



FREMONT, NEWARK & UNION CITY

MARCH 2012

Sunshine Week

March 13 – 18 is Sunshine Week, a nationwide effort to call attention to transparency in government and freedom of information. A Pew Research Center study, released earlier this month, showed that those who think local government does well in sharing information "are also more likely to be satisfied with other parts of civic life."

How well does your local government share information? We all have the right to know what our government is doing – both its successes and failures. Our right to know allows us to contribute to our government and hold government accountable.

For decades, the League of Women Voters has acted as a government watchdog at the federal, state and local levels. **Become a member and join us** in monitoring your local government's budget, observe meetings, and hold them accountable. Join us in making our community a healthy, vibrant and strong community for all.

IN THIS ISSUE

Privatization	p. 3
Consensus Questions	p. 8
In Memorium	p.10

March 12 7-9 P.M. League Office
3375 Country Drive, Fremont

Why is this study important?

In an effort to save money many local and state entities are 'farming out' duties that they previously performed themselves. When this happens does the public lose the opportunity to monitor actions that were previously transparent and accountable? This is only one aspect of Privatization that will be discussed in the consensus meeting.

Other questions members will tackle include:

- Are corporations subject to "Sunshine laws?" Should they be?
- Do Privatized services provide the same degree of concern for the Public Well-being?
- Can Privatized services provide the same quality of services for a reduced cost?
- Will Privatized services compromise environmental protections?
- Is there a way for the government to take over Privatized services if the corporation fails?
- What types of regulations should governments have in place before Privatizing?
- What enforcement resources should be available if government standards are not met by the contractor?

Consensus questions are on pp.8-9. Take a look and come ready to discuss them with other members.

President's Message



A news article reported recently that more American civilians working for businesses that catered to the U.S. military died than

military personnel in Iraq and Afghanistan. The American military services are increasingly using civilians for feeding, transporting, chauffeuring, etc. the military than ever before.

We have heard of libraries, railroads and water departments being turned over to private corporations and businesses. The League wants to be able to comment on these issues. Therefore, we must study them and arrive at a consensus and a position.

Please read the "privatization" papers in our Voter and on the LWVUS website and come to our "privatization" study meeting on Monday, March 12 and help us tackle these complicated issues.

Recently we just saw two versions of democracy in action in Newark and Fremont where a city council member and a mayor, respectively, were appointed to fill vacant terms. The Newark Council went directly from hearing twelve people give their qualifications for being appointed to the Council to a motion picking one of the twelve. Fremont included several steps, a televised interview of each candidate in council chambers, a ranked choice vote of Council members with the city clerk tabulating the results, followed by a motion to appoint one individual as the interim Mayor. We would encourage every elected body in our Tri-City area to have transparent selection policies in place should a vacancy occur again.

Published 10 times a year by the League of Women Voters of Fremont, Newark, and Union City (LWVFNuc)

PO Box 3218 Fremont, CA 94539

510-794-5783

www.lwvfnuc.org

Editor Alex Starr

Layout: Jane Mueller

BOARD OF DIRECTORS 2011-12

Officers

President	Miriam Keller president@lwvfnuc.org
VP Administration VP Program	Sam Neeman Barbara Friedrich program@lwvfnuc.org
VP Voter Service	Sets Amann voterservice@lwvfnuc.org forumsclub@lwvfnuc.org
Secretary	Carolyn Hedgecock
Treasurer	Peter Starr

Directors

Membership Chair	Andrea Schacter membership@lwvfnuc.org
Voter Editor	Alex Starr voteredit@lwvfnuc.org
Publicity Chair	Isabelle McAndrews publicity@lwvfnuc.org
At Large	Kathy Bray
At Large	Martha Crowe
At Large	Judy Keller
Facilities	Eleanor Pickron

Off Board

Education Cmte. Chair	Miriam Keller
Action/Cable Cmte. Chair	Kay Emanuele action@lwvfnuc.org
Webmaster/Db Admin	Peter Starr webmaster@lwvfnuc.org
Admin Team	Jean Holmes
Membership Team	Sam Neeman Kathy Steel-Sabo Lynn Locher
Nominating Cmte.	Marilyn Singer Jean Holmes Gail Blalock

Privatization

League member Isabelle McAndrews provides us with a summary of a very long background article.

