Introduction to the 2013 Voters’ Pamphlet

Welcome! This pamphlet contains information about two initiatives to the Legislature and five tax advisory votes appearing on your ballot. You will also find several pages designed to assist you with voting and the election process.

This election largely features local races and measures. Voters will determine the outcome of local measures and elect officials to serve on city councils, school boards, fire and port commissions. These are elections that have a significant impact on our local communities and ultimately shape our state.

The cover of this pamphlet highlights our latest exhibit at the State Capitol celebrating Washington innovators who dared to dream big. *Grand Coulee to Grunge: eight stories that changed the world*, recounts feats in agriculture, business, science, and technology that put the Evergreen State on the world stage.

As Washington expanded in the 1900s, so did our impact on the world. From cities that were built with Northwest timber to the development of a weapon that would end a world war, our state helped shape the 20th century.

Today, people around the world celebrate Washington lives and legacies. From a Starbucks store in Malaysia to a 747 airplane in Antarctica, Washington is everywhere. The fruits of our labor appear on dinner tables across the world and the music of Hendrix and Nirvana is heard on radio stations from Sydney to Stockholm.

Washington’s story continues, and as a voter you can determine what happens next by participating in the November 5 General Election. Your vote will help choose the leaders in your community and may shape the next eight stories that will change the world.

Kim Wyman
Secretary of State

---

About the cover

The cover features the Secretary of State’s latest public exhibit, *Grand Coulee to Grunge: Eight Stories that Changed the World*. Come learn more about the big dreams and big risks that tell the Washington story.

Free exhibit at the Capitol Building, Fall 2013 - Fall 2014
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Qualifications

You must be at least 18 years old, a U.S. citizen, a resident of Washington State, and not under Department of Corrections supervision for a Washington State felony conviction.

Register to vote & update your address

The voter registration and address update deadline has passed. Submit your registration or address update to www.vote.wa.gov so you can vote in 2014.

New voters may register in person until October 28 at your county elections department.

Military voters are exempt from voter registration deadlines.

CAST YOUR BALLOT

1 Your ballot will be mailed to the address you provide in your voter registration.

2 Vote your ballot and sign your return envelope...

3 ...then return it by mail or to an official ballot drop box by 8 p.m. on November 5.

Where is my ballot?

Your ballot will arrive by October 22.

If your ballot is lost or damaged, contact your county elections department listed at the end of this pamphlet.

VIEW ELECTION RESULTS

www.vote.wa.gov

or get the mobile app
WA State Election Results
Audio and plain text voters’ pamphlets available at www.vote.wa.gov/accessible.

Subscribe to receive a copy on CD or USB drive at (800) 448-4881.
The federal Voting Rights Act requires translated elections materials.

Se habla español
Todos los votantes del estado de Washington tienen acceso al folleto electoral y a los formularios de inscripción en español por internet en www.vote.wa.gov.
Adicionalmente, los votantes de los condados de Yakima, Franklin y Adams recibirán su boleta y folleto electoral de forma bilingüe antes de cada elección.
Si usted o alguien que conoce necesitan asistencia en español llame al (800) 448-4881.

中國口語
所有華盛頓州的選民都可在網站 www.vote.wa.gov 查看中文選民手冊和選民登記表格。
此外，金郡選民也可登記在每次選舉前自動獲取中文選票和選民手冊。
如果您或您認識的人需要語言協助，請致電 (800) 448-4881。

Việt Nam được nói
Ngoài ra, cử tri ở Quận King có thể đăng ký để tự động nhận lá phiếu và sách danh cho cử tri bằng tiếng Việt trước mỗi cuộc bầu cử.
Nếu quý vị hoặc người nào quý vị biết cần trợ giúp ngôn ngữ, xin vui lòng gọi (800) 448-4881.
The Initiative
Any voter may propose an initiative to create a new state law or change an existing law.

Initiatives to the People
are proposed laws submitted directly to voters.

Initiatives to the Legislature
are proposed laws submitted to the Legislature.

The Referendum
Any voter may demand that a law proposed by the Legislature be referred to voters before taking effect.

Referendum Bills
are proposed laws the Legislature referred to voters.

Referendum Measures
are laws recently passed by the Legislature that voters demand be referred to the ballot.

Laws by the People

Before an Initiative to the People or an Initiative to the Legislature can appear on the ballot, the sponsor must collect...

246,372 VOTERS' SIGNATURES
8% of all votes in the last Governor’s race

Before a Referendum Measure can appear on the ballot, the sponsor must collect...

123,186 VOTERS' SIGNATURES
4% of all votes in the last Governor’s race

Initiatives & Referenda
BECOME LAW
with a simple MAJORITY VOTE

WHEN CAN I SIGN?
Voters can sign an Initiative to the People petition from January to July.
Voters can sign an Initiative to the Legislature petition from March to December.
Voters can sign a Referendum Measure petition until 90 days after legislative session ends.
The Secretary of State is not responsible for the content of statements or arguments (WAC 434-381-180).

The Law as it Presently Exists

Under current law, anyone wishing to propose an initiative measure for a statewide vote of the people can file it with the Secretary of State starting ten months before the election at which the voters will consider the measure. Initiative measures petitioning the legislature to enact a proposed measure can be filed with the Secretary of State starting ten months before the legislature’s next regular session. After the Secretary of State accepts the initial filing of the measure, initiative supporters may begin collecting petition signatures.

To have an initiative submitted for a statewide vote of the people or to the legislature, the initiative sponsor must submit petitions to the Secretary of State containing the number of valid signatures required by the Washington State Constitution. Washington law provides that petitions must state the initiative measure in full and contain a place for each petitioner to sign and print their name and the address at which they are registered to vote. Petitions must contain a statement affirming that each person signing does so personally as a Washington voter, is providing correct information, has signed only once, and does so truthfully. The law also requires petitions to contain the signature of the petition circulator, swearing or acknowledging that to the best of his or her knowledge, voters signed the petition freely and without compensation, that to the best of his or her knowledge the information provided by the signors is true and correct, and acknowledging that forging a signature or providing compensation to induce people to sign is illegal. The Secretary of State must reject a signed initiative petition if it does not have the required information, has insufficient signatures, or is filed too late.

In addition to statewide initiatives to the people and initiatives to the legislature, Washington law allows some types of local governments to allow for the filing of local initiatives and to set the requirements for submitting such initiatives.

Under current law, those gathering signatures for petitions and those signing petitions receive the same protection from harassment or assault as anyone else, but no further protection. Washington law provides that a person is guilty of harassment if they threaten to: cause bodily injury to another person, damage another person’s property, restrain any person, or do any other act intended to substantially harm the threatened person’s physical or mental health or safety. Washington's statutes and common law also prohibit assaulting another person with unlawful force and the intent to inflict bodily harm, regardless of whether bodily harm occurs. Assault also includes an act, done with unlawful force, with the intent of causing another person to fear bodily injury, if the act actually does create reasonable apprehension and imminent fear of bodily injury. The crime of stalking is committed if a person intentionally and repeatedly harasses or repeatedly follows a person with intent to frighten, intimidate, or harass the person, or with knowledge that the person is afraid, intimidated, or harassed. A person is guilty of disorderly conduct if the person uses abusive language and thereby creates a risk of assault, intentionally disrupts any lawful assembly, or obstructs vehicular or pedestrian traffic without lawful authority.

The Effect of the Proposed Measure, if Approved

This measure would increase the time for gathering petition signatures by up to six months. Proposed initiative measures for a statewide vote of the people could be filed with the Secretary of State starting sixteen months before the election at which the voters would consider the measure. Proposed initiative measures petitioning the legislature to enact a measure could be filed starting sixteen months prior to the legislature’s next regular session at which the measure would be considered.
Any statewide initiative to the people or local initiative that received the required number of petition signatures in the required timeframe would have to be submitted to a vote of the people at the next election. Local government officials would be required to submit the initiative to a vote regardless of the subject matter of the initiative measure.

The measure would provide that interfering with signature gathering for a state or local initiative or referendum is illegal. Interfering with a person trying to sign a petition, stalking a person who signs a petition, or stalking or retaliating against a person who gathers petition signatures would constitute the misdemeanor of disorderly conduct. Such conduct would be subject to the civil anti-harassment procedures available under RCW 10.14, and civil penalties. Interfering with petition signing and signature gathering would be defined to include, but not limited to, pushing, shoving, touching, spitting, throwing objects, yelling, screaming, being verbally abusive, or other tumultuous conduct, blocking or intimidating, or maintaining an intimidating presence within twenty-five feet of a petition signer or signature gatherer. Initiative or referendum petition signing and signature gathering would be legally protected on public sidewalks and walkways and all sidewalks and walkways that carry pedestrians, including those in front of entrances and exits to stores, and inside or outside public buildings.

Fiscal Impact Statement
Written by the Office of Financial Management
For more information visit www.ofm.wa.gov/ballot

Initiative 517 (I-517) makes changes to the state and local government initiative process. I-517 also provides that interfering with signature gathering for state or local initiatives or referenda is illegal. I-517 has no revenue, expenditure or cost impact on state government. There is no revenue impact on local governments from I-517. However, the expenditure and cost impacts to local governments are indeterminate.

General Assumptions
- The term “next election” is assumed to mean the next general election as provided in RCW 29A.04.043.
- No state or local government revenue impact is assumed if the initiative measure is approved.

State Expenditure and Cost Assumptions
I-517 would increase the time for gathering initiative petition signatures by up to six months. The Secretary of State will need to reprogram the online filing system to require sponsors to indicate the year for which each initiative filing applies. No state expenditure or costs would be required for this task.

Local Expenditure and Cost Assumptions
The initiative power is not available to all local governments. Only counties that have adopted a charter form of government have the power of the initiative. The initiative power is also available only to first-class cities, commission cities and code cities (code cities must formally adopt these powers). Based on research by the Municipal Research and Service Center of Washington, an estimated six counties and 59 cities have initiative power.

