



League Embarks on National Education Study

Last year, when Leagues all over the United States participated in Program Planning, Leagues expressed an interest in studying the Federal role in public education. The national convention adopted this study, and after a year of preparation, LWVUS will embark on the study to arrive at consensus.

The scope includes history, funding, and equity issues under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act and the common core standards/assessments that are required for many Federal grants.

In this issue of the *Voter* are the first two in a series of five articles that provide members with information for our study and consensus this year.

IN THIS ISSUE...

Annual Reports	Page 3
State Convention	Page 5
LWVUS Ed Study	Page 6
Wave of the Future	Page 11
HOA Elections	Page 14

Membership Renewal Time Is Now!

Our League’s fiscal year runs from July 1 to June 30. Now is the time to pay your annual dues. Don’t let this slip to the bottom of your “to do” pile!!

Your renewal “bonus” is automatic membership in LWV California and LWVUS. We send a major portion of dues received to both levels, which enables them to advocate for us on important issues at the State Legislature and the U.S. Congress.

Think of all the benefits your dues will give you:

- Membership in local, state and national League
- The respect of your community
- Dialogue on issues you care about
- Preservation of our Constitutional rights
- Assurance that ALL votes are counted and ALL voices are heard
- Information via extensive League resources
 - Production of the *Voter* newsletter and *Facts for Voters*
- Resources of local Web site

Make out your check today —\$60 for single membership, \$90 for a household—and send it with the form on the back page. Or go online to <http://www.lwvfnuc.org>, click on Join Our League—Renew Your Membership. Renewing online saves us time and money!

Financial support for dues is available through our scholarship program. Contact Andrea Schacter, Membership Chair, for more information.

We believe that with your support, we can make democracy work. Remember: ***Democracy is not a spectator sport!***
Renew now!!

2011 Annual Meeting Sets Course for the Coming Year

LWVFNUC's Annual Meeting took place on June 4 at Sweet Tomatoes restaurant in Fremont. Attendees heard an address by Bob Wieckowski, a member of our League who was elected to the State Assembly last November. Minutes of the meeting will be posted on the Web site as soon as they are reviewed and approved.

Among the agenda items was election of officers and directors. The new Board is listed along the right side of this page.

Kay Emanuele read a poem she composed in honor of outgoing president Alex Starr:

*Our League is better with Alex Starr.
Her kindness and warmth is known afar.
We all know she is extremely smart.
But she thinks and speaks from her heart.
For years she's served as our leader.
Meetings, testimony—wherever we need her.*

*Although her health has not been at it's best,
She's been an inspiration to the rest.
With Peter's support, her focus not doubted.
Under her reign our League's highly touted.
Thank you dear Alex for all you have done.
You've got the respect from each and every one.*

The Voter

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.lwvf nuc.org

Editor Alex Starr

Layout: Jane Mueller

The LWVFNUC office is located at 3375 Country
Drive, Fremont

BOARD OF DIRECTORS 2011-12

Officers

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

Directors

Membership Chair	Andrea Schacter membership@lwvf nuc.org
Voter Editor	Alex Starr votered@lwvf nuc.org
Historian	Isabelle McAndrews
At Large	Kathy Bray
At Large	Martha Crowe
Publicity Chair	Judy Keller publicity@lwvf nuc.org

Off Board

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

Annual Reports for 2010-11

From the 2010-11 Board of Directors,
here are highlights of the past League year.

LWVFNUC Pursues Both Voter Service and Issue Advocacy During Year

By Alex Starr

Our League gathered information for the *Voter Information Book* for the November elections and mailed out over 35,000 copies to likely voters in Fremont and Union City. Our programs this year were interesting and informative, and our Action Committee

followed continuing issues of interest in open government, bullying in schools, housing and transportation. The Education Committee is gearing up for taking the lead on the LWVUS study on the role of the Federal government in education.

League Treasury Ends Year on Solid Footing

By Peter Starr

We have avoided a deficit this year and perhaps even have a small surplus. Most of our expenses ran below budget, and we had a \$924.00 rebate from LWVC for overcharges in our insurance for the past five years. This rebate was not anticipated in our 2010-11 budget.

