



The Voter

“ . . . to promote informed citizen participation in government.”

510-843-8824

fax:510-843-8828

office@lwvbae.org

http://lwvbae.org

October 2010

Prop 23: Dirty Energy Proposition

Proposition 23 “California Jobs Initiative” on the ballot this November would suspend AB32, The Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006, California’s landmark clean air legislation that requires the state to reduce greenhouse gas emissions to 1990 levels by 2020 and allows the creation of a cap-and-trade market to meet that mandate.

Limiting greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions from cars, oil refineries and other industries, has already begun to create a market – and jobs - for solar, wind and other clean energy sources in the nation’s most populous state -- an effort that could falter if the initiative passes. If enacted by voters, Proposition 23 will freeze the provisions of AB 32 until California’s unemployment rate drops to 5.5% or below for four consecutive quarters. California’s unemployment rate has been at 5.5% or below for four consecutive quarters just three times since 1980, according to the National Journal.

Technically, the initiative seeks to “temporarily suspend the operation and implementation of AB 32 until the state’s unemployment rate returns to the levels that existed at the time of its adoption,” which was actually 4.8% at the time the bill was signed according to Prop 23 proponents. The State unemployment rate is now about 12%.

Prop 23 continued on page 2

Pro/Con Forum on Measure R

LWVBAE will hold a Pro/Con forum about planning for the future development of downtown Berkeley. In July, the City Council voted to adopt a “green vision” for the downtown and to submit it to the Berkeley voters. As with most land use planning decisions in Berkeley, there is a long history behind what is now Measure R on the November ballot.

Briefly, in 2005 the City and the University entered into a joint planning process to update the 1990 Downtown Plan. The Downtown Area Plan Advisory Committee (DAPAC) completed its work in 2007. The plan then went to the Planning Commission and the City Council. Both bodies made some changes and a final version of a new Downtown Area Plan (DAP) was adopted by the Council in 2009. In early 2010 a referendum qualified to put the DAP on the ballot. Rather than putting the full measure to the voters, the Council rescinded it, and instead, by a vote of 7 to 2, adopted this to put on the ballot. The policies proposed in Measure R, Adopting a Green Vision for Downtown, are based largely on the DAPAC Plan and the DAP.

When: Tuesday, October 5, 5:00–7:00 pm

Where: Berkeley City College

2050 Center Street, Room 431

Berkeley City College is an ideal location for discussion of the Downtown that is vital to all residents of Berkeley, wherever they live or work. For education or shopping, entertainment or employment, health care or housing, Berkeley residents and visitors care about the quality of life in the center of the City.

Bring your Berkeley friends to this important forum. Listening to knowledgeable speakers with opposing points of view will help you to decide how to vote on Measure R.

Since the forum is part of our LWVBAE’s voter education services, and we have already announced our support for Measure R, we have invited Marion Taylor, an Oakland resident and President of LWV Bay Area to moderate.

Sherry Smith
President

Inside This Issue

Prop 23	2
Environmental Concerns	2
Donations	3
Office Volunteers	3
Spirit of the League Awards	3
Notes from Luncheon	4
Letter to Professor Lakoff	4
Fall General Meeting	5
SB 810	6
The Perils of Peralta	7
Calendar	8

Prop 23

Continued from page 1

In August Sacramento Judge Timothy Frawlet softened the “title and summary” ballot language for Prop 23. Original language drafted by Attorney General Jerry Brown referred to “major polluters,” which the judge changed to “sources of emissions.” The judge also narrowed the wording of the title from “suspends air pollution control laws” to “suspends implementation of air pollution control law (AB 32).” The Brown language had in the initiative summary that it would require the state to “abandon” the law, which the judge changed to “suspend.” In a Los Angeles Times interview Brown said, “I don’t see that this will affect voter’s decisions. It remains clear that we are talking about the suspension of laws relating to pollution.”