If I-517 is approved by the voters, counties and cities with initiative power would be required to submit to a vote any initiative, regardless of its subject matter, that obtains the required number of valid voter signatures within the required timeframe. Counties and cities are required to pay for their proportionate share of costs in a general election. The cost to a county or city to certify a local initiative and place it on the ballot in a general election varies significantly. Costs vary by jurisdiction and election based on the number of registered voters in the jurisdiction, the number of measures and offices on the ballot and the methodology used by the county to apportion costs. Based on information provided by counties and cities, an average cost to verify an initiative signature is estimated at $0.80 per signature and an average general election cost is estimated at $1 per registered voter. However, there are no data to estimate the quantity or location of additional initiatives that may qualify for local elections if I-517 is approved, and therefore, the expenditure and cost impact on counties and cities is indeterminate.

Local governments may experience increased expenditures and costs related to the provision in I-517 that interfering with signature gathering for state or local initiatives or referenda is illegal. There are no data to estimate the annual number of law enforcement actions that may occur from this portion of the initiative, and therefore, the fiscal impact on counties and cities is indeterminate.
Arguement For
Initiative Measure 517

Opponents of Initiatives too often use Bullying to Prevent Citizens from Signing Initiatives They Support

Voters who want to sign a petition – liberal or conservative – deserve protection from bullying and retaliation. I-517 establishes penalties to discourage such bad behavior. Peaceful discussion is legal under I-517; bullying is not.

Pictures, videos, and sworn affidavits here: www.YesOn517.com/Safety

I-517 “Protect Your Right To Vote On Initiatives” is about Letting the People Vote on …

… qualified initiatives. In recent years, 16+ citizen-sponsored initiatives – liberal and conservative – were blocked from a public vote by powerful special interests even though local citizens followed all the rules. I-517 establishes a new state law that prevents interference by special interests, guaranteeing the people’s right to vote. If the initiative qualifies, let the voters decide.

I-517 Puts the Citizen Back in the Citizen Initiative. Increasingly, Initiatives Sponsored by Big Business, …

… Big Labor, and the Rich are the only ones qualifying for the ballot. Why? Since 1912, the number of signatures has skyrocketed while the timeframe for collecting signatures has stayed exactly the same. Almost all other initiative states allow a year or more to collect signatures; I-517 matches the national average. More time means more grassroots groups can compete.

I-517 Makes Citizen Participation Safer and Guarantees the People’s Right to Vote on Initiatives

Without I-517, entrenched politicians and special interests will continue bullying citizens from expressing their free speech rights and blocking voters from exercising their initiative rights. Please vote yes. Thank you.

Rebuttal of Argument Against

Even our opponents agree I-517 protects free speech and encourages more grassroots participation by making the initiative process more affordable. Regarding petitioning, I-517 simply reinforces what the courts have already said: petitioning at places open to the public is guaranteed under the First Amendment. Without I-517, initiative opponents will continue bullying, preventing citizens from expressing themselves and voting on issues they care about. Protect your right to speak out and vote on initiatives – vote yes!

Argument Prepared by
Shawn Newman, Washington Director of Initiative and Referendum Institute, attorney; Erma Turner, testified in Olympia against bullying of petition-signers; Nick Sherwood, numerous red-light camera initiatives blocked from votes; Stonewall Jackson Bird, city blocked public vote on his Bellingham initiative; Eddie Agazarm, veteran petitioner, initiative organizer, and civic activist; Paul Jacob, president of Citizens In Charge, longtime initiative activist.

Contact: YesOn517@gmail.com; www.YesOn517.com

Arguement Against
Initiative Measure 517

I-517 violates Washingtonians’ property rights

Courts have ruled that petitioners must respect private property rights when collecting signatures, but I-517 prevents property owners from having control over signature gathering on their property, infringing upon their constitutionally-guaranteed property rights. Under I-517, law enforcement would be directed to vigorously protect petitioners collecting within a twenty-five foot zone. Business owners would not be able to stop aggressive petitioners from blocking and harassing customers who are trying to enter or exit a store. Instead, their property rights would be disregarded.

I-517 benefits Tim Eyman

Sponsor Tim Eyman is a full-time initiative proponent who makes money off the measures he promotes. Under I-517, it would be easier and cheaper for Eyman to qualify future initiatives to the ballot, meaning he could double his output and increase his profits.

I-517 would make petitioning more intrusive

I-517 allows out of state petitioners to be active in Washington year-round – both inside and outside public buildings. Petitioners could go inside sports stadiums like Safeco Field or Comcast Arena, public libraries, and even public school events like high school football games to ask Washingtonians to sign stacks of petitions.

I-517 would increase elections costs

A provision tucked away in I-517 forces cities and counties to put local initiatives on the ballot even if they’re illegal or invalid, wasting taxpayer dollars on unnecessary elections.

Join former Secretaries of State Ralph Munro and Sam Reed in voting no on I-517.

Rebuttal of Argument For

Former Secretary of State Sam Reed said that most complaints received in his office were from citizens and businesses who were being harassed by signature gatherers and that laws already exist to protect signature gatherers’ safety. Local governments should not be forced into costly legal battles when an initiative is found to be unconstitutional. Former Supreme Court Justice Phil Talmadge says I-517 is unconstitutional as it takes away private property rights of others. Vote No.

Argument Prepared by
Rob McKenna, former Washington State Attorney General; Brian Sonntag, former Washington State Auditor; Jan Gee, Washington Food Industry Association (independent/family-owned grocers); Frank Ordway, League of Education Voters; Andrew Villeneuve, activist and founder of the Northwest Progressive Institute.

Contact: (360) 688-7633; info@nooni517coalition.org; www.no517.org
The Secretary of State is not responsible for the content of statements or arguments (WAC 434-381-180).

Explanatory Statement
Written by the Office of the Attorney General

The Law as it Presently Exists
In general, federal law regulates the safety and quality of food shipped between states, while Washington law regulates the safety and quality of food produced and sold within the state. Both federal and state law identify and regulate foods that are “misbranded” or “adulterated,” but neither state nor federal law requires any specific labeling of foods produced using genetic engineering.

Under Washington law, the director of the state Department of Agriculture is authorized to condemn, seize, and destroy misbranded or adulterated foods and food items. Washington law defines food and food products as “misbranded” where labeling or packaging is false or misleading, and “adulterated” if they contain some added substance that is poisonous or harmful to health, or if they are contaminated, diseased, putrid, or otherwise unfit as food or injurious to health. State law imposes many specific labeling and packaging requirements and prohibitions for food and food products, but it does not require any specific labeling of genetically engineered foods. No provision of state law treats genetically engineered food as adulterated.

Washington law also authorizes the director of the state Department of Agriculture to stop the sale of mislabeled agricultural seeds, flower seeds, and vegetable seeds sold in Washington, and to condemn and seize the seeds if necessary. Seeds are considered to be misbranded if they are not accurately labeled in compliance with state law, but existing state law does not require that genetically engineered seeds be labeled as genetically engineered.

The Effect of the Proposed Measure, if Approved
The measure would impose labeling requirements on genetically engineered foods and seeds offered for retail sale in Washington. The measure defines “genetically engineered” to mean changes to genetic material produced through techniques that directly insert DNA or RNA into organisms or that use cell fusion techniques to overcome natural barriers to cell multiplication or recombination.

Beginning July 1, 2015, any food produced using “genetic engineering” that is not labeled as required in the measure would be considered “misbranded.” The measure would require genetically engineered raw agricultural commodities to be labeled conspicuously with the words “genetically engineered,” and genetically engineered packaged processed foods would have to be labeled conspicuously with the words “partially produced with genetic engineering” or “may be partially produced with genetic engineering.” The measure would exempt the following foods from the labeling requirements: alcoholic beverages; certified organic foods; foods not produced using genetic engineering, as certified by an approved independent organization; foods served in restaurants or in food service establishments; “medical food”; and foods consisting of or derived from animals that have themselves not been genetically engineered, regardless of whether the animal has been fed any genetically engineered food; and processed foods produced using genetically engineered processing aids or enzymes. Processed foods containing small amounts of genetically engineered materials would be exempt until July 1, 2019.

Beginning July 1, 2015, the measure also would require that genetically engineered seeds and seed stock be labeled conspicuously with the words “genetically engineered” or “produced with genetic engineering.”

The measure provides that its requirements are to be implemented and enforced by the state Department of Health, instead of the state Department of Agriculture, and would authorize the Department of Health to assess a civil penalty of up to one thousand dollars per day for each violation. The Department of Health, acting
through the Attorney General, could bring an action in superior court to enjoin a person violating the measure. Separately, after giving sixty days notice, any private person could bring an action in superior court to enjoin a person violating the measure, and potentially recover costs and attorney fees for the action.

**Fiscal Impact Statement**

Written by the Office of Financial Management

For more information visit [www.ofm.wa.gov/ballot](http://www.ofm.wa.gov/ballot)

The initiative authorizes the Washington State Department of Health to adopt rules necessary to implement the initiative. Beginning July 1, 2015, the initiative allows the Department of Health, through the Attorney General, to bring an action to enjoin violations of the initiative’s requirement that most raw agricultural commodities, processed foods, seeds and seed stocks, if produced using genetic engineering, be labeled as genetically engineered when offered for retail sale. Known state agency implementation costs are estimated at $3,368,000 over six fiscal years. State and local revenue and costs from enforcement activities are indeterminate.

**General Assumptions**

- The fiscal estimates contained in this fiscal impact statement are based, in part, on assumptions about the scope and legal effect of the ballot measure should it be enacted by the voters. Such assumptions are not intended to represent legal interpretation or conclusions of law.
- The initiative is effective Dec. 5, 2013. However, the initiative’s labeling requirements begin July 1, 2015.
- Estimates are described using the state’s fiscal year (FY) of July 1 through June 30.

**State Revenue Assumptions**

The initiative would allow the Department of Health (DOH) to assess a civil penalty against any person violating the requirements of the initiative in an amount not to exceed one thousand dollars ($1,000) per day. Additional state revenue could be generated from filing fees for civil actions filed in county superior courts to enforce the initiative’s requirements. As provided in RCW 36.18.025, 46 percent of county superior court filing fees must be remitted to the State Treasurer for deposit in the state general fund and 54 percent of fees remain with the county. There are no data to estimate the annual number of civil actions or civil penalties that may be generated. Therefore, the state revenue impact from the initiative is indeterminate.

