



CENTER FOR AMERICAN PROGRESS ACTION FUND A PROGRESSIVE CALIFORNIA VOTER GUIDE

California voters on November 7 will decide on 13 state propositions. Of these propositions, 1A through 1E are from the California state legislature, and Propositions 83 through 90 are initiatives placed on the ballot by California citizens. Five of these measures will amend the constitution of the state. The following report provides progressives with a guide on how the Center for American Progress Action Fund would recommend voting on each of the 13 propositions.

Proposition 1A: Transportation Funding Protection ***CAP Action Fund Vote: YES***

California's six percent sales tax on gasoline generates about \$2 billion a year for the state government. Since 2002, the state constitution has required that the gas tax revenue be used strictly for transportation, except in a state budget emergency. However, in the years 2003-2004 and 2004-2005, this money was used to help balance the state budget, not transportation.

This measure would amend the state constitution to ensure that the revenue generated from the gasoline tax would be used for transportation by restricting expenditures on schools and other services to only twice over the course of a decade, with a repayment to transportation with interest in three years. This would effectively hold legislators accountable to the intent of the constitutional measure requiring gas tax revenue to be used for transportation.

For more information please visit: www.plan4ourfuture.org

Proposition 1B: Highway Safety, Traffic Reduction, Air Quality, and Port Security **Bond Act of 2006** ***CAP Action Fund Vote: YES***

California spends approximately \$20 billion each year on infrastructure items such as highways, roads, transit, and rail. This money has been generated through state and local taxes and federal funding, with expenditures limited to revenue made for that year.

This measure would allow the state government to sell \$19.9 billion in bonds, which would provide for needed funding for areas such as reduction of traffic congestion, road and highway improvements, local transit expansion, environmental protection reforms, and earthquake safety and security.

For more information please visit: www.ecovote.org



Proposition 1C: Housing and Emergency Shelter Trust Fund Act of 2006

CAP Action Fund Vote: YES

Every year, approximately 200,000 houses and apartments are built with funding primarily from private companies. Some of these developments receive low interest government loan incentives that require companies to sell or rent units to low-income Californians. In addition, programs such as bonds for state housing provide approximately \$2.1 billion in bonds for low-income homebuyers.

This measure would allow the state government to sell \$2.85 billion in bonds for purposes such as providing shelters for battered women and their children, clean and safe housing for low-income seniors, homeownership assistance for disabled military veterans and working families, and other similar programs.

For more information please visit: www.plan4ourfuture.org

Proposition 1D: Kindergarten-University Public Education Facilities Bond Act of 2006

CAP Action Fund Vote: YES

Funding for school facilities in California primarily comes from state and local general obligation bonds. Since 1996, voters have approved \$28.1 billion for K-12 school facilities. Despite this funding, many California schools and universities continue to be overcrowded, dilapidated, and often unsafe.

This measure would allow the state government to sell \$10.4 billion in bonds for additional funding to build and upgrade educational facilities. Specifically, the measure would provide \$7.3 billion for K-12 schools, most of which would require local matching funds, and \$3.1 billion for community colleges and public universities.

For more information please visit: www.plan4ourfuture.org

Proposition 1E: Disaster Preparedness and Flood Prevention Bond Act of 2006

CAP Action Fund Vote: YES

A combination of private and public entities is responsible for flood management and disaster preparedness in California. The state is primarily responsible for flood control in the Central Valley, which includes approximately 1,600 miles of levees, as well as other flood control infrastructure. Funding for the maintenance and construction of flood management structures such as levees comes from a cost share between federal and local government.



This measure would allow the state government to sell \$4.1 billion in bonds for flood control projects such as needed repairs and essential improvements to levees and flood control facilities, increased flood protection for urban areas, and evaluation and repair of the current flood control system. In addition, the measure would work to prevent sewer spillover of wastewater systems.

For more information please visit: www.plan4ourfuture.org

Proposition 83: Sex Offenders, Sexually Violent Predators. Punishment, Residence Restrictions, and Monitoring
CAP Action Fund Vote: NO

Just over one month ago, Gov. Arnold Schwarzenegger signed one of the toughest sex-offender laws in the country—including increased prison terms and measures to limit access to public spaces where children are present.

The Center for American Progress Action Fund supports tough, effective sex-offender laws and enforcement. But while Proposition 83 looks tough, it is unlikely to be effective.

Proposition 83 could cost taxpayers as much as \$500 million, providing little if any improvement in public safety. The measure would forbid ex-offenders from living in urban areas where structures exist to help ensure they do not re-offend (like access to jobs, family members and supervisory services). Instead, these individuals would be dumped in suburban and rural communities that lack the capacity to absorb and keep track of them—or would simply drop out of sight, undermining the reliability of existing sex offender registries. These are among the reasons that prosecutors in some states, such as Iowa, are now seeking to repeal similar laws.

For more information please visit: www.cacj.org and www.aclu-sc.org/Action/GuideNov06

Proposition 84: Water Quality, Safety, and Supply. Flood Control. Natural Resource Protection. Park Improvements. Bonds
CAP Action Fund Vote: YES

California operates a variety of programs and provides grants to private entities to conserve natural resources; protect the environment; provide flood control now, and for the future; and offer recreational opportunities to the public. Funding for these programs comes from General Fund revenues, federal funds, and general obligation bonds that have totaled \$11 billion since 1996.

This measure allows the state to sell an additional \$5.4 billion in general obligation bonds for safe drinking water, water quality, and water supply, as well as flood control, natural resource protection, and park improvements and planning.

