



THE CAPITOL CONNECTION

INSIDE THIS ISSUE:

<i>Darrell Steinberg on Foster Care</i>	2
<i>Headlines</i>	3
<i>Candidates for Office</i>	7
<i>Termed Out Legislators</i>	8

LEGISLATIVE
CALENDAR:

Legislature Reconvenes
January 7, 2002

THE NEXT SPEAKER SPEAKS

EXCLUSIVE: INTERVIEW WITH HERB WESSON



Assembly Member Herb J. Wesson, Jr. (D - Los Angeles/Culver City) was successful in his first bid for public office when he was elected to represent the 47th Assembly District in November of 1998. Prior to his election to the State Assembly, Mr. Wesson served as Chief of Staff to Los Angeles County Supervisor Yvonne Braithwaite Burke and Chief Deputy to Los Angeles City Councilmember Nate Holden.

Mr. Wesson was appointed in his freshman term to chair the powerful Assembly Governmental Organization Committee, which has jurisdiction over legislation pertaining to public records, alcohol, tobacco and the state's emergency response system. Mr. Wesson is expected to be sworn in as Speaker of the Assembly on February 6, 2002.

Mr. Wesson recently took time to share some thoughts with *The Capitol Connection*.

CC: What plans do you have for your upcoming speakership?

Wesson: One of the things I learned from this past year's energy crisis is that you don't always get to set your own agenda. And looking down the barrel of a state budget deficit currently estimated to be in excess of \$12 billion, I expect things will not be much different during this coming year. Events, not my expectations, are going to decide much of what I must concentrate on this coming year.

Having said that, there are issues that have always been of concern to me. I have always been concerned about human rights issues. And I believe strongly that it is the responsibility of government to do all it can to help our children lead healthy, productive lives. To the extent I can, I will pursue those goals while trying to deal with the looming budget shortfall.

CC: Will you initiate any major changes in the way the Assembly conducts its business?

(Continued on page 6)

LEGISLATURE HOLDS PROPOSITION 36 FORUM

Since the passage of Proposition 36 in November of 2000, many people have pondered whether the rehabilitation-over-incarceration model would prove as successful as predicted by its proponents. On Wednesday, November 14, the Assembly and Senate Committees on Public Safety chaired by Assembly Member Carl Washington (D-Paramount) and Senator Bruce McPherson (R-Santa Cruz) held a Joint Informational Hearing to review the implementation of Proposition 36 across the state. Among those reporting on the status of implementation of

the initiative were representatives of parole, probation, courts, counties, treatment providers, ancillary services, the Legislative Analyst's Office, and the public.

Stakeholders testifying at the hearing voiced much agreement on issues of the level of treatment, jurisdiction, amount of funds available, rehabilitation care management, and the fact that it is simply too soon to make conclusions about initiative's success or failure.

(Continued on page 3)

GUEST EDITORIAL:

THE CHALLENGE OF FOSTER CARE REFORM

By Darrell Steinberg

I am a relative newcomer to issues facing California's foster care and the dependency court system. But I believe I approach the issue with fresh eyes. And what I see is this: Despite the many dedicated professionals, laudable legislative efforts and promising pilot projects to improve the lot of foster children, California's child welfare system remains fractured and unresponsive, and lacks accountability. This for the most vulnerable of all populations – victims of child abuse and neglect.

The term “child welfare system” is used broadly to describe the various federal, state and county funding streams (each with its own strings and restrictions), the different foster provider placement options, social workers, the dependency court system, law enforcement, the mental health delivery system, educators of foster youth in public and non-public schools, regional centers, health care providers, and others.

All are assigned a different piece of foster children's broken lives. Many are doing a good job on their individual part. But the bureaucracies are not talking to one another. They are not coordinating their efforts. A child welfare “system” connotes a sharing and coordination of efforts toward a common goal. But that is precisely what California's “system” lacks.