Meantime, media attention has focused on Prop 23’s funding by the by two Texas-based refiners, Valero Energy Corp. and Tesoro Corp. which have been its primary funders, along with other mostly out-of-state petrochemical and fossil fuel interests, including a company owned by oil billionaires Charles and David Koch that contributed \$1 million. The contribution came from Flint Hills Resources LP, based in Wichita, KS, a wholly-owned subsidiary of Koch Industries, the nation’s second-largest private company, with estimated annual revenue of \$100 billion. According to the LA Times, the involvement of the Koch brothers signals that the California initiative is likely to become the focus of a national campaign, now that climate change legislation has stalled in Congress.

As of September 3, the Yes on Prop 23 campaign had raised \$8.2 million.

Opponents of the measure, who raised about \$6.6 million, got a boost in August with a \$2.5-million donation from San Francisco hedge fund mogul Thomas Steyer, the first installment of a \$5-million pledge. Steyer, founder of the \$20-billion Farallon Capital Management, assumed the co-chairmanship of the “No on 23” campaign, with former Secretary of State George Shultz.

Other investors for the “NO on Prop 23 Campaign include \$250,000 from New York investor Nicolas Berggruen, head of Berggruen Holdings, which has made investments in wind energy projects; \$100,000 from Nancy Burnett of Lummi Island, Wash., daughter of David Packard, co-founder of Silicon Valley tech giant Hewlett-Packard, and a supporter of Democratic candidates; and \$75,000 from Warren Hellman, the wealthy San Francisco investor, banjo player and blue-grass aficionado.

According to Todd Woody of California Greening, both sides expect the campaign spending to peak somewhere north of \$100 million by the time Election Day rolls around in November.

Co-chair of the Prop 23 initiative campaign Jon Coupal, who is president of the Howard Jarvis Taxpayers Assn., said, “AB 32 will impose billions of dollars in higher utility rates and fuel prices on California families when they can least afford it,” according to the LA Times interview. Gov. Arnold Schwarzenegger lashed back, “This initiative sponsored by greedy Texas oil companies would cripple California’s fastest-growing economic sector, reverse our renewable energy policy and decimate our environmental progress for the benefit of these oil companies’ profit margins.” The Times quotes him as saying, “I will not allow this to happen on my watch.”

Scientists say that emissions of carbon dioxide and other heat-trapping gases have begun to disrupt Earth’s climate, drying up water supplies from melting snow-packs, causing sea level to rise and spurring heat waves. AB32 aims to cut emissions from transportation, industry and other sources by about 15% below today’s level by 2020.

The LWV California vigorously opposes the Prop 23 “Dirty Energy Proposition” funded by out-of-state oil companies because it would virtually kill AB 32. This proposition would get rid of clean energy standards that will cut air pollution and protect the public health. Proponents say this measure is needed to preserve jobs, but in fact it will jeopardize hundreds of thousands of clean-energy jobs. We must promote California’s role as an innovator and investor in a clean-tech economy.

Gail Schickele
Co-chair Environmental Concerns

Environmental Concerns October 18 Meeting

While Prop 23 is looming to undo California’s 2006 Global Warming Solutions Act (AB32), the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) has been working to put AB 32 to work by reducing carbon emissions with updated CEQA Guidelines that recommend air quality significance thresholds and mitigation measures for local agencies to use when preparing air quality impact analyses under CEQA. The updated CEQA Guidelines seek to better protect the health and well-being of Bay Area residents by addressing new health protective air quality standards, exposure to toxic air contaminants, and adverse effects from global climate change. Toxic air contaminants have no safe level of exposure, each carries health risks and those risks are cumulative.

A speaker from the Air District will update us on how the Bay Area is moving forward with guidelines that address AB 32 ‘s landmark legislation. (Location TBA)

Carol Stone, Co-chair Environmental Concerns

August Donations

To the LWVBAE General Fund

Ruth Arkley
 Mary Breunig
 George and Ann Crowe
 Barbara Davis
 Molly Fraker
 Ruth Hinkins
 Annette Lys
 Fran Packard
 Phyllis Phelps
 Kay Schwartz
 Ruthann Taylor
 Peggy Thomsen
 Elsa Tranter
 George Trilling

To the LWVB Foundation

George and Ann Crowe

Many thanks for remembering our League,

Louetta Erlin
 Donations Secretary

Office Volunteers

Office volunteers learn about the League from the inside out. They answer the phone, get the mail, process checks and receipts and do special projects.

