



THE VOTER

THE LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF CENTRAL YAVAPAI COUNTY

LWVCYC.org LWVCYC@gmail.com P. O. Box 11538, Prescott, AZ 86304-1538 Dec. 2014

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

President/Webmaster
Terri Farneti
533-5297

1st Vice President
Program:
Ellie Laumark
583-2800

2nd Vice President
Membership:
Dale Domzalski
237-9093

Secretary
Linda Greenberg
710-5561

Treasurer
Lindsay Bell
778-0348

Director Action

Public Relations
Toni Denis
848-2753

Director In-House
Communications:
Nancy Shugrue
227-1374

Director Voter Services:
Tricia Powers
830-9030

Nominating Committee
Vicky O'Hara, chm.
Tina Blake
Dale Domzalski, Bd.

**LWVCYC
WINTER SOCIAL**

Prescott Crush Wine Café
1781 E. Highway 69, Suite 15
Prescott, AZ 86301/928-237-5001

**Saturday, December 6, 2014
12:00 Noon to 2:00 PM**



MAKE YOUR MEAL SELECTION:

SALAD/SPINACH with candied pecans, feta, strawberries, avocado & blackberry vinaigrette
PANINI/CHICKEN with mozzarella, roasted red pepper and aioli
PANINI/ROAST BEEF with provolone, caramelized onions & stone ground mustard

PLEASE RSVP BY MONDAY, DECEMBER 1

For more information contact: Dale Domzalski
domzalski@cablone.net 928-237-9093

A nonpartisan membership organization, the League of Women Voters neither supports nor opposes political parties or candidates, but encourages informed and active participation in government, works to increase understanding of major public policy issues, and influences public policy through education and advocacy.



President's Message

This time of year is for embracing gratitude for all good things in your life - family and friends - and the activities that add meaning to your life. Tennis does that for me ☺ -- as does the League of Women Voters.

The election was a tough reality check - with only 36.2% of registered voters VOTING and deciding who our elected officials will be. None of the hard work we have done in registering voters, being visible in the community to assist with questions about voting, informing on the ballot initiatives; the jail tax, etc., is in vain, but it is certainly discouraging. We need to find a way to re-engage voters! What are the hot topics that would illuminate the importance of having their voice heard? We try to do our part in providing informational meetings on the topics of the day, and we have studied issues to come to our positions to be able to take action. We remain vigilant in being the non-partisan political organization founded almost 95 years ago. Offering civil discourse is a haven for those of us who want discussion on both sides of an issue - to educate ourselves and be better citizens.

Our January 3rd meeting will be on Common Core Standards - certainly a hot topic this election season. Ellie Laumark has lined up another excellent panel to discuss this topic. The viewpoints will be inclusive, with those in support and opposed to these standards. We encourage your participation.

In February, we have our annual Program Planning. This is for members to speak up and form the plan of action for our League for the 2015-2016 year. We review our positions and determine if we need to re-study to make them more current - or to take on new studies to create a new position for our League to take action on. It is a very important meeting for membership to forge our League's progress.

I thank each of you for your support as members of our local League. We have many new members whom I have not even met yet, and hope to very soon. We offer the happy hours, coffees and socials as an opportunity to get to know one another - not in just meeting settings - so please join us and have some fun! I thank Dale Domzalski for being the idea person for these social events. She has done a wonderful job as our Vice-President - Membership. Dale will be leaving Prescott soon, and our board will sorely miss her dedication to our League.

The Nominating Committee will be working on filling positions for the 2015-2016 year, and we encourage each member to consider serving to add to the diversity of our board. As I have said before - it is a rewarding experience to work with our current board with the commitment each of us has to future of our League. I am truly grateful for their support.

Wishing you all a Happy Thanksgiving - and looking forward to seeing you at the Winter Social on December 6th! Please make sure to RSVP to Dale with your menu selection - and you may pay at the door.

