

May 2004
2004

LWV/LAC InterLeague Newsletter

President's Message

The League of Women Voters of Los Angeles County in both its values and practices affirms its belief and commitment to diversity, pluralism and affirmative action.

The League of Women Voters welcomes new members, both men and women, who are citizens of voting age.

Inside this issue:

<i>LWVUS Convention</i>	2
<i>Children in Poverty</i>	2
<i>LA County Budget</i>	4
<i>Natural Resources</i>	5
<i>Healthcare</i>	6
<i>LWVCEF Education Study Update</i>	7
<i>State and Local Finance</i>	9

First I would like to express my gratitude to all the members of the County Board and the local leagues for their confidence in electing me to chair the League for the next two years. I will try to live up to your expectations in both action and activities. During the next year I envision the County League facilitating cooperation among the local leagues on countywide voter service projects including SmartVoter and judicial forums. Both the SmartVoter website and the judicial forums provide voters a service not available through other organizations.

Cooperation among the leagues in sharing programs that work in membership, leadership, program and voter service is another goal. With the help of the Management Training Advisors we should be able to mentor each other and share program teams that will enrich many leagues.

Action on the County budget to try to protect vital county-run social services from devastating cuts will be a priority in the coming months. County probation and county health services are in particular jeopardy today. As the League we can work with other organizations and our state board to plead for adequate funding to keep our facilities functioning and to avoid costlier alternatives. The LWVC supports the option of increasing revenue to support vital services, a message our elected officials need to hear. Tax expenditures, otherwise known as tax credits, tax breaks, and incentives, are added to the state code with a majority vote and are rarely examined to determine their effectiveness, usefulness, and drain on the state's revenues. Now is the time to reexamine those myriad tax expenditures to determine which should be rescinded. Unfortunately, it takes a two-thirds vote to rescind, but they should be scrutinized. League is a voice that can put pressure on individual law makers especially since LWVC has a position favoring evaluation of and sun setting of tax expenditures.

Delegates to county convention voted to add Education and Action on Health Care to the program for the next two years, so League will be monitoring plans for health care delivery in the county and working to protect services and fund-

(Continued on page 2)

(Continued from page 1)

ing. Delegates to the county convention voted to adopt a study of Land Use in LA County focusing on both on developed areas adjacent to cities and undeveloped rural areas. A committee is forming to research material on both aspects. Currently, preliminary work is being done to monitor the proposal to develop Tejon Ranch on the LA County-Kern County border which will have implications for traffic congestion, open space and wildlife impacts and a large housing element.

Concurrently, the County Department of Regional Planning is developing an updated County General Plan which is to be adopted in 2005. This is a perfect opportunity for the League to dust off its Land Use, Housing and Transportation positions and use them to address the elements of the proposed General Plan which will direct the development of the county until 2025.

I look forward to working with the fine League members you elected to serve on the County Board and to interact and cooperate with individual leagues in mutual efforts to improve the League's impact in LA County.

Margo Reeg

LWVUS CONVENTION BRIEFING

As County President I am trying to ascertain the interest in a meeting of convention goers. I have found it helpful to hear from experienced Leaguers what to expect and how to prepare for a National convention trip. This year there is a PMP increase proposed of \$0.80. After discussing and voting on a state PMP increase of \$2 at Leadership Council I'm sure this will be hotly debated. No new program is being recommended mainly due to cost and lack of funding sources.

I have reserved the library meeting room at the Whittier Public Library from 2-4 p.m. on Sunday, May 23, for a briefing. We will have the meeting if there are sufficient experienced and new delegates who want to participate. We will have refreshments for those who

attend.

I would like the names of the members who will be delegates from your leagues and their email addresses and phone numbers so I can contact them about the briefing. I also need some experienced convention goers who are willing to share their expertise with new attendees. I know that the meeting we did before the state convention last year was appreciated by those who went.

