

**OFFICIAL BALLOT - KING COUNTY, WASHINGTON  
GENERAL AND SPECIAL ELECTION, NOVEMBER 7, 2006**

**INSTRUCTIONS TO VOTERS:** Use a dark pen to fill in the oval next to your choice. VOTE LIKE THIS:  Fill in the oval completely. If you vote in error at the polls, return the ballot to a poll worker and get another one.  
**INSTRUCTIONS FOR A WRITE-IN VOTE:** Print the name of the WRITE-IN on the blank line below the printed names for that position. If the office is partisan, print the abbreviation of that candidate's political party after the name. Completely darken the oval to the left of the WRITE-IN. (Do not write in a candidate whose name appears on the ballot for that office.)  
**INSTRUCTIONS TO ABSENTEE VOTERS ONLY:** If you make an error in voting, draw an "X" through the error and fill in the correct oval. Do not sign, initial or make any additional marks on the ballot.

| STATE OF WASHINGTON   | KING COUNTY   | STATE SUPREME COURT  |
|---|---|--|
| <b>PROPOSED BY INITIATIVE PETITION</b>  | <b>PROPOSITION NO. 2<br/>PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM<br/>SALES AND USE TAX</b>   | <b>Justice Position No. 2</b><br>Vote for One  |
| <b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 920</b><br><br>Initiative Measure No. 920 concerns estate tax. 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. Should this measure be enacted into law?<br><input type="radio"/> YES<br><input type="radio"/> NO  | The Metropolitan King County Council has passed Ordinance No. 15582 concerning this public transportation system sales and use tax proposition. This proposition would authorize King County to fix and impose an additional sales and use tax of one-tenth of one percent in order to fund expansion of service, operations, maintenance, and capital needs of King County Metro public transportation, including, but not limited to, expanded bus service, accessible services, vanpool programs, passenger facilities, park and ride facilities, and other congestion relief projects to preserve and enhance Metro Transit services as provided in Ordinance No. 15582. Should this proposition be enacted into law:<br><input type="radio"/> APPROVED<br><input type="radio"/> REJECTED | <input type="radio"/> Susan Owens NP<br><input type="radio"/> Stephen Johnson NP<br><input type="radio"/> _____<br>Write-in  |
| <b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 933</b><br><br>Initiative Measure No. 933 concerns government regulation of private property. 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. Should this measure be enacted into law?<br><input type="radio"/> YES<br><input type="radio"/> NO  |   | <b>Justice Position No. 8</b><br>Vote for One<br><input type="radio"/> Gerry L. Alexander NP<br><input type="radio"/> _____<br>Write-in  |
| <b>INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 937</b><br><br>Initiative Measure No. 937 concerns energy resource use by certain electric utilities. 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. Should this measure be enacted into law?<br><input type="radio"/> YES<br><input type="radio"/> NO  |   | <b>Justice Position No. 9</b><br>Vote for One<br><input type="radio"/> Tom Chambers NP<br><input type="radio"/> _____<br>Write-in  |
| <b>PROPOSED TO THE PEOPLE BY THE LEGISLATURE<br/>AMENDMENT TO THE STATE<br/>CONSTITUTION</b>  | <b>FEDERAL</b>  | <b>COURT OF APPEALS<br/>DIV. NO. 1, DIST. NO. 1</b>  |
| <b>HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 4223</b><br><br>The legislature has proposed a constitutional amendment on increasing an exemption from the personal property tax. This amendment would authorize the legislature to increase the personal property tax exemption for taxable personal property owned by each "head of a family" from three thousand (\$3,000) to fifteen thousand (\$15,000) dollars. Should this constitutional amendment be:<br><input type="radio"/> APPROVED<br><input type="radio"/> REJECTED   | <b>United States Senator</b><br>Vote for One<br><br><input type="radio"/> Maria Cantwell D<br><input type="radio"/> Mike McGavick R<br><input type="radio"/> Bruce Guthrie L<br><input type="radio"/> Robin Adair I<br><input type="radio"/> Aaron Dixon G<br><input type="radio"/> _____<br>Write-in   | <b>Judge Position No. 4</b><br>Vote for One<br><input type="radio"/> Ronald E. Cox NP<br><input type="radio"/> _____<br>Write-in   |
|   | <b>United States Representative<br/>Congressional District No. 7</b><br>Vote for One<br><br><input type="radio"/> Jim McDermott D<br><input type="radio"/> Steve Beren R<br><input type="radio"/> Linnea S. Noreen I<br><input type="radio"/> _____<br>Write-in   | <b>Judge Position No. 7</b><br>Vote for One<br><input type="radio"/> Marlin J. Appelwick NP<br><input type="radio"/> _____<br>Write-in   |
|   | <b>STATE OF WASHINGTON</b>  | <b>DISTRICT COURT<br/>WEST ELECTORAL DISTRICT</b>  |
|   | <b>LEG. DIST. NO. 43</b>  | <b>Judge Position No. 1</b><br>Vote for One<br><input type="radio"/> Barbara Linde NP<br><input type="radio"/> _____<br>Write-in   |
|   | <b>Senator</b><br>Vote for One<br><br><input type="radio"/> Ed Murray D<br><input type="radio"/> Loren Nelson R<br><input type="radio"/> _____<br>Write-in  | <b>Judge Position No. 2</b><br>Vote for One<br><input type="radio"/> Mark C. Chow NP<br><input type="radio"/> _____<br>Write-in  |
| <b>KING COUNTY</b>  | <b>Representative Position No. 1</b><br>Vote for One<br><br><input type="radio"/> Jamie Pedersen D<br><input type="radio"/> Hugh Foskett R<br><input type="radio"/> Linde Knighton P<br><input type="radio"/> _____<br>Write-in   | <b>Judge Position No. 3</b><br>Vote for One<br><input type="radio"/> Art Chapman NP<br><input type="radio"/> _____<br>Write-in   |