**State Expenditure and Cost Assumptions**

DOH program development will include expenditures for rule making, inspection and compliance, as well as education and technical assistance to the food industry. The cost of these expenditures over six fiscal years is estimated at $2,168,000. Beginning July 1, 2015, DOH will contract with a private laboratory for product sampling and testing as required in the initiative. Total cost of this expenditure over six fiscal years is estimated at $1,200,000. Table 1.1 shows DOH estimated costs by fiscal year.

**Local Revenue, Expenditure and Cost Assumptions**

Counties may experience increased revenue, expenditures and costs from civil actions filed in county superior courts to enforce the initiative’s requirements. There are no data to estimate the annual number of civil actions that may occur. Therefore, the fiscal impact on counties from the initiative is indeterminate.

| Table 1.1 Department of Health Estimated Costs by Fiscal Year |
|---------------------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| **Fiscal Year** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** | **COSTS** |
| Program Development | $82,000 | $96,000 | $210,000 | $210,000 | $210,000 | $210,000 | $1,018,000 |
| Rule Development | $96,000 | $122,000 | $0 | $0 | $0 | $0 | $218,000 |
| Compliance and Enforcement | $0 | $0 | $239,000 | $231,000 | $231,000 | $231,000 | $932,000 |
| Laboratory Sampling and Testing | $0 | $0 | $300,000 | $300,000 | $300,000 | $300,000 | $1,200,000 |
| **TOTAL** | **$178,000** | **$218,000** | **$749,000** | **$741,000** | **$741,000** | **$741,000** | **$3,368,000** |
Argument For
Initiative Measure 522

Right to Know
In America, we have a right to know important information about the food we eat and feed our families – such as sugar and sodium levels, whether flavors are natural or artificial, the country of origin, and if fish are wild or farm-raised.

We also should have a right to choose whether we want to buy and eat genetically engineered food. Labels matter. They ensure transparency and preserve the freedom to make our own decisions about the food we eat. I-522 is a step in the right direction.

U.S. companies already label genetically engineered foods for markets in the 64 countries that require labeling, including some of Washington’s largest trading partners. Genetically engineered crops, such as wheat, have contaminated conventional crops in the Northwest. Some countries suspended imports from our farmers, putting our economy at risk. Separation and labeling, from the seed level up through the supply chain, helps protect exports to countries that require labeling.

Broad Support
I-522 was brought to the ballot by more than 350,000 citizens and draws strong support from farmers, fishing families, health care professionals, business owners, Republicans, Democrats, and Independents across our state.

Labels Let You Decide
Voting Yes on I-522 is an important step for more information about your food. You should have the freedom to decide what to eat. Your food decisions should be up to you – not corporations, the government, or special interests. Labels let you decide. Vote for the right to know what’s in your food.

Rebuttal of Argument Against
Powerful chemical corporations that genetically engineer food oppose labeling because they care about their profits, not our right to know. The truth: labels ensure transparency. The government has conducted no independent safety tests and the Washington State Nurses Association endorses labeling to trace health issues. Labeling is easy and it gives us the freedom to decide what to buy. Foods are relabeled frequently. Adding words to a label doesn’t increase costs. Trust yourself to decide.

Argument Prepared by
Judy Huntington, RN, Executive Director, Washington Nurses Association; Seth Williams, Fourth-Generation Wheat Farmer, Eastern Washington; Walt Bowen, President, Washington State Senior Citizens’ Lobby; Trudy Bialic, Director of Public Affairs, PCC Natural Markets; Maralyn Chase, State Senator, Democrat, Shoreline; Cary Condotta, State Representative, Republican, Wenatchee.
Contact: (206) 351-3323; info@yeson522.com; www.yeson522.com

Argument Against
Initiative Measure 522

I-522 mandates costly, misleading food labeling regulations in Washington that don’t exist in any other state.

I-522 makes no sense.
For decades, agricultural biotechnology has helped improve food crops so they resist disease, require fewer pesticides or are more nutritious. Today, 70-80% of grocery products include ingredients from these foods, and they’re deemed safe by the FDA and major scientific and medical organizations. Yet I-522 would require thousands of these products to have special, new labels – only for Washington – while giving special exemptions to thousands of others, even when they contain “genetically engineered” (GE) ingredients.

I-522 requires fruits, vegetables and grain-based products to be labeled, but exempts meat and dairy products from animals fed GE grains. It mandates special labels and signs in supermarkets, but exempts restaurants from providing information about GE ingredients in their foods. Foods from foreign countries would be exempt if manufacturers simply claim they’re exempt. So I-522 wouldn’t even give consumers a reliable way of knowing which foods contain GE ingredients.

Higher taxpayer costs, more state bureaucracy and lawsuits.
I-522 would require the state to monitor labels on thousands of products in thousands of stores – costing taxpayers millions. It would allow trial lawyers to sue farmers, food producers and grocers over the wording on food labels – encouraging shakedown lawsuits. And, studies show I-522’s Washington-only labeling requirements would hurt local farmers and increase an average family’s food costs by hundreds of dollars per year.

Washington scientists, farmers and food producers urge no on 522.

Rebuttal of Argument For
Existing food labels already give consumers the option to choose foods without GE ingredients by choosing products labeled “certified organic.” I-522’s complicated, poorly written regulations would put Washington farmers and food producers at a competitive disadvantage, not protect them. I-522 would not protect our export markets or provide consumers with reliable information about our food. But it would increase grocery prices for Washington families and cost taxpayers millions. Vote no on this costly, unnecessary measure.

Argument Prepared by
R. James Cook, Professor Emeritus, WSU; Member, National Academy of Sciences; Dan Newhouse, Former Director, Washington State Department of Agriculture; Mike LaPlant, President, Washington Farm Bureau; Family Farmer, Grant County; Peter Dunbar, M.D., Former President, Washington State Medical Association; Nicole Berg, Family Farmer; National Conservation Leadership Award Winner; Eric Maier, Past President, Washington Association of Wheat Growers.
Contact: (877) 361-3993; info@VoteNOon522.com; www.VoteNOon522.com
Advisory Votes

What’s an advisory vote?
Advisory votes are non-binding. The results will not change the law.
You are advising the Legislature to repeal or maintain a tax increase.

Repeal - you don’t favor the tax increase.
Maintain - you favor the tax increase.

For more information
Call the Legislative hotline at (800) 562-6000.
View the complete text of the bill at www.vote.wa.gov/completetext.
View additional cost information at www.ofm.wa.gov/ballot.

Where are Advisory Votes 1 and 2?
Advisory Votes 1 and 2 were on the ballot last year. Advisory votes are numbered consecutively. This year, your ballot starts with Advisory Vote 3.

Advisory votes are the result of Initiative 960, approved by voters in 2007.

Ten-Year Cost Projection
Provided by the Office of Financial Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Leasehold Excise Tax</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>$145,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>$167,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>$175,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>$183,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>$194,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>$202,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>$210,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>$218,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022</td>
<td>$227,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023</td>
<td>$235,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$1,956,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Final Votes Cast by the Legislature

Senate: Yeas, 47; Nays, 2; Absent, 0; Excused, 0
House: Yeas, 91; Nays, 6; Absent, 0; Excused, 1
See how each legislator voted on SSB 5444 (page 17).
Advisory Vote

4

Senate Bill 5627

The legislature imposed, without a vote of the people, an aircraft excise tax on commuter air carriers in lieu of property tax, costing approximately $500,000 in its first ten years, for government spending.

This tax increase should be:
[ ] Repealed
[ ] Maintained

Ten-Year Cost Projection
Provided by the Office of Financial Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Aircraft Excise Tax</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>$38,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>$38,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>$41,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>$41,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>$44,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>$44,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022</td>
<td>$47,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023</td>
<td>$47,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$410,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Final Votes Cast by the Legislature

Senate: Yeas, 41; Nays, 8; Absent, 0; Excused, 0
House: Yeas, 71; Nays, 22; Absent, 0; Excused, 5

See how each legislator voted on SB 5627 (page 17).

Advisory Vote

5

Engrossed Substitute House Bill 1846

The legislature extended, without a vote of the people, the insurance premium tax to some insurance for pediatric oral services, costing an amount that cannot currently be estimated, for government spending.

This tax increase should be:
[ ] Repealed
[ ] Maintained

Ten-Year Cost Projection
Provided by the Office of Financial Management

Section 3(6)(c) of this bill removes the exemption for pediatric oral services offered as essential health benefits outside the Washington Health Benefit Exchange. Since these services have previously been exempted, this will result in additional revenue for the insurance premium tax. However, the amount of taxable activity resulting from pediatric oral health care services cannot be estimated. Consequently, the amount of additional revenue attributed to pediatric oral services offered as essential health benefits outside the Health Benefit Exchange is indeterminate.

Final Votes Cast by the Legislature

Senate: Yeas, 47; Nays, 1; Absent, 0; Excused, 1
House: Yeas, 95; Nays, 0; Absent, 0; Excused, 3

See how each legislator voted on ESHB 1846 (page 17).
Advisory Vote

6

Second Engrossed Second Substitute House Bill 1971
The legislature eliminated, without a vote of the people, a retail sales tax exemption for certain telephone and telecommunications services, costing approximately $397,000,000 in the first ten years, for government spending.

This tax increase should be:
[ ] Repealed
[ ] Maintained

Ten-Year Cost Projection
Provided by the Office of Financial Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Retail Sales Tax</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>$36,258,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>$12,875,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>$43,470,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>$43,470,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>$43,470,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>$43,470,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>$43,470,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>$43,470,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022</td>
<td>$43,470,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023</td>
<td>$43,470,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$396,893,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Final Votes Cast by the Legislature
House: Yeas, 77; Nays, 15; Absent, 0; Excused, 5
Senate: Yeas, 36; Nays, 11; Absent, 0; Excused, 2
See how each legislator voted on 2E2SHB 1971 (page 17).

Advisory Vote

7

Engrossed House Bill 2075
The legislature extended, without a vote of the people, estate tax on certain property transfers and increased rates for estates over $4,000,000, costing approximately $478,000,000 in the first ten years, for government spending.