Thanks

Margo

CHILDREN IN POVERTY

Legislative Committee Conducts L. A. County Hearing on Proposed State Budget as Part of Its Scope
(Excerpted from Report Prepared by Sally Rivera; Quotations from Committee-Distributed Material)

The Joint Committee to Develop a Master Plan to End Poverty in California held a "press conference" rally and hearing at Los Angeles Valley College in Van Nuys on March 5. The focus of the day's activities was to examine the "impact of the proposed 2004-2005 budget on poverty."

The original committee was established in September 2002 "in order to explore the roots of poverty and all related issues and to find solutions to this pervasive problem. In September 2003, the Joint Committee ... was established so that leaders in both the Senate and the Assembly may work together toward a plan for reform by 2006. The committee is particularly focused on the increasing gap between the rich and the poor and the rising number of full time working families who cannot afford basic needs." The Senate chair is Richard Alarcon (D-20); the Assembly chair is Sally Lieber (D-22).

A series of hearings has been held throughout California: Sacramento, 2002, "to define poverty in California and to determine the direction of the committee"; San Francisco and the East Bay, 2003, to "interview

(Continued on page 3)

(Continued from page 2)

young homeless and previously homeless mothers ... and families of Chinese immigrants"; Sacramento, 2003, "to determine the scope of the lawless Underground Economy and its impact on ... the state economy...; currently, according to the state's Franchise Tax Board, California loses more than \$4 billion each year in income taxes alone because of the Underground Economy"; Fresno and Tulare Counties, 2003, to interview "children of poor rural towns ... [and] farmworkers struggling to find affordable housing, transportation, and healthcare ... [focusing] on poverty in the agricultural sector that includes towns which have experienced 35% unemployment for over 20 years..."; Sacramento, 2003, with "testimony [that included an] overview of the corporation's role in civic society..."; Silicon Valley, 2004, to interview "150 [high]-tech workers who had been unemployed for an average of a year - each - [and] multiple families who live together with other families in small apartment units [because they have pooled] their wages in order to pay ... rent...."

The committee acknowledges the benchmark Federal Poverty Line ("FPL is calculated by measuring the cost of groceries (and multiplying by three). This does not reflect the rising costs of additional basic needs..."). However, it references the Self-Sufficiency Standard as a more realistic economic baseline. "The current federal definition of poverty includes an individual with an income below \$9,214 or a family of four with an annual income of less than \$18,000 per year. However, the actual cost to maintain a self-sufficient lifestyle varies[s] from region to region. For example, in Los Angeles County [the SSS] is \$52,319 [per year for a family of four]."

"... To date the committee has sponsored or introduced the following legislation: SJR 3, TANF Reauthorization; SCR 12, Joint Master Plan Committee; SJR 15, Federal Poverty Guideline; SCA 11, Local Funds for Infrastructure; SB 821, Business School Ethics Coursework; SB 578, Anti-Sweatshop bill."

Legislature members made brief remarks at the rally. Advocates, clients and students who would

be directly impacted by the proposed cuts made short presentations. The thrust of the remarks by all was that the cuts were shortsighted - penny-wise, pound-foolish thinking. Repeatedly speakers emphasized that far greater costs would be incurred later by the state if investing in programs now (education, health care, disability services, child care, etc.) were reduced, capped or eliminated. Several SEIU members spoke in strong opposition to In-Home Support Services cuts.

Senators Alarcon and Wes Chesbro convened the formal hearing. Scott Graves of the California Budget Project gave an overview of the proposed budget and commented that lower-income groups pay the highest taxes in terms of income percentage and transitional aid to families moving to self-sufficiency is cut off before self-sufficiency has been established.