When Public Accountability Applies to the Private Sector

Open government is considered essential for a successful democracy. It is nearly impossible for the People to make government accountable for its actions if government conducts its business in secrecy. Both the federal and state governments have enacted transparency laws to enable its citizens to participate and scrutinize the effectiveness of governmental action. When services and governmental functions are transferred into private hands should the People be able to access records kept by the private entity? This question is discussed by Diane DiIanni in her paper entitled, ‘The Legal Framework of ... Accountability within the Context of Privatization.’ This article is a brief summary of DiIanni’s paper.

To understand why a private sector body may need to reveal its records, it is helpful to review the differences between the private sector and the public sector. The private sector primarily “benefits and financially enrich[es] one or more specific individuals... [so] as to enhance the value of the privately held assets....” By contrast, a public entity operates to promote the general welfare by carrying out governmental functions. To that end, our government is required by transparency laws to conduct its affairs in an open manner to ensure public accountability.

Two federal transparency laws familiar to most people are the federal Sunshine Act and the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA). The federal Sunshine Act requires agencies to provide advance public notice of each meeting and to permit the public to observe its meetings.

Under certain exceptions, an agency may be exempt from opening a meeting to the public. Even when a meeting is closed, a complete transcript must be retained summarizing the deliberations and actions taken.

FOIA requires each agency within the executive branch to promptly release its records upon request, provided that the request reasonably describes the records. Although the government may charge for searching and copying the records, the Act requires records to be made available at a reduced charge if the disclosure would be in the public interest.

States also have open meeting laws similar to the Sunshine Act. Like the Sunshine Act, States require advance public notice of a meeting and a permanent record of the proceedings to be available for public access. “In many states, the law also provides that any action taken at a meeting of a public body in violation of the state’s open meeting law is void and of no effect.”

Certain state legislatures apply their transparency laws to private entities that receive or dispense public funds or to entities that are created or controlled by a public agency. While states have expanded their transparency laws to include private contractors performing public functions, Minnesota addresses this privatization issue at the contract level. In Minnesota, whenever government entities enter into a contract with a private person, the contract must state that all data generated or received by the private person in performing governmental functions are subject to the state’s public record act.

An example of a state’s challenge in accessing a contractor’s records involved Dismas Charities, a company that operates halfway houses for the state of Kentucky and throughout the United States. In 2009, Dismas received \$27 million from the US

Bureau of Prisons. Possible excessive expenditures by Dismas on entertainment and corporate compensation packages prompted the state auditor to investigate. Dismas refused to explain certain questionable expenditures to the Kentucky State

Auditor despite its dependency on public funding. Since Kentucky's contract lacked any provision authorizing Kentucky to review Dismas' records, the Auditor was unable to determine whether the expenditure of state funds by Dismas was unusual or excessive.

Public access litigation brought by the press has resulted in the development of the Functional Equivalency Test. This judicial doctrine states, "where a private contractor is performing a government function in such a manner that the contractor may be deemed the 'functional equivalent of a public body,' the public records laws...apply to that private entity in the same manner as if it were a public body." The following private entities were deemed subject to the public records laws by a court of law:

- New Hampshire Housing authority that dispensed public funds for low-income residents' housing.

- A nonprofit entity whose members were appointed by the mayor of Baltimore.
- A private firm that had the ability to enter into contracts that bound the government, as well as received public funding for its services.

Courts have occasionally held that a private entity did not need to comply with transparency laws. For example, the Connecticut Humane Society was deemed to neither be performing a public function nor to be controlled by a government body.

Private entities can be subject to transparency laws under legislative, judicial and contractual mechanisms. These mechanisms are designed to enable the People to stay informed and participate in open government. Proposals to privatize a government function should be carefully evaluated to ensure that transparency is preserved. In this manner, the People's duty in effectively overseeing government is assured.

Mentoring

There is so much to learn when one is new to the League of Women Voters. Does it ever seem as if you are the only one having questions about our organization and its operation? Do you ever feel a little lost and are unsure how to get more involved? Well, you are not alone. Even long time board members acknowledge that it took them a number of years before they felt grounded in the culture and language of the League.

Since our League has a number of members who have recently joined, the Board decided to initiate a mentor program to facilitate learning and foster a sense of belonging among all of our members. The goal is to meet the needs of all members—new or not so new—who would benefit from a more thorough understanding of the League, its mission and goals, and how we accomplish those goals and ultimately provide service to our community.