We have budgeted \$13,885.00 for expenses for 2011-12, \$1500.00 less than last year. Our income budget includes \$3,970.00 from reserves.

Action Committee Trains Watchful Eye on Current Issues

By Kay Emanuele

The Action Committee meets just once a month, but plans, discusses, informs and influences many of our League's activities. This past year we kept a watchful eye on the Fremont Unified School District (FUSD) Health Sex Education Advisory Committee and heard reports from observer Marilyn Singer. We met with FUSD superintendent Dr. Morris to discuss certain issues and we feel satisfied that changes are coming.

Members of the Action Committee interviewed newly elected officials to learn more about their views and to introduce them to the League. Action also reviewed the candidate forums and the *Voter Information Booklet* to critique and suggest any changes or improvements. Members updated the

LWVFNUC publications *Guide to Government* and *Facts for Voters*. We continue to work to develop a successor to our *Voting Matters* cable TV program, which may appear online rather than cable.

At each meeting, a "specialist" reports on her area of interest: transportation, finance, education, housing and redevelopment, redistricting, community colleges, and health. The committee discusses topics and determines possible action or follow-up. A great deal of information is shared, and we leave each meeting better informed. Please consider joining us this coming year.

Continued on page 4

Annual Reports

Continued from page 3

Program Committee Brings Member Meetings into Focus

By Barbara Friedrich

During the past League year, the Program Committee scheduled the following topics and activities for our member meetings:

September: Pros and cons of three state ballot measures (19, 23, 25) by outside speakers

October: Local ballot issues with speakers from Fremont, Newark, and Union City

November: Fence line tour of the BART tunnel construction

December: Holiday potluck and program planning for State League

January: Speaker Dan Schoenholz on the Fremont General Plan

March: How the stimulus money was spent with speakers from Fremont, Union City, Fremont Unified School District, and Abode Services

April: Speak Up California: discussion led by California Forward on government reform

May: Bullying and its effects: panel discussion and DVD presentation sponsored by the Education Committee.

June: Annual Meeting speaker: Assemblymember Bob Wieckowski

Voter Service Spends Active Year Engaging Voters

By Sets Amann

Here's a recap of Voter Service activities from July 2010-May 2011:

July: Reported monthly on Marilyn Singer's observation of Fremont Unified School District Health and Sex Education Advisory committee. Delivered voter registration affidavits to local sites and reported to Registrar of Voters via LWV of Alameda County.

August: Developed appropriate questions for upcoming tri-city candidates forums for Nov. 2010 city councils and school trustees elections.

September: Held voter registration drive targeted to young voters at DeVry University on Sept. 3, Ohlone Newark Campus on Sept. 14, and Ohlone Main Campus in Fremont on Sept. 15 to coincide with Constitutional Day.

Provided following Candidates Forums chaired by Marilyn Singer:

Alameda County Supervisor

Newark Unified School District Trustees

UTT (TAX Measure in Newark)

Fremont City Council

Union City Council

Alameda County Water District

Fremont Unified School District Trustees

Ohlone College Trustees

20th Assembly District

Sunol School Board Trustees

Union City Council with Union City Chamber

Moderated a forum for the disabled community for Fremont Council Candidates

Continued on page 5

Annual Reports

Continued from page 4

Presented Pros & Cons of ballot propositions to several small groups

Held Public meeting to present ballot measures

Worked on *Voter Information Booklets* for Fremont and Newark

Ordered and delivered *Easy Readers* to voter registration affidavit delivery sites and other public places

October: Sets Amann, Andrea Schacter, and Eleanor Pickron spoke to civic education class at Fremont Adult School about November 2010 election.

November: Participated in Election Day as clerks at various polling places.

December: Discussed programs for January to June 2011 at League Christmas party

January: Interviewed newly elected Union City Council members Lorin Ellis, Emily Duncan, and Pat Gacoscos; interviewed newly elected New Haven Trustees Linda Canlas and Sarabjit Cheema. Reported to ROV on number of affidavits delivered to delivery sites and dates of visits. Reviewed candidates forums from November 2010 election.

February: Updated information for *Facts for Voters* brochure.

March: Attended California Redistricting Information Day and reported on newly elected Redistricting Commissioners and redistricting criteria. John Smith and Marilyn Singer interviewed newly elected Assemblymember Bob Wieckowski.