We train and coordinate volunteers and have *A Primer for Office Volunteers at LWVBAE* to guide the work. (When things are quiet, there are a multitude of informative and interesting things to read).

Since we no longer have a paid Office Manager, office volunteers are more important than ever, especially in this, an election year.

If you have a few hours a month available, contact Jane Barrett at 845-8055 to learn more about this worthwhile and interesting opportunity.



Jim McMahon accepts the “Spirit of the League” award from LWVBAE President Sherry Smith on behalf of EETD.

Another annual highlight is presentation of the LWVBAE “Spirit of the League” awards to individuals and organizations who share common goals with the League and who have exemplified or carried out these goals in their lives or organizational mission. This year, we honored two individuals of wonderfully varied accomplishments.

Frances Townes is an extraordinary woman, by any measurement. A member of the League of Women Voters on both coasts for over 60 years, she has also been a champion of women’s rights, friend of the homeless, an environmental educator, and a visionary community leader. Perhaps her proudest accomplishment was the founding of the Berkeley Ecumenical Chaplaincy to the Homeless, when she was 70. The impact of her involvement has been felt all over the East Bay and beyond, and she is still fully engaged as she approaches the age of 95.

This year, we were so enthused about progress in the field of energy efficiency that we decided to present two individual “Spirit of the League” awards rather than have a single honoree. Our second individual award went to Art Rosenfeld, a world expert on energy efficiency, acknowledged by, among his many other awards, being honored with the Enrico Fermi Award, named for his professor at the University of Chicago. California has benefited from his expertise in many ways, including his having served as a State Energy Commissioner for ten years, continuously a member until earlier this year.

Our organizational “Spirit of the League” award flows from our award to Art Rosenfeld. He co-founded UC’s Institute for Energy and the Environment, now known as the Environmental Energy Technology Division of the Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory. It has grown to a staff of three hundred, following Art’s precept that “Conserving energy is cheaper and smarter than building power plants”. To that end, EETD scientists share results of their research with public policy groups, utilities, the building industry, and other interested parties to ensure that key research information gets from the lab to the marketplace.

Sherry Smith
 President

“Spirit of the League” Awards at Community Luncheon

Our League began its tradition of annual Community Luncheons in 2000, and each has been an outstanding event.

This year’s Luncheon was held August 19 at Hs Lordships Restaurant at the Berkeley Marina, and over 200 guests purchased tickets to attend the largest fundraising event of the League year.

A highlight was the presentation by George Lakoff, UC Berkeley Professor of Linguistics, speaking about “Framing and Voting.” An article about his talk appears on page 4.

Notes from Community Luncheon

Dr. George Lakoff, Professor of Linguistics at U. C. Berkeley described himself as a cognitive scientist who studies the mind, brain and language. As those of you who read his book *Don't Think Of An Elephant: Know Your Values And Frame The Debate* know, Lakoff argues that progressives believed that they could win elections if only the voters truly understood the facts. This is wrong, he claims. Neuroscientists now know that people tend to register input only if it fits with their prior determined value system or worldview.

He stated that conservative university students study economics and business and in those courses they are taught framing theory; while progressive students study environment or sociology, etc. and learn nothing in those courses about framing theory. Progressives need to learn how to frame their arguments based on moral principles or American principles, as Conservatives trained in framing do now.

Lakoff explained that many voters in America are conservative about some issues and progressive about others. They may be conservative about taxes and social services but progressive about individual rights and justice. Conservative politicians have been successful because they have figured out how to speak to the conservative part of the voters' value system. Lakoff proposes that progressives find a way to speak to the progressive side.

As an example of how important framing is, he recounted his effort to place an initiative on the California November 2010 ballot. The initiative, if passed, would have overthrown the two-thirds majority requirement for a vote to increase revenue and pass the budget. (California is one of only three states, the others being Rhode Island and Arkansas, that requires a two-thirds vote to raise revenues and to adopt the budget.)