For more information please visit: www.yeson84.com and www.ecovote.org/endorse



Proposition 85: Waiting Period and Parental Notification Before Termination of a Minor's Pregnancy

CAP Action Fund Vote: **NO**

Since 1953, California state law has allowed minors to receive, without parental consent or notification, the same types of medical care for a pregnancy that are available to an adult. Based on this law and subsequent legal developments related to abortions, minors are able to obtain abortions without parental consent or notification.

This measure would amend the state constitution to require doctors to notify a parent or guardian at least 48 hours prior to performing an abortion on a minor, except in the case of a medical emergency or approval from juvenile court. The law would not require parental consent to administer the abortion; they just must be informed of it. Despite arguments that the measure is intended to protect teens, the initiative, if passed, would actually impede them from getting timely medical care and place the most vulnerable youth in harm's way. For this reason, voters rejected a virtually identical measure, Proposition 73, last year.

For more information please visit: www.noon85.com
and www.plannedparenthood.org/news-articles-press/politics-policy-issues/public-affairs/prop-85-10048%20.htm

Proposition 86: Tax on Cigarettes

CAP Action Fund Vote: **YES**

California charges a \$0.87 excise tax on each package of cigarettes. Revenue generated from the tax funds early childhood development programs, tobacco education and prevention, and health care for uninsured, low-income individuals.

This measure would amend the state constitution to impose an additional tax on a package of cigarettes totaling \$2.60, raising the cost for a pack of cigarettes in California to \$6.60. Revenue from the tax could only be allocated for specific purposes such as hospital emergency care; children's health insurance; tobacco use prevention programs; treatment of various illnesses including cancer, stroke, heart disease, asthma and obesity; and other health programs.

For more information please visit: www.yesonprop86.org

Proposition 87: Oil Tax for Clean Energy

CAP Action Fund Vote: **YES**

California's oil production in 2005 represented approximately 12 percent of the nation's production, making it the third-largest oil producing state. Unlike other oil producing states, however, oil companies in California pay only a minute amount of money in fees (California



generates more funds from hunting and fishing licenses). In addition, oil continues to pollute the state. Moreover, in order to meet demands, California, like the rest of the nation, must rely on foreign sources of oil.

This measure would amend the state constitution to impose a small severance tax on oil production in California that is prohibited from being passed on to consumers. The revenue generated will fund \$4 billion over 10 years in alternative energy programs to reduce the use of oil, promote clean energy, and develop and promote vehicles that use less gasoline and more renewable energy for greater efficiency overall.

For more information please visit: www.yesoncleanenergy.com and www.ecovote.org

Proposition 88. Education Funding. Real Property Parcel Tax
CAP Action Fund Vote: NO

Local governments in California impose a tax based on the assessed value of property. Under this tax, the amount owed increases as the value of the property increases. Some local governments also impose a form of property tax known as a parcel tax. Under this tax, the amount owed is the same for each parcel or unit of land. The last time the state enacted a parcel tax was 1910. The revenue generated from these taxes is used to fund education, health, social, and environmental programs.

This measure would amend the state constitution to create a statewide parcel tax of \$50.00 on each property, and use the revenue generated to fund specific K-12 education programs. However, the practical application of Proposition 88 would fail to come close to meeting its intended purpose of improving schools across the state. The parcel tax collected would generate approximately \$470 million a year for the entire state's schools, which would be less money than the general fund of the San Francisco Unified School District. In addition, the criteria for receiving facility grants is so narrow that only about 140 schools in the state would be eligible. Finally, because of this narrow construction, most of the funding would go to schools where students have done well on standardized tests which are a poor indicator of student needs. A better approach to addressing the funding needs for California's schools is through Proposition 1D.

For more information please visit: www.noprop88.com

Proposition 89: Political Campaigns. Public Financing. Corporate Tax Increase.
Campaign Contribution and Expenditure Limits
CAP Action Fund Vote: YES

In California, candidates for state offices have been collecting record amounts of private donations from individuals, corporations, political parties, and other organizations to pay for the



costs of their political campaigns. The maximum amount of funds that a person or group can give is determined by state law dependent on the office being sought and who is giving the donation. Sometimes, individuals and groups give donations to candidates through committees that often make independent expenditures on things such as television or newspaper advertisements. Like the funding for state ballot initiatives, there are no limits on these independent expenditures. These laws are administered by the Secretary of State and the Fair Political Practices Commission.

This measure would set up a system of public funding for political campaigns. Candidates for state offices could receive public funds for their campaigns if they: do not accept any contributions (except limited party contributions and start-up funds); do not use their own money for the campaign; and follow other rules, such as appearing in public debates. These funds would range from \$250,000 for a State Assembly candidate to \$15 million for a candidate for Governor.

Candidates not accepting public funds would have stricter contribution limits. The measure would also limit corporate contributions to campaigns for or against a ballot measure. The money for the fund would come from raising the states income tax on corporations by 0.2 percent.

For more information please visit: www.cleanmoneyelections.org and www.consumerwatchdog.org

Proposition 90: Government Acquisition, Regulation of Private Property
CAP Action Fund Vote: NO

State and local governments have eminent domain power to acquire private property for public use as long as the owner is paid a fair price. Governments use this power to purchase property from owners who do not want to sell when the land is needed for public facilities such as roads, schools, parks, land conservation, or renovation of low-income neighborhoods.

This measure would amend the state constitution so that governments could not force the sale of private property for private use. The measure would also require that property owners be paid for major economic losses caused by new laws and rules, except when the government is responding to an emergency or protecting public health and safety. The effects of this constitutional amendment, however, would enable large landowners and corporations to demand payouts from state and local taxpayers just by claiming that a law has harmed the value of their property or business, no matter how far-fetched the claim.

For more information please visit: www.noprop90.com