The stakes for the lack of a coordinated effort just got higher. New regulations are transforming the federal compliance reviews of our child welfare system from the old process-based “check-off” to a review based on outcomes. After a year to implement program improvement plans, states that remain in noncompliance will lose a portion of their federal funding. For each year states fail to make substantive improvement, the penalties increase. Currently California does not track foster youth and family outcomes, much less assure good ones. Unless we change how we do business, we are sure to lose funding.

While we don't track outcomes per se, numerous studies indicate that foster children are disproportionately represented in nearly every negative child welfare index: they are more likely to have chronic health and mental health problems, behavioral problems and learning difficulties and to work below grade level in school. According to the most recent studies, within two to four years following emancipation from the foster care system, half of them had not completed high school, over a half were unemployed, and a quarter were homeless. These outcomes are

unacceptable. They fuel my interest in providing the “political lift” necessary to make foster care reform the policymaking priority it deserves to be.

Last year, the Democratic leadership of the Assembly joined together in proposing a 13-bill, \$300 million reform package designed to reduce social worker caseloads, provide support to emancipating foster youth, increase the pool of foster family providers, provide educational support for foster youth, and hold governmental agencies accountable for positive child and family outcomes. The bulk of this reform package fell victim to a worsening economy and the energy crisis. However, we were able to

“A child welfare ‘system’ connotes a sharing and coordination of efforts toward a common goal. But that is precisely what California's ‘system’ lacks.”

enact significant supports for emancipating foster youth as well as AB 636, a bill I introduced to provide clear goals and benchmarks for counties switching to the new outcomes-based accountability system and technical assistance to help struggling counties meet those benchmarks. This bill also convenes the disparate state

and local agencies, foster youth advocates and others to develop a blueprint for meeting the new federal outcome measures and thus better serve California's children and families.

To help cultivate the focus on improving the foster care system, I recently convened a second annual roundtable of child welfare system professionals – juvenile court judges, dependency attorneys, social workers, educators, emancipated foster youth and youth advocates – to discuss next steps in improving California's foster care system. I heard loud and clear the call for multidisciplinary approaches to assess and meet the needs of foster youth. Lack of funding is also clearly a dominant issue. And with the State facing an estimated \$12 billion budget shortfall this year, we must find creative ways to leverage federal and private monies to fund improvements.

The bottom line is that children in foster care are dependents and wards of the State. Simply put, the State is their parent. It is time we took our parental responsibilities seriously.

Assembly Member Steinberg (D-Sacramento) represents the Ninth Assembly District. He is chair of the Assembly Judiciary Committee and a member of the Judicial Council.

PROPOSITION 36 FORUM

(Continued from page 1)

Judge Stephen Manley of the Santa Clara County Superior Court, Norma Suzuki of the Chief Probation Officers of California, and Dan Carson from the Legislative Analyst's Office joined others in noting that Proposition 36 has been implemented for a very short time, and thus it is far too early to assess the relative progress of the initiative or the impact on the population it is intended to serve. Del Sayles-Owen, Deputy Director of the State Department of Alcohol and Drug Programs, William J. Demers from Tehama County, Yvonne Frazier from San Mateo County, and many others further recommended that expansion of treatment services—such as residential and outpatient treatment programs, services tailored around populations with additional mental health problems, and rehabilitation programs for high level treatment and intense supervision clients— must become an essential part of the Proposition 36 framework. In addition, nearly all witnesses expressed the need for continued collaboration among the courts, treatment providers, and the agencies that are a part of the Proposition 36 process. Speaking in support of collaboration among superior courts, Judge Manley said that “Proposition 36 dramatically changed the administration

of justice and the way courts approach clients.”

Randy Snowden of the Napa County Alcohol and Drug Programs and other county treatment representatives emphasized the need for guidelines regarding which county is responsible for probation supervision and treatment when an offender has been arrested in a county other than the county of his or her residence. Another area of concern was lack of facilities and shortage of beds for the offenders eligible for Proposition 36 treatment. Ed McNair from the Board of Prison Terms, and Chuck Deutschman from Contra Costa County Community Substance Abuse Services Division particularly stressed the need for expanded and improved facilities in order to provide adequate, quality care. As one witness testified, the existing facilities are “held together with chicken wire and bubble gum.”