| <b>PROPOSITION NO. 1<br/>AUTHORIZATION TO SELL OR EXCHANGE<br/>CERTAIN REAL PROPERTY</b><br><br>Shall King County be authorized to sell or exchange, in the manner provided by law, and as provided in King County Ordinance No. 15570, certain real property identified and described in King County Ordinance No. 15570 and acquired with proceeds of the county's 1910 Harbor Bond Issue, provided that any proceeds from such sales or exchanges shall be used solely for county capital purposes?<br><input type="radio"/> YES<br><input type="radio"/> NO | <b>Representative Position No. 2</b><br>Vote for One<br><br><input type="radio"/> Frank Chopp D<br><input type="radio"/> Will "Chopper" Sohn R<br><input type="radio"/> _____<br>Write-in   | <b>Judge Position No. 4</b><br>Vote for One<br><input type="radio"/> Eileen A. Kato NP<br><input type="radio"/> _____<br>Write-in  |
|   | <b>KING COUNTY</b>  | <b>Judge Position No. 5</b><br>Vote for One<br><input type="radio"/> Mariane C. Spearman NP<br><input type="radio"/> _____<br>Write-in   |
|   | <b>Prosecuting Attorney</b><br>Vote for One<br><br><input type="radio"/> Norm Maleng R<br><input type="radio"/> _____<br>Write-in   | <b>CITY OF SEATTLE</b>   |
|   |   | <b>Council Position No. 9</b><br>Unexpired 1 Year Term<br>Vote for One<br><input type="radio"/> Stan Lippmann NP<br><input type="radio"/> Sally J. Clark NP<br><input type="radio"/> _____<br>Write-in |
|   |   | <b>SEATTLE MUNICIPAL COURT</b>   |
|   |   | <b>Judge Position No. 1</b><br>Vote for One<br><input type="radio"/> Edsonya Charles NP<br><input type="radio"/> _____<br>Write-in   |

Continued on reverse side

| SEATTLE MUNICIPAL COURT   | CITY OF SEATTLE   | CITY OF SEATTLE   |  |
|---|---|---|--|
| <p align="center"><b>Judge Position No. 2</b><br/>Vote for One</p> <p><input type="radio"/> C. Kimi Kondo <span style="float:right">NP</span></p> <p><input type="radio"/> _____<br/>Write-in</p>   | <p align="center"><b>PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT NO. 7</b><br/><b>CITY COUNCIL QUORUM</b></p> <p>The city council has proposed an amendment to Article IV Section 3 of the city charter concerning how a quorum of the city council is determined. This amendment would change the charter to state that a council quorum is a majority of all nine councilmembers, with two exceptions: (1) To choose a person to fill a council vacancy, a quorum would be a majority of councilmembers holding office when the council chooses the new member; and (2) during declared emergencies, a quorum for all purposes would be a majority of councilmembers available to participate in council meetings and capable of performing their official duties. Should this charter amendment be:</p> <p><input type="radio"/> APPROVED</p> <p><input type="radio"/> REJECTED</p>   | <p align="center"><b>PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT NO. 13</b><br/><b>ADVANCE NOTICE REQUIREMENTS FOR</b><br/><b>BALLOT MEASURES</b></p> <p>The city council has proposed an amendment to Article XVIII Section 3 of the city charter concerning advance notice requirements for certain ballot measures. This amendment would change Article XVIII Section 3 to eliminate the provision that the city clerk must have advance notice of these ballot measures posted, and published in full in the City's official newspaper for 30 days before the date of the election. Instead, the clerk would have to have notice published in full in the City's official newspaper in accordance with state law. Should this charter amendment be:</p> <p><input type="radio"/> APPROVED</p> <p><input type="radio"/> REJECTED</p>  |  |
| <p align="center"><b>Judge Position No. 3</b><br/>Vote for One</p> <p><input type="radio"/> Ron A. Mamiya <span style="float:right">NP</span></p> <p><input type="radio"/> _____<br/>Write-in</p>   |   | <p align="center"><b>PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT NO. 8</b><br/><b>REAPPOINTMENT AND RECONFIRMATION OF</b><br/><b>DEPARTMENT HEADS</b></p> <p>The city council has proposed amendments to Article VIII Section 1, Article XI Section 1, and Article XVI Section 1 of the city charter, and addition of a new section to Article XXII of the city charter, concerning a requirement for council reconfirmation of certain City department heads. These amendments would require that the heads of the Finance Department, Parks Department and Personnel Department be subject to reappointment by the mayor and reconfirmation by the city council every four years. The heads of these three departments in office when these charter amendments take effect would first be subject to council reconfirmation on February 1, 2011. Should these charter amendments be:</p> <p><input type="radio"/> APPROVED</p> <p><input type="radio"/> REJECTED</p> | <p align="center"><b>PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT NO. 14</b><br/><b>CLERK'S COMPILATION OF ORDINANCES</b></p> <p>The city council has proposed an amendment to Article IV Subsection 13B of the city charter concerning the city clerk's duty to compile ordinances. This amendment would eliminate the current requirement that the city clerk each January compile certain ordinances enacted during the previous year and have multiple copies of those ordinances printed, indexed and bound in books with "substantial covers" for use by elected officials, department heads and the general public. Under the amendment, the clerk instead would be required to maintain a compilation of all ordinances enacted each year, to be available to the public at no cost. Should this charter amendment be:</p> <p><input type="radio"/> APPROVED</p> <p><input type="radio"/> REJECTED</p> |
