



The Voter

THE LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS®
OF MENDOCINO COUNTY

NOVEMBER/DECEMBER 2012

JANE PERSON, PRESIDENT

CHARLENE McALLISTER, EDITOR

LWVC'S CHRIS CARSON TO FOCUS ON REFORMS IN CAMPAIGN FINANCE AT NOVEMBER 13 MEETING

LWVC's Chris Carson brings news and interpretation of the League's role in campaign finance reform action at our general meeting Tuesday, November 13, 10 a.m., at the Caspar Community Center.



Chris Carson, LWVC

Ms. Carson is a third generation native of the Los Angeles area. She received a B.A. in history from Immaculate Heart College, Los Angeles, and an M.A. in History from the University of Southern California. Following graduate work, she taught American History (particularly Early American History and American Government) at several South-

ern California colleges. She also served as Director of Education for Heritage Square Museum, a small historic preservation museum. She is active in the Burbank community and recently served on the city's Charter Revision Commission.

For 30 years, Ms. Carson has been an active member of the League of Women Voters at national, state and lo-

cal levels. In January 2005, she joined the Board of Directors of the LWV of California as Government Director. In that capacity, she was responsible for developing and managing education and advocacy in the areas of redistricting, campaign finance, open government, state and local finance relationships and elections/voting rights issues. She currently is LWVC Program Director for Redistricting and Campaign Finance. She has served on the LWVUS Civil Liberties Taskforce, Immigration Study Committee and Campaign Finance Task Force.

We're Moving

To Caspar

Please join us
at our general meeting

Tues., November 13

Caspar
Community Center

Meet LWVC's
Chris Carson
Coffee at 9:30 a.m.

Presentation at 10 a.m.

*LWVMC Meetings
Are open to the public
There is no charge*

INSIDE THIS ISSUE:

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE
BY J. PERSON 2

BROWN ACT-BY
C. McALLISTER 4

CANDIDATE FORUM PHOTOS 5

AMELIA BLOOMER
BY B. AUERBACH 6

CALENDAR 7

LWV PROFILE
CAROL CZADEK
BY S. MITCHELL 8

STATE PROPS
BY B. MATHESON 9

CR Accreditation Status
Update—Page 7

NOVEMBER 6 GENERAL ELECTION VOTER TOOLBOX

<http://www.easyvoterguide.org/wp-content/pdf/FastFacts-BallotMeasures.pdf>

http://ballotpedia.org/wiki/index.php/California_2012_ballot_propositions

<http://cavotes.org/vote/pros-cons-pdf>

<http://www.smartvoter.org/>

<http://votersedge>

2012-2013 Officers
Board of Directors

President Jane Person
964-6351 janeperson@hotmail.com

Vice President Dorine Real
964-2781 dorine@mcn.org

Vice President Patricia Marien
964-4942 paperika@mcn.org

Secretary Cindy Plank
357-4272 theplanks@yahoo.com

Treasurer Lee Tepper
964-2781 eel@mcn.org

JoAn Blackstone Voter Service
937-2481 joanblackstone@comcast.net

Kitty Brown Director
964-8982

Carol Czadek Director
964-9007 norcoel@mcn.org

Pat Dunbar Director
937-3409 pdunbar@mcn.org

Babs Levine Director
937-0629 babs.levine@gmail.com

Barbara Matheson Action
937-5164 ken@mcn.org

Jary Stavely Membership
964-4942 jstavely@mcn.org

Off-Board Chairpersons

Doris Hammer Budget
Betty Barber Nominating

VOTER editor Charlene McAllister
937-4463 charm@mcn.org

VOTER Staff—Barbara Auerbach,
Becky Bowen, Susan Eveleth,
Louis Hough, Barbara Matheson,
Susan Mitchell, Jane Person

President's Message—

Remember that song refrain from the eighties rock group ABBA? “Money, money, money! It’s a rich man’s world!”

Welcome to the world of campaign finance. As every sentient American citizen over the age of 12 knows, the 2010 Supreme Court Citizens United decision has brought staggering amounts of money into election campaigns, probably surpassing the annual GNP of a lot of third world countries. This leads one to a staggering realization: Money elects candidates.

