

5-3-2010

## [McCleary Record on Appeal, Part 13] 07-2-02323-2-172 Part 13

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.law.uw.edu/king>

---

### Recommended Citation

"[McCleary Record on Appeal, Part 13]" 07-2-02323-2-172 Part 13. *King County Superior Court Documents*. 204.

<https://digitalcommons.law.uw.edu/king/204>

This Record on Appeal is brought to you for free and open access by the School Finance Litigation: McCleary v. State of Washington at UW Law Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in King County Superior Court Documents by an authorized administrator of UW Law Digital Commons. For more information, please contact [cnyberg@uw.edu](mailto:cnyberg@uw.edu).

## Frequently Asked Questions about Circulating Initiative and Referendum Petitions

The Secretary of State is frequently asked about issues specifically related to the circulation of petitions and signature gathering. The following questions and answers are designed to summarize these issues.

### **Can initiative petitions be circulated on public property, like sidewalks, parks or libraries?**

If you want to circulate petitions on public property, it would be a good idea to talk to the unit of government involved about any concerns they might have, including whether there might be any permit requirements. There might be other legitimate restrictions or concerns involved, such as making sure that you don't block traffic or interfere with other activities that are taking place at the same time.

### **I've heard that the sponsors of an initiative or referendum have the right to circulate petitions at commercial businesses, such as shopping malls and grocery stores. Is that true?**

This is partly correct. The Washington Supreme Court has long held that petition circulators have the right to gather signatures at large regional shopping malls. The court compared shopping malls to places that have traditionally served as public forums for political expression, such as a downtown business district or traditional town square, and concluded that petitions can be circulated there. The property owners can adopt reasonable time, place, and manner restrictions, but cannot prohibit petition circulation entirely.

More recently, the court has explained that this same rationale does not apply to other retail establishments, such as a grocery store. The court emphasized that it firmly believes that in general private property owners have a right to determine whether or not they will permit signature gathering on their premises. It has found a limited right to circulate petitions at large regional shopping malls that have become the functional equivalent of a town center. As a general rule, therefore, petition gathering must be allowed at large regional malls, but other

retail businesses can decide for themselves whether or not they want to permit it.

**How do we know which properties must permit signature gathering and which can prohibit it?**

The Supreme Court has indicated that most private property owners can decide whether or not to permit petition circulation, with only a narrow exception. The only kind of property where the court has found a right to circulate petitions is large regional shopping malls. In some cases, it might be possible to argue that if a property owner has opened even a smaller premise to the public in a way that makes it the functional equivalent of the town square that the right may apply. Questions such as that would have to be resolved individually in the courts. It seems reasonable to offer a general rule, however, that there is a right to circulate petitions at large malls, but not at other retail establishments.

**Can the property owner restrict where, when, or how petitions can be circulated?**

Yes, within limits. Washington courts have explained that when initiative or referendum supporters collect signatures on private property, there might be limits so that the activity does not interfere with what other people are doing on the property. Just what limits might be reasonable will depend on the circumstances, including how big the area is, the potential for blocking traffic or interfering with the business involved, or perhaps whether somebody else has already made arrangements to be on the property at a particular time. There might also be other reasonable concerns. The only case in which a Washington court has considered specific limits placed on signature gathering by a property owner is called Initiative 172 v. Western Washington Fair Assoc., 88 Wn. App. 579, 945 P.2d 761 (1997).

**What if I'm against an initiative or referendum?**

**Do I have the right to urge people not to sign a petition?**

Yes, as a matter of freedom of speech. Opponents of an initiative or referendum can certainly express the opinion that it would not be a good idea for a voter to sign a petition. An opponent, however, does not have the right to interfere with the petition process. In fact, it is a gross misdemeanor to interfere with somebody else's right to sign a petition, and there are also laws against assaulting people. You can certainly express your opinion, but you must remember that other people have rights to their opinions as well, including the right to sign petitions you may not like.

This principle works both ways, of course. Neither side of an initiative or referendum campaign has the right to prevent the other from expressing opinions.

**Can the Secretary of State force somebody to let me circulate petitions on their property?**

No. If you believe that your rights are being violated or you want more specific guidance as to the law, it may be a good idea to consult with your own attorney. If you believe that a crime has been committed, you should contact your local police or sheriff.

**If I am asked to sign a petition, am I entitled to read the petition or the proposed measure before I make up my mind?**

Yes. State law requires that petitions contain certain information, including the full text of the measure. This includes a ballot title and summary, written by either the Attorney General or a Superior Court judge, and other required information. The full text is usually printed on the back of the petition. Sometimes petition circulators attach the petitions to clip boards in order to make them easier to sign or easier for the circulator to handle. Sometimes the full petition or the full text of the proposal might be folded over or on the back. You should feel free to read any part of the petition that you think is necessary in order for you to make up your mind, even if that means unfolding it or removing it from a clip board.

# Affidavit for Proposed Initiative

I, \_\_\_\_\_, declare as follows:  
print name as registered to vote

1. I am over 18 years of age and competent to testify.
2. I am a registered voter residing at:

\_\_\_\_\_ WA \_\_\_\_\_  
street address city zip code

\_\_\_\_\_ (area code) telephone number  
county

3. I herewith submit a proposed Initiative to the:

People

Legislature

in the form appended hereto regarding the subject of \_\_\_\_\_

4. I request that the Secretary of State transmit a copy of the proposed Initiative to the Office of the Code Reviser. If I submit a final version of the proposed Initiative to the Secretary of State, along with a Certificate of Review issued by the Office of the Code Reviser, I request that the Secretary of State assign the proposed Initiative a number, and transmit a copy to the Attorney General for a ballot title.

5. I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the state of Washington that the foregoing is true and correct and of my own knowledge, and that I executed this declaration at

\_\_\_\_\_, Washington, in the County of \_\_\_\_\_, this

city

county

\_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 20\_\_\_\_.

\_\_\_\_\_  
signature

**Note:** The Office of the Secretary of State posts information regarding proposed Initiatives on the agency's website, including contact information for each sponsor. If you would like alternate contact information to be posted, please provide that information below. Please be aware that all information on this affidavit is public record and is subject to public disclosure.

\_\_\_\_\_ address city state zip code

\_\_\_\_\_ email (area code) telephone number (area code) fax number

revised 1/09

# Affidavit for Proposed Referendum Measure

I, \_\_\_\_\_, declare as follows:  
print name as registered to vote

1. I am over 18 years of age and competent to testify.
2. I am a registered voter residing at:

\_\_\_\_\_ WA \_\_\_\_\_  
street address city zip code

\_\_\_\_\_ (area code) telephone number  
county

3. I herewith submit a proposed Referendum Measure on \_\_\_\_\_  
bill number

in the form appended hereto.

4. I request that the Secretary of State assign the proposed Referendum Measure a number, transmit a copy to the Office of the Code Reviser, and transmit a copy to the Attorney General for a ballot title.

5. I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the state of Washington that the foregoing is true and correct and of my own knowledge, and that I executed this declaration at \_\_\_\_\_, Washington, in the County of \_\_\_\_\_, this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 20\_\_\_\_.

\_\_\_\_\_  
signature

**Note:** The Office of the Secretary of State posts information regarding proposed Referendum Measures on the agency's website, including contact information for each sponsor. If you would like alternate contact information to be posted, please provide that information below. Please be aware that all information on this affidavit is public record and is subject to public disclosure.

\_\_\_\_\_ address city state zip code

\_\_\_\_\_ email (area code) telephone number (area code) fax number

revised 1/09

H


 Enter Keywords

## Elections & Voting

[General Information](#)  
 [Resources](#)  
 [Election Administrators](#)

[Initiatives to the People - 1914 through 2009](#)

[Back](#)

The following is a list of Initiatives to the People filed between 1914 and 2009 with the Office of the Secretary of State.

<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 1</b>	(Statewide Prohibition) Filed January 2, 1914. Re filed as Initiative Measure No. 3.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 2</b>	(Eight Hour Law) Filed January 3, 1914. Re filed as Initiative Measure No. 5.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 3</b>	(Statewide Prohibition) Filed January 8, 1914. Submitted to the voters at the state general election held on November 3, 1914 and approved by the following vote: For - 189,840 Against - 171,208. Act is now identified as Chapter 2, Laws of 1915.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 4</b>	(Drugless Healers) Filed January 13, 1914. No signatures petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 5</b>	(Eight Hour Law) Filed January 15, 1914. No signatures petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 6</b>	(Blue Sky Law) Filed January 30, 1914. Submitted to voters at the state general election held on November 3, 1914 and rejected by the following vote: For - 142,017 Against - 147,298.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 7</b>	(Abolishing the Bureau of Inspection) Filed January 30, 1914. Submitted to the voters at the state general election held on November 3, 1914 and rejected by the following vote: For - 117,882 Against - 167,080.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 8</b>	(Abolishing Employment Offices) Filed January 30, 1914. Submitted to the voters at the state general election held on November 3, 1914 and approved by the following vote: For - 162,054 Against - 144,544. Act is now identified as Chapter 1, Laws of 1915.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 9</b>	(Injured Workmen) Filed January 29, 1914. Submitted to the voters at the state general election held on November 3, 1914 and rejected by the following vote: For - 143,738 Against - 154,166.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 10</b>	(Convict Labor Road Measure) Filed January 29, 1914. Submitted to the voters at the state general election held on November 3, 1914 and rejected by the following vote: For - 111,805 Against - 183,726.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 11</b>	(Fish code) Filed January 29, 1914. Signatures were submitted and found insufficient to qualify the measure for the 1914 general election ballot.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 12</b>	(Abolishing the Tax Commission) Filed January 29, 1914. Signatures were submitted and found insufficient to qualify the measure for the 1914 general election ballot.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 13</b>	(Eight Hour Law) Filed February 10, 1914. Submitted to the voters at the state general election held on November 3, 1914 and rejected by the following vote: For - 118,881 Against - 212,935.



INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 14	(Legislative Reapportionment) Filed May 13, 1914. No signature petitions presented for checking.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 15	(Fundamental Reform Act) Filed May 15, 1914. No signature petitions presented for checking.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 16	(Legislative Reapportionment) Filed May 20, 1914. No signature petitions presented for checking.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 17	(State Road Measure) Filed June 13, 1914. No signature petitions presented for checking.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 18	(Brewers' Hotel Bill) Filed December 14, 1914. This initiative was erroneously numbered since it was actually an Initiative to the Legislature. Now renumbered as Initiative to the Legislature No. 1A.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 19	(Non-Partisan Election and Presidential Primary) Filed February 11, 1916. No signature petitions presented for checking.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 20	(Injured Workmen) Filed February 11, 1916. No signature petitions presented for checking.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 21	(Municipalities & Public Utilities) Filed February 11, 1916. No signature petitions presented for checking.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 22	(Fisheries Code) Filed February 11, 1916. No signature petitions presented for checking.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 23	(Politicians' Code) Filed March 29, 1916. No signature petitions presented for checking.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 24	(Brewers' Bill) Filed April 20, 1916. Submitted to the voters at the state general election held on November 7, 1916 and rejected by the following vote: For - 98,843 Against - 245,399.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 25	(Repealing Statewide Prohibition) Filed May 11, 1916. No signature petitions presented for checking. (Repealing Statewide Prohibition) Filed May 11, 1916. No signature petitions presented for checking.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 26	(Making the State a Prohibition District) Filed October 13, 1916. No signature petitions presented for checking.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 27	(Repealing Chapter 57, Laws of 1915, Relating to Regulation of Common Carriers) Filed October 13, 1916. No signature petitions presented for checking.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 28	(Non-Partisan Elections) Filed October 26, 1916. No signature petitions presented for checking.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 29	(Capitol Removal Bill) Filed November 27, 1916. No signature petitions presented for checking.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 30	(Eight Hour Law) Filed January 9, 1918. No signature petitions presented for checking.

INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 31	(Municipal Marketing Measure) Filed February 5, 1918. No signature petitions presented for checking. (Municipal Marketing Measure) Filed February 5, 1918. No signature petitions presented for checking.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 32	(Picketing Measure) Filed February 5, 1918. No signature petitions presented for checking.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 33	(Non-Partisan Elections and Presidential Primary) Filed February 5, 1918. No signature petitions presented for checking.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 34	(Relating to Salmon Fishing) Filed February 8, 1918. No signature petitions presented for checking. (Relating to Salmon Fishing) Filed February 8, 1918. No signature petitions presented for checking.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 35	(Repealing Chapter 174, Laws of 1919, Relating to Prevention of Criminal Syndicalism) Filed October 7, 1920. Signatures were submitted and found insufficient to qualify the measure for the general election ballot.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 36	(Municipal Marketing Measure) Filed November 16, 1920. No signature petitions presented for checking.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 37	(Relating to Ownership of Land by Aliens) Filed November 19, 1920. No signature petitions presented for checking. (Relating to Ownership of Land by Aliens) Filed November 19, 1920. No signature petitions presented for checking.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 38	(Repealing Chapter 209, Laws of 1907, Relating to the Nomination of Candidates for Public Office) Filed January 11, 1922. No signature petitions presented for checking.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 39	(Repealing Chapter 138, Laws of 1913, Relating to the Initiative Procedure) Filed January 11, 1922. No signature petitions presented for checking.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 40	(Repealing Chapter 174, Laws of 1921, Relating to the Poll Tax) Filed January 18, 1922. Submitted to the voters at the state general election held on November 7, 1922 and approved by the following vote: For - 193,355 Against - 63,494. Act is now identified as Chapter 1, Laws of 1923.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 41	(Non-Partisan Elections) Filed January 18, 1922. No signature petitions presented for checking.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 42	(Workmen's Compensation Measure) Filed January 24, 1922. No signature petitions presented for checking. (Workmen's Compensation Measure) Filed January 24, 1922. No signature petitions presented for checking.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 43	(Relating to Injunctions in Labor Disputes) Filed January 24, 1922. No signature petitions presented for checking.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 44	(Relating to Municipal Ownership) Filed January 28, 1922. No signature petitions presented for checking.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 45	(Legislative Reapportionment) Filed February 14, 1922. No signature petitions presented for checking.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 46	(*30-10* School Plan) Filed February 21, 1922. Submitted to the voters at the state general election held on November 7, 1922 and rejected by the following vote: For - 99,150 Against - 150,114.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 47	(Workmen's Compensation Measure) Filed March 27, 1922. No signature petitions presented for checking.

INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 48	(Compulsory School Attendance) Filed January 7, 1924. No signature petitions presented for checking.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 49	(Compulsory School Attendance) Filed January 15, 1924. Submitted to the voters at the state general election held on November 4, 1924 and rejected by the following vote: For - 158,922 Against - 221,500.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 50	(Limitation of Taxation) Filed February 21, 1924. Submitted to the voters at the state general election held on November 4, 1924 and rejected by the following vote: For - 128,677 Against - 211, 948.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 51	(Pertaining to Salmon Fishing) Filed April 2, 1924. No signature petitions presented for checking.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 52	(Electric Power Measure) Filed April 8, 1924. Submitted to the voters at the state general election held on November 4, 1924 and rejected by the following vote: For - 139,492 Against - 217,393.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 53	(Relating to Sanipractic) Filed February 4, 1926. No signature petitions presented for checking.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 54	(State Commission to License and Regulate Horse-racing, Pool-selling, etc. - Pari-mutuel Measure) Filed February 5, 1926. No signature petitions presented for checking.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 55	(Prohibiting Use of Purse Seines, Fish Traps, Fish Wheels, etc.) Filed February 16, 1928. No signature petitions presented for checking.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 56	(Redistricting State for Legislative Purposes) Filed April 24, 1930. Refiled as Initiative Measure No. 57.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 57	(Redistricting State for Legislative Purposes) Filed April 25, 1930. Submitted to the voters at the state general election held on November 4, 1930 and approved by the following vote: For - 116,436 Against - 115,641. Act is now identified as Chapter 2, Laws of 1931.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 58	(Permanent Registration) Filed January 9, 1932. Submitted to the voters at the state general election held on November 8, 1932 and approved by the following vote: For - 372,061 Against - 75,381. Act is now identified as Chapter 1, Laws of 1933.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 59	(Tax Free Homes) Filed January 9, 1932. No signature petitions presented for checking.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 60	(Licensing of Mercantile Establishments) Filed January 9, 1932. No signature petitions presented for checking.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 61	(Relating to Intoxicating Liquors) Filed January 9, 1932. Submitted to the voters at the state general election held on November 8, 1932 and approved by the following vote: For - 341,450 Against - 208,211. Act is now identified as Chapter 2, Laws of 1933.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 62	(Creating Department of Game) Filed January 9, 1932. Submitted to the voters at the state general election held on November 8, 1932 and approved by the following vote: For - 270,421 Against - 231,863. Act is now identified as Chapter 3, Laws of 1933.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 63	(Exemption of Homes from Taxation) Filed January 9, 1932. No signature petitions presented for checking.

INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 64	(Limits tax Levy on Real and Personal Property to 40 Mills) Filed January 9, 1932. Submitted to the voters at the state general election held on November 8, 1932 and approved by the following vote: For - 303,384 Against - 190,619. Act is now identified as Chapter 4, Laws of 1933.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 65	(Cascade Mountain Tunnel) Filed February 19, 1932. No signature petitions presented for checking.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 66	(Scientific Birth Control) Filed February 26, 1932. No signature petitions presented for checking.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 67	(Abolishes Excise Tax on Butter Substitutes) Filed March 7, 1932. No signature petitions presented for checking.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 68	(Unemployment Insurance) Filed March 21, 1932. No signature petitions presented for checking. (Unemployment Insurance) Filed March 21, 1932. No signature petitions presented for checking.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 69	(Income Tax Measure) Filed March 22, 1932. Submitted to the voters at the state general election held on November 8, 1932 and approved by the following vote: For - 322,919 Against - 136,983. Act is now identified as Chapter 5, Laws of 1933.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 70	(Compulsory Military Training Prohibited) Filed April 4, 1932. No signature petitions presented for checking.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 71	(Liquor Control) Filed January 8, 1934. No signature petitions presented for checking.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 72	(Distribution of Highway Funds) Filed January 8, 1934. No signature petitions presented for checking.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 73	(Catching of Fish) Filed January 8, 1934. No signature petitions presented for checking.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 74	(Tax Free Homes) Filed January 8, 1934. No signature petitions presented for checking.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 75	(Unemployment Insurance) Filed January 19, 1934. No signature petitions presented for checking.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 76	(Tax Free Homes) Filed January 22, 1934. No signature petitions presented for checking.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 77	(Fish Traps and Fishing Regulations) Filed February 1, 1934. Submitted to the voters at the state general election held on November 6, 1934 and approved by the following vote: For - 275,507 Against - 153,811. Act is now identified as Chapter 1, Laws of 1935.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 78	(Distribution of Highway Funds) Filed February 9, 1934. No signature petitions presented for checking.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 79	(Welfare, Old Age Pensions, Liquor Tax) Filed February 20, 1934. No signature petitions presented for checking.
INITIATIVE MEASURE	(Liquor Control) Filed February 24, 1934. No signature petitions presented for checking.

NO. 80

---

**INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 81** (Liquor Control) Filed February 28, 1934. No signature petitions presented for checking.

---

**INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 82** (Fishing Regulations) Filed March 10, 1934. No signature petitions presented for checking.

---

**INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 83** (State Sale of Gasoline) Filed March 16, 1934. No signature petitions presented for checking.

---

**INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 84** (Blanket Primary) Filed March 17, 1934. No signature petitions presented for checking.

---

**INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 85** (State Fire Insurance) Filed March 17, 1934. No signature petitions presented for checking. (State Fire Insurance) Filed March 17, 1934. No signature petitions presented for checking.

---

**INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 86** (State Fire Insurance) Filed March 21, 1934. No signature petitions presented for checking.

---

**INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 87** (Workmen's Compensation) Filed March 22, 1934. No signature petitions presented for checking.

---

**INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 88** (Liquor Control) Filed March 24, 1934. No signature petitions presented for checking.

---

**INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 89** (One Man Grand Jury) Filed March 30, 1934. No signature petitions presented for checking.

---

**INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 90** (Criminal Appeals) Filed March 30, 1934. No signature petitions presented for checking.

---

**INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 91** (Regulating Motor Carriers) Filed March 31, 1934. No signature petitions presented for checking.

---

**INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 92** (Regulating Motor Carriers) Filed April 9, 1934. No signature petitions presented for checking.

---

**INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 93** (Distribution of Highway Funds) Filed May 10, 1934. Signatures were submitted and found insufficient to qualify the measure for the 1934 general election ballot.

---

**INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 94** (40-Mill Tax Limit) Filed May 18, 1934. Submitted to the voters at the state general election held on November 6, 1934 and approved by the following vote: For - 219,635 Against - 192,168. Act is now identified as Chapter 2, Laws of 1935.

---

**INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 95** (Liquor Control) Filed May 26, 1934. No signature petitions presented for checking.

---

**INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 96** (Repeal of Business and Occupation Tax) Filed June 4, 1934. No signature petitions presented for checking.

---

INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 97	(Dog Racing) Filed June 7, 1934. Signatures were submitted and found insufficient to qualify the measure for the 1934 general election ballot.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 98	(Business and Occupation Tax) Filed January 4, 1936. No signature petitions presented for checking.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 99	(Distribution of Highway Funds) Filed January 4, 1936. No signature petitions presented for checking.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 100	(40 -Mill Tax Limit) Filed January 4, 1936. No signature petitions presented for checking.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 101	(Civil Service) Filed January 14, 1936. Submitted to the voters at the state general election held on November 3, 1936 and rejected by the following vote: For - 208,904 Against - 300,274.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 102	(Creating "State Government Bank" Department) Filed January 21, 1936. No signature petitions presented for checking.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 103	(Old Age Pension) Filed January 17, 1936. No signature petitions presented for checking.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 104	(Tax on Gasoline) Filed February 27, 1936. No signature petitions presented for checking. (Tax on Gasoline) Filed February 27, 1936. No signature petitions presented for checking.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 105	Relating to Gill Nets) Filed March 3, 1936. No signature petitions presented for checking. Relating to Gill Nets) Filed March 3, 1936. No signature petitions presented for checking.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 106	(Voter's Identification Certificate) Filed March 3, 1936. No signature petitions presented for checking. (Voter's Identification Certificate) Filed March 3, 1936. No signature petitions presented for checking.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 107	(Tax on Gasoline) Filed March 7, 1936. No signature petitions presented for checking.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 108	(40-Mill Tax Limit) Filed March 12, 1936. No signature petitions presented for checking.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 109	(Admission of Sick to Hospitals) Filed March 14, 1936. No signature petitions presented for checking.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 110	(Annuity for Crippled and Blind) Filed March 27, 1936. No signature petitions presented for checking.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 111	(Admission of Sick to Hospitals) Filed April 8, 1936. No signature petitions presented for checking. (Admission of Sick to Hospitals) Filed April 8, 1936. No signature petitions presented for checking.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 112	(Abolishing Compulsory Military Training) Filed April 9, 1936. No signature petitions presented for checking.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 113	(Tax on Gasoline) Filed April 15, 1936. No signature petitions presented for checking.

<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 114</b>	(40-Mill Tax Limit) Filed April 21, 1936. Submitted to the voters at the state general election held on November 3, 1936 and approved by the following vote: For - 417,641 Against - 120,478. Act is now identified as Chapter 1, Laws of 1937.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 115</b>	(Old Age Pension) Filed April 21, 1936. Submitted to the voters at the state general election held on November 3, 1936 and rejected by the following vote: For - 153,551 Against - 354,162.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 116</b>	(Tax on Gasoline) Filed April 24, 1936. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 117</b>	(Production for Use) Filed May 1, 1936. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 118</b>	(Liens for Labor) Filed May 5, 1936. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 119</b>	(Production for Use) Filed May 9, 1936. Submitted to the voters at the state general election held on November 3, 1936 and rejected by the following vote: For - 97,329 Against - 370,140
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 120</b>	(Tax on Gasoline) Filed May 11, 1936. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 121</b>	(Beer on Sunday) Filed May 14, 1936. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 122</b>	(Pertaining to Bribery and Grafting) Filed May 21, 1936. No signature petitions presented for checking. (Pertaining to Bribery and Grafting) Filed May 21, 1936. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 123</b>	(Business and Occupation Tax) Filed January 27, 1938. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 124</b>	(Distribution of Highway Funds) Filed February 9, 1938. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 125</b>	(Tax on Intoxicating Liquors) Filed February 15, 1938. No signature petitions presented for checking. (Tax on Intoxicating Liquors) Filed February 15, 1938. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 126</b>	(Non-Partisan School Election) Filed February 24, 1938. Submitted to the voters at the state general election held on November 8, 1938 and approved by the following vote: For - 293,202 Against - 153,142. Act is now identified as Chapter 1, Laws of 1939.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 127</b>	(Distribution of Highway Funds) Filed March 14, 1938. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 128</b>	(Civil Service) Filed March 14, 1938. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 129</b>	(40-Mill Tax Limit) Filed March 18, 1938. Submitted to the voters at the state general election held on November 8, 1938 and approved by the following vote: For - 340,296 Against - 149,534. Act is now identified as Chapter 2, Laws of 1939.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE</b>	(Regulation of Labor Disputes) Filed April 6, 1938. Submitted to voters at the state general election held on

NO. 130	November 8, 1938 and rejected by the following vote: For - 268,848 Against - 295,431.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 131	(Civil Service) Filed April 7, 1938. No signature petitions presented for checking.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 132	(Old Age Assistance) Filed April 12, 1938. No signature petitions presented for checking.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 133	(Relating to Licensing Gambling) Filed April 15, 1938. No signature petitions presented for checking.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 134	(Old Age Assistance) Filed April 19, 1938. No signature petitions presented for checking.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 135	(40-Mill Tax Limit) Filed May 14, 1938. Signatures were submitted and found insufficient to qualify the measure for the 1938 general election ballot.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 136	(Relating to Retail Beer and Wine Licenses) Filed June 3, 1938. No signature petitions presented for checking.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 137	(Relating to Gambling) Filed June 9, 1938. No signature petitions presented for checking.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 138	(Relating to Gambling) Filed June 13, 1938. No signature petitions presented for checking.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 139	(P. U. D. Bonds) Filed January 5, 1940. Submitted to voters at the state general election held on November 5, 1940 and rejected by the following vote: For - 253,318 Against - 362,508.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 140	(Liquor Control) Filed January 9, 1940. No signature petitions presented for checking. (Liquor Control) Filed January 9, 1940. No signature petitions presented for checking.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 141	(Old Age Pension) Filed January 11, 1940. Submitted to the voters at the state general election held on November 5, 1940 and approved by the following vote: For - 358,009 Against - 258,819. Act is now identified as Chapter 1, Laws of 1941.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 142	(Chain Store Tax) Filed January 16, 1940. No signature petitions presented for checking.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 143	(Relating to State Sale of Gas and Oil) Filed February 2, 1940. No signature petitions presented for checking.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 144	(Unicameral legislature) Filed February 23, 1940. Withdrawn. Refiled as Initiative Measure No. 147.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 145	(Government Reorganization) Filed March 18, 1940. No signature petitions presented for checking.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 146	(Relating to Sabbath Breaking) Filed March 22, 1940. No signature petitions presented for checking.



INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 147	(Unicameral Legislature) Filed April 9, 1940. No signature petitions presented for checking.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 148	(Liquor Control) Filed May 18, 1940. No signature petitions presented for checking.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 149	(Anti-Subversive Activities) Filed May 23, 1940. No signature petitions presented for checking.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 150	(Intoxicating Liquor Sold by the Drink) Filed January 3, 1942. No signature petitions presented for checking.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 151	(Old Age Assistance) Filed January 3, 1942. Submitted to voters at the state general election held on November 3, 1942 and rejected by the following vote: For - 160,084 Against - 225,027.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 152	(Creating State Elective Offices of Director of Labor and Industries, Director of Social Security and Director of Agriculture) Filed January 27, 1942. No signature petitions presented for checking.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 153	(Reconstitution of Board of State Land Commissioners) Filed February 24, 1942. No signature petitions presented for checking.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 154	(After Discharge Benefits to Persons in the Armed Forces) Filed April 28, 1942. No signature petitions presented for checking.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 155	(Washington Employment Peace Act) Filed January 10, 1944. No signature petitions presented for checking.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 156	(Liberalization of Old Age Assistance Laws) Filed February 19, 1944. Refiled as Initiative Measure No. 157.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 157	(Liberalization of Old Age Assistance Laws) Filed March 3, 1944. Submitted to the voters at the state general election November 7, 1944 and rejected by the following vote: For - 240,565 Against - 403,756.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 158	(Liberalization of Old Age Assistance Laws by the Townsend Clubs of Washington) Filed March 28, 1944. Submitted to the voters at the state general election November 7, 1944 and rejected by the following vote: For - 184,405 Against - 437,502.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 159	(Increase of Injured Workmen's Compensation) Filed January 5, 1946. Signatures were submitted and found insufficient to qualify the measure for the 1946 general election ballot.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 160	(Increase of Injured Workmen's Compensation) Filed January 5, 1946. No signature petitions presented for checking.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 161	(Changing Form of General Election Ballot to Conform with Primary Election Ballot) Filed January 5, 1946. No signature petitions presented for checking.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 162	(Prohibiting the Governor from Employing Members of the Legislature During the Term for which He has been Elected) Filed January 5, 1946. No signature petitions presented for checking.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 163	(Prohibiting the Sale of Beer or Wine by any Person other than the State of Washington) Filed January 9, 1946. Signatures were submitted and found insufficient to qualify the measure for the 1946 general election ballot.

<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 164</b>	(Prohibiting the Sale of Fortified Wines) Filed February 26, 1946. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 165</b>	(Providing for the Sale of Liquor by the Drink) Filed March 1, 1946. Signatures were submitted and found insufficient to qualify the measure for the 1946 general election ballot.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 166</b>	(Relating to Public Utility Districts) Filed April 24, 1946. Signature petitions filed June 29, 1946. Submitted to the voters at the state general election held on November 5, 1946 and rejected by the following vote: For - 220,239 Against - 367,836.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 167</b>	(Providing for Liquor by the Drink at Licensed Establishments) Filed January 2, 1948. Signatures were submitted and found insufficient to qualify the measure for the 1948 general election ballot.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 168</b>	(Providing Liquor by the Drink for Consumption on Premises where Sold) Filed January 2, 1948. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 169</b>	(Providing Bonus to Veterans of World War II) Filed January 2, 1948. Signature petitions filed July 9, 1948 and found sufficient. Submitted to the voters at the state general election held on November 2, 1948 and approved by the following vote: For - 438,518 Against - 337,410. However, State Supreme Court ruled measure unconstitutional February 4, 1949. As a consequence a similar measure was passed into law by the 1949 Legislature (Chapter 180, Laws of 1949).
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 170</b>	(Relating to Liberalization of Social Security Laws) Filed January 13, 1948. Measure refiled as Initiative Measure no. 172.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 171</b>	(Providing Liquor by the Drink with Certain Restrictions) Filed January 19, 1948. Signature petitions filed July 7, 1948 and found sufficient. Submitted to the voters at the state general election held on November 2, 1948 and approved by the following vote: For - 416,227 Against - 373,418. Act is now identified as Chapter 5, Laws of 1949.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 172</b>	(Relating to Liberalization of Social Security Laws) Filed February 26, 1948. Signature petitions filed July 9, 1948 and found sufficient. Submitted to the voters at the state general election held on November 2, 1948 and approved by the following vote: For - 420,751 Against - 352,642. Act is now identified as Chapter 6, Laws of 1949.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 173</b>	(Providing for the Observance of Daylight Saving Time in the State of Washington) Filed May 20, 1948. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 174</b>	(Making application to Congress to call a Convention for the sole purpose of proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to expedite and insure participation of the United States in a world federal government) Filed January 16, 1950. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 175</b>	(Establishing a Department of Youth protection to operate the Washington State Training School and the State School for Girls under non-partisan control) Filed March 31, 1950. No signature petitions presented for checking. (Essential provisions of this measure enacted by the 1951 Legislature - Chapter 234, Laws of 1951)
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 176</b>	(Increasing to sixty-five dollars monthly the minimum grant for certain categories of public assistance, otherwise extending the social security program, and making an appropriation) Filed April 20, 1950. Submitted to the voters at the state general election held on November 7, 1950 and rejected by the following vote: For - 169,400 Against - 534,689.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 177</b>	Filed May 1, 1950. Refiled May 5, 1950 as Initiative Measure No. 178.

<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 178</b>	(Modifying the Citizens' Security Act of 1948 (Initiative Measure No. 172) and transferring the public assistance medical program to the State Department of Health) Filed May 5, 1950. Submitted to the voters at the state general election held November 7, 1950 and approved by the following vote: For - 394,281 Against - 296,290. Act is now identified as Chapter 1, Laws of 1951.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 179</b>	(Liberalizing unemployment compensation benefits and repealing that portion of the Unemployment Compensation Act providing for employer experience rating) Filed May 5, 1950. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 180</b>	(Authorizing the Manufacture, Sale and Use of Colored Oleomargarine) Filed February 4, 1952. Submitted to the voters at the state general election held on November 4, 1952 and approved by the following vote: For - 836,580 Against - 163,752. Act is now identified as Chapter 1, Laws of 1953.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 181</b>	(Prescribing the Observance of Standard Time) Filed February 27, 1952. Submitted to the voters at the state general election held on November 4, 1952 and approved by the following vote: For - 597,558 Against - 397,928. Act is now identified as Chapter 2, Laws of 1953.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 182</b>	(Repealing Sunday Blue Laws) Filed March 24, 1952. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 183</b>	(Petitioning Congress to declare a policy of the United States to live in peaceful coexistence with other nations and to call a conference of the heads of leading nations to negotiate a settlement of existing differences) Filed March 26, 1952. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 184</b>	(Liberalizing Old Age Pension Laws) Filed April 3, 1952. Submitted to the voters at the state general election held on November 4, 1952 and rejected by the following vote: For - 265,193 Against - 646,534.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 185</b>	(Liberalizing Old Age Pension Laws) Filed April 11, 1952. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 186</b>	(Providing a Civil Service System for Employees of County Sheriffs) Filed April 14, 1952. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 187</b>	(Permitting a Modified Coloring of Oleomargarine) Filed May 16, 1952. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 188</b>	(Raising Standards for Chiropractic Examinations) Filed January 4, 1954. Submitted to the voters at the state general election held on November 2, 1954 and rejected by the following vote: For - 320,179 Against - 493,108.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 189</b>	(Legislative Reapportionment) Filed January 4, 1954. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 190</b>	(Presidential Preference Primary) Filed January 6, 1954. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 191</b>	(Attorneys' Fees in Probate) Filed January 21, 1954. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 192</b>	(Regulation of Commercial Salmon Fishing) Filed February 16, 1954. Submitted to the voters at the state general election held on November 2, 1954 and rejected by the following vote: For - 237,004 Against - 555,151.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE</b>	(Statewide Daylight Saving Time) Filed February 23, 1954. Submitted to the voters at the state general

NO. 193	election held on November 2, 1954 and rejected by the following vote: For - 370,005 Against - 457,529.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 194	(Restricting Television Alcoholic Beverage Advertising) Filed March 28, 1954. Submitted to the voters at the state general election held on November 2, 1954 and rejected by the following vote: For - 207,446 Against - 615,794.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 195	(State Toll Commission) Filed March 30, 1954. No signature petitions presented for checking.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 196	(Amending the Unemployment Compensation Act) Filed April 23, 1954. No signature petitions presented for checking.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 197	(Restricting Dams: Columbia River Tributaries) Filed May 12, 1954. No signature petitions presented for checking. (Restricting Dams: Columbia River Tributaries) Filed May 12, 1954. No signature petitions presented for checking.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 198	(Affecting Employer-Employee Relations) Filed January 19, 1956. Submitted to the voters at the state general election held on November 6, 1956 and rejected by the following vote: For - 329,653 Against - 704,903.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 199	(Legislative Reapportionment and Redistricting) Filed February 16, 1956. Submitted to the voters at the November 6, 1956 state general election and approved by the following vote: For - 448,121 Against - 408,287. However, 1957 Legislature extensively amended this act by passing Chapter 289, Laws of 1957 by two-thirds approval of both branches of the Legislature.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 200	(Increasing Public Assistance Benefits) Filed February 27, 1958. No signature petitions presented for checking.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 201	(Washington Fair Labor Standards Act) Filed March 2, 1956. No signature petitions presented for checking.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 202	(Restricting Labor Agreements) Filed January 5, 1958. Signature petitions filed July 3, 1958 and found sufficient. Submitted to voters at the state general election held on November 4, 1958 and rejected by the following vote: For - 339,742 Against - 596,949.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 203	(Wood Pulp Waste Tax) Filed February 23, 1958. No signature petitions presented for checking.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 204	(Civil Service for State Employees) Filed January 8, 1960. No signature petitions presented for checking.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 205	(Authorizing Tavern Spirituous Liquor Licenses) Filed January 8, 1960. Signature petitions filed July 8, 1960 and found sufficient. Submitted to the voters at the November 8, 1960 state general election and rejected by the following vote: For - 357,456 Against - 799,643.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 206	(Authorizing and Licensing "Dentistry") Filed January 11, 1960. No signature petitions presented for checking.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 207	(Civil Service for State Employees) Filed January 13, 1960. Signature petitions filed July 8, 1960 and found sufficient. Submitted to the voters at the November 8, 1960 state general election and approved by the following vote: For - 606,511 Against - 471,730. Act is now identified as Chapter 1, Laws of 1961.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 208	(Authorizing Joint Tenancies in Property) Filed January 13, 1960. Signature petitions filed July 8, 1960 and found sufficient. Submitted to the voters at the November 8, 1960 state general election. Measure approved

into law by the following vote: For - 647,529 Against - 430,698. Act is now identified as Chapter 2, Laws of 1961.

<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 209</b>	(Minimum Old Age Assistance Grants) Filed February 8, 1960. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 210</b>	(Statewide Daylight Saving Time) Filed April 15, 1960. Signature petitions filed July 8, 1960 and found sufficient. Submitted to the voters at the November 8, 1960 state general election and approved by the following vote: For - 596,135 Against - 556,623. Act is now identified as Chapter 3, Laws of 1961.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 211</b>	(State Legislative Reapportionment and Redistricting) Filed January 8, 1962 by the League of Women Voters of Washington. Signature petitions filed on June 29, 1962 and found sufficient. Submitted to the voters at the November 1962 state general election and rejected by the following vote: For - 396,419 Against - 441,085.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 212</b>	(Repealing Certain 1961 Tax Laws) Filed January 8, 1962 by the Citizens' Tax Revolt Group. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 213</b>	(Authorizing and Licensing "Dentistry") Filed January 8, 1962 by the Washington Society of Denturists. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 214</b>	(Restricting the Legislature's Tax Power) Filed February 19, 1962 by the Citizens' Tax Revolt Group. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 215</b>	(Marine Recreation Land Act) Filed January 3, 1964 by the Citizens for Outdoor Recreation, Marvin B. Duming, Chairman. Signature petitions filed on July 3, 1964 and found sufficient. Submitted to the voters at the November 3, 1964 state general election and approved by the following vote: For - 665,737 Against - 381,743. Act is now identified as Chapter 5, Laws of 1965.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 216</b>	(Repeals County, Regional Planning Act) Filed January 3, 1964 by the Committee for Private Property Rights, Joseph W. Shott, Chairman. No Signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 217</b>	(Election of State Game Commissioners) Filed January 8, 1964 by the Washington State Wild Life Council, Inc., Theodore E. Lohman, Vice President. Re filed as Initiative Measure No. 221.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 218</b>	(Automotive Repair Regulatory Act) Filed January 10, 1964 by the Car Owners Association of Washington, John S. Kelly, President. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 219</b>	(Repeal of Metro Enabling Act) Filed January 20, 1964 by the Committee on Constitutional Rights of the State of Washington, Mrs. Ann Kathryn Jensen, Chairman. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 220</b>	(Repeal of Urban Renewal Law) Filed January 20, 1964 by the Committee on Constitutional Rights of the State of Washington, Mrs. Ann Kathryn Jensen, Chairman. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 221</b>	(Election of State Game Commissioners) Filed February 13, 1964 by the Washington State Wild Life Council, Inc., Theodore E. Lohman, Vice President. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 222</b>	(Reallocation of Liquor Sales Revenue) Filed February 20, 1964 by the More & Better Schools for Washington, Lloyd M. Brown, President. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 223</b>	(Extending Saturday Night Closing Hours) Filed February 26, 1964 by the Citizens Committee for Sensible Closing Hours, Chester W. Ramage, President. No signature petitions presented for checking.

<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 224</b>	(Prohibiting City Street Parking Fees) Filed March 31, 1964 by the Committee to Ban Parking Meters in the State of Washington, Edward John Kiter, Chairman. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 225</b>	(Repealing State Statutes Against Discrimination) Filed April 23, 1964 by the Committee for Preservation of Freedom of Choice, William P. Brophy, Chairman. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 226</b>	(Cities Sharing Sales, Use Taxes) Filed January 10, 1966 by the Citizens' Committee for Community Betterment, Wayne C. Booth, Sr. of Seattle, Chairman. 180,898 signatures were filed on July 8, 1966 and found sufficient. Measure submitted to the voters at the November 8, 1966 state general election and rejected by the following vote: For - 403,700 Against - 514,281.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 227</b>	(Buying Back Breakable Beverage Bottles) Filed January 10, 1966 by W. N. Dahmen on behalf of his son Randall Douglas Dahmen of Spokane. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 228</b>	(Tax Exemption: Food and Medicine) Filed February 1, 1966 by Karl J. Beaty of Tacoma. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 229</b>	(Repealing Sunday Activities Blue Law) Filed February 17, 1966 by Lembhard G. Howell, David Sternhoff and Mark Petterson. 187,463 signatures were filed on July 6, 1966 and found sufficient. Measure submitted to the voters at the November 8, 1966 state general election and approved by the following vote: For 604,096 Against - 333,972. Act is now identified as Chapter 1, Laws of 1967.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 230</b>	(Rendering Emergency Aid—Liability Limitation) Filed February 17, 1966 and co-sponsored jointly by the Washington State Association of Fire Chiefs, Washington State Firemen's Association, and Washington Association of Sheriffs and Police Chiefs. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 231</b>	(Repealing Freight Train Crew Law) Filed March 11, 1966 by the Committee for Transportation Economy, Fred H. Tolan, Chairman. Refiled as Initiative Measure No. 233.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 232</b>	(Supreme Court Judges—Powers—Election) Filed March 14, 1966 by Walter H. Philipp of Seattle. No signature petitions presented for checking. Refiled as Initiative Measure No. 31 to the Legislature.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 233</b>	(Repealing Freight Train Crew Law) Filed March 22, 1966 by the Committee for Transportation Economy, Fred H. Tolan, Chairman. 166,866 signatures were filed on July 6, 1966 and found sufficient. Measure submitted to the voters at the November 8, 1966 state general election and approved by the following vote: For - 591,015 Against - 339,978. Act is now identified as Chapter 2, Laws of 1967.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 234</b>	(Civil Service—Certain County Employees—Limited to Class AA and Class A Counties) Filed March 30, 1966 by the Committee to Improve County Government. Refiled as Initiative Measure No. 237.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 235</b>	(Repealing Certain Mental Health Laws) Filed April 1, 1966 by Mrs. Rose R. Garrett Nelson of Puyallup. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 236</b>	(Regulating Highway-Railroad Crossings) Filed April 15, 1966 by the Committee for the Elimination of Public Grade Crossings, Arthur J. McGinn of Spokane, Chairman. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 237</b>	(Civil Service for County Employees) Filed April 15, 1966 by the Committee to Improve County Government, Anne Shannon of Des Moines, Secretary. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 238</b>	(Prohibiting Regulation of Land Use) Filed January 5, 1968 by the Committee for Private Property Rights, Joseph W. Sholt of Olympia, Chairman. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 239</b>	(Mandatory County Civil Service System) Filed January 10, 1968 by the Special Committee of the King County Employees Association, Walter P. Barclay of Seattle, Chairman. No signature petitions presented for

checking.

INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 240	(Termination of Certain Land Use Regulations) Filed January 15, 1968 by Robert W. Sollars of Everett. No signature petitions presented for checking.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 241	(Calling 1970 State Constitutional Convention) Filed February 2, 1968 by the Committee to Call a Constitutional Convention, S. Lynn Sutcliffe of Seattle, Chairman. No signature petitions presented for checking.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 242	(Drivers' Implied Consent--Intoxication Tests) Filed February 8, 1968 by the Washington State Medical Association, Dr. Charles P. Larson of Seattle, Vice President. 123,589 signatures were filed on July 3, 1968 and found sufficient. Measure submitted to the voters at the November 5, 1968 state general election and approved by the following vote: For - 792,242 Against - 394,644. Act is now identified as Chapter 1, Laws of 1969.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 243	(Information for Life Insurance Purchasers) Filed February 19, 1968 by Theodore Radcliff of Wenatchee. No signature petitions presented for checking.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 244	(State--County Tax Millage Shift) Filed February 23, 1968 by the Washington State Association of County Commissioners. No signature petitions presented for checking.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 245	(Reducing Maximum Retail Service Charges) Filed April 4, 1968 by Joseph H. Davis, President and Marvin L. Williams, Secretary-Treasurer of the Washington State Labor Council, AFL-CIO. 143,395 signatures were filed July 5, 1968 and found sufficient. Measure submitted to the voters at the November 5, 1968 state general election and approved by the following vote: For - 642,902 Against - 551,394. Act is now identified as Chapter 2, Laws of 1969.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 246	(Property Tax Millage Rate Reallocation) Filed January 6, 1970 by Donald N. McDonald. Refiled as Initiative Measure No. 248.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 247	(Increasing Maximum Retail Service Charges) Filed January 20, 1970 by the Washington Citizens for Competitive Credit, A. F. Carey of Seattle, Secretary-Treasurer. No signature petitions presented for checking.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 248	(Property Tax Millage Rate Reallocation) Filed January 22, 1970 by Donald N. McDonald of Bothell. No signature petitions presented for checking.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 249	(Authorizing Bingo and Other Games of Chance) Filed February 11, 1970 by the Committee for Bingo of Washington, State Representative Mark Litchman, Jr. of Seattle, Chairman. NOTE: Attorney General refused to issue a ballot title for this measure because, in his opinion, the initiative procedure cannot be used to amend the State Constitution. No further action was taken by the sponsor.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 250	(Certain Salary Increases--Voter Approval) Filed February 17, 1970 by the Committee for Voter Approved Salary Increases, Albert C. Navone of Seattle, Chairman. No signature petitions presented for checking.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 251	(State Taxation--To Regulate Imposition) Filed March 12, 1970 by Vick Gould of Tax Limit League, Bellevue. 135,688 signatures were filed on July 3, 1970 and found sufficient. Measure submitted to the voters at the November 3, 1970 state general election and rejected by the following vote: For 504,779 Against - 527,263.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 252	(Property Taxation--Fixing Maximum Rate) Filed March 12, 1970 by Overtaxed, Inc., Harley H. Hoppe, President. No signature petitions presented for checking.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 253	(Open Land--Special Taxation Basis) Filed March 24, 1970 by the Island County Branch of American Taxpayers Association, Inc., John Metcalf, Vice Chairman. No signature petitions presented for checking.

<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 254</b>	(Certain Gambling Activities--Criminal Exemption) Filed March 26, 1970 by the Washington State Federation of Fraternal, Patriotic, City and Country Clubs, M. R. Reynolds, President. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 255</b>	(Prohibiting Certain Nonrefundable Beverage Receptacles) Filed April 20, 1970 by Robert H. Keller, Jr. of Bellingham. Refiled as Initiative Measure No. 256.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 256</b>	(Prohibiting Certain Nonrefundable Beverage Receptacles) Filed April 23, 1970 by Robert H. Keller, Jr. of Bellingham. 188,102 signatures filed on July 1, 1970 and found sufficient. Measure submitted to the voters at the November 3, 1970 state general election and rejected by the following vote: For - 511,248 Against - 538,118.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 257</b>	(Licensing Dog Racing--Pari-mutuel Betting) Filed April 29, 1970 by Donald Nicholson of Kirkland. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 258</b>	(Certain Cities--Grayhound Racing Franchises) Filed January 7, 1972 by Donald Nicholson of Kirkland. 151,856 signatures were filed on July 7, 1972 and found sufficient. Measure submitted to the voters at the November 7, 1972 state general election and rejected by the following vote: For - 526,371 Against - 895,385.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 259</b>	(Providing for Presidential Preference Primary) Filed January 7, 1972 by Bellingham Junior Chamber of Commerce of Bellingham. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 260</b>	(Regulating Horse and Dog Racing) Filed January 7, 1972 by Friends of Dog Racing et al of Federal Way. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 261</b>	(Liquor Sales by Licensed Retailers) Filed January 10, 1972 by Warren B. McPherson and Robert B. Gould of Seattle. 122,241 signatures were filed on July 7, 1972 and found sufficient. Measure submitted to the voters at the November 7, 1972 state general election and rejected by the following vote: For - 634,973 Against - 779,568.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 262</b>	(Minimum Age for Alcoholic Beverage Purchases) Filed January 13, 1972 by David G. Huey of Sedro Woolley. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 263</b>	(Tax Reform) Filed January 19, 1972 by Robert J. Corcoran of Puyallup. Refiled January 31, 1972 as Initiative Measure No. 267.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 264</b>	(Liberalizing State Regulation of Marijuana) Filed January 20, 1972 by Stephen Wilcox, Debbie Yarbrough, and Thomsen Abbott of Olympia. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 265</b>	(Changing Congressional and Legislative Districts) Filed January 20, 1972 by Joe David of Seattle. Refiled as Initiative Measure No. 266.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 266</b>	(Changing Congressional and Legislative Districts) Filed January 25, 1972 by Vernon L. Martin of Olympia. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 267</b>	(Repealing Most Property Tax Exemptions) Filed January 31, 1972 by Robert J. Corcoran of Puyallup. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 268</b>	(Unicameral Legislature) Filed February 9, 1972 by Philip Tenney Rensvold of Olympia. Attorney General refused to write a ballot title because of the opinion that the initiative procedure cannot be used to amend the constitution.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 269</b>	(Examinations for Diplomas and Degrees) Filed February 9, 1972 by Eugene Lydic of Kelso. No signature petitions presented for checking.



INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 270	(Election Campaign Financial Reports) Filed February 10, 1972 by Robert Corcoran of Puyallup. No signature petitions presented for checking.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 271	(Income Tax and Revenue Distribution) Filed February 28, 1972 by Charles Clark Marshall of Seattle. No signature petitions presented for checking.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 272	(Recreational Personal Property--Taxation Removed) Filed March 1, 1972 by Gary K. Balfew of Vancouver. No signature petitions presented for checking.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 273	(Reducing Motor Vehicle Fuel Tax) Filed March 2, 1972 by Margaret C. Tunks of Seattle. Refiled as Initiative Measure No. 274.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 274	(Reducing Motor Vehicle Fuel Tax) Filed March 13, 1972 by Jeffrey R. Perkins of Seattle. No signature petitions presented for checking.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 275	(Regulating Non-Native Wild Animal Sales) Filed March 23, 1972 by Harry and June Delaloye of Seattle. No signature petitions presented for checking.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 276	(Disclosure--Campaign Finances--Lobbying--Records) Filed March 29, 1972 by Michael T. Hildt of Seattle. 162,710 signatures were submitted and found sufficient. Measure submitted to the voters at the November 7, 1972 state general election and approved by the following vote: For - 969,143 Against - 372,693. Act is now identified as Chapter 1, Laws of 1973.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 277	(Camping on Certain Ocean Beaches) Filed April 5, 1972 by Carl P. Hanun of Aberdeen. No signature petitions presented for checking.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 278	(Tax Revision--Income Tax--Schools) Filed April 14, 1972 by Senator Francis E. Holman, Senator Nat Washington, and Representative Charles Moon of Seattle. No signature petitions presented for checking.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 279	(State Funding of Public Schools) Filed May 19, 1972 by Alvin C. Leonard, Jr. of Bothell. No signature petitions presented for checking.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 280	(Limiting Special Legislative Sessions) Filed March 12, 1973 by Axel Julin, Chairman, Committee to Retain a Part Time Citizen Legislature. No signature petitions presented for checking.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 281	(Elected Officials' Salary Increases) Filed June 8, 1973 by Bruce Helm of Alderwood Manor. Refiled as Initiative Measure no. 282.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 282	(Shall state elected officials' salary increases be limited to 5.5% over 1965 levels, and judges' the same over 1972 levels?) Filed June 12, 1973 by Kenneth D. Hansen of Seattle. 699,098 signatures were submitted and found sufficient. Measure submitted to the voters at the November 6, 1973 state general election and was approved by the following vote: For - 798,338 Against - 197,795. Act is now identified as Chapter 149, Laws of 1974, 1st Extraordinary Session.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 283	(Shall it be unlawful, except in an emergency, to hitchhike, or to pick up a hitchhiker along a public highway?) Filed January 18, 1974 by Ms. Sallyann Devine of Seattle. No signature petitions presented for checking.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 284	(Shall corporations pay a 12% excise tax measured by income so that special school levies may be reduced or eliminated?) Filed January 22, 1974 by Representative Charles Moon. No signature petitions presented for checking.
INITIATIVE MEASURE	(Shall all privately or corporately owned land, including residential real estate, annually be taxed a minimum

NO. 285	of \$2.50 per acre?) Filed January 24, 1974 by Donn C. Higley of Seattle. No signature petitions presented for checking.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 286	(Shall the membership of the legislature be reduced from forty-nine senators and ninety-eight representatives to twenty-one senators and sixty-three representatives?) Filed January 30, 1974 by Harley H. Hoppe of Seattle. No signature petitions presented for checking.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 287	(Shall salmon net fishing be prohibited in designated Puget Sound and adjacent waters unless permitted by a newly established commission?) Filed January 31, 1974 by Dr. Charles F. Raab of Port Angeles. No signature petitions presented for checking.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 288	(Shall couples with children under 18 be ineligible for divorce and, upon separation, shall a commission oversee their children's rights?) Filed February 1, 1974 by Joseph Garske of Yakima. No signature petitions presented for checking.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 289	(Shall additional gambling activities, including slot machines and card rooms, be legalized, local regulation prohibited, and the state gambling commission replaced?) Filed February 4, 1974 by Roy Needham of Yakima. No signature petitions presented for checking.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 290	(Shall liquor prices be limited and revenue distribution formulas changed, a new seven-member liquor board created, and an administrator appointed?) Filed February 25, 1974 by Senator William S. "Bill" Day of Spokane. No signature petitions presented for checking.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 291	(Shall parents and other persons be prohibited from inflicting or threatening bodily punishment upon children or mentally retarded persons?) Filed March 12, 1974 by Shirley Amiel of Bellevue. No signature petitions presented for checking.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 292	(Shall criminal penalties for state traffic law violations and laws imposing state retail sales taxes and use taxes be repealed?) Filed March 18, 1974 by Jack Zektzer of Seattle. No signature petitions presented for checking.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 293	(Shall present laws governing modification, renewal or nonrenewal of certificated school employees' contracts be repealed and merit salary systems adopted?) Filed March 18, 1974 by Senator Hubert F. Donohue of Dayton. No signature petitions presented for checking.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 294	(Shall the legislature be reduced to 21 senators and 63 representatives elected from single-member districts established by this initiative?) Filed March 26, 1974 by Elizabeth J. Bracelin and Robert L. Burnham. No signature petitions presented for checking.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 295	(Shall the retail sales tax be eliminated on sales of food, clothing, medicines and medical devices, and residential construction costs?) Filed April 4, 1974 by Richard Dymont, Chairman, Libertarian Party of Washington. No signature petitions presented for checking.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 296	(Shall the 1973 law substituting principles of comparative negligence for those of contributory negligence in civil damage actions be repealed?) Filed April 9, 1974 by James M. Petra of Chehalis. No signature petitions presented for checking.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 297	(Shall any gambling activities be legal when licensed by the state gambling commission and authorized by the municipality where conducted?) Filed April 15, 1974 by Gary Bacon, Chairman, Committee for Local Option. No signature petitions presented for checking.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 298	(Shall an initiative be adopted stating that no person shall serve for more than eight consecutive years in the legislature?) Filed May 10, 1974 by Harry S. Foster of Edmonds. No signature petitions presented for checking.

<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 299</b>	(Shall the tax on retail sales of liquor (spirits) in the original package be reduced by two cents per ounce?) Filed May 13, 1974 by Alfred J. Schweppe on behalf of the Citizens Committee for Lower Liquor Taxes. 134,695 signatures were submitted and found insufficient to qualify the measure for the 1974 general election ballot.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 300</b>	(Shall certain rights of parents regarding public school curricula and teaching materials be defined and some school district programs restricted?) Filed May 13, 1974 by Sally F. Tinner of Steilacoom. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 301</b>	(Shall present laws governing modification, renewal or nonrenewal of certificated school employees' contracts be repealed?) Filed January 18, 1975 by Dorothy Roberts of Bellevue. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 302</b>	(Shall the minimum age for the purchase or consumption of alcoholic beverages be lowered to 18 years?) Filed January 28, 1975 by Diahn Schmidt of Olympia. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 303</b>	(Shall an initiative be adopted declaring persons having served in the Congress a total of twelve years ineligible for reelection?) Filed January 29, 1975 by Gene Goozman, Sr. of Seattle. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 304</b>	(Shall a new commission appoint the director of fisheries and manage food fish and shellfish for commercial and recreational purposes?) Filed February 3, 1975 by Dr. Charles F. Raab of Port Angeles. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 305</b>	(Shall the legal age for the use and consumption of alcoholic beverages be lowered to 19 years?) Filed February 6, 1975 by Richard Spaulding and William G. Bowie, both of Cheney. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 306</b>	(Shall state appropriations be limited to 9% of state personal income and decreases in state support to municipalities be restricted?) Filed February 13, 1975 by Kenneth D. Hansen of Seattle. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 307</b>	(Shall some common school curricula be specified, teaching methods limited and written parental consent to certain school activities be required?) Filed March 7, 1975 by Paul O. Snyder of Tacoma. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 308</b>	(Shall sales and business and occupation taxes be removed from certain transactions involving clothing, food, shelter, and health care products?) Filed March 10, 1975 by Carl R. Nicolai of Seattle. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 309</b>	(Shall the Shoreline Management Act of 1971 and the subsequent amendments to that Act be repealed?) Filed March 14, 1975 by James Mark Toews of Chehalis. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 310</b>	(Shall the present forest practices act be repealed and be replaced with provisions relating solely to requirements for reforestation?) Filed March 18, 1975 by Betty J. Wells of Camano Island. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 311</b>	(Shall the death penalty be mandatory in cases of first degree murder and the definitions of degrees of murder revised?) Filed March 20, 1975 by Representative Earl F. Tilly. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 312</b>	(Shall an initiative be passed lowering certain real property taxes to 1960 levels, or, if greater, those at last transfer?) Filed April 4, 1975 by Donald H. Sallee of Brinnon. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE</b>	(Shall the names of signers of initiative and referendum petitions be confidential and the petitions destroyed)

<b>NO. 313</b>	after they are canvassed?) Filed April 4, 1975 by Donald H. Sallee or Brinnon. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 314</b>	(Shall corporations pay a 12% excise tax measured by income so that special school levies may be reduced or eliminated?) Filed April 16, 1975 by Representative Charles Moon of Snohomish. 136,077 signatures were submitted and found sufficient. Measure submitted to the voters at the November 4, 1975 state general election and rejected by the following vote: For - 323,831 Against - 652,178.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 315</b>	(Shall maximum income levels entitling elderly and disabled persons to certain property tax exemptions be raised to \$10,000.00?) Filed April 18, 1975 by Representatives Eleanor A. Fortson and John M. Fischer. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 316</b>	(Shall the death penalty be mandatory in the case of aggravated murder in the first degree?) Filed May 26, 1975 by Representative Earl Tilly of Wenatchee. 134,290 signatures were submitted and found sufficient. Submitted to the voters at the November 4, 1975 state general election and approved by the following vote: For - 662,535 Against - 296,257. Act is now identified as Chapter 9, Laws of 1975-76 2nd Extraordinary Session.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 317</b>	(Shall evidence of speeding violations obtained by radar, certain other electronic devices or unmarked police vehicles be inadmissible in court?) Filed January 2, 1976 by David L. Sovy of Seattle. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 318</b>	(Shall all minimum age requirements of twenty-one years be reduced to eighteen?) Filed January 6, 1976 by Martin Ringhofer of Seattle. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 319</b>	(Shall an initiative be adopted memorializing Congress to call a federal constitutional convention to limit taxation on income?) Filed January 7, 1976 by Clarence P. Keating, Jr. of Seattle. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 320</b>	(Shall new or increased taxes be prohibited and regular property taxes retained in the districts where they are collected?) Filed January 2, 1976 by Shirley Amiel of Seattle. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 321</b>	(Shall municipalities be empowered to permit gambling within their boundaries, licensed by the state, with tax revenues allocated to schools?) Filed January 13, 1976 by William O. Kumbera and the Committee for Tax Relief Through Local Option Gambling of Ocean Shores. 136,006 signatures submitted and found insufficient to qualify the measure to the state general election ballot.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 322</b>	(Shall fluoridation of public water supplies be made unlawful and violations subject to criminal penalties?) Filed January 2, 1976 by Caroline A. Sudduth of Seattle. 135,441 signatures were submitted and found insufficient to qualify measure to the state general election ballot. Suit was filed with Thurston County Superior Court against the Secretary of State and on appeal to the Supreme Court. Initiative Measure No. 322 was placed on the general election ballot. It was rejected at the November 2, 1976 general election by the following vote: For - 469,929 Against - 870,631.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 323</b>	(Shall an initiative be adopted declaring that no person shall hold most state elective offices more than twelve consecutive years?) Filed January 2, 1976 by Representative Peter von Reichbauer of Burton and Jack Metcalf of Langley. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 324</b>	(Shall the Shoreline Management Act of 1971 and subsequent amendments to that act be repealed?) Filed January 12, 1976 by Melvin G. Toyne of Mt. Vernon. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 325</b>	(Shall future nuclear power facilities which do not meet certain conditions and receive two-thirds approval by the legislature be prohibited?) Filed February 3, 1976 by David C. H. Howard of Olympia. 165,000 signatures were submitted and found sufficient. Measure submitted to the voters at the November 2, 1976 general election and rejected by the following vote: For - 482,953 Against - 993,756.

<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 326</b>	(Shall grocery store sales of spirituous liquor be allowed, revenue distribution formulas changed, and the state liquor control board reconstituted?) Filed March 17, 1976 by Ruth Berliner of Tacoma. Sponsorship of Initiative withdrawn May 17, 1976.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 327</b>	(Shall commercial fishing and shellfishing be banned on Hood Canal until a sufficient supply is found to exist?) Filed March 12, 1976 by J. L. Parsons of Union. Refiled as Initiative Measure No. 330.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 328</b>	(Relating to term limitation) Filed March 16, 1976 by Patrick W. Biggs of Seattle for the Thomas Jefferson Society. Attorney General declined to prepare ballot title.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 329</b>	(Shall places where obscene films are publicly and regularly shown or obscene publications a principal stock in trade be prohibited?) Filed March 26, 1976 by C. R. Loneragan, Jr. of Seattle. 120,621 signatures submitted and found insufficient to qualify the measure for state general election ballot.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 330</b>	(Shall the commercial taking of fish, crab and shrimp be banned on Hood Canal until a sufficient supply is available?) Filed April 12, 1976 by J. L. Parsons of Union. Refiled as Initiative to the Legislature No. 52.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 331</b>	(Shall future school district special levies for operations be prohibited and previously approved operational levies for collection in 1977 be reduced?) Filed March 27, 1976 by Jerald W. Thiedt of Monroe. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 332</b>	(Shall the state be removed from the liquor business in favor of large grocers and certain other private business enterprises?) Filed April 19, 1976 by Robert B. Gould and Warren McPherson of Woodinville. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 333</b>	(Shall a single pension system, coordinated with social security, replace existing systems for most public employees hired after June 30, 1977?) Filed April 19, 1976 by Senator August P. Mardesich of Everett. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 334</b>	(Shall the fluid ounce tax on spirituous liquor in the original package be lowered from four to two cents?) Filed April 29, 1976 by Juanita K. Heaton of Seattle. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 335</b>	(Shall places where obscene films are publicly and regularly shown or obscene publications a principal stock in trade be prohibited?) Filed January 10, 1977 by C. R. Loneragan, Jr. of Seattle. 175,998 signatures submitted and found sufficient. Measure submitted to the voters at the November 8, 1977 general election and approved by the following vote: For - 522,921 Against - 431,989.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 336</b>	(Shall every municipality be authorized to permit all forms of state licensed gambling with tax revenues allocated to schools?) Filed January 11, 1977 by William O. Kumbera of The Committee for Tax Relief Through Local Option Gambling in Ocean Shores. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 337</b>	(Shall an initiative be adopted promoting the pursuit of peace through principals of mutual love and respect?) Filed January 10, 1977 by Kevin McKeigue of Seattle. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 338</b>	(Shall driving motor vehicles up to 10 m.p.h. over the maximum speed limit be subject to fines not exceeding \$15.00?) Filed January 10, 1977 by Timothy Ramey of Seattle. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 339</b>	(Shall the use of electronic voting devices and electronic vote tallying systems in any election in this state be prohibited?) Filed January 24, 1977 by Clarence P. Keating, Jr. of Seattle. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 340</b>	(Shall a convention be called to propose a new state constitution for approval or rejection by the people in 1979?) Filed January 20, 1977 by Tom A. Alberg, Citizens Coalition for a Constitutional Convention. 75,000 signatures were submitted and found insufficient to qualify for the general election ballot.

INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 341	(Shall minimum age requirements for various purposes other than drinking alcoholic beverages be reduced to eighteen years?) Filed February 7, 1977 by Martin Ringhofer of Seattle. No signature petitions presented for checking.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 342	(Shall an initiative be adopted urging all state legislatures to reject and rescind approval of the Federal Equal Rights Amendment?) Filed February 15, 1977 by Mrs. J. L. Glesener of Kennewick. No signature petitions presented for checking.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 343	(Shall state property taxes be eliminated, all other taxes limited, and state support levels for local government, including schools, mandated?) Filed February 29, 1977 by Shirley Amiel, State Tax Freeze and School Funding Initiative Political Committee of Bellevue. No signature petitions presented for checking.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 344	(Shall the laws of the state be rewritten by January 1, 1981, to eliminate, if possible, ambiguity, redundancy and complexity?) Filed March 7, 1977 by Patrick M. Crawford of Tumwater. No signature petitions presented for checking.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 345	(Shall most food products be exempt from state and local retail sales and use taxes, effective July 1, 1978?) Filed March 30, 1977 by J. Linsey Hinand, Chairperson, Coalition Opposing the Sales Tax on Food of Seattle. 168,281 signatures submitted and found sufficient. Measure submitted to the voters at the November 8, 1977 general election and approved by the following vote: For - 521,062 Against - 443,840.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 346	(Shall the system of property assessment be repealed and a state assessor adopt a system of uniform statewide property assessment?) Filed May 31, 1977 by Susan Sink of Seattle. No signature petitions presented for checking.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 347	(Shall payment of legislator's per-diem allowances be limited to 120 days in odd-numbered years and 60 days in even-numbered years?) Filed June 13, 1977 by Robert B. Overstreet of Everett. No signature petitions presented for checking.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 348	(Shall the new variable motor vehicle fuel tax be repealed and the previous tax and distribution formula be reinstated?) Filed June 29, 1977 by Harley Hoppe of Mercer Island. 202,168 signatures submitted and found sufficient. Submitted to the voters at the November 8, 1977 general election and, following a mandatory recount, was rejected by the following vote: For - 470,147 Against - 471,031.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 349	(Shall minimum age requirements for various purposes other than for drinking alcoholic beverages be reduced to eighteen years?) Filed January 12, 1978 by Martin Ringhofer of Seattle. No signature petitions presented for checking.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 350	(Shall public educational authorities be prohibited from assigning students to other than the nearest or next-nearest school with limited exceptions?) Filed February 10, 1978 by Ben Calay of Seattle. 182,882 signatures were submitted and found sufficient. Submitted to the voters at the November 7, 1978 general election and approved by the following vote: For - 585,903 Against - 297,991.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 351	(Shall the age at which persons may purchase, consume or sell alcoholic beverages be lowered from 21 to 19 years?) Filed February 24, 1978 by Timothy J. Niggemyer of Spokane. No signature petitions presented for checking.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 352	(Shall property owners not be liable for a trespasser's injury, unless the property owner intentionally and knowingly caused the injury?) Filed February 27, 1978 by Gayle Crawford of Olympia. No signature petitions presented for checking.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 353	(Shall all containers of alcoholic beverages clearly bear the warning "Contents may cause brain damage, communication breakdown and family degradation?") Filed April 28, 1978 by June and Pam Riggs of Mountlake Terrace. No signature petitions presented for checking.
INITIATIVE MEASURE	(Shall the first \$10,000 value of a residence regularly occupied by its owner or tenant be exempt from

NO. 354	property taxes?) Filed May 5, 1978 by Harley Hoppe of Mercer Island. No signature petitions presented for checking.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 355	(Relating to gambling and sale of liquor by the drink) Refiled as Initiative Measure No. 356.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 356	(Shall gambling and lotteries be permitted, and time and food sale limitations removed from sales of liquor by the drink?) Filed May 23, 1978 by James Banker of Renton. No signature petitions presented for checking.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 357	(Shall the system of property assessment be repealed and a state assessor adopt a system of uniform statewide property assessment?) Filed May 9, 1978 by Susan M. Sink of Seattle. No signature petitions presented for checking.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 358	(Shall assessed valuations of retired persons' residences remain unchanged and non-voted school levies generally be limited to 6% annual increases?) Filed May 31, 1978 by Harley H. Hoppe of Mercer Island. No signature petitions presented for checking.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 359	(Shall increases in state tax revenues and expenditures be limited to the estimated rate of growth of state personal income?) Filed June 6, 1978 by Will Knedlik of Kirkland. No signature petitions presented for checking.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 360	(Shall an initiative be adopted limiting property taxes to 1% of value and requiring 2/3 legislative approval to change taxes?) Filed June 8, 1978 by J. Van Self and A. M. Lee Parker of Tacoma. Sponsors submitted signatures which were found insufficient to qualify the measure to appear on the 1978 general election ballot.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 361	(Shall minimum age requirements for various purposes other than for drinking alcoholic beverages be reduced to eighteen years?) Filed January 8, 1979 by Martin Ringhofer of Seattle. No signature petitions presented for checking.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 362	(Shall an initiative be adapted prohibiting the possession, construction, transportation or sale of nuclear weapons within the state of Washington?) Filed January 18, 1979 by Randall South of Seattle. No signature petitions presented for checking.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 363	(Shall strikes by public school teachers and other certificated employees be prohibited and penalties imposed for participation in such strikes?) Filed January 31, 1979 by Alan Gottlieb of Bellevue. No signature petitions presented for checking.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 364	(Shall persons with physical handicaps be allowed to serve in the state militia and state and local law enforcement units?) Filed February 1, 1979 by Daniel M. Jones of Olympia. No signature petitions presented for checking.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 365	(Shall liquor retailing become a private business and a new five-member Liquor Control Board be created?) Filed February 22, 1979 by Dennis L. Weaver of Seattle. No signature petitions presented for checking.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 366	(Shall liquor retailing become a private business and any required food to liquor sales ratio in licensed restaurants be prohibited?) Filed February 22, 1979 by Dennis L. Weaver of Seattle. No signature petitions presented for checking.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 367	(Shall nursing homes be required to pay employees wages and benefits equal to those paid hospital employees performing comparable work?) Filed February 9, 1979 by John W. Hempelmann of Seattle. No signature petitions presented for checking.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 368	(Shall the State be absolutely prohibited from levying property taxes and school districts be similarly restricted with exceptions?) Filed February 16, 1979 by John R. McBride of Spokane. No signature petitions presented for checking.

INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 369	(Shall the possession or sale of firearms be restricted, and mandatory sentences imposed for the commission of crimes involving firearms?) Filed February 26, 1979 by Steven L. Kendall of Seattle. No signature petitions presented for checking.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 370	(Shall a presidential preference primary be held to determine the percentage of delegate positions allocated each major political party candidate?) Filed March 30, 1979 by Edward H. Hilscher of Seattle. No signature petitions presented for checking.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 371	(Shall nuclear facilities be required to meet certain safety and liability standards and obtain statewide voter approval prior to operation?) Filed April 28, 1979 by William C. Montague of Seattle. No signature petitions presented for checking.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 372	(State lottery) Filed January 4, 1980 by Lawrence C. Clever of Olympia. This measure was refiled as Initiative Measure No. 380.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 373	(Shall a retiree's residence be taxed at its 1977 value or, when retirement occurs after 1981, its retirement year value?) Filed January 4, 1980 by Doyle R. Conner of Longview. No signature petitions presented for checking.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 374	(Shall property tax increases be limited to two percent annually and special property tax exemptions granted to retired persons?) Filed January 4, 1980 by Bill E. Hughes of Vancouver. No signature petitions presented for checking.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 375	(Shall there be mandatory minimum sentences, restricted local firearms regulations, no affirmative action for police and firemen, and additional prisons?) Filed by Kent Pullen of Kent. No signature petitions presented for checking.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 376	(Shall minimum age requirements for various legal purposes, other than for allowing alcoholic beverage consumption, be reduced to eighteen years?) Filed January 16, 1980 by Martin Ringhofer of Seattle. No signature petitions presented for checking.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 377	(Shall liquor retailing become a private business and any required food to liquor sales ratio in licensed restaurants be prohibited?) Filed January 24, 1980 by Walter M. Friel of Tacoma. No signature petitions presented for checking.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 378	(Shall the State be absolutely prohibited from levying any property taxes and school districts be similarly restricted with limited exceptions?) Filed by Art Lee of Bellingham. No signature petitions presented for checking.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 379	(Shall binding arbitration of public school collective bargaining disputes be required, strikes by public school employees prohibited and penalties established?) Filed February 11, 1980 by Cathleen R. Pearsall of Tacoma. No signature petitions presented for checking.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 380	(Shall a state lottery be established and operated by the Gambling Commission, with the profits deposited in the General Fund?) Filed February 11, 1980 by Lawrence C. Clever of Olympia. No signature petitions presented for checking.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 381	(Shall snare and leghold traps be prohibited after January 1, 1986, with certain exceptions including rodent control and public health?) Filed January 31, 1980 by Curtiss J. Clumpner and Howard F. McGraw of Bellingham. The sponsors refiled the measure as Initiative Measure No. 386.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 382	(Shall joint operating agencies obtain voter approval prior to issuing bonds for the construction or acquisition of significant energy facilities?) Filed February 15, 1980 by Tom Casey. Measure was later refiled a Initiative Measure No. 385.



<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 383</b>	(Shall Washington ban the importation and storage of non-medical radioactive wastes generated outside Washington, unless otherwise permitted by interstate compact?) Filed February 7, 1980 by Allan H. Jones of Seattle. 148,166 signatures were submitted and found sufficient. Submitted to the voters at the November 4, 1980 general election and approved by the following vote: For - 1,211,606 Against - 393,415.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 384</b>	(Shall limitations on property taxes and assessments be imposed and other tax increases prohibited except by a two-thirds legislative vote?) Filed February 20, 1980 by Norman Hildebrand of Tacoma. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 385</b>	(Shall joint operating agencies obtain voter approval prior to issuing bonds for the construction or acquisition of significant energy facilities?) Filed March 3, 1980 by Tom Casey of Elma. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 386</b>	(Shall snare and leghold traps be prohibited after January 1, 1986, with certain exceptions, including rodent control and public health?) Filed March 3, 1980 by Curtiss Clumpner of Lynnwood. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 387</b>	(Shall political contributions and campaign practices be limited, conflicts of interest regulated, disclosure requirements increased and statutes in conflict repealed?) Filed March 11, 1980 by Ann Quantock of Olympia. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 388</b>	(Shall Congress be memorialized to create a space shuttle/energy lottery to increase space travel and achieve energy independence?) Filed March 11, 1980 by Jeff Vale of Des Moines. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 389</b>	(Shall it be unlawful to drive a motor vehicle between the hours of one and two o'clock on Sunday afternoon?) Filed March 12, 1980 by Keith G. Wesley of Seattle. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 390</b>	(Shall private retailers replace state liquor stores with Sunday package sales permitted, tax rates revised and certain licensing conditions prohibited?) Filed April 1, 1980 by John Franco of Seattle. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 391</b>	(Shall an initiative be adopted providing that all Washington land shall be taxed exclusive of any improvements on the land?) Filed April 11, 1980 by Jimmy D. Whittenburg of Olympia. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 392</b>	(Shall a retiree's residence be taxed at its 1977 value or, when retirement occurs after 1982, its retirement year value?) Filed January 19, 1981 by Doyle R. Conner of Longview. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 393</b>	(Shall all timber sold by the state, or any political subdivision, be primarily processed within the state, and violations penalized?) Filed January 5, 1981 by Brian Sirls of Tacoma. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 394</b>	(Shall public agencies obtain voter approval prior to issuing bonds for the construction or acquisition of major public energy projects?) Filed January 6, 1981 by Steve Zemke of Seattle. 185,984 signatures submitted and found sufficient. Submitted to the voters at the November 3, 1981 general election and approved by the following vote: For - 532,178 Against - 384,419.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 395</b>	(Shall all property be taxable based on 1977 valuations; revaluations be prohibited; and excess school levies require two-thirds voter approval?) Filed January 5, 1981 by art Lee of Bellingham. No signatures were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 396</b>	(Shall voter approval be required to construct or finance public or private energy facilities costing more than one billion dollars?) Filed January 19, 1981 by Gretchen J. Hendricks and Jim Lazar of Olympia. No signature petitions present for checking.

<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 397</b>	(Shall an initiative be adopted requiring the legislature to petition Congress to call a constitutional convention to rollback gasoline prices?) Filed January 19, 1981 by Robert G. Materson of Ellensburg. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 398</b>	(Inheritance and Gift Tax) Filed by Dick Patten of Seattle. This measure was refiled as Initiative Measure No. 402.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 399</b>	(Shall inheritance and gift taxes be abolished, and state death taxes be restricted to the federal estate tax credit allowed?) Filed February 19, 1981 by Dick Patten of Seattle. Sponsor refiled this initiative as Initiative Measure No. 402.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 400</b>	(Shall excise, inheritance, gift and property taxes be replaced by a transaction tax on receiving property, limited to one percent?) Filed March 27, 1981 by Clarence P. Keating Jr. of Seattle. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 401</b>	(Shall contributions to legislative candidates be limited, publicity practices regulated, disclosure required, and civil enforcement and criminal penalties be imposed?) Filed April 1, 1981 by Carol Jean Coe of Federal Way. 141,282 signatures submitted and found insufficient to qualify for the general election ballot.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 402</b>	(Shall inheritance and gift taxes be abolished, and state death taxes be restricted to the federal estate tax credit allowed?) Filed April 3, 1981 by Dick Patten of Seattle. 161,449 signatures submitted and found sufficient. Submitted to the voters at the November 3, 1981 general election and approved by the following vote: For - 610,507 Against - 297,445.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 403</b>	(Shall the legal possession of handguns or handgun ammunition be restricted, licensing requirements be broadened and criminal penalties be imposed?) Filed March 16, 1981 by Steven L. Kendall of Seattle. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 404</b>	(Shall an independent commission be responsible for both congressional and legislative redistricting every ten years according to certain prescribed standards?) Filed April 30, 1981 by Jolene Unsoeld of Olympia. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 405</b>	(Alcoholic beverages) Filed April 23, 1981 by Robert J. Corcoran of Puyallup. Measure was refiled as Initiative Measure No. 406.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 406</b>	(Shall all liquor retailing become a private business subject to certain restrictions, and the tax on liquor sales be reduced?) Filed May 15, 1981 by Robert J. Corcoran of Puyallup. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 407</b>	(Shall the crime victims' compensation program be continued, funds appropriated, and programs established to provide information to victims and witnesses?) Filed May 20, 1981 by Manuel E. Costa of Marysville. The sponsor withdrew this initiative and later filed it as Initiative to the Legislature No. 75.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 408</b>	(Motor fuel taxes) Filed May 20, 1981 by Harley H. Hoppe of Mercer Island. Measure refiled as Initiative Measure No. 409.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 409</b>	(Shall the motor vehicle fuel and license tax laws be amended to restore prior tax rates and revise revenue distribution?) Filed June 1, 1981 by Harley H. Hoppe of Mercer Island. No signature petitions submitted for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 410</b>	(Shall all real and personal property be taxable on the basis of 1977 valuations and any revaluation thereafter be prohibited?) Filed January 4, 1982 by Arthur E. Lee of Wenatchee. No signature petitions submitted for checking.

<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 411</b>	(Shall most maximum loan and retail sales interest rates be the higher of 12% or 1% over the discount rate?) Filed January 4, 1982 by Marvin L. Williams and Lawrence G. Kenney of Seattle. Measure refiled as Initiative Measure No. 412.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 412</b>	(Shall the maximum interest rate on retail sales be the higher of 12% or 1% over the federal discount rates?) Filed January 4, 1982 by Marvin L. Williams and Lawrence G. Kenney of Seattle. 183249 signatures were submitted and found sufficient. Submitted to the voters at the November 2, 1982 general election and rejected by the following vote: For - 452,710 Against - 880,135.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 413</b>	(Shall the present state owned and operated liquor distribution system be abolished and replaced with licensed privately owned liquor dealers?) Filed January 6, 1982 by Robert J. Corcoran of Puyallup. This measure refiled as Initiative Measure No. 434.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 414</b>	(Shall a system requiring a minimum five cent refund on sales of beer, malt and carbonated beverage containers be established?) Filed January 7, 1982 by Robert C. Swanson (Citizens for a Cleaner Washington) of Seattle. 193,347 signatures submitted and found sufficient. The measure was submitted to the voters at the November 2, 1982 general election and rejected by the following vote: For - 400,156 Against - 965,951.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 415</b>	(Shall a state board of dentistry be established to license and regulate the practice of dentistry independent of licensed dentists?) Filed January 19, 1982 by Homer A. Moulthrop (Citizens of Washington for Independent Dentistry) of Seattle. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 416</b>	(Shall voter approval be required to increase private utility rates by more than eight percent in any twelve-month period?) Filed January 27, 1982 by Wilmot A. Hall, Jr. of Olympia. This measure refiled as Initiative Measure No. 419.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 417</b>	(Shall the taxable value of principal residences of retirees over 60 be frozen at 75 percent of current assessed value?) Filed January 27 1982 by Ann Clifton of Olympia. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 418</b>	(Shall the state's temporarily increased retail sales and use tax rate be reduced from 5.5 percent to 4.5 percent?) Filed February 3, 1982 by Gregory R. McDonald of Redmond. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 419</b>	(Shall voter approval be required to increase most utility rates by more than eight percent in any twelve-month period?) Filed February 11, 1982 by Wilmot A. Hall of Olympia. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 420</b>	(Shall all penalties, taxes and other limitations pertaining to the use, possession, cultivation, sale or transportation of marijuana be removed?) Filed February 22, 1982 by Lawrence P. McMahon of Seattle. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 421</b>	(Shall emission limitations for motor vehicles, air quality standards relating to such emissions and vehicle emission inspection programs be abolished?) Filed February 22, 1982 by Douglas L. Solbeck and Linda D. Solbeck of Lynnwood. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 422</b>	(Shall a transaction tax on money and property transfers, not exceeding 1%, be substituted for excise, inheritance and property taxes?) Filed February 10, 1982 by Clarence P. Keating, Jr. of Seattle. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 423</b>	(Shall most sales or transfers of vehicles, aircraft and boats be taxed at current values, less trade-in, unless previously taxed?) Filed February 25, 1982 by Stephen Michael and Earl N. Dunham of Longview. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 424</b>	(Number assigned in error. Initiative later became Initiative Measure No. 427).

<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 425</b>	(Shall state marijuana criminal prohibitions, except sales for profit, be repealed but municipal prohibitions be permitted for those under eighteen?) Filed March 12, 1982 by Lawrence P. McMahon of Seattle. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 426</b>	(Shall the value of trade-ins of like kind be subtracted from the tax base for state sales and use taxes?) Filed March 12, 1982 by Stephen Michael and Earl N. Dunham of Longview. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 427</b>	(Shall the state Industrial Insurance Act be amended so as to eliminate the option for covered employers of selfinsure?) Filed March 4, 1982 by Jack C. Martin of Olympia. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 428</b>	(Shall per diem, travel expenses and moving allowances to public officers, employees, board members and elected officials be largely prohibited?) Filed March 2, 1982 by V. R. Van Dyk of Seattle. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 429</b>	(Shall public officers' salaries be reduced to 1979 levels; benefits eliminated; and any further salary increases conditioned upon voter approval?) Filed March 2, 1982 by V. R. Van Dyk of Seattle. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 430</b>	(Shall the possession, use, cultivation and transportation of marijuana by persons nineteen years of age and older be legalized?) Filed March 25, 1982 by Lawrence P. McMahon of Seattle. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 431</b>	(Shall laws concerning lobbying, political fund raising, and the use of such funds be amended with fees and penalties imposed?) Filed March 10, 1982 by V. R. Van Dyk of Seattle. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 432</b>	(Shall monthly grants of Aid to Families with Dependent Children be limited to \$300 or \$450, depending upon family size?) Filed March 16, 1982 by Robert S. Havens and Jean M. Havens of Spokane. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 433</b>	(Shall able persons receiving aid to families with dependent children be required to participate in a community work experience program?) Filed March 19, 1982 by Robert S. Havens and Jean M. Havens of Spokane. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 434</b>	(Shall the state owned and operated liquor distribution system be abolished and replaced with licensed privately owned liquor dealers?) Filed April 13, 1982 by Robert J. Corcoran of Puyallup. This initiative was withdrawn and later filed as initiative to the Legislature #78.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 435</b>	(Shall corporate franchise taxes, measured by net income, replace sales taxes on food and state corporate business and occupation taxes?) Filed April 12, 1982 by Dr. James A. McDermott of Seattle. 250,285 signatures were presented and found sufficient. The measure was submitted to the voters at the November 2, 1982 general election and rejected by the following vote: For - 453,221 Against - 889,091.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 436</b>	(Shall most food products be exempt from state and local retail sales and use taxes, effective December 2, 1982?) Filed April 16, 1982 by Gregory McDonald of Redmond. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 437</b>	(Shall the Food Tax Elimination Act of 1982, exempting most food products from retail sales and use taxation be enacted?) Filed April 15, 1982 by Stephen Michael and Frank Brunner of Lacey. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 438</b>	(Shall tuition and fees be reduced, and the legislature set future increases based on a percentage of the educational costs?) Filed April 16, 1982 by Dennis Eagle (People for Affordable College Tuition) of Bremerton. No signature petitions presented for checking.

<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 439</b>	(Shall county energy allocations in energy emergencies be in direct proportion to the percentage voting against Initiative 394 in 1981?) Filed May 5, 1982 by Richard Hastings of Pasco. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 440</b>	(Shall sellers of home electronic equipment be licensed and commercial repairers of such equipment be required to meet competency standards?) Filed April 20, 1982 by Carl E. McDonald of Sunnyside. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 441</b>	(Shall Initiative 394, requiring voter approval of bonds for major energy project construction or acquisition by public agencies, be repealed?) Filed April 27, 1982 by David L. Moore of Richland. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 442</b>	(Shall the present gambling act be repealed, broader gambling activities authorized, taxes imposed, and certain revenues be dedicated to schools?) Filed April 30, 1982 by Harry Rowe (Committee for Gambling Taxes for Schools) of Seattle. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 443</b>	(Shall the present gambling act be repealed, broader gambling activities authorized, taxes imposed, and certain revenues be dedicated to schools?) Filed May 25, 1982 by Clifford A. Stone of Seattle. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 444</b>	(Shall a tax not to exceed 1% be imposed upon transfers of money or property and present taxes be repealed?) Filed January 10, 1983 by Clarence P. Keating of Seattle. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 445</b>	(Shall eligibility for appointment to Game Commission be restricted; fees reduced; and processing of wildlife damage claims be eliminated?) Filed January 10, 1983 by David Littlejohn of Olympia. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 446</b>	(Shall elections be held to approve or disapprove the performance of state agencies designated by petitions signed by 10,000 registered voters?) Filed on January 10, 1983 by James R. Collier of Silverdale. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 447</b>	(Shall the present Gambling Act be repealed; broader gambling activities authorized; taxes imposed, and certain revenues be dedicated to schools?) Filed on January 24, 1983 by Audrey Stone of Seattle. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 448</b>	(Shall retail sales and use taxes be reduced, the watercraft use tax eliminated, and a penalty for tax nonpayment reduced?) Filed on February 23, 1983 by Kent Pullen of Kent. This measure refiled as Initiative Measure No. 452.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 449</b>	(Regarding WPPSS) Filed on February 23, 1983 by Theodore A. Mahr of Olympia. This measure refiled as Initiative Measure No. 451.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 450</b>	(Regarding the Internal Revenue Service Privacy Act and Paperwork Reduction Act) Filed on February 14, 1983 by John A. Klima of Issaquah. Attorney General declined to prepare a ballot title. This measure refiled as Initiative Measure No. 453.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 451</b>	(Shall laws relating to electrical joint operating agencies be repealed and existing agencies be directed to sell assets and terminate?) Filed on March 4, 1983 by Theodore Mahr of Olympia. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 452</b>	(Shall the state sales tax be reduced to 4.5% and business and occupation surtaxes and boat excise taxes be repealed?) Filed on March 11 by Kent Pullen of Kent. 146,590 signatures submitted and found insufficient to qualify the measure for the state general election ballot.

<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 453</b>	(Shall the federal Internal Revenue Service's notices of the Privacy and Paper Work Reduction Acts be, by state law declaration, prohibited?) Filed on March 15, 1983 by John A. Kima of Mercer Island. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 454</b>	(Shall abortions, unless necessary to preserve life, be ineligible for state medical aid to categorically needy persons under Title XIX?) Filed on March 22, 1983 by James L. King, Jr. of Tacoma. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 455</b>	(Shall the state be directed to seek to require payment in gold of state held securities having a gold clause?) Filed on January 9, 1984 by Robert Ellison of Seattle. this measure refiled as Initiative Measure No. 461.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 456</b>	(Shall Congress be petitioned to decommercialize steelhead, and state policies respecting Indian rights and management of natural resources be enacted?) Filed on January 13, 1984 by Ellis Lind of Redmond and S/SPAWN. 201,188 signatures were submitted and found sufficient. The measure was submitted to the voters at the November 6, 1984 general election and approved by the following vote: For - 916,855 Against - 807,925.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 457</b>	(Shall minimum age requirements by public and private entities be reduced to age 18 except those relating to drinking alcohol?) Filed on January 9, 1984 by Martin D. Ringhofer of Seattle. No signature petitions were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 458</b>	(Shall watercraft be taxed on length rather than value and the funds be used for boating safety programs and facilities?) Filed on January 18, 1984 by Joseph L. Williams of Mercer Island. This measure refiled as Initiative Measure No. 459.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 459</b>	(Shall watercraft be taxed on length rather than value and the funds be used for boating safety programs and facilities?) Filed on January 20, 1984 by Louise Miller of Woodinville. No signature petitions were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 460</b>	(Shall an additional tax be imposed, on beer, liquor, and out-of-state wine, for crime victims, alcohol rehabilitation, enforcement, and education?) Filed on January 12, 1984 by E. C. Renas of Lynnwood. No signature petitions were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 461</b>	(Shall the state seek to require corporations which issued securities having a gold clause to make payment in gold coin?) Filed on January 23, 1984 by Robert Ellison of Seattle. No signature petitions were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 462</b>	(Shall Congress be memorialized to create a space shuttle/energy lottery to increase space travel and achieve energy independence?) Filed on January 13, 1984 by Jeff Vale of Seattle. No signature petitions were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 463</b>	(Shall the legislature be directed to petition Congress to either propose a balanced budget constitutional amendment or call a convention?) Filed on January 24, 1984 by James R. Medley of Seattle. No signature petitions were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 464</b>	(Shall the value of trade-ins of like kind property be excluded from the selling price for the sales tax computation?) Filed on January 24, 1984 by Eugene A. Prince of Thornton. 196,728 signatures presented and found sufficient. The measure was submitted to the voters at the November 6, 1984 general election and approved by the following vote: For - 1,175,781 Against - 529,560.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 465</b>	(Shall state sales and business tax rates be reduced and limitations imposed on State General Fund spending and tax increases?) Filed on February 16, 1984 by Kent Pullen of Kent. No signature petitions were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 466</b>	(Shall Nevada type gambling, regulated by the State Gambling Commission, be permitted if approved by voters in cities and counties?) Filed on February 10, 1984 by Fred M. Ladd of Ocean Shores. No signature petitions were presented for checking.

<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 467</b>	(Shall a tax not to exceed 1% be imposed upon transfers of money or property and present taxes be repealed?) Filed on February 14, 1984 by Clarence P. Keating, Jr. of Seattle. No signature petitions were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 468</b>	(Shall real property tax rates be generally limited to one percent of 1975 property tax values, subject to limited adjustments?) Filed on March 20, 1984 by Martin H. Oitesen of Tacoma. No signature petitions were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 469</b>	(Shall the State Gambling Commission be abolished and the net proceeds of some gambling activities be taxed 25% for schools?) Filed on March 15, 1984 by Michael J. Kinsley of Seattle. No signature petitions were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 470</b>	(Shall public funding of abortions be prohibited, and state funding required to prevent deaths of unborn children and pregnant women?) Filed on April 2, 1984 by Michael Undseth of Brier. This measure refiled as Initiative Measure No. 471.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 471</b>	(Shall public funding of abortions be prohibited except to prevent the death of the pregnant woman or her unborn child?) Filed on April 16, 1984 by Michael Undseth of Brier. 162,324 signatures submitted and found sufficient. The measure was submitted to the voters at the November 6, 1984 general election and was rejected by the following vote: For - 838,083 Against - 949,921.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 472</b>	(Regarding federal initiative and referendum powers) Filed on June 25, 1984 by Steven A. Panteli of Bellingham. Attorney General declined to write a ballot title because time limit expired.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 473</b>	(Shall a transaction tax, not to exceed 1% on transfers of money or property replace present state and local taxes?) Filed on January 7, 1985 by Clarence P. Keating, Jr. of Seattle. No signature petitions were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 474</b>	(Shall property taxes be reduced by deleting taxes previously paid on property now exempt from the 106% tax levy calculation?) Filed on January 31, 1985 by Orville L. Barnes of Spokane. This measure refiled as Initiative Measure No. 477.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 475</b>	(Shall Congress be requested to call a constitutional convention solely to propose an amendment providing federal initiative and referendum powers?) Filed on January 23, 1985 by Steven A. Panteli of Bellingham. No signature petitions were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 476</b>	(Shall denturists be licensed by the state and permitted to supply dentures to people without written directives from a dentist?) Filed on February 25, 1985 by Eldo Al Hohman of Seattle. No signature petitions were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 477</b>	(Shall maximum permissible regular property tax levies be reduced by excluding inventory taxes, and voter-approved taxes from the 106% limitation?) Filed on March 14, 1985 by Orville L. Barnes of Spokane. No signature petitions were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 478</b>	(Shall a transaction tax, not to exceed 1%, on transfers of money or property replace present state and local taxes?) Filed on January 6, 1986 by Clarence P. Keating, Jr. of Seattle. No signature petitions were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 479</b>	(Shall state and local governments be prohibited from funding abortion services unless they are necessary to preserve the woman's life?) Filed on January 6, 1986 by Michael Undseth of Lynnwood. 173,858 signatures were submitted and found insufficient to qualify the measure for the state general election ballot.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 480</b>	(Regarding the publishing of names of victims of sexual attack), Filed on January 6, 1986 by Philip A. Hamlin of Shelton. This measure refiled as Initiative Measure #481.

<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 431</b>	(Shall news media identifying victims, witnesses, or those accused, of sex crimes be fined unless law enforcement has requested disclosure?) Filed on January 14, 1986 by Philip A. Hamlin of Shelton. No signature petitions were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 432</b>	(Shall more out-of-state licensed motor vehicles be required to obtain Washington licenses and the penalties imposed for non-compliance be increased?) Filed on January 6, 1986 by M. Anders Tronsen of Duvall. No signature petitions were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 433</b>	(Shall the 55 m.p.h. speed limit adopted for energy conservation be rescinded and higher speed limits be established as appropriate?) Filed on January 7, 1986 by DeAnn Pullar of Bellingham. No signature petitions were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 434</b>	(Shall the state owned liquor stores be permanently closed and grocery stores and other outlets be licensed to sell liquor?) Filed on January 10, 1986 by Russell J. McCurdy of Seattle. This measure was refiled as Initiative Measure No. 487.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 435</b>	(Shall the state be directed to submit a notice to Congress disapproving designation of a Washington nuclear waste repository site?) Filed on January 28, 1986 by Patricia Anne Herbert of Seattle. This measure was withdrawn by the sponsor.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 436</b>	(Shall new taxes or increases in tax rates require a two-thirds vote by the governing body of the taxing authority?) Filed on January 29, 1986 by Don Jewett of Langley. No signature petitions were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 437</b>	(Shall state liquor stores, and state wholesaling of liquor, be discontinued and qualified grocery stores be licensed to sell liquor?) Filed on February 2, 1986 by Russell J. McCurdy of Seattle. No signature petitions were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 438</b>	(Shall the state ferry system be managed by three full-time commissioners who will set ferry fares, staffing levels, and wages?) Filed on February 3, 1987 by Winfred P. Williams of Bainbridge Island. No signature petitions were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 439</b>	(Shall the legislature submit a constitutional amendment requiring voter approval of new taxes and full funding of state retirement systems?) Filed on February 11, 1986 by James L. King, Jr. of Tacoma. No signature petitions were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 439</b>	(Shall knowingly employing, in certain jobs, persons having preferences for or orientation toward conduct defined as sexually deviant, be prohibited?) Filed on February 21, 1986 by Glenn Dobbs of Chehalis. No signature petitions were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 491</b>	(Shall the minimum disability retirement allowance for Washington Public Employees Retirement System members be sufficient to pay for medical insurance?) Filed on February 14, 1986 by Winfred P. Williams of Bainbridge Island. No signature petitions were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 492</b>	(Shall disability retirees under the Washington Public Employees' Retirement System be exempt from paying state recreational use and entry fees?) Filed on February 14, 1986 by Winfred P. Williams of Bainbridge Island. No signature petitions were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 493</b>	(Shall the legislature be statutorily prohibited from increasing taxes or imposing new taxes unless approved by 60% of each house?) Filed on March 11, 1986 by G. Robert Williams of Longview. No signature petitions were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 494</b>	(Shall state bonds be issued to raise funds for consumer grants to be deposited in banks for qualified registered voters?) Filed on March 24, 1986 by Steven A. Tracy of Longview. No signature petitions were presented for checking.



