implemented.

OPponents SAY

- Experience with voluntarily-negotiated prescription drug discounts in other states indicates that benefits are largely illusory and outweighed by the costs of implementing the program.
The proposed "baseline price" for rebate negotiations is intended to protect the drug manufacturers overall pricing structure and removes any incentive to offer significant rebates.
Proposition 78 is a smokescreen designed and bankrolled with millions of dollars from the prescription drug lobby to block Proposition 79.

FOR MORE INFORMATION

PRO: Californians for Affordable Prescriptions, (916) 448-4234, www.calrxnow.org

CON: Health Access California, (510) 873-8787, www.VoteNoOnProp78.com

Pros & Cons is supported in part by The William and Flora Hewlett Foundation.

PROPOSITION

79

Prescription Drug Discounts. State-Negotiated Rebates.

Initiative Statute.

THE QUESTION

Should California establish a new discount drug program for California residents with an income at or below 400 percent of the federal poverty level and make drug profiteering unlawful?

THE SITUATION

California law currently provides affordable prescription drugs for low- and moderate- income individuals eligible for Medi-Cal or the Healthy Families program. Beginning in 2006, the federal government will provide discounted prescription drug coverage for persons enrolled in Medicare. Various other state and federal programs provide funds to pay part or all of the cost of drugs for specific individuals. In addition, many Californians receive prescription drug coverage through insurance paid for by the individual or provided by their employer.

THE PROPOSAL

Proposition 79 provides for prescription drug discounts to Californians with low and moderate incomes (up to \$38,000 for an individual or \$77,000 for a family of four), or whose medical expenses exceed 5 percent of their income. It will be funded through rebates from participating drug manufacturers negotiated by the California Department of Health Services. Participation in the program will cost \$10 annually and will not be open to those who receive drug coverage from other sources. At least 95 percent of the rebates must be used to fund the discounts to pharmacies. New or extended Medi-Cal contracts are prohibited with manufacturers who do not provide the best price to this program. An oversight board will be established. Civil penalties would be established for profiteering by drug companies.

FISCAL EFFECT

State costs for administration and outreach could be in the low tens of millions of dollars annually. A significant share of these costs would probably be covered by the state General Fund. There could be state costs to cover the funding gap between the time when drug rebates are col-

lected by the state and when the state pays funds to pharmacies for drug discounts provided to consumers. Any such costs not covered through advance rebate payments from drug makers would be borne by the General Fund. There could be unknown net costs or savings due to the link to Medi-Cal contracts, and unknown savings for state and county health programs due to the availability of drug discounts.

SUPPORTERS SAY

- More people will be eligible to participate in Proposition 79 than in Proposition 78.
Proposition 79 builds on a successful effort used for the Medi-Cal program that reduces drug costs for California through enforceable discounts.
The state can use its Medi-Cal program as leverage to force companies to sell drugs at a lower price. Companies that do not give discounts could lose their ability to sell drugs to the Medi-Cal program.

OPponents SAY

- Proposition 79 will establish a large government program costing more to administer than Proposition 78.
The state is not likely to obtain federal approval for linking the drug discount program to Medi-Cal.
Since neither a "fair price" nor a "fair profit" are defined in the measure, lawsuits could result with regard to profiteering.

FOR MORE INFORMATION

PRO: Health Access California, (510) 873-8787, www.VoteYesOnProp79.com

CON: California Against the Wrong Prescription, (916) 448-4234, www.calrxnow.org

Pros & Cons

September 19, 2005

President: Jacqueline Jacobberger
Education Fund Chair: Roberta Davis

About the League

The League of Women Voters, a nonpartisan political organization, encourages the informed and active participation of citizens in government. The League also influences public policy through action and advocacy. The League does not support or oppose candidates or political parties.

The League of Women Voters of California Education Fund publishes the Pros & Cons of the state ballot measures, an explanation of the propositions on the state ballot and the main arguments of their proponents and opponents. The League does not judge the merits of the arguments nor guarantee their validity. Arguments come from many sources and are not limited to those found in the state ballot pamphlet.

League of Women Voters of California Education Fund
801 12th Street, Suite 220
Sacramento, CA 95814
916-442-7215; 916-442-7362, Fax
888-870-8683, Toll-free
lwvc@lwvc.org
www.lwvc.org
www.smartvoter.org

© Copyright 2005 League of Women Voters of California Education Fund. No portion of the Pros & Cons may be reprinted without the express permission of the League of Women Voters of California Education Fund.

Visit the USC California Policy Institute at www.usc-cpi.org for nonpartisan analyses of propositions 73, 74, 76 and 77.

