**36th District Democrats Resolution on Education and Progressive Taxation**

**Submitted by John R. Burbank, 1 18 2016**

**Whereas**, this past summer the State Supreme Court found that the Legislature is in “ongoing violation of its constitutional obligation to amply provide for public education.”

**Whereas**, the Legislature has failed to fund K-12 education as required by the laws the Legislature passed in 2009 and 2010,

**Whereas**, the Legislature overrode Initiative 1351, which would have reduced class sizes throughout the K-12 system, just seven months after its passage, resulting in a disinvestment of $2 billion from K-12 education in the 2015-2017 biennium,

**Whereas**, the state has an embedded fiscal deficit because of the absence of a state income tax.

**Whereas,** the absence of an income tax enables the aggrandizement of the already wealthy and privileged,

**Whereas,** the absence of an income tax starves expected and necessary public goods and services for Washingtonians,

**Whereas,** Washington’s over-reliance on the sales tax makes low income people contribute in taxes more than five times, proportionally, than people in the top 1%,

**Whereas,** it is in the power of the Legislature to institute an income tax for full funding of education and other public services, and to restructure the tax system,

**Whereas**, the voters in the 36th District supported an income tax on the wealthy with a vote of over 61% in support in 2010,

**Whereas,** our newest state representative, Noel Frame, has committed to sponsoring an income tax (see exchange on back side)

**Now, therefore, be it resolved** that 36th District Democrats request the 36th District state legislators sponsor legislation for a progressive income tax, which will result in full funding of education and social services and enable a reduction in the sales tax,

**Be it further resolved** that this resolution should be immediately send to our 36th district state legislators, with the request that they make this commitment.

-----Original Message-----
From: Noel Frame
Sent: Nov 28, 2015 1:32 PM
To: Brian Duncan
Subject: Re: Policy Position on Income Tax Bill for 2016 and Beyond

The answer is yes. And thank you for making this request about income tax is the context of overall reform that reduces other types of tax at the same time. That is what I've been advocating for from day one, as you know. I believe very strongly it is that comprehensive approach that makes it believable for voters.

Because even if by some miracle this were to pass the legislature, I have no doubt Eyman and his people would collect enough signatures for a referendum to challenge it, and it would need to be defensible. I believe what you have suggested here is defensible with the voters.

And assuming we can't get the votes in the legislature to pass it, it gives us a discussion item to highlight in the Finance Committee and take out to voters on behalf of that committee. This is what I mean by using the power of the office. I think it's a fair ask that we sponsor a bill like this. As I've stated before, I did not think it was a strategic request to ask candidates to commit to "move it to the floor" when we know there is not enough support to pass it and in the process may marginalize us from our colleagues and undermine our ability to be effective. Sponsoring a bill as a starting point for discussion in committee and, later, with the voters, is strategic.

Thanks Brian. I still hope I can count on your vote on Wednesday.

Best,

Noel

On Wed, Nov 25, 2015 at 1:57 PM, Brian Duncan <beduncan@earthlink.net> wrote:

Esteemed 36th LD Representative Aspirants Rene, John, Sarah, Jeff, and Noel:

To shine a public spotlight on the central issue of the urgent need for a state income tax, and to harness the current political pressure resulting from the McCleary mandate, I-1351 (lower class size), I-1366 (Eyman sales tax decrease), and crisis-level unmet funding needs for social services:

If appointed, will you sponsor in the upcoming Jan 2016 session, and in all subsequent sessions as necessary until passed, a bill for structural tax reform that includes a progressive income tax/regressive sales tax swap resulting in at least enough net state revenue to fully fund the McCleary mandate ($5.5 B annually: including $4B for McCleary and 1351, plus $1.5B lost to 1366), while at the same time decreasing net state and local taxes for the majority of WA taxpayers?

Thank you in advance for answering, on the record, for elector PCOs to weigh in making their appointment decision, this important policy question as we head into the final stretch of this contest!

Sincerely,

PCO Brian Duncan