

RECEIVED
SUPREME COURT
STATE OF WASHINGTON
Mar 01, 2012, 3:45 pm
BY RONALD R. CARPENTER
CLERK

NO. 86976-6

RECEIVED BY E-MAIL

SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON

COPY

IN THE MATTER OF:

2012 WASHINGTON STATE REDISTRICTING PLAN,

JOHN MILEM,

Petitioner,

STATE'S OPENING BRIEF
DIRECTED TO INTERIM USE OF REDISTRICTING PLAN

ROBERT M. MCKENNA
Attorney General

ROBERT J. FALLIS, WSBA #15473
Assistant Attorney General
(206) 389-3888
E-mail: rustyf@atg.wa.gov

JEFFREY T. EVEN, WSBA #20367
Deputy Solicitor General
(360) 586-0728
E-mail: jeffe@atg.wa.gov

JAMES K. PHARRIS, WSBA #5313
Deputy Solicitor General
(360) 664-3027
E-mail: jamesp@atg.wa.gov

ORIGINAL

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION.....1

II. FACTUAL BACKGROUND2

 A. The Redistricting Commission2

 B. The Commission’s Open And Extensive Public Hearing
 Process4

III. LEGAL ARGUMENT7

 A. This Court Should Enter An Order Providing For The
 Plan To Govern The 2012 Elections Because The Plan
 Constitutes The State Districting Law7

 B. There Is No Practical Alternative To Having The Plan
 Govern The 2012 Elections10

 1. Election Administrators And Candidates Are
 Already Making Decisions Based On The District
 Boundaries Contained In The Plan; Imposing Any
 Other Set Of District Boundaries Would Disrupt The
 Orderly And Efficient Administration Of The
 Elections11

 2. Population Growth In Washington Since The 2000
 Census Prevents The 2002 Redistricting Plan From
 Providing An Alternative To The Plan.....16

 3. Petitioner’s Plans Were Rejected By The
 Redistricting Commission And Are Not A Viable
 Alternative To The Plan18

IV. CONCLUSION21

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

<i>Perry v. Perez</i> , ___ U.S. ___, 132 S. Ct. 934, ___ L. Ed. 2d ___ (Jan. 20, 2012).....	9, 19
<i>State v. Branch</i> , 129 Wn.2d 635, 919 P.2d 1228 (1996).....	8
<i>Storer v. Brown</i> , 415 U.S. 724, 94 S. Ct. 1274, 39 L. Ed. 2d 714 (1974).....	16
<i>Vandermost v. Bowen</i> , 53 Cal. 4th 421, ___ P.3d ___, 2012 WL 246627 (Jan. 27, 2012).	10
<i>Voinovich v. Quilter</i> , 507 U.S. 146, 113 S. Ct. 1149, 122 L. Ed. 2d 500 (1993).....	17
<i>Westberry v. Sanders</i> , 376 U.S. 1, 84 S. Ct. 526, 11 L. Ed. 2d 481 (1964).....	18
<i>White v. Regester</i> , 412 U.S. 755, 93 S. Ct. 2332, 37 L. Ed. 2d 314 (1973).....	17

Constitutional Provisions

U.S. Const. amend XIV	17
Wash. Const. art. II, § 43	1, 2, 7, 10
Wash. Const. art. II, § 43(2).....	3
Wash. Const. art. II, § 43(3).....	3
Wash. Const. art. II, § 43(7).....	2, 7, 8, 16
Wash. Const. art. II, § 43(11).....	7

Statutes

2 U.S.C. § 2c 18

Laws of 2006, ch. 344, § 1 12

Laws of 2011, ch. 10, § 26 13

Laws of 2011, ch. 349, § 2 12

RCW 29A.08.105 15

RCW 29A.16.040 12

RCW 29A.20.021(3) 14

RCW 29A.24.050 14

RCW 29A.76A 2, 8

RCW 44.05 1, 3

RCW 44.05.030 3

RCW 44.05.050 3

RCW 44.05.060 3

RCW 44.05.090 19

RCW 44.05.090(1) 18

RCW 44.05.090(5) 18

RCW 44.05.100(1) 7, 8

RCW 44.05.100(3) 2, 8, 17

RCW 44.05.120(1) 9

RCW 44.05.120(6) 9

RCW 44.05.130 11, 12
RCW 44.07D..... 2, 7

Legislative Materials

Engrossed H. Con. Res. 4409 1, 7, 8, 10
Washington State Redistricting Commission, *Report To The
Legislature, January 9, 2012, as amended by Engrossed H. Con.
Res. 4409, 62d Leg., Reg. Sess. (Wash. 2012)*..... passim

I. INTRODUCTION

This is a challenge to the 2012 Redistricting Plan¹ (“the Plan”) approved by the Washington State Redistricting Commission (“the Commission”) for use in Washington in the decade following the 2010 federal population census. The Commission acted pursuant to the procedure set forth in article II, § 43 of the Washington Constitution and its implementing statutes, and the Plan creates districts for the election of members of the State Legislature and for the State’s Representatives in Congress.

The Commission approved the 2012 Redistricting Plan after an extensive process that took place throughout most of 2011. The Commission held public hearings, deliberated, and approved the Plan in conformity with RCW 44.05, the state’s redistricting law, so as to provide for “fair and effective representation” for the people of Washington. The Legislature later adopted the plan with minor amendments. Engrossed House Concurrent Resolution 4409 (EHCR 4409).

Throughout the redistricting process the Commission conducted 27 public meetings and an additional 18 public forums in cities across the state. All of the public forums, and most of the meetings, were either

¹ Washington State Redistricting Commission, *Report To The Legislature, January 9, 2012, as amended by Engrossed H. Con. Res. 4409, 62d Leg., Reg. Sess. (Wash. 2012) (the Plan)*. The Plan is attached to Mr. Milem’s Petition For Declaratory Judgment as Appendix 1.

webcast or broadcast. The webcasts and broadcasts, and public submissions to the Commission, are available for public review on the Commission's website: <http://www.redistricting.wa.gov/default.asp>.

The Commission is a bipartisan constitutional body whose members collectively have provided well over one hundred years in public service. The Commission's careful review and development of proposed redistricting maps culminated in its January 1, 2012, adoption of the Plan. The Plan, as approved by the Legislature, constitutes the state's districting law. Wash. Const. art. II, § 43(7); RCW 44.05.100(3). It will be codified in the RCW as a statute. *See* RCW 44.07D (2002 Legislative Redistricting Plan); RCW 29A.76A (2002 Congressional Redistricting Plan). This law is entitled to a presumption of validity.

Because the Plan is entitled to a presumption of validity, and is the only redistricting Plan that will permit the 2012 elections to be conducted in an orderly and efficient manner, the Court should enter an order providing that the Plan shall remain in effect pending the conclusion of the litigation on the merits of this challenge to the Plan.

II. FACTUAL BACKGROUND

A. The Redistricting Commission

In 1983 the voters of Washington radically altered the redistricting process. Whereas, previously the state Legislature had drawn legislative

and congressional district lines, Amendment 74 to the Washington Constitution (art. II, § 43), and implementing legislation codified in RCW 44.05, provided for a new approach—a bipartisan commission that would develop redistricting plans pursuant to criteria established in statute.

The Constitution provides for a five person redistricting commission. The four voting members are appointed by each of the four legislative caucuses, and a fifth, non-voting chair is appointed by the voting members. Wash. Const. art. II, § 43(2); *see also* RCW 44.05.030 (same). The four voting members of the Commission—Tim Ceis, Dean Foster, Tom Huff, and Slade Gorton—and the Commission chair, Lura Powell—were appointed in January of 2011. Commission members are subject to various restrictions on legislative and political activities for periods prior to, and during, their service on the Commission. Wash. Const. art. II, § 43(3); *see also* RCW 44.05.050 (rendering ineligible for service on commission certain registered lobbyists and elected officials); RCW 44.05.060 (prohibiting commissioners from participating in specified political activities while a member of the commission).

The 2012 Commission members include a former state attorney general and United States senator; a former chief clerk of the state house of representatives and chief of staff to a governor; a former deputy mayor of the state's largest city and chief of staff for the chief executive of the

state's largest county; a former state legislator, university board president and corporate executive; and a Ph.D., former company president and current board chair of a state endowment.²

B. The Commission's Open And Extensive Public Hearing Process

The Commission held its first meeting on January 18, 2011, beginning a redistricting process that reached fruition in the late hours of January 1, 2012, with the adoption of the Plan. Declaration of Genevieve O'Sullivan, at ¶¶ 2, 11. In between, the Commission undertook an extensive course of public outreach and involvement.

The Commission solicited public input through extensive public outreach that included mainstream and foreign language media, the Commission's website, social media, and through various organizations such as local chambers of commerce, county and city governments, the League of Women Voters, Rotary clubs, and the Association of Washington Cities. The Commission's redistricting brochure was published in English, Spanish, Chinese, Tagalog, and Korean. *Id.* ¶ 3.

The Commission conducted 27 business meetings, all open to the public and the vast majority of which were either webcast or broadcast.

² Biographies for the 2012 Commission members are available online at <http://www.redistricting.wa.gov/commission.asp> (last visited February 25, 2012).

The Commission routinely solicited public comment at these meetings. O'Sullivan Decl., ¶ 4.

In addition, the Commission conducted 18 public forums in 17 cities. These forums were dedicated to providing information and receiving public comment on the redistricting process. Spanish language interpreters were provided at many of the forums. At the forum held in south Seattle, interpreters were provided for the Spanish, Somali, Ethiopian, Oromo, Vietnamese, Chinese, Tagalog, Amharic, and Tigray languages. All of these forums were either broadcast or webcast. The forums were scheduled to make it as easy as possible for typical state residents to attend or participate electronically. Forums were typically held in the early evenings at various community and public facilities. More than 250 people spoke at the public forums. *Id.* ¶ 5.

The Commission received and considered proposed maps from 20 stakeholder groups and individuals. All such submissions were posted on the Commission's website. The Commission also reviewed more than 950 email and web comments from over 1,500 individuals addressing such subjects as communities of interest, existing jurisdictional lines, suggestions for new lines, and the redistricting process in general. The Commission also received over 500 comments via webcast during the meetings and forums. *Id.* ¶ 6.

The Commission had available to it state-of-the-art computer technology and models needed for the complex, technical process of drawing district lines. The Commission also had available to it all of the demographic and other data, such as electoral and geographic data, that traditionally was available to the Legislature when it conducted redistricting. O'Sullivan Decl., ¶ 7.

On September 13, each of the voting commissioners presented an initial draft redistricting map. The maps were posted on the Commission's website and covered in the media. The Commission received public testimony and comments on the maps during the ensuing weeks. *Id.* ¶ 8.

On October 14, the Commission reduced its initial four draft maps to two. Again, these maps were posted on the Commission's website, covered in the media, and commented on at additional public meetings or through other written submissions to the Commission. *Id.* ¶ 9.