He described a poll of California voters that asked whether it was undemocratic to require a two-third majority to raise revenue. The results were 73% agreed, 22% disagreed. So Lakoff wrote the initiative to read "All legislative actions on revenue and budget must be determined by majority vote." But when he submitted the initiative to the Attorney General's Office, Jerry Brown changed the wording to include "raising taxes." A poll using Brown's wording showed that 37% would vote for the initiative and 60% would oppose. The initiative did not qualify for the ballot.

To win, progressives need to frame every issue that they want to use in debate as a moral issue. They need to always tell the truth, but also figure out what their own moral or value basis is for each argument. This will take a lot of thoughtful effort and practice effectively expressing what

they believe.

The audience asked a number of interesting questions. Several asked whether Lakoff tried to persuade the Attorney General. He answered that he was not allowed to speak with him. A representative from Brown's office just said that the two statements meant the same thing. Another asked how would he frame the present war discussion. He said that the basic truth is that force does not work. Give examples of how it has not worked in Iraq, Vietnam and Afghanistan. Someone asked if high school students should be taught framing. He answered that all students from elementary school up should be taught framing theory because they need to know how the brain works, that it sets up frames which then it uses to judge input.

Pat Kuhi

Letter to Professor Lakoff

September 6, 2010

An open letter
To George Lakoff

Re: Speech to the League of Women Voters of Berkeley/Albany/Emeryville

Dear Professor Lakoff:

We were shocked and dismayed at your remarks at the League of Women Voters of Berkeley/Albany/Emeryville's (LWVBAE) Community Luncheon on August 19, attacking the League of Women Voters of California for not supporting your proposed initiative on a majority vote for the state budget and taxes.

You stated that you had been told that the LWVC does not support ballot measures until they have qualified. This is not always the case. While you may have heard someone make such a comment, it does not reflect our policy on initiatives.

When you asked for the League's support for your initiative, our President, Janis Hirohama, wrote you that our state board had decided that "we are not prepared at this time" to make decisions on initiatives for the November ballot. She noted that at that time dozens of initiatives were in circulation but not yet qualified for the ballot, and that several were related to state budget and tax policy. She also noted that for "measures that cover the same subject matter, we may need to decide whether a particular measure is preferable to another, which can be a painstaking process," and said that we would be monitoring the progress of your initiative and others.

We have often supported measures knowing that they would face a tough battle, but that there was at least substantial organization and support from other organizations. We did not see much evidence of that kind of support for your initiative if it did manage to qualify, even though we recognized that a number of League members were interested in it.

We were aware that there were several mistakes in the wording of the measure as you submitted it, for instance that it did not copy the existing language of the state constitution correctly. This and other errors meant that the measure would have to be withdrawn and resubmitted, delaying the process and making it less likely that it would qualify.

We were also amazed that you said at the luncheon that the League does not talk about the issue of majority rule in a democratic system. Nothing could be farther from the truth.

We publish an Action Guide before each election to guide local Leagues and inform the public about the campaigns we support and oppose. The Action Guide for the November 2010 election (it will be posted soon online at ca.lwv.org/lwvonly/action/2010nov/index.html) will have the following language about Proposition 25:

“We support a simple majority vote by the public or the governing body to adopt, repeal or change a revenue or finance measure. To ensure flexible government processes, we support adoptions of budgets, appropriations, taxes, other revenue sources and changes in rates and schedules by a simple majority vote of the governing body.

Changing the vote for the budget and related legislation from two-thirds to a simple majority without at the same time reducing the vote to raise taxes is admittedly a half-way measure. However, we believe it does make a change in the right direction. Majority rule is a fundamental part of representative democracy, and this at least allows the majority to set priorities for spending and to take responsibility for them.”

A flyer we have sent to local Leagues for distribution to the public also makes those points:

“The LWVC supports this measure, which would change the vote required for the Legislature to pass a budget from the current two-thirds to a simple majority. Majority rule is a fundamental part of democracy. The majority should set priorities for spending and take responsibility for them. This measure will change the negotiations over the budget and reduce the stranglehold the minority

now exercises over the process. Under Proposition 25, legislators will forfeit salary if they fail to meet the deadline for passing a budget. Budgets that are late and full of gimmicks harm all Californians, damage the economy, and hurt the state’s credit rating.”