LWVGT (Greater Tucson) Op-Ed: The Day After Midterm Elections

As the final votes from yesterday's midterm elections continue to be counted, it's a good time to look back on the 2014 election cycle and see what we have learned.

For nearly a century, the League of Women Voters has worked to provide education and access to voters to allow them to make educated choices in the voting booth. We are and always have been nonpartisan. We will never support one candidate over another. The League does, after study, take sides on initiatives and referendums, but never candidates.

A trend we have watched grow over the past few election cycles matured this year. The era of the local candidate who decides to run for public office simply because he or she has a strong desire to serve and better the community is ending. It's being replaced with a candidate backed by dark money and campaigns run by party consultants who make all the decisions.

This is not a change that strengthens our democracy nor one voters should embrace.

The 2011 decision by the United States Supreme Court in *Citizens United* has changed political campaign financing in a highly negative way. It provides the average candidate the financial backing (assuming they agree with the agenda of the contributor) to be able to buy thousands of 30-second commercials to spread his/her message. In addition, political action committees or other groups raise money and buy ads as well.

Too often these advertisements are filled with name-calling, appeals to prejudice, shifting blame, distorting positions, evading real issues and sowing confusion in the minds of potential voters. Those ads are frequently funded by unknown donors. Thus the term "dark money." The time-tested need for candidates to raise their own money is disappearing.

Often, outside consultants urge candidates to let the broadcast commercials do the campaigning. This election, the League of Women Voters of Greater Tucson scheduled five candidate forums for people running for statewide office in Arizona. All the forums were to be televised to reach as many voters as possible. Just a few weeks after the invitations were sent, we noticed a trend. Republicans were declining our invitation. Eventually they all did.

Was it coincidence? Or is someone in the background encouraging them not to participate in televised forums for fear of saying something different from the "message" in the commercials?

I certainly hope we have not evolved into a situation where the privileged few control voters' minds and thoughts and also control who gets into public office.

It's impossible to be able to make an educated decision from the content of a television commercial on how a particular candidate will perform once he or she is sworn into office. The voters must ask informed questions of the candidates through direct access and be able to compare their answers.

The voters of Arizona and the nation deserve better. The League supports legislation in Congress to require all political contributions to be public — even political action committees. And we also support efforts that limit those contributions to avoid the exaggeratedly loud voices of a few donors with lots of money.

When the candidates hide behind consultants and commercials, none of us, except for the people pulling the strings, benefit. More worrisome is that democracy is seriously imperiled.

We must reclaim our democracy. Raise your voice and let it be heard! You can reach out to your representative in Congress to voice your support for legislation to void the *Citizens United* ruling. If you don't know how to contact your representative, just go to the League of Women Voters of Greater Tucson's website at lwvgt.org online.

We're here to help!

Judy Moll, who has lived in Tucson for 15 years, is president of the League of Women Voters of Greater Tucson. Her career was in early childhood education. Contact her at president@lwvgt.com

Outside money played huge role in Arizona elections

Mary Jo Pitzl and Rob O'Dell, The Republic | azcentral.com November 8, 2014

Story Highlights

- Doug Ducey attracted \$8.2 million in outside money that either directly supported him or worked to defeat Democrat Fred DuVal.
- Recent decisions by the court eliminated dollar limits and disclosure requirements for certain contributors.

Money talked loudly and persuasively in this year's elections. And money that was spent outside of the candidates' control was the loudest of all, playing a decisive role in most of the statewide races as well as in other down-ballot contests.

Gov.-elect Doug Ducey was the biggest beneficiary, attracting \$8.2 million in outside money that either directly supported him or worked to defeat his opponent, Democrat Fred DuVal. The \$12 million in outside money spent on the governor's race alone eclipsed the total spent in any previous Arizona governor's race.

DuVal noted the influence of that money on Election Night, when he broke from a conciliatory concession speech and told somber supporters he had called to congratulate Ducey. "I would like to call and congratulate the other big winners of tonight's race, but frankly, the other winners are undisclosed, unknown and out of state," DuVal said, as a cheer went up.