This tax increase should be:
[ ] Repealed
[ ] Maintained

Ten-Year Cost Projection
Provided by the Office of Financial Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Estate Tax</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>$109,700,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>$39,300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>$39,300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>$35,300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>$34,400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>$40,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>$42,300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>$44,300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022</td>
<td>$46,100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023</td>
<td>$47,700,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$478,400,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Final Votes Cast by the Legislature
House: Yeas, 53; Nays, 33; Absent, 0; Excused, 11
Senate: Yeas, 30; Nays, 19; Absent, 0; Excused, 0
See how each legislator voted on EHB 2075 (page 17).
Final Votes Cast by Each Legislator

District 1
Sen. Rosemary McAuliffe
(D, Bothell), (360) 786-7600
rosemary.mcauliffe@leg.wa.gov
SSB 5444 (AV 3): Yea
SB 5627 (AV 4): Yea
ESHB 1846 (AV 5): Yea
2E2SHB 1971 (AV 6): Yea
EHB 2075 (AV 7): Yea

Rep. Derek Sanford
(D, Bothell), (360) 786-7928
derek.sanford@leg.wa.gov
SSB 5444 (AV 3): Yea
SB 5627 (AV 4): Yea
ESHB 1846 (AV 5): Yea
2E2SHB 1971 (AV 6): Yea
EHB 2075 (AV 7): Yea

Rep. Luis Moscoso
(D, Mountlake Terrace), (360) 786-7900
luis.moscoso@leg.wa.gov
SSB 5444 (AV 3): Yea
SB 5627 (AV 4): Yea
ESHB 1846 (AV 5): Yea
2E2SHB 1971 (AV 6): Yea
EHB 2075 (AV 7): Yea

District 2
Sen. Randi Becker
(R, Eatonville), (360) 786-7602
randi.becker@leg.wa.gov
SSB 5444 (AV 3): Yea
SB 5627 (AV 4): Yea
ESHB 1846 (AV 5): Yea
2E2SHB 1971 (AV 6): Yea
EHB 2075 (AV 7): Nay

Rep. Gary Alexander
(R, Olympia), (360) 786-7824
gary.alexander@leg.wa.gov
SSB 5444 (AV 3): Yea
SB 5627 (AV 4): Yea
ESHB 1846 (AV 5): Yea
2E2SHB 1971 (AV 6): Yea
EHB 2075 (AV 7): Nay

Rep. J.T. Wilcox
(R, Yelm), (360) 786-7912
jt.wilcox@leg.wa.gov
SSB 5444 (AV 3): Yea
SB 5627 (AV 4): Yea
ESHB 1846 (AV 5): Yea
2E2SHB 1971 (AV 6): Yea
EHB 2075 (AV 7): Nay

District 3
Sen. Andy Billig
(D, Spokane), (360) 786-7604
andy.billig@leg.wa.gov
SSB 5444 (AV 3): Yea
SB 5627 (AV 4): Yea
ESHB 1846 (AV 5): Yea
2E2SHB 1971 (AV 6): Yea
EHB 2075 (AV 7): Yea

Rep. Marcus Riccelli
(D, Spokane), (360) 786-7888
marcus.riccelli@leg.wa.gov
SSB 5444 (AV 3): Yea
SB 5627 (AV 4): Yea
ESHB 1846 (AV 5): Yea
2E2SHB 1971 (AV 6): Yea
EHB 2075 (AV 7): Yea

Rep. Timm Ormsby
(D, Spokane), (360) 786-7946
timm.ormsby@leg.wa.gov
SSB 5444 (AV 3): Yea
SB 5627 (AV 4): Yea
ESHB 1846 (AV 5): Yea
2E2SHB 1971 (AV 6): Yea
EHB 2075 (AV 7): Yea

District 4
Sen. Mike Padden
(R, Spokane Valley), (360) 786-7606
mike.padden@leg.wa.gov
SSB 5444 (AV 3): Yea
SB 5627 (AV 4): Nay
ESHB 1846 (AV 5): Nay
2E2SHB 1971 (AV 6): Nay
EHB 2075 (AV 7): Nay

Rep. Larry Crouse
(R, Spokane Valley), (360) 786-7820
larry.crouse@leg.wa.gov
SSB 5444 (AV 3): Yea
SB 5627 (AV 4): Nay
ESHB 1846 (AV 5): Nay
2E2SHB 1971 (AV 6): Nay
EHB 2075 (AV 7): Nay

Rep. Matt Shea
(R, Spokane Valley), (360) 786-7984
matt.shea@leg.wa.gov
SSB 5444 (AV 3): Yea
SB 5627 (AV 4): Nay
ESHB 1846 (AV 5): Nay
2E2SHB 1971 (AV 6): Nay
EHB 2075 (AV 7): Nay

District 5
Sen. Mark Mullet
(D, Issaquah), (360) 786-7608
mark.mullet@leg.wa.gov
SSB 5444 (AV 3): Yea
SB 5627 (AV 4): Yea
ESHB 1846 (AV 5): Yea
2E2SHB 1971 (AV 6): Yea
EHB 2075 (AV 7): Yea

Rep. Jay Rodne
(R, North Bend), (360) 786-7852
jay.rodne@leg.wa.gov
SSB 5444 (AV 3): Yea
SB 5627 (AV 4): Yea
ESHB 1846 (AV 5): Yea
2E2SHB 1971 (AV 6): Nay
EHB 2075 (AV 7): Excused

Rep. Chad Magendanz
(R, Issaquah), (360) 786-7876
chad.magendanz@leg.wa.gov
SSB 5444 (AV 3): Yea
SB 5627 (AV 4): Yea
ESHB 1846 (AV 5): Yea
2E2SHB 1971 (AV 6): Yea
EHB 2075 (AV 7): Yea

District 6
Sen. Michael Baumgartner
(D, Richland), (360) 786-7614
michael.baumgartner@leg.wa.gov
SSB 5444 (AV 3): Yea
SB 5627 (AV 4): Nay
ESHB 1846 (AV 5): Nay
2E2SHB 1971 (AV 6): Nay
EHB 2075 (AV 7): Nay

Rep. Kevin Parker
(R, Spokane Valley), (360) 786-7922
kevin.parker@leg.wa.gov
SSB 5444 (AV 3): Yea
SB 5627 (AV 4): Nay
ESHB 1846 (AV 5): Nay
2E2SHB 1971 (AV 6): Nay
EHB 2075 (AV 7): Excused

Rep. Jeff Holy
(R, Richland), (360) 786-7986
jeff.holy@leg.wa.gov
SSB 5444 (AV 3): Yea
SB 5627 (AV 4): Nay
ESHB 1846 (AV 5): Nay
2E2SHB 1971 (AV 6): Nay
EHB 2075 (AV 7): Nay

Initiative 960, approved by voters in 2007, requires a list of every Legislator, their party preference, hometown, contact information, and how they voted on each bill resulting in an Advisory Vote.
Initiative 960, approved by voters in 2007, requires a list of every Legislator, their party preference, hometown, contact information, and how they voted on each bill resulting in an Advisory Vote.
| District 17 | Sen. Don Benton |
|------------|--|---|
| (R, Vancouver), (360) 786-7632 | don.benton@leg.wa.gov |
| SB 5444 (AV 3): Yea |
| SB 5627 (AV 4): Nay |
| ESHB 1846 (AV 5): Yea |
| 2E2SHB 1971 (AV 6): Nay |
| EHB 2075 (AV 7): Nay |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep. Monica Stonier</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(D, Vancouver), (360) 786-7994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 5444 (AV 3): Yea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 5627 (AV 4): Nay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESHB 1846 (AV 5): Yea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2E2SHB 1971 (AV 6): Nay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EHB 2075 (AV 7): Nay</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep. Paul Harris</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(R, Vancouver), (360) 786-7976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 5444 (AV 3): Nay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 5627 (AV 4): Nay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESHB 1846 (AV 5): Yea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2E2SHB 1971 (AV 6): Yea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EHB 2075 (AV 7): Nay</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep. Brandon Vick</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(R, Felida), (360) 788-7850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 5444 (AV 3): Yea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 5627 (AV 4): Yea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESHB 1846 (AV 5): Yea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2E2SHB 1971 (AV 6): Yea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EHB 2075 (AV 7): Nay</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep. Liz Pike</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(R, Camas), (360) 786-7812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 5444 (AV 3): Yea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 5627 (AV 4): Nay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESHB 1846 (AV 5): Yea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2E2SHB 1971 (AV 6): Nay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EHB 2075 (AV 7): Excused</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| District 18 | Sen. Ann Rivers |
|------------|--|---|
| (R, La Center), (360) 786-7634 | ann.rivers@leg.wa.gov |
| SB 5444 (AV 3): Yea |
| SB 5627 (AV 4): Nay |
| ESHB 1846 (AV 5): Yea |
| 2E2SHB 1971 (AV 6): Yea |
| EHB 2075 (AV 7): Nay |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep. Richard DeBolt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(R, Chehalis), (360) 788-7896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 5444 (AV 3): Excused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 5627 (AV 4): Excused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESHB 1846 (AV 5): Excused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2E2SHB 1971 (AV 6): Yea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EHB 2075 (AV 7): Nay</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep. Ed Orcutt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(R, Kalama), (360) 786-7990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 5444 (AV 3): Yea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 5627 (AV 4): Nay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESHB 1846 (AV 5): Yea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2E2SHB 1971 (AV 6): Yea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EHB 2075 (AV 7): Nay</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| District 19 | Sen. Brian Hatfield |
|------------|--|---|
| (D, Raymond), (360) 786-7636 | brian.hatfield@leg.wa.gov |
| SB 5444 (AV 3): Yea |
| SB 5627 (AV 4): Yea |
| ESHB 1846 (AV 5): Yea |
| 2E2SHB 1971 (AV 6): Yea |
| EHB 2075 (AV 7): Yea |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep. Dean Takko</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(D, Longview), (360) 786-7806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 5444 (AV 3): Yea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 5627 (AV 4): Yea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESHB 1846 (AV 5): Yea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2E2SHB 1971 (AV 6): Excused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EHB 2075 (AV 7): Yea</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep. Brian Blake</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(D, Aberdeen), (360) 786-7870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 5444 (AV 3): Yea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 5627 (AV 4): Yea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESHB 1846 (AV 5): Yea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2E2SHB 1971 (AV 6): Yea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EHB 2075 (AV 7): Yea</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| District 20 | Sen. John Braun |
|------------|--|---|
| (R, Centralia), (360) 786-7638 | john.braun@leg.wa.gov |
| SB 5444 (AV 3): Yea |
| SB 5627 (AV 4): Yea |
| ESHB 1846 (AV 5): Yea |
| 2E2SHB 1971 (AV 6): Yea |
| EHB 2075 (AV 7): Yea |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep. Richard Reikdal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(D, Tumwater), (360) 786-7940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 5444 (AV 3): Yea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 5627 (AV 4): Yea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESHB 1846 (AV 5): Yea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2E2SHB 1971 (AV 6): Yea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EHB 2075 (AV 7): Yea</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep. Chris Reykdal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(D, Puyallup), (360) 786-7931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 5444 (AV 3): Yea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 5627 (AV 4): Yea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESHB 1846 (AV 5): Yea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2E2SHB 1971 (AV 6): Yea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EHB 2075 (AV 7): Yea</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep. Sam Hunt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(D, Olympia), (360) 786-7992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 5444 (AV 3): Yea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 5627 (AV 4): Yea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESHB 1846 (AV 5): Yea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2E2SHB 1971 (AV 6): Yea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EHB 2075 (AV 7): Yea</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| District 21 | Sen. Paul Shinn |
|------------|--|---|
| (D, Edmonds), (360) 786-7640 | paul.shinn@leg.wa.gov |
| SB 5444 (AV 3): Yea |
| SB 5627 (AV 4): Yea |
| ESHB 1846 (AV 5): Yea |
| 2E2SHB 1971 (AV 6): Excused |
| EHB 2075 (AV 7): Yea |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep. Mary Helen Roberts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(D, Lynnwood), (360) 786-7950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 5444 (AV 3): Yea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 5627 (AV 4): Yea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESHB 1846 (AV 5): Yea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2E2SHB 1971 (AV 6): Yea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EHB 2075 (AV 7): Yea</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep. Marko Liias</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(D, Edmonds), (360) 786-7972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 5444 (AV 3): Yea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 5627 (AV 4): Yea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESHB 1846 (AV 5): Yea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2E2SHB 1971 (AV 6): Yea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EHB 2075 (AV 7): Yea</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep. Kevin Van De Wege</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(D, Sequim), (360) 786-7916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 5444 (AV 3): Yea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 5627 (AV 4): Yea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESHB 1846 (AV 5): Yea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2E2SHB 1971 (AV 6): Yea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EHB 2075 (AV 7): Yea</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep. Steve Tharinger</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(D, Sequim), (360) 786-7904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 5444 (AV 3): Yea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 5627 (AV 4): Yea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESHB 1846 (AV 5): Yea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2E2SHB 1971 (AV 6): Yea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EHB 2075 (AV 7): Yea</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Initiative 960, approved by voters in 2007, requires a list of every Legislator, their party preference, hometown, contact information, and how they voted on each bill resulting in an Advisory Vote.
District 33
Sen. Karen Keiser
(D, Kent), (360) 786-7664
karen.keiser@leg.wa.gov
SSB 5444 (AV 3): Yea
SB 5627 (AV 4): Yea
ESHB 1846 (AV 5): Yea
2E2SHB 1971 (AV 6): Yea
EHB 2075 (AV 7): Yea