Todd Akin is a case in point. Heavily criticized a few months ago for his “legitimate rape” remarks, his embarrassed political party turned off the money faucet for his campaign. When it became evident that the party needed the Missouri senator in order to retake the Senate, the party quickly overcame its embarrassment, turned the spigot back on, and Akin became a contender in the polls.

Both political parties have spent furiously, especially in so-called battleground states. However, campaigning has become less focused on informing voters and more focused on raising money to court these voters, who themselves have been sliced and diced into camps—women, white males, college grads, evangelicals, Hispanics, etc. Here’s the first paragraph of a story about campaign fundraising appearing in the *Santa Rosa Press Democrat* (9/29): “For a day, the presidential contest was almost all about money to wage the presidential contest.”

Contributions to parties do not include money going to the super PACs, which can raise and spend unlimited sums, thanks to the Supreme Court decision. Hundreds of millions of dollars are out there, but just how much or whose money it is we don’t know since the super PACs don’t have to disclose the names of their donors. Also, many states have instigated lawsuits seeking to overturn the campaign finance restrictions



Continued on Page 3

Continued from Page 2

that yet remain on the books in these states. In September the US Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit unanimously rejected a constitutional challenge to Minnesota's ban on direct corporate contributions to state political campaigns.

The Citizens United decision did endorse (but did not mandate) requirements to disclose independent expenditures. The federal disclosure bill, H.R. 4010 or the DISCLOSE 2012 Act, has been strongly supported by LWVUS. In February LWVUS President Elizabeth MacNamara wrote a letter to the House of Representatives urging its support.

This bill has no unduly burdensome registration or reporting provisions such as the U.S. Court of Appeals found onerous in the Minnesota case; it simply requires "corporations, unions, and any other organized group paying for election-cycle messages to disclose expenditures of \$10,000 or more within 24 hours of making them and to identify donors who write checks of \$10,000 or more" (*New York Times* editorial, 9/10/12). Moreover, it includes a "stand by your ad" provision for ads run by such groups. It also requires outside groups to certify their spending is not coordinated with candidates, and, very importantly according to the League, covers transfers of money among groups so that the actual sources of funds being spent to influence federal elections will be evident.

In MacNamara's words the bill "would restore transparency to U.S. elections by requiring complete disclosure of spending on big-money advertising in candidate elections. . . . We must preserve the integrity of our electoral process by increasing transparency and letting the sunshine in. . . . Voters deserve to know the sources of funding for election advertising."

Senate Republicans blocked the bill in July, citing privacy issues.

But the battle is not over. To inform us further and to keep us fired up, we have invited LWVCA's Chris Carson to speak on the League's efforts to get this bill passed. Chris is the League of Women Voters of California off-board Program Director for Campaign Financing/Money in Politics. We welcome her as our November speaker. *Jane Person*

"The Citizens United v. Federal Election Commission decision by the Supreme Court unleashed unlimited corporate and union spending for or supposedly 'independent expenditures' seeking to affect elections. The decision has led to millions of dollars in secret campaign expenditures, as current federal campaign disclosure laws and tax laws did not anticipate this new kind of spending....By making a claim that some campaign ads are 'issue discussion'...and running the ad for more than 60 days before the general election, groups are evading the federal campaign finance laws that require them to disclose their donors."

Source: LWVUS website

www.lwv.org/our-work/improving-elections/money-in-elections

Developments We Continue To Watch in State, Nation

H.R. 4010, S.3369, S. 2219 campaign disclosure requirements for corporations, labor organizations and others. Rep. Mike Thompson and California Senators Feinstein and Boxer are listed as co-sponsors of these introduced pieces of legislation in Congress and in the Senate. Status of the bills listed at Library of Congress at www.thomas.loc.gov

UCLA Law conference in Los Angeles Nov. 17, with presentation about constitutional and legislative remedies to limit influence of big money on democracy sponsored by Common Cause California www.moneyoutvotersin.org

Coverage of County Measure F (Move to Amend) on Nov. 6 ballot. The local Move to Amend movement scheduled a workshop Oct. 28 at the Fort Bragg Library, led by David Cobb, spokesperson for the national movement to abolish corporate personhood by passage of an amendment to the U.S. Constitution.