2011 STATE CONVENTION

Two Delegates Represent LWVFNUC at State Convention

QuickTime™ and a decompressor are needed to see this picture.

Miriam Keller and Syeda Inamdar represented our League at the LWV State Convention, held in May in Ventura. A Smart Voter workshop started the pre-convention activities. The Smart Voter award was presented to the founder of the Smart Voter Web site, Carl Hage.

Miriam Keller attended a workshop about how to convert a League to 501C3 status. It is a complicated process but can have the advantage of generating more donations for a local League by qualifying them for a tax deduction

For a rundown on which Leagues received awards for Web sites, check out the Members Only section of the LWVC Web site.

Recommended program items included an update on the League's initiative and referendum position, education and advocacy on state and local finances, and community education on the initiative and referendum processes. Only one non-recommended program item, criminal justice, passed. No resolutions were presented for the delegates to consider.

In 2012, the Leadership Council will be held the weekend after Mother's Day in Sacramento. The 2013 LWVC Convention's location has not yet been announced.

The History of Federal Government in Public Education: Where Have We Been and How Did We Get Here?

Produced by the LWVUS The Education Study: The Role of the Federal Government in Public Education

Where Have We Been?

From the very beginning of our Republic, a well-educated citizenry was thought to be essential to protect liberty and the general welfare of the people. Even before the Constitution was established, the Land Ordinance of 1785 and the Northwest Ordinance of 1787 included responsibilities of the nation for an education system. Education has long been considered a national concern by the federal government. Through federal action, education has been encouraged and financially supported from the first Northwest Ordinance in 1785 to the present. Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution granted Congress the power to lay and collect taxes to provide for the general welfare of the United States. It is under this “general welfare” clause that the federal government has assumed the power to initiate educational activity in its own right and to participate jointly with states, agencies and individuals in educational activities.

During the first century of our new nation, Congress granted more than 77 million acres of the public domain as an endowment for the support of public schools through tracts ceded to the states. In 1841, Congress passed an act that granted 500,000 acres to eight states and later increased land grants to a total of 19 states. The federal government also granted money, such as distributions of surplus federal revenue and reimbursements for war expenses, to states.

Though Congress rarely prescribed that such funds be used only for schools, education continued to be one of the largest expenses of state and local governments so the states used federal funds whenever possible for education.

Two of our constitutional amendments played an important role in public education. In 1791, the 10th Amendment stated, “The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.” Public education was not mentioned as one of those federal powers, and so historically has been delegated to the local and state governments.

In 1868, the 14th Amendment guaranteed rights to all citizens by stating, “all persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens in the United States and of the state wherein they reside. No state shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any state deprive any person of life, liberty or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the law.”

On the next page is a brief historical overview of federal involvement in public education.

See page 7

History of the Role of the Federal Government in Public Education

Event	Date	Explanation
Land Ordinance & Northwest Ordinance	1785/ 1787	Requirement of a system of public education to be established in each township formed under a specified formula. Regulated monies raised via taxes and selling or renting land.
Land Grants	1841/ 1848	Congress granted 77+ million acres of land in the public domain as endowments for support of schools. Federal government also granted surplus money to states for public education.
Early philosophy – first six presidents		Discussion of a national university and urging of federal involvement in public education. Seen as critical to preparation for citizenship in a republican form of government.
First Morrill Act otherwise known as the Land Grant Act	1862	Donated public lands to states to be used for the endowment to support and maintain at least one college with specific purpose of teaching branches of agriculture, mechanic arts and industrial education.
Original Dept. (Office) of Education established	1867	Began to collect data – information on schools and teaching that would help states establish effective school systems.
Second Morrill Act	1890	Gave the Office of Education responsibility for administering support for the original system of land-grant colleges.
Smith-Hughes Act	1917	Promoted vocational schools
Lanham Act Impact Aid laws	1941 1950	Eased the burden on communities affected by presence of military and federal installations: payments to school districts.
GI Bill	1944	Provided post secondary education assistance to GIs returning from World War II
George-Barden Act	1946	Provided funding for agricultural, industrial and home economics training for high school students
National Defense Education Act	1958	In response to Soviet Sputnik. NDEA included support for loans to college students in science, mathematics and foreign languages.
Elementary and Secondary Education Act	1965	Established comprehensive set of programs including Title I of federal aid to disadvantaged.
Title IX	1972	Prohibited discrimination in education based on gender.
Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act	1973	Prohibited discrimination based on disability.
Department of Education cabinet level agency	1980	Recognized the important role of public education in our country.
Educational Testing Service (ETS) and NAEP	1983	Federal government transferred responsibility for administering the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) to ETS: the nation's report card.
Nation at Risk	1983	Report indicating that the USA was falling behind in education achievement.
President G.H. Bush	1989- 1992	“Indian Education Bill of Rights” K-12 Drug awareness model Advisory committee on Hispanic education America 2000 education reform program Work began on national standards
President W. Clinton	1993- 1999	Academics 2000 offered grant to states / local school districts for innovation. Teach for America.
President G.W. Bush	2001-08	Reauthorization of ESEA –No Child Left Behind.
President Barack Obama	2009 -	President Obama's Blueprint for Reform – Reauthorization of ESEA. Race to the Top: Grants awarded to states with innovative ideas that accepted the Common Core Standards.