Rep. Tina Orwall
(D, Des Moines), (360) 786-8343
tina.orwall@leg.wa.gov
SSB 5444 (AV 3): Yea
SB 5627 (AV 4): Yea
ESHB 1846 (AV 5): Yea
2E2SHB 1971 (AV 6): Yea
EHB 2075 (AV 7): Yea

Rep. Dave Upthegrove
(D, Des Moines), (360) 786-8788
dave.upthegrove@leg.wa.gov
SSB 5444 (AV 3): Yea
SB 5627 (AV 4): Yea
ESHB 1846 (AV 5): Yea
2E2SHB 1971 (AV 6): Yea
EHB 2075 (AV 7): Yea

District 34
Sen. Sharon Nelson
(D, Maury Island), (360) 786-7987
sharon.nelson@leg.wa.gov
SSB 5444 (AV 3): Yea
SB 5627 (AV 4): Yea
ESHB 1846 (AV 5): Yea
2E2SHB 1971 (AV 6): Yea
EHB 2075 (AV 7): Yea

Rep. Eileen Cody
(D, Seattle), (360) 786-7978
eileen.cody@leg.wa.gov
SSB 5444 (AV 3): Yea
SB 5627 (AV 4): Yea
ESHB 1846 (AV 5): Yea
2E2SHB 1971 (AV 6): Yea
EHB 2075 (AV 7): Yea

Rep. Joe Fitzgibbon
(D, Burien), (360) 786-7952
joe.fitzgibbon@leg.wa.gov
SSB 5444 (AV 3): Yea
SB 5627 (AV 4): Yea
ESHB 1846 (AV 5): Yea
2E2SHB 1971 (AV 6): Yea
EHB 2075 (AV 7): Yea

District 35
Sen. Tim Sheldon
(D, Potlatch), (360) 786-7668
timothy.sheldon@leg.wa.gov
SSB 5444 (AV 3): Yea
SB 5627 (AV 4): Yea
ESHB 1846 (AV 5): Yea
2E2SHB 1971 (AV 6): Nay
EHB 2075 (AV 7): Nay

Rep. Kathy Haigh
(D, Shelton), (360) 786-7666
kathy.haigh@leg.wa.gov
SSB 5444 (AV 3): Yea
SB 5627 (AV 4): Yea
ESHB 1846 (AV 5): Yea
2E2SHB 1971 (AV 6): Yea
EHB 2075 (AV 7): Yea

Rep. Drew MacEwen
(R, Union), (360) 786-7902
drew.macewen@leg.wa.gov
SSB 5444 (AV 3): Yea
SB 5627 (AV 4): Yea
ESHB 1846 (AV 5): Yea
2E2SHB 1971 (AV 6): Yea
EHB 2075 (AV 7): Nay

District 36
Sen. Jeanne Kohl-Welles
(D, Seattle), (360) 786-7670
jeanne.kohl-welles@leg.wa.gov
SSB 5444 (AV 3): Yea
SB 5627 (AV 4): Yea
ESHB 1846 (AV 5): Yea
2E2SHB 1971 (AV 6): Yea
EHB 2075 (AV 7): Yea

Rep. Reuben Carlyle
(D, Seattle), (360) 786-7814
reuben.carlyle@leg.wa.gov
SSB 5444 (AV 3): Yea
SB 5627 (AV 4): Yea
ESHB 1846 (AV 5): Yea
2E2SHB 1971 (AV 6): Yea
EHB 2075 (AV 7): Yea

Rep. Gael Tarleton
(D, Everett), (360) 786-7860
gael.tarleton@leg.wa.gov
SSB 5444 (AV 3): Yea
SB 5627 (AV 4): Yea
ESHB 1846 (AV 5): Yea
2E2SHB 1971 (AV 6): Yea
EHB 2075 (AV 7): Yea

District 37
Sen. Adam Kline
(D, Seattle), (360) 786-7688
adam.kline@leg.wa.gov
SSB 5444 (AV 3): Yea
SB 5627 (AV 4): Yea
ESHB 1846 (AV 5): Yea
2E2SHB 1971 (AV 6): Nay
EHB 2075 (AV 7): Yea

Rep. Sharon Tomiko Santos
(D, Seattle), (360) 786-7944
sharon.tomiko.santos@leg.wa.gov
SSB 5444 (AV 3): Yea
SB 5627 (AV 4): Yea
ESHB 1846 (AV 5): Yea
2E2SHB 1971 (AV 6): Nay
EHB 2075 (AV 7): Nay

Rep. Eric Pettigrew
(D, Seattle), (360) 786-7838
eric.pettigrew@leg.wa.gov
SSB 5444 (AV 3): Yea
SB 5627 (AV 4): Nay
ESHB 1846 (AV 5): Nay
2E2SHB 1971 (AV 6): Nay
EHB 2075 (AV 7): Nay

District 38
Sen. Nick Harper
(D, Everett), (360) 786-7674
nick.harper@leg.wa.gov
SSB 5444 (AV 3): Yea
SB 5627 (AV 4): Yea
ESHB 1846 (AV 5): Yea
2E2SHB 1971 (AV 6): Yea
EHB 2075 (AV 7): Yea

Rep. John McCoy
(D, Tulalip), (360) 786-7864
john McCoy@leg.wa.gov
SSB 5444 (AV 3): Yea
SB 5627 (AV 4): Yea
ESHB 1846 (AV 5): Excused
2E2SHB 1971 (AV 6): Nay
EHB 2075 (AV 7): Nay

Rep. Mike Sells
(D, Everett), (360) 786-7840
mike.sells@leg.wa.gov
SSB 5444 (AV 3): Yea
SB 5627 (AV 4): Yea
ESHB 1846 (AV 5): Yea
2E2SHB 1971 (AV 6): Yea
EHB 2075 (AV 7): Yea

District 39
Sen. Kirk Pearson
(R, Monroe), (360) 786-7676
kirk.pearson@leg.wa.gov
SSB 5444 (AV 3): Yea
SB 5627 (AV 4): Yea
ESHB 1846 (AV 5): Yea
2E2SHB 1971 (AV 6): Nay
EHB 2075 (AV 7): Nay

Rep. Dan Kristiansen
(R, Snohomish), (360) 786-7967
dan.kristiansen@leg.wa.gov
SSB 5444 (AV 3): Yea
SB 5627 (AV 4): Nay
ESHB 1846 (AV 5): Nay
2E2SHB 1971 (AV 6): Nay
EHB 2075 (AV 7): Nay

Rep. Elizabeth Scott
(R, Monroe), (360) 786-7816
elizabeth.scott@leg.wa.gov
SSB 5444 (AV 3): Nay
SB 5627 (AV 4): Nay
ESHB 1846 (AV 5): Nay
2E2SHB 1971 (AV 6): Nay
EHB 2075 (AV 7): Nay

Rep. Kevin Ranker
(D, Orca Island), (360) 786-7800
kevin.ranker@leg.wa.gov
SSB 5444 (AV 3): Yea
SB 5627 (AV 4): Yea
ESHB 1846 (AV 5): Yea
2E2SHB 1971 (AV 6): Yea
EHB 2075 (AV 7): Yea