Local Government, Special Districts Recap of Brown Act Developments

By Charlene McAllister

The Brown Act is the state's open meeting law that requires local governments to prepare and post agendas for public meetings and disclose decisions made in closed meetings.

In the past, the state had to reimburse the entities required to comply with the Brown Act for the costs associated with these requirements because they are considered to be a state mandate. When the state budget was adopted this year, money to reimburse those costs was cut from the budget. Since the requirement to post meeting agendas is considered a mandate, the mandate was suspended for three years and therefore, so was the requirement to continue posting public meeting agendas.

Open meetings mean little without public notice of where and when

they are scheduled and what business is to be addressed, or if actions taken after deliberation in closed session are not revealed. Many, if not most, local agencies have pledged to continue to comply with agenda and disclosure requirements voluntarily. That is laudable, but it is no consolation if an agency decides, for whatever reason, not to provide meaningful disclosures on an agenda or after a closed session. In that event, the public has no basis for challenging the secrecy and no remedy for correcting it.

At this writing, we do not know if Proposition 30 will pass. If it passes, the measure would amend the Constitution to specify that the state would not be responsible for paying local agencies the costs of following the open meeting procedures in the Brown Act. It is surmised that this will

then reinstate the Brown Act requirements for posting agendas and reporting on closed sessions.

In January of 2011, Senator Leland Yee (D) District 8, which included parts of San Francisco and San Mateo Counties, introduced SCA 7 which would amend the California Constitution to include the requirement that each public body provide public notice of its meetings and disclose any action taken. This bill remains in committee.

We'd all like to trust that elected officials will act transparently and in the best interest of the public, but history says otherwise. Even though most of our local government bodies voted to continue to follow the requirements of the Brown Act, only by being careful observers can we know if they do in fact, comply.

Doing the Math—How Much Do Brown Act Reimbursements Cost?

It's not easy to follow costs of reimbursement to local California governments for applicable public meeting expenses. Most city governments continued to observe requirements of the act even though many have not been reimbursed since 2005, about the time the state ran out of reimbursement money. The State Controller's office still posts claim forms for special districts and other local governments for appropriate Brown Act public meeting reimbursement based on options that give local governmental bodies a choice of actual costs of open meeting preparation, a standard time (based on a formula for calculating direct and indirect costs) or a flat rate allowance that would have been about \$155 for a typical special district meeting in 2008-2009. According to the Controller's office, only some 500 special districts filed claims for that period. According to the League's Guide to California State Government, there are more than 3,400 special districts in the state's 58 counties.



Wendy Roberts moderated the candidate forum for Second Congressional District candidates Jared Huffman (D) and Dan Roberts (R) Oct. 13, 2012, at Fort Bragg's Town Hall. Wendy Roberts is not related to Dan Roberts.

Our thanks to League and community members who helped with forums: Christine Anderson, Meg Courtney, Pat Dunbar, Kate Lee, Jane Person, and Cindy Plank. And our thanks to JoAn Blackstone for her leadership in making arrangements for all of the LWV forums.

LWV Candidate
Public Forums
October, 2012
A Chance
For Voters
To Meet
Candidates,
Ask Questions,
Get Answers



Assembly Member Wesley Chesbro (D), left, with Tom Lynch (D) and Moderator Wendy Roberts Oct. 10, 2012, Forum for California Second Assembly District, at Fort Bragg's C.V. Starr Center.



Doug Hammerstrom



Rex Gressett



Scott Deitz

League Member Pat Dunbar moderated the Fort Bragg City Council forum with incumbents Doug Hammerstrom and Scott Deitz and candidate Rex Gressett Oct. 17, 2012, in Town Hall.

VOTING HERITAGE—REMEMBERING AMELIA BLOOMER

Editor's Note—A few years ago, League member Carol Ann Falk, suggested donation categories for our League membership that honored suffragists. Ever since then, we've wanted to write a story about Amelia Bloomer, so here it is.