The two-page agenda listing of those scheduled to present information was extensive, covering health services (MediCal reimbursement, developmental disabilities and IHSS, children's mental health, Healthy Families, HIV/AIDS (caps with new enrollees being added - "realistically" - only after the death of a current program participant), impact on elderly, cancer (the statewide prostate cancer program has been singled out as the only health care program to be entirely eliminated)), human services (CalWORKs, child care, food stamps (emphasized as a federal program, federal dollars, minor state costs for administration - by cutting this program, California increases its donor status to the federal government and reduces an important multiplier for the California economy), foster care, SSI), education (K-12 and higher education), probation services and the city of Los Angeles.

[An outgrowth of the Joint Committee is the California Dream Foundation. It will be holding its "Founding Convention on Ending Poverty in California," June 18-19, at the University of Southern California. Registration is \$25. Contact information: P. O. Box 2507, Van Nuys, CA 91401; telephone, 818/725-7900; fax, 818/788-7997.]

Sally Rivera
LWW/LAC Social Policy Director

LOS ANGELES COUNTY BUDGET

The Governor's proposed budget means difficult days ahead for Los Angeles County budgets. In trying to "fix" the 2004-2005 "fiscal problem" of a \$17-billion-dollar deficit, Governor Schwarzenegger seeks changes that will directly and indirectly impact county services and programs. As County CAO David Janssen told the Board of Supervisors [April 20, 2004], it's the state deficit that is causing us distress; local income is all right. The state continues to defer "its obligation to reimburse for mandates that it imposes" and asks counties to pay the penalty imposed by the federal government for the state's failure to implement an automated child support system [cost to LA County: \$11 million].

To the state, the listed items are savings, but to local governments, they are not good news!

—\$1.3 billion shift to the state of property tax money [again!], 75% to come from counties, 25% from cities and special districts.

—\$134 million by eliminating services to at-risk youth and juvenile offenders.

—\$55 million by having counties pay 25% of the state penalty for failing to meet the federal requirement for a state-wide automated child-support collection system.

—\$39.4 million by eliminating payments for the counties' share of costs for the child-support collection system.

—\$38 million by eliminating payments to the counties for booking fees for county jail inmates.

These direct loses are only part of the picture. Results of other proposed changes that particularly impact lower income families would promptly be seen in LA County.

—Enrollment caps on Healthy Families programs, making 113,000 fewer children eligible for health coverage across the state, would be felt here.

—Cutting about \$100 million from centers serving the disabled would be felt here.

—Eliminating the Transitional Food Stamp Benefits Program for former CalWORKS recipients would deny 66,000 low-income California households about \$165.5 million in federal food stamp benefits, while saving the state \$1.6 million in 03-04 and \$5.2 million in 04-05. [Is losing \$165M to

save less than \$7M good budgeting?]

—Rescinding AB231 [changes to food stamp, vehicle, & application rules] would save almost \$1.18 million over two years, while costing about 15,000 low income households about \$37 million in federal benefits.

CAO Janssen referred to the Governor's proposals as "draconic reductions." Even without them, for the third year in a row, the county will have to cut services to balance its budget. Los Angeles County faces \$269 million in cuts in its 2004-2005 budget, prepared before the state budget has been finalized, \$167 million of it representing absorption of costs in existing programs and the other \$102 million, reductions in funding. The County projects Workers' Compensation cost increases of 17.3 %, a 22.8% increase in retiree health insurance costs, and an 87% increase in unemployment insurance.

The Sheriff's Department, already having closed jails and released inmates early because of funding problems, "faces another \$34.8 million reduction to absorb ongoing program costs, and the loss of \$2 million and 28 positions due to reduced state grant funds." There may be a county ballot measure in November asking voters to increase the sales tax in the county by half a cent [to 8.75 %] to offset these lost revenues. [The property taxes being shifted from the county to the state were mostly used to provide police and fire protection.]

The proposed county budget for 2004-2005 is \$20.8 million higher than last year's and includes almost 400 fewer employees. Approximately 59% of the 92,000 county employees work in law and justice, or health and mental health. However, about 30% of the county budget goes to children and family programs, and the Children and Family Services Department will lose the most positions [455], most of them vacant administrative/support positions.