The History of Federal Government in Public Education: **Legislation and Funding for the Education of Children with Special Needs**

Produced by the LWVUS The Education Study: The Role of the Federal Government in Public Education

In 1965, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) was passed by Congress. ESEA was the center of President Johnson's War on Poverty and was influenced by the Civil Rights Act of 1964. The children who were covered by ESEA in 1965 included those who were disabled and covered by an amendment to the original ESEA (Title IV – Aid to handicapped children).

Within the next decade, the education of disabled children was funded by a separate law: the Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975 (EAHCA). Over a 35-year span, the law was reauthorized and became the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), the latest of which was reauthorized in 2004 and called the Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act (IDEIA). The upcoming reauthorization of ESEA will also influence how IDEIA is administered and practiced.

IDEIA has four sections that cover the Free and Appropriate Education (FAPE) of 6.6 million disabled children who are age 0-21.

- Part A (General Provisions)
- Part B (Assistance for Education of All Children with Disabilities)
- Part C (Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities)
- Part D (National Activities to Improve Education of Children with Disabilities)

Mandates in Special Education Funding

Funding requires adherence to the federal mandates. The most important mandate is the zero-reject policy, under which no child is turned away from educational services. To qualify for special education service, a student must be classified with one (or more) of 13 disabilities now covered by IDEIA. The definition of “a child with a disability” is found in the United States Code, Title 29 1401(3) (A):

3) The term ‘child with a disability’ means a child— (i) with mental retardation, hearing impairments (including deafness), speech or language impairments, visual impairments (including blindness), serious emotional disturbance (referred to in this chapter as “emotional disturbance”), orthopedic impairments, autism, traumatic brain injury, other health impairments, or specific learning disabilities; and (ii) Who, by reason thereof, needs special education and related services.

The federal government demands that states submit plans for the distribution of monies to local agencies for direct instructional programming that adhere to federal mandates. Under each state's laws, an Individualized Educational Program (IEP) is constructed for each child receiving services. The purpose of an IEP is to assure the student of a FAPE, as ensured by law. The child is to be placed in the Least Restrictive Environment (LRE) for education.

Continued on page 9

Special Needs Education

Continued from page 8

In order to qualify for federal funds, state and local agencies are bound to federal guidelines to specify identification procedures and the placement of disabled children. State grant applications for federal funds must include a plan for distribution of the funds to local education agencies (LEAs), as well as sufficient time for the general public to review and comment on the state plan. LEAs receive allotments from the state for their district special education needs. The shortfall in funding then needs to be addressed by the local education agencies.

Current Funding Challenges

Federal Underfunding: The Education for All Handicapped Children Act (1975) included legislation for funding local programs through state distribution of 40 percent of the cost. “Full funding” (40 percent) has never happened; the actual amount has varied. There were federal funds covering from 8 to 10 percent of the cost to states ten years ago, according to Katsiyannis, et al. (2001). The FY 2012 U.S. Department of Education Budget lists 17 percent as the current figure, with an estimated \$1,765 cost per pupil. The allotment has increased 1.7 percent in the FY 2012.