By Barbara Auerbach

You've heard about Susan B. Anthony, civil rights leader who fought to introduce women's suffrage, and you've heard about Elizabeth Cady Stanton, who headed the Woman's Rights Convention along with Luretia Coffin Mott at Seneca Falls in 1848. These women were social activists and abolitionists who lead the Woman's Rights Convention to draft and adopt the Seneca Falls Declaration of Sentiments and Resolutions, which began the women's movement.

But who was Amelia Bloomer? Her husband, Dexter Bloomer, encouraged Amelia Bloomer (originally a teacher) to write articles for his New York newspaper, *The Seneca Falls County Courier*.

Yes she wore bloomers, but didn't create them. The bloomer originated with New England temperance activist Libby Miller, who created the look because it was sensible and comfortable. Amelia liked the look and promoted the costume in her publication, *The Lily: A Ladies' Journal, Devoted to Temperance and Literature*. *The Lily* was a magazine she created and printed alongside her husband's newspaper. It began as a women's periodical promoting social issues, temperance, fashion, higher education and eventually the woman's movement. The magazine also became a vehicle for articles written by Elizabeth Cady Stanton and other activists on suffrage.

Amelia Bloomer didn't start out as an activist but eventually she was caught up in the women's movement when she realized speaking out and writing could make a difference to equal rights for women. She wrote in an essay that "woman is entitled to the same means of enforcing those rights as man; and that therefore she should be heard in the formation of Constitutions in the making of the laws, and in the selection of those by whom the laws are administered."

Source: *Teaching With Documents: Petition of Amelia Bloomer Regarding Suffrage in the West*, Linda Simmons, Associate Professor, Northern Virginia Community College, Manassas, VA



Petition of
Mrs Amelia Bloomer for relief from
taxation or political disabilities.

To the Senate and House of Representatives of
the United States, in Congress Assembled.

Mrs Amelia Bloomer, a citizen of the
United States, and a resident of Council Bluffs,
County of Pottawattamie and State of Iowa—the
owner of real and personal property amounting
to several thousand dollars, on which she is
taxed without representation, hereby respectfully
petition your Honorable Body for relief from
this burden of taxation—or for the removal
of her political disabilities, and that she may
be declared invested with full power to exercise
her right of self-government at the ballot-box—
all state constitutions, or statute laws to
the contrary notwithstanding.

In this petition submitted to Congress circa 1878, Amelia Bloomer (inset) requested she either be relieved of paying taxes or allowed to vote. Textual Records from the U.S. House of Representatives Committee on the Judiciary, National Archives and Records Administration. We found no response.

Calendar

Tuesday, November 13—DISCLOSE 2012 Legislation
Chris Carson-LWVC (see Page 1)
9:30 a.m. coffee
Caspar Community Center
10 a.m. meeting

No General Meeting in December — Happy Holidays

Board Meeting December 4, 9:30 a.m.
Fort Bragg Library Meeting Room

Please hold these dates for 2013

All Events at the Caspar Community Center

Tuesday, January 8—General Meeting 10 a.m.

Tuesday, February 12—General Meeting 10 a.m.

Friday, March 15—Meet and Greet
Your Elected Officials 5-7 p.m.

Tuesday, April 9—General Meeting 10 a.m.

Tuesday, May 14—Annual Meeting and Luncheon

All League meetings are open to the public at no charge

All Board Meetings are open to League Members

MISSION STATEMENT

THE LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS,
A NON-PARTISAN POLITICAL ORGANIZATION,
ENCOURAGES INFORMED AND ACTIVE PARTICIPATION
IN GOVERNMENT, STRIVES TO INCREASE UNDERSTANDING
OF MAJOR PUBLIC POLICY ISSUES,
AND INFLUENCES PUBLIC POLICY THROUGH EDUCATION
AND ADVOCACY.

CR Will Learn Status Of Accreditation in 2013

EUREKA—College of the Redwoods, placed on Show Cause sanction by the Accrediting Commission for the Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) in early 2012, will learn its accreditation status in early February, 2013.