In order to help resolve outstanding issues concerning district boundaries efficiently, the Commission formed two working groups to address legislative district boundaries in different regions of the state. Eventually, one of these working groups also addressed unresolved issues involving congressional district boundaries. From mid-October through December these working groups met dozens of times, and the full

Commission met another 14 times, with public comment taken at each of the Commission meetings. O’Sullivan Decl., ¶ 10.

On January 1, 2012, the Commission approved the Plan and submitted it to the state Legislature, thus fulfilling the requirement of RCW 44.05.100(1); O’Sullivan Decl., ¶ 11. On February 7, the president of the state senate signed EHCR 4409, thus concluding the Legislature’s establishment of state districting law for the next decade. *See* Wash. Const. art. II, § 43(7) (the Plan, as approved by the Commission with any legislative amendments, “constitutes the state districting law”); Wash. Const. art. II, § 43(11) (neither the Plan, nor any legislative amendments to the Plan, are subject to the Governor’s signature or veto).

III. LEGAL ARGUMENT

A. **This Court Should Enter An Order Providing For The Plan To Govern The 2012 Elections Because The Plan Constitutes The State Districting Law**

This Court should enter an order providing for the Plan to govern the 2012 elections because, as adopted by the Commission and amended by the Legislature, the Plan “constitutes the state districting law.” Wash. Const. art. II, § 43(7). The state Constitution grants a portion of the state’s legislative power to the Commission, which otherwise would be (and before the adoption of Amendment 74, was) vested in the Legislature. The final plan is codified in the RCW as a statute. *See* RCW 44.07D

(2002 Legislative Redistricting Plan); RCW 29A.76A (2002 Congressional Redistricting Plan). It is, accordingly, entitled to the same presumption of validity as any other legislative act. *State v. Branch*, 129 Wn.2d 635, 648, 919 P.2d 1228 (1996). It is therefore appropriate for the Court to enter an order providing for the Plan to govern the 2012 elections.

The Commission approved and submitted the Plan to the Legislature on January 1, 2012. This was in accordance with RCW 44.05.100(1), which provides that “Upon approval of a redistricting plan by three of the voting members of the commission, but not later than January 1st of the year ending in two, the commission shall submit the plan to the legislature.” Subsequently, the Legislature approved the Plan, with minor amendments. *See* EHCR 4409 (Wash. 2012).

Upon the Legislature’s amendment of the Plan, the Plan became effective as the substantive law to govern the 2012 elections. Wash. Const. art. II, § 43(7). This follows from RCW 44.05.100(3), which provides as follows:

(3) The plan approved by the commission, with any amendment approved by the legislature, shall be final upon approval of such amendment . . . *and shall constitute the districting law applicable to this state for legislative and congressional elections, beginning with the next elections held in the year ending in two. This plan shall be in force until the effective date of the plan based upon the next*

*succeeding federal decennial census or until a modified plan takes effect as provided in RCW 44.05.120(6).*³

(Emphasis added.)

It is thus clear that the Plan currently is effective and is intended to govern state elections until superseded by subsequent plans or unless modified by the Commission. But for this case, there would be no need for an order regarding the applicability of the Plan to the 2012 elections, as substantive state law provides unambiguously that the Plan does so apply. Given, however, that Petitioner has invoked this Court's original jurisdiction and asks this Court to invalidate the Plan, it is important that this Court affirm at the outset that the Plan provides the basis for conducting the 2012 elections pending resolution of this case.

Earlier this year, the United States Supreme Court emphasized that courts deciding upon interim redistricting plans pending litigation "should take guidance from the State's recently enacted plan." *Perry v. Perez*, ___ U.S. ___, 132 S. Ct. 934, 941, ___ L. Ed. 2d ___ (Jan. 20, 2012). Doing so avoids putting the Court into the position of "being compelled to make [an] otherwise standardless decision[]," and "reflects the State's policy judgments on where to place new districts and how to shift existing ones in response to . . . population growth." *Id.* The California Supreme Court

³ RCW 44.05.120(1) provides for the legislature to reconvene the Commission for the purpose of modifying a redistricting plan. RCW 44.05.120(6) establishes the effective date of a modified plan.

also decided earlier this year that the State should use a redistricting plan adopted by that state's redistricting commission to govern 2012 elections pending resolution of a referendum on that plan. The court explained that, among other reasons, it selected the commission's plan for interim use because the districts it devised were "a product of what generally appears to have been an open, transparent and nonpartisan redistricting process as called for by the current provisions of [the state constitution]." *Vandermost v. Bowen*, 53 Cal. 4th 421, ___ P.3d ___, 2012 WL 246627, *33 (Jan. 27, 2012).

This Court should adopt the Plan for use in the 2012 elections for similar reasons. The Plan constitutes the law of this state, as enacted by the bodies constitutionally established to exercise legislative authority regarding district boundaries. Wash. Const. art. II, § 43. It was duly approved, with minor amendments, by the Legislature. EHCR 4409. As such, it is entitled to a presumption of validity pending litigation of this matter, and should be used to conduct the 2012 elections.⁴

⁴ This conclusion remains true even if the Court resolves this case on the merits before the November election. For the reasons described in the next section, this Court should not change the boundaries governing the 2012 primary and general election in the midst of an ongoing election process.

B. There Is No Practical Alternative To Having The Plan Govern The 2012 Elections

Given the Plan's effectiveness and its express statutory application to elections beginning in 2012, the Court should enter an order providing for the Plan to govern the 2012 elections, and any subsequent elections until this litigation is fully resolved. Moreover, there is no practical alternative to the Plan that would allow for orderly and efficient administration of the 2012 elections.

1. Election Administrators And Candidates Are Already Making Decisions Based On The District Boundaries Contained In The Plan; Imposing Any Other Set Of District Boundaries Would Disrupt The Orderly And Efficient Administration Of The Elections

As a result of state statutory deadlines, state and local election administrators have already begun to perform necessary preparatory work for the 2012 elections, which work necessarily relies upon the 2012 Plan for the identification of district and precinct boundaries. As explained below, the drawing of precinct boundaries depends, among other things, on having settled boundaries for legislative districts. Given the nature of these deadlines and the preparatory elections work, it is not possible for the 2012 elections to occur in an orderly and efficient manner using any set of maps other than those contained in the Plan.⁵

⁵ The Legislature has admonished in RCW 44.05.130 that challenges to a redistricting plan are to be adjudicated expeditiously. At the same time, the orderly and

One of the deadlines with which elections administrators must comply is contained in RCW 29A.16.040, which requires all counties to approve new precinct maps no later than April 30, 2012. These maps must reflect, among other considerations, the boundaries for new Congressional and Legislative districts resulting from the 2010 Census as established in the Plan, and which will be used in the 2012 elections. Precinct boundaries are important, because precincts are the basic units through which election officials administer elections, determine ballot contents, and prepare and count ballots. *Cf. Zapotocky v. Dalton*, ___ Wn. App. ___, ___ P.3d ___, 2012 WL 593277, *4 (2012) (describing preparation of vote totals by precinct). It takes time for county auditors to prepare proposed precinct boundaries for consideration by their county legislative authorities, and the nature of that work has already resulted in many county auditors having begun that work in reliance on the Plan. The declarations of the election administrators in King and Pierce Counties,

efficient administration of elections requires state and local election administrators to begin their work early in the calendar year in which a new redistricting map takes effect. In part this is true because the primary now takes place earlier in the year than it did in the recent past, with the result that candidate filing must also take place earlier in the year. *See* Laws of 2011, ch. 349, § 2 (amending RCW 29A.04.311 to move the primary from the third to the first Tuesday in August); *see also* Laws of 2006, ch. 344, § 1 (amending RCW 29A.04.311 to move the primary from September to August). In turn, this also means that precinct boundaries must be established earlier in the year than in the recent past. RCW 29A.16.040 (establishing deadline for finalizing precinct boundaries by reference to period for candidate filing). Establishing an efficient schedule for considering the petition on the merits and applying the Plan in the interim remains true to RCW 44.05.130, while also protecting the interests of both the electorate and candidates in an election process free of confusion and delay.

respectively, reveal that this process has already begun. Huff Decl., ¶ 2; Anderson Decl., ¶ 2.

The task of preparing new precinct boundaries is substantial in magnitude, especially in the state's largest counties. King County, for example, is not only divided among numerous congressional and legislative districts, but also among county council districts and numerous cities and special districts. As a result, King County is also divided among more than 2500 precincts. Huff Decl., ¶ 3. This results in the necessity for numerous changes to precinct boundaries, and has caused the county to double its elections staff working on precinct boundaries. *Id.*, ¶¶ 4-5. In order to present such changes for consideration by the county council, King County's elections officials will need to finish their work by March 30, 2012. *Id.*, ¶ 6.

Similarly, in Pierce County, an additional factor complicates the task of drawing new precinct boundaries. In 2011, the Legislature changed the method for determining the maximum size of a precinct. Laws of 2011, ch. 10, § 26 (amending RCW 29A.16.040). The result is to increase the number of precincts into which Pierce County must be divided from 382 to as many as 550. Pierce County is accordingly redrawing all of its precincts from scratch, a time consuming process that requires much attention to detail. Anderson Decl., ¶ 3.

Counties cannot redraw precinct boundaries without relying on, in addition to other information, settled boundaries for congressional and legislative districts. Anderson Decl., ¶ 4; Huff Decl., ¶ 7. Timely preparation of precinct boundaries for use in the 2012 elections is unrealistic if a new redistricting plan with substantive changes is delivered after March 1, 2012. Anderson Decl., ¶ 6; Huff Decl., ¶ 6.

Another consequential deadline that looms is the statutory requirement that candidates for Congress and the Legislature (along with all other elected offices) must file declarations of candidacy during the week of May 14-18, 2012. RCW 29A.24.050 (as amended by Laws of 2011, ch. 349, § 7, effective Jan. 1, 2012). State law requires the filing officer to determine whether candidates are properly registered to vote within those districts, which obviously requires the district boundaries to be properly reflected in database records in advance. RCW 29A.20.021(3). In order for elections officials to process candidate filings during that week, therefore, all changes in district boundaries must be finalized and entered into county and state voter registration systems before candidates file. Decl. of Catherine S. Blinn, ¶ 5. After the counties approve new precincts that reflect the considerations noted above, the counties will apply those new precincts to their county voter registration systems and then upload that data to the statewide voter registration

database that is maintained by the Secretary of State. The statewide voter registration list is the official list of voters. RCW 29A.08.105. If the counties are delayed in their process of drawing new precincts, the official list of voters will not be final or accurate and will disrupt the conduct of candidate filing by both state and county election officials. Blinn Decl., ¶ 6; *see also* Anderson Decl., ¶ 7; Huff Decl., ¶ 9.