Mentoring can take many forms, but usually involves a relationship between two people—the mentor and the mentee—who meet in a casual atmosphere in order for learning and growth to occur. We think that mentoring can provide a great way to learn more about the League and fully appreciate our unique role.

If you would like to be mentored, or serve as a mentor, please contact Andrea Schacter or Alex Starr.

DEREGULATION OF RAILROADS

By Ted Volskay

BACKGROUND

In 1870, a practice referred to as “pooling” occurred on a large scale among competing railroads as a means to enforce rate and fare agreements. Competing railroads agreed to the division of rail traffic and receipts at stipulated ratios. Arrangements for the division of rail traffic and receipts were referred to as “traffic pools” and “money pools,” respectively. By the late 1880s, strong public opposition to pooling and other monopolistic practices by industry led to passage of the Interstate Commerce Act of 1887.¹ Section 5 of the Interstate Commerce Act states:

That it shall be unlawful for any common carrier subject to the provisions of this act to enter into any contract, agreement, or combination with any other common carrier or carriers for the pooling of freight of different and competing railroads, or to divide between them the aggregate or net proceeds of the earnings of such railroads or any portion thereof...

In addition, the Act required that railroad rates be "reasonable and just" and that railroads publicize shipping rates, prohibited short/long haul fare discrimination, and created the Interstate Commerce Commission to hear complaints against the railroads and enforced laws against unfair practices.

By the 1920s, railroads faced significant financial challenges that could be attributed to federal regulations. Regulations at that time required railroads to service low density, unprofitable lines and to set minimum rates.² Transport of high volume products on major routes was effectively subsidizing unprofitable transport of low volume products on less traveled routes. Consequently, regulatory mandates, forcing railroads into inflexible rate structures and to maintain excess rail capacity, prevented firms from responding to external disturbances such as a recession, a change in

interest rates, or large and unanticipated changes in prices.³ In addition, regulatory inflexibility rendered the rail industry vulnerable to competitors, including barge transport and the developing truck freight industry.

Direct and indirect consequences of regulations at that time resulted in railroad companies having little incentive to invest in innovative technologies to improve operational efficiency. For example, large railroad companies would benefit from the use of cars with significantly higher hauling capacities. To offset the increased cost of specialized freight cars, the railroad would need to lower rates for the intended customer to induce a higher volume of rail traffic. However, the Interstate Commerce Commission usually opposed the new rate, presumably to protect smaller rail carriers that could not or would not invest in the new and more expensive high-capacity rail cars.⁴

The cost of union labor also contributed to the financial stress on railroads. An unintended consequence of regulations during this period was the strengthening rail industry labor unions. Industries, like the railroad industry, were dominated by a few large companies, and regulations limited the entry of potential railroad competitors. This benefited railroad labor unions because the unit cost (per worker) to organize employees was low, and the bargaining power of labor is leveraged when a large proportion of an industry workforce is unionized. In addition, union labor benefited from regulations that allowed rail carriers to pass wage increases to the consumer.⁵

Labor unions also contributed to railroad industry inefficiencies. Railroad unions negotiated work rules that defined appropriate crew sizes, which typically included a conductor, two or more brakemen and, sometimes, a fireman. Labor inefficiencies occurred when rail carriers made the conversion from steam-powered to diesel-powered locomotives.

That change required fewer crew members, but railroads were bound by union work rules to maintain the crew size. Similarly, the union and the rail industry agreed that the “work day” would be based upon mileage covered. Investments in improvements to increase train speed did not result in the anticipated profit potential for the rail industry because faster trains allowed union employees to work multiple shifts. This increased earnings without markedly increasing the number of hours worked each week.⁶

Privatization Case Study: Deregulation of Rail Freight Operations
Governmental Level: Federal Primary Privatization
Mechanism: Deregulation

Almost a century of regulating the railroad industry produced shipping rates that were incapable of responding to market changes, such as the emergence of the interstate highway system during the Eisenhower administration and growing competition from the trucking industry. Passage of the Railroad Revitalization and Regulatory Reform Act in 1976 and the Staggers Rail Act in 1980 provided the flexibility to allow rail pricing to respond to the marketplace, abandon unprofitable routes, and consolidate operations.⁷ More importantly, deregulation has put the U.S. rail freight industry on a more secure financial footing.