Increasing enrollment: Special education enrollment has grown, from 3.8 million in 1973 to 6.6 million in 2011. Federal special education support increases for FY 2012 are held at 1.7 percent over FY 2011.

Maintenance of effort: Because of severe financial straits, more states are applying for waivers to the spending requirement by the federal government for special education funding. The waiver, called a Maintenance of Effort (MOE) has not been easily obtained and involves holding a spending pattern based on the previous year. Waivers were given to Iowa, West Virginia, and Kansas last year; waivers are pending for New Jersey, South Carolina and Alabama (Shah, 2011).

Inclusion and training: Currently, ninety-five percent of disabled children are educated in inclusive classrooms, the rest being educated in separate classes, institutions or at home. An increase in inclusion practices is a strong possibility for fund-strapped districts (Shah, 2011). The balancing act – attention to finances, while providing for children’s needs – continues to be precarious, and it is also critical to provide teachers with quality in-service training.

References

- Katsiyannis, A., Yell, M. & Bradley, R. (2001). Reflections on the 25th anniversary of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. *Remedial and Special Education*, Vol.22, (6), 324-34.
- Shah, N. (2011, February 14). States expected to seek special education funding waivers. *Education Week*. Retrieved from <http://www.edweek.org/ew/articles/2011/02/09/20speced.h30.html>
- U.S. Department of Education. Fiscal Year 2012 Budget Overview. Supporting Individuals with Disabilities. Retrieved from <http://www2.ed.gov/about/overview/budget/budget12/summary/edlite-section2b.html>
- U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. Digest of Education Statistics. Chapter 2, Table 45. Children 3 to 21 years served under Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, Part B, by type of disability: Selected years, 1976 through 2008-09. Retrieved from http://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d10/tables/dt10_045.asp?referrer=list
- U.S. Department of Education (2004). Retrieved from <http://www.ed.gov/policy/speced/guid/idea/idea2004.html>.

Special Education Legislation Milestones

Decade	Case/Legislation	Result
1950	1954: <i>Brown v. Board of Education</i>	Paved the way for special needs children to receive better education, but at this time children were still denied an education based on their disability.
1960	Bureau of Education for Handicapped Created. 1965: Elementary and Secondary Education Act became law.	No funding for handicapped under federal or state law. Amendment to original ESEA Title IV – Aid to handicapped children.
1970	1972: <i>PARC v Pennsylvania</i> and <i>Mills v. Board of Education</i> 1973: Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act became law. 1974: Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) became law. 1975: Education for All Handicapped Children Act (EAHCA) became law,	Ruled: Disabled have equal rights. Protected disabled individuals from discrimination due to disability. Parents gained access to all information maintained by a school district on their students. Free appropriate public education for all handicapped students.
1980	1986: Addition of <i>Handicapped Children's Protection Act</i> to EAHCA.	Mandated that all school students and parents have rights under both Section 504 and EAHCA.
1990	1990: EAHCA amended and called <i>Individuals with Education Disabilities Act</i> (IDEA). 1996: I D E A reauthorized.	IDEA reauthorized. Additions include students to be included in state and national assessments, inclusion (Least Restrictive Environment, LRE). Regular classroom teachers now required to take part in an Individual Education Plan (IEP) team.
2000	2001: No Child Left Behind became the title of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. 2004: Reauthorization of IDEA (P.L. 101-476) now called IDEIA.	Accountability at state and local levels required. School districts are required to provide more instruction and interventions to help prevent enrollment in special education. Response to Intervention (RTI) gains momentum as a screening tool. Students are expected to take responsibility for their behavior and are subject to the same rules as the rest of the students.

© 2011 by the League of Women Voters of the United States

Facing the Wave of the Future

By Alec MacDonald

The next time you look out over the vast blue magnificence of the San Francisco Bay, keep this figure in mind: 16 inches. That's how high you can expect the water to rise by the year 2050 as a result of global warming. From the perspective of a casual observer, it might seem an inconsequential change. However, this increase represents a menace that's difficult to comprehend just by surveying the situation with the naked eye.

