

Pete Rates the Propositions

Sensible opinions on the California ballot propositions

November 1990

by Pete Stahl

CONTENTS:

Alcohol Tax: Propositions 126 and 134	1
Environment: Propositions 128, 130, 132, 135, 138 and 141	2
War on Drugs: Propositions 129 and 133	4
Limits on Legislative Terms: Propositions 131 and 140	5
Making Your Ballot Longer: Propositions 136 and 137	7
Bonds: Propositions 143 through 151	8
Miscellany: Propositions 124, 125, 127, 139 and 142	10

Alcohol Tax: Propositions 126 and 134

Comparison of Alcohol Tax Rates

<u>Tax rates</u>	<u>Current</u>	<u>Nat'l average</u>	<u>Prop 126</u>	<u>Prop 134</u>
one beer (12 oz.)	\$.004	\$.02	\$.02	\$.05
six-pack of beer	.02	.12	.11	.30
fifth of wine	.002	.13	.04	.26
fifth of liquor	.40	.64	.66	1.28

Proposition 126: Two Cents a Beer (General Fund) -- YES

FAILED

At one cent a gallon, California's tax rate on wine is 98% below the national average. It hasn't been raised in 53 years. Our beer rate is 80% below the average and hasn't been raised in 31 years. Liquor is 37% below and hasn't been raised in 23 years. Clearly it's time to raise alcohol taxes, if only to keep up with inflation. But the legislature, once again afraid of offending a powerful lobby, has done nothing. It's up to us voters, who don't depend on campaign contributions from the alcohol industry, to do something.

We've been confronted with two competing alcohol tax propositions. Prop 134, sponsored by activists, seeks a comprehensive solution to the alcohol abuse problem. 134 raises alcohol taxes to more than twice the national average, and installs minimum funding levels for alcohol-related programs. Prop 126 is the alcohol industry's response. It raises alcohol taxes to about the national average (except for wine, which has traditionally received special treatment in California because so much of the industry is located here).

Because it has the industry's backing, Prop 126 might appear to be a self-serving special interest bill, much like the insurance industry's Prop 104 of 1988. But Prop 104, in addition to presenting voters with beneficial bait (no-fault insurance), also contained horrendous hooks (continuation of anti-trust exemptions, prohibition of rate regulation, elimination of non-economic damages, etc.) that made 104 entirely unpalatable. Prop 126, on the other hand, only raises alcohol taxes, and gives the alcohol industry nothing in return, except the possible defeat of Prop 134. Take a look in your first Ballot Pamphlet. Even though 126 is being pushed by the alcohol industry, the only thing it does is raise alcohol taxes--something the industry would *rather not see at all*. This isn't exactly what I'd call self-serving.

Opponents of 126 point out that the tax rates it sets will be in the Constitution, and thus be unable to increase ever again. According to the Legislative Analyst, however, the Legislature will still have the authority to raise rates in the future. (I can't find this in the proposed law, but I'll trust my Analyst. Maybe it's in p. 74, sec. 6, sentence 3.)

So despite what you might think, Prop 126 is entirely benign. The alcohol industry supports it purely as the lesser of what it perceives to be two evils. Because we need to raise alcohol taxes, and because I can't support Prop 134 (see below), I'm happy to recommend Prop 126.

Proposition 134: Five Cents a Beer (Special Fund) -- NO

FAILED

Prop 134 raises alcohol taxes to more than twice the national average. The money raised is earmarked for addiction treatment centers, enforcement of drunk-driving laws, emergency medical care (to help victims of accidents caused by drunk drivers), mental health programs and programs to aid indirect victims of drug and alcohol abuse (such as battered women and children, and infants with prenatal alcohol disorders). Prop 134 stipulates that the money from the new alcohol tax is to supplement money already being allocated from the General Fund for alcohol-related programs.

I have no objection to Prop 134 raising alcohol tax rates so far above the national average. Nor does it bother me that 134's proceeds don't go into the General Fund, as they do now (and would under Prop 126). I think Prop 134 in general is a fine idea: a tax on alcohol should pay for some of the terrible damage alcohol causes.

But Prop 134 adds a permanent minimum General Fund allocation for its programs. 134 requires that the General Fund allocation for alcohol-related programs continue at 1989-90 levels, adjusted upwards for inflation and increased state population. This is the famous "escalator clause." It is similar to the School Funding Guarantee of Prop 98: a predetermined portion of the General Fund must be spent each year for specific purposes. The rationale is that such guarantees are needed to prevent new revenues (the Lottery for Prop 98; the alcohol tax for 134) from supplanting, rather than supplementing, existing funding.

I don't like such guarantees because they straitjacket the Legislature during budgeting, its most important function. It's simply infeasible to budget by initiative. Prop 98 locked in 41% of the budget; Prop 134 will lock in another 5%. Perhaps Prop 200 will lock in 20% for law enforcement, and Prop 250 will lock in 15% for transportation. Pretty soon there will be no flexibility at all, and the voters will have to approve every minor change to the budget. I pay my legislators to worry about whether to allocate \$2 billion or \$3 billion for mental health; I don't have time. If we can't trust our legislators to hammer out a budget, we might as well dissolve the Legislature and do everything ourselves. Hurrumph.

If you support Prop 98's school funding guarantee, you should still look askance at Prop 134's guarantee. I'll grant you that if schools really are the State's highest priority, then maybe they deserve to have 41% of the General Fund reserved for them every year. But are alcohol-related programs California's *second*-highest priority? What about the homeless and the jobless? What about courts and prisons? What about roads and bridges? By giving a special funding guarantee to Prop 134 programs, you reduce the importance of everything else the state funds. It's not right.

I might not mind if the amount of money involved in Prop 134's guarantee were insignificant. But our friendly Legislative Analyst estimates that the 1989-90 allocation is over \$2 billion, or 5% of the entire General Fund. Alcohol abuse is a problem, but not that big of a problem. Prop 134 is a good idea, but it takes that idea one step too far.

Environment: Propositions 128, 130, 132, 135, 138 and 141

Proposition 128: Big Green -- YES **FAILED**

Prop 128 will ban the use of carcinogenic pesticides on food, decrease greenhouse gas production, ban ozone-eating CFCs, prevent and help clean up oil spills, protect old-growth redwood forests, and reduce water pollution. Do you know anybody who *doesn't* want to do any of these? I sure don't. If Prop 128 is considered radical, it's only because it places health and environment ahead of economics. Isn't this the way things ought to be?