Our material in opposition to Proposition 26 raises the same points about the issue of majority rule in a democratic system.

It is unfortunate that you expressed your views in a luncheon format that gave you a forum for making your opinions known, but offered little opportunity for response—only a few written questions from the audience. It would have been inappropriate to debate the issue with you in the context of the community luncheon, but we believe we have an obligation both to answer you and to make that answer available to our members and the guests who attended that event.

Sincerely,

Helen Hutchison, Vice President for Advocacy and Program
League of Women Voters of California

cc:

Janis Hirohama, President, LWVC
Sherry Smith, President, LWVBAE
Jill Kaiser Newcomb, Executive Director, LWVC
Anne Henderson, State & Local Finance Program Director, LWVC

Professor Lakoff’s Response

<http://lwvbae.org/LakoffResponseSeptember2010.pdf>

Reminder: Fall General Meeting

When: Thursday, September 30, 5:30 – 8:30

Where: Northbrae Community Church,
941 The Alameda, Berkeley

5:30 Meet and Greet

6:00 Dinner: A Rainey Sykes production – baked glazed ham, a baked glazed turkey breast, roasted rosemary garlic potatoes, and roasted vegetables plus a tossed green salad and dessert.

7:00 Program: Pros and cons on key ballot measures for the November election.

Call the office to say you’re coming (843-8824) and to make a dinner reservation (\$15 for a real treat). If you need a ride to the meeting, tell the office volunteer, and it will be provided. See you September 30th!

To Supporters of SB 810

September 2, 2010

Dear Friends,

By now most of you have heard the disappointing news that our bill, SB 810, the California Universal Health Care Act, was held on the Assembly Floor on the last night of session, effectively killing the measure until next year. Over my strong objections, Assembly leadership decided to hold the bill. Although we are greatly disappointed, we are determined to come back even stronger next year.

I want to thank and recognize the work of the California School Employees Association and California Nurses Association who worked hard to lobby members all year. I also want to recognize every member of the State Strategy Group.* Without their grassroots efforts we fail. Most importantly, I thank the thousands of advocates who made phone calls, requested meetings, attended rallies, and sent letters, faxes and emails, making it clear to legislators that the single payer health care movement is vibrant, strong and growing larger every day.

Our movement has always acknowledged that it is founded on a long-term vision and strategy. This setback does not change our work, it only emboldens it. For decades we have found the courage to speak out for single payer, even when others around us told us that now is not the right time. We have learned that fear and hesitation can only be overcome by courage and commitment—something with which our movement is rich. That is how we have come so far, and that is why we will win.

Without question, I commit to reintroducing this bill again next year, and to work ever harder with you to achieve the only real solution to our health care crisis—Medicare for All.

I encourage you to begin our work today to ensure the passage of this bill next session. Now is the time to educate your current representatives, and those who are seeking office, about the need for single payer universal health care and to ask for their support. More importantly, now is the time for you to educate your co-workers, neighbors, friends, and family members about why their elected officials should take a strong stance in support of Medicare for All.

We've always said that the closer we come, the harder our work will become. So often, it's "two steps forward, one step back." Let this temporary detour enliven us to work even harder to see single payer become a reality in California. With term limits, it is clear that each new class of representatives needs to be educated and reminded of how

important this issue is to our state. Next year will bring a new governor and a new legislature—and consequently, new opportunities and challenges. To win, we must come closer together as allies, fight smarter, and work even harder.

As the author of SB 810, I believe deeply in you, this cause and this movement. Until every Californian has health care and no family faces medical bankruptcy, we will not be deterred. Until our state budget and entire economy are no longer being swallowed by health care costs, we will not cease. Until we have "Medicare for All," we will not stop fighting. We're the fastest growing grassroots movement in America, and we will win universal health care. Let's dig deep, redouble our efforts and get back to work.