The Department of Health Services will be adding over 300 positions to enhance patient care, to expand services related to trauma and emergency services and bioterrorism, improve information technology functions, and improve internal operations,

(Continued on page 5)

(Continued from page 4)

including contract monitoring. For the first time, funds authorized by voters under Proposition B are included in the budget [\$174 M] and will enhance trauma care.

Budgeting is never easy, but with both state and federal budgets in serious deficit, Los Angeles County faces an unusually difficult year, and the currently proposed budget does not reflect the Governor's proposed cuts. CAO Janssen says he "expects a significant hit, but is hopeful it will not be as extreme as the governor's recommended \$470.4 million – which would devastate County services." Budgets reflect choices and priorities. Proposing cuts that obviously impact those with low incomes most heavily while not restoring higher marginal rates [10 and 11 %] on those with really high incomes [millions] is a clear choice.

Public hearings on the county budget will begin May 12, 2004. The Board will begin deliberations on the budget on June 21. The Legislative Analyst's Office [California's Nonpartisan Fiscal and Policy Advisor] has a summary of the *State Fiscal Picture* on her web site [www.lao.ca.gov]. The California Budget Project [www.cbp.org] has a 60-some page summary with graphs, charts, and digests that clarify the budget and the Governor's proposals. Sacramento legislators are working on the "May revise." Handwritten postcards *can* make a difference. Write.

*Sally Seven,
LWW/LAC Government Director*

NATURAL RESOURCES

ENACT Visits "Green" NRDC Office Building

On Friday, March 19, ENACT members and guests gathered in Santa Monica at the offices of the Natural Resources Defense Council in the Robert Redford Building, the "greenest" building of its kind in the United States. An existing building was taken over and 98% of its materials were recycled for use in the new three story, fifteen thousand

square-foot structure.

All building materials and furnishings reflect concern for the environment and for the health of the people who work there. No toxic materials were used, natural lighting and fresh air ventilation are incorporated into the design. Walls are made of hardyboard, recycled concrete mixed with sawdust which looks like wood but is fireproof and long lasting. Carpets are recycled nylon from a local manufacturer who uses an innovative water-saving process. Paint is low in VOC's (volatile organic compounds, the chemicals that produce the "new" smell in many buildings).

Rainwater is collected and stored in a cistern in the basement; double plumbing allows reclaimed water to be used in flushing toilets, and waste water is filtered before it goes into the storm drain system. All windows open to take advantage of the nearby ocean breezes, and in the parts that are air conditioned, air socks diffuse the air conditioning to cool more effectively. When wood is used, it is either recycled or from sustainable sources such as bamboo. Plantings are drought resistant and are watered by drip irrigation. Solar panels on the roof generate 20% of the building's needs, but the energy saving design saves up to 75% compared to other buildings of similar size.

In addition to its environmental features, it is an aesthetically pleasing work space, with offices opening to a wide central gallery, light wells to provide sunlight and open air space for meals and meetings. City zoning requires retail space to promote foot traffic, so a small store for NRDC items and an educational hub focusing on oceans, toxins, global warming and sustainable construction was added. This area also houses the Leonardo di Caprio online activist center.

The Natural Resources Defense Council was founded in 1970 by a group of Yale Law School graduates and a group of scientists, with funding from a Ford Foundation grant. It helped pass the Clean Water Act and much of the pioneering legislation of that period.

(Continued on page 6)

(Continued from page 5)

Gail Ruderman Feuer, one of NRDC's leading attorneys and an authority on air quality law, spoke following the tour. The nine attorneys in the Los Angeles office deal mainly with air and water, ecological system preservation and environmental justice.