<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 495</b>	(Shall hazardous waste laws be amended to broaden state cleanup enforcement authority, increase and impose fees and specify strict liability?) Filed on April 24, 1986 by Pam Crocker-Davis of Lacey. No signature petitions were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 496</b>	(Shall certain excise taxes imposed in lieu of property taxes be limited to one percent of true and fair value?) Filed on January 5, 1987 by Frank D. Parsons of Bellevue. No signature petitions were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 497</b>	(Shall constitutional impact statements reflecting constitutional compliance or non compliance be required to accompany all bills introduced in the state legislature?) Filed on January 5, 1987 by John A. Klima of Issaquah. No signature petitions were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 498</b>	(Shall approval by two-thirds of a governing body be required for new taxes, tax rate increases, or tax base enlargement?) Filed on January 9, 1987 by D. E. Jewett of Langley. No signature petitions were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 499</b>	(Shall maximum tax rates on real and personal property be reduced and a new maximum include voter approved tax levies?) Filed on January 23, 1987 by Frank D. Parsons of Bellevue. No signature petitions were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 500</b>	(Shall a transaction tax, not to exceed 1% on transfers of money or property replace present state and local taxes?) Filed on January 20, 1987 by Clarence P. Keating, Jr. of Seattle. No signature petitions were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 501</b>	(Shall the statutory maximum tax per gallon on motor vehicle fuels be reduced to a 15 cents per gallon maximum?) Filed on January 28, 1987 by Cecil F. Herman of Olympia. No signature petitions were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 502</b>	(Shall the state law which requires the driver and passengers of a motor vehicle to use safety belts be repealed?) Filed on February 9, 1987 by Donald T. Adsitt of Kennewick. No signature petitions were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 503</b>	(Shall motor vehicle owners and operators be required to maintain vehicle liability insurance and submit proof thereof to license vehicles?) Filed February 13, 1987 by William D. Smith of Cashmere. No signature petitions were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 504</b>	(Shall individuals' net worth be taxed except for current bonded indebtedness be eliminated, and other taxes be reduced?) Filed on March 17, 1987 by Meta Heller of Olympia. No signature petitions were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 505</b>	(Shall individuals' and trusts' net worth be taxed, not property except for current bonded indebtedness, and other taxes be reduced?) Filed March 27, 1987 by Meta Heller of Olympia. No signature petitions were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 506</b>	(Shall the State conduct a March presidential preference primary for major political party candidates and certain election statutes be changed?) Filed on May 12, 1987 by Eddie Rye, Jr. of Seattle. No signature petitions were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 507</b>	(Shall motor vehicle liability insurance be required to drive in this state and proof of insurance submitted to license vehicles?) Filed on January 12, 1988 by William D. Smith of Cashmere. No signature petitions were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 508</b>	(Shall the maximum for property tax rates be reduced and a maximum established to include tax levies approved by voters?) Filed on January 8, 1988 by Frank D. Parsons of Bellevue. No signature petitions were presented for checking.

<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 509</b>	(Shall the first \$150,000 of each piece of property's assessed valuation be exempt from the payment of the property taxes?) Filed on January 15, 1988 by Frank D. Parsons of Bellevue. No signature petitions were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 510</b>	(Shall a two-thirds vote of approval be required to impose new taxes, increase tax rates, or enlarge the tax base?) Filed on January 12, 1988 by D. E. Jewett of Langley. No signature petitions were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 511</b>	(Shall the 106% levy [id limiting the amount taxing districts can levy as regular property taxes be reduced to 98%?] Filed on January 21, 1988 by Frank D. Parsons of Bellevue. No signature petitions were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 512</b>	(Shall state and local tax rates, fees, fines and other charges be stabilized then reduced 2% annually for five years?) Filed on January 11, 1988 by Judith Anderson of Brush Prairie. No signature petitions were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 513</b>	(Relating to household and commercial movers) Filed on January 19, 1988 by Michael P. Shanks of Seattle. Measure was refiled as Initiative Measure No. 514.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 514</b>	(Shall household and local commercial movers be exempted from rate and service area regulation by the Utilities and Transportation Commission?) Filed on February 11, 1988 by Michael P. Shanks of Seattle. No signature petitions were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 515</b>	(Shall the January state holiday which celebrates the birth of Martin Luther King, Jr. be officially designated "Civil Rights Day"?) Filed on February 10, 1988 by Brian Burgett of Olympia. No signature petitions were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 516</b>	(Shall a transaction tax, not to exceed 1%, on transfers of money or property replace present state and local taxes?) Filed on March 4, 1988 by Clarence P. Keating of Seattle. No signature petitions were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 517</b>	(Shall the state operate waste dumpsites and a Hanford facility, require separation of recyclable refuse, and regulate all garbage collectors?) Filed on March 9, 1988 by Michael P. Shanks of Seattle. No signature petitions were presented for checkin
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 518</b>	(Shall the state minimum wage increase from \$2.30 to \$3.85 (January 1, 1989) and then to 4.25 (January 1, 1990) and include agricultural workers?) Filed on March 21, 1988 by Jennifer Belcher of Olympia and Art Wang of Tacoma. 300,900 signatures were submitted and found sufficient. The measure was submitted to the voters at the November 8, 1988 general election and approved by the following vote: For - 1,354,454 Against - 414,926.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 519</b>	(Shall continued frequent contacts with both parents be the most important factor considered by a court in determining child custody?) Filed on March 3, 1988 by Dan D. Milne of Spokane. No signature petitions were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 520</b>	(Shall blood donors, in a voluntary noncompensatory blood donation program, have the right to designate the recipient of their blood?) Filed on March 29, 1988 by Richard E. Woodrow of Lynnwood. No signature petitions were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 521</b>	(Shall active members of the Washington State Bar Association be ineligible to serve as a state legislative representative or senator?) Filed on March 29, 1988 by Eugene Goozman of Seattle. No signature petitions were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 522</b>	(Relating to sentencing for drug offenses) Filed on March 24, 1988 by James K. Linderman of Yacolt. Measure was refiled as Initiative to the Legislature No. 101.

<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 523</b>	Shall a two-thirds vote of approval be required to impose new taxes, increase tax rates, or enlarge the tax base? Filed on January 9, 1989 by D. E. Jewett of Langley. No signature petitions were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 524</b>	(Shall the state expand the definition of child pornography, restrict display of materials, and limit defenses to sexual exploitation charges?) Filed on January 10, 1989 by Andrea K. Vangor of Kirkland. 163,670 signatures were submitted and found insufficient to qualify the measure for the state general election ballot.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 525</b>	(Shall the first \$100,000 of the assessed value of each piece of property be exempt from payment of property taxes?) Filed on January 9, 1989 by Frank D. Parsons of Bellevue. No signature petitions were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 526</b>	(Shall tax, fee and fine rates be reduced 2% annually for five years and new taxes require two-thirds voter approval?) Filed on January 23, 1989 by Judith Anderson of Vancouver. No signature petitions were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 527</b>	(Shall a transaction tax, not exceeding 1% on the transfers of money or property, replace present state and local taxes?) Filed on January 18, 1989 by Clarence P. Keating of Seattle. No signature petitions were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 528</b>	(Shall state laws relating to child custody be revised emphasizing frequent contact with each parent and each having equal custody?) Filed on January 18, 1989 by Dan Milne of Spokane. No signature petitions were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 529</b>	(Shall blood donors, in a voluntary noncompensatory blood donation program, have the right to designate the recipient of their blood?) Filed on February 16, 1989 by Richard E. Woodrow of Lynnwood. No signature petitions were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 530</b>	(Relating to state tax credits) Filed on April 13, 1989 by Lyle Bates of Spanaway. Measure was refiled as Initiative to the People No. 531.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 531</b>	(Shall business donations for child services, benefiting those with income below 200% of federal poverty guidelines, receive state tax credits?) Filed on April 26, 1989 by Lyle Bates of Spanaway. No signature petitions were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 532</b>	(Shall the 1989 Omnibus Alcohol and Controlled Substances Act be repealed, penalties revised for supplying minors, and some marijuana legalized?) Filed on May 10, 1989 by Michael Shanks of Seattle. No signature petitions were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 533</b>	(Shall child custody laws be revised and court custody orders normally direct equal continued and frequent contacts with each parent?) Filed on January 8, 1990 by Bill Harrington of Edmonds. No signature petitions were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 534</b>	(Shall the display and distribution to minors of sexually explicit materials and performances be further restricted, and criminal defenses limited?) Filed on January 9, 1990 by Andrea K. Vangor of Kirkland. 180,373 signatures were submitted and found insufficient to qualify the measure for the 1990 state general election ballot.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 535</b>	(Shall property value for tax purposes be, the January 1, 1985 value or subsequent sale price, revised annually reflecting cost of living?) Filed on January 9, 1990 by Marijcke V. Clapp of Seattle. No signature petitions were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 536</b>	(Shall minimum sentences ranging from five to forty years be established for each of twenty-one crimes listed in this initiative?) Filed on January 19, 1990 by Thomas R. Connon of Tacoma. No signature petitions were presented for checking.

INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 537	(Shall a transaction tax, not to exceed 1%, on transfers of money and property replace present state and local taxes?) Filed on January 22, 1990 by Clarence P. Keating of Seattle. No signature petitions were presented for checking.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 538	(Shall political contributions be limited regarding amount, timing and residency of contributors, and elected officials restricted on mailings and honoraria?) Filed on January 29, 1990 by Robert E. Adams of Bellevue. No signature petitions were presented for checking.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 539	(Shall a two-thirds vote of approval be required to impose new taxes, increase tax rates, or enlarge a tax base?) Filed on January 26, 1990 by D. E. Jewett of Langley. No signature petitions were presented for checking.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 540	(Shall the state be required to include in the medicaid program coverage for chiropractic services?) Filed on January 22, 1990 by Roxanne Dubarry of Everett. No signature petitions were presented for checking.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 541	(Shall the state and local tax levies on buildings be limited to a maximum of 50% of the current tax rate?) Filed on February 5, 1990 by Charles Caussey of Spokane. No signature petitions were presented for checking.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 542	(Shall the reappraisal of real property for property tax purposes only occur when ownership changes or building construction is completed?) Filed on February 23, 1990 by Gary C. Hoyt of Vashon Island. No signature petitions were presented for checking.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 543	(Relating to state fiscal matters) Filed on March 8, 1990 by Linda W. Matson of Olympia. The initiative was withdrawn by the sponsor.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 544	(Relating to state fiscal matters) Filed on March 8, 1990 by John H. Wright of Elma. The initiative was withdrawn by the sponsor.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 545	(Relating to comprehensive land use planning and economic development) Filed on March 15, 1990 by David A. Bricklin of Seattle. The initiative was withdrawn by the sponsor.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 546	(Relating to state fiscal matters) Filed on March 26, 1990 by Linda W. Matson of Olympia. The initiative was withdrawn by the sponsor.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 547	(Shall state growth and environmental protection goals be implemented by measures including local comprehensive land use planning and development fees?) Filed on March 27, 1990 by Jeffrey D. Parsons of Seattle. 229,489 signatures were submitted and found sufficient. The measure was submitted to the voters at the November 6, 1990 general election and defeated by the following vote: For - 327,339 Against - 986,505.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 548	(Shall some state revenues be placed in reserve and 60% legislative approval required for new or increased general revenue taxes?) Filed on March 29, 1990 by Linda W. Matson of Olympia. No signature petitions were presented for checking.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 549	(Shall state growth and environmental protection goals be implemented by measures including local comprehensive land use planning and development fees?) Filed on March 29, 1990 by Theodore A. Mahr of Olympia. No signature petitions were presented for checking.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 550	(Relating to managing growth and economic development) Filed on March 29, 1990 by Theodore A. Mahr of Olympia. The initiative was withdrawn by the sponsor.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 551	(Shall changes be made relating to real property taxes, including valuing property by its purchase price and costs of improvements?) Filed on April 30, 1990 by Karl Thun of Graham. No signature petitions were presented for checking.

<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 552</b>	(Shall limitations be placed on political campaign contributions and contributors, consecutive terms of office, publicly funded incumbent mailings, and honoraria?) Filed on January 7, 1991 by Robert E. Adams of Bellevue. The measure was refiled as Initiative to the People No. 555.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 553</b>	(Shall there be limitations on terms of office for Governor, Lieutenant Governor, State legislators and Washington State members of Congress?) Filed on January 9, 1991 by Gene J. Morain of Tacoma. 254,263 signatures were submitted and found sufficient. The measure was submitted to the voters at the November 5, 1991 general election. It was defeated by the following vote: For - 690,828 Against - 811,686.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 554</b>	(Shall the display and distribution to minors of sexually explicit materials and performances be further restricted, and criminal defenses limited?) Filed on January 10, 1991 by Andrea K. Vangor of Kirkland. No signature petitions were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 555</b>	(Shall limits be placed on campaign contributions and contributors, consecutive terms of office, publicly funded incumbent mailings, gifts, and honoraria?) Filed on January 17, 1991 by Robert E. Adams of Bellevue. No signature petitions were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 556</b>	(Shall the first \$1,000,000 of appraised value of residential property, and \$2,000,000 for farm residences, be exempt from property taxes?) Filed on January 8, 1991 by David S. Henshaw of Belfair. No signature petitions were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 557</b>	(Shall campaign expenditures be limited to 50% of the elected office term salary and violations result in forfeiture of office?) Filed on January 22, 1991 by Douglas N. Maynard of Sedro Woolley. No signature petitions were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 558</b>	(Shall a limit, three consecutive terms or twelve consecutive years, be set for elected national, state, county, and municipal officers?) Filed on January 22, 1991 by Douglas N. Maynard of Sedro Woolley. No signature petitions were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 559</b>	(Shall property value for tax purposes be the January 1, 1985 value or subsequent sales price, adjusted for cost of living changes?) Filed on January 23, 1991 by Marijcke Clapp of Seattle. 276,653 signatures were submitted and found sufficient. The measure was submitted to the voters at the November 5, 1991 general election and defeated by the following vote: For - 592,391 Against - 869,626.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 560</b>	(Shall abortion laws be revised, restricting availability, requiring tests and reports, and prohibiting public funding unless necessary to save life?) Filed on January 17, 1991 by Paul Keister of Pasco. No signature petitions were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 561</b>	(Shall a transaction tax, not exceeding 1% be levied on money and property transfers, and present state taxes be repealed?) Filed on January 22, 1991 by Clarence P. Keating, Jr. of Seattle. No signature petitions were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 562</b>	(Shall a two-thirds vote of approval be required to impose new taxes, increase tax rates, or enlarge a tax base?) Filed on January 29, 1991 by Don E. Jewett of Langley. No signature petitions were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 563</b>	(Shall elected and appointed state legislative and executive branch officials be limited to serving a cumulative maximum of twelve years?) Filed on February 11, 1991 by Eric McAtee of Tacoma. No signature petitions were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 564</b>	(Shall Washington residents elected to Congress have a lifetime limit of not more than twelve years of elected congressional service?) Filed on February 11, 1991 by Craig A. McMillan of Tacoma. No signature petitions were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 565</b>	(Shall the state be required to include chiropractic services in the medical service assistance program available under the medicaid program?) Filed on January 17, 1991 by Roxanne Lea Dubarry of Everett. No

signature petitions were presented for checking.

<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 566</b>	(Shall campaign spending, for offices subject to the state public disclosure act, be limited to the office term's total salary?) Filed on February 8, 1991 by Edward M. Duke of Gig Harbor. No signature petitions were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 567</b>	(Shall it be unlawful after life is created by conception to intentionally hasten or cause death except for capital punishment?) Filed on February 25, 1991 by Mary L. Jarrard of Everett. No signature petitions were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 568</b>	(Shall pit bull dog owners be required to register, confine, and insure the dogs and remove newborns from the state?) Filed on February 25, 1991 by Laurence C. Mathews of Yakima. No signature petitions were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 569</b>	(Shall Utilities and Transportation regulate some medical service rates, some political contributions be prohibited, and motorcycle helmet requirements be changed?) Filed on February 28, 1991 by Jack Zektzer of Seattle. No signature petitions were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 570</b>	(Shall the state dangerous dog act be amended to require hearings and restrict the regulatory authority of cities and counties?) Filed on March 4, 1991 by Cherie R. Graves of Newport. No signature petitions were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 571</b>	(Shall contributions to state legislative and executive campaigns be limited; and may candidates agreeing to expenditure limitations receive matching funds?) Filed on May 15, 1991 by Calvin B. Anderson of Seattle. The initiative was withdrawn by the sponsor.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 572</b>	(Shall cannabis (marijuana) be legalized for adults; amnesty provided for prior cannabis convictions, tax imposed, and provide liquor board regulation?) Filed on May 15, 1991 by Kevin Clark Keyes of Bellingham. No signature petitions were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 573</b>	(Shall candidates for certain offices, who have already served for specified time periods in those offices, be denied ballot access?) Filed on January 3, 1992 by Sherry Bockwinkel of Tacoma. 206,685 signatures were submitted and found sufficient. The measure was submitted to the voters at the November 3, 1992 general election and approved by the following vote: For - 1,119,985 Against - 1,018,260.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 574</b>	(Shall a transaction tax, not exceeding 1%, be charged on property and money transfers; and state authorized taxes be repealed?) Filed on January 3, 1992 by Clarence P. Keating of Seattle. No signature petitions were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 575</b>	(Shall sales and distribution of condoms be prohibited on public school property; and schools teach and encourage abstinence and monogamy?) Filed on January 9, 1992 by J. M. O'Sullivan of Sultan. No signature petitions were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 576</b>	(Shall cannabis (marijuana) be taxed and legalized for adults; amnesty provided for prior cannabis convictions and cannabis testing be prohibited?) Filed on January 13, 1992 by Kevin Clark Keyes of Bellingham. No signature petitions were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 577</b>	(Shall horse racing statutes be amended including polygraph tests for jockeys, owners, trainers, ticket sellers, and prohibiting some betting combinations?) Filed on January 7, 1992 by Randy Baker of Tacoma. No signature petitions were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 578</b>	(Shall the death penalty and the requirement that all female felons be committed to the women's correctional institution be abolished?) Filed on January 7, 1992 by Randy Baker of Tacoma. No signature petitions were presented for checking.

<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 579</b>	(Shall pit bull dog owners be required to register, confine, and insure those dogs and remove newborns from the state?) Filed on January 21, 1992 by L. C. Mathews of Yakima. No signature petitions were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 580</b>	(Shall defendants in many court proceedings commenced by government have a right to jury trial with substantially expanded jury authority?) Filed on January 21, 1992 by Kevin Clark Keyes of Bellingham. No signature petitions were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 581</b>	(Shall cannabis be available by prescriptions and the Agriculture director regulate hemp growers and distribution of industrial grade cannabis?) Filed on January 22, 1992 by Bryan Estes of Bellingham. No signature petitions were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 582</b>	(Shall political campaign contributions be limited and state and legislative candidates agreeing to campaign spending limits be permitted larger contributions?) Filed on January 23, 1992 by Margaret Colony of Bellevue. 151,601 signatures were submitted and they were found insufficient to qualify the measure for the 1992 general election ballot.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 583</b>	(Shall the Legislature be directed to vote on whether Washington should request Congress to propose a balanced budget constitutional amendment?) Filed on February 4, 1992 by Dianne E. Campbell of Woodinville. No signature petitions were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 584</b>	(Shall the requirements to use motorcycle helmets and seatbelts be repealed and hunters not be required to wear orange clothing?) Filed on February 27, 1992 by Patrick M. Crawford of Littlerock. No signature petitions were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 585</b>	(Shall the 1990 and 1991 Growth Management Acts be repealed; and limits imposed on state and local government land controls?) Filed on February 27, 1992 by Patrick M. Crawford of Littlerock. No signature petitions were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 586</b>	(Shall persons charged with drug crimes have their property seized and receive 50 year sentences; and needle exchange programs prohibited?) Filed on February 27, 1992 by Patrick M. Crawford of Littlerock. No signature petitions were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 587</b>	(Relating to growth management.) Filed on March 17, 1992 by J. M. O'Sullivan of Sultan. The initiative was withdrawn by the sponsor.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 588</b>	(Shall the 1990 and 1991 State Growth Management Acts, which provide requirements for local comprehensive land use planning, be repealed?) Filed on March 18, 1992 by J. M. O'Sullivan of Sultan. No signature petitions were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 589</b>	(Shall spending limits, adjusted by inflation and population; revision of property values for tax purposes; and other changes be approved?) Filed on March 9, 1992 by Barbara M. Lindsay of Redmond. No signature petitions were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 590</b>	(Shall criminals who are convicted of "most serious offenses" on three occasions be sentenced to life in prison without parole?) Filed on March 24, 1992 by John Carlson of Bellevue. No signature petitions were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 591</b>	(Shall public officials and employees be civilly and criminally liable for loss of state trust land or trust asset values?) Filed on May 15, 1992 by Patrick A. Parrish of Trout Lake. No signature petitions were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 592</b>	(Shall the State Auditor be required to audit all state trust lands and assets to determine if losses have occurred?) Filed on May 15, 1992 by Patrick A. Parrish of Trout Lake. No signature petitions were presented for checking.

<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 593</b>	(Shall criminals who are convicted of "most serious offenses" on three occasions be sentenced to life in prison without parole?) Filed on January 6, 1993 by Ida Ballasiotes of Mercer Island. 290,613 signatures were submitted and found sufficient. The measure was submitted to the voters at the November 2, 1993 general election and approved by the following vote: For - 1,135,521 Against - 364,567.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 594</b>	(Shall all present state and local taxes be repealed, and replaced with a flat-rate tax system on transfers of property?) Filed on January 6, 1993 by Clarence P. Keating of Seattle. No signature petitions were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 595</b>	(Shall the sale and use of cannabis (marijuana) be permitted and regulated in places where minors do not have access?) Filed on January 5, 1993 by Wayne H. Nelson of Renton. No signature petitions were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 596</b>	(Shall State law be amended to permit persons to burn wood in homes at any time, regardless of air conditions?) Filed on February 19, 1993 by Ralph E. Miller of Lynnwood. No signature petitions were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 597</b>	(Shall a commission approved by the proponent be created to define goals and lawful conduct for elected and appointed officials?) Filed on January 25, 1993 by Forrest E. Owens of Burley. No signature petitions were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 598</b>	(Shall alcohol sale be regulated to prohibit "happy hours" and limit the amount of alcohol served in any one drink?) Filed on February 19, 1993 by Brian Venable of Tacoma. No signature petitions were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 599</b>	(Shall the state rate, review and compensate public and private education providers selected solely by the parents of school-age children?) Filed on February 19, 1993 by Craig L. Williams of Richland. No signature petitions were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 600</b>	(Shall candidates for state and federal office be limited to two consecutive terms, unless they win more terms by write-in?) Filed on February 10, 1993 by Craig L. Williams of Richland. No signature petitions were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 601</b>	(Shall state expenditures be limited by inflation rates and population growth, and taxes exceeding the limit be subject to referendum?) Filed on March 5, 1993 by Gregory J. Seifert of Vancouver. 249,707 signatures were submitted and found sufficient. The measure was submitted to the voters at the November 2, 1993 general election and approved by the following vote: For - 774,342 Against - 737,735.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 602</b>	(Shall state revenue collections and state expenditures be limited by a factor based on personal income, and certain revenue measures repealed?) Filed on March 3, 1993 by Margaret Johnson of Olympia. 440,160 signatures were submitted and found sufficient. The measure was submitted to the voters at the November 2, 1993 general election and defeated by the following vote: For - 673,378 Against - 836,047.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 603</b>	(Shall persons under age 18 be required to maintain at least a 3.0 grade average to keep their driver's licenses?) Filed on February 26, 1993 by John C. Hawthorne of Olympia. No signature petitions were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 604</b>	(Shall attorneys be required to submit fee disputes to citizen settlement, and be restrained from running for certain public offices?) Filed on March 10, 1993 by Patrick M. Crawford of Olympia. No signature petitions were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 605</b>	(Shall all present state and local taxes be repealed, and replaced with a flat rate tax on transfers of property?) Filed on January 10, 1994 by Clarence P. Keating of Seattle. No signature petitions were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 606</b>	(Shall laws on legislative lobbying, pensions, party caucuses, and campaigning be revised, and the legislature be subject to the public records and open meetings acts?) Filed on January 10, 1994 by Shawn



Newman of Olympia. No signature petitions were presented for checking.

<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 607</b>	(Shall persons other than dentists be licensed to make and sell dentures to the public, as regulated by a new state board of denture technology?) Filed on January 10, 1994 by Vallan Charron of Puyallup. 241,228 signatures were submitted and found sufficient. The measure was submitted to the voters at the November 8, 1994 general election and approved by the following vote: For - 955,960 Against - 703,619.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 608</b>	(Shall government be prohibited from according rights or protections based on sexual orientation, and schools from presenting homosexuality as acceptable?) Filed on January 10, 1994 by Gail L. Yenne of Tacoma. No signature petitions were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 609</b>	(Shall campaign contributions be permitted only from voters, and new restrictions be placed on the use of campaign funds, and shall Initiative 134 be repealed?) Filed on January 12, 1994 by Robert E. Adams of Bellevue. No signature petitions were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 610</b>	(Shall rights based on homosexuality, homosexuals' custody of their own or other children, and governmental approval of homosexuality be prohibited?) Filed on January 10, 1994 by Samuel P. Woodard, Sr. of Ariel. No signature petitions were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 611</b>	(Shall informed consent for abortions be defined and required, a 24 hour waiting period imposed, and related criminal penalties created?) Filed on January 13, 1994 by Matthew W. Aamot of Bellingham. No signature petitions were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 612</b>	(To make Washington a multi-cultural state) Filed on January 10, 1994 by Geoffrey Noah Vasil of Lacey. The Attorney General declined to prepare a ballot title.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 613</b>	(Shall persons other than minors be permitted to grow, sell, and use cannabis (marijuana) as licensed, taxed, and regulated by a new cannabis control board?) Filed on January 13, 1994 by Warren J. Nolze of Seattle. The sponsor refiled the measure as Initiative Measure No. 622.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 614</b>	(Shall one million dollars in state funds be set aside to pay for embryo transfers as an alternative to abortion?) Filed on January 26, 1994 by David S. Henshaw of Belfair. No signature petitions were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 615</b>	(Shall lobbyists be required to obtain one million dollar licenses, and shall employees be entitled to leave for legislative testimony?) Filed on January 26, 1994 by David S. Henshaw of Belfair. No signature petitions were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 616</b>	(Shall all persons be required to take a firearm safety course before purchasing firearms, or be subject to a penalty?) Filed on January 26, 1994 by David S. Henshaw of Belfair. No signature petitions were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 617</b>	(Shall fines be assessed on a sliding scale, based on the convicted person's income and the seriousness of the offense?) Filed on January 26, 1994 by David S. Henshaw of Belfair. No signature petitions were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 618</b>	(School levies) Filed on January 26, 1994 by David S. Henshaw of Belfair. The Attorney General declined to prepare a ballot title.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 619</b>	(Amendments to Legislative Bills) Filed on January 26, 1994 by David S. Henshaw of Belfair. The Attorney General declined to prepare a ballot title.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 620</b>	(Shall vehicles no longer be required to have license tabs, and the gas tax be increased to replace lost revenue?) Filed on January 26, 1994 by David S. Henshaw of Belfair. No signature petitions were presented for checking.

<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 621</b>	(Shall all employees be entitled to increased hourly premium wages for work performed at night, or on Saturday or Sunday?) Filed on January 26, 1994 by David S. Henshaw of Belfair. No signature petitions were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 622</b>	(Shall persons other than minors be permitted to grow and sell cannabis (marijuana) as regulated by a cannabis control board?) Filed on February 11, 1994 by Warren J. Nolze of Seattle. No signature petitions were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 623</b>	(Shall new limitations and conditions be placed on public assistance to families, and certain grandparents be obligated for child support?) Filed on February 8, 1994 by David R. Mortenson of Kent. No signature petitions were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 624</b>	(Shall the business activity tax be reduced for certain businesses, and shall some businesses be exempted from paying this tax?) Filed on February 18, 1994 by Corrie Bender of Kent. No signature petitions were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 625</b>	(Shall persons convicted of certain offenses be required to serve full sentences in total confinement, without possibility of early release?) Filed on February 11, 1994 by Bruce Wilson McKay of Tacoma. No signature petitions were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 626</b>	(Shall regulation of private property be restricted, and certain reductions in value be newly defined as takings which require compensation?) Filed on February 25, 1994 by Daniel Wayne Wood of Hoquiam. No signature petitions were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 627</b>	(Shall the licensing department implement a motorcycle awareness program, paid for by twenty percent of all existing motorcycle license fees?) Filed on March 3, 1994 by Gary W. Lawson of Lacey. No signature petitions were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 628</b>	(Shall persons under eighteen be restricted in obtaining driver's licenses or employment, unless they keep a certain grade point average?) Filed on February 23, 1994 by John C. Hawthorne of Olympia. Refiled as Initiative Measure No. 636.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 629</b>	(Public schools and youth violence prevention) Filed on March 4, 1994 by Thomas G. Erickson of Seattle. Refiled as Initiative Measure No. 635.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 630</b>	(Shall public officers and certain businesses be prohibited from harassing or discriminating against targets of the national security agency?) Filed on March 15, 1994 by Elizabeth Patrick of Spokane. No signature petitions were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 631</b>	(Shall the use of state, county, city, or town funds to fund the national security agency be prohibited?) Filed on March 15, 1994 by Elizabeth Patrick of Spokane. No signature petitions were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 632</b>	(Shall laws concerning possession of firearms, juvenile court jurisdiction, and sentences for drive-by shootings and certain other crimes be revised?) Filed on March 30, 1994 by James L. King, Jr. of Tacoma. No signature petitions were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 633</b>	(Shall juvenile justice and child labor laws be revised, and juvenile programs funded with revenue from specified fees and taxes?) Filed on March 30, 1994 by James L. King, Jr. of Tacoma. No signature petitions were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 634</b>	(Shall state agency commercial activity, rulemaking, staffing, contracting, and lobbying be limited, and \$100 million appropriated for prisons and safety?) Filed on March 30, 1994 by Linda A. Smith of Vancouver. No signature petitions were presented for checking.

<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 635</b>	(Shall the establishment of public charter schools to serve at-risk youth be authorized, and \$250 million appropriated for this program?) Filed on March 30, 1994 by Thomas G. Erickson of Seattle. No signature petitions were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 636</b>	(Shall minors be limited to a conditional drivers' license, and shall minors with good grades permitted to work more hours?) Filed on April 6, 1994 by John C. Hawthorne of Olympia. No signature petitions were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 637</b>	(Shall state laws on property ownership, property tax collection, and vehicle licensing be revised and vehicle excise taxes be removed?) Filed on May 12, 1994 by David Nibarger of Spokane. No signature petitions were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 638</b>	(Shall a transaction tax, not exceeding 1%, be charged on property and money transfers; and state authorized taxes be repealed?) Filed on January 9, 1995 by Clarence P. Keating of Seattle. No signature petitions were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 639</b>	(Shall the state be required to establish state-operated facilities for care of all children who are abandoned, abused, or neglected?) Filed on January 9, 1995 by Jim D. Whittenburg of Olympia. No signature petitions were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 640</b>	(Shall state fishing regulations ensure certain survival rates for non-targeted catch, and commercial and recreational fisheries be prioritized?) Filed on January 9, 1995 by Frank Haw of Olympia. 258,995 signatures were filed and found sufficient. The measure was submitted to the voters at the November 7, 1995 general election and rejected by the following vote: For - 566,880 Against - 767,686.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 641</b>	(Relating to Philadelphia II) Filed on January 9, 1995 by Robert B. Adkins of Tacoma. Attorney General declined to write a ballot title.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 642</b>	(Shall school district voters be authorized to adopt deregulated systems of education delivery, and state education appropriations fixed by formula?) Filed on January 9, 1995 by James and Fawn Spady of Seattle. No signature petitions were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 643</b>	(Relating to property taxes) Filed on January 9, 1995 by Donald Carter of Olympia. The initiative was refiled by the sponsor as Initiative #650.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 644</b>	(Shall government be prohibited from placing children for adoption or foster care with any homosexuals or with cohabiting unmarried partners?) Filed on January 9, 1995 by Samuel P. Woodard, Sr. of Ariel. No signature petitions were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 645</b>	(Shall most laws regulating firearms be repealed, including laws relating to concealed pistols, machine guns, and short-barreled rifles or shotguns?) Filed on January 9, 1995 by Samuel P. Woodard, Sr. of Ariel. No signature petitions were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 646</b>	(Shall the state property tax levy for schools be reduced in stages over three years, and then eliminated?) Filed on January 20, 1995 by Jim D. Whittenburg of Seattle. No signature petitions were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 647</b>	(Shall the members of the state utilities and transportation commission be elected, and their regulatory responsibilities extended to new fields?) Filed on January 11, 1995 by Carl Sparr of Spokane. No signature petitions were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 648</b>	(Shall laws be revised concerning state citizenship, property ownership, travel rights, competency certificates, taxation, licenses, public officers, courts, and legislation?) Filed on January 23, 1995 by David L. Nibarger of Spokane. No signature petitions were presented for checking.

<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 649</b>	(Shall most of the 1993 Health Care Act be repealed, and replaced with insurance modifications and health care savings accounts?) Filed on January 19, 1995 by Jerome A. Blome of Kent. No signature petitions were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 650</b>	(Shall taxes on property used as the owner's principal residence be limited, and property assessment be based on "adjusted value"?) Filed on February 10, 1995 by Donald Carter of Olympia. No signatures were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 651</b>	(Shall the state enter into compacts with Indian tribes providing for unrestricted gambling on Indian lands within the state's borders?) Filed on February 28, 1995 by John Kieffer of Fruitland. 267,401 signatures were filed and found sufficient. The measure was submitted to the voters at the November 7, 1995 general election and rejected by the following vote: For - 350,708 Against - 1,010,787.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 652</b>	(Shall juveniles aged thirteen or more charged with crime while in the possession of a weapon be tried as adults?) Filed on March 10, 1995 by Richard E. Woodrow of Lynnwood. No signature petitions were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 653</b>	(Shall public school, health care and assistance officials report "apparent illegal aliens" to INS and deny them education and services?) Filed on April 7, 1995 by Karen E. Small of LaConner. No signature petitions were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 654</b>	(Shall government be prohibited from placing children for adoption or foster care with any "person who practices right-wing fundamentalist Christianity"?) Filed on June 1, 1995 by William S. Humphrey of Seattle. No signature petitions were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 655</b>	(Shall it be a gross misdemeanor to take, hunt, or attract black bears with bait, or to hunt bears, cougars, bobcat or lynx with dogs?) Filed on January 5, 1996 by Joseph F. Scott of Seattle. 228,148 signatures were submitted and found sufficient. The measure was submitted to the voters at the November 5, 1996 general election. It was approved by the following vote: For - 1,387,577 Against - 815,385.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 656</b>	(Shall pit bull dogs be defined as "potentially dangerous," and subjected to strict requirements for registration, secure enclosures, leashes, collars, warning signs, bonds, and vaccinations?) Filed on January 5, 1996 by Laurence C. Mathews of Yakima. No signature petitions were submitted for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 657</b>	(Shall taxes on property used as the owner's principal residence be limited, state taxes on such properties be eliminated, and assessment based on "adjusted value"?) Filed on January 5, 1996 by Donald W. Carter of Olympia. No signature petitions were submitted for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 658</b>	(Shall an office of state inspector general be created to investigate complaints of malfeasance or abuse by government agencies and business licensees?) Filed on January 5, 1996 by Mx. T. Englerius of Seattle. No signature petitions were submitted for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 659</b>	(Shall the use of gill nets and certain other net fishing gear be prohibited, and release of accidentally caught out-of-season fish be required?) Filed on January 17, 1996 by Robert I. Keating of Freeland. No signature petitions were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 660</b>	(Shall the state and its counties, cities and towns be prohibited from appropriating any funds to support the national security agency of the federal government?) Filed on January 8, 1996 by Elizabeth Patrick of Spokane. No signature petitions were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 661</b>	(Shall the state of Washington restrict the activities of the national security agency, and certain officers be barred from engaging in national security agency activities?) Filed on January 8, 1996 by Elizabeth Patrick. No signature petitions were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 662</b>	(Shall an office of state inspector general be created, with certain administrative and investigative powers, headed by a director appointed for a non-renewable five-year term?) Filed on February 12, 1996 by Maximus T. Englerius of Seattle. No signature petitions were presented for checking.

<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 663</b>	(Shall the industrial, medicinal, and personal use of hemp (cannabis or marijuana) be permitted under some conditions, taxed, and regulated by the liquor control board?) Filed on January 30, 1996 by Thomas A. Rohan of Seattle. No signature petitions were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 664</b>	(Shall the state repeal all existing state taxes, and levy instead a 1% tax on all transfers of property and a temporary 1% property tax?) Filed on February 16, 1996 by Clarence P. Keating, Jr. of Seattle. No signature petitions were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 665</b>	(Shall government agencies be required to make disclosures about laws, to respond to requests for clarification, and to prove constitutionality if the law is questioned?) Filed on February 12, 1996 by Peter M. Brennan of Vancouver. No signature petitions were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 666</b>	(Relating to fishing) Filed on February 22, 1996 by Robert I. Keating of Freeland. Measure was refiled as Initiative No. 668.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 667</b>	(Shall property tax values be frozen at their 1995 levels, plus a maximum two percent annual inflation, and annual tax levy increase be gradually reduced?) Filed on February 20, 1996 by Steven R. Hargrove of Poulsbo. No signature petitions were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 668</b>	(Shall the use of gill nets be prohibited, and release be required of out-of-season fish or juvenile Chinook salmon under 22 inches long?) Filed on February 27, 1996 by Robert I. Keating of Freeland. No signature petitions were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 669</b>	(Shall governments be forbidden to grant any protection or recognize rights based on sexual orientation, and shall schools be prohibited from presenting homosexuality as acceptable?) Filed on February 29, 1996 by Mark Roshak of Bothell. No signature petitions were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 670</b>	(Shall the secretary of state be instructed to place a ballot notice concerning congressional and legislative candidates who have not supported Congressional term limits?) Filed on April 1, 1996 by Charles G. Moore of Redmond. 232,522 signatures were submitted and found sufficient. The measure was submitted to the voters at the November 5, 1996 general election and rejected by the following vote: For - 937,873 Against - 1,146,865.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 671</b>	(Shall amended tribal/state agreements be authorized permitting limited electronic gaming on Indian lands for tribal government purposes, with joint regulation and specified use of revenues?) Filed on April 11, 1996 by Doreen M. Maloney of Mount Vernon. 293,996 signatures were submitted and found sufficient. The measure was submitted to the voters at the November 5, 1996 general election and rejected by the following vote: For - 934,344 Against - 1,222,492.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 672</b>	(Shall grandparents be entitled to petition for visitation rights with their grandchildren, in dissolution, separation and custody proceedings?) Filed on April 22, 1996 by Donna J. Honeycutt of Kennewick. No signature petitions were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 673</b>	(Shall health insurance plans be regulated as to provision of services by designated health care providers, managed care provision, and disclosure of certain plan information?) Filed on January 8, 1997 by Stephen E. Wehrly of Vashon. 241,508 signatures were submitted and found sufficient. The measure was submitted to the voters at the November 4, 1997 general election and rejected by the following vote: For - 521,161 Against - 1,087,903
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 674</b>	(Shall state spending on schools, colleges, and libraries be exempt from the state expenditure cap and revenue increase restrictions established in Initiative 601?) Filed on January 14, 1997 by Jasper MacSiarow of Seattle. No signature petitions were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 675</b>	(Shall property values for tax purposes be rebased to their 1992 levels, and new limitations be imposed on increases in property value and taxes imposed?) Filed on January 28, 1997 by Donald Carter of Olympia. No signature petitions were presented for checking.

<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 676</b>	(Shall the transfer of handguns without trigger-locking devices be prohibited and persons possessing or acquiring a handgun be required to obtain a handgun safety license?) Filed on February 3, 1997 by Thomas C. Wales of Seattle. 239,805 signatures were submitted and found sufficient. The measure was submitted to the voters at the November 4, 1997 general election and rejected by the following vote: For - 496,690 Against - 1,194,004.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 677</b>	(Shall discrimination based on sexual orientation be prohibited in employment, employment agency, and union membership practices, without requiring employee partner benefits or preferential treatment?) Filed on February 11, 1997 by Suzanne J. Thomas of Seattle. 229,793 signatures were submitted and found sufficient. The measure was submitted to the voters at the November 4, 1997 general election and rejected by the following vote: For - 666,073 Against - 985,169.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 678</b>	(Shall dental hygienists who obtain a special license endorsement be permitted to perform designated dental hygiene services without the supervision of a licensed dentist?) Filed on February 10, 1997 by Anita R. Munson of Bellingham. 272,764 signatures were submitted and found sufficient. The measure was submitted to the voters at the November 4, 1997 general election and rejected by the following vote: For - 787,607 Against - 883,488.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 679</b>	(Relating to property taxes) Filed on February 3, 1997 by Winton G. Cannon of Bellevue. Measure was refiled as Initiative No. 681.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 680</b>	(Relating to vehicle excise taxes) Filed on February 3, 1997 by Winton G. Cannon of Bellevue. Measure was refiled as Initiative No. 682.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 681</b>	(Shall property taxes be assessed and valued as of the 1989 assessment, property be assessed at 80 percent of value, and levy requirements be changed?) Filed on March 5, 1997 by Winton G. Cannon of Bellevue. No signature petitions were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 682</b>	(Shall current motor vehicle fees and vehicle excise taxes be repealed, and replaced with a new license and fee system based on four defined categories?) Filed on March 5, 1997 by Winton G. Cannon of Bellevue. No signature petitions were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 683</b>	(Shall violent drug-related and drug possession penalties be revised, medical use of Schedule I controlled substances be permitted, and a drug prevention commission be established?) Filed on March 5, 1997 by Robert K. Killian of Seattle. No signature petitions were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 684</b>	(Shall the retail sales tax be increased by one-half of one percent, with the increased revenue earmarked for fish and wildlife enhancement and education?) Filed on March 19, 1997 by Stanley R. Reed of Oak Harbor. No signature petitions were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 685</b>	(Shall penalties for drug possession and drug-related violent crime be revised, medical use of Schedule I controlled substances be permitted, and a drug prevention commission established?) Filed on April 4, 1997 by Robert K. Killian of Seattle. 245,193 signatures were submitted and found sufficient. The measure was submitted to the voters at the November 4, 1997 general election and rejected by the following vote: For - 659,244 Against - 1,006,964.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 686</b>	(Shall courts be barred from ordering any divorced parents to pay support for the post-secondary education of their dependent children over eighteen years of age?) Filed on January 5, 1998 by Robert J. Hoyden of Seattle. No signature petitions were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 687</b>	(Shall property values for tax purposes be re-based to their 1992 levels, and new limitations be imposed on increases in property value and taxes imposed?) Filed on January 13, 1998 by Donald W. Carter of Olympia. No signature petitions were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 688</b>	(Shall the state minimum wage be increased from \$4.90 to \$5.70 in 1999 and to \$6.50 in 2000, and afterwards be annually adjusted for inflation?) Filed on January 13, 1998 by Rick S. Bender of Bothell. 288,357 signatures were submitted and found sufficient. The measure was submitted to the voters at the November 3, 1998 general election and approved by the following vote: For - 1,259,470 Against - 644,764.

<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 689</b>	(Shall property taxes be assessed and valued as of the 1999 assessment; property be assessed at 80 percent of value, and levy requirements be changed?) Filed on January 13, 1998 by Winton G. Cannon of Bellevue. No signature petitions were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 690</b>	(Shall current motor vehicle fees and vehicle excise taxes be repealed, and replaced with a new license and fee system based on five defined categories?) Filed on January 13, 1998 by Winton G. Cannon of Bellevue. No signature petitions were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 691</b>	(Shall motor vehicle excise taxes be cut in half for 1999, repealed beginning 2000, and the legislature and governor directed to address the revenue impact?) Filed on February 26, 1998 by Timothy Eyman of Seattle. No signature petitions were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 692</b>	(Shall the medical use of marijuana for certain terminal or debilitating conditions be permitted, and physicians authorized to advise patients about medical use of marijuana?) Filed on February 26, 1998 by Robert K. Kilian of Seattle. 260,335 signatures were submitted and found sufficient. The measure was submitted to the voters at the November 3, 1998 general election and approved by the following vote: For - 1,121,851 Against - 780,631.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 693</b>	(Shall the state government and cities, towns, and counties be prohibited from using any money to fund the national security agency of the federal government?) Filed on February 24, 1998 by Elizabeth Patrick of Spokane. No signature petitions were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 694</b>	(Shall the termination of a fetus' life during the process of birth be a felony crime except when necessary to prevent the pregnant woman's death?) Filed on March 31, 1998 by Robert V. Bethel of Poulsbo. 216,716 signatures were submitted and found sufficient. The measure was submitted to the voters at the November 3, 1998 general election and rejected by the following vote: For - 802,376 Against - 1,070,360.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 695</b>	(Shall voter approval be required for any tax increase, license tab fees be \$30 per year for motor vehicles, and existing vehicle taxes be repealed?) Filed on January 4, 1999 by Tim D. Eyman of Mukilteo. 514,141 signatures were submitted and found sufficient. The measure was submitted to the voters at the November 2, 1999 general election and approved by the following vote: For - 992,715 Against - 775,054.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 696</b>	(Shall commercial net, troll, and trawl fishing be prohibited in Washington state fresh and marine waters, except tribal fisheries conducted under a valid treaty right?) Filed on January 4, 1999 by Thomas E. Nelson of Seattle. 234,750 signatures were submitted and found sufficient. The measure was submitted to the voters at the November 2, 1999 general election and rejected by the following vote: For - 682,380 Against - 1,044,872.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 697</b>	(Shall existing vehicle taxes and licensing fees be repealed, and replaced with annual fees of \$10 to \$150, depending on weight, length, and vehicle type?) Filed on January 7, 1999 by Winton G. Cannon of Redmond. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 698</b>	(Shall property tax laws be revised including: rollback to 1990 valuation levels; valuation at 80% of true value; and 60% voter approval required for changes?) Filed on January 7, 1999 by Winton G. Cannon of Redmond. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 699</b>	(Shall state property tax rates be reduced and local real estate sales taxes be revised, with limitations on local government development impact fees and conditions?) Filed on January 4, 1999 by Michael N. Matson of Tumwater. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 700</b>	(Shall counties with a population of less than fifteen thousand be authorized to license or permit electronic gaming devices, including slot machines?) Filed on January 5, 1999 by Linda L. Tatlow of Republic. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 701</b>	(Shall the people of Washington censure those members of the Washington state congressional delegation who voted for articles of impeachment against President William Jefferson Clinton?) Filed on January 22, 1999 by Stephen T. Parkinson of Fall City. No signature petitions presented for checking.

<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 702</b>	(Shall labor organizations operating in this state be required to include certain provisions in their constitutions concerning rights of members, election procedures, and officer accountability?) Filed on January 28, 1999 by Jamie B. Newman of Seattle. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 703</b>	(Shall the state apply to Congress to convene a federal constitutional convention to consider an amendment allowing referendums on federal legislative, executive, and judicial acts?) Filed on February 12, 1999 by William R. Walker of Auburn. The initiative was withdrawn by the sponsor.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 704</b>	(Shall all ground water development for domestic use, and all well drilling with the consent of the landowner, be exempt from government regulation and tax?) Filed on March 15, 1999 by Henry R. Stephenson of Colville. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 705</b>	(Shall liquor taxes be repealed, except the existing \$.07 per liter sales tax on spirits and a new tax of \$2.00 per pure alcohol liter?) Filed on March 3, 1999 by Rachel Hawkrigde of Kirkland. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 706</b>	(Shall the existing system of state-owned liquor stores be abolished, and shall liquor be sold by private businesses regulated by the state liquor control board?) Filed on April 8, 1999 by Rachel Hawkrigde of Kirkland. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 707</b>	(Shall the state investment board be directed not to make investments that benefit the federal reserve system, unless either of two stated conditions is met?) Filed on March 15, 1999 by Michael T. Bell of Lake Forest Park. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 708</b>	(Shall public school teachers, other school district employees, and community and technical college faculty receive a cost-of-living salary increase each year, to begin in 2001?) Filed on April 8, 1999 by Lee Ann Prielipp of Federal Way. The initiative was withdrawn by the sponsor.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 709</b>	(Shall unemployment benefits be extended to employees who are separated from employment due to lockouts commencing on or after January 1, 1999, with certain exceptions?) Filed on May 8, 1999 by James Andrew McPhee of Spokane. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 710</b>	(Shall certain 1999 tax and fee increases be nullified, vehicles exempted from property taxes, and property valuations and property tax increases for each jurisdiction limited?) Filed on January 7, 2000 by Tim D. Eyman of Mukilteo, Leo J. Fagan of Spokane, and Ray D. Benham of Kennewick. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 711</b>	(Shall all transportation funds, including transit taxes, be spent 90% for roads; transportation agency performance audits required; carpool lanes eliminated; and road materials be tax-exempt?) Filed on January 7, 2000 by Tim D. Eyman of Mukilteo, Leo J. Fagan of Spokane, and Ray D. Benham of Kennewick. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 712</b>	(Shall the state property tax levy be reduced and taxes on real estate sales be dedicated to specified purposes, with additional limitations on development fees?) Filed on January 7, 2000 by Michael N. Matson of Tumwater. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 713</b>	(Shall it be a gross misdemeanor to capture an animal with certain body-gripping traps, or to poison an animal with sodium fluoroacetate or sodium cyanide?) Filed on January 7, 2000 by Lisa A. Wathne of Seattle. 261,268 signatures were submitted and found sufficient. The measure was submitted to the voters at the November 7, 2000 general election and approved by the following vote: For - 1,315,903 Against - 1,093,587.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 714</b>	(Shall smoking be prohibited in casinos, bars, taverns, bowling alleys, and all public buildings, except tobacco shops?) Filed on January 7, 2000 by Tod A. Green of Moses Lake. No signature petitions presented for checking.