College officials submitted a Show Cause Report to the ACCJC October 15. Show Cause is the most serious sanction and the college's report is a response to the action. If the ACCJC removes accreditation, College of the Redwoods eventually would be forced to close, according to the college communications office. Satellite campuses would then operate as "remote centers." Other California community colleges currently under Show Cause review are City College of San Francisco and Cuesta College, San Luis Obispo County.

College of the Redwoods remained fully accredited during the past year while it prepared the Show Cause Report.

In August, the Board of Trustees hired Tom Henry, a graduate of CR and Humboldt State University, to help resolve accreditation issues. The recently-appointed president is Kathy Smith (previously Kathy Lehner), former president of Mendocino College, Ukiah.

If voters approve Proposition 30 on November 6, CR revenues will increase if college enrollment increases.

The main campus is in Humboldt County (Eureka) with affiliated campuses in Del Norte, Trinity, and Mendocino Counties. The district is governed by a nine-member elected board. A viable community college system is part of the LWVC Social Policy and the League conducted a study of the state community college system in 2001-2003. We will continue to follow this story in 2013.

Profiles in League

Carol Czadek

In Her Own Words



Submitted by Susan Mitchell

What brought you to the Mendocino coast? How long have you lived here?

In 1970 my husband, Jim, and I were living in Berkeley enduring curfews, tear gas, and the presence of the National Guard at our neighborhood corner. We had a revelation one weekend about what lifestyle we wanted for ourselves. Two weeks later we moved to Little River.

Why did you join the League?

As a voter, I have respected and relied on the League's analysis of ballot measures. I was aware of our local League and interested in attending meetings, but always had work or CR classes on Tuesdays. One week after I retired 2 years ago, I came to my first League meeting. I was impressed by intelligent people discussing important topics in an informed way and wanted to be a part of it.

What do you see as the League's purpose in the community?

The League's own manual says it best: "to promote political responsibility through informed and active participation of citizens in government, to work to increase understanding of major public policy issues and to act on selected government issues."

Has your involvement in the League changed your view of politics: local, state, national?

I have always been a political junkie. I hold the moral progressive view that democracy depends on citizens caring about each other and taking responsibility both for themselves and for others. The League's positions seem to uphold this view. So, although my views haven't changed, I am now part of a wider community with which to share ideas and to learn from.

What have you learned from the League?

I've learned that there are many smart, articulate, and caring members. Many of the topics brought up at meetings presented new material to think about and consider. I also now try to have more reasoned and less emotionally charged discussions about politics.

What would you like to achieve in the League?

I have been asked to take over the 9:30 to 10 AM coffee and food buffet. I am happy to help make our meetings more social and to encourage attendance. I am also interested in collaborating with other members to bring a topic up for presentation and discussion at a future meeting.

What issues do you find important that you would like to see the League discuss?

I am interested in how political strategists use language and words to advance their agendas, how and why and in what ways our country is becoming a corporatocracy, war on drugs, the Farm Bill, the Keystone XL Pipeline, energy policy. So many topics and so few meetings and time.

Any biographical information you wish to share?

I am too blessed. I have a wonderful husband, daughter and 2 grandkids, enjoy gardening, bicycling, RVing, ceramics, and reading.

LEAGUE ACTION

COMPILED BY BARBARA MATHESON

Editor's Note—The League of Women Voters never endorses or recommends a vote for candidates. However, the League (based on studies and discussions that lead to consensus on positions) often makes recommendations on issues and the following are recommendations by the League of Women Voters of California on proposed ballot measures on the November 6 ballot.

THE LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF CALIFORNIA RECOMMENDS:

PROP 30 Schools and Local Public Safety Protection Act YES (Initiative Constitutional Amendment)

Proposition 30 begins to move California toward financial stability and adequate funding for all the services we want from our government; we can't continue to cut vital public services like schools and public safety. This measure will provide some much-needed income from a temporary increase in income tax rates for the wealthy and a modest temporary sales tax increase. The plan is a part of a balanced approach to eliminating our deficit that includes \$8 billion in cuts, \$6 billion in new revenues, and \$2.5 billion in loans, deferrals, etc., this year. Proposition 30 also guarantees a stable source of funding for counties to pay for their new public safety responsibilities such as housing low-level prisoners and providing substance abuse treatment.