| <p align="center"><b>Judge Position No. 4</b><br/>Vote for One</p> <p><input type="radio"/> Judith Montgomery Hightower <span style="float:right">NP</span></p> <p><input type="radio"/> _____<br/>Write-in</p>   |   |   | <p align="center"><b>PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT NO. 9</b><br/><b>AUDITOR APPOINTMENT AND TERM</b></p> <p>The city council has proposed an amendment to Article VIII Section 2 of the city charter concerning the city auditor's appointment and length of term in office. This amendment would change the charter to provide that: (1) the auditor would be appointed by a majority of the city council, rather than by the chair of the council finance committee subject to confirmation by a majority of the council, and (2) the auditor would serve a term of four years in office, rather than six years in office. Should this charter amendment be:</p> <p><input type="radio"/> APPROVED</p> <p><input type="radio"/> REJECTED</p>  |
| <p align="center"><b>Judge Position No. 5</b><br/>Vote for One</p> <p><input type="radio"/> George W. Holifield <span style="float:right">NP</span></p> <p><input type="radio"/> _____<br/>Write-in</p>   | <p align="center"><b>PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT NO. 10</b><br/><b>APPOINTMENT AND REMOVAL OF PLANNING</b><br/><b>COMMISSION MEMBERS</b></p> <p>The city council has proposed an amendment to Article XIV Sections 1 and 2 of the city charter concerning the appointment and removal of the City's planning commission members. This amendment would: (1) delete existing language giving the mayor the authority to appoint and remove planning commission members, subject to city council confirmation; and (2) provide instead that planning commission members are appointed in a manner determined by ordinance. Should this charter amendment be:</p> <p><input type="radio"/> APPROVED</p> <p><input type="radio"/> REJECTED</p>  | <p align="center"><b>PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT NO. 16</b><br/><b>OBSOLETE CHARTER REFERENCES</b></p> <p>The city council has proposed amendments to Article XIV Section 2 and Article XIX Section 4 of the charter concerning obsolete references to another charter section that no longer exists. These amendments would delete references in these sections to former Article XIX Section 10, which was repealed by the voters in 1973. Should these charter amendments be:</p> <p><input type="radio"/> APPROVED</p> <p><input type="radio"/> REJECTED</p>   |  |
| <p align="center"><b>Judge Position No. 6</b><br/>Vote for One</p> <p><input type="radio"/> Michael Salvador Hurtado <span style="float:right">NP</span></p> <p><input type="radio"/> _____<br/>Write-in</p>  | <p align="center"><b>PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT NO. 11</b><br/><b>WHEN INITIATIVES AND CHARTER</b><br/><b>AMENDMENTS TAKE EFFECT</b></p> <p>The city council has proposed amendments to Article IV Section 1F and Article XX Sections 1 and 2 of the city charter concerning when initiatives and charter amendments take effect following voter approval. These amendments would change the deadline for the mayor to issue and publish a proclamation putting an initiative or charter amendment into effect following its approval by the voters. The charter currently requires the mayor to issue and publish the proclamation within five days after the election. Under the amendments, the mayor would be required to issue and publish the proclamation within five days after the election results have been certified. Should these charter amendments be:</p> <p><input type="radio"/> APPROVED</p> <p><input type="radio"/> REJECTED</p> | <p align="center"><b>PROPOSITION NO. 1</b><br/><b>TRANSPORTATION LEVY</b></p> <p>The City of Seattle's Proposition 1 concerns allowing increased property taxes for nine years for transportation improvements. If approved, this proposition would fund facilities and services, including: street and bridge maintenance; enhanced transit services; bicycle, pedestrian and safety programs; and a neighborhood street fund, under Ordinance 122232. It would authorize regular property taxes higher than RCW 84.55 limits, allowing collection of up to \$36,650,000 in additional taxes in 2007 and up to \$365,000,000 over nine years. The 2007 total regular tax limit would be \$3.69/\$1,000 assessed value, including approximately \$0.36 additional taxes. Should this levy lid lift be approved?</p> <p><input type="radio"/> LEVY, YES</p> <p><input type="radio"/> LEVY, NO</p>  |  |
| <p align="center"><b>Judge Position No. 7</b><br/>Vote for One</p> <p><input type="radio"/> Fred Bonner <span style="float:right">NP</span></p> <p><input type="radio"/> _____<br/>Write-in</p>   | <p align="center"><b>PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT NO. 12</b><br/><b>COUNCIL VOTING - CHARTER AMENDMENT</b><br/><b>PROPOSALS</b></p> <p>The city council has proposed an amendment to Article XX Section 1 of the city charter concerning which city council members may vote to propose charter amendments. This charter amendment would eliminate the provision that only "elected" council members may vote on whether to propose amendments to the city charter. This would allow a council member who had been selected to fill a vacant council position until the next election to vote on whether to propose charter amendments to the voters. Should this charter amendment be:</p> <p><input type="radio"/> APPROVED</p> <p><input type="radio"/> REJECTED</p>   | <p align="center"><b>PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT NO. 16</b><br/><b>OBSOLETE CHARTER REFERENCES</b></p> <p>The city council has proposed amendments to Article XIV Section 2 and Article XIX Section 4 of the charter concerning obsolete references to another charter section that no longer exists. These amendments would delete references in these sections to former Article XIX Section 10, which was repealed by the voters in 1973. Should these charter amendments be:</p> <p><input type="radio"/> APPROVED</p> <p><input type="radio"/> REJECTED</p>   |  |