<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 715</b>	(Shall citizens be permitted to place small memorials upon the public right-of-way where a death has occurred as a result of a motor vehicle accident?) Filed on January 7, 2000 by Anthony G. Blount of North Bend. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 716</b>	(Shall the state establish a health plan open to all residents, with deficits subsidized by health and stop-loss insurers, additional insurer liability and disclosure requirements?) Filed on January 10, 2000 by Raleigh K. Stitt of Seattle. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 717</b>	(Shall the state property tax levy be reduced by 15% and then phased out, additional levy limits be imposed, and certain homeowner tax deferrals provided?) Filed on January 7, 2000 by Gerald D. Schaefer of Aberdeen. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 718</b>	(Shall property taxes be assessed at the 1990 rates, levy increases (except improvements) require a 60% vote, and property be taxed at 80% of value?) Filed on January 11, 2000 by Winton G. Cannon of Bellevue. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 719</b>	(Shall a pension management board of 14 members be established to set retirement system contribution rates, appoint the state actuary, and review pension policy issues?) Filed on January 7, 2000 by Stanley J. Bianchi, Jr. of Blaine. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 720</b>	(Shall retail stores over one hundred thousand square feet in area be restricted to not more than fifteen thousand square feet of nontaxable merchandise?) Filed on January 7, 2000 by Kevin Raymond Galik of Spokane. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 721</b>	(Shall new or expanded retail stores be restricted to no more than ninety thousand square feet in area, except with a vote of the people?) Filed on January 7, 2000 by Kevin Raymond Galik of Spokane. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 722</b>	(Shall certain 1999 tax and fee increases be nullified, vehicles exempted from property taxes, and property tax increases (except new construction) limited to 2% annually?) Filed on January 28, 2000 by Tim D. Eymann of Mukilteo, Leo J. Fagan of Spokane, and Ray D. Benham of Kennewick. 272,878 signatures were submitted and found sufficient. The measure was submitted to the voters at the November 7, 2000 general election and approved by the following vote: For - 1,295,391 Against - 1,022,349.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 723</b>	(Shall the state property tax levy be reduced, revenues in excess of the state expenditure limit be redirected, and local government levy authority be revised?) Filed on January 12, 2000 by Jeffrey C. Sullivan of Yakima. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 724</b>	(Shall the state property tax levy be eliminated, property assessed at 50% of value and taxed at \$5.90 per \$1000, and revaluation laws be repealed?) Filed on February 8, 2000 by Don Carter of Olympia. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 725</b>	(Shall a state health agency be created and develop a health benefits package for state residents, funded by mandatory premiums, employer assessments, and existing taxes?) Filed on February 1, 2000 by Stuart J. Bramhall of Seattle. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 726</b>	(Shall a list be compiled of automobiles and trucks with imitating daytime running lights, and a fee be imposed on motor vehicles with such lights?) Filed on February 1, 2000 by J. H. Vandermeer of Olympia. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 727</b>	(Shall the legislature be directed to enact legislation calling for a federal Constitutional Convention to consider a proposed amendment establishing a national initiative and referendum?) Filed on February 11, 2000 by Richard Lee Moore of Underwood. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 728</b>	(Shall school districts reduce class sizes, extend learning programs, expand teacher training, and construct facilities, funded by lottery proceeds, existing property taxes, and budget reserves?) Filed on February 8, 2000 by Lisa D. Macfarlane of Seattle. 297,199 signatures were submitted and found sufficient. The

measure was submitted to the voters at the November 7, 2000 general election and approved by the following vote: For – 1,714,485 Against – 675,635.

<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 729</b>	(Shall school districts and public universities be authorized to sponsor charter public schools, independently operated, open to all students, and subject to revised state regulation?) Filed on February 23, 2000 by James R. Spady of Seattle. 306,361 signatures were submitted and found sufficient. The measure was submitted to the voters at the November 7, 2000 general election and rejected by the following vote: For – 1,125,766 Against – 1,211,390.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 730</b>	(Shall financial institutions and insurance companies be required to protect consumer privacy through restrictions on obtaining and transferring personal information unless the consumer consents?) Filed on March 16, 2000 by Brian J. Sullivan of Tacoma. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 731</b>	(Shall the legislature be instructed to convene and to adopt a budget for 1999-2001 that reduces all state expenditures by approximately 2.5%?) Filed on March 9, 2000 by John J. McMillen of Everett. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 732</b>	(Shall public school teachers, other school district employees, and certain employees of community and technical colleges receive annual cost-of-living salary adjustments, to begin in 2001-2002?) Filed on March 14, 2000 by Lee Ann Prielipp of Federal Way. 298,722 signatures were submitted and found sufficient. The measure was submitted to the voters at the November 7, 2000 general election and approved by the following vote: For – 1,501,261 Against – 893,01.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 733</b>	(Shall the privacy of personal information be protected through restrictions on collection, use, and disclosure by businesses, with additional protection for financial and medical information?) Filed on March 15, 2000 by J. R. Baker of Bainbridge Island. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 734</b>	(Shall a property tax exemption be provided for real property used as a principal place of residence for persons 61 years of age or older?) Filed on March 24, 2000 by George F. McRoberts, Jr. of Bothell. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 735</b>	(Shall the privacy of personal information be protected through restrictions on collection, use, and disclosure by businesses, with additional protection for financial and medical information?) Filed on April 14, 2000 by J. R. Baker of Bainbridge Island. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 736</b>	(Shall the national security agency be prohibited from performing certain business in the state of Washington?) Filed on March 27, 2000 by Elizabeth Patrick of Spokane. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 737</b>	(Shall the state and counties, cities, and towns be prohibited from funding the national security agency of the federal government?) Filed on March 27, 2000 by Elizabeth Patrick of Spokane. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 738</b>	(Shall 90% of transportation funds, including transit taxes, be spent for roads; transportation agency performance audits required; and road construction and maintenance be sales tax-exempt?) Filed on April 18, 2000 by Suzanne D. Karr of Everett. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 739</b>	(Shall persons convicted of possessing drugs for personal use be sentenced to treatment rather than imprisonment, and personal marijuana possession penalties reduced to civil infractions?) Filed on April 19, 2000 by Jeffrey T. Haley of Seattle. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 740</b>	(Shall the law require that growing trees on publicly owned lands be forever preserved in order to supply oxygen?) Filed on April 19, 2000 by Kurt Weinreich of Olympia. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 741</b>	(Shall the requirement that a person be licensed to practice law before representing others in court or holding certain public offices be eliminated?) Filed on April 19, 2000 by Kurt Weinreich of Olympia. No

signature petitions presented for checking.

<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 742</b>	(Shall the internal revenue service be instructed to comply with federal and state law and to obtain court orders before taking property in this state?) Filed on April 19, 2000 by Kurt Weinreich of Olympia. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 743</b>	(Shall courts of limited jurisdiction be declared not to have the power to impose fines or imprison any person?) Filed on April 19, 2000 by Kurt Weinreich of Olympia. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 744</b>	(Shall the Revised Code of Washington, the Washington Administrative Code, and all municipal ordinances be declared void and inapplicable to flesh and blood people?) Filed on April 19, 2000 by Kurt Weinreich of Olympia. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 745</b>	(Shall 90% of transportation funds, including transit taxes, be spent for roads; transportation agency performance audits required; and road construction and maintenance be sales tax-exempt?) Filed on May 3, 2000 by Tim D. Eyman of Mukilteo. 274,490 signatures were filed and found sufficient. The measure was submitted to the voters at the November 7, 2000 general election and rejected by the following vote: For - 955,329 Against - 1,394,387.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 746</b>	(Shall persons convicted of possessing drugs for personal use be sentenced to treatment rather than imprisonment, and personal marijuana possession penalties reduced to civil infractions?) Filed on May 19, 2000 by Jeffrey T. Haley of Seattle. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 747</b>	(Statement of the Subject: Initiative Measure No. 747 concerns limiting property tax increases. Concise Description: This measure would require state and local governments to limit property tax levy increases to 1% per year, unless an increase greater than this limit is approved by the voters at an election.) Filed on January 8, 2001 by Tim Eyman of Mukilteo, Leo Fagan of Spokane, Ray Benham of Kennewick, and M. J. Fagan of Spokane. 290,704 signatures were filed and found sufficient. This measure was submitted to the voters at the November 6, 2001 general election and approved by the following vote: For - 826,258 Against - 609,266.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 748</b>	(Statement of the Subject: Initiative Measure No. 748 concerns rent increases on residential rental structures or sites. Concise Description: This measure would allow cities and counties to regulate rent increases on residential buildings by requiring notice of increases, prohibiting retaliatory increases, or prohibiting increases on property not meeting health codes.) Filed on January 10, 2001 by Gregory Gadov of Seattle. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 749</b>	(Statement of the Subject: Initiative Measure No. 749 concerns the manner electing certain state and federal officers. Concise Description: This measure would provide that United States Senators and most statewide elected officers would be elected by a system of electoral votes, which would be distributed among the counties, based on county population.) Filed on January 9, 2001 by Richard Newby of College Place. The initiative was withdrawn by the sponsor.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 750</b>	(Statement of the Subject: Initiative Measure No. 750 concerns the manner in which United States presidential electors are awarded. Concise Description: This measure would provide that presidential electors would be awarded in proportion to the number of counties in the state in which each candidate has received a majority of the votes.) Filed on January 9, 2001 by Richard Newby of College Place. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 751</b>	(Statement of the Subject: Initiative Measure No. 751 concerns the primary system for election of public officers. Concise Description: This measure would adopt a blanket primary allowing voters to choose among official party candidates, party-affiliated candidates, and independent candidates for each partisan office. If courts invalidated this system, an alternative is specified.) Filed on January 8, 2001 by Terry Hunt of Coulee City. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 752</b>	(Statement of the Subject: Initiative Measure No. 752 concerns the state expenditure limit. Concise Description: this measure would amend the state's expenditure limit. Separate limits would apply to all state accounts that are subject to allotment control, with certain exceptions. Procedures would be established for adjusting these limits.) Filed on January 16, 2001 by Chad Taylor of Chehalis. No signature petitions

presented for checking.

<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 753</b>	(Statement of the Subject: Initiative Measure No. 753 concerns lands managed by the department of natural resources. Concise Description: This measure would require the department of natural resources to open lands, roads, and gates managed by the department to all people for all uses, including travel by foot, horseback and motor vehicle.) Filed on January 23, 2001 by Ivan Rolig of Bremerton. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 754</b>	(Statement of the Subject: Initiative Measure No. 754 concerns laws applied to "flesh and blood people". Concise Description: This measure would provide that the Revised Code of Washington, the Washington Administrative Code, and all municipal ordinances are not applicable to "flesh and blood people".) Filed on January 8, 2001 by Kurt Weinreich of Olympia. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 755</b>	(Statement of the Subject: Initiative Measure No. 755 concerns the public disclosure act. Concise Description: This measure would direct courts to impose a one hundred dollar per day penalty when an agency acting in bad faith denies a person inspection or copying of a public record.) Filed on January 8, 2001 by Kurt Weinreich of Olympia. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 756</b>	(Statement of the Subject: Initiative Measure No. 756 concerns limiting federal jurisdiction. Concise Description: This measure would purport to limit federal laws to the District of Columbia, territories such as Guam, and navigable waters, and provide that federal laws do not apply within the State of Washington.) Filed on January 8, 2001 by Kurt Weinreich of Olympia. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 757</b>	(Statement of the Subject: Initiative Measure No. 757 concerns the internal revenue service. Concise Description: This measure would purport to require the internal revenue service to comply with state and federal laws and constitutional provisions, including proceeding in state superior court prior to executing federal tax liens.) Filed on January 8, 2001 by Kurt Weinreich of Olympia. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 758</b>	(Statement of the Subject: Initiative Measure No. 758 contracts creating private monopolies. Concise Description: This measure would declare all contracts creating private monopolies of public resources to be void and unconstitutional, and allow for a thousand dollar per day fine against persons attempting to enforce such contracts.) Filed on January 8, 2001 by Kurt Weinreich of Olympia. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 759</b>	(Statement of the Subject: Initiative Measure No. 759 concerns the state bar association and attorney licensing. Concise Description: This measure would declare the state bar association unconstitutional, provide that the department of licensing would test and license attorneys, and alter laws concerning attorney discipline.) Filed on January 8, 2001 by Kurt Weinreich of Olympia. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 760</b>	(Statement of the Subject: Initiative Measure No. 760 concerns causes of action for violations of state civil rights. Concise Description: This measure would authorize lawsuits and attorney fees against any person who, acting under color of state or local law, violates rights secured by the state Constitution or by any state laws.) Filed on January 8, 2001 by Richard Shepard of Tacoma. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 761</b>	(Statement of the Subject: Initiative Measure No. 761 concerns liability for restricting the use of private real property. Concise Description: This measure would require state and local governments to pay compensation and attorney fees if a law or government act restricted the use of privately owned real property and reduced its market value.) Filed on January 8, 2001 by Richard Shepard of Tacoma. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 762</b>	(Statement of the Subject: Initiative Measure No. 762 concerns restricting the civil forfeiture of property. Concise Description: This measure would generally prohibit the forfeiture of property (other than "contraband") unless the owner had been convicted of a crime and the property was clearly instrumental in committing or facilitating the crime.) Filed on January 8, 2001 by Richard Shepard of Tacoma. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE</b>	(Statement of the Subject: Initiative Measure No. 763 concerns preservation of the blanket primary. Concise

<b>NO. 763</b>	Description: This measure would declare that the people oppose action by the political parties to replace the blanket primary, and would nullify any legislative act abolishing the blanket primary.) Filed on January 25, 2001 by William Pilkey of Olympia. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 764</b>	(Statement of the Subject: Initiative Measure No. 764 concerns privatizing the children's administration of DSHS. Concise Description: This measure would dissolve the children's administration in the department of social and health services. Child protective services would be transferred to the state patrol, and other functions handled by private agencies.) Filed on January 18, 2001 by Jeffery Douglas of Oring. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 765</b>	(Statement of the Subject: Initiative Measure No. 765 concerns property taxes. Concise Description: This measure would eliminate state property tax and laws governing property revaluation and levy limits. Real estate would be assessed at 50% of true value (or less) and taxed at \$5.90 per \$1000.) Filed on February 1, 2001 by Donald Carter of Olympia. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 766</b>	(Statement of the Subject: Initiative Measure No. 766 concerns regulation of marijuana. Concise Description: This measure would legalize and regulate the cultivation, sale, and use of marijuana. A sales tax would be imposed. Use by minors would be prohibited. Amnesty would be extended to past offenders.) Filed on January 24, 2001 by Ross M. Hallett of Port Angeles. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 767</b>	(Relating to clean water, Initiative Measure No. 767 was withdrawn and refilled as Initiative Measure No. 769 before a ballot title was assigned) Filed on February 7, 2001 by Daniel J. Silver of Olympia.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 768</b>	(Statement of the Subject: Initiative Measure No. 768 concerns union membership. Concise Description: This measure would make it unlawful to condition employment on union membership or nonmembership. Contracts allowing retention of union dues or assessments from employee compensation would be void, absent the employee's written consent.) Filed on February 5, 2001 by Muhammad Farrakhan of Seattle. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 769</b>	(Statement of the Subject: Initiative Measure No. 769 concerns financing water quality projects with general obligation bonds. Concise Description: This measure would provide \$1 billion in bonds for drinking water, wastewater treatment, water conservation, and riparian habitat and streamflow improvements. One-tenth of 1% additional sales tax would be imposed until bond retirement.) Filed on February 23, 2001 by Daniel J. Silver of Olympia. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 770</b>	(Statement of the Subject: Initiative Measure No. 770 concerns voter approval of "significant alterations" to high capacity transportation projects. Concise Description: This measure would require voter approval of "significant alterations" to voter-approved propositions for regional high capacity transportation systems. As defined, "significant alterations" include certain cost increases, delays, and elimination of project elements.) Filed on February 6, 2001 by Christopher Clifford of Renton. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 771</b>	(Statement of the Subject: Initiative Measure No. 771 concerns punishment for the murder of a child. Concise Description: This measure would make first degree murder of a child under 13 aggravated first degree murder, and would impose life imprisonment without parole for first degree murder of a child under 16.) Filed on March 2, 2001 by Ann F. Stone of Spokane. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 772</b>	(Statement of the Subject: Initiative Measure No. 772 concerns at-large election of state legislators. Concise Description: This measure would establish 33 representative districts and 11 senate districts, each electing 3 legislators. The top 6 primary candidates would qualify for the general election, where the top 3 would be elected.) Filed on March 8, 2001 by Michael A. Johnson of Cheney. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 773</b>	(Statement of the Subject: Initiative Measure No. 773 concerns additional tobacco taxes for low-income health programs and other programs. Concise Description: This measure would impose an additional sales tax on cigarettes and a surtax on wholesaled tobacco products. The proceeds would be earmarked for existing programs and expanded health care services for low-income persons.) Filed on March 26, 2001 by Astnd Berg of Seattle. 275,081 signatures were submitted and found sufficient. The measure was submitted to the voters at the November 6, 2001 general election and approved by the following vote: For = 948,529 Against = 486,912.

<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 774</b>	(Statement of the Subject: Initiative Measure No. 774 concerns long-term in-home care services. Concise Description: This measure would create a "home care quality authority" to establish qualifications, standards, training, referral, workers compensation, and employment relations for publicly funded individual providers of in-home care to elderly and disabled adults.) Filed on April 6, 2001 by Lars Hennem of Seattle, Deana Knutsen of Lynnwood, and Katrinka Gentile of Shoreline. No signature petitions were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 775</b>	(Statement of the Subject: Initiative Measure No. 775 concerns long-term in-home care services. Concise Description: this measure would create a "home care quality authority" to establish qualifications, standards, accountability, training, referral and employment relations for publicly funded individual providers of in-home services to elderly and disabled adults.) Filed on April 6, 2001 by Lars Hennem of Seattle, Deana Knutsen of Lynnwood, and Katrinka Gentile of Shoreline. 304,327 signatures were submitted and found sufficient. The measure was submitted to the voters at the November 6, 2001 general election and approved by the following vote: For - 880,523 Against - 522,848.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 776</b>	(Statement of the Subject: Initiative Measure No. 776 concerns state and local government charges on motor vehicles. Concise Description: This measure would require license tab fees to be \$30 per year for motor vehicles, including light trucks. Certain local-option vehicle excise taxes and fees used for roads and transit would be repealed.) Filed on January 7, 2002 by Tim D. Eyman of Mukilteo, Ray D. Benham of Kennewick, M. J. Fagan of Spokane, & Leo J. Fagan Spokane. 260,898 signatures were submitted and found sufficient. The measure was submitted to the voters at the November 5, 2002 general election and approved by the following vote: For - 901,478 Against - 849,986.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 777</b>	(Statement of the Subject: Initiative Measure No. 777 concerns employer-employee labor agreements. Concise Description: This measure would prohibit any employer from requiring employees to belong or not to belong to a labor organization, or from requiring employees to pay union dues or representation costs instead of dues.) Filed on January 7, 2002 by Jason C. Smosna of Seattle. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 778</b>	(Statement of the Subject: Initiative Measure No. 778 concerns repealing laws that authorize property forfeiture. Concise Description: This measure would repeal state laws that authorize the seizure and forfeiture of property relating to crimes such as illegal gambling, making or selling illegal drugs, child pornography, tax evasion, and money laundering.) Filed on January 22, 2002 by Ernest R. Lewis of Olympia. This initiative was withdrawn by the sponsor.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 779</b>	(Statement of the Subject: Initiative Measure No. 779 concerns providing bonus compensation to teachers based on parent ratings. Concise Description: This measure would provide yearly bonus payments for public school teachers who are rated highly by students' parents and guardians, calculated as a percentage of average teacher salary, and paid by the state.) Filed on January 18, 2002 by Donald D. Hansler of Spanaway. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 780</b>	(Statement of the Subject: Initiative Measure No. 780 concerns testing requirements for candidates for public office. Concise Description: This measure would require candidates for most elective offices to complete the tenth grade Washington assessment of student learning before filing for office. Scores would be publicly available and in the voters' pamphlet.) Filed on January 9, 2002 by David Marshak of Seattle. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 781</b>	(Statement of the Subject: Initiative Measure No. 781 concerns penalties for officers who seek to weaken initiative measures. Concise Description: This measure would set penalties for any legislator or officer who attempts to overturn or weaken an initiative measure; immediate expulsion from office, five years' imprisonment, and permanent ineligibility to hold public office.) Filed on January 14, 2002 by David A. Whitman of Seattle. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 782</b>	(Statement of the Subject: Initiative Measure No. 782 concerns allocating tax shares according to wealth. Concise Description: This measure would declare that a tiny percentage of individuals and corporations possess 95% of the state's money, and would require that this group pay 95% of all state, county, and city taxes.) Filed on January 14, 2002 by David A. Whitman of Seattle. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 783</b>	(Statement of the Subject: Initiative Measure No. 783 concerns limiting campaign contributions to those entitled to vote. Concise Description: This measure would prohibit any person from contributing to an election campaign except those entitled to vote in the election, prohibit corporate campaign contributions, and prohibit use of non-voter funds for political advertising.) Filed on January 28, 2002 by Roger D. Whitten

of Oakesdale. No signature petitions presented for checking.

---

**INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 784** (Statement of the Subject: Initiative Measure No. 784 concerns property forfeiture arising from controlled substances laws. Concise Description: This measure would make numerous changes to laws forfeiting property connected with drug crimes, including a requirement of conviction of all owners, additional hearings, and requiring sale, not government use, of forfeited property.) Filed on February 8, 2002 by Ernest R. Lewis of Olympia and Richard Shepard of Fircrest. No signature petitions presented for checking.

---

**INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 785** (Statement of the Subject: Initiative Measure No. 785 concerns geographic limitations on distribution of transportation funds. Concise Description: This measure would generally require that vehicle fuel taxes, vehicle licensing fees, fares, tolls, and voter-approved taxes be spent for roads, bridges, and mass transit systems in the county where they are collected. Filed on February 5, 2002 by Brandon Scott Durham of Seattle. No signature petitions presented for checking.

---

**INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 786** (Statement of the Subject: Initiative Measure No. 786 concerns rights, activities or privileges afforded Washington tribes. Concise Description: This measure would declare that any right, activity or privilege afforded the tribes of Washington state would be shared equally and in common with the citizens of Washington state.) Filed on February 15, 2002 by Omer J. Lupien of Oak Harbor. No signature petitions presented for checking.

---

**INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 787** (Statement of the Subject: Initiative Measure No. 787 concerns extending the sales and use taxes to motor vehicle fuel. Concise Description: This measure would extend the sales and use taxes to fuels subject to motor vehicle or special fuel taxes, and to fuels used for public transportation or for transporting persons with special needs.) Filed on February 15, 2002 by Alan C. Harvey of Seattle. No signature petitions presented for checking.

---

**INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 788** (Statement of the Subject: Initiative Measure No. 788 concerns limiting credit card interest. Concise Description: This measure would provide that the amount of interest charged for credit card balances could not exceed 12 percent per year.) Filed on February 22, 2002 by Michael J. Thompson of Seattle. No signature petitions presented for checking.

---

**INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 789** (Statement of the Subject: Initiative Measure No. 789 concerns the operation of individual schools within public school districts. Concise Description: This measure would establish a system for funding public education through allocations to individual schools. Each school principal would develop and manage the school's budget, subject to school board approval and state audit.) Filed on February 27, 2002 by Thomas G. Erickson of Vancouver. No signature petitions presented for checking.

---

**INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 790** (Statement of the Subject: Initiative Measure No. 790 concerns law enforcement officers' and fire fighters' retirement system, plan 2. Concise Description: This measure would place management of the law enforcement officers' and fire fighters' retirement system, plan 2, in a board of trustees consisting of six plan participants, three employer representatives, and two legislators.) Filed on March 5, 2002 by Kelly L. Fox and Harold W. Hanson of Olympia. 345,543 signatures were submitted and found sufficient. The measure was submitted to the voters at the November 5, 2002 general election and approved by the following vote: For - 903,113 Against - 800,105.

---

**INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 791** (Statement of the Subject: Initiative Measure No. 791 concerns the state expenditure limit. Concise Description: This measure would extend state expenditure limits to additional accounts and re-enact and expand the two thirds legislative vote requirement to raise revenue. Reserve levels would be increased and excess amounts would be redistributed.) Filed on March 13, 2002 by Stephanie A. Linklater of North Bend. No signature petitions presented for checking.

---

**INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 792** (Statement of the Subject: Initiative Measure No. 792 concerns vehicular assault while driving under the influence. Concise Description: This measure would make it a class A felony for anyone to operate or drive any vehicle while under the influence of intoxicating liquor or any drug, and cause bodily harm to another.) Filed on March 14, 2002 by Allan Geoffrey Dyer of Kent. No signature petitions presented for checking.

---

**INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 793** (Statement of the Subject: Initiative Measure No. 793 concerns the operation of individual schools within public school districts. Concise Description: This measure would establish a system for funding education, in larger school districts, through allocations to individual schools. District central administrative funding would be reduced. Each principal would manage the individual school's budget.) Filed on April 2, 2002 by Thomas G. Erickson of Vancouver. No signature petitions presented for checking.

<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 794</b>	(Statement of the Subject: Initiative Measure No. 794 concerns the creation of a state health benefits system. Concise Description: This measure would create a Washington health security trust. This agency would develop and administer a single health benefits package for state residents, funded by mandatory premiums, employer assessments, existing taxes, and co-payments.) Filed on March 29, 2002 by Harry Abbott of Everett. No signature petitions presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 795</b>	(Statement of the Subject: Initiative Measure No. 795 concerns establishing a pension management board for Washington public employees. Concise Description: This measure would create a participant-elected pension management board to manage most state retirement systems, and would redefine the duties of agencies, including the state investment board and the department of retirement systems.) Filed on April 3, 2002 by David A. Thurman of Bellingham, Kathleen L. Reim of Sedro-Woolley & Monte E. Bianchi of Mt. Vernon. This initiative was withdrawn by the sponsors.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 796</b>	(Statement of the Subject: Initiative Measure No. 796 concerns replacing "Washington" with "Cascadia" in the Revised Code of Washington. Concise Description: This measure would replace any reference to "Washington" in the Revised Code of Washington with "Cascadia". Abbreviations for "Washington" would be replaced with abbreviations for "Cascadia"). Filed on April 4, 2002 by David John Anderson of Seattle. No signature petitions were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 797</b>	(Statement of the Subject: Initiative Measure No. 797 concerns establishing a pension management board for state retirement systems. Concise Description: This measure would create a participant-elected pension management board to manage most state retirement systems, and would redefine the duties of agencies, including the state investment board and the department of retirement systems.) Filed on April 24, 2002 by David A. Thurman of Bellingham. No signature petitions were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 798</b>	(Statement of the Subject: Initiative Measure No. 798 concerns the operation of individual schools within public school districts. Concise Description: This measure would establish a system for funding education through allocations to individual schools and reductions in central administrative expenses. Each principal would manage the school's budget, subject to audit and board approval.) Filed on April 26, 2002 by Thomas G. Erickson of Vancouver. No signature petitions were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 799</b>	(Statement of the Subject: Initiative Measure No. 799 concerns the operation of individual schools within public school districts. Concise Description: This measure would establish a system for funding education through allocations to individual schools and reductions in central administrative expenses. Each principal would manage the school's budget, subject to audit and board approval.) Filed on May 24, 2002 by Thomas G. Erickson of Vancouver. No signature petitions were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 800</b>	(Statement of the Subject: Initiative Measure No. 800 concerns legal challenges to certain initiatives and other legislative bills. Concise Description: This measure would direct the state attorney general to challenge the provisions of Initiative 601 and certain other initiatives and legislative bills that require supermajority votes on revenues, fees or expenditures.) Filed on January 6, 2003 by Stephen M. Zemke of Seattle. No signature petitions were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 801</b>	(Statement of the Subject: Initiative Measure No. 801 concerns the financial impact of initiatives. Concise Description: This measure would require any initiative requiring new programs or services to specify their sources of revenue, and require any initiative reducing revenue to specify programs or services to be reduced or eliminated.) Filed on January 6, 2003 by Stephen M. Zemke of Seattle. No signature petitions were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 802</b>	(Statement of the Subject: Initiative Measure No. 802 concerns signature gathering for initiative and referendum petitions. Concise Description: This measure would declare it unlawful to pay or receive money or other value based on the number of signatures obtained on an initiative or referendum petition, and would repeal a similar law.) Filed on January 6, 2003 by J. Pat Thompson of Everett. No signature petitions were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 803</b>	(Statement of the Subject: Initiative Measure No. 803 concerns requirements to enact certain legislation that requires supermajority votes. Concise Description: This measure would require initiatives and legislative bills requiring a supermajority vote by the state, counties, cities or ports to raise taxes or fees to make expenditures, to pass by the same supermajority.) Filed on January 6, 2003 by Stephen M. Zemke of Seattle. No signature petitions were presented for checking.



<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 804</b>	(Statement of the Subject: Initiative Measure No. 804 concerns the state voters' pamphlet. Concise Description: This measure would require a voters' pamphlet for primary and general elections involving a statewide office or ballot proposition, and would require voters' pamphlets to contain information concerning state budgets, revenues and services.) Filed on January 6, 2003 by Stephen M. Zemke of Seattle. No signature petitions were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 805</b>	(Statement of the Subject: Initiative Measure No. 805 concerns reviewing initiative measures for constitutionality. Concise Description: This measure would establish a commission to analyze whether proposed initiative measures might be contrary to the state constitution or the federal constitution or laws, and prepare voters' pamphlet statements listing potential challenges.) Filed on January 6, 2003 by Stephen M. Zemke of Seattle. No signature petitions were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 806</b>	(Statement of the Subject: Initiative Measure No. 806 concerns initiative measures repealing existing law. Concise Description: This measure would require an initiative measure to display the full text of any section of law that would be repealed by the measure.) Filed on January 6, 2003 by Stephen M. Zemke of Seattle. No signatures were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 807</b>	(Statement of the Subject: Initiative Measure No. 807 concerns the state expenditure limit. Concise Description: This measure would require either a two-thirds legislative majority or voter approval to "raise state revenues" as defined or increase fees, and revise requirements on spending limit changes and the emergency reserve fund.) Filed on January 6, 2003 by Tim D. Eymann of Mukilteo, Leo J. Fagan of Spokane and M. J. Fagan of Spokane. No signatures were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 808</b>	(Statement of the Subject: Initiative Measure No. 808 concerns the operation of individual schools within public school districts. Concise Description: This measure would establish a system for funding education through allocations to individual schools and reductions in central administrative expenses. Each principal would manage the school's budget, subject to audit and board approval.) Filed on January 6, 2003 by Thomas G. Erickson of Vancouver. No signatures were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 809</b>	(Statement of the Subject: Initiative Measure No. 809 concerns fees to use certain state park and recreation facilities. Concise Description: This measure would require purchasing a pass, in lieu of other fees, to use certain outdoor recreation facilities owned or operated by the state parks and recreation commission and certain other state agencies.) Filed on January 6, 2003 by James L. King, Jr. of Olympia. No signatures were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 810</b>	(Statement of the Subject: Initiative Measure No. 810 concerns the state expenditure limit. Concise Description: This measure would modify the expenditure limit law, including re-setting the base year, increasing the maximum level of the emergency reserve fund, and eliminating transfers to the student achievement, transportation, and general funds.) Filed on January 6, 2003 by James L. King, Jr. of Olympia. No signatures were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 811</b>	(Statement of the Subject: Initiative Measure No. 811 concerns limiting credit card interest rates. Concise Description: This measure would provide that the amount of interest charged for unsecured credit card balances could not exceed twelve percent, per year.) Filed on January 6, 2003 by Michael J. Thompson of Seattle. No signatures were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 812</b>	(Statement of the Subject: Initiative Measure No. 812 concerns uses of public land. Concise Description: This measure would prohibit the grazing of livestock on nonfederal public land in this state, amending or repealing several statutes to reflect this prohibition.) Filed on January 6, 2003 by John J. Anderson of Kettle Falls. No signatures were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 813</b>	(Statement of the Subject: Initiative Measure No. 813 concerns limitations on political campaign contributions. Concise Description: This measure would prohibit campaign contributions by persons not entitled to vote for the candidate or ballot proposition, except token amounts; prohibit contributions by corporations; and prohibit use of non-voter contributions for advertising.) Filed on January 6, 2003 by Roger D. Whitten of Oakesdale. No signatures were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 814</b>	(Statement of the Subject: Initiative Measure No. 814 concerns an income tax. Concise Description: This measure would direct the legislature to enact an income tax that would force those individuals and corporations controlling 95% of the money in the state to pay 95% of the taxes.) Filed on January 6, 2003 by David A. Whitman of Seattle. No signatures were presented for checking.

<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 815</b>	(Statement of the Subject: Initiative Measure No. 815 concerns taxes. Concise Description: This measure would declare that individuals with fifty thousand dollars or less in annual income, and couples with a combined income of less than ninety thousand dollars, would be exempt from paying taxes.) Filed on January 6, 2003 by David A. Whitman of Seattle. No signatures were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 816</b>	(Statement of the Subject: Initiative Measure No. 816 concerns limiting eligibility for public office. Concise Description: This measure would limit eligibility for office of anyone who has served one or more terms in an office involving legislative duties. Such persons would never be eligible for any other public office.) Filed on January 6, 2003 by David A. Whitman of Seattle. No signatures were presented for checking. INITIATIVE MEASUR
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 817</b>	(Statement of the Subject: Initiative Measure No. 817 concerns penalties for broken campaign promises. Concise Description: This measure would declare that any political candidate who promises to support certain legislation but does not, or lies to the taxpayers about any subject would be expelled from office, fined, and imprisoned.) Filed on January 6, 2003 by David A. Whitman of Seattle. No signatures were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 818</b>	(Statement of the Subject: Initiative Measure No. 818 concerns political campaigns. Concise Description: This measure would declare that all political campaigns in the state would last only 14 six-hour days from the date this measure is approved, with no campaign contributions allowed and minimal taxpayer cost. Filed on January 6, 2003 by David A. Whitman of Seattle. No signatures were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 819</b>	(Statement of the Subject: Initiative Measure No. 819 concerns term limits for certain public offices. Concise Description: This measure would set a limit of one two-year term for certain state and local offices in this state. Relatives of current or former officeholders would be ineligible to hold certain public offices.) Filed on January 6, 2003 by David A. Whitman of Seattle. No signatures were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 820</b>	(Statement of the Subject: Initiative Measure No. 820 concerns the effective date of initiatives. Concise Description: This measure would declare that all initiatives would become effective the day they are "approved by the taxpayers of the State of Washington.") Filed on January 6, 2003 by David A. Whitman of Seattle. No signatures were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 821</b>	(Statement of the Subject: Initiative Measure No. 821 concerns penalties for public officials who weaken initiatives. Concise Description: This measure would make it unlawful for any state or local legislative officer to ignore, overturn, or weaken an initiative, other than by referendum. Violators would be expelled from office, fined, and imprisoned.) Filed on January 6, 2003 by David A. Whitman of Seattle. No signatures were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 822</b>	(Statement of the Subject: Initiative Measure No. 822 concerns maximum interest rates. Concise Description: This measure would set a maximum rate of 3% simple interest that could be charged by financial institutions and businesses extending credit to customers. Closing costs and other added fees would be unlawful.) Filed on January 6, 2003 by David A. Whitman. No signatures were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 823</b>	(Statement of the Subject: Initiative Measure No. 823 concerns liquor sales. Concise Description: This measure would abolish the liquor control board, and would permit any purveyor of pharmaceuticals or groceries to sell all of the liquor that has been sold by the liquor board since 1933.) Filed on January 6, 2003 by David A. Whitman. No signatures were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 824</b>	(Statement of the Subject: Initiative Measure No. 824 concerns a statement about "End Seat Belt Piracy." Concise Description: This measure would state: "An \$86.00 seat belt penalty will deprive a mother with two or three small children, minimum wages and no child support to more than a day's wages.") Filed on January 6, 2003 by David A. Whitman of Seattle. No signatures were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 825</b>	(Statement of the Subject: Initiative Measure No. 825 concerns school levies. Concise Description: this measure would declare that school levies are discontinued as of the approval date of this measure.) Filed on January 6, 2003 by David A. Whitman of Seattle. No signatures were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 826</b>	(Statement of the Subject: Initiative Measure No. 826 concerns locksmiths. Concise Description: This measure would prohibit a locksmith from providing copies of keys to any person other than the customer who

paid for the work. Violators and their families would have their licenses permanently revoked.) Filed on January 6, 2003 by David A. Whitman of Seattle. No signatures were presented for checking.

<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 827</b>	(Statement of the Subject: Initiative Measure No. 827 concerns a referendum on the salaries of public officers. Concise Description: This measure would declare that salaries and fringe benefits of everyone appointed or elected to public office in the state must be decided by a referendum to the people retroactive to November 2002.) Filed on January 7, 2003 by David A. Whitman of Seattle. No signatures were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 828</b>	(Statement of the Subject: Initiative Measure No. 828 concerns postage on mailed absentee ballots. Concise Description: This measure would eliminate the requirement that voters pay postage when mailing absentee ballots to the county auditor.) Filed on January 10, 2003 by Emily E. Walters and Jonathan Bongard of Maple Valley. No signatures were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 829</b>	(Statement of the Subject: Initiative Measure No. 829 concerns postage costs on mailed voter registration information. Concise Description: This measure would eliminate postage payment requirements on voter registration forms, and would instruct that the words "NO POSTAGE NECESSARY" be included in the registration form.) Filed on January 10, 2003 by Emily Walters and Jonathan Bongard of Maple Valley. No signatures were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 830</b>	(Statement of the Subject: Initiative Measure No. 830 concerns penalties for public officials in contact with lobbyists. Concise Description: This measure would make it unlawful for certain officials to be seen in the presence of lobbyists. Violators would be expelled from office, fine \$50,000, and sentenced to five years in the penitentiary.) Filed on January 6, 2003 by David A. Whitman of Seattle. No signatures were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 831</b>	(Statement of the Subject: Initiative Measure No. 831 concerns adoption and transmittal of a resolution about Tim Eyman. Concise Description: This measure would set forth "whereas" recitals characterizing Tim Eyman and initiatives he sponsored, followed by a resolution labeling him using a vernacular term that denotes the back end of a horse.) Filed on January 9, 2003 by David G. Goldstein of Seattle. No signatures were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 832</b>	(Statement of the Subject: Initiative Measure No. 832 concerns designated smoking areas in restaurants. Concise Description: This measure would prohibit any restaurant in Kitsap County from designating a smoking area.) Filed on January 6, 2003 by Mary Larson of Port Orchard. No signatures were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 833</b>	(Statement of the Subject: Initiative Measure No. 833 concerns violent sex offenses. Concise Description: This measure would define certain crimes as violent sex offenses, and would require that any person convicted of such an offense be sentenced to life in prison without the possibility of parole.) Filed on January 6, 2003 by Tracy Oetting of Skykomish. No signatures were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 834</b>	(Statement of the Subject: Initiative Measure No. 834 concerns replacing "Washington" with "Cascadia" in the Revised Code of Washington. Concise Description: This measure would replace any reference to "Washington" in the Revised Code of Washington with "Cascadia". Abbreviations for "Washington" would be replaced with abbreviations for "Cascadia".) Filed on January 23, 2003 by George C. Deane of Everett. No signatures were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 835</b>	(Statement of the Subject: Initiative Measure No. 835 concerns establishing a pension board for state retirement systems. Concise Description: This measure would create a participant-elected pension board to supervise state retirement systems, and would redefine the duties of the state actuary, the joint committee on pension policy, and the pension funding council.) Filed on January 24, 2003 by David A. Thurman of Bellingham. No signatures were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 836</b>	(Statement of the Subject: Initiative Measure No. 836 concerns enforcement of safety belt laws. Concise Description: This measure would provide that laws concerning the use of vehicle safety belts, except children's belts, would be enforced only as a secondary action when a driver has been detained for another reason.) Filed on January 29, 2003 by Daniel J. Goebel of Lacey. No signatures were presented for checking.

<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 837</b>	(Statement of the Subject: Initiative Measure No. 837 concerns donations of human organs. Concise Description: This measure would create a presumption that when an individual over eighteen dies, his or her organs are available for donation, unless the individual or a family member specifically opts against organ donation.) Filed on January 27, 2003 by Donald J. Coleman of Olympia. No signatures were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 838</b>	(Statement of the Subject: Initiative Measure No. 838 concerns marriages. Concise Description: This measure would legalize marriages between two people of the same sex.) Filed on January 16, 2003 by Roger D. Whitten of Oakesdale. No signatures were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 839</b>	(Statement of the Subject: Initiative Measure No. 839 concerns repealing the business and occupation tax. Concise Description: This measure would repeal the state business and occupation tax levied on the act or privilege of engaging in business activities.) Filed on January 16, 2003 by Roger D. Whitten of Oakesdale. No signatures were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 840</b>	(Statement of the Subject: Initiative Measure No. 840 concerns controlled substances. Concise Description: This measure would remove marijuana from the schedules of unlawful controlled substances. The definition of "drug paraphernalia" would be amended to remove certain objects designed for use in ingesting marijuana, cocaine, or hashish.) Filed on January 16, 2003 by Roger D. Whitten of Oakesdale. No signatures were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 841</b>	(Statement of the Subject: Initiative Measure No. 841 concerns the repeal and future limitation of ergonomics regulations. Concise Description: This measure would repeal existing state ergonomics regulations and would direct the department of labor and industries not to adopt new ergonomics regulations unless a uniform federal standard is required.) Filed on January 29, 2003 by Randy M. Gold of Wenatchee. 258,411 signatures were submitted and found sufficient. The measure was submitted to the voters at the November 4, 2003 general election and approved by the following vote: For – 656,737 Against – 570,980.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 842</b>	(Statement of the Subject: Initiative Measure No. 842 concerns health care financing. Concise Description: This measure would create a Washington health security trust to develop a health care plan for all state residents, funded by co-payments, employer and employee assessments, and shifting tax revenues from other uses.) Filed on January 28, 2003 by Harold Abbott of Everett. No signatures were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 843</b>	(Statement of the Subject: Initiative Measure No. 843 concerns state sales and use taxes on motor vehicles. Concise Description: This measure would place the state's portion of the sales tax and the use tax on motor vehicles in the motor vehicle fund, to be used only for road construction and maintenance purposes.) Filed on February 10, 2003 by Suzanne D. Karr of Everett. No signatures were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 844</b>	(Statement of the Subject: Initiative Measure No. 844 concerns performance audits of state agencies and institutions. Concise Description: This measure would direct the state auditor to conduct performance audits of state agencies and institutions. A citizens' oversight committee would be created, and \$5 million would be appropriated for fiscal year 2004.) Filed on February 10, 2003 by Suzanne D. Karr of Everett. No signatures were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 845</b>	(Statement of the Subject: Initiative Measure No. 845 concerns government contracts. Concise Description: This measure would require the granting of preferential treatment to economically disadvantaged businesses in awarding government contracts.) Filed on January 30, 2003 by Walter K. Backstrom of Woodinville. No signatures were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 846</b>	(Statement of the Subject: Initiative Measure No. 846 concerns enacting a state income tax. Concise Description: this measure would impose an income tax on taxpayers with adjusted gross income exceeding \$100,000 per year. The rate would range from 1% to 2%. Deductions would be similar to federal tax deductions.) Filed on February 5, 2003 by Stephen P. Martin of Silverdale. No signatures were presented for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 847</b>	(Statement of the Subject: Initiative Measure No. 847 concerns employing dismissed Liquor Board employees. Concise Description: This measure would require any private merchant with ten or more employees, to be eligible to sell liquor in the state, to employ at least one former state liquor board employee until retirement.) Filed on February 10, 2003 by David A. Whitman of Seattle. No signatures were presented for checking.

<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 848</b>	(Statement of the Subject: Initiative Measure No. 848 concerns prohibiting the implementation of a Link Light Rail system. Concise Description: This measure would prohibit the Central Puget Sound Regional Transit Authority (Sound Transit) from implementing its Link Light Rail system, and would also prohibit counties and cities from implementing this light rail system.) Filed on February 14, 2003 by Tim D. Eyman of Mukilteo, M. J. Fagan of Spokane and Leo J. Fagan of Spokane. The Initiative was withdrawn by the sponsors.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 849</b>	(Statement of the Subject: Initiative Measure No. 849 concerns filing affidavits when submitting initiatives. Concise Description: This measure would permit a person, when submitting more than one initiative, to file a single affidavit rather than a separate affidavit for each measure.) Filed on February 24, 2003 by David A. Whitman. No signatures were submitted for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 850</b>	(Statement of the Subject: Initiative Measure No. 850 concerns the time to submit initiative measures. Concise Description: This measure would permit sponsors to submit their initiatives on July 1 "to give sponsors plenty of time to collect signatures.") Filed on February 24, 2003 by David A. Whitman. No signatures were submitted for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 851</b>	(Statement of the Subject: Initiative Measure No. 851 concerns providing bonus compensation to teachers based on parent ratings. Concise Description: This measure would provide yearly bonus payments for public school teachers based on parent/guardian ratings, calculated as a percentage of average teacher salary, and funded by a sales tax increase of 0.15 percent.) Filed on March 6, 2003 by Donald D. Hansler of Spanaway. No signatures were submitted for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 852</b>	(Statement of the Subject: Initiative Measure No. 852 concerns prohibiting the implementation of the Link Light Rail system. Concise Description: This measure would prohibit the Central Puget Sound Regional Transit Authority (Sound Transit) and nearby counties and cities from implementing the Link Light Rail system between SeaTac and Seattle, beyond existing contractual obligations.) Filed on March 12, 2003 by Tim D. Eyman of Mukilteo. No signatures were submitted for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 853</b>	(Statement of the Subject: Initiative Measure No. 853 concerns revising laws concerning state fiscal matters. Concise Description: This measure would revise the way the state expenditure limit is calculated, require adoption of biennial budget goals and priorities, provide for periodic citizen reviews of tax exemptions, and eliminate legislative supermajority requirements.) Filed on March 26, 2003 by Stephen M. Zemke of Seattle. No signatures were submitted for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 854</b>	(Statement of the Subject: Initiative Measure No. 854 concerns regional transportation. Concise Description: This measure would provide for elected regional transportation accountability boards (required in Central Puget Sound, optional elsewhere). Each board would consolidate and govern existing regional transportation agencies and coordinate planning, funding, and services.) Filed on April 4, 2003 by Michael K. Vaska, Bruce Agnew, and David A. Russell of Issaquah. No signatures were submitted for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 855</b>	(Relating to property taxes) Filed on April 10, 2003 by Tim D. Eyman. The initiative was withdrawn by the sponsor.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 856</b>	(Statement of the Subject: Initiative Measure No. 856 concerns property taxes. Concise Description: This measure would reduce the state property tax levy by 25%, repeal local government authority to increase regular levies 1% per year, and require general election voter approval for such local levy increases.) Filed on April 29, 2003 by Tim D. Eyman of Mukilteo. No signatures were submitted for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 857</b>	(Statement of the Subject: Initiative Measure No. 857 concerns wages and benefits of individual home care providers. Concise Description: This measure would provide the following to individual providers of publicly-funded home care: wages of at least \$11.50 per hour by mid-2004; workers compensation coverage; and subsidized enrollment in the basic health plan.) Filed on April 29, 2003 by Sally Easterwood-Wilbon, Doris Cole, and Lacey Wright of Seattle. No signatures were submitted for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 858</b>	(Statement of the Subject: Initiative Measure No. 858 concerns wages and benefits of individual home care providers. Concise Description: This measure would provide the following to individual providers of publicly-funded home care: compensation as provided in their collective bargaining agreement; workers compensation coverage; and subsidized enrollment in the state's basic health plan.) Filed on April 29, 2003 by Sally Easterwood-Wilbon and Doris Cole of Seattle. No signatures were submitted for checking.

<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 859</b>	(Relating to property taxes) Filed on May 22, 2003 by Tim D. Eyman of Mukilteo. The initiative was withdrawn by the sponsor.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 860</b>	(Statement of the Subject: Initiative measure No. 860 concerns property tax levies. Concise Description: This measure would reduce regular property tax levies by counties, cities, and other local taxing districts by 25% beginning in 2005. The measure would not affect voter-approved special levies, including local school levies.) Filed on January 2, 2004 by Tim D. Eyman of Mukilteo, M. J. Fagan and Leo J Fagan of Spokane and Robert E. Henkel of Tacoma. No signatures were submitted for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 861</b>	(Statement of the Subject: Initiative Measure No. 861 concerns violent sex offenses. Concise Description: This measure would define certain crimes as violent sex offenses, and would require that any person convicted of such an offense be sentenced to life in prison without the possibility of parole.) Filed on January 2, 2004 by Tracy Oetting of Skykomish. No signatures were submitted for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 862</b>	(Statement of the Subject: Initiative Measure No. 862 concerns salaries for elected officials. Concise Description: This measure would limit the salaries of all elected officials to be no higher than the average annual income of a Washington resident as designated by the federal census or the World Almanac.) Filed on January 2, 2004 by Patrick M. Crawford of Littleton. No signatures were submitted for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 863</b>	(Statement of the Subject: Initiative Measure No. 863 concerns abolishing the Department of Ecology. Concise Description: This measure would provide that the state Department of Ecology would be dismantled and abolished.) Filed on January 2, 2004 by Patrick M. Crawford of Littleton. No signatures were submitted for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 864</b>	(Statement of the Subject: Initiative Measure No. 864 concerns property tax levies. Concise Description: This measure would reduce regular property tax levies otherwise allowed to counties, cities and other local taxing districts, by 25% beginning in 2005. Voter-approved levies, including local school levies, would be excluded.) Filed on January 5, 2004 by Tim D. Eyman of Mukilteo, M. J. Fagan of Spokane and Leo J. Fagan of Spokane. No signatures were submitted for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 865</b>	(Statement of the Subject: Initiative Measure No. 865 concerns sales tax on food products. Concise Description: This measure would revise the law defining how food products are exempt from sales tax, repealing 2003 amendments to this law, and exempting diet supplements from sales tax (but not from use tax.) Filed on January 7, 2004 by David L. Steyh and Suzann M. Steyh of Seattle. No signatures were submitted for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 866</b>	(Statement of the Subject: Initiative Measure No. 866 concerns revenue and taxation. Concise Description: This measure would exempt over-the-counter drugs purchased without a prescription from the sales tax, making such over-the-counter drugs subject to the use tax.) Filed on January 7, 2004 by David L. Steyh and Suzann M. Steyh of Seattle. No signatures were submitted for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 867</b>	(Statement of the Subject: Initiative Measure No. 867 concerns sales and use tax on pet food. Concise Description: This measure would exempt sales of pet food and specialty pet food from sales and use tax. The exemption would apply to commercial feed prepared and distributed for consumption by domesticated animal pets.) Filed on January 7, 2004 by David L. Steyh and Suzann M. Steyh of Seattle. No signatures were submitted for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 868</b>	(Statement of the Subject: Initiative Measure No. 868 concerns credit card interest. Concise Description: This measure would provide that the amount of interest charged for unsecured credit card balances could not exceed twelve percent per year.) Filed on January 2, 2004 by Michael J. Thompson of Seattle. No signatures were submitted for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 869</b>	(Statement of the Subject: Initiative Measure No. 869 concerns health care financing. Concise Description: This measure would create a Washington health security trust to develop a health care plan for all state residents, funded by co-payments, assessments on employers and employees, and shifts of existing tax revenue.) Filed on January 2, 2004 by Harold Abbott of Everett. No signatures were submitted for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 870</b>	(Statement of the Subject: Initiative Measure No. 870 concerns the purchase of cigarettes or tobacco products. Concise Description: This measure would raise from eighteen to twenty-one the minimum at which a person can legally purchase or possess cigarettes or tobacco products.) Filed on January 15, 2004 by

Laura A. Coleman of Olympia. No signatures were submitted for checking.

**INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 871** (Statement of the Subject: Initiative Measure No. 871 concerns providing bonus compensation to teachers based on parent ratings. Concise Description: This measure would provide yearly bonus payments for public school teachers based on parent/guardian ratings, calculated as a percentage of average teacher salary, and funded by a sales tax increase of 0.15 percent.) Filed on January 13, 2004 by Donald D. Hansler of Spanaway. No signatures were submitted for checking.

**INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 872** (Statement of the Subject: Initiative Measure No. 872 concerns elections for partisan offices. Concise Description: This measure would allow voters to select among all candidates in a primary. Ballots would indicate candidates' party preference. The two candidates receiving most votes advance to the general election, regardless of party.) Filed on January 8, 2004 by Terry Hunt of the Washington State Grange. The measure was submitted to the voters at the November 2, 2004 general election and approved by the following vote: For - 1,632,225 Against - 1,095,190

**INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 873** (Statement of the Subject: Initiative Measure No. 873 concerns an income tax. Concise Description: this measure Would direct the legislature to enact an income tax that would force those individuals and corporations controlling 95% of the money in the state to pay 95% of the taxes.) Filed on January 9, 2004 by David A. Whitman of Seattle. No signatures were submitted for checking.

**INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 874** (Statement of the Subject: Initiative Measure No. 874 concerns taxes. Concise Description: This measure would declare that the following taxes shall be eliminated: sales tax, gasoline tax, small business tax, telephone tax, and real estate tax.) Filed on January 9, 2004 by David A. Whitman of Seattle. No signatures were submitted for checking.

**INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 875** (Statement of the Subject: Initiative Measure No. 875 concerns taxes. Concise Description: This measure would declare that individuals with fifty thousand dollars or less in annual income, and couples with a combined income of less than ninety thousand dollars, would be exempt from paying taxes.) Filed on January 21, 2004 by David A. Whitman of Seattle. No signatures were submitted for checking.

**INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 876** (Statement of the Subject: Initiative Measure No. 876 concerns the relationship between citizens and government. Concise Description: This measure would state that: government should stop threatening citizens with punishment; any language suggesting that government employees are protected more than ordinary citizens should be stricken; and that recall should be democratic.) Filed on February 6, 2004 by Javier O. Lopez of Lacey. No signatures were submitted for checking.

**INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 877** (Statement of the Subject: Initiative Measure No. 877 concerns taxes. Concise Description: This measure would provide that no taxes should be raised in the state until the government proves to the citizens that it has become fiscally responsible.) Filed on February 6, 2004 by Javier O. Lopez of Lacey. No signatures were submitted for checking.

**INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 878** (Statement of the Subject: Initiative Measure No. 878 concerns elected offices and government. Concise Description: This measure would state that elected offices should be open to all citizens, that "the 10% fees" stop a citizen from running, and that government should not be in any type of business.) Filed on February 6, 2004 by Javier O. Lopez. No signatures were submitted for checking.

**INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 879** (Statement of the Subject: Initiative Measure No. 879 concerns seat belt usage. Concise Description: This measure would repeal the existing requirement that adults (age 16 and over) wear safety (seat) belts in a properly adjusted and securely fastened manner when operating or riding in a motor vehicle.) Filed on January 20, 2004 by John Mills of Seattle. No signatures were submitted for checking.

**INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 880** (Statement of the Subject: Initiative Measure No. 880 concerns school districts. Concise Description: This measure would make contract negotiations between school districts and educational employees subject to the Open Public Meetings Act beginning no later than seven days after negotiations have commenced.) Filed on January 20, 2004 by John Mills of Seattle. No signatures were submitted for checking.

**INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 881** (Statement of the Subject: Initiative Measure No. 881 concerns retail sales tax on food products. Concise Description: This measure would expand the sales tax exemption for "food and food ingredients" to include prepared food, soft drinks and dietary supplements. This items would still be subject to use tax.) Filed on January 20, 2004 by John Mills of Seattle. No signatures were submitted for checking.

<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 882</b>	(Statement of the Subject: Initiative Measure No. 882 concerns making the director of labor and industries an elected officer. Concise Description: This measure would provide that the director of labor and industries shall be elected by the people as a nonpartisan officer in the same way and for the same term as the governor.) Filed on February 13, 2004 by Timothy D. Fard of Olympia. No signatures were submitted for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 883</b>	(Statement of the Subject: Initiative Measure No. 883 concerns transportation spending. Concise Description: This measure would dedicate transportation project spending through adoption of vehicle-delay criteria, sale of \$10 billion in bonds, restrictions on designating high-occupancy vehicle lanes; and tax exemptions for transportation project labor and materials.) Filed on February 2, 2004 by Richard E. Patten of Kirkland. No signatures were submitted for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 884</b>	(Statement of the Subject: Initiative Measure No. 884 concerns dedicating funds designated for educational purposes. Concise Description: This measure would create an education trust fund for smaller classes, extended learning programs, certain salary increases, preschool access, and expanded college enrollments and scholarships, funded by increasing retail sales tax by 1%.) Filed on February 27, 2004 by Lisa D. Macfarlane of Seattle. The measure was submitted to the voters at the November 2, 2004 general election and was rejected by the following vote: For - 1,102,996 and Against - 1,654,112.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 885</b>	(Statement of the Subject: Initiative Measure No. 885 concerns electronic lottery machines. Concise Description: This measure would authorize licensed non-tribal gambling establishments to operate the same type and number of electronic lottery machines as tribal governments, using generated state revenue to reduce the state property tax levy.) Filed on March 1, 2004 by Tim D. Eymann of Mukilteo. Initiative was withdrawn by the sponsor.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 886</b>	(Statement of the Subject: Initiative Measure No. 886 concerns a process to provide citizens' opinions to state government. Concise Description: This measure would establish a program, funded by fees and donations, whereby citizens can volunteer to meet in small groups and give their opinions on topics selected by the governor, auditor, and legislators.) Filed on February 26, 2004 by Richard J. Spady of Bellevue. No signatures were submitted for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 887</b>	(Statement of the Subject: Initiative Measure No. 887 concerns driving under the influence of alcohol. Concise Description: This measure would increase certain "driving under the influence" offenses to felonies, provide tax credits to establishments providing designated driver services, create designated driver programs, and impose new taxes on alcoholic beverage sales.) Filed on February 27, 2004 by Allan Dyer of Kent. No signatures were submitted for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 888</b>	(Relating to Smoking) Filed on March 12, 2004 by Linda W. Matson. The initiative was withdrawn by the sponsor.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 889</b>	(Statement of the Subject: Initiative Measure No. 889 concerns smoking in public places. Concise Description: This measure would generally prohibit smoking in public places where minors are allowed, and establish conditions when facilities could be designated for smoking in whole or part. Inconsistent local regulation would be prohibited.) Filed on March 15, 2004 by James A. Stevenson of Tumwater. No signatures were submitted for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 890</b>	(Statement of the Subject: Initiative Measure NO. 890 concerns amending the Clean Indoor Air Act by expanding smoking prohibitions. Concise Description: This measure would prohibit smoking inside buildings and vehicles open to the public and places of employment and within reasonable distance outside their airway openings. Tribal establishments are not affected.) Filed on March 15, 2004 by Patty M. Carlson of Tacoma. No signatures were submitted for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 891</b>	(Statement of the Subject: Initiative Measure No. 891 concerns smoking in public places where minors are allowed. Concise Description: This measure would prohibit smoking in public places where minors are allowed, and establish conditions when facilities could be designated for smoking in whole or part. Inconsistent local laws would be prohibited.) Filed on March 24, 2004 by Michael N. Matson, Sr. of Tumwater. No signatures were submitted for checking.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 892</b>	(Statement of the Subject: Initiative Measure No. 892 concerns authorizing additional "electronic scratch ticket machines" to reduce property taxes. Concise Description: This measure would authorize licensed non-



tribal gambling establishments to operate the same type and number of machines as tribal governments, with a portion of tax revenue generated used to reduce state property taxes.) Filed on March 23, 2004 by Tim D. Eyman of Mukilteo. The measure was submitted to the voters at the November 2, 2004 general election and was rejected by the following vote: For - 1,069,414 and Against - 1,711,785.

---

**INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 893** (Statement of the Subject: Initiative Measure No. 893 concerns property tax homestead exemptions. Concise Description: This measure would allow property owners to file claims obtaining partial exemptions from the real property taxes that would otherwise be assessed on their residences, and describes how the exemptions would be calculated.) Filed on March 9, 2004 by Steve Zemke of Seattle. No signatures were submitted for checking.

---

**INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 894** (Statement of the Subject: Initiative Measure No. 894 concerns changes to construction of high capacity transit projects. Concise Description: This measure would terminate high-capacity transit construction projects, including certain existing light and commuter rail, if cost, ridership or route length differ by designated amounts from original plans. Voters could approve project continuation.) Filed on March 29, 2004 by John F. Dodd of Seattle. No signatures were submitted for checking.

---

**INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 895** (Statement of the Subject: Initiative Measure No. 895 concerns changes to requirements for health insurance plans and rate adjustments. Concise Description: This measure would allow a seller of health plans to offer small employers a plan with less coverage of services and fewer categories of providers along with at least one more comprehensive plan.) Filed on March 19, 2004 by Carolyn Ann Logue, Marsha Tellesbo-Kembel and Gary L. Smith of Lacey. No signatures were submitted for checking.

---

**INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 896** (Statement of the Subject: Initiative Measure No. 896 concerns establishing an elected office of state inspector general. Concise Description: This measure would establish an inspector general, authorized to resolve complaints regarding governmental and private conduct, conduct hearings, issue fines and orders, and bring court actions, with appointments of women and minorities discouraged.) Filed on April 8, 2004 by Maximus T. Englerius of Seattle. No signatures were submitted for checking.

---

**INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 897** (Statement of the Subject: Initiative Measure No. 897 concerns consumer credit reports. Concise Description: This measure would require consumer reporting agencies to provide each consumer (age seventeen or older), upon the consumer's request, with at least four free copies per calendar year of the consumer's credit report.) Filed on June 15, 2004 by Jon T. Haugen of Vancouver. No signatures were submitted for checking.

---

**INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 898** (Relating to raising the minimum age to possess tobacco products.) Filed on June 15, 2004 by Jon T. Haugen of Vancouver. The initiative was filed too late to be assigned a ballot title.

---

**INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 899** (Relating to tobacco taxes) Filed on June 15, 2004 by Jon T. Haugen of Vancouver. The initiative was filed too late to be assigned a ballot title.

---

**INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 900** Statement of Subject: Initiative Measure No. 900 concerns performance audits of governmental entities. Concise Description: This measure would direct the state auditor to conduct performance audits of state and local governments, and dedicate 0.16% of the state's portion of sales and use tax collections to fund these audits. Filed on January 10, 2005 by Tim Eyman, M.J. Fagan, and Leo J. Fagan. 311,858 signatures were turned in and the measure was submitted to the voters at the November 8, 2005 general election and was passed by the following vote: For -994757 and Against -767844.

---

**INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 901** Statement of Subject: Initiative Measure No. 901 concerns amending the Clean Indoor Air Act by expanding smoking prohibitions. Concise Description: This measure would prohibit smoking in buildings and vehicles open to the public and places of employment, including areas within 25 feet of doorways and ventilation openings unless a lesser distance is approved. Filed on January 10, 2005 by Christopher J. Covert-Bowlds. 321,615 signatures were turned in and the measure was submitted to the voters at the November 8, 2005 general election and was passed by the following vote: For -1153353 and Against -670225.

---

**INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 902** Statement of Subject: Initiative Measure No. 902 concerns outsourcing jobs to foreign countries. Concise Description: This measure would classify entities outsourcing jobs to foreign countries as "ethically deficient" and bar "ethically deficient" business entities from doing business in Washington, while providing criminal penalties for "ethically deficient" municipal officers. Filed on January 10, 2005 by Kris Craig. No signatures were submitted for checking.

---

**INITIATIVE MEASURE NO.903** Relating to the initiative and referendum process. Filed on January 10, 2005 by Tim Eyman, M.J. Fagan, and Leo J. Fagan. The initiative was withdrawn

**INITIATIVE MEASURE NO.904** Statement of Subject: Initiative Measure No. 904 concerns a process to provide citizens' opinions to governments. Concise Description: This measure would establish a network of citizen councilors, coordinated by the state auditor's office, where volunteers would meet in small groups and share their opinions on topics of public interest for tabulation. Filed on January 19, 2005 by Richard J. Spady. No signatures were submitted for checking.

**INITIATIVE MEASURE NO.905** Statement of Subject: Initiative Measure No. 905 concerns the initiative and referendum. Concise Description: This measure would require voter approval for changes in laws affecting the state initiative and referendum, provide expedited review of emergency clauses on bills, and require them to serve a compelling governmental purpose. Filed on January 26, 2005 by Tim Eyman, M.J. Fagan, and Leo J. Fagan. No signatures were submitted for checking.

**INITIATIVE MEASURE NO.906** Statement of Subject: Initiative Measure No. 906 concerns compensating property owners for certain land use restrictions. Concise Description: This measure would establish when state and local governments must compensate property owners for applying land use regulations, would identify exceptions, and would require compensation equal to the reduction in fair market value. Filed on January 11, 2005 by Katharine S. Jackson. No signatures were submitted for checking.

**INITIATIVE MEASURE NO.907** Statement of Subject: Initiative Measure No. 907 concerns energy conservation in homes. Concise Description: This measure would require residents of cities with a population of 500,000 or more, in homes with three or more bedrooms, to refrain from heating at least one bedroom from October to February. Filed on January 31, 2005 by Mark Horan. No signatures were submitted for checking.

**INITIATIVE MEASURE NO.908** Statement of Subject: Initiative Measure No. 908 concerns vehicle license plates. Concise Description: This measure would require a car or other vehicle to have only one license plate, mounted on the rear of the vehicle. Existing statutes would be amended to reflect this change. Filed on March 1, 2005 by Chris DeLong. No signatures were submitted for checking.

**INITIATIVE MEASURE NO.909** Statement of Subject: Initiative Measure No. 909 concerns motorcycles. Concise Description: This measure would make it lawful for a person over sixteen years of age to operate a small motorcycle known as a "pocket rocket" on the streets of any city or town. Filed on March 14, 2005 by Troy Houghtaling. No signatures were submitted for checking.

**INITIATIVE MEASURE NO.910** Statement of Subject: Initiative Measure No. 910 concerns vehicle license fees. Concise Description: This measure would set vehicle license tab fees at 0.416 percent of vehicle value based on the original selling price, gradually depreciated, with maximum annual fees of \$250 and minimum fees of \$30. Filed on April 22, 2005 by Lorinda Roland. No signatures were submitted for checking.

**INITIATIVE MEASURE NO.911** Statement of Subject: Initiative Measure No. 911 concerns smoking in public places. Concise Description: This measure would permit smoking in most public places except where minors are allowed, and would require all local governments to follow state laws concerning smoking in public places. Filed on May 5, 2006 by Gary L. Murrey. No signatures were submitted for checking.

**INITIATIVE MEASURE NO.912** Statement of Subject: Initiative Measure No. 912 concerns motor vehicle fuel taxes. Concise Description: This measure would repeal motor vehicle fuel tax increases of 3 cents in 2005 and 2006, 2 cents in 2007, and 1.5 cents per gallon in 2008, enacted in 2005 for transportation purposes. Filed on May 12, 2005 by Jane M. Milhans. 400,996 signatures were turned in and the measure was submitted to the voters at the November 8, 2005 general election and was rejected by the following vote: For -823366 and Against - 931186.

**INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 913** Statement of Subject: Initiative Measure No. 913 concerns revenues and fees for state and local governments. Concise Description: This measure would require state and local governments to receive either two-thirds legislative approval or majority voter approval to increase taxes or fees, and would require both approvals for certain state tax increases. Filed on January 9, 2006 by Tim D. Eyman, M. J. Fagan, Leo J. Fagan. Withdrawn by the sponsors. No signatures submitted.

**INITIATIVE MEASURE** Statement of Subject: Initiative Measure No. 914 concerns prohibiting discrimination and preferential

<b>NO. 914</b>	treatment. Concise Description: This measure would prohibit public and private entities from using race, sex, color, ethnicity, or national origin in decisions about employment, contracting, subcontracting, college admissions and school assignment, and limit collection of data. Filed on January 9, 2006 by Tim D. Eyman, M. J. Fagan, Leo J. Fagan. Withdrawn by the sponsors. No signatures submitted.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 915</b>	Statement of Subject: Initiative Measure No. 915 concerns limiting motor vehicle charges. Concise Description: This measure would cap motor vehicle registration charges at \$30 per year, repeal taxes and fees exceeding the \$30 limit, calculate vehicle taxes and fees based on purchase price, and retire certain bonds. Filed on January 9, 2006 by Tim D. Eyman, M. J. Fagan, Leo J. Fagan. Withdrawn by the sponsors January 30, 2006. No signatures submitted.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 916</b>	(relating to transportation) Filed January 9, 2006 by Tim D. Eyman, M. J. Fagan, Leo J. Fagan. Withdrawn by the sponsors January 17, 2006. No signatures submitted.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 917</b>	Statement of Subject: Initiative Measure No. 917 concerns limiting motor vehicle charges. Concise Description: This measure would cap motor vehicle registration charges at \$30 per year, repeal taxes and fees exceeding the \$30 limit, calculate vehicle taxes and fees based on purchase price, and retire certain bonds. Filed January 9, 2006 by Tim D. Eyman, M. J. Fagan, Leo J. Fagan. 266,035 signatures were filed, with 219,175 acceptable signatures and 46,859 invalid signatures. The percentage of invalid signatures was 17.61% . The measure did not qualify to the ballot.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 918</b>	Revised Ballot Title Statement of Subject: Initiative Measure No. 918 concerns transportation. Concise Description: This measure would open carpool lanes during off-peak hours, dedicate state motor vehicle sales and use taxes to fund road expansion projects, and require the state issue \$10 billion in bonds for this. Filed January 9, 2006 by Tim D. Eyman, M. J. Fagan, Leo J. Fagan. No signatures submitted.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 919</b>	Statement of Subject: Initiative Measure No.919 concerns a process to provide citizen's opinions to governments. Concise Description: This measure would establish a network of citizen councilors, coordinated by the State Auditor's office, where volunteers would meet in small groups and share their opinions on topics of public interest for tabulation. Filed January 9, 2006 by Richard J. Spady. No signatures submitted.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 920</b>	Revised Ballot Title Statement of Subject: Initiative Measure No. 920 concerns estate tax. Concise Description: This measure would repeal Washington's state laws imposing tax, currently dedicated for the education legacy trust fund, on transfers of estates of persons dying on or after the effective date of this measure. Filed January 9, 2006, by Dennis Falk. 395,219 signatures were filed and the measure was submitted to the voters at the November 7, 2006, General Election and was rejected by the following vote: Yes - 778,047, No - 1,258,110.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 921</b>	Statement of Subject: Initiative Measure No. 921 concerns punishment for certain crimes. Concise Description: This measure would classify certain crimes as violent sex offenses and would impose life imprisonment without possibility of release on adults who are convicted of such offenses, or of sexually violent predator escape. Filed on January 9, 2006, by Tracy Oetting of Skykornish. No signatures submitted.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 922</b>	Statement of Subject: Initiative Measure No. 922 concerns prohibiting "dangerous" initiatives and referendums. Concise Description: This measure would prohibit "dangerous" ballot measures, require sponsors to research the effects of their measures, prohibit certain donations and payments, authorize criminal penalties, and authorize a 1-2% sales tax increase if necessary. Filed 01/13/2006, by Ms. Gretchen Sand. No signatures submitted.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 923</b>	Statement of Subject: Initiative Measure No. 923 concerns creation of a universal health care system. Concise Description: This measure would establish a department of universal health care to operate a health care system open to all legal residents and funded by the state and by patient co payments based on income. Filed 01/09/2006, by Mr. Kris Craig. No signatures submitted.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 924</b>	Statement of Subject: Initiative Measure No. 924 concerns expenditures by school districts. Concise Description: This measure would require, beginning with the 2007-2008 school year, that school districts spend at least 65% of "operational expenditures" on "classroom instructional expenditures," as defined by the initiative, with certain waivers available. Filed 01/10/2006, by Mr. Brian Janssen. No signatures submitted.

<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 925</b>	Statement of Subject: Initiative Measure No. 925 concerns giving notice of insolvency proceedings. Concise Description: This measure would amend receivership laws to require notice to all employees if their business employer files an insolvency proceeding such as a receivership, assignment for the benefit of creditors, bankruptcy or liquidation. Filed 01/13/2006, by Mr. Dale D. DeWalt. No signatures submitted.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 926</b>	Statement of Subject: Initiative Measure No. 926 concerns public employee collective bargaining agreements. Concise Description: This measure would prohibit collective bargaining agreements for certain public employees from requiring the employee to pay any fees, dues or other obligations to a bargaining representative as a condition of employment. Filed 01/09/2006, by Mr. John M. Smith. No signatures submitted.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 927</b>	Relating to prohibiting preferential treatment. Withdrawn by Sponsor, Filed 1/18/2006, by Mr. Tim Eyman, Mr. M. J. Fagan, Mr. Leo J. Fagan. Withdrawn by sponsors. No signatures submitted.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 928</b>	Statement of Subject: Initiative Measure No. 928 concerns sex offender registration. Concise Description: This measure would set minimum terms of ten years (first conviction) and twenty years (second conviction) for felony sex offenders who fail to register, and would require electronic monitoring of certain sex offenders. Filed 01/17/2006, by Ms. Anne Hogenson. No signatures submitted.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 929</b>	Statement of Subject: Initiative Measure No. 929 concerns vehicle license plates. Concise Description: This measure would require a car, truck, or other vehicle to have only one license plate, mounted on the rear of the vehicle. Existing statutes would be amended to reflect this change. Filed 01/23/2006, by Ms. Amber Garrett. No signatures submitted.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 930</b>	Statement of Subject: Initiative Measure No. 930 concerns revenues and fees for state and local governments. Concise Description: This measure would require two-thirds approval by the legislative body, or majority approval by the legislative body and voter approval, for state and local governments to increase taxes, fees or other revenue. Filed 01/19/2006, by Mr. Tim Eyman, Mr. M. J. Fagan, Mr. Leo J. Fagan. No signatures submitted.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 931</b>	Relating to transportation. Filed 01/17/2006, by Mr. Tim Eyman, Mr. M. J. Fagan, Mr. Leo J. Fagan. Withdrawn by Sponsor. No signatures submitted.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 932</b>	Statement of Subject: Initiative Measure No. 932 concerns creation or consolidation of counties. Concise Description: This measure would establish procedures for forming or consolidating counties, including a petition, approval by either the legislature or local voters, division of county assets and liabilities, and electing initial county officers. Filed 01/19/2006, by Mr. Steven Pyeatt. No signatures submitted.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 933</b>	Statement of Subject: Initiative Measure 933 concerns government regulation of private property. Concise Description: This measure would require compensation when government regulation damages the use or value of private property, would forbid regulations that prohibit existing legal uses of private property, and would provide exceptions or payments. Filed 01/24/2006, by Mr. Daniel W. Wood. 317,353 signatures were filed and the measure was submitted to the voters at the November 7, 2006 General Election and was rejected by the following vote: Yes - 839,992, No - 1,199,679.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 934</b>	Statement of Subject: Initiative Measure No. 934 concerns qualifications for state elective office. Concise Description: This measure would require every candidate for state elective office to pass the tenth grade Washington assessment of student learning (WASL) test, and to file an affidavit so certifying before filing for office. Filed 02/03/2006, by Mr. Donald D. Hansler. No signatures submitted.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 935</b>	Statement of Subject: Initiative Measure No. 935 concerns providing bonus compensation to teachers based on parent ratings. Concise Description: This measure would provide yearly bonus payments for public school teachers based on parent/guardian ratings, calculated as a percentage of average teacher salary, and funded by a sales tax increase of 0.15 percent. Filed 02/03/2006, by Mr. Donald D. Hansler. No signatures submitted.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 936</b>	Statement of Subject: Initiative Measure No. 936 concerns criminal sentences for certain sex offenders. Concise Description: This measure would establish minimum sentences for certain sex offenses against children, developmentally disabled persons, mentally disordered persons, frail elderly persons or vulnerable adults, and restrict eligibility for treatment-based alternative sex offender sentencing. Filed 02/01/2006, by

Mr. James M. Hines. No signatures submitted.

<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 937</b>	Statement of Subject: Initiative Measure No. 937 concerns energy resource use by certain electric utilities. Concise Description: This measure would require certain electric utilities with 25,000 or more customers to meet certain targets for energy conservation and use of renewable energy resources, as defined, including energy credits, or pay penalties. Filed 01/25/2006, by Mr. Robert Jay Pregulman. 337,804 signatures were filed and the measure was submitted to the voters at the November 7, 2006 General Election and was passed by the following vote: Yes – 1,042,679, No – 972,747.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 938</b>	Statement of Subject: Initiative Measure No. 938 concerns sex offender monitoring. Concise Description: This measure would require constant electronic monitoring for any sex offender who is convicted of failure to register, is classified as risk level III, or registers as "transient" or with "no known address." Filed 02/10/2006, by Ms. Anne Hogenson. No signatures submitted.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 939</b>	Statement of Subject: Initiative Measure No. 939 concerns sex offender registration. Concise Description: This measure would establish mandatory minimum sentences for failure to register after conviction of a felony sex offense: up to twelve months in prison (first conviction) and at least seventeen months (subsequent convictions). Filed 2/10/2006, by Ms. Anne Hogenson. No signatures submitted.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 940</b>	Relating to open ballot voting. Filed 02/17/2006, by Mr. Timothy J. Janssen. Withdrawn by Sponsor. No signatures submitted.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 941</b>	Statement of Subject: Initiative Measure No. 941 concerns nominations of candidates for elective office. Concise Description: This measure would permit minor political parties or independent groups to nominate a candidate even if another party nominates the candidate. A candidate could still receive only one vote per ballot. Filed 02/17/2006, by Mr. Timothy J. Janssen. No signatures submitted.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 942</b>	Statement of Subject: Initiative Measure No. 942 concerns rainwater. Concise Description: This measure would provide that collection of rainwater for storage and reuse on the same property where collected shall not be restricted, regulated, or require water rights. Certain local safety regulations would apply. Filed 02/15/2006, by Ms. Tamara Seasholtz. No signatures submitted.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 943</b>	Statement of Subject: Initiative Measure No. 943 concerns prohibiting discrimination and preferential treatment. Concise Description: This measure would prohibit government from considering race, sex, color, ethnicity or national origin as factors in employment, contracting, college admission and public school assignment decisions, and limit collecting information regarding these factors. Filed 03/02/2006, by Mr. Tim Eyman, Mr. Leo J. Fagan, Mr. M. J. Fagan. The measure was withdrawn by the sponsors. No signatures submitted.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 944</b>	Statement of Subject: Initiative Measure No. 944 concerns taxes, revenues and fees for state and local governments. Concise Description: This measure would require state and local governments to receive two-thirds approval by the legislative body, or majority approval by the legislative body and voter approval to increase taxes, fees or other revenue. Filed 03/02/2006, by Mr. Tim Eyman, Mr. Leo J. Fagan, Mr. M. J. Fagan. No signatures submitted.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 945</b>	Relating to citizens' rights in the initiative and referendum process. Filed 03/02/2006, by Mr. Tim Eyman, Mr. Leo J. Fagan, Mr. M. J. Fagan. Withdrawn by sponsor. No signatures submitted.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 946</b>	Statement of Subject: Initiative Measure No. 946 concerns identity verification and immigration status of applicants for public benefits. Concise Description: This measure would require state and local government employees to verify identity and immigration status of every applicant for non-federally mandated public benefits, and report immigration violations, making failure to report a misdemeanor. Filed 03/15/2006, by Mr. Robert D. Baker. No signatures submitted.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 947</b>	Statement of Subject: Initiative Measure No. 947 concerns the initiative and referendum process. Concise Description: This measure would direct a two-thirds legislative vote on emergency clauses or bills affecting the initiative and referendum process; provide judicial review of emergency clauses; define and provide penalties for interference with petition-signing. Filed 03/30/2006, by Mr. Tim Eyman, Mr. Leo J. Fagan, Mr. M. J. Fagan. No signatures submitted.

<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 948</b>	Statement of Subject: Initiative Measure No. 948 concerns prohibiting discrimination and preferential treatment. Concise Description: This measure would prohibit government from considering race, sex, color, ethnicity or national origin as factors in employment, contracting, college admission and public school assignment decisions, and limit collecting information regarding these factors. Filed 03/23/2006, by Mr. Tim Eyman, Mr. Leo J. Fagan, Mr. M. J. Fagan. This measure was withdrawn by the sponsors. No signatures submitted.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 949</b>	Statement of Subject: Initiative Measure No. 949 concerns amendments to the law against discrimination. Concise Description: This measure would amend the laws against discrimination by removing all references extending coverage of the law to discrimination based on "sexual orientation" or "sexual preference" in employment, housing, and public accommodations. Filed 03/28/2006, by Mr. Tim Eyman, Mr. Leo J. Fagan, Mr. M. J. Fagan. This measure was withdrawn by the sponsors. No signatures submitted.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 950</b>	Relating to prohibiting discrimination and preferential treatment. Filed 05/02/2006, by Mr. Tim Eyman, Mr. Leo J. Fagan, Mr. M. J. Fagan. Withdrawn by sponsor. No signatures submitted.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 951</b>	Statement of Subject: Initiative Measure No. 951 concerns prohibiting discrimination and preferential treatment. Concise Description: This measure would prohibit government from using race, sex, color, ethnicity or national origin as factors in employment, contracting and education, including school admissions and assignments, and limit collecting information regarding these factors. Filed 05/05/2006, by Mr. Tim Eyman, Mr. Leo J. Fagan, Mr. M. J. Fagan. This measure was withdrawn by the sponsors. No signatures submitted.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 952</b>	Statement of Subject: Initiative Measure No. 952 concerns use of video lottery terminal revenue for "green power" projects. Concise Description: This measure would direct the lottery commission to operate up to 10,000 video lottery terminals and create a board to distribute revenues for "green power" tax incentives, home improvement loans, and educational grants. Filed 05/11/2006, by Mr. Jon T. Haugen. No signatures submitted.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 953</b>	Statement of Subject: Initiative Measure No. 953 concerns tax and fee increases imposed by state government. This measure would require two-thirds legislative approval or voter approval for tax increases, legislative approval of fee increases, certain published information on tax-increasing bills, and advisory votes on taxes enacted without voter approval. Filed 01/08/2007, by Mr. Tim Eyman, Mr. M. J. Fagan, Mr. Leo J. Fagan. No signatures submitted.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 954</b>	Statement of Subject: Initiative Measure No. 954 concerns tax and fee increases imposed by state government. This measure would require two-thirds legislative approval or voter approval for tax increases, legislative approval of fee increases, certain published information on tax-increasing bills, and advisory votes on taxes enacted without voter approval. Filed 01/08/2007, by Mr. Tim Eyman, Mr. M. J. Fagan, Mr. Leo J. Fagan. No signatures submitted.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 955</b>	Statement of Subject: Initiative Measure No. 955 concerns a process to provide citizens' opinions to governments. This measure would establish a network of citizen councilors, coordinated by the state auditor's office, where volunteers would meet in small groups and share their opinions on topics of public interest for tabulation. Filed 01/08/2007, by Mr. Richard J. Spady. No signatures submitted.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 956</b>	Statement of Subject: Initiative Measure No. 956 concerns long-term care services. This measure would increase training for long-term care providers, require certain training by labor-management partnerships, and require the governor to bargain training costs with provider representatives and request legislative funding of agreed costs. Filed 01/10/2007, by Ms. Charisa Raynor. No signatures submitted.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 957</b>	Statement of Subject: Initiative Measure No. 957 concerns eligibility for marriage. This measure would limit marriage to those couples who are biologically capable of having children together, and would invalidate the marriages of couples who fail to procreate children within three years after marrying. Filed 01/10/2007, by Mr. Gregory Paul Gadow. No signatures submitted.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 958</b>	Statement of Subject: Initiative Measure No. 958 concerns cutting trees and brush. This measure would allow cutting trees or vegetation on private property within 100 feet of the owner's home, building, building site, or utility line on the property, without fees, licenses, permits or fines. Filed 01/16/2007, by Mr. Frank M. Penwell. No signatures submitted.

<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 959</b>	Statement of Subject: Initiative Measure No. 959 concerns giving notice of insolvency proceedings. This measure would require businesses to notify employees when filing insolvency proceedings, including bankruptcy, and authorize civil penalties, damages and attorney fees for failure to notify employees, absent employee forgiveness or certain prayer. Filed 01/11/2007, by Mr. Dale D. DeWalt. No signatures submitted.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 960</b>	Statement of Subject: Initiative Measure No. 960 concerns tax and fee increases imposed by state government. This measure would require two-thirds legislative approval or voter approval for tax increases, legislative approval of fee increases, certain published information on tax-increasing bills, and advisory votes on taxes enacted without voter approval. Filed 01/08/2007, by Mr. Tim Eyman, Mr. M. J. Fagan, Mr. Leo J. Fagan. 314,504 signatures turned in on July 6, 2007. Certified to the ballot on July 19, 2007. Passed by voters 816,792 to 777,125 on November 6, 2007.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 961</b>	Statement of Subject: Initiative Measure No. 961 concerns telephone disclosure and privacy. This measure would restrict certain telephone solicitation practices, including: prohibiting the blocking of a business caller's identity, establishing a state "no call" list, and providing for regulation by the utilities and transportation commission. Filed 01/08/2007, by Mr. Rand Lee Foster. No signatures submitted.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 962</b>	Statement of Subject: Initiative Measure No. 962 concerns prohibiting "dangerous" initiatives and referendums. This measure would prohibit "dangerous" ballot measures, require sponsors to research the effects of their measures, prohibit certain donations and payments, authorize criminal penalties, and authorize an unspecified tax increase if necessary. Filed 01/22/2007, by Ms. Gretchen Sand. No signatures submitted.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 963</b>	Statement of Subject: Initiative Measure No. 963 concerns amendments to the law against discrimination. This measure would amend the law against discrimination by removing all references providing coverage against discrimination based on "sexual orientation" in employment, housing, public accommodations, insurance, and credit transactions. Filed 01/19/2007, by Mr. Kenneth L. Hutcherson. No signatures submitted.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 964</b>	Statement of Subject: Initiative Measure No. 964 concerns review of an option to replace the Alaska Way Viaduct. This measure would require the Department of Transportation to review proposed construction of a floating bridge to replace the Alaska Way Viaduct on State Route 99, and report its feasibility to the governor. Filed 01/29/2007, by Mr. Kingsley S. Hall, Jr.. No signatures submitted.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 965</b>	Statement of Subject: Initiative Measure No. 965 concerns the death penalty. This measure would allow the death penalty for importing, manufacturing, delivering, or possessing with intent to manufacture or deliver certain illegal drugs, or for committing certain violations relating to the conduct of elections. Filed 01/19/2007, by Mr. Patrick M. Crawford. No signatures submitted.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 966</b>	Statement of Subject: Initiative Measure No. 966 concerns identity, eligibility and immigration status verification for public benefits' applicants. This measure would require state and local government employees to verify identity and eligibility status of applicants for non-federally mandated public benefits using specified identification methods, report immigration violations or face misdemeanor penalty. Filed 01/30/2007, by Mr. Robert D. Baker. No signatures submitted.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 967</b>	Statement of Subject: Initiative Measure No. 967 concerns electronic voting. This measure would provide that no law, ordinance, rule, government budget, or state Supreme Court decision would be official unless you vote on it using software specified in the text of the measure. Filed 02/05/2007, by Mr. Kevin Donahoe. No signatures submitted.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 968</b>	Statement of Subject: Initiative Measure No. 968 concerns patient care by physicians and dentists. This measure would require adoption of standard care levels and checklists for physicians' and dentists' patients to sign, and revoke the licenses of physicians and dentists who do not submit completed checklists daily. Filed 02/05/2007, by Mr. Kevin Donahoe. No signatures submitted.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 969</b>	Statement of Subject: Initiative Measure No. 969 concerns online government performance ratings. This measure would provide that no government promotion or firing would be permitted without performance audits, trends, and job performance ratings by the public and maintained online at a designated private website. Filed 02/05/2007, by Mr. Kevin Donahoe. No signatures submitted.

**INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 970** Statement of Subject: Initiative Measure No. 970 concerns long-term care services for the elderly and persons with disabilities. This measure would require increased training and certification for long-term care workers, with labor-management partnerships providing certain training, and the governor bargaining with worker representatives for training costs, and requesting agreed legislative funding. Should this measure be enacted into law? Yes  No  Filed 02/13/2007, by Ms. Charrisa Raynor. No signatures submitted.

**INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 971** Statement of Subject: Initiative Measure No. 971 concerns treatment of criminals. This measure would declare that criminals who cause human physical injury or death would get no mercy whatsoever, with advanced technology evidence collection (like cell phone photography) and location tracking (with GPS chips). Filed 02/14/2007, by Mr. Kevin Donahoe. No signatures submitted.

**INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 972** Statement of Subject: Initiative Measure No. 972 concerns establishing a universal health care system. This measure would establish a department of universal health care to operate a health care system for all legal residents and qualifying non-residents, to be funded by the state and by patient co payments. Filed 02/23/2007, by Mr. Kris Craig. No signatures submitted.

**INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 973** Statement of Subject: Initiative Measure No. 973 concerns long-term care services for the elderly and persons with disabilities. This measure would require increased training, certification, and certain public funding for long term care workers. Labor-management partnerships would provide certain training. The governor would negotiate training costs with worker representatives for legislative approval. Filed 03/09/2007, by Ms. Charrisa Raynor. No signatures submitted.

**INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 974** Statement of Subject: Initiative Measure No. 974 concerns suits for damages. This measure would prohibit Washington state courts from awarding money damages for non-monetary losses, including pain and suffering, but would permit awarding punitive damages, with at least 80% paid to certain charitable organizations. Should this measure be enacted into law? Yes  No  Filed 03/19/2007, by Mr. Kevin Wright. No signatures submitted.

**INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 975** Statement of Subject: Initiative Measure No. 975 concerns compulsory voter registration. This measure would require that everybody who is legally eligible to vote in Washington must register to vote, and would require registration when applying for or renewing a driver's license, with certain exceptions. Should this measure be enacted into law? Yes  No  Filed 04/06/2007, by Mr. Kramer R. Phillips. No signatures submitted.

**INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 976** Statement of Subject: Initiative Measure No. 976 concerns trading in special influence. This measure would elevate the crime of "trading in special influence" from a class C felony to a class A felony, and address standards for a court to apply when sentencing those convicted. Should this measure be enacted into law? Yes  No  Filed 04/20/2007, by Mr. David Henshaw. No signatures submitted.

**INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 977** Statement of Subject: Initiative Measure No. 977 concerns motor vehicle licenses. This measure would repeal certain motor vehicle license laws, including license tab renewal fees. The Department of Revenue would be required to increase the fuel tax to offset license fee losses. Should this measure be enacted into law? Yes  No  Filed 04/20/2007, by Mr. David Henshaw. No signatures submitted.

**INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 978** Statement of Subject: Initiative Measure No. 978 concerns operating motor vehicles. This measure would require drivers to respond to merge signs by immediately merging into the appropriate lane without passing other vehicles. Violators would be fined \$50 for every vehicle passed without merging. Should this measure be enacted into law? Yes  No  Filed 04/20/2007, by Mr. David Henshaw. No signatures submitted.

**INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 979** Statement of Subject: Initiative Measure No. 979 concerns firearm safety. This measure would require any person applying for a concealed pistol license to attend a firearm safety class before receiving the permit, and would impose penalties for making false statements about class attendance. Should this measure be enacted into law? Yes  No  Filed 04/27/2007, by Mr. David Henshaw. No signatures submitted.

**INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 980** Statement of Subject: Initiative Measure No. 980 concerns embryo transfers as an alternative to abortion. This measure would establish a program paying 90% of the cost of embryo transfers as an abortion alternative, appropriating \$1 million for this purpose, and providing a penalty for fraudulently obtaining such funds. Should this measure be enacted into law? Yes  No  Filed 04/27/2007, by Mr. David Henshaw. No signatures submitted.

**INITIATIVE MEASURE** Statement of Subject: Initiative Measure No. 981 concerns communications between elected officials and



NO. 981	lobbyists. This measure would require lobbyists to pay a \$1000 registration fee and file recordings of communications with elected officials, and would provide criminal and civil penalties for certain acts by lobbyists and officials. Should this measure be enacted into law? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Filed 04/27/2007, by Mr. David Henshaw. No signatures submitted.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 982	Statement of Subject: Initiative Measure No. 982 concerns wage compensation. This measure would require additional compensation for employees working certain weekday and weekend hours, as described, at not less than 5% to 10% over their regular employment wage rate. Should this measure be enacted into law? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Filed 04/27/2007, by Mr. David Henshaw. No signatures submitted.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 983	Statement of Subject: Initiative Measure No. 983 concerns penalties for lying about war. This measure would define the crime of lying about war, and would make this a felony punishable by life imprisonment without possibility of parole if death or injury to a Washington citizen results. Should this measure be enacted into law? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Filed 05/11/2007, by Mr. David Henshaw. No signatures submitted.
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 984	Statement of Subject: Filed 01/04/2008, by Mr. Tim Eyman. *Withdrawn by Sponsor on 01-14-2008*
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 985	Statement of Subject: Initiative Measure No. 985 concerns transportation. This measure would open high-occupancy vehicle lanes to all traffic during specified hours, require traffic light synchronization, increase roadside assistance funding, and dedicate certain taxes, fines, tolls and other revenues to traffic-flow purposes. Should this measure be enacted into law? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Filed 01/04/2008, by Mr. Tim Eyman. *Certified to the Ballot on 21 July, 2008
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 986	Statement of Subject: Initiative Measure No. 986 concerns driver instruction permit requirements. This measure would require applicants for a driver's instruction permit to verify that they have completed a course in cardiopulmonary resuscitation (CPR), automated external defibrillator use (AED), and first aid. Should this measure be enacted into law? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Filed 01/04/2008, by Mr. Michael J. Amaral. *No signatures submitted*
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 987	Statement of Subject: Initiative Measure No. 987 concerns employee compensation. This measure would require payment of additional compensation to employees performing work during certain weekday and certain weekend hours, as described, at not less than 5% to 10% over their regular wage rate. Should this measure be enacted into law? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Filed 01/04/2008, by Mr. David Henshaw. *No signatures submitted*
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 988	Statement of Subject: Initiative Measure No. 988 concerns operating motor vehicles. This measure would require drivers to respond to merge signs by merging into the appropriate lane without passing other vehicles. Violators would be fined \$50 for every vehicle passed without merging. Should this measure be enacted into law? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Filed 01/04/2008, by Mr. David Henshaw. *No signatures submitted*
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 989	Statement of Subject: Initiative Measure No. 989 concerns embryo transfers as an alternative to abortion. This measure would establish a state program paying 90% of the cost of embryo transfers as an abortion alternative, appropriating \$1,000,000 for this purpose, and providing a penalty for fraudulently obtaining such funds. Should this measure be enacted into law? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Filed 01/04/2008, by Mr. David Henshaw. *No signatures submitted*
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 990	Statement of Subject: Initiative Measure No. 990 concerns lying about war. This measure would define the crime of lying about war, and would make this a felony punishable by life imprisonment without possibility of parole if death or injury to a Washington citizen results. Should this measure be enacted into law? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Filed 01/04/2008, by Mr. David Henshaw. *No signatures submitted*
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 991	Statement of Subject: Initiative Measure No. 991 concerns communications between elected officials and lobbyists. This measure would require lobbyists to pay a \$1,000 registration fee and file recordings of communications with elected officials, and would provide criminal and civil penalties for certain acts by lobbyists and officials. Should this measure be enacted into law? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Filed 01/04/2008, by Mr. David Henshaw. *No signatures submitted*
INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 992	Statement of Subject: Initiative Measure No. 992 concerns firearm safety. This measure would require a firearm safety class to receive a concealed pistol license, and penalize applicants who falsify attendance on

applications, and dealers who sell firearms to persons who have not attended. Should this measure be enacted into law? Yes  No  Filed 01/04/2008, by Mr. David Henshaw. \*No signatures submitted\*

<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 993</b>	Statement of Subject: Initiative Measure No. 993 concerns new product warranties. This measure would require a five-year warranty on new products sold in Washington, not including task-specific disposable products, with a one-year warranty on shoes, and would revise existing laws concerning motor vehicle warranties. Should this measure be enacted into law? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Filed 01/04/2008, by Mr. David Henshaw. *No signatures submitted*
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 994</b>	Statement of Subject: Initiative Measure No. 994 concerns certain assault crimes. This measure would revise the definition of first degree assault, second degree assault, and second degree assault of a child, and would increase the seriousness level of certain assault crimes for sentencing purposes. Should this measure be enacted into law? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Filed 01/04/2008, by Mr. David Henshaw. *No signatures submitted*
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 995</b>	Statement of Subject: Initiative Measure No. 995 concerns trading in special influence. This measure would elevate the crime of "trading in special influence" from a class C felony to a class A felony, and address standards for a court to apply when sentencing those convicted. Should this measure be enacted into law? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Filed 01/04/2008, by Mr. David Henshaw. *No signatures submitted*
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 996</b>	Statement of Subject: Initiative Measure No. 996 concerns motor vehicle licenses. This measure would repeal certain laws relating to motor vehicle licenses, including license tab renewal fees. The Department of Revenue would be required to increase the fuel tax to offset license fee losses. Should this measure be enacted into law? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Filed 01/04/2008, by Mr. David Henshaw. *No signatures submitted*
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 997</b>	Statement of Subject: Initiative Measure No. 997 concerns valuation of single-family residences for property tax purposes. This measure would limit tax valuation of single-family residences to the assessed value on December 31, 2005, adjusted annually for inflation but not greater than two percent higher than the previous year's valuation. Should this measure be enacted into law? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Filed 01/07/2008, by Mr. Jon T. Haugen. *No signatures submitted*
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 998</b>	Statement of Subject: Initiative Measure No. 998 concerns retail sales and use taxes. This measure would revise Washington law regarding imposition, collection, administration, and distribution of, state and local sales and use taxes in specific ways. Should this measure be enacted into law? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Filed 01/07/2008, by Mr. Bronn Journey. *No signatures submitted*
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 999</b>	Statement of Subject: Initiative Measure No. 999 concerns legal rights of minors. This measure would require a minor's consent for certain types of treatment, modify minors' rights to make certain decisions concerning themselves, and modify the laws on domestic violence and the emancipation of minors. Should this measure be enacted into law? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Filed 01/08/2008, by Ms. Angela M. Smith. *No signatures submitted*
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 1000</b>	Statement of Subject: Initiative Measure No. 1000 concerns allowing certain terminally ill competent adults to obtain lethal prescriptions. This measure would permit terminally ill, competent, adult Washington residents, who are medically predicted to have six months or less to live, to request and self-administer lethal medication prescribed by a physician. Should this measure be enacted into law? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Filed 01/09/2008, by Mr. Booth Gardner. <u>*Certified to ballot on 13 August 2008</u>
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 1001</b>	Statement of Subject: Initiative Measure No. 1001 concerns elections. This measure would direct legislative enactment of a voting system in which voters would rank candidates for an office based on the voters' preference, with the winner determined based on voter rankings. Should this measure be enacted into law? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Filed 01/15/2008, by Mr. Jackson E. Millikan. *No signatures submitted*
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 1002</b>	Statement of Subject: Filed 01/04/2008, by Mr. Tim Eyman. *Withdrawn by sponsor on 2-04-2008*
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 1003</b>	Statement of Subject: Initiative Measure No. 1003 concerns arrest and detention of certain persons. This measure would restrict release by law enforcement officers of persons arrested or detained who are or may be illegal foreign nationals, require state oversight, local government plans, and establish penalties for noncompliance. Should this measure be enacted into law? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Filed 01/09/2008, by Ms. Rebecca Turner. *No signatures submitted*

**INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 1004** Statement of Subject: Initiative Measure No. 1004 concerns voter registration. This measure would require every applicant for a new or renewed driver's license or state identicaid who is eligible to vote to register to vote, with the Secretary of State determining eligibility. Should this measure be enacted into law? Yes  No  Filed 01/04/2008, by Mr. Kramer R. Phillips. \*No signatures submitted\*

**INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 1005** Statement of Subject: Initiative Measure No. 1005 concerns employment of alcohol servers. This measure would prohibit termination of the employment of a bartender or cocktail waitress who refuses, on ethical grounds, to serve alcohol to a woman that he or she believes is pregnant. Should this measure be enacted into law? Yes  No  Filed 01/22/2008, by Mr. Max V. Denny. \*No signatures submitted\*

**INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 1006** Statement of Subject: Initiative Measure No. 1006 concerns traffic safety education. This measure would require state assistance and reimbursement to school districts for traffic safety education programs, and dedicate 15% of fines from certain driving-related offenses to school district traffic safety education programs. Should this measure be enacted into law? Yes  No  Filed 01/18/2008, by Mr. David L. Sliop. \*No signatures submitted\*

**INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 1007** Statement of Subject: Initiative Measure No. 1007 concerns driver instruction permit requirements. This measure would require applicants for a driver's instruction permit to verify that they have completed a course in cardiopulmonary resuscitation (CPR) and first aid, including use of an automated external defibrillator (AED). Should this measure be enacted into law? Yes  No  Filed 01/30/2008, by Mr. Michael J. Amaral. \*No signatures submitted\*

**INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 1008** Statement of Subject: Initiative Measure No. 1008 concerns the use of public money and public resources. This measure would prohibit the state and local government units from using money or public resources for anything to do with global warming or the emission or reduction of emission of greenhouse gases. Should this measure be enacted into law? Yes  No  Filed 01/31/2008, by Mr. Patrick M. Crawford. \*No signatures submitted\*

**INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 1009** Statement of Subject: Initiative Measure No. 1009 concerns matters related to the initiative and referendum process. This measure would require a two-thirds legislative vote on certain bills affecting the initiative or referendum process, provide for judicial review of emergency clauses, and revise requirements concerning signature gathering and petition language. Should this measure be enacted into law? Yes  No  Filed 02/07/2008, by Mr. Tim Eyman. \*No signatures submitted\*

**INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 1010** Statement of Subject: Initiative Measure No. 1010 concerns presidential electoral votes. This measure would allocate Washington's electoral votes proportionately as specified, based on the popular vote for presidential and vice-presidential candidates, and provide for selection of presidential electors and judicial review of elector contests. Should this measure be enacted into law? Yes  No  Filed 01/23/2008, by Mr. Allan Dyer. \*No signatures submitted\*

**INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 1011** Statement of Subject: Initiative Measure No. 1011 concerns the Port of Seattle. This measure would eliminate all Port of Seattle commissioner and staff positions, direct the transfer of Port operations to King County, discontinue Port property taxes, and require certain Port bonds to be retired. Should this measure be enacted into law? Yes  No  Filed 02/06/2008, by Mr. Tim Eyman. \*No signatures submitted\*

**INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 1012** Statement of Subject: Initiative Measure No. 1012 concerns disclosure of the presence of mold by property inspectors. This measure would require the Washington State Department of Agriculture to require wood destroying organism inspectors and home inspectors to disclose the presence and amount of mold on the properties that they inspect. Should this measure be enacted into law? Yes  No  Filed 02/08/2008, by Mrs. Teresa R. McCormick. \*No signatures submitted\*

**INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 1013** Statement of Subject: Initiative Measure No. 1013 concerns notice of administrative agencies' policies and opinions. This measure would require state administrative agencies to issue interpretive or policy statements advising the public of their opinions, approaches and likely courses of action. Should this measure be enacted into law? Yes  No  Filed 02/08/2008, by Mrs. Teresa R. McCormick. \*No signatures submitted\*

**INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 1014** Statement of Subject: Filed 02/07/2008, by Mr. Tim Eyman. \*Withdrawn by sponsor on 02-26-2008\*

**INITIATIVE MEASURE** Statement of Subject: Initiative Measure No. 1015 concerns long-term care workers for the elderly or

<b>NO. 1015</b>	persons with disabilities. This measure would require newly-hired long-term care workers for the elderly or persons with disabilities to be certified after passing an examination. It would also require increased training and additional criminal background checks. Should this measure be enacted into law? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Filed 02/11/2008, by Ms. Linda S. Lee. *No signatures submitted*
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 1016</b>	Statement of Subject: Initiative Measure No. 1016 concerns smoking restrictions. This measure would allow smoking in places of employment that are private facilities, except when such facilities are open to the public. It would also permit smoking in cigar stores and cigar bars. Should this measure be enacted into law? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Filed 02/20/2008, by Mr. Joseph P. Arundel. *No signatures submitted*
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 1017</b>	Statement of Subject: Initiative Measure No. 1017 concerns the Port of Seattle. This measure would direct transfer of all Port of Seattle operations and responsibilities to King County, discontinue Port of Seattle property taxes, and require certain Port of Seattle bonds to be retired early. Should this measure be enacted into law? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Filed 02/13/2008, by Mr. Tim Eyman. *No signatures submitted*
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 1018</b>	Statement of Subject: Initiative Measure No. 1018 concerns the initiative and referendum processes. This measure would require two-thirds legislative majority on certain bills concerning initiatives or referendums; limit legal challenges to initiatives and referendums to post-election lawsuits; and revise petition acceptance, language and signature gathering requirements. Should this measure be enacted into law? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Filed 02/27/2008, by Mr. Tim Eyman. *No signatures submitted*
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 1019</b>	Statement of Subject: Initiative Measure No. 1019 concerns the Port of Seattle. This measure would direct the transfer of Port of Seattle operations and responsibilities to King County, discontinue certain existing Port of Seattle property taxes, and withdraw its authority to levy certain property taxes. Should this measure be enacted into law? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Filed 03/05/2008, by Mr. Tim Eyman. *No signatures submitted*
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 1020</b>	Statement of Subject: Filed 03/10/2008, by Mr. Tim Eyman. *Withdrawn by sponsor on 03-20-2008*
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 1021</b>	Statement of Subject: Initiative Measure No. 1021 concerns long-term care workers for the elderly or persons with disabilities. This measure would revise examination, certification, and professional discipline standards and requirements, including increased training and criminal background check requirements, relating to long-term care workers for the elderly or persons with disabilities. Should this measure be enacted into law? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Filed 02/27/2008, by Ms. Linda S. Lee. *No signatures submitted*
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 1022</b>	Statement of Subject: Measure No. 1022 concerns the state property tax levy. This measure would repeal the laws imposing the state property tax for the support of the common schools, and would also repeal laws relating to the distribution and equalization of this tax. Should this measure be enacted into law? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Filed 03/04/2008, by Mr. Winton G. Cannon. *No signatures submitted*
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 1023</b>	Statement of Subject: Initiative Measure No. 1023 concerns confinement of egg-laying domestic birds. This measure would make it a gross misdemeanor, as of 2015, to confine egg-laying domestic birds on a farm in a manner that prevents them from fully spreading their wings, with certain exceptions. Should this measure be enacted into law? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Filed 02/27/2008, by Ms. Inga Gibson. *No signatures submitted*
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 1024</b>	Statement of Subject: Initiative Measure No. 1024 concerns confinement of certain farm animals. This measure would make it a gross misdemeanor, as of 2015, to tether or confine certain farm animals in a manner that prevents them lying down, standing, or turning, with certain specified exceptions. Should this measure be enacted into law? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Filed 02/27/2008, by Ms. Inga Gibson. *No signatures submitted*
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 1025</b>	Statement of Subject: Initiative Measure No. 1025 concerns the Port of Seattle. This measure would require transfer of Port of Seattle operations and responsibilities to King County; discontinue Port of Seattle property taxes and authority to levy property taxes; and provide for state auditor oversight. Should this measure be enacted into law? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Filed 03/17/2008, by Mr. Tim Eyman. *No signatures submitted*
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 1026</b>	Statement of Subject: Initiative Measure No. 1026 concerns elections. This measure would restrict regulation of initiative and referendum processes; require two-thirds legislative vote for any bill exempt from referendum with reasons to be specified; and revise certain election-related petition requirements and formats. Should this measure be enacted into law? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Filed 03/03/2008, by Mr. John M. Smith. *No signatures submitted*

<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 1027</b>	Statement of Subject: Initiative Measure No. 1027 concerns the initiative and referendum processes. This measure would require a two-thirds legislative majority to change laws concerning initiatives or referendums; prohibit pre-election lawsuits challenging initiatives and referendums; and revise laws concerning petition acceptance, filing, language and signature gathering. Should this measure be enacted into law? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Filed 03/20/2008, by Mr. Tim Eyman. *No signatures submitted*
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 1028</b>	Statement of Subject: Initiative Measure No. 1028 concerns Washington citizen and tribal rights. This measure would require that any right, activity or privilege afforded to the federally recognized tribes of Washington State be shared equally and in common with the people of Washington State. Should this measure be enacted into law? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Filed 03/17/2008, by Mr. Omer Lupien. *No signatures submitted*
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 1029</b>	Statement of Subject: Initiative Measure No. 1029 concerns long-term care services for the elderly and persons with disabilities. This measure would require long-term care workers to be certified as home care aides based on an examination, with exceptions; increase training and criminal background check requirements; and establish disciplinary standards and procedures. Should this measure be enacted into law? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Filed 03/12/2008, by Ms. Linda S. Lee. *Certified to ballot on 13 August 2008
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 1030</b>	Statement of Subject: Initiative Measure No. 1030 concerns property taxes. This measure would add provisions to state law concerning how assessed value and tax rates are computed for private real property, and require the legislature to enact laws to carry out its intent. Should this measure be enacted into law? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Filed 03/26/2008, by Mr. Winton G. Cannon. *No signatures submitted*
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 1031</b>	Statement of Subject: Filed 01/05/2009, by Mr. Tim Eyman. *Withdrawn by sponsor 01-09-2008
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 1032</b>	Statement of Subject: Initiative Measure No. 1032 concerns state, county and city revenue. This measure would limit growth of certain state, county and city revenue to annual inflation and population growth, not including voter-approved revenue increases. Revenue collected above the limit would reduce property tax levies. Should this measure be enacted into law? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Filed 01/05/2009, by Mr. Tim Eyman. *Withdrawn by sponsor on 01-27-2009
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 1033</b>	Statement of Subject: Initiative Measure No. 1033 concerns state, county and city revenue. This measure would limit growth of certain state, county and city revenue to annual inflation and population growth, not including voter-approved revenue increases. Revenue collected above the limit would reduce property tax levies. Should this measure be enacted into law? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Filed 01/05/2009, by Mr. Tim Eyman. *Certified to Ballot on July 15, 2009
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 1034</b>	Statement of Subject: Filed 01/09/2009, by Mr. Tim Eyman. *Withdrawn by sponsor on 01-21-2009
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 1035</b>	Statement of Subject: Initiative Measure No. 1035 concerns state, county and city revenue. This measure would limit growth of certain state, county and city revenue to annual inflation and population growth, except certain voter-approved revenue increases. Revenue collected above the limit would reduce property tax levies. Should this measure be enacted into law? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Filed 01/05/2009, by Mr. Tim Eyman. *Withdrawn by Sponsor on 01-27-2009
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 1036</b>	Statement of Subject: Initiative Measure No. 1036 concerns charges relating to motor vehicles. This measure would set annual vehicle fees at a total of \$30, repeal or reduce certain taxes and fees, calculate vehicle taxes based on depreciated purchase price, and require retirement of certain bonds. Should this measure be enacted into law? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Filed 01/20/2009, by Mr. Tim Eyman.
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 1037</b>	Statement of Subject: Initiative Measure No. 1037 concerns commercial use of military service members' names, portraits or pictures. This measure would prohibit the use of the name, portrait, or picture of a current or former service member for certain commercial purposes without consent, and provide remedies for violation of this prohibition. Should this measure be enacted into law? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Filed 01/08/2009, by Mr. Nathan D. Olson. Withdrawn by Sponsor 3/18/2009
<b>INITIATIVE MEASURE</b>	Statement of Subject: Filed 01/20/2009, by Mr. Tim Eyman. *Withdrawn by sponsor on 2-3-2009

NO. 1038

**INITIATIVE MEASURE  
NO. 1039**

Statement of Subject: Initiative Measure No. 1039 concerns determining the taxable value of property. This measure would establish taxable value of property purchased before 2009 at assessed value and property purchased after 2009 at agreed sale price or cost, with taxable value increasing thereafter one percent annually. Should this measure be enacted into law? Yes  No  Filed 01/05/2009, by Ms. L. Courtney Cox.

**INITIATIVE MEASURE  
NO. 1040**

Statement of Subject: Initiative Measure No. 1040 concerns a supreme ruler of the universe. This measure would prohibit state use of public money or lands for anything that denies or attempts to refute the existence of a supreme ruler of the universe, including textbooks, instruction or research. Should this measure be enacted into law? Yes  No  Filed 01/15/2009, by Ms. Kimberlie Struiksma. \*Withdrawn by sponsor on 03-03-09

**INITIATIVE MEASURE  
NO. 1041**

Statement of Subject: Initiative Measure No. 1041 concerns driver instruction permit requirements. This measure would require applicants for a driver's instruction permit to verify that they have completed a course in cardiopulmonary resuscitation (CPR) and first aid, including the use of an automated external defibrillator. Should this measure be enacted into law? Yes  No  Filed 01/06/2009, by Mr. Michael Amaral.

**INITIATIVE MEASURE  
NO. 1042**

Statement of Subject: Initiative Measure No. 1042 concerns charges relating to motor vehicles. This measure would set annual motor vehicle fees at \$30 total, repeal or reduce certain taxes and fees, require voter approval for certain tax or fee increases, and require retirement of certain bonds. Should this measure be enacted into law? Yes  No  Filed 01/30/2009, by Mr. Tim Eyman.

**INITIATIVE MEASURE  
NO. 1043**

Statement of Subject: Initiative Measure No. 1043 concerns public and private enforcement of immigration laws. This measure would require state and local agencies to enforce federal immigration laws and verify immigration status to issue driver's licenses and public benefits. All employers would have to "E-Verify" employees' immigration status. Should this measure be enacted into law? Yes  No  Filed 01/13/2009, by Mr. Wendell L. Hannigan. \*Revised by Court Order\*

**INITIATIVE MEASURE  
NO. 1044**

Statement of Subject: Initiative Measure No. 1044 concerns taxes on business receipts. This measure would repeal the business and occupation tax as of 2011, and direct the 2010 legislature to enact instead a flat tax on corporate and other business income, subject to certain deductions. Should this measure be enacted into law? Yes  No  Filed 01/29/2009, by Mr. James E. Vaughn.

**INITIATIVE MEASURE  
NO. 1045**

Statement of Subject: Initiative Measure No. 1045 concerns a state-run health insurance program. This measure would create a new state insurance agency to develop the contents of a state-run health insurance program covering all Washington residents and funded by premiums paid by Washington employers and employees. Should this measure be enacted into law? Yes  No  Filed 01/29/2009, by Mr. James E. Vaughn.

**INITIATIVE MEASURE  
NO. 1046**

Statement of Subject: Initiative Measure No. 1046 concerns safety equipment. This measure would repeal mandatory helmet use when operating motorcycles, motor-driven cycles, mopeds, and electric-assisted bicycles; repeal mandatory safety belt use for persons sixteen or older; and repeal state regulation of hunters' clothing. Should this measure be enacted into law? Yes  No  Filed 01/26/2009, by Mr. Patrick M. Crawford.

**INITIATIVE MEASURE  
NO. 1047**

Statement of Subject: Initiative Measure No. 1047 concerns a supreme ruler of the universe. This measure would prohibit state use of public money or lands for anything that denies or attempts to refute the existence of a supreme ruler of the universe, including textbooks, instruction or research. Should this measure be enacted into law? Yes  No  Filed 02/09/2009, by Ms. Kimberlie Struiksma.

**INITIATIVE MEASURE  
NO. 1048**

Statement of Subject: Initiative Measure No. 1048 concerns the conduct of elections. This measure would revise requirements for candidates to qualify for the primary and general election ballots, repealing laws providing that only the top vote-getters in the primary would advance to the general election. Should this measure be enacted into law? Yes  No  Filed 02/13/2009, by Mr. Joshua T. Goodin.

**INITIATIVE MEASURE  
NO. 1049**

Statement of Subject: Statement of Subject: Initiative Measure No. 1049 concerns charges relating to motor vehicles. Concise Description: This measure would set annual vehicle fees at \$30, lower dealer service fees, repeal or reduce certain taxes and fees, base vehicle taxes on depreciated purchase price, and require retirement of certain bonds. Should this measure be enacted into law? Yes  No  Filed 03/06/2009, by Mr.

Tim Eyman.

---

**INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 1050** Statement of Subject: Initiative Measure No. 1050 concerns drivers' licenses. This measure would propose a system in which unpaid traffic violations would result in restricted drivers' licenses permitting driving 12 hours per day, with provisions for recovering an unrestricted license by paying fines. Should this measure be enacted into law? Yes  No  Filed 04/24/2009, by Mr. William L. Cork.

---

**INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 1051** Statement of Subject: Filed 05/28/2009, by Mr. Tim Eyman. "Withdrawn by sponsor on 06-10-2009"

---

[Address Confidentiality](#) | [Apostiles](#) | [Archives](#) | [Charitable Trusts & Solicitations](#) | [Corporations](#) | [Digital Signatures](#)  
[Elections & Voting](#) | [International Trade](#) | [Legacy Project](#) | [Library](#) | [Medals of Merit & Valor](#) | [News Releases](#) | [Productivity Board](#)  
[State Flag](#) | [State Seal](#) | [Washington History](#)

Washington Secretary of State  
520 Union Ave SE  
PO Box 40229, Olympia WA 98504-0229  
(360) 902-4180



[Phone Numbers](#) | [Privacy Policy](#) | [Accessibility](#)







Enter Keywords

## Elections &amp; Voting

General Information

Resources

Election  
Administrators

PRINT THIS PAGE

## Proposed Initiatives to the People - 2009

The following is a list of proposed initiatives to the People filed to date with the Office of the Secretary of State. To be certified, a petition must contain the signatures of at least 241,153 registered voters. The deadline for filing petition signatures for the following initiatives is 5:00 p.m. July 2, 2009. Questions regarding the content of initiatives should be directed to the sponsor(s).

NOTE: Initiative numbers are not assigned until the proposal has been reviewed by the state Code Reviser and the sponsor has submitted the final language of the proposed initiative. The content of initiatives is described as general "subject matter" pending the issuance of an official ballot title and summary by the state Attorney General.

Assigned Number: 1031  
Filed: 01/05/2009

**Initiative Subject**  
Related to lower property taxes (Ver A)

**Sponsor**  
Mr. Tim Eyman  
Mr. Leo Fagan  
Mr. M.J. Fagan  
PO Box 18250  
Spokane, WA 99228  
425-493-8707  
Fax: 425-493-8707  
jakatak@comcast.net

[View Complete Text](#)

\*Withdrawn by sponsor 01-09-2008

Assigned Number: 1032  
Filed: 01/05/2009

**Ballot Title**  
Initiative Measure No. 1032 concerns state, county and city revenue.

**Sponsor**  
Mr. Tim Eyman  
Mr. Leo Fagan  
Mr. M.J. Fagan  
PO Box 18250  
Spokane, WA 99228  
425-493-8707  
Fax: 425-493-1027  
jakatak@comcast.net

This measure would limit growth of certain state, county and city revenue to annual inflation and population growth, not including voter-approved revenue increases. Revenue collected above the limit would reduce property tax levies.

Should this measure be enacted into law? Yes  No

**Ballot Measure Summary**  
This measure would limit growth in state revenues deposited in funds subject to the state expenditure limit, and limit growth in county and city revenues deposited into the county and city current expense funds. The limit would be adjusted based on annual growth in inflation and population. The limit also would apply to revenues transferred out of these funds. The limit would exclude voter-approved revenue increases. Revenues above the limit would reduce property tax levies.

\*Withdrawn by sponsor on 01-27-2009

[View Complete Text](#)

Assigned Number: 1033  
Filed: 01/05/2009

**Ballot Title**  
Initiative Measure No. 1033 concerns state, county and city revenue.

**Sponsor**  
Mr. Tim Eyman  
Mr. Leo Fagan  
Mr. M.J. Fagan  
PO Box 18250  
Spokane, WA 99228  
425-493-8707  
Fax: 425-493-1027  
jakatak@comcast.net

This measure would limit growth of certain state, county and city revenue to annual inflation and population growth, not including voter-approved revenue increases. Revenue collected above the limit would reduce property tax levies.

Should this measure be enacted into law? Yes  No

**Ballot Measure Summary**  
This measure would limit growth in state revenues deposited

in funds subject to the state expenditure limit, and limit growth in county and city revenues deposited into the county and city current expense funds. The limit would be adjusted based on annual growth in inflation and population. The limit also would apply to revenues transferred out of these funds. The limit would exclude voter-approved revenue increases. Revenues above the limit would reduce property tax levies.

316,444 signatures were turned in on July 2, 2009. A random check was performed and the initiative was statistically found to have sufficient signatures.

Assigned Number: 1034  
 Filed: 01/09/2009  
[Address Confidentiality](#) | [Apostilles](#) | [Archives](#)  
[Sponsorable Trusts & Solicitations](#) |  
[Mr. Tim Eyman](#) | [Digital Signatures](#)  
[Mr. Leo Fagan](#) | [Elections & Voting](#) | [International Trade](#) |  
[Mr. M.J. Fagan](#) | [Leona Project Library](#) | [Medals of Merit &](#)  
[Spokane News Archive](#) | [Productivity Board](#)  
[State Seal](#) | [Washington History](#)  
 Fax: 425-493-1027  
[jakatak@comcast.net](mailto:jakatak@comcast.net)

**\*Certified to Ballot on July 15, 2009**

[View Complete Text](#)

**Initiative Subject**  
 Related to protecting the Initiative Process

[View Complete Text](#)

**\*Withdrawn by sponsor on 01-21-2009**

**Assigned Number:** 1035  
**Filed:** 01/05/2009

**Sponsor**  
 Mr. Tim Eyman  
 Mr. Leo Fagan  
 Mr. M.J. Fagan  
 PO Box 18250  
 Spokane, WA 99228  
 425-493-8707  
 Fax: 425-493-1027  
[jakatak@comcast.net](mailto:jakatak@comcast.net)

**Ballot Title**  
 Initiative Measure No. 1035 concerns state, county and city revenue.

*This measure would limit growth of certain state, county and city revenue to annual inflation and population growth, except certain voter-approved revenue increases. Revenue collected above the limit would reduce property tax levies.*

Should this measure be enacted into law? Yes  No

**Ballot Measure Summary**  
 This measure would limit growth in state revenues deposited in funds subject to the state expenditure limit, and limit growth in county and city revenues deposited into the county and city current expense funds. The limit would be adjusted based on annual growth in inflation and population. The limit would apply to revenues transferred out of these funds. The limit would exclude certain voter-approved revenue increases. Revenues above the limit would reduce property tax levies.

**\*Withdrawn by Sponsor on 01-27-2009**

[View Complete Text](#)

**Assigned Number:** 1036  
**Filed:** 01/20/2009


**Sponsor**  
 Mr. Tim Eyman  
 Mr. Leo Fagan  
 Mr. M.J. Fagan  
 PO Box 18250  
 Spokane, WA 99228  
 425-493-8707  
 Fax: 425-493-1027  
[jakatak@comcast.net](mailto:jakatak@comcast.net)

**Ballot Title**  
 Initiative Measure No. 1036 concerns charges relating to motor vehicles.

*This measure would set annual vehicle fees at a total of \$30, repeal or reduce certain taxes and fees, calculate vehicle taxes based on depreciated purchase price, and require retirement of certain bonds.*

Should this measure be enacted into law? Yes  No

**Ballot Measure Summary**  
 This measure would set basic vehicle license charges at \$25 annually, plus a \$5 filing fee. Certain taxes and fees would be repealed or reduced. A valuation schedule based on purchase price and depreciation would be used to calculate motor vehicle taxes. The measure would require certain transportation authority bonds to be retired, and the taxes pledged to repay these bonds would be discontinued on their retirement date or March 31, 2010, whichever occurs first.

[View Complete Text](#) Assigned Number: 1038  
Filed: 01/20/2009Sponsor  
Mr. Tim Eyman  
Mr. Leo Fagan  
Mr. M.J. Fagan  
PO Box 18250  
Spokane, WA 99228  
425-493-8707  
Fax: 425-493-1027  
jakatak@comcast.netInitiative Subject  
Related to protecting initiative process[View Complete Text](#) 

\*Withdrawn by sponsor on 2-3-2009

Assigned Number: 1039  
Filed: 01/05/2009Sponsor  
Ms. L. Courtney Cox  
Dr. Kenneth R. Sinibaldi  
10654 S. Lakeshore  
Chelan, WA 98816  
509-687-3426Ballot Title  
Initiative Measure No. 1039 concerns determining the taxable value of property.

This measure would establish taxable value of property purchased before 2009 at assessed value and property purchased after 2009 at agreed sale price or cost, with taxable value increasing thereafter one percent annually.

Should this measure be enacted into law? Yes  No **Ballot Measure Summary**

This measure would direct that property acquired before January 1, 2009, be valued for taxation as stated in the 2009 property tax statement notice, and increased one percent per year thereafter. Property acquired on or after January 1, 2009, would be valued based on the agreed sale price or documented costs, including construction, increased one percent per year thereafter. Disputes about property value for property tax purposes would be resolved through submission to independent appraisers.

[View Complete Text](#) Assigned Number: 1040  
Filed: 01/15/2009Sponsor  
Ms. Kimberlie Struiksma  
PO Box 501  
Blaine, WA 98231  
360-332-2181  
Fax: 360-332-2181  
kimberlies@hotmail.comBallot Title  
Initiative Measure No. 1040 concerns a supreme ruler of the universe.

This measure would prohibit state use of public money or lands for anything that denies or attempts to refute the existence of a supreme ruler of the universe, including textbooks, instruction or research.

Should this measure be enacted into law? Yes  No **Ballot Measure Summary**

This measure would require state government not to use public funds or property for anything that denies or attempts to refute the existence of a supreme ruler of the universe, including but not limited to appropriations for displays, textbooks, scientific endeavors, instruction, and research projects. The measure would provide that no person shall be questioned based on their personal values, beliefs, or opinions regarding the existence of a supreme ruler of the universe.

\*Withdrawn by sponsor on 03-03-09

[View Complete Text](#) 

Assigned Number: 1042  
Filed: 01/30/2009

**Sponsor**

Mr. Tim Eyman  
Mr. Leo Fagan  
Mr. M.J. Fagan  
PO Box 18250  
Spokane, WA 99228  
425-493-8707  
Fax: 425-493-1027  
jakatak@comcast.net

**Ballot Title**

Initiative Measure No. 1042 concerns charges relating to motor vehicles.

This measure would set annual motor vehicle fees at \$30 total, repeal or reduce certain taxes and fees, require voter approval for certain tax or fee increases, and require retirement of certain bonds.

Should this measure be enacted into law? Yes  No

**Ballot Measure Summary**

This measure would set basic vehicle license charges at \$25 annually, plus a \$5 filing fee. Certain taxes and fees would be repealed or reduced. Government-imposed fees and taxes on vehicles would take effect only if approved by voters in an election. The measure would require certain transportation authority bonds to be retired, and the taxes pledged to repay these bonds would be discontinued on their retirement date or March 31, 2010, whichever occurs first.

[View Complete Text](#) 

Assigned Number: 1043  
Filed: 01/13/2009

**Sponsor**

Mr. Wendell L. Hannigan  
PO Box 65488  
University Place, WA 98464  
206-935-3505

[info@respectwashington.us](mailto:info@respectwashington.us)

**Ballot Title**

Initiative Measure No. 1043 concerns public and private enforcement of immigration laws.


This measure would require state and local agencies to enforce federal immigration laws and verify immigration status to issue driver's licenses and public benefits. All employers would have to "E-Verify" employees' immigration status.

Should this measure be enacted into law? Yes  No

**Ballot Measure Summary**

This measure requires state and local agencies to assist in enforcing federal immigration laws. All private and public employers would be required to "E-Verify" immigration status of employees, subject to loss of licenses and other penalties. It would require verification of immigration status of applicants for many public benefits. Nonprofit organizations would be prohibited from offering employment services without proof of immigration status. Issuance of driver's licenses would be prohibited without proof of immigration status.

\*Revised by Court Order\*

[View Complete Text](#) 

Assigned Number: 1044  
Filed: 01/29/2009

**Sponsor**

Mr. James E. Vaughn  
14416 168th St  
Orting, WA 98360  
253-241-9634  
Fax: 206-347-4578  
[jvaughn50@comcast.net](mailto:jvaughn50@comcast.net)

**Ballot Title**

Initiative Measure No. 1044 concerns taxes on business receipts.

This measure would repeal the business and occupation tax as of 2011, and direct the 2010 legislature to enact instead a flat tax on corporate and other business income, subject to certain deductions.

Should this measure be enacted into law? Yes  No

**Ballot Measure Summary**

This measure would repeal the gross receipts tax, commonly known as the business and occupation tax, effective January 1, 2011. The measure would direct the legislature, during its 2010 session, to enact and implement a flat tax on corporate and business taxable income to replace the business and occupation tax. The measure would set forth certain requirements for such a flat tax, such as setting the maximum rate and describing the deductions and credits allowed.

[View Complete Text](#) Assigned Number: 1045  
Filed: 01/29/2009Sponsor  
Mr. James E. Vaughn  
14416 168th St  
Orting, WA 98360  
253-241-9634  
Fax: 206-347-4578  
[vaughn50@comcast.net](mailto:vaughn50@comcast.net)**Ballot Title**

Initiative Measure No. 1045 concerns a state-run health insurance program.

This measure would create a new state insurance agency to develop the contents of a state-run health insurance program covering all Washington residents and funded by premiums paid by Washington employers and employees.

Should this measure be enacted into law? Yes  No **Ballot Measure Summary**

This measure would create a new state agency, headed by an appointed commissioner, to begin establishing a state-run health insurance program to provide selected health care benefits to all Washington residents. New commissions, boards, and offices would be created to establish policies regarding medical issues, represent consumers, plan for public health care needs, recommend premium amounts, set payment schedules, and administer program finances. The program would be funded by premiums paid by employers and employees.

[View Complete Text](#) Assigned Number: 1046  
Filed: 01/26/2009Sponsor  
Mr. Patrick M. Crawford  
P.O. Box 161  
Littlelock, WA 98558  
360-357-7536[blaster-chemist@uno.com](mailto:blaster-chemist@uno.com)**Ballot Title**

Initiative Measure No. 1046 concerns safety equipment.

This measure would repeal mandatory helmet use when operating motorcycles, motor-driven cycles, mopeds, and electric-assisted bicycles; repeal mandatory safety belt use for persons sixteen or older; and repeal state regulation of hunters' clothing.

Should this measure be enacted into law? Yes  No **Ballot Measure Summary**

This measure would repeal requirements mandating use of motorcycle helmets when operating a motorcycle, motor-driven cycle, or moped on a public or private road, and mandating use of a bicycle helmet when operating an electric-assisted bicycle. It would repeal requirements regarding use of safety belts by persons sixteen years old or older. The Department of Fish and Wildlife would not have authority to specify or define the clothing that may be used by hunters.

[View Complete Text](#) Assigned Number: 1047  
Filed: 02/09/2009Sponsor  
Ms. Kimberlie Struiksma  
P.O. Box 501  
Blaine, WA 98231  
360-332-2181  
Fax: 360-332-2181  
[Kimberlie@hotmail.com](mailto:Kimberlie@hotmail.com)**Ballot Title**

Initiative Measure No. 1047 concerns a supreme ruler of the universe.

This measure would prohibit state use of public money or lands for anything that denies or attempts to refute the existence of a supreme ruler of the universe, including textbooks, instruction or research.

Should this measure be enacted into law? Yes  No

Assigned Number: 1048  
Filed: 02/13/2009

**Ballot Measure Summary**

This measure would require state government not to use public funds or property for anything that denies or attempts to refute the existence of a supreme ruler of the universe, including but not limited to appropriations for displays, textbooks, scientific endeavors, instruction, and research projects.

**Sponsor**

Mr. Joshua T. Goodin  
56011 Murray Rd E  
Ashford, WA 98304  
360-569-2296

\*Last day to challenge ballot title and/or summary: 03-06-2009 [fort\\_mac\\_1814@yahoo.com](mailto:fort_mac_1814@yahoo.com)

[View Complete Text](#) 

**Ballot Title**

Initiative Measure No. 1048 concerns the conduct of elections

This measure would revise requirements for candidates to qualify for the primary and general election ballots, repealing laws providing that only the top vote-getters in the primary would advance to the general election.

Should this measure be enacted into law? Yes  No

**Ballot Measure Summary**

This measure would repeal laws providing that only the top two vote-getters in the primary election would advance to the general election and repeal the residency requirement for candidates. Additional candidates filing the required number of petition signatures could also participate in the general election. The option of "none of the above" would be added to the general election ballot. If "none of the above" gained a majority, new candidates would have to be nominated.

[View Complete Text](#) 

Assigned Number: 1049  
Filed: 03/06/2009

**Sponsor**

Mr. Tim Eyman  
Mr. Leo Fagan  
Mr. M.J. Fagan  
P O Box 18250  
Spokane, WA 99228  
425-493-8707  
Fax 425-493-1027  
[jakatak@comcast.net](mailto:jakatak@comcast.net)

**Ballot Title**

Statement of Subject: Initiative Measure No. 1049 concerns charges relating to motor vehicles.

Concise Description: This measure would set annual vehicle fees at \$30, lower dealer service fees, repeal or reduce certain taxes and fees, base vehicle taxes on depreciated purchase price, and require retirement of certain bonds.

Should this measure be enacted into law? Yes  No

**Ballot Measure Summary**

This measure would set basic vehicle license charges at \$25 annually, plus a \$5 filing fee; require voter approval for additional charges; limit the vehicle documentation service fee to \$5; repeal or reduce certain taxes and fees; and establish a valuation schedule to calculate motor vehicle taxes. Certain transportation authority bonds would be retired and the taxes pledged to repay them would be discontinued on their retirement date or March 31, 2010, whichever occurs first.

[View Complete Text](#) 

Assigned Number: 1050  
Filed: 04/24/2009

**Sponsor**

Mr. William L. Cork  
9053 Fruitdale Rd

**Ballot Title**

Initiative Measure No. 1050 concerns drivers' licenses.

This measure would propose a system in which unpaid traffic violations would result in restricted drivers' licenses permitting driving 12 hours per day, with provisions for recovering an

Sedro Wooley, WA 98284  
360-856-5837

unrestricted license by paying fines.

Should this measure be enacted into law? Yes  No

Assigned Number: (not assigned)  
Filed: 01/09/2009

**Ballot Measure Summary**

This measure would propose a system in which people with traffic ticket violations would receive a restricted driver's license permitting them to drive 12 hours each day. The licenses would permit driving from 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. unless the license holder applied for different hours and paid an additional fee to the department of licensing. The measure describes how to obtain additional driving hours or recover a regular license by paying off traffic fines.

**Sponsor**  
Mr. Tim Eyrman  
Mr. Leo Fagan  
Mr. M. J. Fagan  
PO Box 18250  
Spokane, WA 99228  
425-493-8707  
Fax: 425-493-1027  
[jakatak@comcast.net](mailto:jakatak@comcast.net)

[View Complete Text](#) 

**\*Expired 02-02-2009\***

Assigned Number: (not assigned)  
Filed: 04/24/2009

**\*Expired 5-16-2009\***

**Sponsor**  
Mr. William Cory Potts  
8443 NE 6th St  
Medina, WA 98039  
206-963-9584

Washington Secretary of State  
520 Union Ave SE  
PO Box 40229, Olympia WA 98504-0229  
(360) 902-4180



[Phone Numbers](#) | [Privacy Policy](#) | [Accessibility](#)

J





Enter Keywords



## Elections &amp; Voting

General Information

Resources

Election  
Administrators

PRINT THIS PAGE

## Proposed Initiatives to the Legislature - 2009

The following is a list of proposed initiatives to the 2010 Legislature filed to date with the Office of the Secretary of State. To be certified, a petition must contain the signatures of at least 241,153 registered voters. The deadline for filing petition signatures for the following initiatives is 5:00 p.m. December 31, 2009. Questions regarding the content of initiatives should be directed to the sponsor(s).

NOTE: Initiative numbers are not assigned until the proposal has been reviewed by the state Code Reviser and the sponsor has submitted the final language of the proposed initiative. The content of initiatives is described as general "subject matter" pending the issuance of an official ballot title and summary by the state Attorney General.

**Assigned Number:** 432  
**Filed:** 04/27/2009

**Ballot Title**

Statement of Subject: Initiative Measure No. 432 concerns election candidacy petitions.

**Sponsor**  
Mr. Clifford M. Greene  
P.O. Box 612  
Bellevue, WA 98009  
Phone:

**Concise Description:** This measure would revise the number of registered voter signatures required to be included on petitions submitted by an indigent candidate in lieu of paying the filing fee for an elective public office.

Should this measure be enacted into law? Yes  No

partyofcommons@yahoo.com

**Ballot Measure Summary**

This measure would change the number of registered voter signatures required to be filed with a petition to seek elective office where the candidate lacks sufficient assets to pay the filing fee for the office. The required number would be: 500 signatures for a statewide office, 200 for U.S. representative, and 50 for any other state or local office. The measure would require candidates to file affidavits if their claims of indigency were challenged.

[View Complete Text](#)

**Assigned Number:** 433  
**Filed:** 06/08/2009

**Ballot Title**

Statement of Subject: Initiative Measure No. 433 concerns motor vehicle taxes, fees, and tolls, and certain transportation bonds.

**Sponsor**  
Mr. Tim Eyman  
Mr. M.J. Fagan  
Mr. Leo Fagan  
PO Box 18250  
Spokane, WA 99228  
Phone: 425-493-8707  
Fax: 425-493-1027  
jakatak@comcast.net

**Concise Description:** This measure would set \$30 annual vehicle fees; base vehicle taxes on depreciated purchase-price; and require retirement of certain bonds, dedication of tolls to specific projects, and voter approval for increased vehicle-related charges.

Should this measure be enacted into law? Yes  No

**Ballot Measure Summary**

This measure would set vehicle license fees and charges at \$30 annually; subtract other charges from license fees and vehicle sales taxes; require voter approval for additional charges; repeal certain taxes and fees; establish a valuation schedule for motor vehicle taxes; require that within 90 days certain transportation authority bonds be retired and the collection of pledged taxes discontinued; and require the legislature to set transportation tolls with each toll dedicated to a specific project.

\*Last day to challenge title and/or summary: 06-23-2009

[View Complete Text](#)

**Assigned Number:** 434  
**Filed:** 06/18/2009

**Ballot Title**

Statement of Subject: Initiative Measure No. 434 concerns motor vehicle taxes, fees, and tolls, and certain transportation bonds.

**Sponsor**  
Mr. Tim Eyman  
Mr. Leo Fagan  
Mr. M.J. Fagan  
PO Box 18250  
Spokane, WA 99228

**Concise Description:** This measure would set annual vehicle fees at \$30 plus voter-approved increases; base vehicle taxes on depreciated purchase price; require retirement of certain bonds; and require dedication of transportation tolls to specific projects.

Should this measure be enacted into law? Yes  No

Phone: 425-493-8707  
 Fax: 425-493-1027  
 jakatak@comcast.net

**Ballot Measure Summary**

This measure would set vehicle license fees and charges at \$30 annually; subtract other charges from license fees and vehicle sales taxes; require voter approval for additional license fees and taxes and fees; establish a valuation schedule for motor vehicle taxes; require that the collection of transportation authority bonds be retired and the collection of the legislature to set transportation tolls with each toll dedicated to a specific project.

[Address Confidentiality](#) | [Apostilles](#) | [Archives](#)  
[Charitable Trusts](#) | [Clemency](#) | [Criminal Justice](#)  
[Digital Signatures](#) | [Elections](#) | [Economic Development](#)  
[Energy](#) | [Environmental](#) | [Executive Orders](#) | [Finance](#)  
[Government](#) | [Health](#) | [History](#) | [Immigration](#)  
[Intergovernmental](#) | [Judicial](#) | [Labor](#) | [Landmarks](#)  
[Legislation](#) | [Legislative Process](#) | [Medals of Merit & Valor](#) | [News Releases](#) | [Productivity Board](#)  
[State Flag](#) | [State Seal](#) | [Washington History](#)

[View Complete Text](#) 

Assigned Number: 435  
 Filed: 06/26/2009

**Ballot Title**

Statement of Subject: Initiative Measure No. 435 concerns the initiative and referendum process.

**Sponsor**  
 Mr. Tim Eyman  
 Mr. M.J. Fagan  
 Mr. Leo Fagan  
 PO Box 18250  
 Spokane, WA 99228  
 Phone: 425-493-8707  
 Fax: 425-493-1027  
 jakatak@comcast.net

**Concise Description:** This measure would penalize interference with signature gathering; prohibit licensing of signature gatherers; prohibit requiring identifying information from gatherers; exempt information about signers from public records requests; and extend time for signature gathering.

Should this measure be enacted into law? Yes  No

**Ballot Measure Summary**

Under the measure, interfering with signature gathering would be subject to anti-harassment laws and other penalties. Licensing of signature gatherers would be prohibited, and gatherers could not be required to reveal identifying information. Identifying information of signers would be redacted from petitions in public records requests. The time for gathering signatures would be extended, and signature gathering would be legal inside and outside of public buildings. Limits would be placed on rejecting signatures or petitions.

[View Complete Text](#) 

Assigned Number: 436  
 Filed: 07/01/2009

**Initiative Subject**  
 Related to \$30 car tabs

**Sponsor**  
 Mr. Tim Eyman  
 Mr. Leo Fagan  
 Mr. M.J. Fagan  
 PO Box 18250  
 Spokane, WA 99228  
 Phone: 425-493-8707  
 Fax: 425-493-1027  
 jakatak@comcast.net

\*Withdrawn by sponsor 07-15-09

[View Complete Text](#) 

Assigned Number: 437  
 Filed: 07/15/2009

**Ballot Title**

Statement of Subject: Initiative Measure No. 437 concerns income taxes.

**Sponsor**  
 Mr. Tim Eyman  
 Mr. M.J. Fagan  
 Mr. Leo Fagan  
 PO Box 18250  
 Spokane, WA 99228  
 Phone: 425-493-8707  
 Fax: 425-493-1027  
 jakatak@comcast.net

**Concise Description:** This measure would prohibit the imposition of an income tax.

Should this measure be enacted into law? Yes  No

**Ballot Measure Summary**

This measure would provide that it would be illegal to enact an income tax, and that this measure would supersede any preexisting law, rule, policy, or ordinance.

[View Complete Text](#) 

Assigned Number: 438  
 Filed: 07/15/2009

**Initiative Subject**  
 Related to the initiative process

**Sponsor**  
 Mr. Tim Eyman  
 Mr. M.J. Fagan  
 Mr. Leo Fagan  
 P.O. Box 18250  
 Spokane, WA 99228  
 Phone: 425-493-8707  
 Fax: 425-493-1027  
 jakatak@comcast.net

\*Withdrawn by sponsor on 07-23-2009

[View Complete Text](#) 

Assigned Number: 439

Initiative Subject

Filed: 07/21/2009

Related to car tabs

Assigned Number: 440  
Filed: 07/21/2009

**Sponsor**  
Mr. Tim Eyman  
Mr. Leo Fagan  
Mr. Michael J. Fagan  
P.O. Box 18250  
Spokane, WA 99228  
Phone: 425-493-8707  
Fax: 425-493-1027  
jakatak@comcast.net

\*Withdrawn by sponsor on 07-28-2009

[View Complete Text](#)

**Sponsor**  
Mr. Tim Eyman  
Mr. Leo Fagan  
Mr. Michael J. Fagan  
PO Box 18250  
Spokane, WA 99228  
Phone: 425-493-9127  
Fax: 425-493-1027  
jakatak@comcast.net

**Ballot Title**  
Statement of Subject:  
Initiative Measure No. 440  
concerns the initiative and  
referendum process.

**Concise Description:** This  
measure would penalize  
interference and retaliation  
related to signature  
gathering; prohibit public  
disclosure and restrict use of  
names on petitions; extend  
time for initiative signature  
gathering; and limit grounds  
for rejecting petitions.

Should this measure be  
enacted into law? Yes  No

**Ballot Measure Summary**  
Under the measure,  
interfering with or retaliating  
against signature gatherers  
or petition signers would be  
subject to anti-harassment  
laws and criminal penalties.  
Gatherers' and signers'  
names would be exempt from  
public disclosure and use of  
those names would be  
restricted. The time for filing  
the initiative would be  
extended from ten to sixteen  
months. Signature gathering  
would be legal in certain  
public places. Signatures and  
petitions could not be  
rejected because of signature  
gatherers' actions.

[View Complete Text](#)Assigned Number: 441  
Filed: 07/29/2009

**Ballot Title**  
Statement of Subject: Initiative Measure No. 441 concerns motor vehicle related fees, taxes, tolls and  
certain transportation bonds.

**Sponsor**  
Mr. Tim Eyman  
Mr. M.J. Fagan  
Mr. Leo J. Fagan  
PO Box 18250  
Spokane, WA 99228  
Phone: 425-493-8707  
Fax: 425-493-1027  
jakatak@comcast.net

**Concise Description:** This measure would require \$30 vehicle license fees; reduce vehicle taxes and fees  
and require voter-approval of increases; require certain bond retirement; limit toll-setting to the  
legislature; and dedicate tolls to specific projects.

Should this measure be enacted into law? Yes  No

**Ballot Measure Summary**  
This measure would set vehicle license fees at \$30 per year; subtract other charges from license fees  
and vehicle taxes; reduce certain motor vehicle taxes and fees; require voter approval of vehicle charge  
increases; repeal authority for certain voter-approved vehicle tax surcharges; require that certain  
transportation authority bonds be retired within 90 days and that collection of pledged taxes be  
discontinued; and require the legislature to set transportation tolls and dedicate tolls to specific projects.

[View Complete Text](#)Assigned Number: 442  
Filed: 07/29/2009

**Initiative Subject**  
Related to the Initiative Process

**Sponsor**  
Mr. Tim Eyman  
Mr. M.J. Fagan  
Mr. Leo J. Fagan  
PO Box 18250

\*Withdrawn by sponsor on 08-07-2009

[View Complete Text](#)

Spokane, WA 99228  
Phone: 425-493-8707  
Fax: 425-493-1027  
jakatak@comcast.net

Assigned Number: 443  
Filed: 08/07/2009

Initiative Subject

**Sponsor**  
Mr. Tim Eymann  
Mr. M.J. Fagan  
Mr. Leo J Fagan  
PO Box 18250  
Spokane, WA 99228  
Phone: 425-493-8707  
425-493-1027  
jakatak@comcast.net

\*Withdrawn by Sponsor 8/10/2009

[View Complete Text](#) 

Assigned Number: 444  
Filed: 08/10/2009

Initiative Subject  
\*Relating to the Initiative Process.

**Sponsor**  
Mr. Tim Eymann  
Mr. M. J. Fagan  
Mr. Leo J. Fagan  
PO Box 18250  
Spokane, WA 99228  
Phone: 425-493-8707  
425-493-1027  
jakatak@comcast.net

[View Complete Text](#) 

Washington Secretary of State  
520 Union Ave SE  
PO Box 40229, Olympia WA 98504-0229  
(360) 902-4180



[Phone Numbers](#) | [Privacy Policy](#) | [Accessibility](#)

K



Enter Keywords

## Elections &amp; Voting

General Information

Resources

Election  
Administrators

PRINT THIS PAGE

## Proposed Referendum Measures - 2009

Referendum petitions against a measure passed by the Legislature shall be filed with the Secretary of State not later than ninety days after final adjournment of the session in which the measure passed.

The following is a list of proposed referendum measures filed to date with the Office of the Secretary of State. To be certified, a petition must contain the signatures of at least 120,577 registered voters. The deadline for filing petition signatures for the following referenda is 5:00 p.m. July 25, 2009. Questions regarding the content of referenda should be directed to the sponsor(s).

Assigned Number: 69  
Filed: 04/22/2009

Referendum Subject  
EHB 1053

Sponsor  
Ms. Amilee Wilson  
P.O. Box 19743  
Olympia, WA 98501  
Phone:

\*Withdrawn by Sponsor\*

[View Complete Text](#)

Assigned Number: 70  
Filed: 04/29/2009

Ballot Title  
Statement of Subject: The legislature passed Senate Bill 5599 concerning election of the President of the United States [and voters have filed a sufficient referendum petition on this bill].

Sponsor  
Mr. David John Anderson  
P.O. Box 386  
Shaw Island, WA 98286  
Phone: 360-317-6113

Concise Description: This bill would enter Washington into an agreement to appoint presidential electors pledged to support the winner of the national popular vote, if states possessing a majority of electoral votes enact the agreement.

[voteonpopvote@gmail.com](mailto:voteonpopvote@gmail.com)

Should this bill be:

Approved

Rejected

## Ballot Measure Summary

The President is elected through "electoral college" votes cast by electors appointed from each state. This bill enters Washington into an agreement under which each state enacting the agreement will appoint presidential electors who are pledged to support the candidate receiving the largest national popular vote, instead of the candidate receiving the most votes in that state. The agreement would take effect only if states holding at least a majority of electoral votes enact it.

[View Complete Text](#)

Assigned Number: 71  
Filed: 05/04/2009

Ballot Title  
Statement of Subject: The legislature passed Engrossed Second Substitute Senate Bill 5688 concerning rights and responsibilities of state-registered domestic partners [and voters have filed a sufficient referendum petition on this bill].

Sponsor  
Mr. Lawrence Stickney  
P.O. Box 501  
Arlington, WA 98223  
Phone: 360-631-1894

Concise Description: This bill would expand the rights, responsibilities, and obligations accorded state-registered same-sex and senior domestic partners to be equivalent to those of married spouses, except that a domestic partnership is not a marriage.

[lstickney@valuesaction.org](mailto:lstickney@valuesaction.org)

Should this bill be:

Approved

Rejected

## Ballot Measure Summary

Same-sex couples, or any couple that includes one person age sixty-two or older, may register as a domestic partnership with the state. Registered domestic partnerships are not marriages, and

marriage is prohibited except between one man and one woman. This bill would expand the rights, responsibilities, and obligations of registered domestic partners and their families to include all rights, responsibilities, and obligations granted by or imposed by state law on married couples and their families.

