

General Election Sample Ballot – November 2, 2010

Snohomish County, Washington

How to vote


Use a single line to mark your vote.
Do not use a felt pen. Please use a pencil or pen.
Voting more than once per race or question will cancel that vote.

How to change a vote

Draw a line through your choice like this: ~~George Washington~~.
You have the option of making another choice.

How to vote a write-in

To vote for a person not on the ballot, connect the arrow and write in the name of the person on the line provided.



Proposed by Initiative Petition

Initiative Measure No. 1053

Initiative Measure No. 1053 concerns tax and fee increases imposed by state government. This measure would restate existing statutory requirements that legislative actions raising taxes must be approved by two-thirds legislative majorities or receive voter approval, and that new or increased fees require majority legislative approval. Should this measure be enacted into law?

Yes
No

Initiative Measure No. 1082

Initiative Measure No. 1082 concerns industrial insurance. This measure would authorize employers to purchase private industrial insurance beginning July 1, 2012; direct the legislature to enact conforming legislation by March 1, 2012; and eliminate the worker-paid share of medical-benefit premiums. Should this measure be enacted into law?

Yes
No

Initiative Measure No. 1098

Initiative Measure No. 1098 concerns establishing a state income tax and reducing other taxes. This measure would tax “adjusted gross income” above \$200,000 (individuals) and \$400,000 (jointfilers), reduce state property tax levies, reduce certain business and occupation taxes, and direct any increased revenues to education and health. Should this measure be enacted into law?

Yes
No

Initiative Measure No. 1100

Initiative Measure No. 1100 concerns liquor (beer, wine and spirits). This measure would close state liquor stores; authorize sale, distribution, and importation of spirits by private parties; and repeal certain requirements that govern the business operations of beer and wine distributors and producers. Should this measure be enacted into law?

Yes
No

Proposed by Initiative Petition

Initiative Measure No. 1105

Initiative Measure No. 1105 concerns liquor (beer, wine and spirits). This measure would close all state liquor stores and license private parties to sell or distribute spirits. It would revise laws concerning regulation, taxation and government revenues from distribution and sale of spirits. Should this measure be enacted into law?

Yes
No

Initiative Measure No. 1107

Initiative Measure No. 1107 concerns reversing certain 2010 amendments to state tax laws. This measure would end sales tax on candy; end temporary sales tax on some bottled water; end temporary excise taxes on carbonated beverages; and reduce tax rates for certain food processors. Should this measure be enacted into law?

Yes
No

Proposed to the People by the Legislature

Referendum Bill No. 52

The legislature has passed Engrossed House Bill No. 2561, concerning authorizing and funding bonds for energy efficiency projects in schools. This bill would authorize bonds to finance construction and repair projects increasing energy efficiency in public schools and higher education buildings, and continue the sales tax on bottled water otherwise expiring in 2013. Should this bill be:

Approved
Rejected

Amendment to the State Constitution Senate Joint Resolution No. 8225

The legislature has proposed a constitutional amendment concerning the limitation on state debt. This amendment would require the state to reduce the interest accounted for in calculating the constitutional debt limit, by the amount of federal payments scheduled to be received to offset that interest. Should this constitutional amendment be:

Approved
Rejected

Proposed to the People by the Legislature

Amendment to the State Constitution Engrossed Substitute House Joint Resolution No. 4220

The legislature has proposed a constitutional amendment on denying bail for persons charged with certain criminal offenses. This amendment would authorize courts to deny bail for offenses punishable by the possibility of life in prison, on clear and convincing evidence of a propensity for violence that would likely endanger persons. Should this constitutional amendment be:

Approved
Rejected

READ: Each candidate for partisan office may state a political party that he or she prefers. A candidate’s preference does not imply that the candidate is nominated or endorsed by the party, or that the party approves of or associates with that candidate

Federal Partisan Office

U. S. SENATOR 6 YEAR TERM (VOTE FOR ONE)

Patty Murray
(Prefers Democratic Party)

Dino Rossi
(Prefers Republican Party)

U. S. REPRESENTATIVE DIST 1 2 YEAR TERM (VOTE FOR ONE)

Jay Inslee
(Prefers Democratic Party)

James Watkins
(Prefers Republican Party)

U. S. REPRESENTATIVE DIST 2 2 YEAR TERM (VOTE FOR ONE)

John Koster
(Prefers Republican Party)

Rick Larsen
(Prefers Democratic Party)

Legislative
Partisan Office

1st DIST REPRESENTATIVE POS 1
2 YEAR TERM (VOTE FOR ONE)

Derek Stanford
(Prefers Democratic Party)