Since deregulation, rail carriers have been given the latitude to negotiate rates.⁸ Railroads are now able to negotiate rates directly with shippers, and the rail companies can tailor their capacity and services to the customer’s production and inventory policies.⁹ In addition, railroads are now able to abandon unprofitable routes and consolidate their operations.¹⁰ One result of this has been a substantial increase in the number of smaller low-cost, non-union, railroads that bought less profitable railroad tracks from the larger railroads. Surprisingly, the actual competition generated by the market has become more intense compared to level of competition prior to deregulation.¹¹

Deregulation of the rail industry also allowed the railroads to adopt labor-saving information technologies, which made it possible to automate traffic control such as signaling, car management, dispatching and tracking.¹² Use of labor-saving technologies led to the elimination of the caboose (last car on a freight train that had a kitchen and sleeping facilities for crew members) and associated crew members.¹³ This resulted in an overall decline in the railroad workforce of approximately 52 percent from 1973 (pre-deregulation) to 1996. Despite the loss of railroad jobs and the introduction of smaller, nonunionized railroad companies, overall union membership in the rail industry workforce declined by only 9 percent, and the adjusted weekly earnings of rail workers remained about the same over the same 23-year period.¹⁴

External shocks to the economy, such as a change in interest rates, or fluctuations in the price of petroleum as well as deregulation of the trucking industry, have prompted the deregulated rail freight industry to improve customer service and operational efficiency, and rely heavily on innovation. The expanded use of intermodal operations, double stack rail cars, and computerized systems to track trains and manage railroad capacity has led to lower costs for shippers and higher profitability for rail interests.¹⁵

Things to Consider

- Although there was competition among railroads, the rail freight business was a virtual monopoly in certain parts of the United States prior to passage of the Interstate Commerce Act in 1887.
- Prior to passage of the Interstate Commerce Act in 1887, barge traffic along major river routes provided the only meaningful competition for bulk transport of freight outside the rail industry.
- Development of bulk transport by truck since the 1930s has provided more competition in the freight transport industry.

- The Interstate Commerce Commission initially was tasked with the authority to regulate railroads and was given the authority to regulate the trucking industry in 1935 following passage of the Motor Carrier Act.
- Competition between the rail and trucking industries became more significant after passage of the Federal-Aid Highway Act in 1956 and development of the interstate highway system by the Eisenhower administration.
- Rail and truck freight transport industries were both “deregulated” by 1980. However, passenger rail traffic is dominated by Amtrak, a government owned corporation.

- Railroad unions have remained relatively strong compared to the trucking and airline industries since they were deregulated. This is attributed to the oligopolistic nature of the rail freight business.¹⁶

Ted Volskay (LWVNC) is a member of the LWVEF Education Study Committee on Privatization of Government Services, Assets and Functions.

Produced by the Privatization of Government Services, Assets and Functions Study, 2011

© League of Women Voters

ENDNOTES

- 1 Emory R. Johnson and Thurman W. Van Metre (1918). "Chapter XVIII. Pools and Traffic Associations". *Principles of Railroad Transportation*. New York: D. Appleton. pp. 292-307. Not available online
- 2 James Peoples. "Deregulation and the Labor Market," *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, Volume 12, Number 3, pp. 111-130, (summer) 1998. Journal access limited to American Economic Assoc. members
- 3 Clifford Winston (1998). "U.S. Industry Adjustment to Economic Deregulation," *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, Volume 12, Number 3, pp. 89-110, (summer) 1998. Journal access limited to American Economic Assoc. members
- 4 Clifford Winston (2005). "The Success of the Staggers Rail Act of 1980," AEI-Brookings Joint Center for Regulatory Studies, Related Publication 05-24, October 2005. http://www.brookings.edu/~media/Files/rc/papers/2005/10_railact_winston/10_railact_winston.pdf
- 5 See endnote 2. 6 See endnote 2.
- 7 See endnote 2. William W. Wilson, Wesley W. Wilson, and Won W. Koo. "Modal Competition in Grain Transport," *Journal of Transportation Economics and Policy*, September 1988. <http://www.jstor.org/pss/20052857>
- 8 See endnote 2. 9 See endnote 3. 10 See endnote 2. 11 See endnote 3. 12 See endnote 2. 13 See endnote 4. 14 See endnote 2.
- 15 See endnote 4. 16 See endnote 2.