| <p align="center"><b>Judge Position No. 10</b><br/>Vote for One</p> <p><input type="radio"/> Jean Rietschel <span style="float:right">NP</span></p> <p><input type="radio"/> _____<br/>Write-in</p>   | <p align="center"><b>PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT NO. 6</b><br/><b>CITY COUNCIL MEETING LOCATIONS</b></p> <p>The city council has proposed an amendment to Article IV Section 6 of the city charter concerning council meeting locations in case of an emergency or disaster. This amendment would change the charter to allow the city council to meet at locations other than its regular meeting place when permitted by state law in the event of an emergency or disaster. Should this charter amendment be:</p> <p><input type="radio"/> APPROVED</p> <p><input type="radio"/> REJECTED</p>   | <p align="center"><b>PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT NO. 16</b><br/><b>OBSOLETE CHARTER REFERENCES</b></p> <p>The city council has proposed amendments to Article XIV Section 2 and Article XIX Section 4 of the charter concerning obsolete references to another charter section that no longer exists. These amendments would delete references in these sections to former Article XIX Section 10, which was repealed by the voters in 1973. Should these charter amendments be:</p> <p><input type="radio"/> APPROVED</p> <p><input type="radio"/> REJECTED</p>   |  |
| <p align="center"><b>CITY OF SEATTLE</b></p>  | <p align="center"><b>INITIATIVE 91</b><br/><b>FOR-PROFIT PROFESSIONAL SPORTS</b><br/><b>ORGANIZATIONS</b></p> <p>Seattle Initiative Measure Number 91 concerns property, goods, and services Seattle provides to for-profit professional sports. If enacted the measure would require that for-profit professional sports organizations pay the City at least "fair value" for goods, services, real property, or facilities the City provides or leases to them, either directly or through another public entity or a non-profit organization. The measure defines "fair value," based in part on the rate of return for 30-year U.S. Treasury Bonds. Any Seattle resident would have standing to file a lawsuit challenging City acts that allegedly violated the measure. Should this measure be enacted into law?</p> <p><input type="radio"/> YES</p> <p><input type="radio"/> NO</p>   | <p align="center"><b>PROPOSITION NO. 1</b><br/><b>TRANSPORTATION LEVY</b></p> <p>The City of Seattle's Proposition 1 concerns allowing increased property taxes for nine years for transportation improvements. If approved, this proposition would fund facilities and services, including: street and bridge maintenance; enhanced transit services; bicycle, pedestrian and safety programs; and a neighborhood street fund, under Ordinance 122232. It would authorize regular property taxes higher than RCW 84.55 limits, allowing collection of up to \$36,650,000 in additional taxes in 2007 and up to \$365,000,000 over nine years. The 2007 total regular tax limit would be \$3.69/\$1,000 assessed value, including approximately \$0.36 additional taxes. Should this levy lid lift be approved?</p> <p><input type="radio"/> LEVY, YES</p> <p><input type="radio"/> LEVY, NO</p>  |  |
| <p align="center"><b>INITIATIVE 91</b><br/><b>FOR-PROFIT PROFESSIONAL SPORTS</b><br/><b>ORGANIZATIONS</b></p> <p>Seattle Initiative Measure Number 91 concerns property, goods, and services Seattle provides to for-profit professional sports. If enacted the measure would require that for-profit professional sports organizations pay the City at least "fair value" for goods, services, real property, or facilities the City provides or leases to them, either directly or through another public entity or a non-profit organization. The measure defines "fair value," based in part on the rate of return for 30-year U.S. Treasury Bonds. Any Seattle resident would have standing to file a lawsuit challenging City acts that allegedly violated the measure. Should this measure be enacted into law?</p> <p><input type="radio"/> YES</p> <p><input type="radio"/> NO</p>   | <p align="center"><b>PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT NO. 6</b><br/><b>CITY COUNCIL MEETING LOCATIONS</b></p> <p>The city council has proposed an amendment to Article IV Section 6 of the city charter concerning council meeting locations in case of an emergency or disaster. This amendment would change the charter to allow the city council to meet at locations other than its regular meeting place when permitted by state law in the event of an emergency or disaster. Should this charter amendment be:</p> <p><input type="radio"/> APPROVED</p> <p><input type="radio"/> REJECTED</p>   | <p align="center"><b>PROPOSITION NO. 1</b><br/><b>TRANSPORTATION LEVY</b></p> <p>The City of Seattle's Proposition 1 concerns allowing increased property taxes for nine years for transportation improvements. If approved, this proposition would fund facilities and services, including: street and bridge maintenance; enhanced transit services; bicycle, pedestrian and safety programs; and a neighborhood street fund, under Ordinance 122232. It would authorize regular property taxes higher than RCW 84.55 limits, allowing collection of up to \$36,650,000 in additional taxes in 2007 and up to \$365,000,000 over nine years. The 2007 total regular tax limit would be \$3.69/\$1,000 assessed value, including approximately \$0.36 additional taxes. Should this levy lid lift be approved?</p> <p><input type="radio"/> LEVY, YES</p> <p><input type="radio"/> LEVY, NO</p>  |  |