Overall, the majority of stakeholders, while in agreement that it is too early to evaluate the success of the measure, offered positive feedback about the current status of Proposition 36 implementation, and expressed optimistic predictions for the initiative's future.

RIPPED FROM THE HEADLINES...

“Ripped From the Headlines” highlights news stories of interest including headlines and lead paragraphs, without editorial comment from *The Capitol Connection*.

“Squalor in the streets: Mentally ill cycle through system.” *San Francisco Chronicle* (November 4, 2001)

Anguished family members of mentally ill people have been campaigning to give government more authority to force people to accept outpatient mental health treatment – particularly if they have a history of failing to follow treatment programs.

For two years, Assemblywoman Helen Thomson, D-Davis, has sought legislation allowing a judge to order patients to follow treatment programs when not hospitalized. Her bills have been blocked by state Senate President Pro Tem John Burton, D-San Francisco.

Thomson's proposal could ultimately affect all 20,000 people who had two or more 72-hour or 14-day holds in a year, plus many others. But she proposes starting with a \$35 million program that would affect 3,000 people a year.

Burton sides with a patients' rights movement that argues society should live up to its promise of community-based treatment before taking away the civil liberties of the mentally ill.

“Ruling Shields Threats Told to Therapists.” *Los Angeles Times* (November 5, 2001)

People who threaten during therapy sessions to commit violence

cannot be held criminally liable for their threats, a California appeals court has ruled in a decision that divides mental health experts and law enforcement officials.

Many counselors praised the ruling, arguing that the whole point of therapy is for people to express their true feelings and that the prosecutions--if allowed to stand--would have a chilling effect on their sessions.

Therapists in California are still required by law to warn potential victims if a patient makes a credible threat of violence. Threats made directly to a victim are also open to prosecution. But some in law enforcement believe that these laws aren't enough and that the appeals court decision represents a step backward.

"If this stands, then you leave the victims without a way to protect themselves," said Superior Court Judge Pamela Iles, who hears all domestic violence cases in south Orange County.

“Circuit Says Three Strikes Can Be Cruel.” *The Recorder* (November 5, 2001)

The 9th U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals on Friday ruled that sending people convicted of minor offenses to jail for long sentences under California's Three Strikes violates the constitutional prohibition on cruel and unusual punishment.

The decision, coming seven years after voters enacted the controversial tough-on-crime provision, does not overturn Three

(Continued on page 4)

RIPPED FROM THE HEADLINES...

Strikes but may serve as a barrier against much-criticized applications of the law.

“High-paying, hands-on job. Help Wanted: Court reporters needed in state.” *The Recorder* (November 10, 2001)

Wanted: people with nimble fingers and good posture willing to put in a few years of training and find themselves making big money while sitting in on depositions and court proceedings.



Courts nationally and in California can't find enough reporters. Yet few people are training for the field despite annual pay that averages \$62,000 nationally. Some reporters earn well into the six-figure range.

“Funding Mechanism for Legal Aid Upheld.” *Los Angeles Times* (November 15, 2001)

A federal appeals court rejected claims Wednesday that a program that generates millions of dollars for legal assistance for the poor violates the Constitution.

The program, known as IOLTA (interest on lawyers' trust accounts), provides \$13 million a year to 102 legal services programs in California and \$149 million nationwide. Every state legislature has created such a program. The case before the 9th Circuit originated in Washington state, where the program was challenged by a conservative public interest law organization.

“Lawmaker seeks probe into abuses of mandatory arbitration.” *San Francisco Chronicle* (November 18, 2001)

The chairman of the state Assembly's Judiciary Committee has called for hearings on mandatory arbitration, a private, quasi-legal system of resolving disputes that critics say deprives millions of employees, patients and other consumers of fundamental legal rights.

Citing abuses revealed in a series of Chronicle stories last month, Assemblyman Darrell Steinberg, D-Sacramento, said the committee will investigate whether arbitration proceedings are tainted by conflicts of interest and whether arbitrators adequately disclose business relationships that could affect their neutrality.