Rep. Kristine Lytton
(D, Anacortes), (360) 786-7800
kristine.lytton@leg.wa.gov
SSB 5444 (AV 3): Yea
SB 5627 (AV 4): Yea
ESHB 1846 (AV 5): Yea
2E2SHB 1971 (AV 6): Yea
EHB 2075 (AV 7): Yea

Rep. Jeff Morris
(D, Mount Vernon), (360) 786-7970
jeff.morris@leg.wa.gov
SSB 5444 (AV 3): Yea
SB 5627 (AV 4): Yea
ESHB 1846 (AV 5): Yea
2E2SHB 1971 (AV 6): Yea
EHB 2075 (AV 7): Yea
Initiative 960, approved by voters in 2007, requires a list of every Legislator, their party preference, hometown, contact information, and how they voted on each bill resulting in an Advisory Vote.
District 49

**Sen. Annette Cleveland**  
(D, Vancouver), (360) 786-7696  
annette.cleveland@leg.wa.gov  
SSB 5444 (AV 3): Yea  
SB 5627 (AV 4): Yea  
ESHB 1846 (AV 5): Yea  
2E2SHB 1971 (AV 6): Yea  
EHB 2075 (AV 7): Yea

**Rep. Sharon Wyline**  
(D, Vancouver), (360) 786-7924  
sharon.wylie@leg.wa.gov  
SSB 5444 (AV 3): Yea  
SB 5627 (AV 4): Yea  
ESHB 1846 (AV 5): Yea  
2E2SHB 1971 (AV 6): Yea  
EHB 2075 (AV 7): Yea

**Rep. Jim Moeller**  
(D, Vancouver), (360) 786-7872  
jim.moeller@leg.wa.gov  
SSB 5444 (AV 3): Yea  
SB 5627 (AV 4): Yea  
ESHB 1846 (AV 5): Yea  
2E2SHB 1971 (AV 6): Yea  
EHB 2075 (AV 7): Yea

---

**Political parties**

**Washington State Democrats**  
PO Box 4027  
Seattle, WA 98194  
(206) 583-0664  
info@wa-democrats.org  
www.wa-democrats.org

**Washington State Republican Party**  
11811 NE 1st St, Ste A306  
Bellevue, WA 98005  
(425) 460-0570  
wagop@wsrp.org  
www.wsrp.org

---

**Election results mobile app**

Free! Available for iPhone and Android.

Search for "WA State Election Results" in the app store on iTunes or Google Play.

Results are announced after 8 p.m. on Election Day and are updated frequently.

*Results are not final or official until certified.*
State judicial offices in Washington are nonpartisan, meaning they do not identify a political party preference. Judicial candidates must be registered voters of the state and in good standing to practice law in Washington. Judicial candidates are prohibited from making misleading or untruthful comments, or statements that appear to commit them on legal issues likely to come before them in court.

All elected state officials must be registered voters in the state of Washington. Some offices may have additional requirements. State officials are typically elected in even years. The offices open for election this year are due to vacancies.

Court of Appeals Judge
Courts of Appeals Judges serve six-year terms. A total of 22 judges serve three divisions headquartered in Seattle, Tacoma and Spokane. Each division is further split into three districts. Courts of Appeals Judges hear most appeals that come up from the superior courts.

Candidate statements are printed exactly as submitted. The Office of the Secretary of State does not make corrections of any kind or verify statements for truth or fact.
John Gary Metro
(Nonpartisan)


Other Professional Experience: Former research assistant to Professor Joseph Bankman Stanford University Law School

Education: Graduate of Reed College, Portland, Oregon. Law degree from the University of Oregon School of Law.

Community Service: Past member of the Board of Directors of the Walla Walla County Red Cross.

Statement: I am a running for judge because I believe in judicial restraint. If I am elected, I will interpret the laws enacted by the legislature in a manner which is consistent with the laws’ plain meaning. I will not make new law. I will work to preserve and protect the Constitution of the United States and the Constitution of the State of Washington. I will work to preserve the delicate balance inherent in our federalist system of government.

I am married and have one child. My wife works for the Walla Walla Catholic Schools and my son attends the University of Washington. Over the years I have represented people from all walks of life. I try to treat all people whether rich or poor, young or old, sick or healthy, in a manner which shows respect for the dignity of the human soul.

Contact: (509) 529-2351; metrojgary@yahoo.com

George Fearing
(Nonpartisan)


Other Professional Experience: George taught continuing legal education seminars; served as pro-bono counsel to ARC of Tri-Cities, numerous religious organizations.

Education: Juris Doctor, University of Washington Law School; Bachelors/Business Administration, *Magna cum laude*, Walla Walla College

Community Service: President of the Walla Walla University Alumni Association; Rotarian; Sabbath School teacher and church board member; Tri-City Academy Board

Statement: The son of a minister and a nurse, George Fearing’s parents instilled in him an ethic of hard work and service to others. George Fearing understands that a judge does not create law, but listens intently and patiently to each side in a case and carefully applies the established law to the case.

George has earned a superior reputation for his extraordinary character, integrity, and knowledge of the law. George has argued before the Court of Appeals and State Supreme Court. George represented the counties of Benton, Franklin, Columbia, Klickitat, and Grant; and the cities of Pasco, Richland, Pullman, Clarkston, Kennewick, Walla Walla, Mesa, Moses Lake, Othello, Prosser, and others throughout Eastern and Central Washington. He has repeatedly and successfully defended law enforcement officers wrongfully sued for protecting the community. He has represented individuals harmed in accidents and employees wrongfully terminated. George excels in research and writing, skills essential for an appeals judge.

George enjoys music, traveling, and climbing Badger Mountain with his son.

“It’s an honor to be appointed the Court of Appeals, and I pray that I will do an excellent job for the citizens of Washington. I respectfully ask for your vote.” - George Fearing

For more information: (509) 378-5415; georgefearing@outlook.com
Keep your voting address confidential

The Address Confidentiality Program can register participants to vote without creating a public record.

To enroll, you must:

• be a victim of domestic violence, sexual assault, trafficking or stalking, or be employed in criminal justice and a target of felony harassment on the job
• have recently moved to a new location that is unknown to the offender and undocumented in public records
• meet with a victim advocate who can assist with threat assessment, safety planning, and the program application

Call (800) 822-1065 or visit www.sos.wa.gov/acp.
Complete Text
Initiative Measure 517

AN ACT Relating to establishing protections for citizens exercising their First Amendment rights by participating in the initiative and referendum process; amending RCW 9A.84.030 and 29A.72.030; adding new sections to chapter 29A.72 RCW; creating new sections; and prescribing penalties.

BE IT ENACTED BY THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON:

POLICIES AND PURPOSES

NEW SECTION. Sec. 1. The people want to ensure their right to participate in the initiative and referendum process is protected. Citizens’ participation in the legislative process by initiative and referendum has been subjected to hostility, interference and threats of interference and retaliation by private and governmental actions. As promised by the Washington state Constitution: “The first power reserved by the people is the initiative.”

Article I, section 4 of the Washington state Constitution and the First Amendment to the United States Constitution recognizes the right of the people to petition the government. This act is intended to protect the rights provided by these constitutional provisions. This measure would establish protections for citizens exercising their First Amendment rights by participating in the initiative and referendum process. The people find that citizens’ right to participate in the initiative and referendum process needs to be protected.

ESTABLISHING PROTECTIONS FOR CITIZENS EXERCISING THEIR FIRST AMENDMENT RIGHTS BY PARTICIPATING IN THE INITIATIVE AND REFERENDUM PROCESS

NEW SECTION. Sec. 2. A new section is added to chapter 29A.72 RCW to read as follows:

This section establishes protections for signature gathering for any state or local initiative or referendum. Interfering with signature gathering shall be illegal. Any person who is gathering signatures for an officially filed and processed initiative or referendum shall not have his or her right to petition deterred or infringed upon. Any person who is trying to sign a petition for an officially filed and processed initiative or referendum shall not have his or her right to sign a petition deterred or infringed upon. Any person who interferes with any person gathering signatures or interferes with any person trying to sign a petition or retaliates against or stalks any person who signed a petition or retaliates against or stalks any person who gathered signatures for a petition shall be subject to the anti-harassment procedures in chapter 10.14 RCW and civil penalties and shall be guilty of disorderly conduct under RCW 9A.84.030. For purposes of this section, “interfering with” includes, but is not limited to, pushing, shoving, touching, spitting, throwing objects, yelling, screaming, or being verbally abusive, or other tumultuous conduct, blocking or intimidating, or maintaining an intimidating presence within twenty-five feet of any person gathering signatures and any person trying to sign a petition. As the courts have consistently ruled, the signing of a petition and the collection of voter signatures is core political speech, which is deserving of the highest levels of protection. Signature gathering and petition signing for an officially filed and processed initiative or referendum shall be a legally protected activity on public sidewalks and walkways and all sidewalks and walkways that carry pedestrian traffic, including those in front of the entrances and exits of any store, and inside or outside public buildings such as public sports stadiums, convention/exhibition centers, and public fairs. Law enforcement must vigorously protect the rights of the people who want to sign initiative and referendum petitions, and the people who collect voter signatures on initiative and referendum petitions, to ensure they are not inhibited or restricted in any way.

The people find that they must be able to safely, freely, and peacefully petition their government for change without fear of interference and retaliation. As promised by the Washington state Constitution: “The right of the people to petition the government has been subjected to hostility, interference and threats of interference and retaliation. Without the right to petition, there is no functioning initiative and referendum process. Maximum legal protections must be afforded persons gathering signatures and persons trying to sign petitions to protect them from interference, harassment, threat, or retaliation. Maximum penalties must be imposed against persons who interfere with the constitutionally protected right to initiative and referendum.