| <p align="center"><b>REFERENDUM NO. 1</b><br/><b>ADULT ENTERTAINMENT</b></p> <p>The Seattle City Council passed Ordinance Number 121952 concerning the licensing and regulation of adult entertainment. Voters filed a sufficient referendum petition to refer the ordinance to a public vote. Among other things, Ordinance Number 121952 would: (1) add new provisions concerning license issuance, suspension and revocation; (2) prohibit adult entertainers from performing within four feet of customers, or directly accepting gratuities; (3) require specific lighting levels at adult-entertainment premises; (4) prohibit entertainment that is not visible from all public areas within the premises; (5) require premises to allow announced City inspections during business hours; and (6) allow the city attorney to file nuisance actions against adult-entertainment premises that violate the law. Should this ordinance be:</p> <p><input type="radio"/> APPROVED</p> <p><input type="radio"/> REJECTED</p> | <p align="center"><b>PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT NO. 6</b><br/><b>CITY COUNCIL MEETING LOCATIONS</b></p> <p>The city council has proposed an amendment to Article IV Section 6 of the city charter concerning council meeting locations in case of an emergency or disaster. This amendment would change the charter to allow the city council to meet at locations other than its regular meeting place when permitted by state law in the event of an emergency or disaster. Should this charter amendment be:</p> <p><input type="radio"/> APPROVED</p> <p><input type="radio"/> REJECTED</p>   | <p align="center"><b>PROPOSITION NO. 1</b><br/><b>TRANSPORTATION LEVY</b></p> <p>The City of Seattle's Proposition 1 concerns allowing increased property taxes for nine years for transportation improvements. If approved, this proposition would fund facilities and services, including: street and bridge maintenance; enhanced transit services; bicycle, pedestrian and safety programs; and a neighborhood street fund, under Ordinance 122232. It would authorize regular property taxes higher than RCW 84.55 limits, allowing collection of up to \$36,650,000 in additional taxes in 2007 and up to \$365,000,000 over nine years. The 2007 total regular tax limit would be \$3.69/\$1,000 assessed value, including approximately \$0.36 additional taxes. Should this levy lid lift be approved?</p> <p><input type="radio"/> LEVY, YES</p> <p><input type="radio"/> LEVY, NO</p>  |  |
| <p align="center"><b>REFERENDUM NO. 1</b><br/><b>ADULT ENTERTAINMENT</b></p> <p>The Seattle City Council passed Ordinance Number 121952 concerning the licensing and regulation of adult entertainment. Voters filed a sufficient referendum petition to refer the ordinance to a public vote. Among other things, Ordinance Number 121952 would: (1) add new provisions concerning license issuance, suspension and revocation; (2) prohibit adult entertainers from performing within four feet of customers, or directly accepting gratuities; (3) require specific lighting levels at adult-entertainment premises; (4) prohibit entertainment that is not visible from all public areas within the premises; (5) require premises to allow announced City inspections during business hours; and (6) allow the city attorney to file nuisance actions against adult-entertainment premises that violate the law. Should this ordinance be:</p> <p><input type="radio"/> APPROVED</p> <p><input type="radio"/> REJECTED</p> | <p align="center"><b>PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT NO. 6</b><br/><b>CITY COUNCIL MEETING LOCATIONS</b></p> <p>The city council has proposed an amendment to Article IV Section 6 of the city charter concerning council meeting locations in case of an emergency or disaster. This amendment would change the charter to allow the city council to meet at locations other than its regular meeting place when permitted by state law in the event of an emergency or disaster. Should this charter amendment be:</p> <p><input type="radio"/> APPROVED</p> <p><input type="radio"/> REJECTED</p>   | <p align="center"><b>PROPOSITION NO. 1</b><br/><b>TRANSPORTATION LEVY</b></p> <p>The City of Seattle's Proposition 1 concerns allowing increased property taxes for nine years for transportation improvements. If approved, this proposition would fund facilities and services, including: street and bridge maintenance; enhanced transit services; bicycle, pedestrian and safety programs; and a neighborhood street fund, under Ordinance 122232. It would authorize regular property taxes higher than RCW 84.55 limits, allowing collection of up to \$36,650,000 in additional taxes in 2007 and up to \$365,000,000 over nine years. The 2007 total regular tax limit would be \$3.69/\$1,000 assessed value, including approximately \$0.36 additional taxes. Should this levy lid lift be approved?</p> <p><input type="radio"/> LEVY, YES</p> <p><input type="radio"/> LEVY, NO</p>  |  |