- [Address Confidentiality](#) | [Apostiles](#) | [Archives](#)
- | [Charitable Trusts & Solicitations](#) |
- [Corporations](#) | [Digital Signatures](#)
- [Elections & Voting](#) | [International Trade](#) |
- [Legacy Project](#) | [Library](#) | [Medals of Merit & Valor](#) | [News Releases](#) | [Productivity Board](#)
- [State Flag](#) | [State Seal](#) | [Washington History](#)

[View Complete Text](#) 

Assigned Number: 72  
Filed: 05/27/2009

Sponsor  
Mr. Gerald Galland  
P.O. Box 1843  
Milton, WA 98354  
Phone: 253-838-8690

[jerry@votenoannexation.com](mailto:jerry@votenoannexation.com)

**Ballot Title**

Statement of Subject: The legislature passed Engrossed Substitute Initiative 508 concerning annexation of unincorporated areas [and voters have filed a sufficient referendum petition on part of this bill].

**Concise Description:** This bill would permit cities and towns to annex certain fire district territory after an agreement, in addition to other methods, and would also reduce property percentage requirements for some annexation petitions.

Should this bill be:

Approved   
Rejected

**Ballot Measure Summary**

The portions of ESSB 5808 covered by this referendum measure would permit a city or town to annex unincorporated areas served by a fire protection district – in addition to existing annexation methods – by interlocal agreement between the city or town, the county and the fire district serving the area. It would also make uniform for all cities the procedure for annexation by petition of owners of 60% of assessed property value in an annexation area.

\*Revised by court order on 06-18-2009

[View Complete Text](#) 

Washington Secretary of State  
520 Union Ave SE  
PO Box 40229, Olympia WA 98504-0229  
(360) 902-4180



[Phone Numbers](#) | [Privacy Policy](#) | [Accessibility](#)

L




---

THE WASHINGTON STATE  
HERITAGE CENTER

---

## The Vision

*The Washington State Heritage Center will be an educational and cultural landmark welcoming all visitors to the Capitol Campus, highlighting the history and culture of the State of Washington. It will be a shining example of timeless design and worthy of its purpose – a permanent home for the people's historical records, documents and library collections that are vital to our democracy.*



## Mission

Through exceptional collections, interactive exhibits, and educational programs, the Washington State Heritage Center connects people with their shared history and government, providing an unrivaled visitor experience on the Capitol Campus.

*"The Washington State Heritage Center, a center for excellence, that will educate and enhance the understanding of our unique heritage and promote a dynamic future for our great State and its people."*

- Secretary of State Sam Reed

« Back

---

WASHINGTON STATE HERITAGE CENTER  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE  
PO BOX 40222, OLYMPIA, WA 98504-0222  
info@heritagecenter.wa.gov - (360) 902-4151

M

SUBSCRIBE | MANAGE SUBSCRIPTION | DELIVERY ISSUES | E-EDITION | CONTACT US

# The Olympian



Olympia Weather  
Cloudy 64°F  
Hi/Low: 70°/55°



SIGN IN | BECOME A MEMBER

Search

NEWS SPORTS OPINION LIVING ENTERTAINMENT ANNOUNCEMENTS GOVERNMENT OUTDOORS MULTIMEDIA CLASSIFIED PLACE AN AD  
Letters To The Editor Editorials Ask The Editors Editorial Board Reader Network Caption Contest

**Video Reports**

- Thurston County F...
- Capital Lakefair ...
- Capital Lakefair ...

Play video

**If you died today, who would take care of your family?**

10-Yr Level Term	Age male	40 \$20.99
Life Insurance	45 \$31.08	
\$500,000 Policy	50 \$46.00	
(Monthly Premiums)	55 \$77.00	

Get A FREE Life Insurance Quote Today!  
**Click Here**  
AccuQuote

## Don't let dream of Heritage Center fade away

THE OLYMPIAN | Published July 02, 2009

Print email Buzz up!

Real Estate | Apartments | Jobs | Cars

COMMENTS (2) RECOMMEND (1)

The majestic state Heritage Center overlooking Capitol Lake is a victim of the economic recession.



**How to View Your Credit Report and Scores for Free**  
We all know the importance of having an accurate

The \$141 million center, a focal point of state history, is still in the design stage. It was scheduled for completion in 2012, but because of financial shortfalls the project has been put on hold for one or two years by the Legislature.

It's easy, during this forced lull, for naysayers to start picking away at the project. There are those who would like to completely torpedo the Heritage Center.

That's why it's incumbent for people such as Gov. Chris Gregoire, Secretary of State Sam Reed, Sen. Karen Fraser, D-Thurston County, and other advocates who have grasped the vision to maintain their optimism and continually promote the Heritage Center as an important next step for the Capitol Campus.

**More Articles:**

- The Secret to Getting Highly Discounted Cruise Tickets
- Computer Slowing Down? What to Do About It
- Are You Snoring Yourself To Death?
- A cost-effective way to treat your diabetes

Advertising provided by: ARALifeStyle.com

The center, which will be built on the bluff overlooking Capitol Lake on the northern edge of the campus, will be a focal point for campus visitors to start their tour.

They will learn about the history of the Washington Territory and the important events and people that have shaped Washington since statehood.

Go to most any community and there is a library or museum or civic center where visitors can learn about local history.

That's missing from the Capitol Campus.

While architects are about 80 percent completed with their design plans, the Heritage Center will combine State Archives, the State Library and State Capital Museum offices and exhibits. The state-of-the-art facility will offer interactive displays and colorful images from Washington's comprehensive collections. The center will provide citizens with centralized access to state and local history. And through links with TWW, the state's public affairs network, history lessons will be available to thousands of classrooms across the state.

"The Heritage Center will cultivate all of us and safeguard our history for generations to come," Reed said. "I firmly believe we have a responsibility to protect our history and make it accessible to everyone."

The Heritage Center project has enjoyed broad, bipartisan support. The vote to build the center was 45-1 in the Senate and 85-15 in the House.

Then the economy went south.

The center relies on a \$2 charge on filing real estate transactions and a \$5 fee on incorporation filings by businesses to pay for the project. Those fees slid dramatically when the economy slipped into recession.

Gov. Gregoire tried to save the project by including \$29 million in her construction budget request to lawmakers. But in the end, legislators decided to delay the project for one, perhaps two years. It's now scheduled for completion in 2013 or 2014. "We're holding firm on our existing plan," Reed said. He's also been touring the state encouraging private donors and community leaders to maintain their support for the Heritage Center.

Sen. Fraser, who has championed the project alongside Reed, said, "The vision is still there. But what we need is for the economy to come around and then the fee revenue will come around."

Meanwhile, lawmakers want to take advantage of the delay to take a closer look at the project. They included money in the budget to reconsider the building plans and make sure they match the amount of fee money coming in.

This is still a very worthwhile project which has a reliable funding source. The center will add immensely to the knowledge of all those individuals who visit the state Capitol Campus — including the more than 70,000 school children who come here annually. What better place for students and adults to learn state history and see government in action? The Heritage

**What's for Dessert?**

Click here to Get Recipes  
Fruit Vendors.com

**TOP JOBS**

- Dental Hygienist  
Cooper Dental Arts Center
- Clinical Staff Pharmacist  
Capital Medical Center
- COUNCIL REPRESENTATIVE  
WA Federation of State Employees
- Registered Nurse and Lic. Practical Nurses & MA  
Group Health
- Registered Nurse, CNM, PA-C  
Planned Parenthood of Western WA

cancerbuilder  
find  
All Top Jobs >



**Video Reports**

- Thurston County F...
- Capital Lakefair ...
- Capital Lakefair ...

Play video

**Site Map**

**News**

- South Sound
- Northwest
- National News
- Business
- Odd News
- Stock Market
- Education
- Environment
- Traffic
- Weather
- RSS Feeds
- Corrections

**Government**

- Elections
- National Elections
- State Government

**Sports**

- High School Sports
- College Sports
- Motor Sports
- Golf
- Winter Sports
- Seahawks
- Sounders FC
- Mariners

**Outdoors**

- Hunting
- Outdoors Blog
- Fishing Blog
- Outings
- Travel
- Tides

**Blogs**

- Adam Wilson's Blog
- Ask the Editors
- Chester Allen's Blog
- Education Blog
- Hot Flashes
- Olympian Site Blog
- Let's Talk Fishing
- Pet The Blog
- Pro Sports Blog
- The Politics Blog
- Sports Blog
- The Game Log

**Columns**

- Busy Mama
- Scoundings
- Video Guy

**Multimedia**

- Local Video
- Local Galleries
- Today in Photos
- Nation & World Galleries
- Your Videos
- Your Photos
- Mobile website
- Map the news: Newsgarden
- Photo Reprints

**Living**

- Horoscope
- Home & Garden
- Health & Fitness
- Books
- Holidays
- Travel



N

# ARCHIVAL RECORDS



## COLLECTION POLICY and TRANSFER MANUAL

**Office of the Secretary of State**  
*Sam Reed, Secretary of State*

Division of Archives & Records Management

Olympia, Washington  
February 2009



# **ARCHIVAL RECORDS**

## **COLLECTION POLICY AND TRANSFER MANUAL**

Office of the Secretary of State  
*Sam Reed, Secretary of State*

Division of Archives & Records Management  
Jerry Handfield, State Archivist

Olympia, Washington  
September 2003

**State Government Archives Staff:**

Research / General Information  
research@secstate.wa.gov  
(360) 586-1492

David Hastings  
Acquisitions and Processing  
dhastings@secstate.wa.gov  
(360) 753-1801

Lupita Lopez  
Research Assistant  
llopez@secstate.wa.gov  
(360) 586-4505

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Mission Statement	Page 1
Legal Authority	1
Public Records Defined	1
Purpose of the Archives	2
Appraisal and Collection Policy	3
Ownership of Transferred Records	4
Access to Records	5
Differences Between the Archives & the Records Center	5
Transfer and Disposition of Archival Records	6
Transfer Procedures for Archival Records	6
Preparing the Records for Transfer	6
<b>Instructions for Filling Out the Archival Box Content List Form</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Labeling the Boxes</b>	<b>8</b>
Supplies, Shipping and Referencing	9
<b>Sample Forms (May be Copied)</b>	<b>10</b>

*To All State Records Keepers,*

*Each state agency is an important part of the state and its history. It is essential that the archival records of state agencies be preserved. The archival program is people dependent, therefore your understanding, cooperation and support in preserving the historical record is essential. Without your help the job will not be done, and much of the historical record will be lost, inadvertently destroyed or ultimately will disintegrate. We hope you will view preservation of the archives not just as a legal requirement but as an important cultural responsibility in which you can actively participate and support.*

## **Mission Statement**

The mission of the Washington State Archives is "To centralize the archives of the state of Washington, to make them available for reference and scholarship, and to ensure their proper preservation." (RCW 40.14.020). To accomplish this mission, the State Archives is authorized to inspect and appraise all state government records for archival value. Additionally, the State Archives designates which records shall be transferred to the Archives, preserves those records as a public trust, and ensures that all citizens have free and ready access to those records under the provisions of the law.

## **Legal Authority**

"All public records, not required in the current operation of the office where they are made or kept. . . shall be transferred to the state archives so that the valuable historical records of the state may be centralized, made more widely available, and insured preservation." (RCW 40.14.030). Under the terms of the law, all state government agencies are obliged to submit their records to the State Archives for review and possible inclusion in the archival collections when the agency which created those records no longer needs them for day-to-day operations.

The State Archives serves as the archival repository for all state government agencies. However, state agencies share responsibility by providing for the preservation of historical public records until such time as they can be transferred to the Archives, and ensuring that such records are transferred to Archives in a timely manner.

## **Public Records Defined**

"The term 'public records' shall include any paper, correspondence, completed form, bound record book, photograph, film, sound recording, map drawing, machine-readable material, or any other document, regardless of physical form or characteristics, and including such copies thereof, that have been made or received by any agency of the state of Washington in connection with the transaction of public business." (RCW 40.14.010).

Essentially, all documentation produced by or received by any government agency, regardless of form and including electronic records, are "public records." This includes the records of agency directors and members of boards and commissions.

## Purpose of the Archives and Archival Collections

The purpose of the Archives is to document the history, organization and functions of Washington State government agencies and their impact on the lives of citizens. The archival collections consist of over 100,000 cubic feet (around 250 million documents) of records that document many aspects of the history of the state and activities of state government. The collections date from the establishment of Washington Territory in 1853 to the present. Included among them are the papers of each governor, legislative records, court records, records from all state agencies, and all of the "official records" of the state, including governors' proclamations, executive orders, election results, and the laws as passed and signed.

**"To centralize the archives of Washington."** Researchers from all over the world rely on the Archives for information about Washington, its government, and its citizens. To best serve them, it is essential that the information be centralized and not scattered in various locations statewide, which is why state agencies may not establish and operate their own individual "archives."

Public records must always remain in government custody. They may not be donated to organizations such as libraries, museums or historical societies, and government employees under penalty of law may not take them home. Public records are the property of the State.

**"To make them available for reference and scholarship."** The Archives employs professionally trained staff dedicated to helping researchers find and understand state government records. This guarantees the best possible service to the public.

**"To ensure their proper preservation."** All records deteriorate, whether they are paper, electronic, optical images, photographs, or other media. The Archives operates a records conservation lab that employs techniques to preserve records, and all of the most important historical records in the custody of the Archives are stored in special temperature/humidity controlled vaults which extends the life of records many times over.

**To provide continuity of care and continuing access.** The State Archives is established by law to take care of the state's historical records and is equipped and staffed to do so. Generally state agencies do not have the facilities, equipment or people with the time or professional archival training to do archival work, and a change in staffing or agency outlook can often result in the neglect or even destruction of records.

## Appraisal and Collection Policy

The purpose of archival appraisal is to select those state government records that document the functions, programs, and activities of state government agencies. To achieve this, the Archives has the legal mandate to collect records from every level of government which will serve the purpose of documenting Washington's history. It is the policy of the State Archives to collect historically significant records from all branches and agencies of government, including the executive, judicial and legislative branches.

**Evidentiary Records:** The kinds of records that merit inclusion in the Archives are those which provide essential evidentiary information on state agency functions. The Archives seeks to acquire those records which are the primary records of how citizens are governed, managed, or otherwise relate to public institutions over time. Examples of records which are traditionally appraised as "archival" for their evidentiary value include: records designated by law as having permanent historical value; records which best reflect the mission, goals, programs, functions, and organization of state agencies and programs; and records that provide the most accurate, understandable, accessible and succinct sources of information. Additionally, the State Archives also collects records that have "intrinsic" value, based upon the physical form of the record, its uniqueness, or other factors arising out of its creation or use.

**Informational Records:** In addition to documenting the functions of state government, the Archives is also responsible for preserving records that have valuable information for a variety of researchers. For example; the legal community in establishing legislative intent; genealogists seeking to find out about their ancestors; citizens seeking records to document and safeguard their rights; historians seeking primary historical source materials of all kinds; and state agency officials researching the actions and activities of their agencies in the past.

### Typical Archival Government Records:

- Executive level correspondence and subject files
- State agency annual/biennial reports
- Primary documentation of state government programs
- Meeting minutes
- Studies
- Research reports
- Public affairs office files

**Non-Government Records:** In addition to government records, the State Archives collects records derived from other sources which may augment government records collections or otherwise shed light on government policies or activities. These may include the papers of legislators, private papers of former government officials, private collections of documents and manuscript materials, working files, studies, and

publications featuring government activities.

**The Archival Appraisal Process:** Archival appraisal is a multi-step process which begins with the analysis of state agency Records Retention Schedules by the State Archives Appraisal Committee. Records may be re-appraised later after their transfer to the archives and prior to their disposal. In some cases only a portion of the records are saved for archives. State agencies are kept informed of the archival status of the records which they have created, and if it is determined that the "archival" status of a record needs to be changed they are consulted.

Once records have been designated as "archival" they are earmarked for eventual transfer to the State Archives. When the state agency that created the records no longer has a current administrative, legal or fiscal need for such records (as defined in the agency's records retention schedules), they must be transferred to the State Archives. The maximum length of time a state agency may retain archival records is fifty years, but usually the retention period is much shorter. If an agency is required by law to keep certain records permanently (such as board minutes), the State Archives assumes the responsibility for such requirements.

### **Ownership of Transferred Records**

All records created, collected or maintained by state agencies are the property of the State of Washington and the public that paid for their creation. The agency that creates or maintains the records is the legal custodian of the records until such time as they are transferred to the Archives or destroyed.

Records transferred to the Archives come under both the physical and legal control of the Archives. The Archives can decide, after careful consideration and in consultation with the agency of origin, to weed, sample or dispose of records that have been transferred. The final decision as to which records are to be preserved forever by the State Archives is up to the State Archivist and staff.

Records transferred to the Archives are open to the public for research under the terms of the Public Disclosure Act with no further reference to the agency of origin. They may be researched and copied, but they may not be removed from the Archives.

Agencies are not charged a box storage fee for records transferred to the Archives. Instead, their maintenance and storage are paid for out of the Archives and Records Management Revolving Fund, which is not based upon the number of boxes stored.



## **Access to Records**

Public records transferred to the Washington State Archives are open for inspection and examination by the public unless prohibited by specific statute or restricted under the terms of the Public Disclosure Act (RCW 42.17). All records that have been transferred to archival custody are available to researchers on equal terms of access. The Archives does not grant privileged or exclusive use of materials to any person or organization. Records that are in the custody of the Archives must be used and copied on site at the Archives. They may not be removed for any purpose unless special arrangements have been made or they are subpoenaed into court.

## **Differences Between the Archives and the Records Center**

Often when people speak of "archiving" their records or sending their records to archives they are really speaking about the State Records Center. Although both the State Records Center and the State Archives are part of the Washington State Division of Archives and Records Management, and although the jobs of both sections are to store records and provide reference services, there are several fundamental differences.

### **State Records Center:**

- Serves as an off-site storage facility for state agency records
- Only stores records which have Records Retention Schedules and have not yet reached the end of their retention period
- Only allows the agency of origin access to the records
- Checks records back out to the agency of origin upon request
- Charges the agency of origin for storage based upon the number of boxes stored
- Assigns each box a unique bar-code number for inventory control, tracking and reference

### **State Archives:**

- Only stores records which have historical value
- Only takes in records which have completed their retention period (or in some cases, records which were never scheduled)
- Allows access to anyone, under the terms of the Public Disclosure Act
- Does not check records out except under very special circumstances
- Does not charge for box storage
- Catalogs its holdings by subject, content and origin

## **Transfer and Disposition of Archival Records**

Records designated as, "archival" on the Records Retention Schedule, are determined by the State Archives as having continuing historical significance. They must be transferred to the Archives at the end of their retention period. If the records are first sent to the State Records Center for temporary storage prior to the expiration of their retention periods they must be accompanied by an Archival Box Content List. This is important, for when the boxes reach the end of their retention periods they will be transferred directly to the Archives where the Content List will be essential in the cataloguing process.

### **Transfer Procedures for Archival Records**

Records are transferred to the State Archives either directly from the agency that created them or via the State Records Center.

**Direct Transfers:** State agencies may transfer archival records directly to the State Archives if they have reached the end of their retention periods or if they are records with historical value which have never been scheduled. The records must be boxed in records center boxes and the boxes must be labeled. An Archival Box Content List must accompany the boxes.

Records from the Office of the Governor, Office of the Lieutenant Governor, the House of Representatives and the State Senate are always transferred directly to the State Archives.

**Transfers from the State Records Center:** When the end of the total retention period of archival records stored at the State Records Center has been reached the Records Center automatically transfers those records directly to the State Archives, informing the agency of origin of the transfer. In order to catalog the records into the Archives system it is essential that the Archival Box Content List has been prepared.

### **Preparing the Records for Transfer**

Records designated for transfer to the Archives should be placed in file folders upright in records center boxes. They should be in the order in which they were originally used. Do not put hanging files in the boxes. If the records are being sent to either the Records Center or the Archives, the Archival Box Content List needs to be prepared.

## Instructions for Filling Out the Archival Box Content List

The Archival Box Content List is used to transfer records directly to the Archives and also is placed in the box when sending archival records to the Records Center, which will later be transferred to the Archives. *Records designated as "archival" which are being shipped to the State Records Center will require both the Records Center Transmittal and the Archival Box Content List.*

1. Leave the top set of boxes blank
2. On the next set of boxes fill in: Agency Name, Office Name, name and mail stop of the person sending the records.
3. In the next section, leave Location blank, fill in Box Number, Record Series and File Titles, and the Inclusive Dates.

After the boxes have been received and accessioned by the Archives, a copy of the Archival Box Content List will be mailed back to the agency of origin.



**SECRETARY  
of STATE**

**DIVISION OF ARCHIVES & RECORDS MANAGEMENT  
ARCHIVAL BOX CONTENTS LIST**

*Archives  
Use Only* ⇒

Received By	Date	Accession Number
-------------	------	------------------

Name of Agency Office of the Governor	Office / Sub-Division Correspondence Unit	Transmitted By Jane Doe
--	--	----------------------------

Location	Box #	Record Series / File Title	Date(s)
<i>Archives Use Only</i>		<b>GENERAL CORRESPONDENCE FILES</b>	
	25	Accountancy Board Administrative Law Judge Arts Commission Asian-American Affairs Commission Attorney General Awards	1983
	26	Blind, Commission for the Boards and Commissions Bob Hope Heart Research Center Boeing Company	1983


Please attach one copy of this form to the Record Center Transmittal Form (if applicable) and place one copy of this form in the Record Cover Box.

## Labeling the Boxes

Boxes should be labeled consecutively, beginning with Box #1. It is essential that the number on the box label correspond with the box number on the Archival Box Contents List.

Instructions for Filling out the Archival Box Label:

1. **Record Group Name:** Agency or department where the records came from
2. **Sub-Group Name:** Name of the office which created the records
3. **Record Series Name:** From the Records Retention Schedules or name commonly applied to the records
4. **Arrangement:** The way in which the files are arranged. i.e. alphabetical, numerical, chronological, none
5. **Description:** Usually the titles of the first and last file in the box
6. **Inclusive Dates:** The earliest and latest dates of the files in the box
7. **Control Number:** Leave blank
8. **Accession Number:** Leave blank
9. **Box Number:** Relates to "Box Number" on Transmittal form

 <b>SECRETARY of STATE</b> <small>Palais National</small>  <b>Division of Archives and Records Management</b>	RECORD GROUP TITLE <b>Office of the Governor</b>	
	SUB-GROUP TITLE <b>Correspondence Unit</b>	
	SERIES TITLE <b>General Correspondence Files</b>	
	ARRANGEMENT <b>Alphabetical</b>	
	DESCRIPTION <b>Accountancy Board – Awards</b>	
	ARCHIVES BRANCH <input type="checkbox"/> NY <input type="checkbox"/> FS <input type="checkbox"/> SV <input type="checkbox"/> CE <input type="checkbox"/> EA <input type="checkbox"/> SA	
INCLUSIVE DATES <b>1983</b>	BOX NO. <b>25</b>	
STACK LOCATION	CONTROL NO.	ACCESSION NO.

SSA-16 (REV. 10/97)

## **Supplies, Shipping, and Referencing**


**Supplies:** Boxes, labels, and Archival Box Contents List forms may be ordered from the Archives by calling 586-1492. The Archival Box Content List may also be downloaded as a Word document at our web page at [www.secstate.wa.gov/archives](http://www.secstate.wa.gov/archives). If you wish you may replicate the forms as closely as possible on your own computer.

**Shipping:** Once the boxes are packed, labeled and the forms are prepared, call the Archives for a records pickup at 586-1492. Records are generally picked up within three working days.

**Referencing Records:** Requests for access to records stored in the Archives may be arranged by calling the State Government Records Section at 586-1492. The records may be researched and copied at the Archives.

Reference service can be expedited by referring to your copies of the Archives transmittal forms and supplying the Archives with the Accession Number, Box Number, File Name, and Location.







Enter Keywords

### Washington State Library

[Home](#) [Washington Resources](#) [Services to Libraries](#) [Ask a Librarian](#)

[PRINT THIS PAGE](#)

#### About the State Library

[Back](#)

Jan Walsh, State Librarian  
[jwalsh@secstate.wa.gov](mailto:jwalsh@secstate.wa.gov)

Mail: PO BOX 42460  
OLYMPIA WA 98504-2460

Location: Point Plaza East  
6880 Capitol Blvd Tumwater

Telephone:  
Reception: (360) 704-5200  
Circulation: (360) 704-5213  
Reference: (360) 704-5221

General Information Email  
[askalibrarian@secstate.wa.gov](mailto:askalibrarian@secstate.wa.gov)

[Vision, Mission and Purpose](#)  
[History](#)  
[Hours of Operation & Directions](#)  
[Photocopying & Printing](#)  
[Library Staff Directory](#)  
[Branches](#)  
[Employment Opportunities](#)  
[Friends of the Washington State Library](#)

#### Vision, Mission and Purpose

##### Vision

To ensure that Washingtonians have access to the information they need today and to the history of Washington for tomorrow.

##### Mission and Purpose

- Collect, preserve, and make accessible to Washingtonians materials on the government, history, culture, and natural resources of the state.
- Provide leadership and coordination of services to all libraries in the state of Washington.
- Support the information needs of residents in state institutions and of the visually impaired.
- Serve as the primary source in the region for published information from the federal government.

[Address Confidentiality](#) | [Apostilles](#) | [Archives](#) | [Charitable Trusts & Solicitations](#) | [Corporations](#) | [Digital Signatures](#)  
[Elections & Voting](#) | [International Trade](#) | [Legacy Project](#) | [Library](#) | [Medals of Merit & Valor](#) | [News Releases](#) | [Productivity Board](#)  
[State Flag](#) | [State Seal](#) | [Washington History](#)

Washington Secretary of State  
Point Plaza East, 6880 Capitol Blvd. Tumwater  
PO Box 42460, Olympia WA 98504-2460  
(360) 704-5200

[Phone Numbers](#) | [Privacy Policy](#) | [Accessibility](#)







Enter Keywords

# Washington State Library

- [Home](#)
- [Washington Resources](#)
- [Services to Libraries](#)
- [Ask a Librarian](#)

[PRINT THIS PAGE](#)

## About the State Library

[Back](#)

Jan Walsh, State Librarian  
[jwalsh@secstate.wa.gov](mailto:jwalsh@secstate.wa.gov)

Mail: PO BOX 42460  
OLYMPIA WA 98504-2460

Location: Point Plaza East  
6980 Capitol Blvd Tumwater

Telephone:  
Reception: (360) 704-5200  
Circulation: (360) 704-5213  
Reference: (360) 704-5221

General Information Email  
[askalibrarian@secstate.wa.gov](mailto:askalibrarian@secstate.wa.gov)

- [Vision, Mission and Purpose](#)
- [History](#)
- [Hours of Operation & Directions](#)
- [Photocopying & Printing](#)
- [Library Staff Directory](#)
- [Branches](#)
- [Employment Opportunities](#)
- [Friends of the Washington State Library](#)

## History of the Washington State Library

The first American library north of the Columbia River, the Washington State Library was established by the Organic Act of the Territory of Washington passed on March 2, 1853. This act provided for \$5,000 to be spent on books for the territorial library. The first Territorial Governor, Isaac Ingalls Stevens, selected and purchased over 2,000 books with those funds. He had also asked for documents and published archives from the executives of each state and territory of the United States and from a number of learned societies. One month before Governor Stevens arrived in the territory, 1,850 books had already been placed on the shelves. Another 2,000 followed, shipped around Cape Horn. Most of the original collection consisted of law textbooks and law reports and a sizeable number of science books. However, novels were also included, as were five mounted maps, and terrestrial and celestial globes. These materials were the core of the collection until Washington became a state in 1889.

According to the Organic Act, the library was "to be kept at the seat of government." As the seat of government moved, so did the library. The first books to arrive were stored in an Olympia warehouse. They were subsequently moved to a room in a one-story building between 2nd and 3rd Avenue on the west side of Main Street (Capitol Way) that had been rented by Governor Stevens from Father Pascal Ricard of the Oblate Mission. In the fall of 1854, the library was housed in a building located at the corner of Fourth Avenue and Main Street in Olympia, presided over by the first librarian, B.F. Kendall. It was later relocated to the first Old Capitol building, which stood near the present-day Legislative Building. It remained there until 1891 when it was moved to the McKenny Building (again on the corner of 4th and Main). In 1901 the collection was moved to the Old Capitol Building on South Washington Street. The library was moved yet again in 1917 to the basement of the Temple of Justice where it remained until 1959 when it was moved to its next home, the Joel M. Pritchard Library, located south of the Legislative Building. In 2001 the library was moved to its current home in Tumwater at Point Plaza East on Capitol Boulevard.

In the first librarian's report to the Territorial Legislature in December of 1854, there were 2,130 books in the library. Only about 12 books were added to the general collection and 8,000 to the law collection between 1853 and 1889. By 1892 there were 16,000 volumes. By 1906 the law library collection numbered 28,000 volumes, covering 4,152 feet of shelving. At that time the general collection occupied 1,300 linear feet, bound papers covered 792 feet of shelving, and the reference section covered 2,700 linear feet. In 1907 legal materials (including items from the original territorial collection) were moved to the State Law Library. At the time of the library's centennial in 1953, the collection exceeded 270,000 volumes, 200,000 of which were newspapers, documents, and magazines. By the late 1990's, the library had reached 547,554 volumes and still retained 750 items from the original territorial collection.

The Washington State Library has promoted numerous services throughout its history. In 1905 it became a clearing house for old magazines and collected issues indexed in *Poole's* and the *Reader's Guide* from libraries in the state. In 1933, the Legislative Information Service was made available at the library to help Washington lawmakers to prepare bills for the Legislature. In carrying out its mission to preserve the state's written record, the Washington State Library began the Washington Author Collection in 1940 and in 1952 began to microfilm early state newspapers. Currently the Washington State Library offers historical and government resources relevant to the general public, professionals, researchers and students, provides consulting, administrative, and other services to aid the planning and development of libraries in the state of Washington, serves as a Regional Federal Depository Library and Washington State Publications Depository.

- [Address Confidentiality](#)
- [Apostilles](#)
- [Archives](#)
- [Charitable Trusts & Solicitations](#)
- [Corporations](#)
- [Digital Signatures](#)
- [Elections & Voting](#)
- [International Trade](#)
- [Legacy Project](#)
- [Library](#)
- [Medals of Merit & Valor](#)
- [News Releases](#)
- [Productivity Board](#)
- [State Flag](#)
- [State Seal](#)
- [Washington History](#)

Washington Secretary of State  
Point Plaza East, 6880 Capitol Blvd. Tumwater  
PO Box 42460, Olympia WA 98504-2460  
(360) 704-5200



[Phone Numbers](#) | [Privacy Policy](#) | [Accessibility](#)



Enter Keywords

Washington State Library

[Home](#)[Washington Resources](#)[Services to Libraries](#)[Ask a Librarian](#)[PRINT THIS PAGE](#)**Branch Libraries****Laura Sherbo, Branch Library Services Program Manager**

P.O. Box 42460  
 Olympia, WA 98504-2460  
 Phone: 360-704-5250  
 Email: [lsherbo@secstate.wa.gov](mailto:lsherbo@secstate.wa.gov)

**Airway Heights Corrections Center**

P.O. Box 1899  
 Airway Heights, WA 99001-1899  
 Phone: 509-244-6700 x 6239  
 Email: [ahcc@secstate.wa.gov](mailto:ahcc@secstate.wa.gov)

**Clallam Bay Corrections Center**

1830 Eagle Crest Way  
 Clallam Bay, WA 98326-9775  
 Phone: 360-953-3216  
 Email: [cbcc@secstate.wa.gov](mailto:cbcc@secstate.wa.gov)

**Coyote Ridge Corrections Center**

P.O. Box 769  
 Connet, WA 99326-0769  
 Phone: 509-543-5800 x 3101  
 Email: [crcc@secstate.wa.gov](mailto:crcc@secstate.wa.gov)

**Department of Labor and Industries**

P.O. Box 44606  
 Olympia, WA 98504-4606  
 Phone: 360-902-5498  
 Email: [library-mpi@secstate.wa.gov](mailto:library-mpi@secstate.wa.gov)

**Department of Transportation**

P.O. Box 47425  
 Olympia, WA 98504-7425  
 Phone: 360-705-7750  
 Email: [library@wsdot.wa.gov](mailto:library@wsdot.wa.gov)

**Eastern State Hospital - Patient's Library**

P.O. Box 800  
 Maple Street  
 Medical Lake, WA 99022-0800  
 Phone: 509-565-4276  
 Email: [esh@secstate.wa.gov](mailto:esh@secstate.wa.gov)

**Eastern State Hospital - Staff Services Library**

P.O. Box 800  
 Maple Street  
 Medical Lake, WA 99022-0800  
 Phone: 509-585-4527  
 Email: [mwhite@secstate.wa.gov](mailto:mwhite@secstate.wa.gov)

**McNeil Island Corrections Center**

P.O. Box 88900  
 Steilacoom, WA 98388-0900  
 Phone: 253-588-5281 x 1509  
 Email: [micc@secstate.wa.gov](mailto:micc@secstate.wa.gov)

**Monroe Correctional Complex - Twin Rivers Unit**

P.O. Box 888  
 Monroe, WA 98272-0888  
 Phone: 360-794-2481  
 Email: [trcc@secstate.wa.gov](mailto:trcc@secstate.wa.gov)

**Monroe Correctional Complex - Washington State Reformatory Unit**  
 P.O. Box 777  
 Monroe, WA 98272-0777  
 Phone: 360-794-2673  
 Email: [wsr@secstate.wa.gov](mailto:wsr@secstate.wa.gov)

**Natural Resources Building Library**  
 P.O. Box 47000  
 Olympia, WA 98504-7000  
 Phone: 360-902-2992  
 Email: [library-nrb@secstate.wa.gov](mailto:library-nrb@secstate.wa.gov)

**Stafford Creek Corrections Center**  
 191 Constantine Way  
 Aberdeen, WA 98520  
 Phone: 360-537-2258  
 Email: [sccc@secstate.wa.gov](mailto:sccc@secstate.wa.gov)

**Utilities and Transportation Commission**  
 P.O. Box 47250  
 Olympia, WA 98504-7250  
 Phone: 360-664-1199  
 Email: [library-utc@secstate.wa.gov](mailto:library-utc@secstate.wa.gov)

**Washington Corrections Center**  
 P.O. Box 900  
 Shelton, WA 98584  
 Phone: 360-426-4433 x 5505  
 Email: [wcc@secstate.wa.gov](mailto:wcc@secstate.wa.gov)

**Washington Corrections Center for Women**  
 9601 Bujacich Road NW  
 Gig Harbor, WA 98332-8300  
 Phone: 253-858-4230  
 Email: [wccw@secstate.wa.gov](mailto:wccw@secstate.wa.gov)

**Washington State Penitentiary - East Complex**  
 1313 N 13th Ave  
 Walla Walla, WA 99362-8817  
 Phone: 509-526-6403  
 Email: [wsp-ec@secstate.wa.gov](mailto:wsp-ec@secstate.wa.gov)

**Washington State Penitentiary - West Complex**  
 1313 N 13th Ave  
 Walla Walla, WA 99362  
 Phone: 509-525-3610 x 5071  
 Email: [wsp-wc@secstate.wa.gov](mailto:wsp-wc@secstate.wa.gov)

**Western State Hospital**  
 9601 Steilacoom Blvd SW  
 Lakewood, WA 98493-7213  
 Phone: 253-756-2593  
 Email: [wsh@secstate.wa.gov](mailto:wsh@secstate.wa.gov)

**Washington Talking Book & Braille Library**  
 Danielle King, Program Manager  
 2021 9th Avenue  
 Seattle, WA 98121-2783  
 Phone: 206-615-0400  
 Email: [wtbl@secstate.wa.gov](mailto:wtbl@secstate.wa.gov)

[Address Confidentiality](#) | [Appellites](#) | [Archives](#)  
 | [Charitable Trusts & Solicitations](#) |  
 | [Corporations](#) | [Digital Signatures](#)  
 | [Elections & Voting](#) | [International Trade](#) |  
 | [Legacy Project](#) | [Library](#) | [Medals of Merit & Valor](#) | [News Releases](#) | [Productivity Board](#)  
 | [State Flag](#) | [State Seal](#) | [Washington History](#)

Washington Secretary of State  
 Point Plaza East, 6880 Capitol Blvd, Tumwater  
 PO Box 42460, Olympia WA 98504-2460  
 (360) 704-5200

[Phone Numbers](#) | [Privacy Policy](#) | [Accessibility](#)



BEST IMAGE POSSIBLE

FILED  
KING COUNTY, WASHINGTON

FEB 04 2010

~~SUPERIOR COURT CLERK~~  
BY NANCYL SLYE  
DEPUTY

THE HONORABLE JOHN P. ERLICK

STATE OF WASHINGTON  
KING COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT

MATHEW & STEPHANIE McCLEARY,  
on their own and on behalf of KELSEY &  
CARTER McCLEARY, their two children  
in Washington's public schools;  
ROBERT & PATTY VENEMA, on their  
own behalf and on behalf of HALIE &  
ROBBIE VENEMA, their two children in  
Washington's public schools; and  
NETWORK FOR EXCELLENCE IN  
WASHINGTON SCHOOLS ("NEWS"), a  
state-wide coalition of community groups,  
public school districts, and education  
organizations,

Petitioners,

v.

STATE OF WASHINGTON,

Respondent.

NO. 07-2-02323-2 SEA

SUBMISSION OF DEPOSITION  
TESTIMONY BY BRYON W.  
MOORE

The parties offer into Evidence the following deposition testimony designations and exhibits, corresponding objections and attached pages from the June 12, 2009, deposition transcript for trial witness Bryon W. Moore:

1 **I. Petitioners' Deposition Designations (transcript highlighted in yellow):**

2 Cover page (page 1)  
3 Appearances page (page 2)

4 **In addition to the portions of the deposition transcript designated by Respondent, Petitioners designate the following:**

5

Page:Line Range	Trial Exhibit Offered	Respondent's Objections
6 10:1-11:22	Petitioners offer Trial Exhibit 260 (Dep. Ex. 459)	
7		
8 15:19-16:2		
9		
10 16:8-18:6		
11		
12 20:5-12		
13		
14 20:20-21:15		
15		
16 34:22-36:5		
17		
18 42:13-43:11		
19		
20 46:22-47:16		
21		
22 53:16-54:19		
23		
24 56:1-5		
25		
26 58:23-59:3		

Page:Line Range	Trial Exhibit Offered	Respondent's Objections
59:18-60:22	Petitioners offer Trial Exhibit 265 (Dep. Ex. 464)	<p>Tr. Ex. 265 - Relevance, ER 702, Lack of foundation, Hearsay.</p> <p><b>Petitioners respond that the witness, Bryon Moore, was the State's designee for the Joint Task Force on School Construction Funding. Mr. Moore was staff for the Task Force and identified the document as a presentation made to the Task Force. The document is relevant and a business record regarding school construction and school health issues.</b></p> <p><i>Resp. withdraws its objection based on Petitioner's explanation.</i></p>
63:17-64:25	Petitioners offer Trial Exhibit 264 (Dep. Ex. 463)	<p>Tr. Ex. 264 - Relevance.</p> <p><b>Petitioners respond that this document is a relevant presentation by the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction to the Joint Task Force on School Construction Funding regarding funding and school construction.</b></p> <p><i>Resp. withdraws its objection based on Petitioner's explanation.</i></p>
67:18-69:11		
70:3-71:15		
72:11-73:11		
74:2-77:4		
88:9-12		
92:14-94:5		
95:16-23		

Page:Line Range	Trial Exhibit Offered	Respondent's Objections
102:23-103:11		
116:7-117:12		

II. Respondent's Designations (transcript highlighted in blue):

Page: Line Range	Trial Exhibit Offered	Petitioners' Objections
5:12-15		
7:4-9:24		
11:23-25		
12:4-13:10		
14:17-15:18		
18:7-20:4		
21:16-23:19		
24:2-28:3		
28:10-29:1		
29:13-23		
30:1-32:2		
32:20-34:21		
36:6-38:2		
38:6-16		
38:22-39:24		
40:7-41:12		
43:12-44:16		
44:19-46:21		



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26


Page: Line Range	Trial Exhibit Offered	Petitioners' Objections
50:14-52:6		
52:16-53:10		
54:20-55:25		
56:6-58:22		
59:4-17		
65:1-66:4		
66:19-67:17		
71:16-72:10		
73:16-24		
79:19-80:20		
85:21-88:8		
88:13-89:19		
91:16-92:13		
94:11-95:15		
98:2-102:22		
103:12-105:25		
106:17-107:5		
107:10-20	Resp. offers Tr. Ex. 267 (Dep. Ex. 466)	
108:7-16		
109:8-20		
111:1-25		

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26

DATED this 20<sup>th</sup> day of October, 2009.

FOSTER PEPPER PLLC

ROBERT M. MCKENNA  
Attorney General



THOMAS F. AHEARNE, WSBA #14844  
CHRISTOPHER G. EMCH, WSBA #26457  
EDMUND ROBB, WSBA #35948  
Attorneys for Petitioners

WILLIAM G. CLARK, WSBA #9234  
CARRIE L. BASHAW, WSBA #20253  
Assistant Attorneys General  
Attorneys for Respondent

SUPERIOR COURT OF WASHINGTON FOR COUNTY OF KING

-----

MATHEW & STEPHANIE McCLEARY, )  
 on their own behalf and on )  
 behalf of KELSEY & CARTER )  
 McCLEARY, their two )  
 children in Washington's ) No. 07-2-02323-2 SEA  
 public schools; et al., )  
 Petitioners, )  
 vs. )  
 STATE OF WASHINGTON, )  
 Respondent. )

-----

DEPOSITION UPON ORAL EXAMINATION  
 OF  
 BRYON W. MOORE

-----

9:05 a.m.  
 June 12, 2009  
 1125 South Washington  
 Olympia, Washington

Margaret Walkky, CCR, RPR, RMR, CRR  
 Court Reporter, License No. 2540

SEATTLE DEPOSITION REPORTERS, LLC

A P P E A R A N C E S

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

For Petitioners:

THOMAS F. AHEARNE  
Foster Pepper  
1111 Third Ave, Ste 3400  
Seattle, Washington 98101  
206-447-4400  
aheat@foster.com

For Respondent:

WILLIAM G. CLARK  
Assistant Attorney General  
800 5th Ave, Ste 2000 TB-14  
Seattle, Washington 98104  
206-389-2794  
billc2@atg.wa.gov

and

MARTY LOVINGER  
Office of Senate Counsel  
401 Legislative Building  
PO Box 40482  
Olympia, Washington 98504  
360-786-7443  
lovinger.marty@leg.wa.gov

I N D E X

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

EXAMINATION	PAGE	
By Mr. Ahearne	4	
EXHIBIT	DESCRIPTION	PAGE
459	Notice of 30(b)(6) deposition of	10
	Joint Legislative Task Force on	
	School Construction Funding	
460	Joint Legislative Task Force on	11
TrEx 261	School Construction Funding, final	
	report	
461	Joint Legislative Task Force on	16
TrEx 262	School Construction Funding, interim	
	report, August 28, 2007	
462	PowerPoint: The 2 percent rule,	52
TrEx 263	6-16-08	
463	PowerPoint: Gordon Beck - nonleg	52
TrEx 264	presentation OSPI	
464	PowerPoint: 1. What is the problem?	52
TrEx 265	Task Force on School Construction,	52
	July 16, 2008, Board of Health	
465	Email to Priddy and Mannix from Beck,	52
TrEx 266	6-6-08	

1	EXHIBIT	DESCRIPTION	PAGE
2	466	Email to Moore and Pennucci from AOS,	107
3	TrEx 267	11-9-07	
4	467	PowerPoint: Update on the work of the	111
5	TrEx 268	Joint Task Force on Basic Education	
6		Finance, 5-14-08	
7			
8			
9			
10			
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			

1 Whereupon,  
2 BRYON W. MOORE,  
3 having been first duly sworn, was called as a witness  
4 herein and was examined and testified as follows:  
5

6 EXAMINATION

7 BY MR. AHEARNE:

8 Q. Good morning.

9 A. Good morning.

10 Q. My name is Tom Ahearne. I'm with the law  
11 firm of Foster Pepper and I represent the petitioners  
12 in this suit. (Could we start out by you stating your  
13 name and address for the record?)

14 A. Sure. It's Bryon Moore, and I live at  
15 4536 South K Street in Tacoma.)

16 Q. Have you ever had your deposition taken  
17 before?

18 A. I have not.

19 Q. Has your attorney explained the basic  
20 deposition procedures to you?

21 A. Yes.

22 Q. So you understand that the court reporter  
23 is going to type down word for word all the questions  
24 that are asked today and all the answers you give  
25 today?

1 Q. I'd like to very briefly just go through  
2 your background and I'll just tell you my questions in  
3 order and then you can just sort of give me a  
4 narrative. (Where did you go to high school, college,  
5 anything after that and then the jobs you had?)

6 A. Okay. I went to high school in Lakewood,  
7 Washington. I graduated from Lakes High School, went  
8 to Pierce College and the University of Washington at  
9 Tacoma, graduating in 1994.)

10 (In terms of employment, I started with the  
11 Senate in 1995. Prior to that, I worked in a variety  
12 of retail capacities, different miscellaneous jobs, was  
13 also in the United States Army before joining the  
14 Senate in '95. Did you want to discuss my capacities  
15 with the Senate?)

16 Q. Yes, just briefly.)

17 A. I started as a clerk in 1995 for the  
18 Senate, quickly transitioning into a session analyst  
19 position, and then I became a fiscal analyst and for 13  
20 years was a fiscal analyst covering a variety of  
21 different areas, and most recently in the fall of last  
22 year, I became the operating budget coordinator.)

23 Q. And this is all on the Senate side?)

24 A. Yes.)

25 Q. Could you briefly just explain the)



1 difference between a session analyst, a fiscal analyst  
2 and the operating budget coordinator?

3 A. Yes. A session analyst is typically an  
4 entry level position in which both the Senate and the  
5 employee is looking at whether they fit in that  
6 particular capacity. The responsibilities are very  
7 similar in that the person is responsible for providing  
8 information and analysis that assists members in making  
9 fiscal budget decisions.)

10 Q. All right. But when you were a session  
11 analyst, that was on the fiscal side?

12 A. Yes.)

13 Q. Okay. Now, is there any particular  
14 committee that you've worked for all along?

15 A. Throughout this entire time, it was with  
16 the Senate Ways & Means Committee.)

17 Q. Then a fiscal analyst?

18 A. Similar thing, it's analyzing, providing  
19 information to members, both in formal hearings as well  
20 as informal discussions. Again, the primary purpose is  
21 to assist them in making fiscal decisions.)

22 Q. When you say a fiscal decision, what do  
23 you mean?

24 A. Making budgetary decisions as well as  
25 decisions about, their decisions about the passage of

1 legislation that has fiscal impact.

2 Q. And when you say fiscal decision, do you  
3 basically mean deciding how much money to spend on  
4 certain programs?

5 A. Primarily, yes.

6 Q. Anything else?

7 A. It's anything that relates to potentially  
8 the implementation. So it might not necessarily be  
9 exclusive of the decision about the amount, but maybe  
10 decisions about how.

11 Q. About how you spend that amount?

12 A. About how you spend that amount, correct.

13 Q. Then when you became the operating budget  
14 coordinator, what's the distinction there?

15 A. The operating budget coordinator is  
16 responsible for assisting collectively all the fiscal  
17 analysts in basically doing the same thing. It's the  
18 same kind of role in that the responsibilities are to  
19 coordinate the information flow to members that again  
20 allow them to make the various fiscal decisions before  
21 them.

22 Q. Okay, and all this time you're working  
23 with members, it's members of the Senate?

24 A. Yes.

25 Q. First exhibit.

1 (Exhibit-459 marked.)

2 Q. Handing you what's been marked as 459, is  
3 this the notice for today's deposition?

4 MR. CLARK: Before you answer, I need to  
5 state for the record that when I received this, I  
6 immediately sent over an email to your office --

7 MR. AHEARNE: I will get to whether it's  
8 for 1 or 2, paragraph 1 or 2.

9 MR. CLARK: He's not here to testify on  
10 paragraph 1, period.

11 MR. AHEARNE: I understand that, I  
12 understand that.

13 MR. CLARK: Okay.

14 Q. Is this the notice for this deposition,  
15 subject to Mr. Clark's comments?

16 A. Yes.

17 Q. So now I will get to page 2. You notice  
18 there are two paragraphs. Number 1, "The operations,  
19 funding and performance of Washington's public  
20 schools," and then paragraph 2, "The review,  
21 conclusions and outcomes of the Joint Legislative Task  
22 Force on School Construction Funding. This includes  
23 the task force's 'Final Report', the cover page of  
24 which is attached to this notice." Are you the witness  
25 for paragraph number 2?

1 A. I believe so, yes.

2 MR. CLARK: And we're not producing  
3 someone today for paragraph 1. We've objected to that.

4 MR. AHEARNE: No, we don't need to waste  
5 time on that. I fully understand.

6 MR. CLARK: He's here for paragraph 2.

7 MR. AHEARNE: Got it, all right, and the  
8 report, the cover page is attached. Why don't we just  
9 go ahead and mark that.)

10 (Exhibit-460 marked.)

11 Q. Handing you Exhibit-460, is this the final  
12 report that's referenced in the deposition notice for  
13 today?

14 A. Yes.)

15 Q. Could you please briefly just explain what  
16 the purpose of the final report, which is Exhibit-460,  
17 what's the purpose of that document?

18 A. This report reflects the work and final  
19 recommendations as a result of the effort of the Joint  
20 Legislative Task Force on School Construction Funding  
21 that was completed or that took place between 2007 and  
22 2008.

23 Q. When was this final report issued?

24 A. I believe December of 2008 or January of  
25 2009.

1 Q. It was in the time frame December of '08  
2 or January of '09?

3 A. Yes.

4 Q. Could you briefly describe the process  
5 that the task force went through to come up with or end  
6 up with this final report?

7 A. The task force began in the spring of -- I  
8 take that back, the summer of 2007. They met 12 to 13  
9 times, receiving a variety of information covering the  
10 aspects of the task force, which were to conduct a  
11 review of school construction funding and  
12 spending-related issues. It involved staff  
13 presentations, testimony and discussions with school  
14 district representatives, school construction experts  
15 and other relevant parties. And again, that took place  
16 over 12 to 13 meetings during the legislative interims  
17 and this report reflects the final results of that.  
18 They did their work in two phases. So there were two  
19 phases, one that resulted in recommendations in  
20 December of 2007, and then this is the results of the  
21 completion of that effort.