Voter Service

The Rules Have Changed: Elections 2012

There are significant changes for the 2012 elections. The Top Two primary system will be used in June. Online voter registration could be up and running in the summer and redistricting means that many voters will see different names on the ballot and/or new district lines and numbers. This is the time for voters to do their homework and avoid confusion at the ballot box. You can keep in touch with the latest election information by going to the League of Women Voter websites, including SmartVoter.org and CAVotes.org.

Privatization Study Consensus Questions

The purpose of this study is to identify policies and parameters that should be considered when any governmental entity is planning to undertake some type of privatization process.

1. As a general matter, the extent to which government functions, services and assets have been privatized in the past decade is:
 Much too much Too much About right Too little Much too little No consensus
2. Core government services and functions important to well-being of the people should remain with government and not be transferred to the private sector.
 Strongly agree Agree Disagree Strongly disagree No consensus
3. As a matter of good government policy, which of the following criteria should be applied when making decisions to transfer government services, assets and functions to the private sector?
 - a. Transparency and Accountability: All government contracts with private companies for services must ensure public access to relevant records and information regarding contracted services, functions and assets and provide for adequate government oversight and control.
 High priority Lower priority Not a priority No consensus
 - b. Public Well-being: Provisions are in place to assure that, in the event any public services are to be privatized, there will be no increased risks to public well-being, especially to vulnerable populations.
 High priority Lower priority Not a priority No consensus
 - c. Cost and Quality: Privatized services should not appreciably increase the costs or decrease the quality of services to the public.
 High priority Lower priority Not a priority No consensus
 - d. Environmental and Natural Resources: Defined parameters should be in place to assure that environmental and natural resources are not compromised.
 High priority Lower priority Not a priority No consensus
 - e. Contracts and Sales of Public Assets: All government contracts and privatized public assets should be subject to competitive bidding and comply with all laws regarding awarding contracts.
 High priority Lower priority Not a priority No consensus
 - f. Economic Impact: Privatization should not result in a negative economic impact on the communities in which the services are provided.
 High priority Lower priority Not a priority No consensus
 - g. Government Recovery of Services and Assets: Provisions should be in place to recover key services, assets and functions should the private sector fail to safeguard them.
 High priority Lower priority Not a priority No consensus
4. Privatization is not appropriate:
 - a. When the government lacks the will, ability or resources to adequately oversee contracts with the private entity and any successor thereto.
 Agree Disagree No Consensus
 - b. When there is no private entity able or willing to provide the service for the short and long term.
 Agree Disagree No Consensus
 - c. When it poses a potential threat to national security.
 Agree Disagree No Consensus
 - d. When it poses a risk to personal or security data.
 Agree Disagree No Consensus
 - e. When there has been evidence of potential corruption.
 Agree Disagree No Consensus
 - f. When the private entity's goals and purposes are not compatible with public well-being.
 Agree Disagree No Consensus
 - g. When the private entity has not complied with existing government requirements for public records, open meetings or publication of reports and audits.
 Agree Disagree No Consensus

h. When a loss of revenue decreases government support for mandated or critical services.

Agree Disagree No Consensus

5. Some states have developed laws and regulations to control the process of privatization within their jurisdictions.

As a general matter, should privatization be regulated?

a. Yes, all privatization efforts should be regulated.

b. Yes, some types of privatization efforts should be regulated.

c. No, privatization efforts should never be regulated

d. No consensus

6. Which of the following should be included in the regulatory process when privatizing public assets, services and functions?

a. Timely public announcements regarding intentions to privatize and the clear and measurable expected benefits to the public

Strongly agree Agree Disagree Strongly disagree No consensus

b. Public and stakeholder (investors, shareholders, experts) input into the decision and terms of the contract.

Strongly agree Agree Disagree Strongly disagree No consensus

c. Feasibility study regarding performance, costs and benefits.

Strongly agree Agree Disagree Strongly disagree No consensus

d. Adherence to all laws regarding public contracts..

Strongly agree Agree Disagree Strongly disagree No consensus

e. Transition plans for displaced employees.

Strongly agree Agree Disagree Strongly disagree No consensus

f. Accountability and transparency provisions in all contracts.

Strongly agree Agree Disagree Strongly disagree No consensus

g. Regular performance evaluations including meaningful opportunity for public comment.

Strongly agree Agree Disagree Strongly disagree No consensus

h. Provisions for transferring services and assets back to the government or another contractor in the event of inadequate performance.