Dennis Richter
(Prefers Republican Party)

1st DIST REPRESENTATIVE POS 2
2 YEAR TERM (VOTE FOR ONE)

Heidi Munson
(Prefers Republican Party)

Luis Moscoso
(Prefers Democratic Party)

10th DIST REPRESENTATIVE POS 1
2 YEAR TERM (VOTE FOR ONE)

Norma Smith
(Prefers Republican Party)

Laura Lewis
(Prefers Democratic Party)

10th DIST REPRESENTATIVE POS 2
2 YEAR TERM (VOTE FOR ONE)

Barbara Bailey
(Prefers Republican Party)

Tom Riggs
(Prefers Democratic Party)

21st DISTRICT SENATOR
4 YEAR TERM (VOTE FOR ONE)

Paull Shin
(Prefers Democratic Party)

David Preston
(Prefers Republican Party)

21st DIST REPRESENTATIVE POS 1
2 YEAR TERM (VOTE FOR ONE)

Mary Helen Roberts
(Prefers Democratic Party)

Ed Borey
(Prefers Republican Party)

21st DIST REPRESENTATIVE POS 2
2 YEAR TERM (VOTE FOR ONE)

Marko Liias
(Prefers Democratic Party)

Elizabeth Scott
(Prefers Republican Party)

Legislative
Partisan Office

32nd DISTRICT SENATOR
4 YEAR TERM (VOTE FOR ONE)

Maralyn Chase
(Prefers Democratic Party)

David Baker
(Prefers Republican Party)

32nd DIST REPRESENTATIVE POS 1
2 YEAR TERM (VOTE FOR ONE)

Cindy Ryu
(Prefers Democratic Party)

Art Coday
(Prefers Republican Party)

32nd DIST REPRESENTATIVE POS 2
2 YEAR TERM (VOTE FOR ONE)

Ruth Kagi
(Prefers Democratic Party)

Gary (G) Gagliardi
(Prefers Republican Party)

38th DISTRICT SENATOR
4 YEAR TERM (VOTE FOR ONE)

Nick Harper
(Prefers Democratic Party)

Rod Rieger
(Prefers Conservative Party)

38th DIST REPRESENTATIVE POS 1
2 YEAR TERM (VOTE FOR ONE)

John McCoy
(Prefers Democratic Party)

Hugh Fleet
(Prefers Republican Party)

38th DIST REPRESENTATIVE POS 2
2 YEAR TERM (VOTE FOR ONE)

Mike Sells
(Prefers Democratic Party)

Iris Lilly
(Prefers Republican Party)

39th DIST REPRESENTATIVE POS 1
2 YEAR TERM (VOTE FOR ONE)

Dan Kristiansen
(Prefers Republican Party)

Eleanor Walters
(Prefers Democratic Party)

39th DIST REPRESENTATIVE POS 2
2 YEAR TERM (VOTE FOR ONE)

Kirk Pearson
(Prefers Republican Party)

Legislative
Partisan Office

44th DISTRICT SENATOR
4 YEAR TERM (VOTE FOR ONE)

Dave Schmidt
(Prefers Republican Party)

Steve Hobbs
(Prefers Democratic Party)

44th DIST REPRESENTATIVE POS 1
2 YEAR TERM (VOTE FOR ONE)

Hans Dunshee
(Prefers Democratic Party)

Bob McCaughan
(Prefers Republican Party)

44th DIST REPRESENTATIVE POS 2
2 YEAR TERM (VOTE FOR ONE)

Mike Hope
(Prefers Republican Party)

John Boerger
(Prefers Democratic Party)

County
Partisan Office

PROSECUTING ATTORNEY
SHORT & 4 YEAR TERM (VOTE FOR ONE)

Mark Roe
(Prefers Democratic Party)

Jim Kenny
(Prefers Democratic Party)

Judicial
Nonpartisan Office

STATE SUPREME COURT POS 1
6 YEAR TERM (VOTE FOR ONE)

Jim Johnson

STATE SUPREME COURT POS 5
6 YEAR TERM (VOTE FOR ONE)

Barbara Madsen

STATE SUPREME COURT POS 6
6 YEAR TERM (VOTE FOR ONE)

Richard B. Sanders

Charlie Wiggins

APPEALS COURT DIV 1 DIST 2 POS 1
6 YEAR TERM (VOTE FOR ONE)

Steve Dwyer

District Court
Nonpartisan Office

CASCADE DISTRICT JUDGE POS 1
4 YEAR TERM (VOTE FOR ONE)