PROP 31 Government Performance and Accountability Act NO (Initiative Constitutional Amendment and Statute)

Proposition 31 is based on good intentions and has some pieces that, taken alone, the League could support. However, Prop 31 has several significant flaws. There are questions about whether or not the provisions allow local governments to suspend state environmental requirements. What is clear is that there will be significant legal uncertainty, and years of litigation. In addition, the measure prescribes the specific manner of state and local government budgeting and puts this process into the state constitution. Prop 31 has other questionable provisions, such as establishing a significant shift of power over appropriations to the governor at times of fiscal emergency.

PROP 32 Special Exemptions Act NO (Initiative Statute)

This measure is not the campaign finance reform measure its proponents say it is. Proposition 32 promises "political reform" but is really designed by special interests to help themselves and harm their opponents. It looks like a campaign political finance reform measure but unfairly targets one set of large campaign donors while giving other donors unlimited power. Its ban on payroll deductions for political giving will affect unions but not corporations, and even the restriction it places on contributions to candidates by corporations is full of loophole exemptions. It does not fix the problem of money in politics; Super PACs and independent expenditure committees will continue to spend without limitation.

PROP 34 SAFE California Act YES (Initiative Statute)

The SAFE California Act will replace the death penalty in California with a sentence of life in prison without the possibility of parole. Convicted killers will stay in prison for the rest of their lives, eliminating the possibility of executing an innocent person in California. This will save over \$100 million every year—because the court and incarceration costs are so much higher for prisoners at risk for a death penalty. \$100 million of these savings will be allocated over the next four years to pay for increased investigation of unsolved rape and murder cases. Convicted killers will be required to work and pay restitution into a victims' compensation fund.

PROP 40 Redistricting YES (Referendum)

We strongly urge a "YES" vote on this referendum on the state Senate maps drawn by the independent Citizens Redistricting Commission. The question on a referendum is not intuitive; it asks if you want to retain the new law, or in this case, the maps drawn by the Citizens Redistricting Commission. So vote YES to affirm the maps drawn by the Citizens Redistricting Commission, YES—in support of the Commission, YES—to validate the open, transparent process, YES—to retain fair districts.

Membership in The League of Women Voters of Mendocino County is a bargain and a statement. You will be saying that you are committed to the ballot as a means for change and for providing non-biased information to voters. **The issues your League follows are those that affect every resident's family and community.** Get involved in the League of Women Voters. Dues for the 2012-2013 League year are due September 18, 2012.

Please consider joining at one of these levels:

Susan B. Anthony Individual Membership \$55 ____

Amelia Bloomer Two-member Household Membership \$80 ____

Elizabeth Cady Stanton Membership \$100 ____

Carrie Chapman Catt Membership \$250 or more ____

Donation _____

Please send me more information:

Name/Names: _____

Address _____

City: _____ State _____ ZIP _____

Phone _____ E-mail: _____

Please make checks payable to LWV Mendocino County
And mail to: LWVMC
P.O. Box 1128
Fort Bragg, CA 95437

The League of Women Voters
of Mendocino County
P.O. Box 1128
Fort Bragg, CA 95437
(707) 937-4952

www.lwv.org

www.ca.lwv.org

www.mendo.ca.lwvnet.org

Mendocino County
Public Television
Meeting Coverage
www.mendocoasttv.org

Mendocino County
Election Office
(707) 463-4371

To check status of mailed-in ballot, visit:
www.co.mendocino.ca.us/acr/cgi-bin/absentee.pl

From the Brennan Center for Justice—The History of Voting
http://www.youtube.com/watch?feature=player_embedded&v=2k57ARG7Kxg



*The LWVMC Gratefully
Acknowledges Generous Donations
to our 2012 Virtual Garden Tour*

Betty Barber

Meg Courtney

Carol Cradek

Pat Dunbar

Doris Hammer

Shirley and Don Kirkpatrick

Nancy Kleiber

Charlene McAllister

Susan Mitchell

Carl Moore

Jean and Art Morley

Jennifer Owen

Jane Person

Dorine Reat and Lee Tepper

Betty Stavelly