Sec. 3. RCW 9A.84.030 and 2007 c 2 s 1 are each amended to read as follows:

(1) A person is guilty of disorderly conduct if the person:
(a) Uses abusive language and thereby intentionally creates a risk of assault;
(b) Intentionally disrupts any lawful assembly or meeting of persons without lawful authority;
(c) Intentionally obstructs vehicular or pedestrian traffic without lawful authority; (((ee))
(d)(i) Intentionally engages in fighting or in tumultuous conduct or makes unreasonable noise, within five hundred feet of:
(A) The location where a funeral or burial is being performed;
(B) A funeral home during the viewing of a deceased person;
(C) A funeral procession, if the person described in this subsection (d) knows that the funeral procession is taking place; or
(D) A building in which a funeral or memorial service is being conducted; and
(ii) Knows that the activity adversely affects the funeral, burial, viewing, funeral procession, or memorial service; or
(e) Interferes with or retaliates against a person collecting signatures or signing any initiative or referendum petition by pushing, shoving, touching, spitting, throwing objects, yelling, screaming, being verbally abusive, blocking or intimidating, or other tumultuous conduct or maintaining an intimidating presence within twenty-five feet of any person gathering signatures or any person trying to sign any initiative or referendum petition.

(2) Disorderly conduct is a misdemeanor.

GUARANTEING THE PEOPLE’S RIGHT TO VOTE ON INITIATIVES THAT SUBMIT SUFFICIENT VALID VOTER SIGNATURES

NEW SECTION. Sec. 4. A new section is added to chapter 29A.72 RCW to read as follows:

Any state or local initiative for which sufficient valid voter signatures are submitted within the time period required must be submitted to a vote of the people at the next election date. The people are guaranteed the right to vote on any initiative that obtains the required number of valid voter signatures in the required time frame. Government officials, both elected and unelected, must facilitate and cannot obstruct the processing of any initiative
petition and must facilitate and cannot obstruct the public vote of any initiative. For local initiatives, government officials must, in all circumstances, strictly comply with the requirements of this act for any initiative regardless of its subject matter. The term “local legislative authority” must be construed to include the people via local initiative regardless of the subject matter of the ballot measure. Citizens have just as much right to decide issues via local initiative regardless of the subject matter of the ballot measure. The people find that allowing more time for citizens to participate in the signature gathering process will deter such despicable tactics. The people find that:

NEW SECTION. Sec. 7. BE IT ENACTED BY THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON:

AN ACT Relating to disclosure of foods produced through genetic engineering; adding a new chapter to Title 70 RCW; and prescribing penalties.

NEW SECTION. Sec. 1. The people find that:

(1) Polls consistently show that the vast majority of the public, typically more than ninety percent, wants to know if their food was produced using genetic engineering. Without disclosure, consumers of genetically engineered food unknowingly may violate their own dietary and religious restrictions.

(2) Currently, there is no federal or state law that requires food producers to identify whether foods were produced using genetic engineering. At the same time, the United States food and drug administration does not require safety studies of such foods. Unless these foods contain a known allergen, the United States food and drug administration does not require the developers of genetically engineered crops to consult with the agency. Consultations with the United States food and drug administration are entirely voluntary and the developers themselves may decide what information they may wish to provide.

(3) Mandatory identification of foods produced with genetic engineering can provide a critical method for tracking the potential health effects of consuming foods produced through genetic engineering.

(4) Consumers have the right to know whether the foods they purchase were produced with genetic engineering. The genetic engineering of plants and animals is an imprecise process and often causes unintended consequences. Mixing plant, animal, bacterial, and viral genes in combinations that cannot occur in nature produces results that are not always predictable or controllable, and can lead to adverse health or environmental consequences.

(5) United States government scientists have stated that the artificial insertion of genetic material into plants, a technique unique to genetic engineering, can cause a variety of significant problems with plant foods. Such genetic engineering can increase the levels of known toxicants in foods and introduce new toxicants and health concerns.

(6) Forty-nine countries, including Japan, South Korea, China, Australia, New Zealand, Thailand, Russia, the European Union member states, and other key United States trading partners, have laws mandating disclosure of genetically engineered foods on food labels. Many countries have restrictions or bans against foods produced with genetic engineering.

(7) No international agreements prohibit the mandatory identification of foods produced through genetic engineering.

(8) Numerous foreign markets with restrictions against foods produced through genetic engineering have restricted imports of United States crops due to concerns about genetic engineering. Some foreign markets are choosing to purchase agricultural products from countries other than the United States because genetically engineered crops are not identified in the United States, making it impossible for buyers to distinguish what does or does not meet their national labeling laws or restrictions, rendering United States’ products less desirable. Trade losses are estimated at billions of dollars. Mandatory identification of foods produced with genetic engineering can be a critical method for preserving the economic value of exports to markets with restrictions and prohibitions against genetic engineering.

(9) Industry data shows foods identified as produced without genetic engineering, including conventional foods identified this way, typically more than ninety percent, wants to know if their food was produced using genetic engineering.
way, are the fastest growing label claim. Consumers have a right to an informed choice at the point of sale.

(10) Farmers from a wheat growing region of the state have gathered more than two thousand six hundred signatures on a petition demanding mandatory disclosure for crops produced with genetic engineering. The farmers are concerned they will lose their wheat export markets if genetically engineered wheat is approved.

(11) Agriculture is Washington's number one employer and wheat is Washington's number two export crop, second only to goods and services produced by the Boeing company, and ahead of Microsoft, which ranks third.

(12) Preserving the identity, quality, and reliability of Washington's agricultural products is of prime importance to our state's fiscal health.

(13) The cultivation of genetically engineered crops can cause serious impacts to the environment. For example, most genetically engineered crops are designed to withstand weed killing herbicides. As a result, genetically engineered crops have caused hundreds of millions of pounds of additional herbicides to be applied to the nation's farmland. The massive increase in use of these herbicides has caused emergence of herbicide-resistant weeds, which have infested farm fields and roadways, complicating weed control for farmers and encouraging use of increasingly toxic and more dangerous herbicides. These toxic herbicides damage the vitality of the soil, contaminate drinking water supplies, and pose health risks to consumers and farmworkers. The public should have the choice to avoid purchasing foods produced in ways that can lead to such harm.

(14) United States department of agriculture data shows Washington state ranks second in the nation for organic farm-gate sales at two hundred eighty-one million dollars per year. While total United States food sales are virtually stagnant, growing less than one percent overall, the organic food industry grew at 7.7 percent according to 2010 data. Sales of organic fruits and vegetables increased eleven and eight-tenths percent, accounting for approximately twelve percent of all United States' fruit and vegetable sales. Organic dairy, another key industry in Washington state, grew at nine percent and comprises nearly six percent of the total United States dairy market. Organic farmers are prohibited from using genetically engineered seeds or livestock feed.

(15) Trade industry data shows the organic industry is creating jobs at four times the national rate.

(16) Published data shows organic farming is more profitable and economically secure than conventional farming over the long term. This important element of Washington's economy must be protected.

(17) Conventional farmers have a right to choose what crops they grow and many conventional farmers want to grow traditional crops developed without genetic engineering. Identifying seeds and seed stock produced with genetic engineering would protect farmers' rights to know what they are purchasing and protect their right to choose what they grow.

(18) The purpose of this chapter is to ensure people are fully informed about whether the food they purchase and eat was produced through genetic engineering so they may choose for themselves whether to purchase and eat such food. Identifying foods produced through genetic engineering also will help protect our state's export market.

NEW SECTION, Sec. 2. The definitions in this section apply throughout this chapter unless the context clearly requires otherwise.

(1) “Department” means the department of health.

(2) “Enzyme” means a protein that catalyzes chemical reactions of other substances without itself being destroyed or altered upon completion of the reactions.
such a commodity, or in the case of such a commodity that is not separately packaged or labeled, on a label appearing on the retail store shelf or bin where such a commodity is displayed for sale;

(b) In the case of any processed food, on the front of the package of such food produced by a manufacturer, with the words “partially produced with genetic engineering” or “may be partially produced with genetic engineering” stated clearly and conspicuously, and

(c) In the case of any seed or seed stock, on the seed or seed stock container, sales receipt or any other reference to identification, ownership, or possession, with the words “genetically engineered” or “produced with genetic engineering” stated clearly and conspicuously.

(2) Subsections (1) and (3) of this section do not require either the listing or identification of any ingredient or ingredients that were genetically engineered, nor that the term “genetically engineered” be placed immediately preceding any common name or primary product descriptor of a food.

(3) Subsection (1) of this section does not apply to any of the following:

(a) Food consisting entirely of, or derived entirely from, an animal that has not itself been genetically engineered, regardless of whether the animal has been fed or injected with any food produced with genetic engineering or any drug that has been produced through means of genetic engineering;

(b) A raw agricultural commodity or food that has been grown, raised, produced, or derived without the knowing and intentional use of genetically engineered seed or food. To be included within the exclusion under this subsection, the person supplying a raw agricultural commodity or food must provide a sworn statement that the raw agricultural commodity or food: (i) Has not been knowingly or intentionally produced through genetic engineering; and (ii) has been segregated from, and has not been knowingly or intentionally commingled with, foods that may have been genetically engineered at any time. In providing such a sworn statement, a person may rely on a sworn statement from his or her own supplier that contains such an affirmation;

(c) Any processed food that would be subject to this section solely because one or more processing aids or enzymes were produced or derived with genetic engineering;

(d) Any alcoholic beverage that is subject to regulation under Title 66 RCW;

(e) Until July 1, 2019, any processed food that would be subject to this section solely because it includes one or more materials produced by genetic engineering, provided that the engineered materials in the aggregate do not account for more than nine-tenths of one percent of the total weight of the processed food;

(f) Food that an independent organization has determined has not been knowingly and intentionally produced from or commingled with genetically engineered seed or genetically engineered food, provided that such a determination has been made pursuant to a sampling and testing procedure approved for this purpose in rules adopted by the department. These rules may not approve a sampling and testing procedure unless it is consistent with the sampling and testing principles recommended by internationally recognized standards organizations, such as the international standards association and the grain and feed trade association. No testing procedure may be approved by the department unless: (i) It does not rely on testing processed foods in which no deoxyribonucleic acid is detectable; and (ii) it is consistent with the most recent “Guidelines on Performance Criteria and Validation of Methods for Detection, Identification and Quantification of Specific DNA Sequences and Specific Proteins in Foods” (CAC/GL 74, 2010) published by the codex alimentarius commission;

(g) Food that has been lawfully certified to be labeled, marketed, and offered for sale as “organic” pursuant to the federal organic foods production act of 1990 and the regulations promulgated pursuant thereto by the United States department of agriculture;

(h) Food that is not packaged for retail sale and that either: (i) Is a processed food prepared and intended for immediate human consumption; or (ii) is served, sold, or otherwise provided in any restaurant or other food service establishment that is engaged primarily in the sale of food prepared and intended for immediate human consumption; or

(i) Medical food.