Air pollutants both visible and microscopic exacerbate asthma and respiratory illness, and contribute to 50,000 deaths every year. Smog and ozone also cause cancer, with diesel exhaust as the main carcinogenic. The federal level of acceptable risk from air pollution is one death per one million; in parts of the Los Angeles basin, pollution is 1200 to 1500 times that figure. Although air quality in the basin has improved since 1970, six years ago this trend began to be reversed. And the "easy stuff" has been done; attaining cleaner air is ever more difficult. Diesel regulation has been lax, and even though the USEPA will require all diesel trucks to be 90% less polluting by 2007, this will affect only new trucks, and not the many old trucks which should be fitted with particulate traps. Progress has been made in retrofitting school buses, trash trucks and some city buses. Most RTD buses in Los Angeles County have been converted to CNG (natural gas) as have those in the Coachella and some of the OCTA buses in Orange County. Programs for trading credits have not been successful. Hand held blowers and gardening tools are a concern. Consumer products are among the biggest polluters: hair spray and deodorant sprays, even when they are not aerosols, put VOC's into the air in surprisingly large quantities.

Among its many actions, NRDC brought a successful law suit against the grocery chains, who settled by agreeing to convert their fleets of trucks to natural gas. Recently Ms. Feuer was the lead attorney in a successful lawsuit against the Port of Los Angeles, which had undertaken a large expansion without going through environmental procedures. The port has not yet implemented all the requirements, but one outcome may be that some container ships will be required to use electric rather than diesel power while in port. Ships are major polluters and regulating them is difficult because they are international.

What can we do to help with air pollution? Stop

using hair spray, keep informed about what the AQMD is doing and about state and federal regulatory changes, and join activist networks online and elsewhere. Ms. Feuer stressed that thousands of emails can make a difference in influencing legislators, officials and regulators.

Margo Reeg
ENACT Co-Chair

HEALTH CARE

SB 921: Passing Fundamental Health Care Reform May Take Years, But We Have to Start Now

Californians know our health care system is in crisis. Every day's headlines bring striking news of its collapse. From abandoned hospitals to the buckling emergency system to workers fighting to defend health care coverage for themselves and their families, the issue of health care has raced to the top of people's concerns. A single-payer system, with a public health trust fund acting as the single insurer, would save about \$14 billion in administrative costs, would reduce drug and equipment costs by about \$4 billion, and would reduce emergency room costs by about \$3 billion – more than enough to provide coverage to all Californians without spending a dollar more than we do now on health care was shown in a 2002 study of the single payer proposal. A similar study of the fiscal impact of SB 921 is underway and the results will be available in May. Senator Kuehl's SB 921 would establish a single-payer system and has already passed the Senate.

But SB 921, as the Senator and the bill's supporters are fully aware, will require a multi-year effort. Why, then, is it so important for us to support it now? First, the system is too near collapse to wait four years before we embark on a multi-year lobbying effort to address its fundamental unsoundness. Fighting for SB 921 and educating legislators and the public about our broken and unfair system will mean that we won't be starting the conversa-

(Continued on page 7)

(Continued from page 6)

tion about fundamental reform in three to four years – we'll be ready to implement it. Second, as more and more Californians are affected by our broken system, more are listening to a message of fundamental reform.

Already, one in five Californians does not have health insurance. One in two bankruptcies is related to medical bills. Our public system is disintegrating. Health insurance premiums have increased by double digits in each of the last three years, putting the squeeze on businesses, on labor, and on families.

In short, our system is self-destructing, and people are ready to engage in a dialogue about real reform. An ABC/Washington Post poll in October 2003 found that people prefer a system providing universal coverage to the current system of employer-based coverage by a 2-1 margin.

SB 921 passed the Senate last year, and this year advocates are organizing for a tough battle in the Assembly Health Committee, which could take place as early as April. The League of Women Voters of California strongly supports SB 921. Here's how individual League members can help.

Join the effort now – and help push SB 921 through the Assembly Health Committee this year! You can find everything you need to take the action at the SB 921 campaign web site at <http://www.sb921campaign.org>.

What you can do:

Contact your Assembly Member as soon as possible and ask them to vote Yes on SB 921. You can use arguments from the above text. Los Angeles County Assembly Members of the Assembly Health Committee who need to hear from you.