Ducey television ads

Newly elected Republican governor Doug Ducey and groups supporting him ran more than 7,800 television ads during the 2014 election cycle. Some were in support of his candidacy; others targeted opponents.

DuVal television ads

DuVal and PACs supporting him aired about 4,500 television ads during this election cycle. Most were positive or "mixed," meaning supportive of DuVal while critical of his opponent. One political action committee spent almost \$872,000 on ads targeting Doug Ducey.

But for many worried about the growing influence of outside money on elections, in particular dollars from undisclosed donors, Arizona's 2014 election left little to cheer about. "This was no election. It was an auction. Thank you, U.S. Supreme Court," Athia Hardt, a Democrat who has been active in politics, posted on her Facebook page.

Recent decisions by the court eliminated dollar limits and disclosure requirements for certain contributors, setting off the spending spree. Spending reports filed with the Arizona Secretary of State's Office show the Republican candidates who benefited the most from outside money won in almost all of Tuesday's high-profile races: governor, attorney general, secretary of state and the Corporation Commission.

It was a different story for Democrats in the state's two most competitive congressional races, where outside spending for both major-party candidates was about equal. Democrat Rep. Ann Kirkpatrick handily defeated Republican Andy Tobin, and Democrat Rep. Ron Barber is in a still-too-close-to-call race with Republican Martha McSally.

Spending by outside groups in Arizona congressional races more than doubled between 2010 and 2012, from \$9million to \$19million. In state and legislative races, outside spending totaled \$27.3 million this year. Because of this spending, 2014, a midterm election without a U.S. Senate race on the ballot, featured four of Arizona's 10 most expensive races since 1990.

In this new landscape, outside spending can eclipse what the candidates themselves raise. This allows candidates benefiting from outside spending to deliver a positive message while the outside groups do the dirty work of trying to sully their opponents' name.

"These groups are now playing a much more defined role in outside spending (on campaigns)," said Paul Johnson, a former Phoenix mayor who has remained active in politics.

In the governor's race, for example, the Republican Governors Association and its RGA Arizona PAC aired more than 4,000 TV ads attacking DuVal, according to Kantar Media/CMAG, which monitors political advertising nationwide.

Meanwhile, Ducey's own campaign aired more than 5,000 ads casting its candidate in a positive light and about 700 ads to specifically attack DuVal. (The figures, reported by the Center for Public Integrity, only include ads on broadcast networks, not cable networks.)

The parallel efforts worked well for Ducey, whom Johnson called the "model" for future campaigns. But it's not fail-safe.

Gov's race: Nearly \$19 mil spent

Arizona gubernatorial candidates and groups supporting or opposing them spent \$18.7 million in TV ads during this election cycle. Here's a look at the top five spenders.

Political consultant Matt Benson noted state schools superintendent candidate David Garcia had \$802,000 in outside money benefiting his campaign, while opponent Diane Douglas had \$1,100.

Yet Douglas has maintained a lead in the close contest, which as of Friday was still undecided.

"Outside spending is a bogeyman that Democrats have latched onto to excuse their own ineffectiveness as candidates and campaigns," said Benson, who worked on Attorney General-elect Mark Brnovich's campaign. "This is the second consecutive midterm cycle in which Democrats haven't won a single statewide office."

'Inherently corrupting'

Outside spenders this election included political-action and independent-expenditure committees, which are required to disclose their contributions and expenditures, and non-profits, which can keep their donors secret.

Of the \$27.3 million in outside spending, at least 46 percent came from groups that don't have to disclose their donors. The motives of these "dark money" donors may never be known. It's inherently corrupting," pollster Mike O'Neil said. "But if you really want to know what they are buying, you would have to know who they are."