Become a State-of-the-Art Citizen www.SmartVoter.org

- Your complete personalized ballot—anytime you want it
Your polling place
Profiles of candidates in your community
Ballot measures
Election results

www.SmartVoter.org

Electric Service Providers. Regulation.

Initiative Statute.

THE QUESTION

Should the state expand its regulation of the electric industry?

THE SITUATION

Most of the electricity used in California comes from large investor owned utilities (IOUs) which are regulated by the California Public Utilities Commission (PUC). Smaller amounts come from largely unregulated publicly owned utilities and electric service providers (ESPs). Customers of ESPs receive their electricity via the local utility's distribution system in "direct access" accounts. Customers are mostly large businesses seeking less costly electricity as well as individuals seeking "green" electricity from alternative energy sources. New "direct access" accounts for individuals were temporarily suspended as a result of the 2000-01 statewide energy crisis.

THE PROPOSAL

Proposition 80 will give the PUC more control over California's electricity providers. It will keep customers from switching from private utilities to other providers. All electricity sellers will be required to use more renewable energy resources, with a goal of 20 percent by 2010 (instead of by 2017.)

Electric service providers would come under PUC control and regulation. Also, the suspension of new accounts for direct access electricity would become permanent. Priority would be given to "cost effective" energy efficiency and conservation programs and "cost effective" renewable resources. Several current PUC practices will be put into law by this measure.

FISCAL EFFECT

The PUC administrative costs could range from very little up to around \$4 million annually. Consumers would pay fees to cover the increase. It is not possible to determine the effect of this measure on electricity rates or on state and local government finances.

SUPPORTERS SAY

- Proposition 80 ensures that all electricity providers are regulated so traders cannot manipulate the system again. It can correct California's failed experiment with electricity deregulation.
- Requiring adequate supplies for long-term needs provides the market stability needed for investments in new, clean electricity sources.
- Competition between independent generators and utilities will assure low rates for consumers.
- It speeds up the shift to renewable energy and gives priority to energy efficiency programs.

OPPOSITIONS SAY

- Proposition 80 is the wrong way to make energy policy and it won't prevent another energy crisis
- More regulations could stall investment in the creation of new power plants needed to prevent future blackouts.
- Growth of the alternative "green" energy industry (solar, wind, geothermal) would be hindered by the ban on new direct access accounts.
- Energy policy is too complex for the initiative process and should be developed through a comprehensive approach that includes public hearings.

FOR MORE INFORMATION

PRO: The Utility Reform Network (TURN), (415) 929-8876, www.turn.com

CON: Californians for Reliable Electricity, (916) 551-2513, www.NoProp80.com

Local Leagues in California

For more information about ballot measures and speakers for your community group, contact your local League of Women Voters listed below:

Alameda	Monterey Peninsula
Arcadia MAL Unit	North Coast San Diego County
Bakersfield	North Orange County
Beach Cities	North San Mateo County
Benicia	Northwest Riverside County
Berkeley/Albany/Emeryville	Oakland
Beverly Hills	Orange Coast
Butte County	Palo Alto
Capistrano Bay Area	Palos Verdes Peninsula
Central Orange County Area	Pasadena Area
Central San Mateo County	Piedmont
Claremont Area	Plumas County MAL Unit
Cupertino/Sunnyvale	Redding Area
Davis	Sacramento County
Diablo Valley	Salinas Valley
Downey	San Bernardino
East San Diego County	San Diego
East San Gabriel Valley	San Francisco
Eastern Sierra	San Joaquin County
Eden Area	San Jose/Santa Clara
El Dorado County	San Luis Obispo County
Escondido	Santa Barbara
Fremont/Newark/Union City	Santa Cruz County
Fresno	Santa Maria Valley
Glendale/Burbank	Santa Monica
Humboldt County	Sonoma County
Indian Wells Valley MAL Unit	South San Mateo County
Livermore/Amador Valley	Southwest Riverside County
Long Beach Area	Southwest Santa Clara Valley
Los Altos/Mountain View Area	Torrance
Los Angeles	Tulare County
Marin County	Ventura County
Marysville/Yuba City	West Contra Costa County
Mendocino County	Western Nevada County
Merced County	Whittier
Modesto	Woodland

You will find contact information for these local Leagues at www.lwvc.org

Not a Member of the League of Women Voters? Please Join!

The League of Women Voters of California is strictly nonpartisan; we never support or oppose any political party or candidate. At the same time, we are wholeheartedly political, working to influence public policy through education and advocacy. Membership in the League is open to citizens of voting age. Others are invited to join as associate members.