Pesticide ban. Currently the state's Department of Food and Agriculture (DFA) allows pesticide residues on our food if the DFA determines the amount poses an "acceptable health risk." Upon reflection, this is pretty ludicrous. Pesticides are insect poison. They're bad for you in any amount. Many are known carcinogens; yet their health risk is somehow "acceptable." Prop 128 will toss the concept of "acceptable health risk" out the window, and ban completely any pesticide with any ingredient that can cause cancer or reproductive harm. (Currently the DFA considers only the *active* ingredient when it assesses a pesticide's health risk.) Prop 128 also prohibits any residues to remain on food unless they can be shown to pose "no significant risk." Prop 128 shifts the burden of proof from the DFA doctors to the pesticide manufacturers where it belongs.

To cushion the shock to the agricultural industry, Prop 128 will allow the offending pesticides to be phased out over a five-to-eight year period.

One might expect the DFA to have a natural bias towards agriculture--if a pesticide is cheap and effective and only a little bit carcinogenic, DFA will have a hard time denying it to farmers. Prop 128 will place pesticide testing in the hands of the Department of Health Services (DHS), which is charged with protecting the health of all citizens. DHS presumably doesn't care one whit about farm profits, and will do a tighter job of testing.

Will banning so many pesticides drive up the price of food? Yes, it will. Industry estimates of 40 to 50% jumps in fruit and vegetable prices are, however, baloney. June's *California Magazine* quotes an unpublished report commissioned by a pesticide industry group as concluding that a family of four will see its annual food bill go up by less than \$200 per year. That's less than five dollars per person each month. Given the high rate of inflation you can expect in the coming months, that's just noise.

Greenhouse gas reduction. Massive quantities of man-made gases, principally carbon dioxide, are gradually warming the atmosphere and will eventually cause potentially-catastrophic global climate changes. Prop 128 will require statewide emissions of carbon dioxide to be reduced 20% by 2000, and 40% by 2010. Although 128 is not specific about how to achieve these reductions, one can guess that power plants and automobiles, the largest offenders, will come under tighter controls.

Trees convert carbon dioxide to harmless oxygen. When land is cleared for new development, most of the trees on the property are usually destroyed. Prop 128 will require developers to plant a new tree for every 500 square feet of development, slightly mitigating the destruction.

CFCs. CFCs are magical chemicals used in air conditioners, refrigerators, styrofoam and electronics manufacturing. But when they're released into the atmosphere, CFCs destroy the ozone layer which protects you and me from harmful ultraviolet rays. Prop 128 will ban CFCs in California by 1997, and require mechanics who service your car's air conditioner to recover the CFCs it would otherwise release.

Oil drilling and spilling. Prop 128 places into law the current "administrative" ban on new offshore oil and gas drilling leases. 128 will also impose small fees on oil transported through California waters to seed a \$500 million Oil Spill Prevention and Response Fund. The Fund will be used to clean up spills, restore affected shorelines, give loans to spill victims, and so on. Those responsible for spills would be required to reimburse the Fund.

Old growth redwoods. Once upon a time there were 1.7 million acres of ageless, majestic old-growth redwoods in California. Now there are only 200,000 acres left, over half of it in the private hands and waiting to be logged. Prop 128 will issue a \$300 million bond, of which \$200 million will buy up these last few remaining stands to preserve for posterity. Prop 128 imposes a one-year ban on logging old-growth redwoods to give the State a chance to buy them. The remaining \$100 million of bond money is for reforestation and urban forestry programs.

Water quality. Prop 128 will accelerate the schedule for the Water Resources board and sewage treatment facilities to meet new standards for marine water quality.

Environmental Advocate. Lastly, Prop 128 will create an elected official, the Environmental Advocate, whose job it will be to enforce all the state's environmental laws. I don't think the Environmental Advocate will make a big difference, but it will raise people's consciousness on environmental issues.

All of the plausible arguments against Prop 128 have the same basis: it will cost too much. I have this response: HEALTH is more important than MONEY. If Prop 128 required pesticide manufacturers to hire armed guards for their delivery trucks, or oil companies to paint all their supertankers lavender, I might agree that 128 is simply a nuisance designed to "get" big industry. But the reforms Prop 128 proposes will have serious, far-reaching consequences for the health of every person in California (and most of the rest of the nation, for that matter). I am willing to pay more for my food if I can live longer. I am happy to put up with imperfect-looking produce if I can avoid toxic pesticides. I am thrilled to pay more for gasoline if it will protect our beaches. Yes, Prop 128 will cost us more--let there be no doubt about that. But look at what we're buying: better health, longer life, more trees, preserved forests, safer beaches, and a less-depleted ozone layer, *for all the people*. I challenge you to find a better use for your dollars.

Proposition 130: Forest Acquisition & Logging Restriction -- YES **FAILED**

Of California's 100 million acres of land, 19 million are considered loggable. The federal U. S. Forest Service controls nine million of these loggable acres, and two million more are set aside as parks, wilderness areas, and open space preserves. This leaves eight million acres of loggable land under the control of the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CDFFP). Props 130 and 138 are concerned with these eight million acres.

Prop 130 is a radical proposal to prohibit clearcut logging, ensure renewability of forest resources, and preserve old-growth forests on the aforementioned eight million acres. If Prop 130 passes, it will be a serious blow to California's logging industry. 130 even recognizes this fact, and includes \$30 million to train displaced logging workers for other occupations.

Prohibition on clearcut logging. Under current regulations, loggers are allowed to remove all trees from a logging site, leaving the land bald and unprotected. Depending on the terrain, a certain number of trees must be left growing on the land five years after logging has ceased, but this is often merely a token gesture. Prop 130 would allow loggers to remove only 60% of the timber from any 2 1/2 acre area. This means timber harvesting must be only partial, and uniform throughout the site.

Of course it will be more costly to loggers to leave 40% of the trees standing, and yields per acre will be lower. Prop 130 offers no compensation to loggers for their increased costs and lost revenues. But clearcutting is wrong. It's complete destruction of the eco-system; it creates huge erosion hazards; and it can leave sites unviable for a century or more. By preventing clearcuts, Prop 130 will eliminate the needless scarring of our landscape.

Sustainable forestry. Prop 130 prohibits loggers from harvesting more timber at a site than is replenished over ten years. Put another way, loggers can cut down only as much wood on a site as will grow back in ten years. This will allow the logger to return in a decade and harvest the timber again. It's called "sustainable forestry," and it's an alternative to "slash and abandon," in which the logger clearcuts a site then forgets about it since it won't be useful again in his lifetime.