Strongly agree Agree Disagree Strongly disagree No consensus

i. Adequate resources for enforcement.

Strongly agree Agree Disagree Strongly disagree No consensus

LWV California Legislative Priorities

Adopted by the LWVC Board of Directors on January 30, 2012

Priority Issues for Action in the Legislature:

- State and Local Finances/State Budget
- Support reform of the state budgeting process
- Support equitable and adequate generation and distribution of tax revenues

Other Legislative Issues, As Time and Resources Permit:

- Support requests from local Leagues and inter-League organizations (ILOs) for advocacy on bills of specific interest to their jurisdictions
- Take action as appropriate on core issues: Redistricting, Elections, Initiative and Referendum Process, Voting Rights, Campaign Finance Reform, and Reproductive Choices
- Consider Program Director recommendations for action on the highest priority bills in their program areas. We anticipate action in the areas of Health Care, and Campaign Finance Reform.

Statewide Ballot Measures:

- Review all statewide ballot measures and recommend a position or neutrality on each one to the LWVC Board of Directors

In Memoriam

Julianne Howe (1923 - 2011)

Julianne McDonald Howe died on December 30, 2011. Born in Livingston California, she came to the Bay Area when her father went to work for the California Nursery in Niles. She graduated from Washington Union High School, received a BA in Public Administration from UC Berkeley in 1945 and was a proud lifetime member of Phi Beta Kappa and the UC Alumni Association.

In December of 1944, Julianne married Lieutenant Francis Milton Howe, of Mission San Jose. After the war they set up housekeeping in Mission San Jose and founded Industrial Electric Manufacturing Company. As treasurer of the company, Julianne contributed to the Fremont business community for many years.

Julianne was active in local causes. She was a faithful member of St. Joseph's Parish, was close to the Dominican Sisters, the Sisters of the Holy Family, and the Sisters of the Holy Names.

She was a founding member of the Fremont, Newark and Union City League of Women Voters. She was a founding member of the Mission San Jose Historical Society and served on its board.

A lifelong ardent lover of nature and she was an accomplished amateur photographer, focusing on nature subjects. She worked extensively with camera groups and camera clubs in the Bay Area and Northern California. Julianne received many awards for her photographs, and was a regular winner at the Fremont Cultural Arts Council Annual Juried Photographic Exhibit.

Julianne is survived by one daughter, two sons, three grandchildren and one great grandchild. Julianne celebrated Christmas with her first great grand child, Aubin Daniel.

Phyllis Merrifield (1920-2012)

Arriving in Fremont from New York in 1961, Phyllis was active in the Fremont community for more than 50 years. Described as a one-woman tour de force, her coalition of entrepreneurial music lovers provided the impetus to create the Fremont Symphony Orchestra (FSO). In recognition of her achievements, Phyllis was awarded the Rotary Club's prestigious Paul Harris Award by Niles Rotary in 1990. The Symphony recognized Phyllis in 1998 for her generous support and 27 years of service on the board of directors. She sponsored the FSO Young Artist Competition from 1998-2002 and on November 28, 2011 was honored at a ceremony at Mission Coffee Roasting Company for her role in founding the Fremont Symphony Guild 46 years ago.

The League of Women Voters of Fremont had already formed when Phyllis and her family moved to Fremont and she became an active member almost the moment she arrived. Over the years, she served on the board of directors in many capacities, including president.

Phyllis served on the Alameda County Arts Commission for seven years, and the Fremont Cultural Arts Council, where she judged young artist competitions. She also served on the Artsfund Grants Panel, and volunteered at the Smith Center to assist with musical performances. A 48-year member of the Music Teachers Association of California, Phyllis taught piano even after moving into Merrill Gardens. She influenced multiple generations and helped her students appreciate good music.

Phyllis had a full and rich life, traveling the world; enjoying her many friends, relatives, and students; and always giving back to her community. She will be missed.

A memorial service will be held for Phyllis Merrifield at Merrill Gardens, 2860 Country Drive, in Fremont, Sunday, March 18 at 3 pm.

WELCOME TO OUR NEW MEMBER JUDY CHONG

Judy has been a resident of Fremont for 30 years and is married with 3 children & 2 grandchildren. She was formerly a pharmacist & received her training at UC Berkeley and UCSF. She received a masters degree from CSU East Bay & now works as an exercise physiologist & personal trainer. Her interests are healthcare, zoning & ecology.