- Yes, I want to join. Enclosed is my check for \$50.00 payable to the League of Women Voters of California.
- Please send me more information about the League and its publications.
- I would like to support the League with a gift of \$ _____

Name: _____
 Address: _____
 City: _____ Zip: _____
 Phone: _____
 Email: _____

Mail to: LWVC

801 12th St., Suite 220, Sacramento, CA 95814
(916) 442-7215; (916) 442-7362, Fax
(888) 870-VOTE, Toll free
www.lwvc.org; lwvc@lwvc.org

Dues and gifts to the League of Women Voters of California are not tax deductible. Gifts to the LWVC Education Fund are tax deductible.

This ad was paid for by the League of Women Voters of California

WHY A SPECIAL ELECTION?

On June 13, 2005, Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger called for a statewide special election for November 8, 2005. The California Constitution gives the governor the power to call a special election when an initiative has qualified for the ballot. Since 1911, there have been 14 special elections with eight since the end of World War II, including the historic 2003 gubernatorial recall election.

In many ways, the procedures for special elections are identical to those for regularly scheduled elections. By gathering the necessary signatures and meeting the qualifications and deadlines outlined by California law, individuals and organizations can place measures on the ballot. The Legislature can also put measures on the ballot.

California governors call a special election by issuing a proclamation 148 days or more prior to Election Day; legislative approval is not necessary. Once the proclamation is declared, a series of deadlines arise for the special election, including filing dates, ballot preparation and summary, voter registration, and legislature ballot submissions.

For more information about this election, see the Secretary of State's Web site at www.ss.ca.gov/elections.

HOW TO EVALUATE INITIATIVES

- Who are the real sponsors and opponents of the measure? Investigate the names of groups with which you are not familiar.
- Does the measure deal with one issue which can be easily decided by a "yes" or "no"? Or is it a complex issue which should be thoroughly examined in the legislative arena?
- Is it written well? Are there conflicts in the measure that may require court resolution or interpretation? Is it "good government" or will it cause more problems than it will resolve?
- If the measure amends the Constitution, consider whether it really belongs in the Constitution. Amending the Constitution is cumbersome and costly and requires a vote of the people. Would a statute accomplish the same purpose?
- Does the measure create its own revenue source? Does it earmark, restrict, or obligate a specific percentage of General Fund revenues? Consider the effect on the overall flexibility of the budget.
- Examine the measure by its merits. During the campaign, be wary of distortion tactics and commercials that rely on image, but tell nothing of substance about the measure.

Courtesy of Margaret Craig, LWV Orange Coast

The Voter

THE VOTER IS PUBLISHED nine times a year by the League of Women Voter of Glendale/Burbank, California.

President: Monica Marquez

Editor: Chris Carson

Production: Carole Dougherty

Circulation: Anna Rundle

The **League of Women Voters**, a nonpartisan political organization, encourages the informed and active participation of citizens in government, works to increase understanding of major public policy issues, and influences public policy through education advocacy.

The League never supports or opposes any political party or candidate. We advocate only on issues that members have studied and come to a consensus on. In an era of proliferating and powerful special interests, the League's advocacy in the public interest is increasingly recognized as an essential voice of democracy.

Ballot Information You Need

SMART VOTER www.smartvoter.org Your one stop shop for all voting information.

LWVC website www.lwvc.org All the information you need on ballot measures and League advocacy

Easy Voter Guide www.easyvoter.org simple, concise ballot measure information in English, Spanish, Chinese, Korean and Vietnamese. [Easy Voter is funded by the League of Women Voters, California Secretary of State, California State Library and the Hewlett Foundation]

LA County Registrar/Recorder www.lavote.net FAQ's for Voters, general information

CATHY SELLITTO
NOTARY PUBLIC
 Mobile Service
 Business Hospitals Residence
 (818) 502-0661



Membership Application

It is easy to join the League of Women Voters of Glendale/Burbank. All Citizens of voting age are welcome. Associate Membership is open to all others.

YES! I want to add my voice to yours by joining the League of Women Voters as part of your voice for citizens and force for change. I enclose: (please check one or more of the following)

- \$60.00 for a one-year individual membership (includes a copy of our VOTER, nine times per year)
- \$100.00 for a one-year household membership for two members who share the same address (include a copy of our VOTER, nine times per year)
- \$30.00 for a one-year student membership

Name/Names _____

Address _____

City, State, Zip _____

Telephone _____

I would like to receive my VOTER by email.
My email address is _____

Make check payable to League of Women Voters. Mail to Vera Naylor, 7714 Via Capri, Burbank CA 91504

I am unable to join League at this time, but enclose a contribution of \$ _____

Gifts made payable to "LWV Education Fund" are tax deductible.