As with the prohibition on clearcuts, the requirement for sustainable forestry is, in the short term, more expensive for loggers. Over the long term, though, sustainable forestry makes sense. Loggers can re-use roads and other facilities. And, of course, sustainable forestry is a big win for the ecology.

Preservation of old-growth forests. Prop 128 (Big Green) contains \$200 million to purchase old-growth redwood stands. Prop 130 pours in another \$710 million, in the form of a bond. I don't know how much old-growth forest the total of \$910 million will buy, but I bet it's a lot. There seems to be considerable debate over the ecological importance of keeping these old-growth forests virgin. Some claim that there would be devastating repercussions throughout the state if they were allowed to be logged. I figure we might as well play it safe and take the stands out of the hands of potential harvesters; there's no turning back if we decide not to.

Do not vote lightly for Prop 130. It will probably cause a great deal of hardship in the far northern counties, where timber employs over ten percent of the workforce and over half of the manufacturing workers. Some towns might just wither up and blow away from the lack of business. It's uncertain whether the logging workers displaced by 130 will be able to find other jobs in the area, even with the retraining 130 provides. Prop 130 could uproot families, sending them to Oregon or elsewhere. Nevertheless, we need Prop 130 to end the ecologically *and long-term economically* harmful practice of clearcutting. In the final analysis, Prop 130 will ensure that California's timber is indeed a renewable resource.

Proposition 132: Ban on Gill Net Fishing off the Southern California Coast -- YES

PASSED

Gill nets and trammel nets are efficient at catching tasty rockfish like seabass and halibut. They are also efficient at catching innocent mammals who feed on the rockfish, like dolphins and sea lions. For this reason it's illegal to use gill nets and trammel nets north of Point Reyes (near San Francisco). Prop 132 would make it illegal to use these nets to take rockfish *anywhere* on California's coast. 132 would also ban the nets for any purpose from Point Arguello (near Santa Barbara) to the Mexican border.

Yes, a total ban on these nets from Oregon to Baja would be better. But you must *never* vote down a proposition because it doesn't go far enough. I urge you to consider each proposition on the basis of what it *will* do, not what it won't. You do *not* have the option of voting down 132 and waiting for a total ban to come waltzing down the pike. It just won't happen.

Prop 132 gives commercial fishermen three years to convert from gill and trammel nets to other means. If they give up their nets earlier, they will receive special compensation from the state for income lost to those still using the nets. This is a really neat feature that will encourage compliance with the new law *before* it becomes mandatory.

Proposition 135: Pesticide Industry Pork Barrel -- NO

FAILED

Prop 135 is the pesticide industry's desperate response to Big Green. Much of 135 simply restates existing law. This is so 135 can overrule Prop 128 if (ha ha) both of them pass. The other provisions of Prop 135 are purely for the benefit of the industry. Under 135 the government would pay for disposal of pesticides that lose their registration (the industry pays for this now). Under 135 the government would shell out \$125 million for development of new pesticides (the industry pays for this now). Under 135 the government would cancel fees that growers and food processors currently pay to support pesticide regulation. Under 135 the Environmental Advocate would be appointed rather than elected, and would be directed not to ". . . interfere with or affect the responsibilities or actions of the Director of the Department of Food and Agriculture . . ." In effect, this emasculates the Environmental Advocate, making the office into a joke. Prop 135 is as blatant as any piece of special-interest legislation I've ever seen. Even if it *had* some beneficial provisions, the best 135 could deserve is your disdain.

Proposition 138: Logging Industry Pork Barrel -- NO

FAILED

Prop 138 is the timber industry's desperate response to Prop 130. Although it isn't quite as blatant as the pesticide industry's shameless Prop 135, Prop 138 nevertheless is on your ballot to protect loggers: no more, no less. Prop 138 starts by preventing the state from acquiring *any* old-growth redwood stands before the turn of the century, except for a specific 1618 acres in Humboldt County. This will give loggers a decade to destroy these ancient and venerable trees. 138 continues by giving \$120 million in bonds to timberland owners as loans and grants to *increase* logging production. Sure, another \$180 million goes to beneficial reforestation programs, but that hardly makes up for the free gift. Prop 138 goes on to replace the current Timber Harvesting Plan (THP), a sort of sylvan Environmental Impact Report valid for a single property for three years, with a Long-Term Industrial Timber Management Plan (TMP), which is valid forever for all property a logger owns. This will drastically reduce the amount of scrutiny to which logging plans are subjected. Finally, Prop 138 affirms the practice of clearcutting, although it isn't called that. It's called "silvicultural techniques . . . designed to achieve even aged timber management." Yes, Prop 138 *claims* to restrict clearcutting, but its definition of "clearcutting" is so narrow as to make the restriction meaningless. So you can see that Prop 138 is by and for the logging industry. Maybe you don't want to vote for the anti-logging Prop 130. Fine. But do not vote for 138 as an alternative. That would be like burning down your house simply because you didn't want to paint it.

Proposition 141: Extension of Toxic Chemical Restrictions to Public Agencies -- YES

FAILED

Do you know anybody who's in favor of discharging cancer-causing chemicals into drinking water supplies? I sure don't. Prop 65 (Nov. '86) imposed tough restrictions on how much carcinogenic waste can be discharged into sources of drinking water. But Prop 65 applied only to private farms and industries. Prop 141 will extend Prop 65's restrictions to government facilities such as power plants, landfills and military bases. The way I look at it, if you're drinking toxic benzene, you don't care if it comes from a public or private facility--you just want it stopped. Prop 141 will fill a serious hole in Prop 65, making this a safer state in which to live.

War on Drugs: Propositions 129 and 133

Proposition 129: John Van de Kamp's Program: \$740 M Prison Bond, etc. -- YES

FAILED

Poor, toothless Prop 129. It was supposed to be a tough crime measure for John Van de Kamp to use in his campaign for Governor. But Van de Kamp lost in the primary, so now 129 is an orphan. Prop 129 was going to raise lots of new money by bringing California's tax laws into conformity with federal laws. But the Legislature has already enacted those changes,

so that part of 129 is useless. And 129 was going to transfer \$1.2 billion into a new Anti-Drug Superfund. But 129 allows the Legislature to reduce the amount transferred, and the Legislature has *already* taken steps to do so.