Arizona Public Service is widely believed to have contributed to political non-profit groups that supported Arizona Corporation Commission candidates Tom Forese and Doug Little, and attacked their rivals. The commission regulates APS and other utilities. The non-profit groups are not required to disclose donors, and APS has refused to confirm or deny involvement.

Forese said he was disappointed that money — not energy policy or other Corporation Commission duties — dominated the race. Forese said his attorneys advised him that if he spoke about the outside money, it could be construed as illegal coordination with an independent-expenditure committee.

As for what his donors, mostly anonymous, expect once he takes his seat in January, Forese said he will vote his conscience. "The onus is on the candidate to make sure the only decision is made by me, weighing the facts and following my conscience," he said.

Others see clear motives behind the outside spending. The day after the election, commission staffers proposed ending a requirement that utilities reduce the power they produce through energy-conservation efforts. Commissioner Gary Pierce said the requirement had become too onerous for utilities, although research has shown energy-efficiency practices are the most cost-effective way for utilities to cut power production. The issue will likely be decided after the two newest members, elected Tuesday, are seated.

Democratic Corporation Commission candidate Jim Holway, who lost to Forese and Little, said dark money and the rumored involvement of APS has "damaged the credibility and put into question the integrity

of the Corporation Commission." He said regulators are intimidated, noting the commission declined to order APS to disclose whether it donated to the non-profit groups.

Just the prospect of being targeted by outside spending can make elected officials beholden to outside interests, said Chris Herstam, a former Republican lawmaker. "As they formulate public policy, they will do so knowing that their names could be put on the dark-money hit list in the next election," he said. "The power and influence of wealthy and corporate contributors will become monstrous."

But for some voters, the beauty of unnamed donors is that it's impossible to link money to motive, said Kathie Trojanowski, a retired speech pathologist and Republican voter. "Having anonymous donors is the best thing that ever happened because then the candidate doesn't owe anybody anything," she said.

She reflects the view of Sean Noble, who has controlled political non-profit groups that don't have to disclose their donors. Noble argues anonymous political speech is vital to American political life, shielding the speaker from retribution from the government. It can also level the playing field if there is a deep-pocketed candidate, he said.

That was the case with Republican Christine Jones, who put \$5.3 million of her own money into her gubernatorial campaign. In response, outside groups countered with \$373,000 attacking her. Jones lost to Ducey in the GOP primary.

Negative messages

Voters lamented the onslaught of negative ads that crowded the airwaves, filled their mailboxes and piled up in their e-mail. "At this point in the election season, everyone's sick and tired of the advertisements that bash the other candidates," Berenice Aguirre-Rosales of Phoenix said on Election Day.

Tom O'Halleran, who ran an unsuccessful bid for state Senate as an independent in north-central Arizona, said the negativity alienates voters.

Holway said he believes negative ads turned off voters in the Corporation Commission race.

Voter turnout was 44 percent, compared with almost 56 percent in the last midterm election.

"Negative advertising suppresses the vote," O'Halleran said. "When I talk to people, they don't want to be a part of it."

The outside spending can drown out a candidate's message. "I felt like a piñata," said state Rep. John Kavanagh, R-Fountain Hills. He was targeted by \$160,000 in outside money during his GOP primary for a state Senate seat. Although he prevailed, he said without the outside money "my victory margin would have been wider than it was and my name wouldn't have been muddied."

Arizona's Clean Elections system could be another casualty of outside spending. The system gives candidates a predetermined amount of money to run on, and those amounts are known. That makes it easy for outside groups, or opposing campaigns, to strategize how to outspend such candidates.

Democratic secretary of state candidate Terry Goddard attributes his loss to \$300,000 in television ads that cast him in a negative light and hit the airwaves in the last 10 days of the campaign. That money came from the 60 Plus Association, a dark-money group that also ran ads critical of DuVal in the governor's race. The \$300,000 almost equaled the money that Goddard had available for the general election as a publicly funded candidate.