Assembly Member George Nakano, 53rd AD, 916 319 2053, Sacramento, CA 95814

Assembly Member Dario Frommer, 43rd AD, 916 319 2043, Sacramento, CA 95814

Assembly Member Gloria Negrete McLeod, 61st AD, 916 319 2061, Sacramento, CA 95814

Assembly Member Mark Ridley-Thomas, 48th AD, 916 319 2048, Sacramento, CA 95814

Assembly Member Ed Chavez, 57th AD, 916 319 2057, Sacramento, CA 95814

Assembly Member Keith Stuart Richman, 36th AD, 916 319 2038, Sacramento, CA 95814

Stay informed. Sign up for Senator Kuehl's Health Care for All Californians Action Alert list at www.healthcareforall.org. You'll receive news, actions, and updates every month.

*Sheila Hoff,
LWV/LAC Health Care Director*

LWVCEF EDUCATION UPDATE **STUDY—Step I: Educating Ourselves**

(The following is the first in a series of articles that will be distributed to local Leagues in California for use by local study committees and for reproduction in local League VOTERS. For an electronic copy, please email Barbara Inatsugu, LWVCE/EF Program Director for Education, at LWVinatsugub@aol.com. Copies are available in both Word and WordPerfect.)

PUBLIC SCHOOL FUNDING IN CALIFORNIA

At the last LWVC State Convention, local League delegates voted for an update of our Education position, utilizing such resources as the Master Plan for Education report and recommendations and other materials. Before we can move into an analysis of these recommendations it is imperative that we all have a basic understanding of the current education system. As school districts around California are currently in the process of developing their budgets for 2004-05, we thought it seemed appropriate to start with how our public schools are funded in California.

EdSource has developed several publications in this area that we will utilize to assist our study. All of these publications are available for free on the EdSource website www.edsource.org. They include:

(Continued on page 8)

(Continued from page 7)

Q&A: The Basics of California's School Finance System (2 pages) August 2003
http://www.edsource.org/pub_qa_finance.cfm

This publication gives background on the different sources of revenue, how funding is determined and distributed to schools, and briefly introduces the question: Are we funding our schools adequately and fairly?.

Q&A: The School District Budget Process (2 pages) August 2003
http://www.edsource.org/pub_qa_budget.cfm

This publication explains the budget process from who decides how the funds are spent in local school districts. It includes pressures school districts face when creating their budgets, and how the public can get information and get involved in the local process.

How California Ranks: The state's expenditures for K-12 education (4 pages) August 2003
http://www.edsource.org/pub_abs_ranks03.cfm

This publication compares how California ranks on education funding, class size and teacher salaries when compared to other states.

The following two publications are also available online or in hard-copy and will add to the depth of your resource materials regarding public school finance in California.

2004-05 Budget Analysis (Legislative Analyst= Office) - Education

http://www.lao.ca.gov/analysis_2004/education/education_anl04.pdf#page=37 - This document is the Education chapter of the much larger LAO's *Analysis of the 2004-05 Budget Bill*. Pages 37-57 describe and analyze the Governor's Consolidation Proposal and present alternative ideas.

School Finance and California's Master Plan for Education

http://www.ppic.org/content/pubs/R_601JSR.pdf -

This document, published by the Public Policy Institute of California, was used by the Finance & Facilities Working Group for the K-12 Final Report of the Joint Committee to Develop a Master Plan. It contains information on governance, adequacy, and possible funding options for state and local revenues.

The Education Study committee is also working on several other public education-related areas, including governance, school district organization, accountability, teaching, curriculum and the implications of the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB).

We encourage local Leagues to host forums using these materials as we bring them forward. This is a wonderful opportunity to connect with other organizations in your communities, such as your local PTA and other parent groups, your local school district, your business communities, and other individuals and organizations.

There are many ongoing discussions in Sacramento regarding changes in how we fund schools. It is important that we all have a good understanding of what we have now before exploring possible changes in education funding.