So what will this impotent Proposition do? Three things. First, we can assume that *some* amount of money will find its way into the Superfund. The Superfund will give more money to police and sheriffs to battle drugs, especially in schools and gang-infested neighborhoods. It will also fund drug-abuse treatment centers and prevention programs, better parole supervision for drug offenders, and the cutely-named CrackDown Task Force.

Second, Prop 129 will authorize \$740 billion in bonds for prison construction, of which \$306 million will go to build a special drug-offender prison in the Mojave Desert. Please see Prop 144 for my position on prison bonds. (I favor them.) Third, Prop 129 will modify Prop 115's limits on our right of privacy. You will recall that 115 limits the rights of the accused to those rights deriving from the U. S. Constitution. Among the rights in the California Constitution now denied to defendants is the right of privacy. It is widely assumed that if *Roe v. Wade* were overturned, a state law banning abortions that's still on the books (!) could again be enforced unless the privacy clause is reinstated. Prop 129 states that the right of privacy should be denied only "insofar as it relates to the admissibility of evidence," and goes on to state that Prop 115 "shall not be construed to abridge the right to privacy as it affects reproductive choice." Prop 129 is a must-pass for pro-choice voters. Prop 129 won't accomplish most of the things it wants. It won't raise any new money. It won't fund the Drug War as much as advertised. And it certainly won't get John Van de Kamp elected Governor. But we shouldn't judge a ballot measure by what it won't do. If we focus on what Prop 129 will do, it looks like a pretty good deal.

Proposition 133: Leo McCarthy's Program: Half-Cent Sales Tax Increase -- NO **FAILED**

Prop 133 will jack up the state sales tax by half a cent. This will raise the enormous sum of \$7.5 billion--a fifth the size of this year's General Fund. What will Prop 133 do with all this money? 42% will go to anti-drug education. With nearly \$800 million a year, it will buy the snazziest dang anti-drug education you've ever seen. There will be aerial spectaculars with laser light shows and dancing girls, catered by Alice Waters and Wolfgang Puck. \$800 million is \$160 per student per year. Is this overkill? You betcha.

And who's paying for all this education? Everyone in California, regardless of their ability to pay. Prop 133 taxes sales, not income. It hits hardest the poor people who have to live in drug-infested neighborhoods. This is cruel and heartless. These people need that \$160 per student just to survive.

Sure, Prop 133 will also allocate smaller amounts to law enforcement, drug treatment and prisons and jails. But at its core, Prop 133 is a dumb idea. It imposes a harshly regressive tax to pay for programs that will be *of limited effectiveness at best*. I can't think of a reason why it should merit anybody's support.

Limits on Legislative Terms: Propositions 131 and 140

Proposition 131: Eight Years in a Row (Twelve for Legislators), Public Campaign Financing -- YES **FAILED**

THROW THE B*ST*RDS OUT! The call echoes throughout the state. Everybody I know thinks the entire Assembly and Senate is a bunch of no-good, dirty scumbags. Yet we voters keep re-electing them: most legislators have been in office ten years or more. Why? The true root of the problem is anti-competitive districts. Nearly all of California's legislative districts have been drawn to contain a decisive majority for one party or the other, making the result of November general elections a foregone conclusion. We voters had a chance to change this in June with Props 118 and 119, but we blew it and turned down both of them.

Okay, so the November elections are meaningless. But why do we keep *re-nominating* our no-good, rotten legislators in the June primaries? Because these legislators are *well-known, established community leaders*, and you can't just vote against them and for some *weirdo you've never heard of*, for crying out loud. Who cares how they've voted? Who *knows* how they've voted? They're our leaders, and we have no reason to just *dump* them.

This mentality has resulted in virtually guaranteed re-election for all incumbents as long as they shy away from controversy. So they shy away. They shy away from insurance, the environment, cigarette and alcohol taxes, the budget, and anything else that might get them in trouble. In fact, so many legislators shy away from so many subjects that the Legislature has become *paralyzed with fear!* This is why nothing ever seems to get done; this is why there are twenty-eight propositions on your ballot; this is why we have come to hate the Legislature so awfully much.

Prop 131 will limit state senators and assemblymembers to twelve years in a row (that's three four-year terms for senators, or six two-year terms for assemblymembers). After a term off, they'll all be able to run again. With limits to their terms our legislators won't be as worried about perpetual re-election, so maybe they'll be able to take occasional stands on tough issues. And with forced turnover, maybe we voters will be able to judge candidates on what they stand for, not on how well they've avoided offending people. More elections will be about issues, not perceived "leadership" qualities. Let's remember: legislators are your *representatives*; your *leaders* are your president, governor and mayor.

Prop 131 will also limit the Governor, Attorney General, Treasurer, etc. to two four-year terms in a row. This has been common practice anyway, and should therefore be unnoticeable. Yes, 131 will prevent Bill Honig from being Superintendent

of Schools for Life, and March Fong Eu will eventually have to be pried out of the Secretary of State's office. But 131 will also prevent future Jesse Unruhs from becoming monster power bosses, and that makes it worth it.

Prop 131's term limits are mild, especially next to Prop 140's limits of six or eight years ever. There's a reason for not being so severe: *institutional memory*. If no one in a body has been there more than five years, no one will remember *why* a six-year-old bill was worded the way it was, or what some critical testimony was, or why a particular action was taken. With 140, state laws could undergo sea changes every six years, and chaos would result. Prop 131 is the prudent, gentle way of generating needed turnover in the Legislature.

* * *

One of the candidates for Governor recently commented that her standing in the polls each week appeared to be a direct result of how much television time she was buying. When she bought a lot, her standing went up; when she bought a little, it went down. Logically, if she raised enough money to buy enough air time, she'd win the election. So she should spend her entire campaign raising money.

Money buys exposure, and exposure buys votes. Therefore money buys votes and wins elections. It's a sad fact of our political system, but the candidate with the most money virtually always wins. I don't believe this fits the definition of "democracy." I believe the proper word is "plutocracy." Go look it up. In addition to limiting terms in office, Prop 131 also seeks to impose limits on the amount of money candidates can raise and spend in a campaign. By doing so, 131 hopes to reduce the "pluto" and add a little more "demo" to our "cracy."

The money-raising limits will work like this: The prohibition on honoraria June's Prop 112 imposed on state officials is extended to local officials. The maximum amount of gifts an official may accept in a year from a single source is reduced from the current \$250 (\$1000 for local officials) to \$100. Individuals, corporations and labor unions would be allowed to contribute only \$1,000 to a candidate per election, with a limit of \$40,000 total over a two-year period. Political Action Committees (PACs) would be limited to \$2,500 per candidate, unless the PAC accepts only contributions of \$100 or less, in which case the PAC may give \$10,000 to each candidate. Candidates would be allowed to receive no more than one-third of their total contributions from PACs.