The statutory considerations discussed above demonstrate how the application of the Plan to the 2012 elections is necessary to avoid disorder and inefficiency in the work that state and local elections administrators must perform. In addition, the orderly and efficient conduct of elections depends also on the ability of candidates to file and campaign for office in an organized manner. Numerous candidates have already begun campaigns and raised funds, seeking various legislative positions based upon the Plan. Filings with the state Public Disclosure Commission identify 187 candidates who have begun fundraising for the combined 147 seats in the state Senate and House. Decl. of Jeffrey T. Even, Ex. A. Notably, these include one race with 6 candidates, two races with 4 candidates each, and three races with 3 candidates each. *Id.* Similarly, candidates for Congress have already begun campaigns based upon the Plan, and 36 of them have reported fundraising to the Federal Election Commission. Even Decl., Ex. B. Notably, these include a total of 11

candidates seeking office in the First Congressional District (which was significantly redrawn in the Plan, and in which the incumbent member of Congress is not seeking re-election) and 4 candidates in the Tenth Congressional District (which is newly-created in 2012). Additionally, state and local officials have made information available to the public, which other potential candidates and voters have likely relied upon in planning for the upcoming elections. *See* Washington State Redistricting Commission web site (<http://www.redistricting.wa.gov/maps.asp> (last visited February 25, 2012)),⁶ Huff Decl., ¶ 8.

In short, disruption and confusion, for elections administrators, candidates, and the electorate alike, would result if the Plan were abruptly replaced with some other set of district or precinct boundaries. *Cf. Storer v. Brown*, 415 U.S. 724, 730, 94 S. Ct. 1274, 39 L. Ed. 2d 714 (1974) (noting the danger of chaos in the electoral process absent appropriate regulatory action).

2. Population Growth In Washington Since The 2000 Census Prevents The 2002 Redistricting Plan From Providing An Alternative To The Plan

Looking to the state's 2002 redistricting plan as a carry-over plan pending the resolution of the merits of the litigation would be contrary to

⁶ The Redistricting Commission has also posted a "district finder" that allows voters to find their own districts under the new plan. <http://www.redistricting.wa.gov/DistrictFinder/> (last visited February 25, 2012).

the terms of article II, section 43(7) and RCW 44.05.100(3), and otherwise would not be a viable option. Since the 2000 Census, Washington's population has grown by over eight hundred thousand people, or approximately 14 percent. Given the pattern and magnitude of that population growth, significant population disparities would exist among some districts if the 2002 maps were used. Based on 2010 Census data, at least eight legislative districts have populations that deviate at least 10 percent from mathematical equality. Decl. of Robert J. Fallis, Ex. A. Given the magnitude of this deviation and the fact that the 2002 maps do not represent the *current* application of state redistricting criteria, using the 2002 maps would be legally questionable under the Fourteenth Amendment. *See, e.g., Voinovich v. Quilter*, 507 U.S. 146, 161, 113 S. Ct. 1149, 122 L. Ed. 2d 500 (1993) (legislative redistricting plan with population deviation of at least 10 percent creates prima facie case of discrimination under Fourteenth Amendment); *White v. Regester*, 412 U.S. 755, 764, 93 S. Ct. 2332, 37 L. Ed. 2d 314 (1973) (population deviations of at least 10 percent must be justified "based on legitimate considerations incident to the effectuation of a rational state policy").

Moreover, Washington's population growth since the 2000 Census has resulted in Congress awarding Washington a tenth Congressional seat. Fallis Decl., Ex. C. The 2000 redistricting plan contains only nine

congressional districts. Aside from one person, one vote issues,⁷ a redistricting plan that failed to provide a district for each of the ten Congressional representatives to which Washington is now entitled would clearly fail “to provide fair and effective representation” and thus be in violation of state law. *See* RCW 44.05.090(5) (redistricting commission to exercise powers, *inter alia*, “to provide fair and effective representation”); *see also* 2 U.S.C. § 2c (federal statute requiring that all states establish the same number of districts as it is allotted Representatives, and to elect Representatives only from districts so established). Using the 2002 Plan for the 2012 election would (1) result in denying Washington its tenth seat in Congress; and (2) elect the remaining nine from districts that are no longer substantially equal in population.

3. Petitioner’s Plans Were Rejected By The Redistricting Commission And Are Not A Viable Alternative To The Plan

As discussed above, the Plan is currently in effect and is entitled to a presumption of validity. Petitioner submitted proposed plans to the

⁷ According to the 2010 Census, Washington’s population is 6,724,540. Fallis Decl., Ex. B. The target population of each district, based on the allocation of ten congressional districts, is 672,454. *Id.* However, spread among the nine congressional districts contained in the 2002 redistricting map, Washington’s current population would result in significant and legally unsustainable population deviations in every congressional district. *See, e.g., Westberry v. Sanders*, 376 U.S. 1, 7, 84 S. Ct. 526, 11 L. Ed. 2d 481 (1964) (art. II, § 1 of U.S. Constitution requires population among congressional districts to be as nearly equal “as is practicable”); RCW 44.05.090(1) (“Districts shall have a population as nearly equal as is practicable, excluding nonresident military personnel, based on the population reported in the federal decennial census.”).

Commission, which were considered but not adopted. The interim use of petitioner's proposed maps, rather than the Plan adopted by the Commission and the Legislature, would effectively destroy the presumption of the Plan's validity. The use of petitioner's plans would disregard the discretion placed in the Commission and the Legislature, and the decisions that the Commission and Legislature made following months of public input, in favor of the preferred alternative of one individual. *See Perry*, 132 S. Ct. at 941 (courts "should take guidance from the State's recently enacted plan in drafting an interim plan"). Petitioner himself recognizes that there is not necessarily a single, "right" way to draw a districting plan. *See* Petition, Appendix 6, at 3 ("In drawing district boundaries, one is faced with balancing many factors, each of which individually might lead to a different outcome in district boundaries than any of the others"), 4 ("[R]edistricting involves balancing many factors and considerations").

RCW 44.05.090 sets forth the criteria that the Commission is to apply in developing a redistricting plan:

(1) Districts shall have a population as nearly equal as is practicable, excluding nonresident military personnel, based on the population reported in the federal decennial census.

(2) *To the extent consistent with subsection (1) of this section* the commission plan should, *insofar as practical*, accomplish the following:

(a) District lines *should* be drawn so as to coincide with the boundaries of local political subdivisions and areas recognized as communities of interest. The number of counties and municipalities divided among more than one district *should* be as small as possible;

(b) Districts *should* be composed of convenient, contiguous, and compact territory. Land areas may be deemed contiguous if they share a common land border or are connected by a ferry, highway, bridge, or tunnel. Areas separated by geographical boundaries or artificial barriers that prevent transportation within a district *should* not be deemed contiguous; and

(c) *Whenever practicable*, a precinct shall be wholly within a single legislative district.

(3) The commission's plan and any plan adopted by the supreme court under RCW 44.05.100(4) shall provide for forty-nine legislative districts.

(4) The house of representatives shall consist of ninety-eight members, two of whom shall be elected from and run at large within each legislative district. The senate shall consist of forty-nine members, one of whom shall be elected from each legislative district.

(5) The commission shall exercise its powers to provide fair and effective representation and to encourage electoral competition. The commission's plan shall not be drawn purposely to favor or discriminate against any political party or group.

(Emphasis added.)

As the phrasing of the above criteria makes clear, the law provides the Commission with wide latitude to determine how the criteria should be applied given the particular circumstances. However, petitioner's plans apparently are based on a different, ordered hierarchy that is not found in

state law but rather seemingly represents his own individual conception of how redistricting should occur.⁸ These policy preferences of an individual should not take precedence over an official state redistricting plan that was the product of months of public input and deliberation, is presumed valid, and is the only plan which can be applied so as to permit the orderly and efficient administration of the 2012 elections.

///

///

///

⁸ "So, what are my priorities in redistricting?

First, no missing geography . . .

Second, no discontinuities . . .

Third, satisfaction of applicable requirements of the voting rights act . . .

Fourth, satisfaction of the constitutional limitations on overall range of district populations, one percent for congressional districts and ten percent for legislative districts . . .

Fifth, no unnecessarily divided counties . . .

Sixth, no unnecessarily divided municipalities . . .

Seventh, careful attention to transportation routes . . .

Eighth, identification of communities and efforts to avoid dividing them as much as possible . . .

Ninth, simple boundaries . . .

Tenth, compactness . . .

Eleventh, competitive districts . . .

Twelfth, fairness between the parties . . ."

See Petition, Appendix 6, at 4.

IV. CONCLUSION

For the reasons discussed above, the state respectfully requests an order providing for the district boundaries contained in the Plan to apply to the 2012 elections, and to any subsequent elections, until the pending litigation is resolved.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this 1st day of March, 2012.

ROBERT M. MCKENNA
Attorney General



ROBERT J. FALLIS, WSBA #15473
Assistant Attorney General
(206) 389-3888
E-mail: rustyf@atg.wa.gov

JEFFREY T. EVEN, WSBA #20367
Deputy Solicitor General
(360) 586-0728
E-mail: jeffe@atg.wa.gov

JAMES K. PHARRIS, WSBA #5313
Deputy Solicitor General
(360) 664-3027
E-mail: jamesp@atg.wa.gov

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify, under penalty of perjury under the laws of the state of Washington, that on this date I have caused a true and correct copy of the foregoing document to be served via Electronic mail and First Class United States Mail, postage prepaid, on the following:

John Milem
1600 NE 125th Ave.
Vancouver, WA 98684
milemjohn@comcast.net
Petitioner Pro Se

DATED this 1st day of March, 2012, at Olympia, Washington.


KRISTIN D. JENSEN
Legal Assistant

RECEIVED
SUPREME COURT
STATE OF WASHINGTON
Mar 01, 2012, 3:45 pm
BY RONALD R. CARPENTER
CLERK

NO. 86976-6

RECEIVED BY E-MAIL

SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON

IN THE MATTER OF:

2012 Washington State Redistricting
Plan,

JOHN MILEM,

Petitioner.

DECLARATION OF
CATHERINE S. BLINN

COPY

I, Catherine S. Blinn, declare as follows:

1. I am over 18 years of age and competent to testify. I currently serve as Co-Director of Elections in the Office of the Secretary of State. The following information is true and correct and of my own knowledge.

2. By statute, candidates seeking elected office in 2012 must file a declaration of candidacy during the week of May 14-18, 2012. RCW 29A.24.050.

3. The duties of the Elections Division of the Secretary of State's Office include accepting declarations of candidacy from candidates for United States House of Representatives. We also accept declarations of candidacy from candidates for the Washington State Senate and House of Representatives, if those candidates file for a legislative district that includes voters from more than one county. RCW

ORIGINAL

29A.24.070. Candidates from legislative districts contained entirely within a single county file declarations of candidacy with their local county elections officials.


4. State law requires that when the filing officer, whether that is the Secretary of State or the county auditor, receives a declaration of candidacy we must determine whether the candidate is properly registered to vote within the jurisdiction of the office for which they file. In the case of candidates for the state Senate or House of Representatives, this means determining whether the candidate is registered to vote within the legislative district they seek to represent. RCW 29A.20.021(3). Candidates for the United State House of Representatives are only required to be residents of Washington. RCW 29A.20.021(4).

5. In order to determine whether a candidate for the legislature is properly registered to vote within the legislative district, all changes to district boundaries must be finalized and entered into county and state voter registration systems before candidates file.