“(Arbitration) is an area that has become a high priority for me,” said Ronald George, chief justice of the California Supreme Court. “There's still room for improvement, and I'm interested to see what (Steinberg) has to propose.”

“Daniel Weintraub: Tweaking California's experiment with term limits.” *Sacramento Bee* (November 20, 2001)

California voters in 1990 decided to apply term limits to the Legislature, capping Assembly service at three two-year terms and limiting senators to two four-year stints in office. Many voters simply concluded that the best term limits – free elections – were no longer working.

Now, a decade after the experiment began, Californians will get their first chance to adjust it. A March ballot measure, Proposition 45, would allow lawmakers to seek two additional terms in the Assembly or one in the Senate if they first secure signatures from

20 percent of the voters in their district.

While the proposed change is modest, Proposition 45 might serve as a referendum on the whole idea of term limits, which are difficult to judge as a matter of principle and which have had a mixed record in practice in California.

By their nature term limits are antidemocratic, depriving voters of the right to elect whom they choose to public office. But they are a tempting way to guard against the abuse of power, to dislodge lawmakers who otherwise would serve until they die. If you're going to use them to do the voters' dirty work, the trick is to find the right balance between constant change, which can breed legislative disarray, and the kind of lifers we had before.

“Court clarifies decision on adoptions. Past ‘2nd-parent’ cases not invalid.” *San Francisco Chronicle* (November 22, 2001).

The state appellate court that last month prohibited an adoption procedure widely used by same-sex couples said yesterday it was not deciding the validity of thousands of such adoptions performed in the past 15 years.

The Court of Appeal in San Diego refused to reconsider its 2-to-1 ruling on Oct. 25 that found no legal authority in California for so-called second-parent adoptions, which allow a biological parent's unmarried partner to gain equal status as a parent.

But the court deleted some of the language in its ruling that suggested all past second-parent adoptions -- estimated by gay-rights organizations at 10, 000 to 20,000 -- were illegal.

“Bill would give tribe cop powers.” *San Jose Mercury News* (November 25, 2001)

Under a bill before the state Legislature, tribal security officers on reservations across California could gain full police powers, just like other state, county and city law enforcement officers. That would give them the authority to arrest and jail non-Indians.

Critics fear tribes would misuse their power and put tribal interests above the law while remaining untouchable in the courts because their reservations are sovereign entities.

But supporters of the measure said it's long overdue, saying the need for tribal law enforcement has increased with the growth in Indian gambling and other ventures.

“Jury of their peers. Successful youth court serves as a model to programs nationwide.” *San Francisco Chronicle* (November 26, 2001)

Legal experts said youth courts have become one of the most successful innovations in the juvenile justice system. Working with local courts and probation officers, students recruited from high schools serve as the lawyers, prosecutors, and, of course, the jurors. The justice they mete out is real, and the punishments stick.

The young defendants typically are first-time offenders from ages 11 to 17 who have admitted to petty offenses or doing drugs. Sentences are supervised by a probation officer and include community service, personal apologies and self-esteem counseling.

Contra Costa, Alameda and Santa Clara are among 32 California counties with youth court programs. There are 850 similar courts

(Continued on page 5)

RIPPED FROM THE HEADLINES...

(Continued from page 4)

nationwide, a number that court officials expect to surge to 3,000 in the next few years.

“Youth courts focus on the next generation,” Chief Justice Ronald George told more than 100 judges, probation officers and high school administrators who gathered in San Francisco last month. “They provide hands-on experience for students to demonstrate the importance of the rule of law.”

“Public Knowledge.” *San Diego Union Tribune* (November 27, 2001)
Highly personal, albeit public, information collected by government agencies is now readily accessible to any and everyone with the click of a mouse.

Those who took the time and trouble of physically, rather than electronically, tracking down public records on a certain individual usually has a specific interest in doing so. Today, however, with the ease of computer searches, anyone can spend a few minutes tracking down government records containing highly personal information on friends, neighbors, co-workers or complete strangers. This might include an individual’s Social Security number, date of birth, address, phone number, annual income and other data.