Sincerely,
Senator Mark Leno

*American Medical Student Association
Amnesty International USA
California Alliance for Retired Americans
California Church IMPACT
California Faculty Association
California Federation of Teachers
California Gray Panthers
California Health Professions Student Alliance
California National Organization of Women
California Nurses Association
California Retired Teachers Association
California School Employees Association
California Teachers Association
Consumer Federation of California
Courage Campaign
Dolores Huerta Foundation
Entertainment Strategy Group
Health Care for All-California
Labor Task Force for Universal Healthcare
League of Women Voters of California
Physicians for a National Health Program-California
Progressive Caucus of the California Democratic Party
Progressive Democrats of America
Single Payer Now
Visión y Compromiso (Vision and Commitment)
Wellstone Democratic Renewal Club

Note: The LWVBAE Health Care Committee will continue to educate and advocate along with LWVC and, will be supporting Senator Leno when he brings the the bill up in January to the new Legislature.

Li-hsia Wang
Healthcare Director

The Perils of Peralta

The troubled management and finances of our community college district are still making headlines. As we reported in our September 2009 *Voter*, Peralta's expensive, untested new Information Technology system, PeopleSoft, could not cope with processing the thousands of student registrations and applications for financial aid in the fall of 2008. Quick fixes only made matters worse.

Extraordinary staff efforts enabled the spring 2009 registration period to proceed more smoothly, but the ill-managed transition to the new PeopleSoft system proved to be only the tip of the iceberg. There were still so many irregularities and gaps in the District's available financial data that the external auditors could not close the books on fiscal year 2008–09, citing over 30 significant deficiencies and major weaknesses in the way the District was managing its money. In many cases, basic data could not be found—there were no documents, no paper trail to explain where money went. Fiscal 2008–09 was not cleared for closure until April of this year.

All California community college districts are accountable to their accrediting agency, the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC), which oversees the rigor of their curricula, the adequacy of their facilities and their financial viability. Peralta had drawn criticism before, with unfulfilled promises to bring order to its confused accounting, but this past spring it was put on watch and faced with more severe sanctions: either it would clean up its problems by a date certain or face penalties.

Anticipating the ACCJC's actions, the District's trustees, last December, brought in, at the state Chancellor's recommendation, the Recovery Team, a group of financial analysts of varied backgrounds, with extensive experience in restoring order to colleges in fiscal difficulty. They have been hard at work ever since. Their findings have documented in detail the gaps and slipshod reporting the auditors had noted. In the meantime, the Board of Trustees decided in January, to fire the Chief Financial Officer and not to renew the contract of then Chancellor Elihu Harris.

The efforts of the Recovery Team and the commitment of the Trustees to finally put the District on a sound financial footing convinced the ACCJC evaluators at their June 2010 meeting, to extend their previous deadline until this October, but at the same time, they put the District on probation, the next-to-last step before de-accrediting the institution.

Even as the Peralta administration confronted the ACCJC's reports itemizing a laundry list of inadequate or ill-advised decisions, harsh words about the trustees them-

selves emerged from a 27–page report from the Alameda County Grand Jury issued in July (The complete report is available at the Alameda County website, www.acgov.org, through the search bar under the title 2009-2010 Alameda County Grand Jury Final Report, Peralta Community College District).

Under year–long investigation for mismanagement and malfeasance, the District's trustees as a group were cited for a host of failings, ranging from the personal—abuse of District credit cards, failure to account properly for expenses charged to the District, extravagant overspending, even for activities that are properly charged to the District—to the professional—inadequate oversight of Peralta's finances, ignorance about what District policies were and failure to enforce them. The absence of transparency, or responsibility to the taxpayers of the county, was cited repeatedly.

For example, the report cites the 8 foreign trips taken by the director of international affairs including trips to China, and the 6 management employees who went to Beijing for recruitment. "The district needs to evaluate its foreign recruitment program and, for example, consider using the internet for student recruitment... There needs to be greater transparency on how foreign recruitment funds are accounted for; if the allegations of great profit by the district are factually correct; and if the cost of sending multiple employees on foreign trips is the best value for taxpayers in terms of time, effort and money."