6. After county legislative authorities approve new precincts that reflect the 2011 law change to precinct size and reflect the 2012 Redistricting Plan adopted by the Redistricting Commission and approved by the Washington State Legislature, the counties will apply those new precincts to their county voter registration systems and then

upload that data to the statewide voter registration database that is maintained by the Secretary of State's Office. The statewide voter registration list is the official list of voters. If this process is delayed, the official list of voters will not be final or accurate and will disrupt the conduct of candidate filing May 14 – 18, 2012.

7. I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the state of Washington that the foregoing is true and correct and of my own knowledge, and that I executed this declaration at Olympia, Washington, in the County of Thurston, this 28 day of February, 2012.



Catherine S. Blinn

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify, under penalty of perjury under the laws of the state of Washington, that on this date I have caused a true and correct copy of the foregoing document to be served via Electronic mail and First Class United States Mail, postage prepaid, on the following:

John Milem
1600 NE 125th Ave.
Vancouver, WA 98684
milemjohn@comcast.net
Petitioner Pro Se

DATED this 1st day of March, 2012, at Olympia,
Washington.


KRISTIN D. JENSEN
Legal Assistant

RECEIVED
SUPREME COURT
STATE OF WASHINGTON
Mar 01, 2012, 3:45 pm
BY RONALD R. CARPENTER
CLERK

NO. 86976-6

RECEIVED BY E-MAIL *bjh*

SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON

IN THE MATTER OF:

2012 Washington State Redistricting
Plan,

JOHN MILEM,

Petitioner.

DECLARATION OF

ROBERT J. FALLIS

COPY

I, Robert J. Fallis, declare as follows:

1. I am over 18 years of age and competent to testify. I am an attorney admitted to practice law in the state of Washington, currently employed by the Washington State Attorney General. I am one of the counsel for the Respondent in this matter. The following information is true and correct and of my own knowledge.


2. Exhibits A and B to this declaration are tables containing Washington state population data by legislative and congressional district, respectively, that I copied from the website of the Washington State Redistricting Commission, at http://www.redistricting.wa.gov/maps_draft.asp under the heading "Districts established by 2001 Commission" (visited February 24, 2012). These tables show population growth by district between 2000 and

ORIGINAL

2010, including the amount of population deviation from mathematical equality among districts.

3. Exhibit C to this declaration is a table showing the United States Government's apportionment of population and the number of representatives, by state, pursuant to the 2010 census, that I copied from the website of the United States Census Bureau, at http://www.census.gov/population/apportionment/data/2010_apportionment_results.html (visited February 24, 2012). This table shows the number of apportioned representatives based on the 2010 census, including the change in seats from the 2000 census apportionment.

4. I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the state of Washington that the foregoing is true and correct and of my own knowledge, and that I executed this declaration at Seattle, Washington, in the County of King this 29th day of February, 2012.


Robert J. Kallis

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify, under penalty of perjury under the laws of the state of Washington, that on this date I have caused a true and correct copy of the foregoing document to be served via Electronic mail and First Class United States Mail, postage prepaid, on the following: . . .

John Milem
1600 NE 125th Ave.
Vancouver, WA 98684
milemjohn@comcast.net
Petitioner Pro Se

DATED this 1st day of March, 2012, at Olympia,
Washington.


KRISTIN D. JENSEN
Legal Assistant

Malapportionment Report for Washington State Legislative Districts

Official Census 2000 and Census 2010 figures; population figures are as of April first of the respective year

District	Total Population 2000	Total Population 2010	2000-2010 Change (Numeric)	2000-2010 Change (Percent)	Target Population*	Deviation from Target (Numeric)	Deviation from Target (Percent)
01	120,291	147,265	26,974	22.4%	137,236	10,029	7.3%
02	120,370	163,707	43,337	36.0%	137,236	26,471	19.3%
03	120,287	120,601	314	0.3%	137,236	-16,635	-12.1%
04	120,286	141,254	20,968	17.4%	137,236	4,018	2.9%
05	120,288	161,403	41,115	34.2%	137,236	24,167	17.6%
06	120,293	141,123	20,830	17.3%	137,236	3,887	2.8%
07	120,290	130,475	10,185	8.5%	137,236	-6,761	-4.9%
08	120,289	149,474	29,185	24.3%	137,236	12,238	8.9%
09	120,287	136,166	15,879	13.2%	137,236	-1,070	-0.8%
10	120,300	134,117	13,817	11.5%	137,236	-3,119	-2.3%
11	120,329	134,027	13,698	11.4%	137,236	-3,209	-2.3%
12	120,286	132,531	12,245	10.2%	137,236	-4,705	-3.4%
13	120,290	143,750	23,460	19.5%	137,236	6,514	4.7%
14	120,285	130,478	10,193	8.5%	137,236	-6,758	-4.9%
15	120,287	132,788	12,501	10.4%	137,236	-4,448	-3.2%
16	120,288	154,830	34,542	28.7%	137,236	17,594	12.8%
17	120,288	150,727	30,439	25.3%	137,236	13,491	9.8%

Washington	5,894,121	6,724,540	830,419	14.1%
------------	-----------	-----------	---------	-------

*The target population represents the statewide population of 6,724,540 divided equally among forty-nine Legislative Districts

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2000 and Census 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171, PL 1 & 2) Summary Files

Prepared by staff of the Washington State Redistricting Commission, P.O. Box 40948, Olympia, WA 98504-0948

February 23, 2011

EXHIBIT A

Malapportionment Report for Washington State Legislative Districts

Official Census 2000 and Census 2010 figures; population figures are as of April first of the respective year

District	Total Population 2000	Total Population 2010	2000-2010 Change (Numeric)	2000-2010 Change (Percent)	Target Population*	Deviation from Target (Numeric)	Deviation from Target (Percent)
18	120,111	160,083	39,972	33.3%	137,236	22,847	16.6%
19	120,301	126,904	6,603	5.5%	137,236	-10,332	-7.5%
20	120,296	141,029	20,733	17.2%	137,236	3,793	2.8%
21	120,286	133,156	12,870	10.7%	137,236	-4,080	-3.0%
22	120,281	141,695	21,414	17.8%	137,236	4,459	3.2%
23	120,250	130,119	9,869	8.2%	137,236	-7,117	-5.2%
24	120,277	132,679	12,402	10.3%	137,236	-4,557	-3.3%
25	120,282	145,035	24,753	20.6%	137,236	7,799	5.7%
26	120,307	133,755	13,448	11.2%	137,236	-3,481	-2.5%
27	120,371	123,857	3,486	2.9%	137,236	-13,379	-9.7%
28	120,248	119,494	-754	-0.6%	137,236	-17,742	-12.9%
29	120,298	127,259	6,961	5.8%	137,236	-9,977	-7.3%
30	120,294	129,998	9,704	8.1%	137,236	-7,238	-5.3%
31	120,299	137,685	17,386	14.5%	137,236	449	0.3%
32	120,307	122,038	1,731	1.4%	137,236	-15,198	-11.1%
33	120,121	129,246	9,125	7.6%	137,236	-7,990	-5.8%
34	120,297	125,055	4,758	4.0%	137,236	-12,181	-8.9%

Washington	5,894,121	6,724,540	830,419	14.1%
------------	-----------	-----------	---------	-------

*The target population represents the statewide population of 6,724,540 divided equally among forty-nine Legislative Districts

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2000 and Census 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171, PL 1 & 2) Summary Files

Prepared by staff of the Washington State Redistricting Commission, P.O. Box 40948, Olympia, WA 98504-0948

February 23, 2011

EXHIBIT A

Malapportionment Report for Washington State Legislative Districts

Official Census 2000 and Census 2010 figures; population figures are as of April first of the respective year

District	Total Population 2000	Total Population 2010	2000-2010 Change (Numeric)	2000-2010 Change (Percent)	Target Population*	Deviation from Target (Numeric)	Deviation from Target (Percent)
35	120,303	138,142	17,839	14.8%	137,236	906	0.7%
36	120,288	133,901	13,613	11.3%	137,236	-3,335	-2.4%
37	120,279	127,546	7,267	6.0%	137,236	-9,690	-7.1%
38	120,284	129,624	9,340	7.8%	137,236	-7,612	-5.5%
39	120,298	143,154	22,856	19.0%	137,236	5,918	4.3%
40	120,279	138,925	18,646	15.5%	137,236	1,689	1.2%
41	120,289	142,722	22,433	18.6%	137,236	5,486	4.0%
42	120,288	146,619	26,331	21.9%	137,236	9,383	6.8%
43	120,254	133,976	13,722	11.4%	137,236	-3,260	-2.4%
44	120,283	156,499	36,216	30.1%	137,236	19,263	14.0%
45	120,286	136,432	16,146	13.4%	137,236	-804	-0.6%
46	120,267	127,849	7,582	6.3%	137,236	-9,387	-6.8%
47	120,302	140,146	19,844	16.5%	137,236	2,910	2.1%
48	120,294	130,423	10,129	8.4%	137,236	-6,813	-5.0%
49	120,467	134,779	14,312	11.9%	137,236	-2,457	-1.8%
Washington	5,894,121	6,724,540	830,419	14.1%			

EXHIBIT A

*The target population represents the statewide population of 6,724,540 divided equally among forty-nine Legislative Districts

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2000 and Census 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171, PL 1 & 2) Summary Files

Prepared by staff of the Washington State Redistricting Commission, P.O. Box 40948, Olympia, WA 98504-0948

February 23, 2011

Malapportionment Report for Washington State Congressional Districts

Official Census 2000 and Census 2010 figures; population figures are as of April first of the respective year

District	Total Pop. 2000	Total Pop. 2010	2000-2010 Change (Numeric)	2000-2010 Change (Percent)	Target Population*	Deviation from Target (Numeric)	Deviation from Target (Percent)
01	654,904	739,455	84,551	12.9%	672,454	67,001	10.0%
02	654,903	760,041	105,138	16.1%	672,454	87,587	13.0%
03	654,898	779,348	124,450	19.0%	672,454	106,894	15.9%
04	654,901	774,409	119,508	18.2%	672,454	101,955	15.2%
05	654,904	723,609	68,705	10.5%	672,454	51,155	7.6%
06	654,902	709,570	54,668	8.3%	672,454	37,116	5.5%
07	654,902	704,225	49,323	7.5%	672,454	31,771	4.7%
08	654,905	810,754	155,849	23.8%	672,454	138,300	20.6%
09	654,902	723,129	68,227	10.4%	672,454	50,675	7.5%
10**	-	-	-	-	672,454	-672,454	-100.0%
Washington	5,894,121	6,724,540	830,419	14.1%			

EXHIBIT B

*The target population represents the statewide population of 6,724,540 divided equally among ten Congressional Districts

**Congressional District 10 was awarded to Washington following the 2010 Census and will be created in the 2011 redistricting process

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2000 and Census 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171, PL 1 & 2) Summary Files

Prepared by staff of the Washington State Redistricting Commission, P.O. Box 40948, Olympia, WA 98504-0948

File created February 23, 2011

Table 1. APPORTIONMENT POPULATION AND NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIVES, BY STATE: 2010 CENSUS