Strict disclosure

Most people upset by the proliferation of outside spending admit nothing can be done to limit it. But some say requiring dark-money groups to disclose their donors would at least reveal who's trying to influence voters. Voters could then draw their own conclusion about the groups' motives.

The U.S. Supreme Court's 2010 ruling in the *Citizens United vs. Federal Election Commission* case cleared the way for corporations to contribute unlimited amounts to outside groups, but it did not make those donations secret. "The only thing the states can do at this point is require strict disclosure," retired Montana Supreme Court Justice James Nelson said on a recent visit to Phoenix. Montana's Legislature tried to reverse the impact of that ruling in its state but failed.

Nelson suggested states could adopt laws requiring disclosure of every person who donated to a 501(c)4 corporation. Those non-profits don't have to name their donors under federal tax law.

Secretary of State-elect Michele Reagan made an unsuccessful bid to require disclosure this year, but the bill she sponsored as a state senator died after an initial positive vote. Reagan has since said there is little states can do to force non-profits to disclose their donors.

Goddard has vowed to keep working to shine a light on dark money, saying there is legislative support for such a bill. He's also said he would lead a citizens' initiative to put the matter on the ballot if the Legislature fails to act. He, like many others, believes that if people had to put their names on the ads they sponsor, they might think twice about the tone of the message.

"Without meaningful and timely disclosure laws, the dark money will forever negatively impact our political landscape," said Herstam, the former lawmaker.

But disclosure is an imperfect answer, an expert said. David Berman, who authored a paper on dark money for Arizona State University's Morrison Institute for Public Policy, is not convinced revealing who paid for an attack ad would matter to voters. "It's remedy that's not going to remedy too much," said Berman, a senior research fellow.

Outside groups and campaigns always seem to find a way around it, he said. And once elected, public officials who have benefited from anonymous spending suddenly become reluctant to push for disclosure. Of the 10 most expensive races in Arizona since 1990, four occurred this year.

Republic reporters Alia Beard Rau, Rebekah L. Sanders and Yvonne Wingett Sanchez contributed to this article.

Editor's note: This story continues an occasional series, Shadow Campaigns, to shed light on outside spending in this year's election. Operating with fewer restrictions on donations and expenditures than candidate campaigns, these groups are attempting to sway voters by spending record amounts, in some cases more than the candidates themselves.

Dark Money Helped Win the Senate

NYT Editorial

By [THE EDITORIAL BOARD](#), NYT, Nov. 8, 2014

The next Senate was just elected on the greatest wave of secret, special-interest money ever raised in a congressional election. What are the chances that it will take action to reduce the influence of money in politics?

Nil, of course. The next Senate majority leader, Mitch McConnell, has long been the most prominent advocate for unlimited secret campaign spending in Washington, under the phony banner of free speech. His own campaign benefited from \$23 million in unlimited spending from independent groups like the National Rifle Association, the National Association of Realtors and the National Federation of Independent Business.

The single biggest outside spender on his behalf was a so-called social welfare group calling itself the Kentucky Opportunity Coalition, [which spent \\$7.6 million](#) on attack ads against his opponent, Alison Lundergan Grimes. It ran more ads in Kentucky than any other group, aside from the two campaigns.

What is its social welfare purpose, besides re-electing Mr. McConnell? [It has none](#). Who gave that money? It could have been anyone who wants to be a political player but lacks the courage to do so openly — possibly coal interests, retailers opposed to the minimum wage, defense contractors, but there's no way for the public to know. You can bet, however, that the senator knows exactly to whom he owes an enormous favor. The only name associated with the group is Scott Jennings, a deputy political director in the George W. Bush White House, who also worked for two of Mr. McConnell's previous campaigns.

The [\\$11.4 million](#) spent anonymously for Mr. McConnell, though, didn't even make him the biggest beneficiary of secret donations, a phenomenon that grew substantially in this election cycle. In the 2010 midterms, when this practice was just getting started, \$161 million was spent by groups that did not disclose

donations. In this cycle it was up to at least \$216 million, and 69 percent of it was spent on behalf of Republicans, [according to the Center for Responsive Politics](#).