22 Q. When you say "this is the results of the  
23 completion of that effort," you're referring to  
24 Exhibit-460?

25 A. Yes.

1 Q. When you reference staff presentations,  
2 who is staff? What are you talking about?

3 A. This task force was provided staff support  
4 per the budget proviso that created the task force from  
5 legislative staff both on the Senate and the House  
6 side. So that involved myself, three other staff at  
7 various points in time from the legislative side, and  
8 then the task force also elected to hire a consultant  
9 that had had experience in school construction issues  
10 that they found helpful to the work of the task force.

11 Q. Could you briefly describe the process  
12 that the task force went through to find the consultant  
13 that they would choose to retain?

14 A. Mike Roberts was, is the consultant that  
15 was hired.

16 Q. What's the name of the company he's with?

17 A. I believe his firm is just Mike Roberts  
18 Consulting or Mike Roberts.

19 Q. Would it be the Berk & Associates?

20 A. I'm sorry, no. There's -- Mike Roberts  
21 was actually hired by the task force explicitly. There  
22 was also a variety of different efforts that came out  
23 of the task force, direction through budget proviso and  
24 other language, and what you were referencing with  
25 Berk & Associates is one of those ancillary efforts.

1 Q. All right. So Mr. Roberts was the  
2 consultant hired by the task force?

3 A. Yes.

4 Q. Did Mr. Roberts provides any sort of  
5 report or submissions to the task force, written?

6 A. Yes.

7 Q. What role did his written submissions play  
8 in the task force's conclusions?

9 A. Like the legislative staff participation,  
10 they were presentations made in the various meetings of  
11 the task force, so they would all be documents that  
12 would be part of the records from those meetings.

13 Q. If you know, was Mr. Roberts hired  
14 pursuant to any sort of an RFP process?

15 A. I believe it was a sole source contract.

16 Q. Sole source, okay.

17 You also mentioned testimony. What kind  
18 of testimony did the task force secure? What I'm  
19 really looking at is how did the task force decide who  
20 to hear from?

21 A. The task force elected, consulted with the  
22 Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction,  
23 consulted with different school district staff that  
24 they had already had contact with for determining who  
25 might have relevant information. Some of the specific

1 efforts and issues that were addressed by the task  
2 force, there were obvious and apparent experts. For  
3 example, talking about the different kind of lease  
4 purchasing arrangements that the Department of General  
5 Administration had conducted, obviously the Department  
6 of General Administration was one of the likely people  
7 to provide information on that issue. And similarly,  
8 it was other entities like that.

9 Q. And why would the Department of General  
10 Administration have information relative or relevant to  
11 school construction or facilities?

12 A. This was dealing with the specific issue  
13 on what are an alternative financing mechanism dealing  
14 with lease purchases. So one of the many issues that  
15 was addressed by the School Construction Task Force was  
16 that issue, where they considered that and looked at it  
17 as potentially being relevant to constructing school  
18 buildings.

19 Q. And if you can just state for the record,  
20 what is the Department of General Administration?

21 A. It is a state agency that has  
22 responsibility for a variety of administrative support  
23 functions primarily for other state agencies.

24 Q. Is part of their charge dealing with the  
25 facilities that are owned by the state and the state



1 agencies?

2 A. Yes.

3 (Exhibit-461 marked.)

4 Q. Handing you Exhibit-461, is this the  
5 interim report or the phase one report that you had  
6 referenced earlier?

7 A. No.

8 Q. What is Exhibit-461?

9 A. This is the first packet for the very  
10 first meeting, I believe, of the School Construction  
11 Task Force.

12 Q. Again, could you tell me what the general  
13 purpose for Exhibit-461 was?

14 A. This was the packet that went to the task  
15 force members for the first -- to provide the  
16 information that was going to be discussed at the first  
17 meeting.

18 Q. If I can ask you to turn to page 11 of  
19 Exhibit-461, please. Actually, pages 11 through 38 is  
20 a PowerPoint presentation. Page numbers on the even  
21 numbers are way on the bottom left-hand side. Could  
22 you identify what pages 11 through 38 are?

23 A. This was the staff presentation to that  
24 first, one of the staff presentations at that first  
25 meeting.)

1 Q. When it says staff presentation, this  
2 would have been one of the Senate staff?

3 A. This was a joint presentation by both  
4 Senate staff and House staff to the task force.

5 Q. If I can ask you to turn to pages 13 and  
6 14 of the presentation it says, "Since 1995, total  
7 school district capital spending has increased." Do  
8 you see that?

9 A. Yes.

10 Q. What does "capital spending" mean?

11 A. This is my understanding of -- this amount  
12 is, it is reflective of the amount that school  
13 districts report as spending through the financial  
14 system for capital-related spending.

15 Q. When you say the reported on the system,  
16 you're talking about the F-195s, F-196s?

17 A. Yes. This information is provided to the  
18 Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction.

19 Q. If I can ask you to turn to page 15,  
20 please, what was the significance of this particular  
21 slide?

22 A. This information combines the previous two  
23 slides in a percentage.

24 Q. Do you recall who made this presentation?

25 A. I believe this, I covered this section of

1 the presentation.

2 Q. What was the point you were trying to make  
3 in this slide?

4 A. The purpose of it is to combine the  
5 previous two slides into a percentage to show how it  
6 has changed over time.

7 Q. And the "it" you're referring to is what?

8 A. The percentage of capital spending;  
9 relevant to total capital spending.)

10 Q. When you say "state sources" there, what  
11 are you referring to?

12 A. This is the amount that is reflective  
13 primarily of the funding that comes from the state  
14 school construction assistance program.)

15 Q. What other components of state sources  
16 would there be?

17 A. Again, this reflects what school districts  
18 report and so it might include some miscellaneous  
19 amounts that school districts elect to move over to  
20 school capital-related spending from other sources, but  
21 it is primarily related to the state school  
22 construction assistance funding program.)

23 Q. If I can ask you to turn to page then 16  
24 and my question really is, what's the distinction  
25 between the graph on page 16 and the one on 13? What's

1 the point you're trying to make by those two?

2 A. Page 16 is reflective of the amount, the  
3 total amount, estimated total amount that's associated  
4 with school construction projects that are eligible for  
5 state assistance; whereas page 13 is reflective of a  
6 broader or potentially broader array of school  
7 capital-related spending activities.)

8 Q. When you say "eligible for state  
9 assistance," could you tell me what you mean by that?

10 A. The state has established a school  
11 construction assistance formula and page 16 is  
12 reflective of the reported amounts associated with that  
13 formula, the total eligible cost for that total, for  
14 that formula.)

15 Q. And one last slide, if I can ask you to  
16 please turn to page 18, and what was the purpose of  
17 drawing the distinction between the graph on page 18  
18 and the graph on page 15?)

19 A. Page 15 is reflective of the percent  
20 attached with total capital spending --

21 Q. When you say -- I'm sorry, go ahead.

22 A. -- as a percent, or state assistance  
23 relative to the total amount of state assistance;  
24 whereas the graph on page 18 is reflective of that  
25 narrower amount of state assistance versus total)

1 eligible costs or total associated costs with that  
2 state assistance one. So it's -- the percentage that  
3 is on page 18 is reflective of that narrower band of  
4 school construction projects.

5 Q. So if I understand it correctly, page 18  
6 shows the percent of construction costs on eligible  
7 projects that the state funds?

8 A. Yes.

9 Q. And page 15 is the percentage of all  
10 school district construction projects that the state  
11 funds?

12 A. Yes.

13 Q. If I can ask you to turn to page 117,  
14 please, could you explain what the 2002 House Task  
15 Force was and why this is part of the briefing  
16 materials here for the Construction Task Force?

17 A. This, page 117 and --

18 Q. I think it goes through 160, if my little  
19 book ends are correct.

20 A. Page 117 through 160 are reflective of the  
21 results of the 2002 House Task Force that studied  
22 similar issues to the Joint Legislative Task Force on  
23 School Construction Funding.

24 Q. If I can ask you to turn to page 161  
25 through 168, could you identify what that is?

1 A. I believe that this reflects the  
2 recommendations resulting from a 1998 Task Force on  
3 School Construction Financing that appears to be  
4 conducted by the House of Representatives.

5 Q. Okay, and the last, if you turn to page  
6 169 and I think it goes to the end of the document,  
7 could you explain what page 169 is, please?

8 A. Reading from the title, it is the State  
9 Board of Education White Paper on the school  
10 construction funding.

11 Q. Would this have been one of the documents  
12 that the Joint Legislative Task Force on School  
13 Construction Funding considered in its review of  
14 construction funding issues in the state?

15 A. Yes.

16 Q. If I can ask you to go back to  
17 Exhibit-460, please, the first question is: On page 3,  
18 there's an appendix E that's referenced as being  
19 available in January of 2009 and at least according to  
20 the folks in my firm that were looking on the web, it  
21 wasn't there as of at least a few days ago. Do you  
22 know what the status is on appendix E?

23 A. I do not.

24 Q. I just want to know if there was some  
25 decision not to do it or there's a holdup or something,

1 but as far as you know, it should be there or is in the  
2 process?

3 A. I don't know the status of that particular  
4 report.

5 Q. (Do you know what that report was generally  
6 about?)

7 A. (This was a report that was contracted I  
8 believe by the Office of the Superintendent of Public  
9 Instruction to fulfill one of their legislatively  
10 directed activities associated with the task force,  
11 which was to specifically look at the issue about the  
12 issues surrounding regional assistance needs of school  
13 districts for school construction.)

14 Q. What do you mean by "regional assistance  
15 needs"?

16 A. The regional assistance that I'm referring  
17 to would be reflective of school construction  
18 assistance, which could cover a variety of issues that  
19 would allow, would assist school districts in  
20 completing school construction projects, a variety of  
21 different issues associated with that.

22 Q. What I was trying to get at, what's the  
23 regional? I mean, is the thought that different  
24 regions had different costs? I'm trying to get at, why  
25 is the word "regional" in there? What's that for?

1           A.   Right now the Office of the Superintendent  
2 of Public Instruction provides assistance to school  
3 districts for school construction issues and they  
4 primarily deliver that through regionally-based  
5 assistance. You know, given we have 295 school  
6 districts throughout the state, they deliver that  
7 assistance through a regional-based approach, which is  
8 the way that we have historically provided that  
9 assistance. So I think that regional assistance and  
10 the potential need for more of it or different kind of  
11 it would presumably be delivered through that same kind  
12 of structure.

13           Q.   When you say it's delivered through a  
14 regional structure, is that sort of like the ESDs?

15           A.   There is assistance that is provided  
16 through the educational service districts, ESDs, as  
17 well as there's what are called regional coordinators  
18 that I believe are employed by the Office of the  
19 Superintendent of Public Instruction.

20           Q.   If I can ask you to turn to page 4 of the  
21 final report, please, and actually, I guess I should  
22 start, could you give me a brief explanation of what  
23 the Joint Legislative Task Force on School Construction  
24 Funding was charged with doing? Page 9 maybe, is that  
25 what you were looking for?



1 A. Yes, thank you.

2 Q. Could you identify what appendix A is  
3 that's on page 9?

4 A. Appendix A is the budget proviso that was  
5 included in the, originally included in the 2007  
6 capital budget, and was amended and included again in  
7 the 2008 capital budget.

8 Q. So then my question was if you can  
9 describe what the charge was of the Joint Legislative  
10 Task Force on School Construction Funding, and your  
11 answer is what?

12 A. It was charged with looking, the School  
13 Construction Task Force was charged with looking at  
14 statutory provisions regarding school construction  
15 projects, eligibility requirements, formulas associated  
16 with the state's school construction assistance  
17 program, flexibility needed in the system to address  
18 different kinds of school district needs and potential  
19 revenue sources, and there was a specific mention of  
20 looking at alternatives to what are called impact fees.

21 Q. What did the task force do with respect to  
22 reviewing the statutory provisions regarding the  
23 funding of school construction projects?

24 A. In the course of the task force meetings,  
25 they looked, they considered what are the statutory and

1 legal, other legal framework for how the state  
2 administers the school construction assistance program.

3 Q. What is that basic statutory framework?

4 A. The framework is set up as a school  
5 construction assistance program that is based upon a  
6 local/state responsibility. And in terms of the state  
7 assistance program part of that, it is based upon  
8 eligibility which is partially set out in statute and  
9 partially set out in administrative rules.

10 Q. When you say the eligibility requirements,  
11 could you briefly summarize what the eligibility  
12 requirements are?

13 A. The state school construction assistance  
14 program has two components to it. It has one that is  
15 associated with new school construction or new school  
16 buildings and one that is based upon modernization of  
17 existing school buildings. The eligibility  
18 requirements or eligibility for those two associated  
19 components of the program are a little different. The  
20 first one is based upon the number of unhoused  
21 students, and the second -- which is the new school  
22 construction component. The second one, modernization,  
23 is based upon the age of the facility that is  
24 potentially being replaced or remodeled and the  
25 replacement cost associated with that project, and that

1 is set out in statute and in WAC.

2 Q. And actually, if we can, sort of jumping  
3 ahead here, if I can ask you to turn to page, it looks  
4 like 57 in appendix F, it's a graphic. You mentioned  
5 new construction and modernization, replacement. Does  
6 the graphic on page 57 describe the formulas for new  
7 construction?

8 A. Yes.

9 Q. The graphic on page 58 of appendix F, does  
10 that describe the state's formula for the modernization  
11 and replacement?

12 A. Yes.

13 Q. So when I was asking about eligibility,  
14 actually, why don't we just sort of jump ahead. Using  
15 this graphic that's on page 57, it's entitled  
16 Exhibit-21, SCAGP Formula Schematic for New  
17 Construction Projects. Do you see that?

18 A. Yes.

19 Q. Could you sort of just walk us through  
20 that schematic on how the state funding formula works  
21 for new construction?

22 A. Yes. The column A of the document shows  
23 that the amount that is allowed according to the  
24 existing state funding formula eligibility criteria  
25 varies by age of student, and in the case of K-6)

1) students, it is 90 square feet per student; grades 7)  
2) through 8, it is 117; 9 through 12, it's 130; and for)  
3) students with disabilities, it is 144 square feet per)  
4) student.)

5) Q.) If I can interrupt for a second, how were)  
6) those numbers, 90, 117, 130, 144, how were they)  
7) determined?)

8) A.) My understanding of how they were)  
9) developed is that they were, this was part of the)  
10) formula that was established in the late '80s and)  
11) historically been adjusted since that time.)

12) Q.) Did the task force review at all how those)  
13) numbers are adjusted over time?)

14) A.) Yes.)

15) Q.) And from that review, what was the)  
16) conclusion of the task force as to how they've been)  
17) adjusted over time?)

18) A.) The recommendations reflect the only rules)  
19) from those conclusions that I can provide information)  
20) on, which there is a specific direction in the)  
21) recommendations to do further review of the square)  
22) footage and the other associated component which is the)  
23) area cost allowance.)

24) Q.) But from the task force's review of this)  
25) issue, when was the last time the state looked at the)

1 space allocation numbers to see whether they were  
2 actually the space allocation numbers that are needed  
3 in today's schools?

4 MR. CLARK: Object to the form of the  
5 question. You can go ahead and answer it. Object to  
6 the form of the question because I think the term  
7 "needed" is vague. Needed by whom?

8 That's my form objection. Bryon, you can  
9 go ahead and answer the question.

10 A. The last time that I'm aware that the  
11 legislature took explicit action on the square footage  
12 per student was 2005, in which they enhanced the square  
13 footage that was allowed through the existing funding  
14 formulas, and I believe that these amounts reflective  
15 on page 57 are those, those adjusted, enhanced square  
16 footage.

17 I cannot answer the question about the  
18 legislature considering those square footages, because  
19 at least my assessment would be that they would be  
20 constantly looking at those amounts in each year that  
21 they developed the capital budget.

22 Q. As part of the task force's review of the  
23 construction funding in our state, did the task force  
24 look into whether these 90, 117, 130, 144 numbers were  
25 based on what the schools actually needed to educate

1) kids?

2 MR. CLARK: Again, same objection.

3 MR. AHEARNE: I was just asking whether  
4 they looked into it.

5 MR. CLARK: I still object to the form of  
6 the question.

7 MR. AHEARNE: Okay. Could you please  
8 reread the question.

9 (Record read as requested.)

10 MR. CLARK: I still have the same  
11 objection to that term, "needed." Again, you can go  
12 ahead and answer, Bryon.

13) (A.) The information that was provided to the  
14) task force in other staff presentations reflect --  
15) provide different information related to the square  
16) footage that is actually being constructed by school  
17) districts, and also the information provided  
18) information regarding how these particular figures were  
19) arrived at as well as showing how they have changed  
20) over time.)

21) (Q.) Did the task force do any investigation  
22) into whether these numbers for the space allocation  
23) were adequate in today's world?)

24 MR. CLARK: Again, object to the form of  
25 the question as vague.

1 (A.) They did a significant review of the  
2 square footage issue as well as the other components of  
3 the state school construction funding formula.)

4 (Q.) Let's focus on the square footage issue.  
5 We're talking about the square feet in the space  
6 allocation column of the new construction formula,  
7 correct?

8 (A.) Yes.

9 (Q.) And you said that the task force did  
10 review those numbers.)

11 (A.) Yes.

12 (Q.) Okay, and part of that review was  
13 reviewing whether those numbers are adequate in today's  
14 world?)

15 (A.) The information that was provided to the  
16 task force at their request covered issues associated  
17 with the needs of school districts associated with  
18 school construction funding, the issue associated with  
19 how the amounts that are included in the state funding  
20 formula have changed over time.)

21 (Q.) Did the task force reach any conclusions  
22 as to whether the current space allocation square  
23 footage numbers are or are not adequate in today's  
24 schools?)

25 (A.) The explicit action by the task force)

1) which is included as a recommendation in the final  
2) report is to look at square footage and the area cost  
3) allowance, presumably around some of those issues about  
4) how square footage issues may have changed over time.

5) Q. Okay. I understand that, but would I be  
6) correct then in understanding that the task force did  
7) not come to a conclusion one way or the other as to  
8) whether the current space allocation square footage  
9) numbers are or are not adequate for today's schools?

10) A. In terms of formal recommendations by the  
11) task force, I do not believe that there's anything  
12) directly on point to that issue. If you were  
13) interested in where individual task force members were,  
14) that information would have to come from them in terms  
15) of their conclusions.

16) Q. So if I understand your answer correctly,  
17) or do I understand your answer correctly that the task  
18) force itself made no conclusions as to whether the  
19) square footage space allocation numbers are or are not  
20) adequate, correct?

21) A. There's nothing formally in the final  
22) report that is directly on that specific issue, that  
23) uses the word "adequacy" or any other word like that.

24) Q. But if I understand your answer correctly,  
25) individual task force members may have their own



1) individual opinions on that issue?)

2) A. Yes.)

3 Q. As the designee to speak for the task  
4 force on this report, did the task force have any  
5 opinion, one way or the other, as to whether the  
6 current space allocation square footage numbers should  
7 be changed to reflect current reality in today's  
8 schools?

9 MR. CLARK: You can go ahead and answer  
10 the question if you understand it. It's slightly  
11 different than the last one, but you can go ahead and  
12 answer it. You're asking about opinions. Before it  
13 was recommendations, and they're different words and  
14 they may address the same --

15 MR. AHEARNE: What I'm trying to do, I'm  
16 trying to get around the hesitancy here, just cut to  
17 the chase on this. Why don't we just read the question  
18 again, because I think we can move on after that.

19 (Record read as follows:

20 "Question: As the designee to speak for  
21 the task force on this report, did the task force have  
22 any opinion, one way or the other, as to whether the  
23 current space allocation square footage numbers should  
24 be changed to reflect current reality in today's  
25 schools?")

1 (A.) The task force again in the final report  
2 has a recommendation that specifically directs further  
3 review of the square footage and the area cost  
4 allowance, and that language is included in the  
5 2009-'11 capital budget to be conducted by the Office  
6 of the Superintendent of Public Instruction for them to  
7 report back to the School Construction Task Force.

8 (Q.) And when you say "report back to the  
9 School Construction Task Force," what's the current  
10 status of the School Construction Task Force?

11 (A.) Pursuant to the 2009-'11 capital budget,  
12 the School Construction Task Force was extended for one  
13 additional year and I do not -- I should correct that  
14 slightly. The efforts of the School Construction Task  
15 Force were continued for one additional year.

16 (Q.) Now you've confused me. What's the  
17 purpose of the clarification on the efforts?

18 (A.) I believe the '09-'11 capital budget might  
19 have slightly different language in terms of the  
20 membership and so forth of the School Construction Task  
21 Force. So it's not an identical task force  
22 construction structure. I believe there's slightly  
23 fewer members, for example.

24 (Q.) It may be a different technical entity,  
25 but the general thought is the same, to continue the

1 work in Exhibit-460 into the next year?)

2 A. That is correct.

3 Q. Going back to the diagram on page 57, it's  
4 entitled Exhibit-21 of Exhibit-460, we've talked about  
5 the space eligibility. We've talked about the grade  
6 level, age of kids and eligibility. Where does the  
7 current capacity figure come from in this formula?

8 A. This formula provides the components that  
9 are used for determining the eligible costs for the  
10 state school construction assistance program. The end  
11 result is then compared to the school districts'  
12 current capacity that they have in terms of school  
13 building square footage and that is one step along the  
14 way of this formula. That determines, the difference  
15 between the number, the amount that is determined  
16 according to this formula and the amount of square  
17 footage they have determines what is typically called  
18 the number of unhoused students and therefore the  
19 amount of eligible square footage that they would be  
20 eligible for according to the school construction  
21 assistance formula related to new construction.

22 Q. Again, so I can make sure I understand  
23 this, let's pretend there's a school district that is  
24 K-6 and the future enrollment figure is determined to  
25 be a thousand kids, all right?

1 A. Yes.)

2 Q. If I understand this correctly, you take  
3 the thousand times the 90 square feet, so I guess  
4 90,000 square feet?

5 A. Yes.)

6 Q. Now, if this school district already has  
7 90,000 square feet of existing space for K-6, they are  
8 not eligible for state assistance, so there's zero  
9 eligible area; is that correct?

10 A. At that point in time, that is correct.)

11 Q. But if they have, I'm making up numbers,  
12 let's say they have 50,000 square feet existing, they  
13 have 40,000 of eligible square footage?

14 A. Yes.)

15 Q. Okay, and then what you do is you take  
16 that 40,000 and you multiply it times area cost  
17 allowance to come up with a dollar figure; is that  
18 correct?

19 A. That is correct.)

20 Q. Then we've got 40,000 times 168.79.  
21 Whatever dollar number that is then goes to this match  
22 ratio, which is some percentage between 20 and 100  
23 percent, correct?

24 A. Yes.)

25 Q. So let's say that this particular

1 district, it happens to be 50 percent.) The amount of  
2 money that the school district is eligible to get for  
3 the new construction is half of the 40,000 times the  
4 168.69?

5 A. Yes.

6 Q. I just want to make sure I understood how  
7 the formula works.

8 A. I should also note this obviously is a  
9 simplified, somewhat simplified graphic. There are  
10 other components that go into it. For example,  
11 architectural and engineering fees and other companies  
12 are also provided in the state assistance program that  
13 are not reflected in that, in the area cost allowance  
14 that is depicted here. So there are additional  
15 components to the formula.

16 Q. As a practical matter, is the most  
17 significant chunk of the money the product of the  
18 formula that's on page 57?

19 A. Yes.

20 Q. And the architectural fees and other  
21 things, those are additional add-ons, but they are  
22 relatively small compared to the junk that comes out of  
23 the formula?

24 A. That is correct.

25 Q. Going back to the formula, on the area

1) cost allowance, how is that number determined?

2) A. This is the amount that is specified in  
3) each biennial appropriations act and adjusted for in  
4) the supplemental capital budget, but it is specified in  
5) the capital budget throughout the --

6) Q. How is it determined what that number is  
7) going to be in the capital budget?

8) A. It is specified in the capital budget. It  
9) has been adjusted for inflation and again most recently  
10) in 2005 that component was enhanced as well.

11) Q. When you say "enhanced," you mean  
12) increased?

13) A. Yes.

14) Q. Did the task force look into whether the  
15) current figure, which is 168.79 per square foot,  
16) correct?

17) A. It reports that that is the amount in  
18) 2008. I'm not -- I do not know what the current amount  
19) is.

20) Q. Whether it changed in 2009?

21) A. Yeah.

22) Q. Did the task force look into whether the  
23) dollar number that's specified as the area cost  
24) allowance is the actual cost of construction?

25) A. The task force looked at issues associated

(1) with all aspects of the funding formula, which included  
(2) the area cost allowance.

3 Q. So would the answer to my question be  
4 yes?

5 A. Could you repeat the question?

(6) Q. Sure. Did the task force look into  
(7) whether the area cost allowance number was the actual  
(8) cost of construction that school districts faced?

(9) A. The School Construction Task Force  
(10) requested and received information regarding the area  
(11) cost allowance compared to the amount that is currently  
(12) being reflected in the bid prices that school districts  
(13) are reporting.

(14) Q. So would that mean that they did look into  
(15) whether the current area cost allowance number is the  
(16) actual number the school districts face?

17 MR. CLARK: I think the question has been  
18 asked and answered, object. I mean, again if you can  
19 answer the question, you should go ahead, but I object  
20 that we're really going around the same question and  
21 answer here.

(22) A. The comparison point that I'm making that  
(23) the School Construction Task Force looked at was the  
(24) amount that is being reflected in bid prices which is  
(25) reflective of what school districts are receiving for

1 the school construction projects that they are  
2 submitting for proposals and requests from contractors  
3 for.)

4 Q. Is that the full extent of what the task  
5 force did to determine whether the current area cost  
6 allowance number is the actual number the school  
7 districts face in today's construction climate?

8 A. No.

9 Q. What else did they do?

10 A. The School Construction Task Force also  
11 looked at issues associated with school construction  
12 inflation, which is partially reflected in the area  
13 cost allowance. They also heard from school district  
14 personnel as well as other relevant entities regarding  
15 the amounts that are being reflected for school  
16 construction bids. Additionally they heard people that  
17 had information on why there might have been school  
18 construction inflation and school construction bid  
19 price increases that were fairly significant in recent  
20 years.)

21 Q. Did the task force come to any conclusions  
22 as to whether the state funding formulas area cost  
23 allowance figure was the actual cost that school  
24 districts faced in today's world?

25 MR. CLARK: Again, I object, asked and



1 answered.

2 MR. AHEARNE: That question has not been.

3 MR. CLARK: I disagree and I've objected.

4 So, you know, we can agree to disagree and he can

5 answer the question.

6 MR. AHEARNE: Fine, let's go on.

7 A. The final report of the School  
8 Construction Task Force directs the Office of the  
9 Superintendent of Public Instruction to provide a  
10 report back to the School Construction Task Force on  
11 issues associated with area cost allowance as well as  
12 square footage.)

13 Q. So is my understanding correct that the  
14 task force did not reach a conclusion one way or the  
15 other as to whether the current area cost allowance  
16 figure is the actual cost of construction?

17 A. There's nothing in the final report,  
18 directly on that specific issue.)

19 Q. Is there something indirectly on that  
20 issue?

21 A. Again, the recommendation that, the  
22 request of the Office of the Superintendent of Public  
23 Instruction do further work around it.)

24 Q. The last component of this formula, the  
25 match ratio, could you briefly explain what determines

1 whether you're at the 20 percent match or the 100  
2 percent match?)

3 A.) Essentially this component of the funding  
4 formula is based upon the relative property wealth of a  
5 school district to the state-wide average, and a school  
6 district with a 20 percent match ratio, for example,  
7 would have relative to the state-wide average a fairly  
8 high property wealth or assessed value per student.  
9 Likewise, a district that could have a match ratio  
10 creeping towards 100 percent would have low property --  
11 or yeah, low property wealth relative to the state-wide  
12 average.)

13 Q. The fourth bullet under basic match ratio,  
14 it says, "Match ratio will be the highest of" and it  
15 lists three thing and then it's got this little formula  
16 in a box. Could you sort of put that into English for  
17 me as to what that means?

18 A. To be honest, I have not seen the match  
19 ratio depicted in that way. So the one component that  
20 is depicted on this page that I'm not familiar with is  
21 the 3 minus and the 3 plus, but the graphic is  
22 essentially depicting what I was just articulating in  
23 narrative form about the associated -- the districts'  
24 adjusted assessed value, which is reflected,  
25 abbreviated in AV, versus the state-wide average.

1 Q. Then at the bottom there where it says,  
2 "Plus growth points," could you briefly tell me what  
3 the growth points factors is for?

4 A. Again, I'm not, I should note that I'm not  
5 familiar with this detailed level of the funding  
6 formula.

7 Q. The formula, okay.

8 A. But I believe that it is reflective of  
9 the -- there are additional add-on points that are  
10 provided in the state match formula associated with  
11 high growth districts and that box I believe is a  
12 depiction of that.

13 Q. Okay, and you had previously mentioned  
14 that there are some other add-ons that for new  
15 construction in addition to the number that's produced  
16 by this equation that's on page 57 here. (One would be  
17 like architectural engineering fees.) Could you give  
18 me, I'm not asking for an exhaustive list off the top  
19 of your head, but some other examples?

20 A. Constructability reviews, architectural  
21 engineering fees, furniture and equipment associated  
22 with the building, those are the ones that come to  
23 mind, but there's six, seven or so additional add-on  
24 components to it.

25 Q. And are those based on the total?

1 construction that the school district is doing, or only  
2 the eligible square feet that the school district is  
3 doing?

4 A. There's different ways that those are  
5 calculated, but they're primarily based upon the  
6 funding formula that's for the state school  
7 construction assistance program or the eligible amount.

8 Q. And when you're talking about the basic  
9 funding formula, you're talking about the one that's  
10 depicted at least graphically on page 57 here?

11 A. That is correct.

12 Q. Turning to page 58, there's a similar  
13 graphic with respect to modernization/replacement. Do  
14 you see that?

15 A. Yes.

16 Q. It appears that the funding formulas or at  
17 least the framework is basically the same as with  
18 construction; is that correct?

19 A. That is correct.

20 Q. What's the difference between, what's the  
21 distinction between new construction and  
22 modernization/replacement?

23 A. The new construction component of the  
24 funding formula is primarily based upon addressing and  
25 providing assistance for unhoused students. The

1 modernization program in contrast is primarily based  
2 upon replacing or remodeling the existing facility  
3 based upon the age of that facility and the need of  
4 that facility.

5 Q. But if I understand it correctly, for a  
6 school district that wants to do some sort of  
7 modernization, be it for technology or security and  
8 safety or things like that, they have to still meet the  
9 eligible area requirement first for qualifying for the  
10 component of the modernization aspect of the funding  
11 formula?

12 A. Yes.

13 Q. In your answer, you said modernization.  
14 Is there a difference between modernization or  
15 replacement, or are they the same thing in your answer?

16 A. They are the same thing.

17 Q. We sort of got sidetracked on the formulas  
18 in the eligibility requirements there. Going back to  
19 what you referred me to, the proviso, which is page 9  
20 of the report and under subsection 1C, you referred to  
21 the different district needs and I see under this  
22 proviso it talks about the diverse district and  
23 geographic needs. What did the task force consider  
24 with respect to diverse district and geographic needs?  
25 I mean, what's that talking about?

1 A. This language is reflective of the fact  
2 that, I believe is reflective of the fact that there  
3 are 295 school districts and their needs related to  
4 school construction might be different, and therefore  
5 the construction provided in the proviso was to look at  
6 those issues.

7 Q. Did the task force reaching any  
8 conclusions as to whether there are differences, for  
9 example, in geographic areas in needs between school  
10 districts?

11 A. The School Construction Task Force looked,  
12 spent a great deal of time looking at the issue of  
13 regional variation in school construction, particularly  
14 around cost, inflation, things of that nature.

15 Q. Did the task force reach any conclusions  
16 with respect to regional variation?

17 A. There's nothing in the recommendations  
18 that are directly on that issue of regional variation.  
19 There are recommendations that touch on some of the  
20 issues associated with that regional variation.

21 Q. And when you say "recommendations," is  
22 that another recommendation that OSPI or someone should  
23 look into it and report back?

24 A. There are recommendations in the task  
25 force final report that both are further evaluation and

1 study, as well as explicit action that is recommended.

2 Q.) What would be the explicit action?

3 A.) For example, on page 7, there is, "Provide  
4 technical assistance and finance support for school  
5 districts' land acquisitions."

6 Q.) And to the best of your knowledge, is the  
7 state doing that now?

8 A.) The state does provide assistance,  
9 currently does provide assistance related to school  
10 district land acquisition associated with their efforts  
11 to provide assistance for overall school construction  
12 funding.

13 Q.) But is the state as a result of the task  
14 force's work, to the best of your knowledge, has the  
15 state adopted the task force's recommendation on that  
16 point?

17 A.) There is a proviso in the capital budget,  
18 the 2009-'11 capital budget that directs the Office of  
19 the Superintendent of Public Instruction to review and  
20 make available additional information that could assist  
21 with school district land acquisitions.

22 Q.) Still on page 9, the proviso that you had  
23 pointed out to me, under 1C, the last line talks about  
24 "the needs of school districts that have experienced  
25 consecutive school levy failures." Did the School

1) Construction Task Force look into the needs of school  
2) districts that have experienced consecutive school levy  
3) failures?

4) A. The task force heard from a variety of  
5) different school districts, some of which I believe had  
6) experienced levy failures. I don't know about  
7) consecutive levy failures. I'd have to go back and  
8) check the record for that specific issue.

9) Q. What impact, if any, would consecutive  
10) school levy failures have on a school district's  
11) ability to construct or renovate facilities?

12) A. Presumably the impact from having  
13) consecutive levy failures would be that the school  
14) district would not be able to go forward with the  
15) school construction projects that they had assumed to  
16) be funded from that levy.

17) Q. Going back to page 4 of Exhibit-460, we've  
18) spent a fair bit of time talking about the proviso and  
19) the formulas and all, but if I can ask you to look at  
20) the first paragraph under the section labeled Proviso,  
21) is that a fair summary of what the joint task force was  
22) charged with doing?

23) A. Yes.

24) Q. Okay, and if I can ask you to then go to  
25) -- the reason I'm pausing here is we've covered a lot



# BULKY SUB

CASE # 07-2-02323-2 3ea

SEGMENT 2 OF 2

1 Q. Going to page 6 entitled Principles, do  
2 you see that?

3 A. Yes.

4 Q. Could you just explain what the reasoning  
5 was behind stating three principles at the beginning of  
6 the report here?

7 A. In the course of the School Construction  
8 Task Force, specifically as they began phase 2 of their  
9 work, which was in early 2008, the task force thought  
10 that it would be helpful to establish principles that  
11 might guide their further effort and those are  
12 reflected in principles 1, 2 and 3 which are depicted  
13 on page 6.

14 Q. With respect to principle number 1, it  
15 talks about, "The connections between K-12 operating  
16 and capital needs to be recognized." Do you see that  
17 part?

18 A. Yes.

19 Q. What kind of connections and what kind of  
20 recognition is that referring to?

21 A. One of the issues that the School  
22 Construction Task Force as they conducted their work  
23 focused quite a bit of their time around was that there  
24 are reciprocal relationships between the operating and  
25 the capital budget decisions that are made, and that

1) principle is reflective of the task force collective  
2) recognition of that fact.

3) Q. So if I can try to simplify, would that  
4) be, for example, there's a relationship between the  
5) capital construction costs and let's say maybe the  
6) operating maintenance costs?

7) A. Yes.

8) Q. And so this first principle, recognizing  
9) the connections, are those connections recognized  
10) currently in the way the state funds school  
11) construction?

12) A. There certainly are aspects of the current  
13) funding formula when address that relationship, yes.

14) Q. When you're talking about the funding  
15) formula in that answer, you're talking about the  
16) construction funding formula?

17) A. Yes.

18) Q. Okay, and how does the construction  
19) funding formula address the relationship between  
20) operating costs like maintenance and the actual  
21) construction or renovation costs?

22) A. Right now according to current rules,  
23) there is a requirement that school districts spend 2  
24) percent of their costs which primarily come out of the  
25) operating side of their budget on maintenance in order

1 to qualify for the full amount of state assistance in  
2 the future. That would be an example of that  
3 connection that you are talking about.

4 Q. Referring to?

5 A. The connection between the operating and  
6 the capital budgets as they relate to maintenance.

7 MR. AHEARNE: Sort of jumping ahead to  
8 where I had planned to go and I want to now mark  
9 several exhibits, because this 2 percent role that you  
10 brought up was something I was going to deal with  
11 later. Just because of the way I have my notes  
12 organized, I have to mark all three of these together,  
13 so what I will do is I will start with, I'll jumble  
14 them a little.

15 (Exhibit-462 through 465 marked.)

16 Q. I'll ask you to look at Exhibit-462,  
17 please. This is one of the PowerPoint presentations.  
18 If you'd look through this, is this the kind of 2  
19 percent rule that you were talking about?

20 A. Yes.

21 Q. On the relationship between how  
22 maintenance is accounted for or there's a connection  
23 with it in the state funding formulas?

24 A. Yes.

25 Q. Did the task force look into how this 2

1) percent rule was developed or what its purpose was or  
2) whether it should be changed or did it make any  
3) recommendations? It's a very open-ended question, but  
4) I'm trying to --

5) A. They certainly spent a fair amount of  
6) time, I want to say three to four meetings, which in  
7) part this was part of their agenda for those three or  
8) four meetings, this issue, the 2 percent rule. I  
9) believe there was a recommendation that discusses this  
10) issue.

11) Q. And those would be those two pages of  
12) final recommendations?

13) A. Yes.

14) Q. On pages 7 and 8 of the final report?

15) A. Yes.

16) Q. Okay. If I can keep on Exhibit-462 for  
17) one minute, please, if I can ask you to turn to slide  
18) 13, please, could you, slide 13 is a slide that relates  
19) to the small repair grant program?

20) A. Yes.

21) Q. Could you explain what, if any,  
22) consideration the task force put into the small repair  
23) grant program that the state runs?

24) A. The small repair grant program as  
25) reflected here is a program that was in operation and

1) is currently in operation that provides assistance to  
2) school districts for small repair amounts that are  
3) outside of the eligibility criteria in the state  
4) funding formula, and they spent time both in phase I of  
5) the effort taking place in 2007 on that issue and I  
6) believe that they had this as part of the agenda for at  
7) least one meeting in 2008, but I'd have to recall the  
8) specific meeting notes to make sure of that.)

9) Q. All right, but to the best of your  
10) recollection, what conclusions or recommendations, if  
11) any, did the task force come to with respect to the  
12) state's small repair grant program?

13) A. I do not believe that there are any  
14) specific recommendations in the final report that are  
15) reflective of this. I'd have to go back and look, but  
16) I believe in phase I of the recommendations there was a  
17) recommendation that specifically dealt with exploring  
18) the issue of whether the small repair grant program  
19) needed to get changed in some way.)

20) Q. Okay, and could you briefly just explain  
21) what the small repair grant program is designed to do?

22) A. The small repair grant program as  
23) structured in the language in the capital budget  
24) provides assistance, I believe the limitation is no  
25) more than \$100,000 per project, for school districts to)

1 make small repairs such as maintenance, roofing issues,  
2 things of that nature that are not large modernization  
3 projects, and that the state provides assistance  
4 through that small repair grant program for those  
5 activities.)

6 Q.) And if I understand it correctly, at least  
7 to the best of your recollection, the task force did  
8 not make any recommendations as to whether that program  
9 should be, the dollars should be increased, decreased,  
10 kept the same, anything like that?

11 A.) The task force, again, in phase 1 of the  
12 recommendations, which was in the fall of 2007 or  
13 winter 2007, I believe had a recommendation for further  
14 evaluation. The final report does not contain a  
15 specific recommendation on the small repair grant  
16 program.)

17 Q.) Was there a reason why the task force did  
18 not include recommendations on the small repair grant  
19 program in its final report?

20 A.) I think, my recollection of the discussion  
21 was that there wasn't a need, that the task force  
22 determined pursuant to that phase 1 recommendation that  
23 there wasn't a need to restructure the small repair  
24 grant program, that it was being operationalized as  
25 they I think intended or at least envisioned.)

1 Q. Okay. I just want to make sure I  
2 understand. You can restructure it as in having  
3 different qualifications, eligibility requirements, et  
4 cetera. You could also fund it more to allow all the  
5 projects that are qualified as opposed to just some of  
6 them. Were there any discussions as to the amount of  
7 funding in the small repair grant program?

8 A. There were. One thing that we did not  
9 cover in the discussions is, while I'm here to provide  
10 information on the full range of the School  
11 Construction Task Force, my direct experience with the  
12 issue ended in the fall of 2008 as I transitioned to a  
13 different position, and so a different person that I  
14 have had discussions with has gotten me up to speed on  
15 what took place subsequent to that time. So my  
16 knowledge is a little limited.

17 But having said that, the capital budget  
18 did include \$20 million I believe for the small repair  
19 grant program and which would have been a sizable  
20 enhancement to the program from its current state.

21 Q. When you say "the capital budget," you  
22 were there referring to the '09-'11 capital budget?

23 A. That's correct.

24 Q. While we're on the subject of the  
25 maintenance, if I can ask you to look at Exhibit-465,



1 please, which is an email from -- well, a couple of  
2 background questions.

3 You said you talked to someone else. Who  
4 is the other person you talked to to get you up to  
5 speed?

6 A. I talked to Elise Greef.

7 Q. Then next, this Exhibit-465 is an email  
8 from Gordon Beck?

9 A. Yes.

10 Q. Who is Gordon Beck or what's his role?

11 A. Gordon Beck is the director of the school  
12 facilities program in the Office of the Superintendent  
13 of Public Instruction.

14 Q. And attached to Exhibit-465 are some  
15 PowerPoint slides relating to building maintenance with  
16 accounting code 62 and 64. Did the task force consider  
17 as part of the relationship between operating and  
18 capital funding the state's funding for things like  
19 maintenance, plant maintenance, grounds maintenance, et  
20 cetera?

21 A. There was information provided to the task  
22 force on that issue, I believe, by the Office of the  
23 Superintendent of Public Instruction.

24 Q. Going back to these general principles in  
25 the final report, which is the recognition that the

1 K-12 operating and capital budgets must be connected,  
2 did the task force consider whether to make any  
3 recommendations on the connection between the operating  
4 side, for example, plant supervision, ground  
5 maintenance and plant maintenance that's illustrated in  
6 465 on the one hand, and the state capital funding  
7 formulas that we talked earlier about, either new  
8 construction or renovation?

9 A.) There's at least one recommendation in the  
10 final report that touches on that issue.

11 Q.) And which one is that?

12 A.) Recommendation number 2.)

13 Q.) Under Resources?

14 A.) Yes.)

15 Q.) Could you explain how the recommendation  
16 number 2 relates to then the operating side of plant  
17 ground and maintenance?

18 A.) Under current law, painting and other  
19 small repairs are excluded from eligibility for funding  
20 from capital levy revenues, which are a distinct levy  
21 that school districts are authorized to put forward  
22 before the voters.)

23 Q.) So on Resources, number 2, when it's  
24 talking about these levy revenues, that's the local  
25 school district funds, correct?

1 A. Yes.

2 Q. Not the state funds, correct?

3 A. That is correct.

4 Q. So then the reason for this particular  
5 recommendation of the task force was what?

6 A. To allow school districts additional  
7 flexibility as it relates to painting, preventative  
8 maintenance, et cetera, for those activities to be  
9 funded from capital levy revenues in addition to  
10 currently those activities are primarily funded out of  
11 operating revenues.

12 Q. If I understand at least recommendation 2  
13 here under Resources, it's to change the law to allow  
14 school districts to use their local levy funds for  
15 preventative maintenance in contrast to the law today  
16 which says they cannot; is that correct?

17 A. That is correct.

18 Q. Since I had to mark, it was easier for me  
19 to mark the other two exhibits at the same time since I  
20 had these PowerPoints together. Could you briefly  
21 identify what Exhibit-464 is, please?

22 A. I believe this is the document, the  
23 presentation document that was provided by Craig  
24 McLaughlin, who presented to the task force on July  
25 16th, 2008 on the issue of the Board of Health

1 potential rule change.

2 Q. Is this an example of one of the people  
3 that the task force called in to testify on certain  
4 issues that the task force thought was important?

5 A. Yes.

6 Q. Very briefly, do you recall what the  
7 summation of or the significant points of his  
8 presentation were? Maybe I can ask the question a  
9 different way. Why did the task force call in the  
10 State Board of Health person and how does that relate  
11 to school construction at all?

12 A. The proposed change to the board that the  
13 Board of Health was considering related to school  
14 health issues, had implications for school construction  
15 and the task force wanted to consider those issues.

16 Q. Did the task force reach any conclusions  
17 with respect to those issues?

18 A. Recommendation number 8 of the final  
19 report touches on that issue.

20 Q. And you're looking at the paragraph 8  
21 that's on page 8 of the final report, correct?

22 A. That is correct.

23 Q. When the task force was making this  
24 recommendation to evaluate funding to implement the  
25 Board of Health's proposed rule revisions for school

1 which might or might not have been connected to this  
2 issue and this recommendation, elected to include a  
3 proviso in the 2009-'11 operating budget which  
4 specified that the Board of Health was not to go  
5 forward with the adoption of that rule unless there was  
6 funding and explicit authorization provided by the  
7 legislature.

8 Q. And this recommendation was made, it's a  
9 simple question, did the task force have any intent on  
10 whether this evaluation of the rule should be something  
11 that's done promptly, in the due course, or it just  
12 wasn't thought of one way or the other?

13 A. I think they were aware of the urgency  
14 that was at least in part established, because the  
15 Board of Health was going through their rule adoption  
16 process.

17 Q. All right. Then the last one of these  
18 three presentations that I marked together, 463, could  
19 you briefly identify this? Why would something like a  
20 case study of Evergreen School District be looked at?

21 A. The case study was primarily presented,  
22 this is a presentation given by Gordon Beck from the  
23 Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction. It  
24 was provided to the task force because at least in part  
25 the task force had visited in their very first meeting

1 Union High School and seen Union High School, and so it  
2 was thought by legislative staff as well Mr. Beck that  
3 providing an example of how the school construction  
4 formula works in terms of funding, in terms of  
5 schedule, in terms of changes would be beneficial, and  
6 this presentation I believe reflects the attempt at  
7 that.

8 Q. Exhibit-463 would be another example of  
9 the kinds of testimony that the task force asked for in  
10 its process of considering the issues that led to its  
11 final report?

12 A. Yes.

13 Q. Going back to the final report again, we  
14 were on principle number 1 on page 6. Principal number  
15 2 where in the last sentence it talks about, "The  
16 recommendations and changes in the school construction  
17 funding formula must be reflective of what the state  
18 intends to fund." Do you see that?

19 A. Yes.

20 Q. When the task force wrote this, what was  
21 the understanding of "what the state intends to fund"?

22 A. The understanding or the information that  
23 was provided to the task force and that I assume was  
24 partially reflected in that sentence is related to the  
25 current state funding formula.

1 Q. Then maybe I'm missing something. My read  
2 of guiding principle number 2 is that the funding  
3 formula has to be more transparent or clear or easily  
4 understood to be reflective of what the state intends  
5 to fund. So my question was: What did the task force  
6 have in mind there as to what the state intends to  
7 fund? Because if the answer is simply well, it's  
8 what's in that formula, well, there's no reason for  
9 number 2 because number 2 already, the funding formula  
10 already fully clearly explains it.

11 A. The task force during the course of their  
12 deliberations spent considerable time on the issue that  
13 they labeled transparency in the current and in any  
14 potential funding formula related to school  
15 construction. One of the recommendations on that  
16 specific issue which was ultimately included in  
17 legislation that passed, the legislature this last  
18 legislative session related to the naming conventions  
19 of the components of the school construction funding  
20 formula.

21 I think the conclusion of the task force  
22 was that some of those terms could be misinterpreted or  
23 that they at least were not fully reflective of what  
24 the state funds, and so to the average citizen, they  
25 might be confused by that. So there was a desire to

1 change some of those, those names to make them more  
2 easily translatable. And in part, that's I believe  
3 where you are headed next, to the Berk & Associates  
4 report.

5 Q. I was just going to ask you a follow-up  
6 question. The kinds of clarifications, using different  
7 phrases and words, those are the kinds of  
8 recommendations that the Berk & Associates report made  
9 to the task force; is that correct?

10 A. Yes.

11 Q. They made a lot of recommendations, but  
12 using clearer language was one of them?

13 A. Yes.

14 Q. Did the task force come to any guiding  
15 principle or consensus as to what the state should be  
16 funding with respect to school district facilities?

17 A. I think the answer is reflected in their  
18 final recommendations from the task force.

19 Q. The third guiding principle talks about  
20 "practical reality of implementing the kinds of,  
21 changes being discussed and the resource constraints."  
22 What does it mean by "resource constraints"? Does that  
23 mean like the budget crisis or what?

24 A. My understanding based upon the task force  
25 deliberations is that those resource constraints, that



1 resource constraint reference is related to the  
2 recognition by the task force members that given the  
3 magnitude that school construction funding, both state  
4 and local, plays, that any changes would be significant  
5 and therefore have to be phased in over time.)

6 Q. And generally what's the local role that  
7 local dollars play in school construction funding?)

8 A. At least as it relates to the state  
9 assistance school construction funding formula, the  
10 funding formula is specified as a state and local  
11 partnership and that's reflected in the, again, the  
12 statutory and the rules that establish the funding  
13 formula.)

14 Q. The funding formula you're talking about  
15 is the ones that we went through in that graphic; is  
16 that correct?)

17 A. That is correct.)

18 Q. Since we talked about the  
19 Berk & Associates report, why don't we just move to  
20 that. That's appendix F to the final report of the  
21 task force. Could you just briefly identify what  
22 appendix F is?)

23 A. Appendix F is reflective of the final  
24 report provided by Berk & Associates to the Office of  
25 the Superintendent of Public Instruction pursuant to