STATE	APPORTIONMENT POPULATION (APRIL 1, 2010)	NUMBER OF APPORTIONED REPRESENTATIVES BASED ON 2010 CENSUS	CHANGE IN SEATS FROM CENSUS 2000 APPORTIONMENT
Alabama	4,802,982	7	0
Alaska	721,523	1	0
Arizona	6,412,700	9	+1
Arkansas	2,926,229	4	0
California	37,341,989	53	0
Colorado	5,044,930	7	0
Connecticut	3,581,628	5	0
Delaware	900,877	1	0
Florida	18,900,773	27	+2
Georgia	9,727,566	14	+1
Hawaii	1,366,862	2	0
Idaho	1,573,499	2	0
Illinois	12,864,380	18	-1
Indiana	6,501,582	9	0
Iowa	3,053,787	4	-1
Kansas	2,863,813	4	0
Kentucky	4,350,606	6	0
Louisiana	4,553,962	6	-1
Maine	1,333,074	2	0
Maryland	5,789,929	8	0
Massachusetts	6,559,644	9	-1
Michigan	9,911,626	14	-1
Minnesota	5,314,879	8	0
Mississippi	2,978,240	4	0
Missouri	6,011,478	8	-1
Montana	994,416	1	0
Nebraska	1,831,825	3	0
Nevada	2,709,432	4	+1
New Hampshire	1,321,445	2	0
New Jersey	8,807,501	12	-1
New Mexico	2,067,273	3	0
New York	19,421,055	27	-2
North Carolina	9,565,781	13	0
North Dakota	675,905	1	0
Ohio	11,568,495	16	-2
Oklahoma	3,764,882	5	0
Oregon	3,848,606	5	0
Pennsylvania	12,734,905	18	-1
Rhode Island	1,055,247	2	0
South Carolina	4,645,975	7	+1
South Dakota	819,761	1	0
Tennessee	6,375,431	9	0
Texas	25,268,418	36	+4
Utah	2,770,765	4	+1
Vermont	630,337	1	0
Virginia	8,037,736	11	0
Washington	6,753,369	10	+1
West Virginia	1,859,815	3	0
Wisconsin	5,698,230	8	0
Wyoming	568,300	1	0
TOTAL ¹	309,183,463	435	

¹ Apportionment population includes the resident population for the 50 states, as ascertained by the Twenty-Third Decennial Census under Title 13, United States Code, and counts of overseas U.S. military and federal civilian employees (and their dependents living with them) allocated to their home state, as reported by the employing federal agencies. The apportionment population excludes the population of the District of Columbia.

RECEIVED
SUPREME COURT
STATE OF WASHINGTON
Mar 01, 2012, 3:45 pm
BY RONALD R. CARPENTER
CLERK

NO. 86976-6

RECEIVED BY E-MAIL

SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON

IN THE MATTER OF:

2012 Washington State Redistricting
Plan,

JOHN MILEM,

Petitioner.

DECLARATION OF
JEFFREY T. EVEN

COPY

I, Jeffrey T. Even, declare as follows:


1. I am over 18 years of age and competent to testify. I am an attorney admitted to the practice of law in the state of Washington, currently employed by the Washington State Attorney General. I am one of the counsel for Respondent in this matter. The following information is true and correct and of my own knowledge.

2. Exhibit A to this declaration is a table that I downloaded from the website of the Washington State Public Disclosure Commission, at http://www.pdc.wa.gov/MvcQuerySystem/Candidate/leg_candidates (visited February 23, 2012). The table shows candidates who have filed state campaign finance reports, indicating that they are raising funds to seek office in the Washington State Legislature in 2012.

3. Exhibit B to this declaration is a table containing data that I copied from the website of the Federal Election Commission (FEC), at

<http://www.fec.gov/index.shtml> (visited February 23, 2012). I searched the FEC website for candidates who have filed federal campaign finance reports with the FEC, indicating that they are raising campaign contributions to run for the United States House of Representatives from a district located in Washington.

4. I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the state of Washington that the foregoing is true and correct and of my own knowledge, and that I executed this declaration at Olympia, Washington, in the County of Thurston, this 29th day of February, 2012.



Jeffrey T. Even

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify, under penalty of perjury under the laws of the state of Washington, that on this date I have caused a true and correct copy of the foregoing document to be served via Electronic mail and First Class United States Mail, postage prepaid, on the following: . . .

John Milem
1600 NE 125th Ave.
Vancouver, WA 98684
milemjohn@comcast.net
Petitioner Pro Se

DATED this 1st day of March, 2012, at Olympia,
Washington.


KRISTIN D. JENSEN
Legal Assistant

Legislative Candidates - Thursday, February 23, 2012

Name	Dist	Office	Pos	Pty	Contributions	Expenditures	Debt	Ind Sup	Ind Opp
BOND JACOB L	01	STATE SENATOR		D	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
MCAULIFFE ROSEMARY A	01	STATE SENATOR		D	\$4,350.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
PALUMBO GUY F	01	STATE SENATOR		I	\$21,489.99	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
TRAVIS BRIAN M	01	STATE SENATOR		R	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
STANFORD DEREK C	01	STATE REPRESENTATIVE	01	D	\$17,606.90	\$3,057.77	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
TRAVIS BRIAN M	01	STATE REPRESENTATIVE	01	R	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
MOSCOSO LUIS S	01	STATE REPRESENTATIVE	02	D	\$14,715.49	\$5,638.40	\$3,225.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
BECKER RANDI L	02	STATE SENATOR		R	\$64,043.00	\$5,103.12	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
LACHNEY BRUCE L	02	STATE SENATOR		D	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
ALEXANDER GARY C	02	STATE REPRESENTATIVE	01	R	\$32,655.00	\$2,942.16	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
HUNT GRAHAM R	02	STATE REPRESENTATIVE	01	R	\$320.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
MCCUNE JAMES G	02	STATE REPRESENTATIVE	01	R	\$5,225.00	\$1,748.22	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
SATIACUM ROBERT K	02	STATE REPRESENTATIVE	01	D	\$1,405.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
WILCOX JAMES T III	02	STATE REPRESENTATIVE	02	R	\$42,081.27	\$14,578.63	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
BROWN LISA J	03	STATE SENATOR		D	\$153,672.65	\$61,095.15	\$225.00	\$0.00	\$0.00

EXHIBIT A

Legislative Candidates - Thursday, February 23, 2012

Name	Dist	Office	Pos	Pty	Contributio ns	Expenditur es	Debt	Ind Sup	Ind Opp
BILLIG ANDREW S	03	STATE REPRESENTATIVE	01	D	\$29,003.16	\$1,748.32	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
ORMSBY TIMM S	03	STATE REPRESENTATIVE	02	D	\$13,377.98	\$240.40	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
CROUSE LARRY W	04	STATE REPRESENTATIVE	01	R	\$5,915.81	\$2,464.27	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
SHEA MATT T	04	STATE REPRESENTATIVE	02	R	\$16,652.02	\$12,288.15	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
MULLET MARK D	05	STATE SENATOR		D	\$17,520.00	\$367.90	\$2,912.25	\$0.00	\$0.00
PFLUG CHERYL A	05	STATE SENATOR		R	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
TOFT BRADLEY M	05	STATE SENATOR		R	\$4,400.00	\$1,829.25	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
ANDERSON EDWIN GLENN	05	STATE REPRESENTATIVE	02	R	\$8,671.58	\$1,144.14	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
MAGENDANZ CHAD L	05	STATE REPRESENTATIVE	02	R	\$5,533.60	\$1,272.42	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
RODNE JAY R	05	STATE REPRESENTATIVE	U	R	\$9,725.00	\$3,382.93	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
PARKER KEVIN C	06	STATE REPRESENTATIVE	01	R	\$145,047.57	\$56,778.59	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
AHERN JOHN E	06	STATE REPRESENTATIVE	02	R	\$10,880.49	\$5,088.16	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
SHORT SHELLY A	07	STATE REPRESENTATIVE	01	R	\$17,626.21	\$2,879.43	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
KRETZ JOEL A	07	STATE REPRESENTATIVE	02	R	\$15,929.92	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
CLOUGH JERAME V	08	STATE REPRESENTATIVE	01	D	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00

EXHIBIT A

Legislative Candidates - Thursday, February 23, 2012

Name	Dist	Office	Pos	Pty	Contributions	Expenditures	Debt	Ind Sup	Ind Opp
HALER LAWRENCE E	08	STATE REPRESENTATIVE	02	R	\$17,150.29	\$848.80	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
KLIPPERT BRADLEY A	08	STATE REPRESENTATIVE	U	R	\$5,041.36	\$236.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
SCHOESLER MARK G	09	STATE SENATOR		R	\$96,890.36	\$4,494.91	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
FAGAN SUSAN K	09	STATE REPRESENTATIVE	01	R	\$20,879.34	\$12,248.70	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
SCHMICK JOSEPH S	09	STATE REPRESENTATIVE	02	R	\$52,314.42	\$11,837.02	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
HAUGEN MARY MARGARET	10	STATE SENATOR		O	\$29,463.20	\$1,620.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
SMITH NORMA C	10	STATE REPRESENTATIVE	01	R	\$19,670.75	\$4,014.34	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
BAILEY BARBARA F	10	STATE REPRESENTATIVE	02	R	\$83,311.00	\$27,690.54	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
RIGGS THOMAS E	10	STATE REPRESENTATIVE	02	D	\$147.45	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
HASEGAWA ROBERT A	11	STATE SENATOR		D	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
PRENTICE MARGARITA L	11	STATE SENATOR		D	\$112,566.99	\$84,595.88	\$825.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
VIRK BOBBY S	11	STATE SENATOR		D	\$15,400.00	\$1,133.42	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
BERGQUIST STEVEN A	11	STATE REPRESENTATIVE	01	D	\$1,000.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
FLYNN JAMES J	11	STATE REPRESENTATIVE	01	D	\$4,268.57	\$1,144.54	\$520.50	\$0.00	\$0.00
HUDGINS ZACHARY L	11	STATE REPRESENTATIVE	01	D	\$13,472.00	\$200.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00

EXHIBIT A

Legislative Candidates - Thursday, February 23, 2012

Name	Dist	Office	Pos	Pty	Contributions	Expenditures	Debt	Ind Sup	Ind Opp
KREJCI HOLLY	11	STATE REPRESENTATIVE	01	D	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
HOLLAND ROBERT E	11	STATE REPRESENTATIVE	02	D	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
BOWMAN STEPHANIE L	11	STATE REPRESENTATIVE	U	D	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
PARLETTE LINDA EVANS	12	STATE SENATOR		R	\$49,225.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
CONDOTTA CARY L	12	STATE REPRESENTATIVE	01	R	\$17,468.40	\$2,703.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
ARMSTRONG MICHAEL D	12	STATE REPRESENTATIVE	02	R	\$43,671.00	\$21,641.59	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
HAWKINS BRAD M	12	STATE REPRESENTATIVE	02	R	\$7,559.47	\$6,720.27	\$4,700.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
HINKLE WILLIAM R	13	STATE REPRESENTATIVE	02	R	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
MANWELLER MATHEW	13	STATE REPRESENTATIVE	02	R	\$50,881.76	\$11,301.99	\$322.72	\$0.00	\$0.00
WARNICK JUDITH M	13	STATE REPRESENTATIVE	U	R	\$9,650.00	\$1,255.88	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
KING CURTIS P	14	STATE SENATOR		R	\$76,182.85	\$7,397.15	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
JOHNSON NORMAN M	14	STATE REPRESENTATIVE	01	R	\$23,717.51	\$1,961.88	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
ROSS CHARLES R	14	STATE REPRESENTATIVE	02	R	\$21,049.96	\$672.92	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
CHANDLER BRUCE Q	15	STATE REPRESENTATIVE	01	R	\$18,997.25	\$2,000.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
TAYLOR DAVID V	15	STATE REPRESENTATIVE	U	R	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00