| <p align="center"><b>REFERENDUM NO. 1</b><br/><b>ADULT ENTERTAINMENT</b></p> <p>The Seattle City Council passed Ordinance Number 121952 concerning the licensing and regulation of adult entertainment. Voters filed a sufficient referendum petition to refer the ordinance to a public vote. Among other things, Ordinance Number 121952 would: (1) add new provisions concerning license issuance, suspension and revocation; (2) prohibit adult entertainers from performing within four feet of customers, or directly accepting gratuities; (3) require specific lighting levels at adult-entertainment premises; (4) prohibit entertainment that is not visible from all public areas within the premises; (5) require premises to allow announced City inspections during business hours; and (6) allow the city attorney to file nuisance actions against adult-entertainment premises that violate the law. Should this ordinance be:</p> <p><input type="radio"/> APPROVED</p> <p><input type="radio"/> REJECTED</p> | <p align="center"><b>PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT NO. 6</b><br/><b>CITY COUNCIL MEETING LOCATIONS</b></p> <p>The city council has proposed an amendment to Article IV Section 6 of the city charter concerning council meeting locations in case of an emergency or disaster. This amendment would change the charter to allow the city council to meet at locations other than its regular meeting place when permitted by state law in the event of an emergency or disaster. Should this charter amendment be:</p> <p><input type="radio"/> APPROVED</p> <p><input type="radio"/> REJECTED</p>   | <p align="center"><b>PROPOSITION NO. 1</b><br/><b>TRANSPORTATION LEVY</b></p> <p>The City of Seattle's Proposition 1 concerns allowing increased property taxes for nine years for transportation improvements. If approved, this proposition would fund facilities and services, including: street and bridge maintenance; enhanced transit services; bicycle, pedestrian and safety programs; and a neighborhood street fund, under Ordinance 122232. It would authorize regular property taxes higher than RCW 84.55 limits, allowing collection of up to \$36,650,000 in additional taxes in 2007 and up to \$365,000,000 over nine years. The 2007 total regular tax limit would be \$3.69/\$1,000 assessed value, including approximately \$0.36 additional taxes. Should this levy lid lift be approved?</p> <p><input type="radio"/> LEVY, YES</p> <p><input type="radio"/> LEVY, NO</p>  |  |
| <p align="center"><b>REFERENDUM NO. 1</b><br/><b>ADULT ENTERTAINMENT</b></p> <p>The Seattle City Council passed Ordinance Number 121952 concerning the licensing and regulation of adult entertainment. Voters filed a sufficient referendum petition to refer the ordinance to a public vote. Among other things, Ordinance Number 121952 would: (1) add new provisions concerning license issuance, suspension and revocation; (2) prohibit adult entertainers from performing within four feet of customers, or directly accepting gratuities; (3) require specific lighting levels at adult-entertainment premises; (4) prohibit entertainment that is not visible from all public areas within the premises; (5) require premises to allow announced City inspections during business hours; and (6) allow the city attorney to file nuisance actions against adult-entertainment premises that violate the law. Should this ordinance be:</p> <p><input type="radio"/> APPROVED</p> <p><input type="radio"/> REJECTED</p> | <p align="center"><b>PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT NO. 6</b><br/><b>CITY COUNCIL MEETING LOCATIONS</b></p> <p>The city council has proposed an amendment to Article IV Section 6 of the city charter concerning council meeting locations in case of an emergency or disaster. This amendment would change the charter to allow the city council to meet at locations other than its regular meeting place when permitted by state law in the event of an emergency or disaster. Should this charter amendment be:</p> <p><input type="radio"/> APPROVED</p> <p><input type="radio"/> REJECTED</p>   | <p align="center"><b>PROPOSITION NO. 1</b><br/><b>TRANSPORTATION LEVY</b></p> <p>The City of Seattle's Proposition 1 concerns allowing increased property taxes for nine years for transportation improvements. If approved, this proposition would fund facilities and services, including: street and bridge maintenance; enhanced transit services; bicycle, pedestrian and safety programs; and a neighborhood street fund, under Ordinance 122232. It would authorize regular property taxes higher than RCW 84.55 limits, allowing collection of up to \$36,650,000 in additional taxes in 2007 and up to \$365,000,000 over nine years. The 2007 total regular tax limit would be \$3.69/\$1,000 assessed value, including approximately \$0.36 additional taxes. Should this levy lid lift be approved?</p> <p><input type="radio"/> LEVY, YES</p> <p><input type="radio"/> LEVY, NO</p>  |  |
| <p align="center"><b>REFERENDUM NO. 1</b><br/><b>ADULT ENTERTAINMENT</b></p> <p>The Seattle City Council passed Ordinance Number 121952 concerning the licensing and regulation of adult entertainment. Voters filed a sufficient referendum petition to refer the ordinance to a public vote. Among other things, Ordinance Number 121952 would: (1) add new provisions concerning license issuance, suspension and revocation; (2) prohibit adult entertainers from performing within four feet of customers, or directly accepting gratuities; (3) require specific lighting levels at adult-entertainment premises; (4) prohibit entertainment that is not visible from all public areas within the premises; (5) require premises to allow announced City inspections during business hours; and (6) allow the city attorney to file nuisance actions against adult-entertainment premises that violate the law. Should this ordinance be:</p> <p><input type="radio"/> APPROVED</p> <p><input type="radio"/> REJECTED</p> | <p align="center"><b>PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT NO. 