NEW SECTION. Sec. 4. The department may adopt rules necessary to implement this chapter, provided that the department is not authorized to create any exemptions beyond those provided in section 3(3) of this act.

NEW SECTION. Sec. 5. (1) The department, acting through the attorney general, may bring an action in a court of competent jurisdiction to enjoin any person violating this chapter.

(2) The department may assess a civil penalty against any person violating this chapter in an amount not to exceed one thousand dollars per day. Each day of violation is considered a separate violation.

(3) An action to enjoin a violation of this chapter may be brought in any court of competent jurisdiction by any person in the public interest if the action is commenced more than sixty days after the person has given notice of the alleged violation to the department, the attorney general, and to the alleged violator.

(4) The court may award to a prevailing plaintiff reasonable costs and attorneys’ fees incurred in investigating and prosecuting an action to enforce this chapter.

NEW SECTION. Sec. 6. Sections 1 through 5 of this act constitute a new chapter in Title 70 RCW.

NEW SECTION. Sec. 7. If any provision of this act or its application to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the remainder of the act or the application of the provision to other persons or circumstances is not affected.
## Contact Your County Elections Department

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Address Details</th>
<th>Phone Numbers</th>
<th>Email Addresses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adams County</td>
<td>210 W Broadway, Ste 200, Ritzville, WA 99169</td>
<td>(509) 659-3249, (509) 683-1411</td>
<td><a href="mailto:heidih@co.adams.wa.us">heidih@co.adams.wa.us</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asotin County</td>
<td>PO Box 129, Asotin, WA 99402</td>
<td>(509) 243-2084</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dmckay@co.asotin.wa.us">dmckay@co.asotin.wa.us</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benton County</td>
<td>PO Box 470, Prosser, WA 99350</td>
<td>(509) 736-3085</td>
<td><a href="mailto:elections@co.benton.wa.us">elections@co.benton.wa.us</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chelan County</td>
<td>PO Box 4760, Wenatchee, WA 98807</td>
<td>(509) 667-6808</td>
<td><a href="mailto:elections@co.chelan.wa.us">elections@co.chelan.wa.us</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clallam County</td>
<td>223 E 4th St, Ste 1, Port Angeles, WA 98362</td>
<td>(360) 417-2221</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jmaxon@co.clallam.wa.us">jmaxon@co.clallam.wa.us</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clark County</td>
<td>PO Box 8815, Vancouver, WA 98666-8815</td>
<td>(360) 397-2345</td>
<td><a href="mailto:elections@clark.wa.gov">elections@clark.wa.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia County</td>
<td>341 E Main St, Ste 3, Dayton, WA 99328</td>
<td>(509) 382-4541</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sharon_richter@co.columbia.wa.us">sharon_richter@co.columbia.wa.us</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cowlitz County</td>
<td>207 4th Ave N, Rm 107, Kelso, WA 98626-4124</td>
<td>(360) 577-3005</td>
<td><a href="mailto:elections@co.cowlitz.wa.us">elections@co.cowlitz.wa.us</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas County</td>
<td>PO Box 456, Waterville, WA 98858</td>
<td>(509) 745-8527</td>
<td><a href="mailto:elections@co.douglas.wa.us">elections@co.douglas.wa.us</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferry County</td>
<td>350 E Delaware Ave, Ste 2, Republic, WA 99166</td>
<td>(509) 775-5200</td>
<td><a href="mailto:elections@co.ferry.wa.us">elections@co.ferry.wa.us</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin County</td>
<td>PO Box 1451, Pasco, WA 99301</td>
<td>(509) 545-3538</td>
<td><a href="mailto:elections@co.franklin.wa.us">elections@co.franklin.wa.us</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garfield County</td>
<td>PO Box 278, Pomeroy, WA 99347-0278</td>
<td>(509) 683-1411</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ddeal@co.garfield.wa.us">ddeal@co.garfield.wa.us</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant County</td>
<td>PO Box 37, Ephrata, WA 98823</td>
<td>(509) 754-2011 ext 377</td>
<td><a href="mailto:elections@co.grant.wa.us">elections@co.grant.wa.us</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grays Harbor County</td>
<td>100 W Broadway, Ste 2, Montesano, WA 99853</td>
<td>(360) 864-1556</td>
<td><a href="mailto:emailballot@co.grays-harbor.wa.us">emailballot@co.grays-harbor.wa.us</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Island County</td>
<td>PO Box 1410, Coupeville, WA 98239</td>
<td>(360) 679-7366</td>
<td><a href="mailto:elections@co.island.wa.us">elections@co.island.wa.us</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson County</td>
<td>PO Box 563, Port Townsend, WA 98368-0563</td>
<td>(360) 385-9119</td>
<td><a href="mailto:elections@co.jefferson.wa.us">elections@co.jefferson.wa.us</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King County</td>
<td>919 SW Grady Way, Renton, WA 98057</td>
<td>(206) 296-8683</td>
<td><a href="mailto:elections@kingcounty.gov">elections@kingcounty.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitsap County</td>
<td>614 Division St, MS 31, Port Orchard, WA 98366</td>
<td>(360) 337-7128</td>
<td><a href="mailto:auditor@co.kitsap.wa.us">auditor@co.kitsap.wa.us</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kittitas County</td>
<td>205 W 5th Ave, Ste 105, Ellensburg, WA 98926-2891</td>
<td>(509) 962-7503</td>
<td><a href="mailto:elections@co.kittitas.wa.us">elections@co.kittitas.wa.us</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Klickitat County</td>
<td>205 S Columbus, Stop 2, Goldendale, WA 98601</td>
<td>(509) 773-4001</td>
<td><a href="mailto:voting@co.klickitat.wa.us">voting@co.klickitat.wa.us</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewis County</td>
<td>PO Box 29, Chehalis, WA 98532-0029</td>
<td>(360) 740-1278</td>
<td><a href="mailto:heather.boyer@lewiscountywa.gov">heather.boyer@lewiscountywa.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln County</td>
<td>PO Box 28, Davenport, WA 99122-0028</td>
<td>(509) 725-4971</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sjohnston@co.lincoln.wa.us">sjohnston@co.lincoln.wa.us</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mason County</td>
<td>PO Box 400, Shelton, WA 98584</td>
<td>(360) 427-9670 ext 470</td>
<td><a href="mailto:elections@co.mason.wa.us">elections@co.mason.wa.us</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Okanogan County</td>
<td>PO Box 1010, Okanogan, WA 98840-1010</td>
<td>(509) 422-7240</td>
<td><a href="mailto:elections@co.okanogan.wa.us">elections@co.okanogan.wa.us</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific County</td>
<td>PO Box 97, South Bend, WA 98586-0097</td>
<td>(360) 875-9317</td>
<td><a href="mailto:pgardner@co.pacific.wa.us">pgardner@co.pacific.wa.us</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pend Oreille County</td>
<td>PO Box 5015, Newport, WA 99156</td>
<td>(509) 447-6472</td>
<td><a href="mailto:elections@pendoreille.org">elections@pendoreille.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pierce County</td>
<td>2501 S 35th St, Ste C, Tacoma, WA 98409</td>
<td>(253) 798-VOTE (8683)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:pcelections@co.pierce.wa.us">pcelections@co.pierce.wa.us</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Juan County</td>
<td>PO Box 638, Friday Harbor, WA 98250-0638</td>
<td>(360) 378-3357</td>
<td><a href="mailto:elections@sanjuanco.com">elections@sanjuanco.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skagit County</td>
<td>PO Box 1306, Mount Vernon, WA 98273-1306</td>
<td>(360) 336-9305</td>
<td><a href="mailto:scelections@co.skagit.wa.us">scelections@co.skagit.wa.us</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skamania County</td>
<td>PO Box 790, Stevenson, WA 98648-0790</td>
<td>(509) 427-3730</td>
<td><a href="mailto:elections@co.skamania.wa.us">elections@co.skamania.wa.us</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snohomish County</td>
<td>PO Box 398, Bellingham, WA 98227-0398</td>
<td>(360) 676-6742</td>
<td><a href="mailto:elections@co.snohomish.org">elections@co.snohomish.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spokane County</td>
<td>1033 W Gardner Ave, Spokane, WA 99260</td>
<td>(509) 477-2320</td>
<td><a href="mailto:elections@spokanecounty.org">elections@spokanecounty.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stevens County</td>
<td>215 S Oak St, Rm 106, Colville, WA 99114-2836</td>
<td>(509) 684-7514</td>
<td><a href="mailto:elections@co.stevens.wa.us">elections@co.stevens.wa.us</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thurston County</td>
<td>2000 Lakeridge Dr SW, Olympia, WA 98502-6090</td>
<td>(360) 786-5408</td>
<td><a href="mailto:elections@co.thurston.wa.us">elections@co.thurston.wa.us</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wahkiakum County</td>
<td>PO Box 543, Cathlamet, WA 98612</td>
<td>(360) 795-3219</td>
<td><a href="mailto:elections@co.wahkiakum.wa.us">elections@co.wahkiakum.wa.us</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walla Walla County</td>
<td>PO Box 2176, Walla Walla, WA 99362-0356</td>
<td>(509) 524-2530</td>
<td><a href="mailto:elections@co.walla-walla.us">elections@co.walla-walla.us</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whatcom County</td>
<td>PO Box 398, Bellingham, WA 98227-0398</td>
<td>(360) 676-6742</td>
<td><a href="mailto:elections@co.whatcom.wa.us">elections@co.whatcom.wa.us</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitman County</td>
<td>PO Box 191, Colfax, WA 99111</td>
<td>(509) 397-5284</td>
<td><a href="mailto:elections@co.whitman.wa.us">elections@co.whitman.wa.us</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yakima County</td>
<td>PO Box 12570, Yakima, WA 98909-2570</td>
<td>(509) 574-1340</td>
<td><a href="mailto:iVote@co.yakima.wa.us">iVote@co.yakima.wa.us</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Your county can help you...

- get a replacement ballot
- use an accessible voting unit
- register to vote
- update your address
"I am a change maker" by Amy Shell
2013 Kids’ Art Contest winner (Bennett Elementary, Bellevue)