Of course, the best way to prevent one candidate from burying the opposition under an avalanche of dollars would be to limit the amount a candidate could spend. The U. S. Supreme Court says strict limits would be an unconstitutional infringement upon free speech, but we *can* limit spending in exchange for *public campaign funding*. This is how presidential elections are conducted, and this is what Prop 131 will do for state contests. For example, let's say you're running for State Senate. Under 131, if you raise \$50,000 (to prove that you're serious) and if you have a viable opponent (someone with a war chest of \$75,000 or more), you become eligible for public funding. You will now get three dollars from the State for every dollar you raise inside your district, and one dollar for every dollar raised outside your district. Only contributions from individuals will be matched, and only up to \$250 per individual. In exchange for public financing, you must agree to limit your expenditures to \$425,000 for the primary, and \$700,000 for the general election. If your opponent *refuses* the public funding/spending limit deal, your spending cap will be lifted completely, but you'll get to *keep* the State's money. This will encourage your opponent to accept public financing as well. (Dollar amounts will be different for each level of government, of course.)

You might be a little bit dubious about public campaign financing. It seems like a questionable use of your tax dollars to pay for Wilson and Feinstein to throw rocks at each other over the airwaves. For the price of a single TV commercial we could house dozens of homeless people, or improve our schools, or buy another mass-transit rail car.

These arguments miss the point. Prop 131's public financing will allow candidates to get their snouts out of the money-raising trough long enough to do some genuine, issues-oriented campaigning. Since only contributions from individuals are matched, 131 will allow candidates of the people to have a chance against those funded by industry or PACs. Prop 131 will help even out the playing field in future elections by ensuring at least a semblance of financial parity among the candidates. That's a little more democratic, isn't it?

Proposition 140: Two Terms EVER (Three for Assembly), No Retirement -- NO PASSED

You might like it that Prop 140 limits the Governor, Attorney General, Secretary of State, and so on to two terms in the same office. You might like it that Prop 140 limits state senators to two terms, and assemblymembers to three terms, lifetime. You might even like it that Prop 140 trashes the state legislators' retirement system. But you can't possibly like what Prop 140 does to the Legislature's operating budget.

Prop 140 slashes legislative expenditures by more than a third. This means your senator and assemblyperson will have fewer staff members to research the issues. Now where will your legislators turn for crucial information? Not to me--I'm busy, and besides, I don't care about 90% of the stuff that comes before the legislature. But the lobbyists care. They care enough to do the research, to provide it to your legislators, and to slant the facts in their own favor. You know what sort of laws would result, and I don't think you like it very much.

Or maybe you do. All right, say you want the Legislature's budget clobbered. Under Prop 140, the legislative budget is initially maimed, but then it starts ballooning again, growing each year in proportion to the entire state budget. California's population grows by half a million every year, so the state budget goes up plenty. But the population of senators and assemblythings is stable at 120. So if Prop 140 passes, pretty soon the legislative budget will be higher than it would be if 140 never made it to the ballot!

If you like legislative term limits, vote for Prop 131. If you want to can the legislators' retirement system, go run your own initiative campaign. Prop 140 will seriously impair your legislators' judgement by depriving them of research staff. They'll need that research staff more than ever if Prop 140's term limits pass: they'll all be rookies in 1996.

Making Your Ballot Longer: Propositions 136 and 137

Proposition 136: Voter Approval of New Taxes -- NO FAILED

Prop 136 is an anti-initiative initiative. It's a bomb designed to destroy Props 129, 133, 134, and all future special-purpose taxes. Prop 136 is deceptively written to give the impression of benign intent. But don't be deceived by its appearance.

First, a couple of definitions. *General* taxes, like the income and sales taxes, fund the entire government, while *special* taxes are those earmarked for special purposes. Prop 126's alcohol tax is *general* because it funds government in general, while Prop 134's alcohol tax is *special* because its proceeds are earmarked for special alcohol-related programs.

About half of the people in California live in *charter cities*. Although other entities in the state require voter approval for all new taxes, *charter cities* can impose new or increased *general* taxes with just a vote of their city councils. Prop 136 closes this loophole, requiring voter approval of new or increased *general* taxes in *charter cities*. Sounds fair enough. This is the sheep's clothing in which the wolf of Prop 136 is clad.

Prop 136 would require that any *special* taxes enacted by initiative would need two-thirds voter approval, not just the simple majority they need now. Since two-thirds voter approval is just about impossible, Prop 136 would torpedo any future attempts to use taxes on an item to pay for things related to that item. For example, we would be unable to use increased cigarette taxes to fund medical care and anti-tobacco education. We couldn't impose a fee on car tires to pay for roads, or on candy to pay for dental programs, or on MTV to pay for services for the deaf. Under 136, every new tax will have to be a *general* tax.

"So what?" I hear you bleat. Well, consider this: without the ability to link revenues to specific programs, every new tax measure brought before the voters will be a just a new tax. No particular benefits will be attached. If people are willing to pay more sales taxes to help the homeless, too bad. The increased taxes go into the General Fund, and the Legislature will decide whether the homeless get any help. Prop 136 will eliminate the voters' ability to make sacrifices for a purpose. Why vote for something that disempowers The People?

Strangely, Prop 136 exempts *special* gasoline and sales taxes for transportation from its two-thirds vote provision. More wool on the beast, I'm afraid.

Now for the most devious aspect of 136. Successful propositions on this ballot will go into effect November 7, the day after the election. But Prop 136 says it will go into effect on November 6. Since it gives itself a one-day head start, Prop 136 will be waiting to pounce on the unsuspecting Props 129, 133 and 134, *even if they get more votes than 136!* This is unbelievably arrogant, and almost certainly illegal. Propositions have no business ambushing each other. This sort of provision, if upheld, will turn future ballots into juvenile games of "tag."

Proposition 137: Prevention of Modifications to the Initiative Process -- NO FAILED

California's quaint political system has included initiatives since 1911, when Gov. Hiram Johnson led a revolt against the railroad robber-barons who owned the government back then. The state Constitution now contains rules for the number of signatures needed to qualify, the ban on multiple-subject initiatives, the prohibition of initiatives naming individuals to office, and so on. It would take a vote of the people to change any of these.