The report ends with 16 recommendations with which the Trustees must comply:

- Recommendation 10:10 The Peralta Community College District Board of Trustees must review the financial statements of the district during open session at a regular meeting of the board of trustees on a monthly basis.
- Recommendation 10-15: The Peralta Community College District Board of Trustees must require out-of-state travel by all district employees to be approved in advance by the board and heard as individual action items at a board meeting and not as part of the agenda's consent calendar.

The Recovery Team is committed to identifying not just the failures of the past, but also necessary policies and procedures to ensure that responsible, transparent fiscal management practices are implemented. Their recommendations will be issued sometime this fall, and we will be following their work closely. Stay tuned...

Helene Lecar
Education Director

League Leaders 2009-2010

Board of Directors

President Sherry Smith
Recording Secretary Angharad Jones
Treasurer Bill Chapman
VP Administration Diane Akers
VP Membership Jane Coulter
VP Program Ginette Polak
VOTER Editor Fran Packard
Voter Registration Phoebe Watts
Education Director Helene Lecar
Environmental Concerns Carol Stone
Gail Schickele
Healthcare Director Li-hsia Wang
Volunteer Coordinator Jane Barrett
Directors-at-Large Mim Hawley
Jinky Gardner

Off-Board Portfolios

Albany Action Jewel Okawachi
Civics Education Jinky Gardner
Climate Change Regina Beatus
Community Luncheon Suzanne Chun
Database Coordinator Jane Coulter
Donations Secretary Louetta Erlin
Dues Coordinator Mina Jenner
Housing Issues Jean Safir
Juvenile Justice Lois Brubeck
LWV Bay Area Liaison Jean Safir
Library Liaison Claudia Berger
Smart Voter Sherry Smith
Web Manager/Computer Consultant
Bill Chapman
Women's Issues Charlotte Lichterman



League of Women Voters
Berkeley, Albany and Emeryville
1414 University Avenue, Suite D
Berkeley, CA 94702-1509

Non-Profit
Organization
U.S. Postage
P A I D
Berkeley, CA
Permit No. 29

RETURN SERVICE REQUESTED



The Voter is published 9 times a year by the League of Women Voters of Berkeley, Albany and Emeryville
1414 University Avenue, Suite D
Berkeley, CA 94702-1509

Telephone: 510.843.8824
Facsimile: 510.843.8828
Email: office@lwvbae.org

Editor: Fran Packard
Editorial Board: Jane Brandes, Bill Chapman, Sherry Smith
Technical Consultant: Bill Chapman
Current and past issues of the *VOTER* are posted on our website
<http://lwvbae.org>.

The League of Women Voters is a nonpartisan political organization that encourages active and informed participation in government, and influences public policy through education and advocacy.

Calendar — Berkeley addresses unless otherwise noted

September

20	Mon	1:30-3:30 pm	Health Care Com. LWVBAE Office	L. Wang	848-5765
25	Sat	9:00 am	Coastal Cleanup Day	P. Donald	981-6720
29	Wed	3:00-5:00 pm	Board Meeting, LWVBAE Office	S. Smith	548-1769
30	Thur	5:30-8:30 pm	Fall General Meeting, see p.5	G. Polak	841-4546

October

1	Fri	5:00 pm	Deadline for November <i>Voter</i>	F. Packard	845-3037
5	Tues	5:00-7:00 pm	Pro/Con Forum: Measure R, Berkeley City College, 2050 Center St., see p.1	J. Bergen	848-3954
18	Mon	1:30-3:30 pm	Health Care Com. LWVBAE Office	L. Wang	848-5765
18	Mon	5:00 pm	Last Day to Register to Vote	P. Watts	525-6614
18	Mon	7:30-9:00 pm	Environmental Concerns, see p.2	C. Stone	549-0959
27	Wed	3:00-5:00 pm	Board Meeting, LWVBAE Office	S. Smith	548-1769

November

2	Tuesday	Election Day Polls Open 7:00 am-8:00 pm			
---	---------	---	--	--	--