That’s not to say government records should no longer be public. Or that public records should not be accessible on the Internet. But, in light of recent advances in technology, lawmakers in Washington and Sacramento ought to have a fresh debate about the kinds of personal information that should and should not be publicly available.

“High Court Will Ponder Judges’ Political Speech.” *Daily Journal* (December 4, 2001)

Taking on a major First Amendment issue, the Supreme Court on Monday agreed to consider whether states can bar judicial candidates from announcing their views on controversial legal and political issues.

Although the case that was granted review comes from Minnesota, most of the 33 other states in which judges face election – including California – have some candidates speech limits in their judicial codes of conduct. Minnesota’s limits, however, are at the more restrictive end of the spectrum.

California’s Canon 5 states that judges “are entitled to entertain their personal views on political questions” but must “avoid political activity that may create the appearance of political bias or impropriety.” Neither the California Supreme Court nor the federal courts has ruled on the constitutionality of that rule.

“Feeling the Knife: Faced with tighter budgets, state courts are suspending jury trials, laying off workers and trimming special programs.” *The National Law Journal* (December 6, 2001)

The recession is forcing cutbacks at state courts across the country.

New Hampshire will stop holding jury trials for the most part this month and in four months in 2002. Florida courts have a hiring freeze. Courts in Seattle face layoffs. And the California judiciary has slashed \$61 million from next year’s budget.

Other states, such as North Carolina, Arizona, Georgia, New York and Illinois, are facing budget cuts or bracing for them in the next fiscal year.

“Eye of the Beholder” Headlines...

“More California students passing physical fitness test” *San Jose Mercury News* (December 11, 2001)

“State Youths Flunk Fitness Exam” *The Los Angeles Times* (December 11, 2001)

The picture may be most grim in New Hampshire. Court officials there say they will suspend civil and criminal jury trials during this month and during April, July, August and December 2002, except for previously scheduled first-degree murder and capital trials and those involving a speedy-trial issue.

“California slow to execute death row inmates, report finds.” *San Diego Union Tribune*. (December 12, 2001)

California has the largest death row population of any state, but just nine executions since the U.S. Supreme Court reinstated the death penalty in 1976, the U.S. Justice Department said yesterday.

“Our attorneys are frustrated by the pace. Victims throughout the state are incredibly frustrated by the pace,” said Nathan Barankin, a spokesman for state Attorney General Bill Lockyer. “There’s no reason for these cases to take 20 years.”

However, he and death penalty opponents said the pace reflects a deliberate approach that has helped protect California from the sort of highly publicized convictions of innocent people that prompted Illinois to declare a moratorium and raised fairness questions in Texas.

“George says economy bars push for judicial pay hike.” *Metropolitan News* (December 12, 2001)

Because of an economic downturn that threatens to leave the state government billions of dollars in the hole, the judicial branch is deferring its plan to lobby for judicial pay raises and the creation of new judgeships, Chief Justice Ronald George said yesterday. George and the Judicial Council, the policy-making body for the courts, previously had asked the governor and Legislature to approve an 8.5 percent raise for judges and as many as 50 new judgeships.

“It’s deferred, not cancelled,” George said of the plan during his annual holiday reception for newspaper reporters and editors who cover the courts. “We recognized that it would not be appropriate to pursue at this time.”



Chief Justice
Ronald M. George

EXCLUSIVE: INTERVIEW WITH HERB WESSON

(Continued from page 1)

Wesson: What changes may be necessary will be made gradually. For the most part, I believe the Assembly operates well. I suspect, however, that as the year goes on some fine-tuning may be necessary and I will respond to those issues as they arise.

CC: As we approach the start of the second year of the session, what are some of the most significant challenges facing the Legislature in general and your caucus in particular?

Wesson: Clearly our most difficult challenge will be dealing with the \$12 billion shortfall projected for next year's budget. During the past few years, we have made enormous strides in improving the quality of education in our public schools and providing health care for the children of working families who have none. I will not willingly reverse these long overdue advances. And following the events of September 11, there are more demands than ever on our state.