6</b><br/><b>CITY COUNCIL MEETING LOCATIONS</b></p> <p>The city council has proposed an amendment to Article IV Section 6 of the city charter concerning council meeting locations in case of an emergency or disaster. This amendment would change the charter to allow the city council to meet at locations other than its regular meeting place when permitted by state law in the event of an emergency or disaster. Should this charter amendment be:</p> <p><input type="radio"/> APPROVED</p> <p><input type="radio"/> REJECTED</p>   | <p align="center"><b>PROPOSITION NO. 1</b><br/><b>TRANSPORTATION LEVY</b></p> <p>The City of Seattle's Proposition 1 concerns allowing increased property taxes for nine years for transportation improvements. If approved, this proposition would fund facilities and services, including: street and bridge maintenance; enhanced transit services; bicycle, pedestrian and safety programs; and a neighborhood street fund, under Ordinance 122232. It would authorize regular property taxes higher than RCW 84.55 limits, allowing collection of up to \$36,650,000 in additional taxes in 2007 and up to \$365,000,000 over nine years. The 2007 total regular tax limit would be \$3.69/\$1,000 assessed value, including approximately \$0.36 additional taxes. Should this levy lid lift be approved?</p> <p><input type="radio"/> LEVY, YES</p> <p><input type="radio"/> LEVY, NO</p>  |  |
| <p align="center"><b>REFERENDUM NO. 1</b><br/><b>ADULT ENTERTAINMENT</b></p> <p>The Seattle City Council passed Ordinance Number 121952 concerning the licensing and regulation of adult entertainment. Voters filed a sufficient referendum petition to refer the ordinance to a public vote. Among other things, Ordinance Number 121952 would: (1) add new provisions concerning license issuance, suspension and revocation; (2) prohibit adult entertainers from performing within four feet of customers, or directly accepting gratuities; (3) require specific lighting levels at adult-entertainment premises; (4) prohibit entertainment that is not visible from all public areas within the premises; (5) require premises to allow announced City inspections during business hours; and (6) allow the city attorney to file nuisance actions against adult-entertainment premises that violate the law. Should this ordinance be:</p> <p><input type="radio"/> APPROVED</p> <p><input type="radio"/> REJECTED</p> | <p align="center"><b>PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT NO. 6</b><br/><b>CITY COUNCIL MEETING LOCATIONS</b></p> <p>The city council has proposed an amendment to Article IV Section 6 of the city charter concerning council meeting locations in case of an emergency or disaster. This amendment would change the charter to allow the city council to meet at locations other than its regular meeting place when permitted by state law in the event of an emergency or disaster. Should this charter amendment be:</p> <p><input type="radio"/> APPROVED</p> <p><input type="radio"/> REJECTED</p>   | <p align="center"><b>PROPOSITION NO. 1</b><br/><b>TRANSPORTATION LEVY</b></p> <p>The City of Seattle's Proposition 1 concerns allowing increased property taxes for nine years for transportation improvements. If approved, this proposition would fund facilities and services, including: street and bridge maintenance; enhanced transit services; bicycle, pedestrian and safety programs; and a neighborhood street fund, under Ordinance 122232. It would authorize regular property taxes higher than RCW 84.55 limits, allowing collection of up to \$36,650,000 in additional taxes in 2007 and up to \$365,000,000 over nine years. The 2007 total regular tax limit would be \$3.69/\$1,000 assessed value, including approximately \$0.36 additional taxes. Should this levy lid lift be approved?</p> <p><input type="radio"/> LEVY, YES</p> <p><input type="radio"/> LEVY, NO</p>  |  |
| <p align="center"><b>REFERENDUM NO. 1</b><br/><b>ADULT ENTERTAINMENT</b></p> <p>The Seattle City Council passed Ordinance Number 121952 concerning the licensing and regulation of adult entertainment. Voters filed a sufficient referendum petition to refer the ordinance to a public vote. Among other things, Ordinance Number 121952 would: (1) add new provisions concerning license issuance, suspension and revocation; (2) prohibit adult entertainers from performing within four feet of customers, or directly accepting gratuities; (3) require specific lighting levels at adult-entertainment premises; (4) prohibit entertainment that is not visible from all public areas within the premises; (5) require premises to allow announced City inspections during business hours; and (6) allow the city attorney to file nuisance actions against adult-entertainment premises that violate the law. Should this ordinance be:</p> <p><input type="radio"/> APPROVED</p> <p><input type="radio"/> REJECTED</p> | <p align="center"><b>PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT NO. 6</b><br/><b>CITY COUNCIL MEETING LOCATIONS</b></p> <p>The city council has proposed an amendment to Article IV Section 6 of the city charter concerning council meeting locations in case of an emergency or disaster. This amendment would change the charter to allow the city council to meet at locations other than its regular meeting place when permitted by state law in the event of an emergency or disaster. Should this charter amendment be:</p> <p><input type="radio"/> APPROVED</p> <p><input type="radio"/> REJECTED</p>   | <p align="center"><b>PROPOSITION NO. 1</b><br/><b>TRANSPORTATION LEVY</b></p> <p>The City of Seattle's Proposition 1 concerns allowing increased property taxes for nine years for transportation improvements. If approved, this proposition would fund facilities and services, including: street and bridge maintenance; enhanced transit services; bicycle, pedestrian and safety programs; and a neighborhood street fund, under Ordinance 122232. It would authorize regular property taxes higher than RCW 84.55 limits, allowing collection of up to \$36,650,000 in additional taxes in 2007 and up to \$365,000,000 over nine years. The 2007 total regular tax limit would be \$3.69/\$1,000 assessed value, including approximately \$0.36 additional taxes. Should this levy lid lift be approved?</p> <p><input type="radio"/> LEVY, YES</p> <p><input type="radio"/> LEVY, NO</p>  |  |