Several aspects of the initiative process, however, are controlled by statute. Among these are rules for the way petitions are circulated, and rules for qualification of initiatives at the local level. These rules can be changed by the Legislature and Governor. Prop 137 would require voter approval for any such changes.

What's going on here? Who would want to preserve this wacky initiative system? I'll tell you who: big industry. The folks who qualified initiatives to benefit the insurance industry, the logging industry, the alcohol industry. They're afraid the Legislature might require the signature collection agencies they hire to identify their true sponsors. Do you think Prop 104 would have qualified in 1988 if the petitions had said, "*Sponsored By Your Friendly Insurance Industry, Which Has Raised Your Rates 40% In The Last Two Years?*"

I love the initiative process. It's great that The People can get involved and make a difference. But there's something seriously wrong when we start seeing counter-initiatives, and counter-counter-initiatives, each one more deceptive than the next. It would be great for the Legislature to enact rules preventing some of the awful confusion on the ballot. Then maybe we'd see only true grass-roots initiatives for the benefit of all. I don't want to strap the added burden of voter approval on these badly-needed regulations. Vote "no" on 137, and maybe next election you won't have to read 28 ballot arguments from me.

Bonds: Propositions 143 through 151

My Semi-biennial Lecture on Bonds

When California wants to finance a large project, it asks the voters for permission to take out a loan. Props 143 through 151 are just such requests. If the voters approve, the legislature may take out loans for the projects by selling general obligation bonds, which are paid back with interest over 20 or 30 years. The bond payments come out of the state's General Fund. So when we vote on the bonds, we are really voting on whether the project in question ought to be added to the state's budget.

"Wait a minute!" I hear you cry. "What about those interest payments? It says here that we usually end up paying more for *interest* than for the bonds themselves!" Yes, it's true. It's also true when you take out a loan to buy a house, or a car, or anything else that you need immediately but can't pay for yet. It's usually worth paying the premium of interest to get the funding now.

"Well and good," you continue, "but there are *five billion dollars* in bonds on this ballot. Isn't that too much to borrow?" For you, yes, but the State of California can handle it. The state's current bond debt is among the lowest in the country. California bonds have the highest possible credit rating. At \$700 million, current bond payments are less than two percent of the General Fund. The bonds on this ballot will raise it to just over three percent, still a tiny percentage.

The projects proposed in 143 through 151 are real estate acquisitions and improvements. The money isn't going for momentary expenses like salaries or stationery. It's sensible for the state to make extended payments for land, buildings and vehicles which will be used far into the future. Remember, too, that California's population continues to skyrocket at the rate of half a million people a year. Borrowing makes particular sense if you know your income will go up in the future. As the state grows, the General Fund will certainly grow too.

There is another, more important reason to vote for a bond measure, however. In addition to being formal requests for permission to take out "loans", bond measures are also looked upon as referenda on the merits of the proposed projects. If a bond measure fails, legislators are likely to believe that the public feels the project is not worthy of receiving any state funding. You may have meant, "yes on the project but no on the bonds," but your message to Sacramento will read, "no on the project." So if you vote down a bond measure just because you don't like bonds, you may well have killed forever the project the bonds were to have funded.

Proposition 143: \$450 M for College & University Construction -- YES **FAILED**

Prop 143 will provide \$450 million to the University of California, California State University, California Community Colleges and the Maritime Academy for the purchase and improvement of land and buildings. Back before 1984 state tideland oil revenues provided about \$125 million a year for college construction. But foreign oil prices have been so low that this revenue has all but disappeared. Over two million students attend the campuses Prop 143 will help. We need 143 to fund new and improved facilities for our expanding populace and for our renewed emphasis on excellence in education.

Considering my earlier assurances about bonds funding only capital projects, you might be dismayed to see "instructional equipment" among the items Prop 143 bonds will fund. It looks as though bond money could be for used for things as transitory as pencils or as volatile as lab chemicals: hardly capital items. But appearances can be deceiving. The money for instructional equipment is to be disbursed in the form of *loans* to community college districts. The loans will be paid back *with interest*, covering the cost of the bonds, out of the remaining state tideland oil revenues. So this provision amounts to an advance on future oil revenues, *not* use of capital funds for non-capital items.

Proposition 144: \$450 M for Prison Construction -- YES **FAILED**

Thanks to Props 1 (June '82), 17 (June '84), 54 (Nov. '86), 80 (Nov. '88) and 120 (June '90), state prison capacity has grown from 23,000 in 1981 to 51,000 in 1990. But the prison *population* has grown to 90,000, still 76% over capacity. By 1995, the Department of Corrections estimates the population will be 153,000. Prop 144 will provide \$450 million to build new state prisons and relieve the overcrowding.

If you favor getting tough on criminals, you have an obligation to vote to fund more prison cells. If the prison system isn't expanded, overcrowding will increase to the point where judges will *have* to release prisoners before their sentences are up, citing the "cruel and unusual punishment" clause in the Constitution. Convicted felons will be freely roaming the streets like packs of wild dogs. It won't be safe to go out after dark. Entire cities will be held hostage to fear and terror. Vote yes on 144 to prevent this god-awful scene. Don't turn California into a true-life Chuck Norris movie.

If, on the other hand, you believe that incarceration is not the best way to rehabilitate criminals, you may be tempted to vote against Prop 144. Fewer prison cells will mean shorter sentences and the institution of better alternatives such as work furloughs, social programs, etc. But at what cost? The courts will not step in until *well after* overcrowding has gotten out of hand. In the meantime, you will have subjected the prisoners to some of the *most cruel, inhumane* conditions imaginable: overcrowded prisons. Your goal of using other means to rehabilitate criminals may be noble, but this is the wrong way of achieving it. You cannot trample on the human rights and basic dignity of the prisoners in your quest to reform our system of justice. You must vote in favor of 144.

Probably the most popular argument against 144 is that it adds an unnecessary \$450 million to the \$2.5 billion approved since 1980. Prop 144 is needed, so the argument goes, only because of gross mismanagement in the prison construction program. Okay, maybe it's true. So what? The consequences of not expanding the prisons will be just as dire regardless of the cause--mismanagement, floods, strikes, or lack of funds. Prop 144 bonds will cost the State \$40 million per year, or less than two dollars per Californian. When you look at it that way, it's a small price to pay.