Those mere 16 inches translate into flood vulnerability for a whopping 281 square miles, more than a third of which is residential land. At risk are 99 miles of major roads and highways, 70 miles of railroads, and nearly three-quarters of both the San Francisco and Oakland airports. The area also runs thick with pipes and transmission lines carrying necessities like gasoline, electricity, and drinking water. More than 400 points of public access to the Bay — sites such as waterfront parks, piers, trails, and overlooks — stand to be affected, along with 95 percent of the Bay's tidal marshes and tidal flats.

To quote the San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission, which disclosed all these vexing details in its 2009 draft report *Living with a Rising Bay*, "Today's extreme flood event is about the same as a mid-century high tide." Consider the implications of BCDC's statement: What we now deem a once-in-a-lifetime deluge will be visiting our shores twice a day in 2050. And that's not even the worst of it — by 2100, the Bay will have swelled by 55 inches, perhaps more.

In fact, scientists anticipate this escalation to continue much farther into the future. The oceans have been growing in volume because of two steady influences, thermal expansion and ice sheet melting, and neither of those will stabilize for a good long while. Even if humankind were to magically stop producing the greenhouse gases that have been heating up the planet, thermal expansion would still take

centuries to level off, and ice sheet melting would not cease for several millennia.

This is the trouble posed by the encroaching waves lapping eagerly at our shores — they will not recede no matter what we do. So while communities typically address climate change by targeting its causes, in this context they will be forced to focus more on its effects. The standard environmentalist approach of mitigation appears unable to ease this particular problem; the situation demands adaptation.

As a strategy, adaptation gets deployed locally, tailored to the specific conditions, geography, and usage of a given place. Mitigation, on the other hand, generally operates on a broader level (think national energy policy or international emission reduction pacts) and theoretically costs much less (remember the old saying, "An ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure"). The two work in concert toward the same goal, however, and need not be viewed as mutually exclusive. While communities coordinate with each other across borders to implement mitigation, at home they plan adaptation.

How does adaptation planning happen? An important initial step is to identify the planning area's assets in terms of population, construction, and ecology. Who lives and works there, and do they have special needs? What streets, bridges, tunnels, housing, offices, schools, hospitals, and utility networks have

Continued on page 12

Wave of the Future

Continued from page 11

been built there? And which natural habitats sustain what kind of plants and animals there?

Once this inventory of assets has been compiled, the next step is to conduct a vulnerability assessment. A vulnerability assessment analyzes the inventory along three criteria: Exposure (whether an asset will be subject to flooding), sensitivity (how much an asset will suffer when flooded), and adaptive capacity (whether an asset has the ability to adjust to changes brought on by flooding). With a vulnerability assessment in hand, a community can then begin gauging risks, establishing priorities, and crafting specific adaptive measures.

On paper, this process looks relatively manageable, but actually moving it forward takes time, energy, resources, and funding. Local jurisdictions may feel hesitant to make that investment, especially when they have more immediately pressing issues to confront. Decision makers and stakeholders have to worry about how the nearby public beach, ferry landing, or wastewater treatment plant will fare in the next round of budget cuts before they even think about whether those same assets might fall victim to sea level rise decades down the line. And, when they do contemplate the long-term possibilities, they often must grapple with unfamiliar concepts and mind-boggling scenarios.

In order to support local jurisdictions as they face this daunting challenge, a fleet of agencies and organizations has begun stepping up to provide helpful tools and information (*see box below*). For instance, following up publication of its *Living with a Rising Bay* draft report, BCDC has partnered with the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's Coastal Services Center to launch ART, the Adapting to Rising Tides project. After a regional kickoff meeting last fall introduced the relevant background concepts to decision makers and

stakeholders, ART project coordinators began accepting applications from Bay Area communities to participate in an adaptation planning pilot program. The coordinators sought to select a length of Bay shoreline that, in addition to featuring diverse characteristics and regionally significant transportation infrastructure, came with the backing of fully committed community leaders eager to engage in the project.

Among many worthy applications, they found their match in a stretch of Alameda County's southern coast spanning from Union City to Emeryville. Along with touchdowns of both the San Mateo-Hayward Bridge and the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge, the section includes several popular parks and key industrial zones. It will receive a vulnerability assessment by next January, with adaptation planning scheduled for completion sometime in late 2012.