We must provide additional security for the people of California by increasing the capacity of police, fire and health officials to respond to any acts of terrorism. Clearly we need to look to the federal government for help in these difficult times. The government of California, no less than the airline industry, has been the victim of the terrorist attacks on the east coast, and relief should be provided. Finding the right balance between addressing the need for these increased services with diminished resources will be extremely difficult. I expect to work closely with Governor Davis and the members of the Senate to craft appropriate solutions.

CC: What has been the most significant impact of term limits and how would passage of Proposition 45 in March affect the conduct of legislative business?

Wesson: Term limits has had an enormous impact on the ability of the Legislature to perform the tasks we are elected to perform. Term limits robs voters of the right to choose talented, experienced public servants to represent them in Sacramento. In the Assembly, where the maximum time served is only six years, we find that our members must move on just as they get good at their jobs. We are constantly shuffling committee assignments and leadership. Furthermore, the constant pressure on members of the Legislature to seek new offices distracts them from their legislative duties.

I believe that Proposition 45 on the March ballot will alleviate some of these problems by allowing legislators to serve four additional years -- two more terms in the Assembly and one more in the Senate -- if they can gather the signatures of 20 percent of the electorate in their district. This change will allow the voters in any one district to maintain in office a legislator they believe is representing them well in Sacramento. It holds the potential for providing additional stability to both the Senate and Assembly while at the same time giving local voters a choice.

CC: Do you expect to make many changes in committee assignments or committee chairs?

Wesson: Certainly there will be changes in committee assignments and leadership, although I do not expect a wholesale reshuffling of assignments right away. Some changes will be necessary when I become Speaker. At that

time, for example, I will have to give up being chair of the Governmental Organization Committee. Someone will have to be appointed to that spot. New vacancies will be created on other committees as well. I'm sure that as the needs and interests of members change during the year, further changes will become necessary.

CC: Which judicial issues are you particularly interested in?

Wesson: Our courts have played a vital role in the expansion of civil rights and the protection of civil liberties in this country. And part of this should be working to make sure that those who dispense justice reflect the diversity of California's population. It is also my strong belief that all Californians -- rich or poor -- should continue to have access to our system of justice. That means supporting efforts to provide low-cost legal services to low-income Californians. It also means making properly trained interpreters available for those who need them. Finally, it means working to see that our court facilities themselves are kept safe and in good repair to serve the public.



Wesson addresses colleagues on the Assembly floor.

MOVING ON: THE TERM LIMIT SHUFFLE

As an election year approaches, California is once again feeling the effect of legislative term limits. Of the 80 members of the Assembly, 21 are precluded from running for another term. In the Senate, seven of the 40 members have reached their two-term maximum. Eager to continue their public service as elected officeholders, many of these legislators have announced their candidacy for other posts.

Changes to the term limit law may be forthcoming. Proposition 45 on the March 2002 ballot would allow an otherwise termed-out incumbent to run for reelection if he or she can gather a sufficient number of signatures from

voters in their district. Proponents believe Proposition 45 will help ensure that legislators who enjoy strong support from their constituents have an opportunity to run for one additional four-year term in the Senate and two more two-year terms in the Assembly. Opponents of Proposition 45 believe the measure is an attempt to circumvent term limits, which were approved by voters as a constitutional amendment in 1990.

The last day for candidates to file for office with the Secretary of State was December 7. See the chart below for a list of legislators who have declared their candidacy for other offices.