EXHIBIT A

Legislative Candidates - Thursday, February 23, 2012

Name	Dist	Office	Pos	Pty	Contributions	Expenditures	Debt	Ind Sup	Ind Opp
HEWITT MICHAEL D	16	STATE SENATOR		R	\$117,182.48	\$1,460.17	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
NEALEY TERRY R	16	STATE REPRESENTATIVE	02	R	\$12,100.00	\$461.60	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
BENTON DONALD M	17	STATE SENATOR		R	\$54,951.47	\$10,795.12	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
PROBST TIMOTHY P	17	STATE REPRESENTATIVE	01	D	\$31,740.46	\$9,898.79	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
HARRIS PAUL L	17	STATE REPRESENTATIVE	U	R	\$20,122.75	\$4,144.04	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
ZARELLI JOSEPH P	18	STATE SENATOR		R	\$68,580.67	\$26,862.34	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
RIVERS ANNA M	18	STATE REPRESENTATIVE	01	R	\$25,596.71	\$1,941.87	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
ORCUTT EDMUND T	18	STATE REPRESENTATIVE	02	R	\$27,536.14	\$7,288.90	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
PIKE LIZ S	18	STATE REPRESENTATIVE	02	R	\$3,325.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
HATFIELD BRIAN A	19	STATE SENATOR		D	\$68,077.33	\$5,075.47	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
WINSMAN RICK	19	STATE SENATOR		R	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
BLAKE BRIAN E	19	STATE REPRESENTATIVE	U	D	\$62,786.09	\$2,536.32	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
TAKKO DEAN A	19	STATE REPRESENTATIVE	U	D	\$66,064.23	\$1,648.54	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
LUND JAMI L	20	STATE SENATOR		R	\$6,694.82	\$6,694.82	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
SWECKER DANIEL P	20	STATE SENATOR		R	\$23,897.02	\$15,370.69	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00

EXHIBIT A

Legislative Candidates - Thursday, February 23, 2012

Name	Dist	Office	Pos	Pty	Contributions	Expenditures	Debt	Ind Sup	Ind Opp
DEBOLT RICHARD C	20	STATE REPRESENTATIVE	01	R	\$52,520.00	\$8,357.83	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
CHAPMAN DARRELL L	21	STATE REPRESENTATIVE	02	D	\$10,583.71	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
LIAS MARKO S	21	STATE REPRESENTATIVE	02	D	\$7,030.70	\$6,542.94	\$8,525.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
FUNK ANDREW G	21	STATE REPRESENTATIVE	U	R	\$1,495.26	\$1,495.26	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
ROBERTS MARY HELEN	21	STATE REPRESENTATIVE	U	D	\$4,950.48	\$46.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
FRASER KAREN R	22	STATE SENATOR		D	\$42,231.52	\$18,488.23	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
REYKDAL CHRIS P	22	STATE REPRESENTATIVE	01	D	\$14,829.28	\$12,686.10	\$3,200.93	\$0.00	\$0.00
WARD CHRISTOPHER	22	STATE REPRESENTATIVE	01	R	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
HUNT SAMUEL W	22	STATE REPRESENTATIVE	U	D	\$16,202.13	\$3,005.35	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
ROCKEFELLER W PHILLIPS	23	STATE SENATOR		D	\$26,414.11	\$2,722.31	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
ROLFES CHRISTINE N	23	STATE SENATOR		D	\$35,681.60	\$9,115.90	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
HANSEN DREW D	23	STATE REPRESENTATIVE	02	D	\$98,077.71	\$3,923.26	\$140.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
OLSEN JAMES M	23	STATE REPRESENTATIVE	02	R	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
ROLFES CHRISTINE N	23	STATE REPRESENTATIVE	02	D	\$5,374.60	\$5,374.60	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
APPLETON SHERRY V	23	STATE REPRESENTATIVE	U	D	\$8,146.87	\$1,752.10	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00

EXHIBIT A

Legislative Candidates - Thursday, February 23, 2012

Name	Dist	Office	Pos	Pty	Contributions	Expenditures	Debt	Ind Sup	Ind Opp
HARGROVE JAMES E	24	STATE SENATOR		D	\$29,472.00	\$8,709.27	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
VAN DE WEGE KEVIN W	24	STATE REPRESENTATIVE	01	D	\$24,094.20	\$9,287.50	\$225.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
THARINGER STEPHEN P	24	STATE REPRESENTATIVE	02	D	\$4,494.24	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
DAMMEIER BRUCE F	25	STATE SENATOR		R	\$164,403.96	\$28,791.01	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
KASTAMA JAMES M	25	STATE SENATOR		D	\$8,616.33	\$6,930.21	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
LOOKER DANE A	25	STATE REPRESENTATIVE	01	R	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
HILTON WILLIAM (BILL) L	25	STATE REPRESENTATIVE	02	D	\$1,900.00	\$150.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
ZEIGER HANS A	25	STATE REPRESENTATIVE	02	R	\$32,336.48	\$4,308.39	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
SCHLUMPF SHELLY L	25	STATE REPRESENTATIVE	U	R	\$2,350.00	\$0.00	\$300.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
ANGEL JANICE E	26	STATE REPRESENTATIVE	01	R	\$13,925.00	\$193.35	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
RICHARDS DOUGLAS R	26	STATE REPRESENTATIVE	02	R	\$11,743.85	\$7,170.17	\$1,636.07	\$0.00	\$0.00
SEAQUIST LARRY R	26	STATE REPRESENTATIVE	02	D	\$18,034.22	\$8,688.84	\$4,225.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
CONNELLY JOHN (JACK) R JR	27	STATE SENATOR		D	\$108,555.22	\$83,778.66	\$87,300.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
DARNEILLE JEANNIE L	27	STATE SENATOR		D	\$18,603.36	\$647.95	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
HILL ROBERT JESSE	27	STATE SENATOR		I	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00

EXHIBIT A

Legislative Candidates - Thursday, February 23, 2012

Name	Dist	Office	Pos	Pty	Contributions	Expenditures	Debt	Ind Sup	Ind Opp
JINKINS LAURIE A	27	STATE REPRESENTATIVE	01	D	\$22,315.21	\$4,195.21	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
FEY JACOB C	27	STATE REPRESENTATIVE	02	D	\$12,427.62	\$4,930.10	\$933.75	\$0.00	\$0.00
MERRITT JAMES R	27	STATE REPRESENTATIVE	02	D	\$1,314.40	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
WALKER LAUREN B	27	STATE REPRESENTATIVE	02	D	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
CARRELL MICHAEL J	28	STATE SENATOR		R	\$45,323.41	\$3,183.26	\$1,500.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
CHOINIERE ERIC C	28	STATE SENATOR		D	\$2,079.52	\$1,140.65	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
KELLEY TROY X	28	STATE REPRESENTATIVE	01	D	\$74,063.81	\$1,353.10	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
WAGEMANN JOHN P	28	STATE REPRESENTATIVE	02	R	\$7,927.04	\$3,239.08	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
GREEN TAMI J	28	STATE REPRESENTATIVE	U	D	\$11,100.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
LADENBURG CONNIE J	29	STATE REPRESENTATIVE	01	D	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
SAWYER DAVID J	29	STATE REPRESENTATIVE	01	D	\$6,321.21	\$2,768.91	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
KIRBY STEVEN T	29	STATE REPRESENTATIVE	02	D	\$22,370.00	\$3,019.30	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
EIDE TRACEY J	30	STATE SENATOR		D	\$7,050.00	\$75.00	\$825.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
FLYGARE ROGER G	30	STATE REPRESENTATIVE	01	D	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
HOFFMAN RICK A	30	STATE REPRESENTATIVE	01	D	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00

EXHIBIT A

Legislative Candidates - Thursday, February 23, 2012

Name	Dist	Office	Pos	Pty	Contributions	Expenditures	Debt	Ind Sup	Ind Opp
KOCHMAR LINDA L	30	STATE REPRESENTATIVE	01	R	\$1,250.00	\$1,204.33	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
MACFARLANE THOM O	30	STATE REPRESENTATIVE	01	D	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
MILOSCIA MARK A	30	STATE REPRESENTATIVE	01	D	\$5,500.00	\$5,250.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
MOORE WILLIAM A JR	30	STATE REPRESENTATIVE	01	R	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
BARRERA DOMINIC X	30	STATE REPRESENTATIVE	02	D	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
ASAY KATRINA L	30	STATE REPRESENTATIVE	U	R	\$13,935.00	\$696.11	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
DAHLQUIST CATHERINE C	31	STATE REPRESENTATIVE	01	R	\$21,000.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
HURST CHRISTOPHER A	31	STATE REPRESENTATIVE	02	O	\$125,944.71	\$4,371.38	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
RYU CINDY S	32	STATE REPRESENTATIVE	01	D	\$37,597.13	\$13,735.52	\$1,800.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
KAGI RUTH LECOCQ	32	STATE REPRESENTATIVE	02	D	\$9,101.73	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
ORWALL TINA L	33	STATE REPRESENTATIVE	01	D	\$15,883.89	\$281.24	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
UPTHEGROVE DAVID P	33	STATE REPRESENTATIVE	02	D	\$33,932.69	\$8,900.73	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
CODY EILEEN L	34	STATE REPRESENTATIVE	01	D	\$29,125.00	\$16,576.44	\$225.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
FITZGIBBON JOSEPH C	34	STATE REPRESENTATIVE	02	D	\$18,777.77	\$14,334.70	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
GRIFFEY DANIEL G	35	STATE REPRESENTATIVE	01	R	\$16,090.79	\$12,829.47	\$565.00	\$0.00	\$0.00