**SPEAK OUT FOR
REPRODUCTIVE JUSTICE!**

June 8, 2004

Sacramento Convention Center
9:00 to 4:30

- EDUCATE your Legislators
- CAUCUS with Women's Health Advocates from all over California
- PROTECT Women's Health
- LEARN about emerging issues

For more information contact:

Jo Ann Madigan (415) 346-0563

jomadigan@earthlink.net

Structural Budget Gap Begs for Reform



Policymakers are struggling to find ways to close California's persistent structural budget gap. A structural deficit exists when the state's taxes, fees and other revenue sources are insufficient to fund existing service levels adjusted for population growth and inflation.

The Legislative Analyst estimates the gap at \$15 billion and states that the spending cuts, deferrals, etc. in the Governor's proposed budget would not eliminate it but merely reduce it to \$5-7 billion per year. Only some combination of ongoing spending cuts or revenue increases can close a structural gap.

Where did the gap come from? One major element is the heavy dependence of California's budget on the personal income tax. Taxes on capital gains and stock options ballooned to \$17.6 billion in 2000-01 and then fell to \$6.2 billion in 2003-04.

Another large factor is the substantial tax cuts of the 1990s. Tax cuts enacted since 1998-99 alone have reduced annual state revenues by approximately \$5.6 billion.

The economic downturn and demographic factors have also played a part. Revenues have gone down, but population has gone up, especially in groups needing government services.

State income taxes are deductible on federal income tax forms. That means that when the rate in California was decreased to 9.3 percent, more income was taxed at the federal level. Restoring the 10 and 11 percent tax rates in California would add revenue for the needs within the state while reducing the amount of Californians' income going to the federal government. On average, the higher state taxes paid by top-bracket earners would be more than offset by recent federal tax cuts.

Sales tax revenue has declined over the years as a share of personal income because of a shift from consuming goods to purchasing services, and of increased Internet and mail-order sales. The California Budget Project estimates that if the same share of personal income went to taxable goods as in the late 1970s, revenues would be \$10.2 billion higher. Taxing some services could help fill the structural budget gap.

California is one of only three states that routinely require a 2/3 vote to pass the state budget. This empowers the minority disproportionately, whereas a majority vote requirement would actually place responsibility on legislators, making them take ownership of the budget and the process. Perhaps less negotiation about "pork barrel" budget items would take place.

The hidden budget—tax expenditures—also plays a part. Never comparing the choices within the budget to the "off budget" credits, exemptions, and deductions makes it difficult to make decisions about the revenues and programs most important to managing our state. And while raising taxes requires a 2/3 vote in the legislature, granting a tax break that lowers someone's taxes takes only a simple majority.

The \$15 billion bond to cover California's existing debt is giving the governor and legislature some breathing room. It has given them time to address structural impediments to a balanced budget. We need to consider what size budget is necessary when we have more people living longer, when there are more children in our schools and when we want our citizens to be healthy.

May 2004

**League of Women Voters
of Los Angeles County**

Margo Reeg, President
Chris Carson, Editor
carsonlww@earthlink.net

We're on the Web!!
<http://lacilo.ca.lwvnet.org>

Calendar

May 11—LWVLAC Board Meeting, LA League Office

May 15-16—LWVC Leadership Council, Sacramento

June 2—WPC Meeting, LA League Office

June 8—Sacramento Lobby Day (See Page 8)

June 8-9—LWVLAC Board Retreat

July 13—LWVLAC Board Meeting

July 24—Popovers in Pasadena, Women's City Club

**SUBSCRIBE TO THE
LWV/LAC NEWSLETTER!!!**

Sign Up Today!! For hard copy subscriptions, the subscription is \$10.00 per year. If you receive it by email, it's free!!

Name _____

Address _____

City _____ Zip _____

Local League _____

Email Address _____

For information, contact carsonlww@earthlink.net