Legislator	Current Office	Term Limited in 2002?	New Office Legislator is Running For	Is This an Open Seat?	Incumbent (Reason Incumbent is Leaving)
Dickerson (R-Redding)	AD 2	NO	SD 04	YES	Maurice Johannessen (termed out in 2002)
Aanestad (R-Grass Valley)	AD 3	NO	SD 04	YES	Maurice Johannessen (termed out in 2002)
Shelley (D-San Francisco)	AD 12	YES	SOS	YES	Bill Jones (termed out in 2002)
Migden (D-San Francisco)	AD 13	YES	BOE 01	YES	Johan Klehs (termed out in 2002)
Leach (R-Walnut Creek)	AD 15	YES	SPI	YES	Delaine Eastin (termed out in 2002)
Cardoza (D-Merced)	AD 26	YES	US House of Representatives	NO	Gary Condit
Briggs (R-Clovis)	AD 29	NO	US House of Representatives	YES	No incumbent
Florez (D-Shafter)	AD 30	NO	SD 16	YES	Jim Costa (termed out in 2002)
Ashburn (R-Bakersfield)	AD 32	YES	SD 18	YES	Jack O'Connell (running for SPI)
Cardenas (D-Sylmar)	AD 39	YES	L.A. City Council	YES	Seat currently vacant. Run-off election in March.
Cedillo (D-Los Angeles)	AD 46	NO	SD 22	YES	Richard Polanco (termed out in 2002)
Havice (D-Cerritos)	AD 56	YES	US House of Representatives	YES	No incumbent
Calderon (D-Montebello)	AD 58	NO	Insurance Commissioner	YES	Harry Low (Retiring)
Leonard (R-San Bernardino)	AD 63	YES	BOE 02	YES	Dean Andal (termed out in 2002)
Hollingsworth (R-Murrieta)	AD 66	NO	SD 36	YES	Ray Haynes (termed out in 2002)
Zettel (R-Poway)	AD 75	NO	SD 36	YES	Ray Haynes (termed out in 2002)
Monteith (R-Modesto)	SD 12	YES	US House of Representatives	NO	Gary Condit
McPherson (R-Santa Cruz)*	SD 15	NO	Lt. Governor	NO	Cruz Bustamante
O'Connell (D-San Luis Obispo)	SD 18	YES	SPI	YES	Delaine Eastin (termed out in 2002)
McClintock (R-Thousand Oaks)*	SD 19	NO	Controller	YES	Kathleen Connell (termed out in 2002)
Ackerman (R-Irvine)*	SD 33	NO	Atty. General	NO	Bill Lockyer
Haynes (R-Riverside)	SD 36	YES	AD 66	YES	Dennis Hollingsworth (Running for SD 36)

* Retains current seat if campaign for new office is not successful.

Key: AD = Assembly District, SD = Senate District, BOE = Board of Equalization, SOS = Secretary of State, SPI = Superintendent of Public Instruction



Judicial Council of California
Administrative Office of the Courts
Office of Governmental Affairs

770 "L" Street, Suite 700
Sacramento, CA 95814
Telephone 916-323-3121
Fax 916-323-4347
TDD 800-735-2929

Editorial Board

June Clark
Kate Howard
Kourtney Krieger
Ray Le Bov
Martin Riley

Contributors

Yvette Trevino
Alla Vorobets

MORE ON TERM LIMITS

The following is a list of termed out legislators who have not filed for another elective office.

Assembly Members:

Strom-Martin (D-Duncan Mills)
Thomson (D-Davis)
Aroner (D-Berkeley)
Papan (D-Millbrae)
Alquist (D-Santa Clara)
Keeley (D-Boulder Creek)
Runner (R-Lancaster)
Hertzberg (D-Van Nuys)
Wright (D-So. Ctrl. Los Angeles)
Washington (D-Paramount)
Pacheco, Rod (R-Riverside)
Campbell, Bill (R-Villa Park)
Wayne (D-San Diego)

Senate Members:

Johannessen (R-Redding)
Costa (D-Fresno)
Polanco (D-Los Angeles)
Peace (D-El Cajon)

While not termed out, Assembly Members Pescetti (R-Rancho Cordova) and Kelley (R-Idyllwild) have chosen not to seek reelection.

Subscribe Today!

The Capitol Connection is delivered electronically each month to hundreds of subscribers at no charge.

People interested in subscribing can contact Yvette Trevino, 916-323-3121, e-mail: yvette.trevino@jud.ca.gov.

The Capitol Connection is on the Web!

Looking for a past issue of the Capitol Connection? Find it online! The Capitol Connection is available on the Internet at www.courtinfo.ca.gov/courtadmin/aoc/capconn.htm.