Proposition 145: \$325 M for Housing and the Homeless -- YES FAILED

Estimates of the number of homeless people in California vary from 50,000 to 250,000. These people need a hand. But in the last decade federal funding of housing programs has dropped by 78%. Furthermore, over 100,000 subsidized low-income rental units are due to become market-rate units in the next few years. This means that unless we do something soon, the housing problem will reach *even higher* proportions. Prop 145 will provide \$315 million in state bonds to help alleviate the awful shortage of low-income housing.

The money from 145 will go to six programs. \$190 million is allocated for low-interest loans for first-time home buyers. \$45 million goes to the owners of those low-income rental units about to become market-rate, in exchange for continued low rental rates. Another \$45 million is for cheap loans to make run-down rental units safe for occupancy, again in exchange for continued low rents. Amounts of \$15 million or less are to insure loans for reconstruction of run-down rental units; grants for emergency shelters; and grants to build and rehabilitate farmworker housing. If you've been following the plight of migrant farmworkers in California, you'll be especially glad to see Prop 145 helping them.

Proposition 146: \$800 M for School Construction -- YES PASSED

Prop 146 will provide \$800 million for construction and modernization of elementary, junior high and high schools. At least \$500 million will be used to build new schools. Before the famous Prop 13 of 1978, most school districts funded their own construction. But local districts can no longer afford this, so the state has taken over. Since 1982, voters have approved about four billion dollars in school construction bonds. Nevertheless, five billion dollars worth of applications for school construction and reconstruction are pending.

Proposition 147: \$225 M for Jail Construction -- YES FAILED

County jails are filled to over capacity in 52 of California's 58 counties. In 18 counties, it's gotten to the point where courts have imposed *absolute population limits*, forcing early prisoner releases to make room for incoming prisoners. Props 2 (Nov. '82), 16 (June '84), 52 (June '86) and 86 (Nov. '88) provided \$1.5 billion for new jails and juvenile facilities. Prop 147 pours in another \$225 million. Everything I said about Prop 144 goes here, too.

Proposition 148: \$380 M for Water and Flood Control -- YES FAILED

Of the \$380 million in Prop 148, \$95 million is for water reclamation projects, \$20 million for water conservation and groundwater recharge projects, and \$20 million is for special drought relief projects. That's all you should need to know about Prop 148. The drought has reached a critical stage in many parts of the state. Prop 148 will help pay for permanent solutions to our chronic water problem.

\$90 million from Prop 148 is allocated for flood control, primarily where my brother lives in Orange County. Believe me, things are expensive there, and in case of a flood there would a lot more than \$90 million in damage. Remember that the State incurs a cost (in below-market loans) when the Governor declares a disaster, so this part of Prop 148 can be considered an insurance policy against flooding along the South Coast.

The rest of Prop 148 will fund a variety of water programs, including the Safe Drinking Water Program, sewage plants in small communities, groundwater treatment, and sewage-treatment plants along the Mexican border that will protect our citizens from pollution originating in Mexico. Since much of Prop 148 is loans, not grants, the net cost of Prop 148 is about \$200 million lower than it might otherwise appear.

Proposition 149: \$437 M for Parks & Recreation -- YES FAILED

The state government has been heavily funding local development of parklands for over twenty-five years. Prop 149 raises \$437 million, of which \$182 million continues aid to local governments. Local agencies have grown to depend on this aid. Remember that local governments' budgets are on a shoestring due to the limits Prop 13 placed on their revenues. The first items slashed from local budgets, of course, are non-essential things like parks and recreation. Prop 149 will help ensure that parks and recreation get their proper funding.

Of the remaining \$255 million in Prop 149, \$109 million is to expand and upgrade the State Park system. \$31 million is for forest fire stations and for demonstration forests where the state develops ecological logging practices. Lesser amounts fund the acquisition of wildlife habitats and the purchase of open space and parkland in the Santa Monica Mountains, around

Lake Tahoe and along the Pacific Coast. Also included are construction of and/or improvements to several museums around the state, including a new museum dedicated to Latino History, Art and Culture. These are all beneficial programs whose capital nature is appropriate for bonds.

Proposition 150: \$200 M for County Courthouses -- YES FAILED

Since Prop 13 took away local governments' ability to pay for large projects, the state has been supplying funds for local building construction and renovation. The state pays for construction of schools, community colleges, county jails, parks-and-recreation buildings, water treatment facilities, and so on. There are bonds for all of these on this ballot. Eventually you can expect to see every type of locally-owned building come up for a bond measure. Prop 150 is \$200 million for county courthouses. The argument is the same here as it is for the others.

Proposition 151: \$30 M for Child Care -- YES FAILED

Prop 151 provides \$30 million for child care facilities and equipment. The need for child care is undisputed. Child care will allow poor, single mothers to work, giving them a chance to escape an otherwise hopeless cycle of poverty. It will allow both parents in middle-class families to develop fulfilling careers. And it can introduce children to an instructional/institutional environment at an early age, making them more likely to succeed when they start school in earnest. \$30 million is less than one percent of the total of the bonds on this ballot. It's one dollar per Californian. It's not much, but it's a start.

Miscellany: Propositions 124, 125, 127, 139 and 142

Proposition 124: Stock Ownership by Hospital Districts -- NO FAILED

Government agencies can't own stock in corporations. This is prudent and sensible: we wouldn't want to tie government budgets to the whims of the stock market. Prop 124 would allow California's 57 public hospital districts to invest money in health-care corporations. Why? So the public hospitals can attract doctors with the lure of profitable medical joint ventures.

Medical joint ventures are private labs and clinics jointly owned by the hospital and the doctors. For instance, a hospital might invest in a radiologist's private x-ray clinic in return for the doctor's part-time services at the hospital. The hospital is happy because it gets the radiologist, and radiologist is happy because she doesn't have to come up with all the capital to open the x-ray clinic.

But now we see the radiologist with a patient at the hospital. The patient needs x-rays. Where should the radiologist send him? If the x-rays are taken at the hospital they'll be cheaper, but if they're done at the radiologist's clinic the radiologist gets to keep the profit. Suddenly there's a conflict between the patient's best interests and the doctor's bank account. You can guess what happens: the doctor makes a referral to her own clinic, and the patient has no idea that the same services are available cheaper elsewhere.

This kind of flagrant kickback is illegal under federal laws. It has been decried as unethical by the American College of Surgeons and the American College of Radiologists. But it is almost impossible to detect because patients are unaware of it. Nationwide, patients of doctors who own medical labs get 45 percent more lab tests than other patients, according to a 1989 federal study. And the figure is much worse in California--probably the worst in the nation--according to the editor of the New England Journal of Medicine.