EXHIBIT A

Legislative Candidates - Thursday, February 23, 2012

Name	Dist	Office	Pos	Pty	Contributions	Expenditures	Debt	Ind Sup	Ind Opp
HAIGH KATHRYN M	35	STATE REPRESENTATIVE	01	D	\$12,421.52	\$5,102.52	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
DAVIS JEFFERSON S	35	STATE REPRESENTATIVE	02	D	\$21,521.83	\$9,516.28	\$1,800.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
GAITHER GLENN H	35	STATE REPRESENTATIVE	02	I	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
MACEWEN DREW C	35	STATE REPRESENTATIVE	02	R	\$6,881.51	\$4,053.87	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
RING-ERICKSON LYNDA J	35	STATE REPRESENTATIVE	02	D	\$16,410.00	\$9,921.86	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
CARLYLE REUVEN M	36	STATE REPRESENTATIVE	01	D	\$82,771.54	\$7,720.64	\$225.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
DICKERSON MARY LOU	36	STATE REPRESENTATIVE	02	D	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
KNIGHTON LINDE B	36	STATE REPRESENTATIVE	02	O	\$708.53	\$413.45	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
SANTOS SHARON T	37	STATE REPRESENTATIVE	01	D	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
PETTIGREW ERIC	37	STATE REPRESENTATIVE	02	D	\$33,399.35	\$6,628.35	\$225.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
MCCOY JOHN R	38	STATE REPRESENTATIVE	01	D	\$11,902.20	\$1,375.20	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
SELLS MICHAEL S	38	STATE REPRESENTATIVE	02	D	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
WILSON SAMUEL D	38	STATE REPRESENTATIVE	U	R	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
STEVENS VALERA A	39	STATE SENATOR		R	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
KRISTIANSAN DANIEL P	39	STATE REPRESENTATIVE	01	R	\$22,613.22	\$480.56	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00

EXHIBIT A

Legislative Candidates - Thursday, February 23, 2012

Name	Dist	Office	Pos	Pty	Contributions	Expenditures	Debt	Ind Sup	Ind Opp
PEARSON KIRK J	39	STATE REPRESENTATIVE	U	O	\$25,742.38	\$17,406.73	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
RANKER KEVIN M	40	STATE SENATOR		D	\$62,308.57	\$11,605.10	\$225.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
LYTTON KRISTINE C	40	STATE REPRESENTATIVE	01	D	\$20,117.53	\$324.96	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
MORRIS JEFFREY R	40	STATE REPRESENTATIVE	02	D	\$17,789.86	\$4,353.44	\$825.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
JARRETT FRED	41	STATE SENATOR		D	\$7,638.89	\$1,334.69	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
LITZOW STEPHEN R	41	STATE SENATOR		R	\$122,584.37	\$38,109.47	\$2,000.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
DUNBAR PETER J	41	STATE REPRESENTATIVE	01	R	\$1,830.90	\$1,039.83	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
MAXWELL MARCIE E	41	STATE REPRESENTATIVE	01	D	\$36,359.79	\$5,608.06	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
CLIBBORN JUDITH R	41	STATE REPRESENTATIVE	02	D	\$43,471.49	\$7,707.51	\$225.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
LIFTO ERIC R	41	STATE REPRESENTATIVE	02	R	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
OVERSTREET JASON E	42	STATE REPRESENTATIVE	01	R	\$8,973.45	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
BUYS VINCENT K	42	STATE REPRESENTATIVE	02	R	\$15,673.45	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
LINVILLE KELLI J	42	STATE REPRESENTATIVE	02	D	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
PEDERSEN JAMIE D	43	STATE REPRESENTATIVE	01	D	\$17,831.68	\$1,059.11	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
CHOPP FRANK V JR	43	STATE REPRESENTATIVE	02	D	\$31,182.49	\$6,425.06	\$825.00	\$0.00	\$0.00

EXHIBIT A

Legislative Candidates - Thursday, February 23, 2012

Name	Dist	Office	Pos	Pty	Contributions	Expenditures	Debt	Ind Sup	Ind Opp
GADOW GREGORY P	43	STATE REPRESENTATIVE	02	I	\$1,789.58	\$802.08	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
DUNSHEE HANS M	44	STATE REPRESENTATIVE	01	D	\$13,586.03	\$10,857.34	\$225.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
BOND JACOB L	45	STATE REPRESENTATIVE	01	D	\$800.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
GOODMAN ROGER E	45	STATE REPRESENTATIVE	01	D	\$9,689.11	\$1,875.04	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
HAISTINGS KEVIN E	45	STATE REPRESENTATIVE	01	R	\$250.00	\$0.00	\$9.63	\$0.00	\$0.00
LALIBERTE ERIC	45	STATE REPRESENTATIVE	01	D	\$10,194.89	\$729.34	\$5,000.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
SPRINGER LAWRENCE S	45	STATE REPRESENTATIVE	02	D	\$85,995.63	\$30,491.40	\$825.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
FROCKT DAVID S	46	STATE SENATOR		D	\$3,400.00	\$720.22	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
FROCKT DAVID S	46	STATE REPRESENTATIVE	01	D	\$9,313.47	\$2,817.01	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
POLLET GERALD	46	STATE REPRESENTATIVE	01	D	\$1,200.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
KENNEY PHYLLIS G	46	STATE REPRESENTATIVE	02	D	\$5,699.62	\$99.78	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
CANN SYLVESTER	46	STATE REPRESENTATIVE	U	D	\$15,680.40	\$874.70	\$3,477.55	\$0.00	\$0.00
HARGROVE MARK D	47	STATE REPRESENTATIVE	01	R	\$28,205.66	\$3,442.78	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
VIRK BOBBY S	47	STATE REPRESENTATIVE	01	D	\$200,341.55	\$92,546.28	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
SULLIVAN PATRICK J	47	STATE REPRESENTATIVE	02	D	\$55,624.11	\$10,955.37	\$225.00	\$0.00	\$0.00

EXHIBIT A

Legislative Candidates - Thursday, February 23, 2012

Name	Dist	Office	Pos	Pty	Contributions	Expenditures	Debt	Ind Sup	Ind Opp
HUNTER ROSS A	48	STATE REPRESENTATIVE	01	D	\$29,853.49	\$7,067.89	\$373.50	\$0.00	\$0.00
EDDY DEBORAH H	48	STATE REPRESENTATIVE	02	D	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
PRIDEMORE CRAIG A	49	STATE SENATOR		D	\$84,013.88	\$11,123.68	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
STOBER TY	49	STATE SENATOR		D	\$4,750.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
CLEVELAND ANNETTE	49	STATE SENATOR		D	\$7,825.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
JACKS JAMES F II	49	STATE REPRESENTATIVE	01	D	\$303.41	\$303.41	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
MOELLER JAMES C	49	STATE REPRESENTATIVE	U	D	\$29,496.42	\$10,649.17	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00

EXHIBIT A

Candidate Name	Candidate Office	State	Dist.	Candidate Party Affiliation	Candidate Incumbent Description	Total Receipts
<u>ANDERS, GREG</u>	H	WA	02	REP	CHALLENGER	\$441,604.87
<u>BRODHEAD, STEPHAN ANDREW</u>	H	WA	10	REP	CHALLENGER	
<u>BURNER, DARCY</u>	H	WA	01	DEM	OPEN	\$127,875.30
<u>CLOUGH, JERAME V</u>	H	WA	04	DEM	CHALLENGER	\$30,740.45
<u>COWAN, RICH</u>	H	WA	05	DEM	CHALLENGER	
<u>CRAMER, THOMAS ALLEN</u>	H	WA	10	DEM	CHALLENGER	\$3,170.00
<u>DELBENE, SUZAN K</u>	H	WA	01	DEM	OPEN	\$30,782.58
<u>DICKS, NORMAN D</u>	H	WA	06	DEM	INCUMBENT	\$629,113.49
<u>FLEMMING, STANLEY L K</u>	H	WA	10	REP	CHALLENGER	\$4,750.00
<u>GOODMAN, ROGER</u>	H	WA	01	DEM	OPEN	\$209,330.20
<u>HASTINGS, DOC</u>	H	WA	04	REP	INCUMBENT	\$662,367.43
<u>HAUGEN, JON I</u>	H	WA	03	DEM	CHALLENGER	
<u>HECK, DENNIS</u>	H	WA	10	DEM	CHALLENGER	\$624,503.94
<u>HERRERA BEUTLER, JAIME</u>	H	WA	03	REP	INCUMBENT	\$854,715.55
<u>HOBBS, STEVE</u>	H	WA	01	DEM	OPEN	\$124,392.04
<u>HUBER, ERNEST</u>	H	WA	08	REP	CHALLENGER	

EXHIBIT B

<u>HUGHES,</u> <u>ANDREW</u>	H	WA	01	DEM	OPEN	\$183,214.52
<u>IFITS</u> <u>ISHMAEL,</u> <u>LARRY WAYNE</u>	H	WA	01	IND	OPEN	
<u>KOSTER,</u> <u>JOHN M</u>	H	WA	01	REP	CHALLENGER	\$248,005.04
<u>LARSEN, RICK</u>	H	WA	02	DEM	INCUMBENT	\$704,787.07
<u>LIAS, MARKO</u> <u>MR</u>	H	WA	01	DEM	OPEN	\$87,597.68
<u>MCDERMOTT,</u> <u>JAMES</u>	H	WA	07	DEM	INCUMBENT	\$219,042.29
<u>MURI,</u> <u>RICHARD</u> <u>WALTER</u>	H	WA	09	REP	CHALLENGER	\$102,248.05
<u>PORTERFIELD,</u> <u>KAREN</u>	H	WA	08	DEM	CHALLENGER	\$12,080.00
<u>POSTMA,</u> <u>JAMES LEE</u>	H	WA	09	REP	CHALLENGER	
<u>RAUNIYAR,</u> <u>DARSHAN</u>	H	WA	01	DEM	OPEN	\$140,027.51
<u>REICHERT,</u> <u>DAVE</u>	H	WA	08	REP	INCUMBENT	\$877,536.33
<u>RIVERS,</u> <u>DONOVAN</u> <u>DON</u>	H	WA	07	DEM	CHALLENGER	
<u>RODGERS,</u> <u>CATHY</u> <u>MCMORRIS</u>	H	WA	05	REP	INCUMBENT	\$773,414.00
<u>RUDERMAN,</u> <u>LAURA E</u>	H	WA	01	DEM	OPEN	\$258,859.00
<u>SAUERWEIN,</u> <u>ROBERT DALE</u>	H	WA	06	REP	CHALLENGER	\$2,898.00
<u>SMITH, D</u> <u>ADAM</u>	H	WA	09	DEM	INCUMBENT	\$537,202.35
<u>UELMAN,</u> <u>ELIZABETH</u>	H	WA		DEM	CHALLENGER	

EXHIBIT B

<u>UEL</u> <u>ELIZABETH</u>	H	WA	03	DEM	CHALLENGER	
<u>WATKINS,</u> <u>JAMES</u>	H	WA	01	REP	OPEN	\$54,103.40
<u>YOUNG, JESSE</u> <u>L</u>	H	WA	06	REP	CHALLENGER	\$98,810.00

Show By Page | Total Result(s): 40

RECEIVED
SUPREME COURT
STATE OF WASHINGTON
Mar 01, 2012, 3:46 pm
BY RONALD R. CARPENTER
CLERK

NO. 86976-6

RECEIVED BY E-MAIL

SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON

IN THE MATTER OF:

2012 Washington State Redistricting
Plan,

JOHN MILEM,

Petitioner.