In Colorado, at least [\\$18 million in dark money](#) was spent on behalf of Cory Gardner, the Republican newly elected to the Senate; \$4 million was spent on behalf of Senator Mark Udall, the Democratic incumbent. In North Carolina, \$13.7 million in secret donations was spent for Thom Tillis, the new Republican senator; \$2.6 million went to Senator Kay Hagan, who was ousted.

Dark money wasn't the only type of spending that polluted the cycle; this year there were 94 "super PACs" set up for individual candidates, all of which are attempts to bypass federal limits and allow big givers to support the candidates of their choice. (These donations have to be disclosed.) [Of the \\$51.4 million](#) these groups spent, 57 percent were on behalf of Democrats. Overall, of the \$525.6 million in independent expenditures this cycle (excluding party committees), about 57 percent was for Republicans.

That money wasn't just spent on attack ads. [As Nicholas Confessore of The Times reported](#), it was used for tracking opponents and digging up damaging information, and expanding the ground game to turn out voters. Republicans used the money to set up a "research" group called America Rising, which existed only to sell embarrassing information and footage about Democratic candidates to Republican campaigns and super PACs.

Political operatives say this year was just a dress rehearsal for 2016, when there will be even more money, much of it secret, all benefiting the interests of the richest and best connected Americans. Given big money's influence on Tuesday, the chances for limiting it are more distant than ever.



Membership:

Our November 1 meeting had 62 total attendees. 38 guest and speakers + 24 members. We had a wonderful time at the Happy Hour on Thursday, November 20. Nine people attended.

Winter Social is next month! December 6, 2014 at Prescott Crush Wine Café ~ Noon to 2pm. Please call or email Dale at domzalski@cablone.net to RSVP and give her your meal selection.



Program VP Ellie Laumark, President Terri Farneti, and Prescott Valley Chamber of Commerce President/CEO Marnie Uhl at the November LWV Meeting



A Way to help the AZ League Financially

Amazon Smile

The State League has just joined a new program to help raise funds. AmazonSmile is a simple and automatic way for you to support the State League every time you shop, at no cost to you. When you shop at smile.amazon.com, you'll find the exact same low prices, vast selection and convenient shopping experience as Amazon.com, with the added bonus that Amazon will donate a 0.5% of the purchase price to the State League's Education Foundation. To shop at Amazon Smile, simply go to smile.amazon.com instead of just amazon.com and search for the League of Women Voters of **AZ** as your selected charitable organization.

[View Online](#)

Share This: [f](#) [t](#) [+](#)



MAKING DEMOCRACY WORK

Dear Supporter:

The 2014 election was one of the most expensive in American history because of the Supreme Court's *Citizens United* decision, which allowed groups to pump hundreds of millions of dollars into our elections, with little or no disclosure or transparency required.

It was also the first federal election where we saw the full effect of the Supreme Court's decision to gut key provisions of the Voting Rights Act, allowing states to enact voter suppression laws that kept far too many eligible voters from casting their ballots on Election Day.

How much do you know about how the changes in these laws affected the election? [Click here to find out!](#)

In League,

Elisabeth MacNamara

President, League of Women Voters



PS: #GivingTuesday is just around the corner! Celebrated annually on the first Tuesday after Thanksgiving, it is a great way to support your favorite cause. [Pledge to support the League on December 2 and your donation will be matched dollar-for-dollar by generous League supporters!](#)

**IMPORTANT WEBSITE
REFERENCES**

LWVUS Website
www.lwv.org

LWVAZ Website
www.lwvaz.org

LWVCYC Website
LWVCYC.org

We recommend that you check these out monthly, or more often. Lots of good information! Bookmark them to save on typing, or go to lwvaz.org, where there are links to click on. Or Google LWVCYC!