THE LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS RECOMMENDS NOVEMBER 8, 2005 SPECIAL ELECTION

✗ PROP 73 *Waiting Period and Parental Notification before Termination of Minor's Pregnancy.* **OPPOSE**

Parents rightfully want to be involved in their teenagers' lives and all parents want what is best for their children. But good family communication can't be imposed by government. Mandatory notification laws may sound good, but in the real world, vulnerable teenagers who can't talk to their parents may resort to unsafe, illegal abortions.

✗ PROP 74 *Public School Teachers. Waiting Period for Permanent Status. Dismissal.* **OPPOSE**

The League supports fair, rigorous, and effective teacher evaluation and tenure procedures. However, this measure raises questions of due process rights and may limit the use of dismissal for cause. It does nothing to encourage teachers to enter and remain in the profession.

✗ PROP 75 *Public Employee Union Dues. Restrictions on Political Contributions. Employee Consent Requirement.* **OPPOSE**

The League supports fair, even-handed campaign finance reform, but this measure is bad policy. It restricts public employee unions' use of member dues for political activity but has no similar constraint on corporations.

✗ PROP 76 *State Spending and School Funding Limits.* **OPPOSE**

This constitutional amendment changes the state's spending cap, increases the governor's power to make budget cuts, and revises the Proposition 98 minimum guarantees for state support of education. It reduces flexibility to address changing needs and will cause cuts in essential services. School funding will be permanently reduced by \$4 billion per year. Our system of checks and balances will be undermined by giving this and all future governors the power to make cuts unilaterally. This is not budget reform!

✗ PROP 77 *Redistricting.* **OPPOSE**

California needs to reform the way legislative and congressional district lines are drawn, but this flawed measure doesn't measure up. The makeup of its redistricting panel and its neglect of communities of interest in drawing plans are bad policy. This proposal calls for an immediate redistricting that would ignore three million new Californians, and it requires a cumbersome, wasteful ratification of every set of plans by the people.

✗ PROP 78 *Discounts on Prescription Drugs.* **OPPOSE**

There are two prescription drug initiatives on this ballot. Drug companies have contributed over \$50 million to support Proposition 78, an inferior program that depends on their voluntary participation.

✓ PROP 79 *Prescription Drug Discounts. State-Negotiated Rebates.* **SUPPORT**

Proposition 79 offers deeper drug discounts to nearly twice as many Californians as Proposition 78. It has an enforcement mechanism to hold drug companies accountable for providing discounts.

Because League positions do not cover the issues in *PROP 80, Electric Service Providers. Regulation*, the LWVC is remaining neutral on this initiative. 9/13/2005

VOTE WITH THE LEAGUE ON NOVEMBER 8

Speakers Bureau

We have trained speakers who are ready, willing and able to explain the propositions to groups in our communities. They can clear up the fog surrounding the ballot measures and have the Pros and Cons to hand out. If you want a League speaker to talk to your group, please email Monica Marquez at marquezlwv@earthlink.net or call 818-247-2407

Or perhaps you want the League's take on the ballot measures. We do advocacy; in fact we already have some dates set. For this email Chris Carson carsonlwv@earthlink.net or call 818-247-2407

Finance Drive Continues

Thanks to these loyal League members who have already sent in their contributions: **Inez Truger, Hallie Duck, Roberta Kiehl, Joan Mircheff, Mary Baldino, Connie Wilson, Wendy Kazanjian, Vera Naylor, Georganne Thomsen, Carole Dougherty**

It's not too late. Help support the work of the League. If you've misplaced your return envelope, we'll be delighted to send you another one!

Here's a NEW way to support the League



Now there's a new way to support the League. Donate your car, boat, RV, or motorcycle by calling 1-800-320-0476. You'll get a deduction on your taxes, avoid a hassle at the DMV and provide a new source of funding for our organization.

From now until December 31, 2005, your local League will automatically receive a portion of the proceeds from any vehicle donation made in your area.

Welcome new member Mike Chapman



1125 E. Broadway
Glendale, CA 91205
Brdwy / Chevy Chase Dr.
tel: 818.242.4270
fax: 818.242.0525
M-F 8:30-6:30
Sat. 10-4; Sun. 12-4

249 N. Brand Blvd.
Glendale, CA 91203
Corner of Brand / Calif.
tel: 818.244.4448
fax: 818.244.4795
Open M-Sat.



MAIL BOXES ETC.
A UPS Company

Andrea Williams
Manager / Notary Public

©2005 United States Postal Service. All rights reserved.

League of Women Voters
Burbank/Glendale

VOTER

7714 Via Capri
Burbank CA 91504
(818) 247-2407

League websites:
LWV Glendale/Burbank
<http://www.gb.ca.lwvnet.org>

LWV California
<http://www.ca.LWV.org>

LWV United States
<http://www.LWV.org>

Printed courtesy of Mail Boxes Etc.