| <p align="center"><b>REFERENDUM NO. 1</b><br/><b>ADULT ENTERTAINMENT</b></p> <p>The Seattle City Council passed Ordinance Number 121952 concerning the licensing and regulation of adult entertainment. Voters filed a sufficient referendum petition to refer the ordinance to a public vote. Among other things, Ordinance Number 121952 would: (1) add new provisions concerning license issuance, suspension and revocation; (2) prohibit adult entertainers from performing within four feet of customers, or directly accepting gratuities; (3) require specific lighting levels at adult-entertainment premises; (4) prohibit entertainment that is not visible from all public areas within the premises; (5) require premises to allow announced City inspections during business hours; and (6) allow the city attorney to file nuisance actions against adult-entertainment premises that violate the law. Should this ordinance be:</p> <p><input type="radio"/> APPROVED</p> <p><input type="radio"/> REJECTED</p> | <p align="center"><b>PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT NO. 6</b><br/><b>CITY COUNCIL MEETING LOCATIONS</b></p> <p>The city council has proposed an amendment to Article IV Section 6 of the city charter concerning council meeting locations in case of an emergency or disaster. This amendment would change the charter to allow the city council to meet at locations other than its regular meeting place when permitted by state law in the event of an emergency or disaster. Should this charter amendment be:</p> <p><input type="radio"/> APPROVED</p> <p><input type="radio"/> REJECTED</p>   | <p align="center"><b>PROPOSITION NO. 1</b><br/><b>TRANSPORTATION LEVY</b></p> <p>The City of Seattle's Proposition 1 concerns allowing increased property taxes for nine years for transportation improvements. If approved, this proposition would fund facilities and services, including: street and bridge maintenance; enhanced transit services; bicycle, pedestrian and safety programs; and a neighborhood street fund, under Ordinance 122232. It would authorize regular property taxes higher than RCW 84.55 limits, allowing collection of up to \$36,650,000 in additional taxes in 2007 and up to \$365,000,000 over nine years. The 2007 total regular tax limit would be \$3.69/\$1,000 assessed value, including approximately \$0.36 additional taxes. Should this levy lid lift be approved?</p> <p><input type="radio"/> LEVY, YES</p> <p><input type="radio"/> LEVY, NO</p>  |  |
| <p align="center"><b>REFERENDUM NO. 1</b><br/><b>ADULT ENTERTAINMENT</b></p> <p>The Seattle City Council passed Ordinance Number 121952 concerning the licensing and regulation of adult entertainment. Voters filed a sufficient referendum petition to refer the ordinance to a public vote. Among other things, Ordinance Number 121952 would: (1) add new provisions concerning license issuance, suspension and revocation; (2) prohibit adult entertainers from performing within four feet of customers, or directly accepting gratuities; (3) require specific lighting levels at adult-entertainment premises; (4) prohibit entertainment that is not visible from all public areas within the premises; (5) require premises to allow announced City inspections during business hours; and (6) allow the city attorney to file nuisance actions against adult-entertainment premises that violate the law. Should this ordinance be:</p> <p><input type="radio"/> APPROVED</p> <p><input type="radio"/> REJECTED</p> | <p align="center"><b>PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT NO. 6</b><br/><b>CITY COUNCIL MEETING LOCATIONS</b></p> <p>The city council has proposed an amendment to Article IV Section 6 of the city charter concerning council meeting locations in case of an emergency or disaster. This amendment would change the charter to allow the city council to meet at locations other than its regular meeting place when permitted by state law in the event of an emergency or disaster. Should this charter amendment be:</p> <p><input type="radio"/> APPROVED</p> <p><input type="radio"/> REJECTED</p>   | <p align="center"><b>PROPOSITION NO. 1</b><br/><b>TRANSPORTATION LEVY</b></p> <p>The City of Seattle's Proposition 1 concerns allowing increased property taxes for nine years for transportation improvements. If approved, this proposition would fund facilities and services, including: street and bridge maintenance; enhanced transit services; bicycle, pedestrian and safety programs; and a neighborhood street fund, under Ordinance 122232. It would authorize regular property taxes higher than RCW 84.55 limits, allowing collection of up to \$36,650,000 in additional taxes in 2007 and up to \$365,000,000 over nine years. The 2007 total regular tax limit would be \$3.69/\$1,000 assessed value, including approximately \$0.36 additional taxes. Should this levy lid lift be approved?</p> <p><input type="radio"/> LEVY, YES</p> <p><input type="radio"/> LEVY, NO</p>  |  |

**Vote both sides of ballot**