

advertisement

BURBANK LEADER



Every Wednesday and Saturday
with the
Los Angeles Times

BURBANK LEADER

[REAL ESTATE](#) [RENTALS](#) [JOBS](#) [AUTOMOTIVE](#) [CLASSIFIEDS](#)

Special Section



Forecast



Cloudy, 60-44

February 17, 2006

Search

go >

OPINION

- Home
- News
- Sports
- Business
- Education
- Opinion
- Politics & Government
- Columns
- Entertainment
- Calendar
- Features
- Public Safety
- Religion

- Reader Photos
- Archives

- Classifieds
- Real Estate
- Rentals
- Jobs
- Automotive

- How to Subscribe
- Contact the Burbank Leader
- Customer Service
- Display Advertising
- Classified Advertising
- Fictitious Business Name/DBA Advertising

- Other TCN Papers:
- Daily Pilot
- Laguna Beach

[Email Story](#)
[Print Story](#)

Election figures: the numbers don't lie

By Carolyn Berlin

Published February 18, 2006

While reading Alfred Aboulsaad's recent letter ("An underwhelming vote and letter," Wednesday) my first reaction was thank goodness Alfred Aboulsaad is on the Charter Review Committee currently examining whether we will continue the practice of having both Primary and General Elections in Burbank. He made a good point that in our recent special election with five candidates and only one vacant seat, the votes were split in such a manner that no one candidate won by a 50% majority.

When reviewing the votes, however, I came to an entirely different conclusion than Aboulsaad concerning who voted for whom and why. It appears there are at least 857 voters in Burbank who definitely want a relocated Bob Hope Airport terminal with all its negative impacts. If Dontanville had not run, these votes would have most likely gone to Bill Wiggins. Wiggins might have even won if there were only four candidates, but we'll never know. Next, at least 1,048 voters wanted another woman/mother on the council, who is also an attorney who expressed concern about traffic, empty storefronts, likes and mixed-use (multi-family and commercial) projects. Then, another 1,081 voters wanted a young Glendale attorney who took similar positions on the same issues as Gordon. The 4,028 minority vote or 35.3% who voted for Bill Wiggins were happy with the direction Burbank has been going. But, when you add the 4,285 votes, or 37.6%, received by Gordon with the votes received by other candidates, 64.7%, of the voters wanted change and not more of the same. Even if you discount the 857 votes that would have probably voted for Bill Wiggins based on his airport-

MORE STORIES

MAILBAG

[Election figures: the numbers don't lie](#)

[City shouldn't stifle learning of creativity](#)

[`Working group' mostly noise, not substance](#)

MAILBAG

[Coastline Pilot](#)
[Huntington Beach](#)
[Independent](#)
[Glendale News-Press](#)
[La Canada](#)
[Valley Sun](#)
[Crescenta Valley Sun](#)
[Foothill Leader](#)

LOS ANGELES TIMES

expansion record, Gordon received more than 2,000 votes than the nearest contender with similar positions on the issues. So not only did Gordon clearly win the election based on the issues, had there been a primary and a general election for this one seat, voters would have had a clear choice to vote for the status quo with Bill Wiggins or David Gordon for change.

Based on the results of the candidate's record and the winner's position on the issues, I suspect there would have been a broader spread in Gordon's victory, but because there was no runoff, we'll never know.

Aboulsaad made the arguments to continue with the Primary and General Election so that we have a clear choice of candidates for each available seat in future elections. I hope we don't hear a different recommendation from his Charter Review Committee.



As far as Aboulsaad's comments about the Home Depot day laborer center, there was no question in my mind about the inappropriateness of this center when I listened to the oath of office taken by Gordon as our new councilman. The oath called for him to uphold the laws of the United States and the State of California. With that in mind, what possible justification is there for these day laborer centers? What makes it appropriate for our city to ignore tax, employment and immigration laws and encourage violation of these laws?

There are clear studies that people are being exploited in the payment of wages, injured without workers' compensation benefits and encouraged to violate federal and state laws. Why is a nonprofit church charity being asked to provide assistance in seemingly a violation of laws that have nothing to do with religious beliefs? Does this church provide asylum from the IRS? Since the Catholic Charities is an independent contractor for the city of Burbank, will the city pay

them to provide us asylum from the IRS? Does this mean that if we all sign up for work, can we stop paying taxes? Why would anyone want to frequent a store and support this type of illegal activity?

Why should our police resources be drained by these types of facilities and parking meters be proposed to pay for police officers in the downtown? With Lowes, OSH, and DoltCenter, we could do without a Home Depot and all these illegal, controversial issues that have put us back in the headlines and are draining our police resources unnecessarily.

Maybe the parking meters belong at Home Depot to pay for police needed for that site and not in downtown Burbank.

* CAROLYN BERLIN is a resident of Burbank.