Ultimately, ART project coordinators hope that the pilot will yield a template for others to consult when attempting to counteract sea level rise elsewhere around the region, and for that matter, around the globe. After all, while every mile of the world's susceptible shorelines will receive the threat in a unique way, those advancing waters constitute a mutual concern. To successfully deal with it, coastal communities everywhere will have to share information and ideas.

Sixteen inches may loom large on the horizon, but with some collaboration, they might not be so insurmountable.

Sea Level Rise Support Network

The San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission (www.bcdc.ca.gov) and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's Coastal Services Center (www.csc.noaa.gov) target sea level rise in their own programming, as well as through their

Continued on page 13

Wave of the Future

Continued from page 12

partnership on the Adapting to Rising Tides project (<http://risingtides.csc.noaa.gov>).

The California Coastal Commission is the state agency in charge of planning and regulating the use of land and water along the Pacific coast (<http://www.coastal.ca.gov>).

The Bay Area Ecosystems Climate Change Consortium (www.baeccc.org) is a new coalition of federal, state, and non-governmental entities set to confront climate change through adaptive management strategizing.

The San Francisco Planning and Urban Research Association (www.spur.org) has produced a number of reports addressing sea level rise, most recently *Climate Change Hits Home* (2011). The Pacific Institute (www.pacinst.org) has also released an influential report on the subject entitled *The Impacts of Sea-level Rise on the California Coast* (2009).

The Scripps Institution of Oceanography (<http://sio.ucsd.edu>) at the University of California at San Diego conducts applicable oceanic and atmospheric research.

LWVFNUC

Ken Ballard Will Be Fondly Remembered

We are saddened to report that League member Ken Ballard passed away on May 13. Ken was inspired to join the League at the time we were studying the community college districts. He was a much-valued Board member and contributor to lively discussion. His daughters, Melissa Ballard and Melanie Willson, were kind enough to forward his obituary to us.

Kenneth J. "Ken" Ballard Jan 22 1930 - May 13, 2011

Ken Ballard passed away peacefully at home in the presence of his family, after a long battle with cancer. He was born in Highland Park, Ill to Berton and Gertrude Ballard, then moved with his family to the Bay Area in 1934. A retired pharmacist, he had a life-long love of learning, graduating first from Cal, then getting his Pharm.D. from UCSF in 1955. Ken married the love of his life Emylou on November 23, 1956 and they had two daughters. Emylou preceded him in death in September 1998. He had a long history of community involvement, including the Boy Scouts, the US Public Health Service, Angeles Girl Scout Council, Los Angeles PTSA, Alameda County Measure A Bond Oversight Committee, and the League of Women Voters.

Ken was tirelessly devoted to his extended family, and loved time with them above all else. He is survived by his brother and sister-in-law Bert and Sue Ballard of Berkeley, his daughters Melissa Ballard of Pacifica and Melanie, and her husband Jared Willson of Piedmont, grandchildren Kenny, Gabriel, Abigail, Rebecca and Nate, in addition to numerous nieces and nephews. He is sadly missed by all his family for his ever-present positive attitude, good humor, intelligent and inquisitive mind, and his generous and loving heart. Donations may be made in Ken's memory to The Prostate Cancer Foundation, www.pcf.org/donate or The UCSF Prostate Cancer Center www.ucsfhealth.org/clinics/prostatecancercenter.

Home Owners Association Election Committee Seeks New Members

By Jean Holmes, HOA Representative

The HOA Committee acts as Independent Inspectors of Elections for Home Owners Associations and Common Interest Developments. Our responsibility is to take custody of the secret ballots, count those ballots at the HOA's Annual Meeting, and certify the election results.

This is a very League-like activity that satisfies the requirements of the California Civil Code, provides a needed service to HOAs, and earns funds for our ongoing League Voter Service projects.

The committee will welcome and train new

members. If you are interested in being part of the HOA Committee or know of an association in need of our services, please contact us through the League's Web site, lwvfnuc.org/HOA.

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 years old, or who are non-citizens, are welcome as non-voting Associate Members. Annual 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 more 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 \$ _____