Our website includes current and past VOTERS, and other great material. You can also find us on Facebook and Twitter.

Reminder – Members are always welcome to attend Board meetings.

To request placement of an item on the Board agenda and/or to receive the Board agenda packet, contact the LWVCYC President a week in advance.

LWV MEMBERSHIP REGISTRATION

2014-2015

Membership in the LWV is open to any person 18 and over who subscribes to the purposes and policies of the LWVUS. Dues for 2013-2014 cover payment for local (\$16.00), state (\$13), and national (\$31.00) memberships.

Name: _____

Address: _____

City/Zip: _____

Phone: _____ Fax: _____

Email: _____

Note type of membership, and make check to “LWVCYC”:

_____ \$60/Yr Individual Membership

_____ \$90/Yr Household Membership

Plus suggested donation:

\$_____ Contribution to League (not tax deductible)

\$_____ *Contribution to Education Fund (tax deductible)

*Donations to the LWVAZ Education Fund must be made by separate check, to preserve tax deductibility. This supports our Webpage and Voter Service activities. Thank you!

Both new and renewal members, please include this form with your check.

New: _____

Renewal: _____

OR

Be a “Friend” of LWVCYC:

_____ \$50/Yr Individual or _____ \$75/Yr Household
(open to businesses and individuals)

Please mail this form and all checks to:

LWVCYC

PO Box 11538 Prescott, AZ 86304-1538

Please renew your membership, if you have not already done so!

LWVCYC Calendar 2014-15

DAY	DATE	TIME	ACTIVITY	TOPIC/PLACE
Thu	Nov 27		Thanksgiving	
Tues.	Dec. 2	8-9:30	Board Meeting	
Sat.	Dec. 6	12noon To 2	Holiday Brunch	Brunch and fun! Prescott Crush Wine Cafe
Thu	Dec 25		Christmas	
Fri..	Jan. 2	8-9:30	Board Meeting	
Sat.	Jan. 3	9-11:30	General Meeting Las Fuentes	The Core Curriculum: The Good, The Bad, or the Ugly
Thu	Jan 15	5	Thursday Meet-Up	Happy Hour/Eagles Nest
Tues.	Feb. 3	8-9:30	Board Meeting	
Sat.	Feb. 7	9-11:30	General Meeting Las Fuentes	Local and State Program Planning, LWV Studies Review
Thu	Feb 19	10	Thursday Meet-Up	Coffee Hour/Starbucks on 69
Tues.	Mar 3	8-9:30	Board Meeting	
Sat.	Mar 7	9-11:30	General Meeting Las Fuentes	Water – Is there enough in the Yavapai Highland? What can we do about it? What is being done?
Thu	Mar 19	5	Thursday Meet-Up	Happy Hour/Eagles Nest
Tues.	Mar. 31	8-9:30	Board Meeting	
Sat.	Apr. 4	9-11:30	General Meeting Las Fuentes	Legislative Update
Thu	Apr. 16	10	Thursday Meet-Up	Coffee Hour/Starbucks on 69
Tues.	Apr 24	8-9:30	Board Meeting	
Sat.	May 2	10:30- 1:30	Annual Meeting	Election of Officers, Program, , Lunch, Speaker
Thu	May 21	5	Thursday Meet-Up	Happy Hour/Eagles Nest
Sat	June 6	10-4	Board Retreat	?
Thu	June 18	10	Thursday Meet-Up	Coffee Hour/Starbucks on 69
Thu	July 16	5	Thursday Meet-Up	Happy Hour/Eagles Nest





**League of Women Voters
of Central Yavapai County
P.O. Box 11538
Prescott, AZ 86304-1538**

A nonpartisan membership organization, the League of Women Voters neither supports nor opposes political parties or candidates, but encourages informed and active participation in government, works to increase understanding of major public policy issues, and influences public policy through education and advocacy.