The joint ventures Prop 124 would allow can be beneficial when they provide services that are otherwise unavailable. But often they duplicate services or are "spun off"--that is, removed from the hospital and placed into the venture. In such cases the joint venture can actually *reduce* the hospital's income. If joint ventures are what private hospitals want to do, that's their business decision. But if this is what it takes for public hospitals to attract doctors, they're better off without them.

Proposition 125: Use of Gas Taxes & DMV Fees for Rail Car Purchases -- YES FAILED

Do you remember Prop 5 of 1974? Do you remember 1974? Okay, here's a refresher. Until 1974 all gas taxes, truck weight fees and DMV fees were used for road construction and repair. Prop 5 allowed these funds to be used for mass-transit tracks and stations as long as the voters in a county approved. Prop 125 would allow the funds also to be used for mass-transit rail cars and locomotives, again with voter approval.

Opponents of Prop 125 squawk that it will increase the degree to which motorists subsidize mass transit. I find this a point in 125's favor. If drivers pay for mass-transit systems, someday they will be able to abandon their cars and become users of those systems.

Proposition 127: Reassessment Exemption for Earthquake Safety Improvements -- NO

PASSED

The famous Prop 13 of 1978 says that your property's *assessed value* can go up only 2% a year so long as you don't remodel or sell. So while your property may be worth twice what it was ten years ago, its *assessed value* will have barely changed. Since property taxes are based on *assessed value*, the amount of property tax you pay depends more on how long you've owned your property than how much it's really worth. It's sort of like paying income tax based on how long you've had your current job. It's ridiculous.

Since Prop 13 passed, we voters have approved about a zillion little exemptions to let special people avoid being reassessed when they move or remodel: disaster victims, people who inherit their property, people over 55 who move into cheaper homes, people who fire-proof their property, people who live in historic buildings. Prop 127 extends reassessment exemptions to people who remodel buildings to make them earthquake-safe.

On the surface Prop 127 seems charitable and innocuous. But every time we grant a reassessment exemption like Prop 127, we make the lunacy I pointed out in the first paragraph more palatable, and thus postpone the day when California comes to its senses and repeals Proposition 13. Prop 110 hopes to eliminate the complaints of yet another class of citizens upset with the system of "property tax based on length of ownership," and thus perpetuate a fundamentally flawed law.

I don't usually recommend protest votes, but I've taken up repeal of Prop 13 as a crusade. Soon it won't be unusual for people who have just bought their property to pay *ten times more* property taxes than their neighbors who have owned since 1978. It's as unfair and arbitrary to base taxation on length of ownership as it would be to base it on length of hair or length of name. Prop 127 will pass easily. Your "no" vote will send a tiny message that we are unwilling to accept this law any more.

Proposition 139: Employment of Prison Inmates -- NO

PASSED

Inmates in California's prisons and jails are currently employed in several government programs, such as making license plates or furniture for government offices. There are fewer jobs than prisoners who want to work, however. Prop 139 would start a new program of private employment for inmates. All work would take place within the prisons, in facilities leased to the employers at or below market rates. Inmates' wages would be comparable to those for similar work outside prison, and the prisoners could not be used as replacements for striking laborers. The inmates' wages would have up to eighty percent deducted for taxes, room & board reimbursement to the state, restitution to the criminal's victims, and support for the prisoner's family.

There are good reasons to allow prison inmates to work. The self-esteem a job gives an inmate is of tremendous value in the inmate's rehabilitation. Under Prop 139, money earned by inmates can go for victim restitution, thereby reducing the victims' dependence on the wealth of the criminal for their compensation. 139 would also allow inmates' earnings to go to their families, who would otherwise receive nothing. And 139 will help defray the state's cost of housing and feeding the prisoners, reducing the burden on taxpayers.

But Prop 139 contains a tax incentive that might cost free workers their jobs. Businesses participating in Prop 139 programs would get a state income tax credit of ten percent of the inmate wages they pay. That's no small potatoes. Taken with the potentially great savings on facility leasing, it could cause some manufacturers to jettison their free employees in favor of convict labor. I'm all for the benefits described in the paragraphs above, but not at the cost of innocent workers' jobs. We've got to reserve some reward for those who abide by the law.

Proposition 142: Cal-Vet Loan Program -- YES

PASSED

The Cal-Vet loan program provides low-interest home and farm loans to veterans. Cal-Vet gets the money it lends from the sale of bonds. When the veterans pay off their loans, they do so at a rate that allows Cal-Vet to pay for the bonds, the interest on the bonds, and all bureaucratic overhead. In this way, the program has been completely self-supporting since 1921 (the year of Warren Harding's inauguration). Clearly the Cal-Vet program is a winner.

The only catch is that the State periodically needs voters' permission to sell more bonds to fuel Cal-Vet. Hence Prop 3 (Nov. '82), Prop 29 (Nov. '84), Prop 42 (June '86), Prop 76 (June '88) and the current Prop 140. I heartily recommend a vote in favor of 140 to ensure the continuation of this smashing success.

Pete recommends:

- 124 NO Public Hospital Stock Ownership
- 125 YES DMV Fees for Rail Car Purchases
- 126 YES Alcohol Tax: Two Cents A Beer
- 127 NO Property Tax/Earthquake Safety
- 128 YES Big Green
- 129 YES Drug Wars/Prison Bonds
- 130 YES Logging Restrictions
- 131 YES Term Limits/Public Financing
- 132 YES Gill Net Fishing Ban
- 133 NO Drug Wars/Sales Tax Increase
- 134 NO Alcohol Tax: Five Cents A Beer
- 135 NO Pesticide Industry Pork Barrel
- 136 NO Great-Grandson of Prop 13
- 137 NO Initiative Process
- 138 NO Logging Industry Pork Barrel
- 139 NO Employment of Prison Inmates
- 140 NO Term Limits/No Retirement
- 141 YES Toxic Chemicals Law Extension
- 142 YES Cal-Vet Loan Program
- 143 YES College Construction Bonds
- 144 YES Prison Construction Bonds
- 145 YES Housing/Homeless Bonds
- 146 YES School Construction Bonds
- 147 YES Jail Construction Bonds
- 148 YES Water Projects Bonds
- 149 YES Parks & Recreation Bonds
- 150 YES County Courthouses Bonds
- 151 YES Child Care Bonds

O - Passed

$$10/29 = 5/14 = 2\frac{1}{7} = .357$$

Pete Rates the Propositions
1760 O'Farrell Street #18
San Francisco, CA 94115