Jay F. Wisman

District Court
Nonpartisan Office

EVERETT DISTRICT JUDGE POS 1
4 YEAR TERM (VOTE FOR ONE)

Roger Fisher

EVERETT DISTRICT JUDGE POS 2
4 YEAR TERM (VOTE FOR ONE)

Tam T. Bui

EVERGREEN DIST JUDGE POS 1
4 YEAR TERM (VOTE FOR ONE)

Steve Clough

EVERGREEN DIST JUDGE POS 2
4 YEAR TERM (VOTE FOR ONE)

Patricia Lyon

NE ELECTORAL DIST JUDGE POS 1
4 YEAR TERM (VOTE FOR ONE)

Janet E. Garrow

NE ELECTORAL DIST JUDGE POS 2
4 YEAR TERM (VOTE FOR ONE)

Frank V. LaSalata

NE ELECTORAL DIST JUDGE POS 3
4 YEAR TERM (VOTE FOR ONE)

Linda Jacke

NE ELECTORAL DIST JUDGE POS 4
4 YEAR TERM (VOTE FOR ONE)

Peter L. Nault

NE ELECTORAL DIST JUDGE POS 5
4 YEAR TERM (VOTE FOR ONE)

David A. Steiner

NE ELECTORAL DIST JUDGE POS 6
SHORT & 4 YEAR TERM (VOTE FOR ONE)

John OBrien

Michael Finkle

NE ELECTORAL DIST JUDGE POS 7
SHORT & 4 YEAR TERM (VOTE FOR ONE)

Donna Tucker

Larry Mitchell

District Court
Nonpartisan Office

SOUTH DISTRICT JUDGE POS 1
4 YEAR TERM (VOTE FOR ONE)

Timothy P. Ryan

SOUTH DISTRICT JUDGE POS 2
4 YEAR TERM (VOTE FOR ONE)

Jeffrey D. Goodwin

SOUTH DISTRICT JUDGE POS 3
4 YEAR TERM (VOTE FOR ONE)

Carol A. McRae

Public Utility District
Nonpartisan Office

PUD DIST 1 COMMISSIONER DIST 3
6 YEAR TERM (VOTE FOR ONE)

Tanya (Toni) Olson

Brian McMahan

City & Town

City of Arlington
Proposition No. 1

Permanent Levy for Emergency Medical Services

Shall the City of Arlington be authorized to impose a PERMANENT regular property tax levy of \$.50 or less per thousand dollars of assessed valuation for emergency medical services?

YES
NO

City of Mountlake Terrace
Proposition No. 1

Civic Campus Bonds

The City Council of the City of Mountlake Terrace adopted Ordinance No. 2537 concerning a proposition for financing a new civic campus and other community improvements. If approved, this proposition would authorize the City to issue bonds for the construction of a new civic campus and other improvements as listed in Ordinance No. 2537. It would authorize issuance of not more than \$37,500,000 of general obligation bonds maturing within 30 years or less, and authorize the annual levy of excess property taxes to pay and retire such bonds, all as provided in Ordinance No. 2537. Should this proposition be approved?

YES
NO

City & Town

City of Mukilteo
Proposition No. 1

Initiative Measure

Mukilteo Initiative No. 2 concerns automatic ticketing machines. This measure would prohibit Mukilteo from using camera surveillance to impose fines unless two-thirds of the Council and a majority of the voters approve, limit fines, repeal Ordinance 1246 allowing the machines, and mandate an advisory vote. Should this measure be enacted into law?

YES
NO

City of Mukilteo
Proposition No. 2

Advisory Vote on South Mukilteo Annexation

The Mukilteo City Council is considering annexation of the area commonly referred to as the South Mukilteo Annexation Area. This annexation would add approximately 11,000 residents and approximately double the City's commercial acreage. What is your position on the proposed South Mukilteo Annexation?

SUPPORT ANNEXATION
OPPOSE ANNEXATION
NO OPINION

City of Stanwood
Proposition No. 1

Property Tax Levy for Fire Protection and Related Costs

The City of Stanwood has adopted Resolution 2010-1 concerning funding for fire protection services. If approved, this proposition shall fund firefighting staffing and related costs for fire protection services. This proposition would allow the City to increase its current expense levy to two dollars and sixty-seven cents (\$2.67) per one thousand dollars of assessed value for collection in 2011 and increase the levy each year thereafter as allowed by chapter 84.55 RCW. Should this proposition be:

APPROVED
REJECTED

City of Stanwood
Proposition No. 2

Emergency Medical Services Levy

The City of Stanwood has adopted Resolution 2010-2 concerning funding for emergency medical services. If approved, this proposition shall fund delivery of 24-hour basic life support and advanced life support services. This proposition would allow the City to increase its current expense levy to fifty cents (\$.50) per one thousand dollars of assessed value for collection in 2011 and increase the levy each year thereafter as allowed by chapter 84.55 RCW. Should this proposition be:

APPROVED
REJECTED

School District

Monroe School District No. 103
Proposition No. 1

Replacement Educational Technology
and Capital Projects Levy

The Board of Directors of Monroe School District #103 adopted Resolution No, 9-2010 concerning a Replacement Educational Technology and Capital Projects Levy. This proposition would authorize the modernization, renovation and improvement of existing facilities and the acquisition of technology and equipment; and authorize the District to levy following excess taxes on all taxable property within the District

Collection Years	Approximate Levy Rate/\$1,000 Assessed Value	Levy Amount
2011	\$0.54	\$2,440,000
2012	\$0.54	\$2,500,000
2013	\$0.63	\$2,985,000
2014	\$0.64	\$3,075,000

all as provided in District Resolution No. 9-2010.
Should this proposition be approved?

YES
NO

Fire District

Fire Protection District No. 7
Proposition No. 1

Authorizing Additional Property Tax Levy
for Emergency Medical Services

Will Snohomish County Fire Protection District No. 7 be authorized to impose a PERMANENT regular property tax levy of \$0.50 or less per thousand dollars of assessed valuation for emergency medical and paramedic services?

YES
NO

Fire Protection District No. 19
Proposition No. 1

Emergency Medical Service Levy

Will Snohomish County Fire Protection District No. 19 be authorized to impose a PERMANENT regular property tax levy of \$.50 cents or less per thousand dollars of assessed valuation to pay for emergency medical care and related services?

YES
NO

Fire Protection District No. 21
Proposition No. 1

Permanent Levy for Emergency Medical
Services

Will Snohomish County Fire District 21 be authorized to impose a PERMANENT regular property tax levy of \$.50 or less per thousand dollars of assessed valuation for emergency medical services?

YES
NO

Fire District

Fire Protection District No. 22
Proposition No. 1

Proposition Authorizing Restoration of
Previous Property Tax Levies

The Board of Commissioners of Snohomish County Fire Protection District No. 22 adopted Resolution No. 2010-1 concerning the District's regular property tax levy for maintenance and operations. This proposition would restore the District's regular property tax levy for maintenance and operations to an amount not to exceed \$1.50 per \$1,000 of assessed valuation to be levied in 2010 for collection in 2011. The dollar amount of the 2010 levy shall serve as the base for the purpose of computing subsequent levies as provided by chapter 84.55 RCW. Should this proposition be:

APPROVED
REJECTED

Fire Protection District No. 24
Proposition No. 1

Permanent Levy for Emergency Medical
Services

Will Snohomish County Fire Protection District No. 24 be authorized to impose a PERMANENT regular property tax levy of \$.50 or less per thousand dollars of assessed valuation for emergency medical services?

YES
NO

Fire Protection District No. 25
Proposition No. 1

Permanent Levy for Emergency Medical
Services

Will Snohomish County Fire Protection District 25 be authorized to impose a PERMANENT regular property tax levy of \$.50 or less per thousand dollars of assessed valuation for emergency medical services?

YES
NO

Port District

Port of Everett
Proposition No. 1

Number of Port Commissioners

The Commissioners of the Port of Everett adopted Resolution No. 934-A concerning a proposition to increase the number of port commissioners. This proposition would increase the number of commissioners of the Port District from three (3) commissioners to five (5) commissioners. Should this proposition be:

APPROVED
REJECTED

Port of Everett
Proposition No. 2

New Port Commissioner Districts

The Commissioners of the Port of Everett adopted Resolution No. 935-A concerning the districts of new port commissioners. In the event that the number of port commissioners of the Port of Everett is increased from three port commissioners to five port commissioners, this proposition would direct that the districts for the two new commissioners include the entire port district. Should this proposition be:

APPROVED
REJECTED

Transportation District

Edmonds Transportation Benefit District
Proposition No. 1

The Board of Directors of the Edmonds Transportation Benefit District adopted Ordinance No. 2 concerning financing specified transportation improvements by an increase in vehicle fee. This proposition would authorize an additional vehicle fee under RCW 82.80.140 of \$40, for a total of \$60 per vehicle, in order to fund transportation improvements specifically described and prioritized in the ordinance, which would include walkways, bicycle loop signage, signalization, intersection improvements, lighting, corridor enhancements, and roadway improvements, all as provided in Ordinance No. 2. Should this proposition be:

APPROVED
REJECTED