DECLARATION OF
SHERRIL HUFF

COPY

I, Sherril Huff, declare as follows:

1. I am over 18 years of age and competent to testify. I currently serve as the King County Elections Director. The following information is true and correct and of my own knowledge.

2. State law requires that all counties approve new maps, dividing the county into precincts for voting purposes, no later than April 30, 2012. RCW 29A.16.040. My office is already at work preparing a proposed new precinct map, so that we can present this map to the King County Council in time for the Council to adopt new precincts to meet this statutory deadline.

3. King County not only contains all or part of numerous Congressional and Legislative districts, but is also divided among county council districts and numerous cities and special districts. The number of subdivisions within the county, in addition to the size of the county's

ORIGINAL

population, makes it necessary to divide the county into numerous precincts. Prior to 2012, King County contained 2532 precincts. We anticipate that after adopting new precincts in 2012, King County will contain approximately 2507 precincts. The task of drawing such precincts is time consuming, and requires much attention to detail.

4. Congressional and legislative redistricting result in numerous changes to precinct boundaries in King County. In King County, 106 precincts were split by the new congressional and legislative district boundaries, which will result in 151 precinct alterations. Additionally, 1081 precincts move, in whole, from one district to another. This does not include another 115 precinct alterations made necessary by redistricting County Council districts, and precinct balancing.

5. My office has doubled its staff and spent the last two months working on this project, not including the time spent working with the Redistricting Commission in rectifying some ambiguous census boundary issues in relation to district boundaries.

6. In order for the King County Council to have time to review and act upon a proposal to adopt new precinct boundaries, it is necessary for my office to present proposed new precinct boundaries to the Council no later than March 30, 2012. Timely preparation of new precinct

boundaries for use in the 2012 election is unrealistic if a new redistricting plan with substantive changes is delivered after March 1, 2012.

7. We cannot draw precinct boundaries without relying upon, among other information, settled boundaries for congressional and legislative districts.

8. Other steps to inform potential candidates and voters of new congressional and legislative districts to be used in the 2012 primary and general election have already been taken by my office, and by others. These include:

- a. We have created and advertised a new interactive mapping application for people to find their new districts: <http://www.kingcounty.gov/elections/referenceresources/electionmaps/findmydistrict.aspx> (last visited February 25, 2012);
- b. Other agencies and interested parties have downloaded the district files from the counties' public data portal: <http://www5.kingcounty.gov/gisdataportal/> (last visited February 25, 2012);
- c. We have made new maps available to the public through our web site.¹

¹ Congressional district maps are available at: <http://your.kingcounty.gov/elections/gis/maps/composite/cong2012.pdf> (last visited February 25, 2012).

9. The duties of my office also include accepting declarations of candidacy from candidates for the Washington State Senate and House of Representatives from legislative districts that are contained entirely within King County. RCW 29A.24.070. State law requires that upon receiving such declarations of candidacy, my office determines whether the candidate is properly registered to vote within the legislative district that he or she seeks to represent. RCW 29A.20.021(3). In order to make this determination, all changes to legislative district boundaries must be finalized and entered into our county voter registration system before candidates file.

10. I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the state of Washington that the foregoing is true and correct and of my own knowledge, and that I executed this declaration at Seattle, Washington, in the County of King, this 27th day of February, 2012.



Sherril Huff

Legislative district maps are available at:
<http://your.kingcounty.gov/elections/gis/maps/composite/leg2012.pdf> (last visited
February 25, 2012).

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify, under penalty of perjury under the laws of the state of Washington, that on this date I have caused a true and correct copy of the foregoing document to be served via Electronic mail and First Class United States Mail, postage prepaid, on the following:

John Milem
1600 NE 125th Ave.
Vancouver, WA 98684
milemjohn@comcast.net
Petitioner Pro Se

DATED this 1st day of March, 2012, at Olympia,
Washington.


KRISTIN D. JENSEN
Legal Assistant

RECEIVED
SUPREME COURT
STATE OF WASHINGTON
Mar 01, 2012, 3:46 pm
BY RONALD R. CARPENTER
CLERK

NO. 86976-6

RECEIVED BY E-MAIL

bjh

SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON

IN THE MATTER OF:

2012 Washington State Redistricting
Plan,

JOHN MILEM,

Petitioner.

DECLARATION OF
JULIE ANDERSON

COPY

I, Julie Anderson, declare as follows:

1. I am over 18 years of age and competent to testify. I currently serve as the Pierce County Auditor. The following information is true and correct and of my own knowledge.

2. State law requires that all counties approve new maps, dividing the county into precincts for voting purposes, no later than April 30, 2012. RCW 29A.16.040. My office is already at work preparing a proposed new precinct map, so that we can present this map to the Pierce County Council in time for the Council to adopt new precincts in time to meet this statutory deadline. Precinct boundaries cannot be changed during the period that starts 14 days before candidate filing, and ends with the day of the general election. RCW 29A.16.040(1). In 2012, this means that the county cannot change precinct boundaries between April 30 and November 6.

ORIGINAL

3. In Pierce County, an additional change to state law requires major changes to prior precinct boundaries, in addition to changes necessitated by redistricting. In 2011, the Legislature amended RCW 29A.16.040 to change the method for determining the maximum size of a precinct. Laws of 2011, ch. 10, § 26. The result of this change is to increase the number of precincts into which Pierce County must be divided from 382 to as many as 550. All precincts are being redrawn from scratch. The task of drawing such precincts is time consuming, and requires much attention to detail.

4. We cannot draw precinct boundaries without relying upon, among other information, settled boundaries for congressional and legislative districts.

5. My office has already begun the process of preparing new precinct boundaries based upon congressional and legislative district boundaries adopted by the Redistricting Commission and approved by the legislature.

6. Timely preparation of new precinct boundaries for use in the 2012 elections is unrealistic if a new redistricting plan with substantive changes is delivered after March 1, 2012.

7. The duties of my office also include accepting declarations of candidacy from candidates for the Washington State Senate and House of

Representatives from legislative districts that are contained entirely within Pierce County. RCW 29A.24.070. State law requires that upon receiving such declarations of candidacy, my office determine whether the candidate is properly registered to vote within the legislative district that he or she seeks to represent. RCW 29A.20.021(3). In order to make this determination, all changes to legislative district boundaries must be finalized and entered into our county voter registration system before candidates file.

8. I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the state of Washington that the foregoing is true and correct and of my own knowledge, and that I executed this declaration at Tacoma, Washington, in the County of Pierce, this 24th day of February, 2012.



Julie Anderson

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify, under penalty of perjury under the laws of the state of Washington, that on this date I have caused a true and correct copy of the foregoing document to be served via Electronic mail and First Class United States Mail, postage prepaid, on the following:

John Milem
1600 NE 125th Ave.
Vancouver, WA 98684
milemjohn@comcast.net
Petitioner Pro Se

DATED this 1st day of March, 2012, at Olympia,
Washington.


KRISTIN D. JENSEN
Legal Assistant

RECEIVED
SUPREME COURT
STATE OF WASHINGTON
Mar 01, 2012, 3:46 pm
BY RONALD R. CARPENTER
CLERK

NO. 86976-6

RECEIVED BY E-MAIL

SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON

IN THE MATTER OF:

2012 Washington State Redistricting
Plan,

JOHN MILEM,

Petitioner.

DECLARATION OF
GENEVIEVE
O'SULLIVAN

COPY

I, Genevieve O'Sullivan, declare as follows:

1. I am over 18 years of age and competent to testify. I currently serve as Communications Director for the Washington State Redistricting Commission ("the Commission"). The following is true and correct and of my own knowledge.

2. The four voting members of the Commission—Tim Ceis, Dean Foster, Tom Huff, and Slade Gorton—and the Commission chair, Lura Powell—were appointed in January of 2011. The Commission held its first meeting on January 18, 2011.

3. As a part of the process of adopting the 2012 redistricting plan for the state of Washington, the Commission solicited public input through extensive public outreach that included mainstream and foreign language media, the Commission's website, social media, and through

ORIGINAL

various organizations such as local chambers of commerce, county and city governments, the League of Women Voters, Rotary clubs, and the Association of Washington Cities. The Commission's redistricting brochure was published in English, Spanish, Chinese, Tagalog, and Korean.

4. Throughout the redistricting process, the Commission conducted 27 public meetings. The Commission routinely solicited public comment at these meetings.

5. In addition, the Commission conducted 18 public forums in 17 cities. These forums were dedicated to providing information and receiving public comment on the redistricting process. Spanish language interpreters were provided at many of the forums. At the forum held in south Seattle, interpreters were provided for the following languages: Spanish, Somali, Ethiopian, Oromo, Vietnamese, Chinese, Tagalog, Amharic, and Tigray. The forums were scheduled to make it as easy as possible for typical state residents to attend or participate electronically. Forums were typically held in the early evenings at various community and public facilities. More than 350 people spoke at the public forums. All of the public forums, and most of the meetings, were either webcast or broadcast. The webcasts and broadcasts, and public submissions to the

Commission, are available for public review on the Commission's website. <http://www.redistricting.wa.gov/default.asp>.

6. The Commission received and considered proposed maps from 20 stakeholder groups and individuals. All such submissions were posted on the Commission's website. The Commission or its staff also reviewed more than 950 email and web comments from over 1,500 individuals addressing such subjects as communities of interest, existing jurisdictional lines, suggestions for new lines, and the redistricting process in general. The Commission also received over 500 comments via webcast during the meetings and forums.

7. The Commission had available to it state-of-the-art computer technology and models needed for the complex, technical process of drawing district lines. The Commission also had available to it all of the demographic and other data that traditionally was available to the legislature when it conducted redistricting.


8. On September 13, each of the voting commissioners presented their initial draft redistricting maps. The maps were posted on the Commission's website and covered in the media. The Commission received public testimony and comments on the maps during the ensuing weeks.

9. On October 14, the Commission reduced its initial four draft maps to two. These maps were posted on the Commission's website, covered in the media, and commented on at additional public meetings or through other written submissions to the Commission.

10. In order to help resolve outstanding issues efficiently, the Commission formed two working groups to address legislative district boundaries in different regions of the state. Eventually, one of these working groups also addressed unresolved issues involving congressional district boundaries. From mid-October through December these working groups met dozens of times, and the full Commission met another fourteen times, with public comment taken at each of these Commission meetings.

11. On January 1, 2012, the Commission approved the 2012 redistricting plan and submitted it to the state legislature.

12. I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the state of Washington that the foregoing is true and correct and of my own knowledge, and that I executed this declaration at Olympia, Washington, in the County of Thurston, this 28 day of February, 2012.



Genevieve O'Sullivan

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify, under penalty of perjury under the laws of the state of Washington, that on this date I have caused a true and correct copy of the foregoing document to be served via Electronic mail and First Class United States Mail, postage prepaid, on the following:

John Milem
1600 NE 125th Ave.
Vancouver, WA 98684
milemjohn@comcast.net
Petitioner Pro Se

DATED this 1st day of March, 2012, at Olympia,
Washington.


KRISTIN D JENSEN
Legal Assistant