WHY I JOINED THE LEAGUE

Editor's Note: We will be featuring a short paragraph from a current League member who answers the question, *Why I joined the League*. We hope this inspires you to ask friends and colleagues to join.

I joined the League of Women Voters of Fremont (as it was then called) in the mid-1970's so that I could learn more about the by Fremont community. I was encouraged to join the late Maxine Durney, director of the Fremont libraries, as a way to be involved in the community in one of the important organizations in Fremont. The connection with Fremont was wonderful, and the League helped me learn about local and California government and politics as we did local and state studies through the 1970's and 1980's. I was immediately impressed by the knowledge and intelligence of my fellow League members, and have learned from them over the years. Why have I remained a member since then? It's the League members who are so interesting and committed to the mission of the LWV, the local voter service work the League has done (I have always enjoyed moderating candidate forums), plus supporting the important work the League does locally and nationally.

Sandi Pantages

DID YOU KNOW...

From the Bulletin of the Special Convention of the National League of Women Voters, 1928 Chicago.

A Few Casual Reflections in a Presidential Year

The 'presidential year' makes the League's Department of Efficiency in Government assume an importance out of proportion perhaps to the other departments of work...

Preceding a nation-wide election for the chief executive of the country the people's mind is turned towards public problems as at no other time. Their imagination is stimulated, their hopes aroused. True, they concern themselves more with the candidates than they do with principles and while the sophisticated dread change, the unsophisticated expect too much from change. League experience, short as it has been (for eight years is but a fleeting second) has made many a woman politically weatherwise, and in this year of 1928 she will not expect too much or hope for too little.

When the spokesmen of the parties engage in large talk about ECONOMY, as they are sure to do, she will not be satisfied with generalities. She will wish to know just how these savings are to be effected.

When the campaign orators talk about HONESTY in elections the politically weatherwise lady is certainly going to inquire how soon the parties will insist that Congress enact a corrupt practices act which shall apply to primaries.

When they talk about EFFICIENCY in the public business she will want to know why the merit system in civil service cannot have a fair chance to demonstrate whether greater efficiency may not be got that way. She will certainly want to know whether election laws which provide for permanent registration, for appointment of officials without partisan considerations but on the basis of ability to perform the required duties would not operate to produce economy, honesty, and efficiency.

Elizabeth J. Hause

CALENDAR

Feb. 25	LWVC workshops	9-2 San Jose
March 12	Privatization Consensus Meeting	League Office 3375 Country Drive, Fremont
March 15	Action Committee	12-2 Kay's Home
March 27	Board Meeting	6:45 P.M. at League Office 3375 Country Drive, Fremont
May 19, 20	LWV Council	Holiday Inn Capitol Plaza, Sacramento
June 8-10	LWVUS National Convention	Washington Hilton, Washington, D.C.

ALL MEETINGS ARE FREE, OPEN TO THE PUBLIC AND WHEEL CHAIR ACCESSIBLE

Mission

The League of Women Voters of Fremont, Newark, and Union City, a nonpartisan political organization, encourages the informed and active participation in government, works to increase understanding of major public policy issues, and influences public policy through education and advocacy.

Diversity Policy

LWVFNUC affirms its commitment to reflect the diversity of our communities in our membership and actions. We believe diverse views are important for responsible decision making and seek to work with all people and groups who reflect our community diversity.

Join the LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS today!

Any person, man or woman, who subscribes to the purpose and policy of the League may join. To be a voting member, one must be at least 18 years of age and a U.S. citizen. Members under 18, or non-citizens, are welcome as non-voting Associate Members. Dues include membership in LWVFNUC, Bay Area League, and the California and National Leagues. Financial support for dues is available through our scholarship program. Contact Andrea Schacter, Membership Chair, for information.

Name (s) _____

New Member Renewal

Transfer from _____

Address _____

Phone _____

E-mail _____

*Please make your check payable to:
LWVFNUC and mail it with this
form to:*

LWVFNUC-MEMBERSHIP
P. O. Box 3218
Fremont, CA 94539

Individual Membership—\$60
 Household Membership—\$90
Donation to LWVFNUC

\$ _____

Donation to Ed. Fund (*Make
separate check payable to
LWVFNUC Ed Fund*)

\$ _____

Total Enclosed \$ _____