

## **Proposition 1A – “Safe, Reliable High-Speed Passenger Train Bond Act**

### **Summary:**

This measure authorizes the state to sell \$9.95 billion in general obligation bonds to fund (1) pre-construction activities and construction of a high-speed passenger train system in California between San Francisco, Los Angeles, and Anaheim (\$9 billion), and (2) capital improvements to passenger rail systems that expand capacity, improve safety, or enable train riders to connect to the high-speed train system (\$950 million). The bond funds would be available when appropriated by the Legislature. General obligation bonds are backed by the state, meaning that the state is required to pay the principal and interest costs on these bonds.

### **Arguments For:**

An 800-mile High-Speed Train network that will relieve 70 million passenger trips a year that now clog California’s highways and airports, which would relieve traffic congestion and pollution.

Travel from Los Angeles to San Francisco in about 2½ hours for about \$50 a person.

### **Arguments Against:**

Will cost \$20 billion in principle and interest (estimated debt service on the bonds is \$647 million/year), not including on-going maintenance.

General Obligation bonds are paid for out of the General Fund, meaning while this bond does not directly raise new taxes, paying for it could result in either tax increases or spending cuts from other State budget items to repay the bonds.

The state already has over \$100 billion in bond debt.

### **Notes:**

## **Proposition 2 – “Standards for Confining Farm Animals. Initiative Statute.”**

### **Summary:**

This measure prohibits with certain exceptions the confinement on a farm of pregnant pigs, calves raised for veal, and egg-laying hens in a manner that does not allow them to turn around freely, lie down, stand up, and fully extend their limbs. Under the measure, any person who violates this law would be guilty of a misdemeanor, punishable by a fine of up to \$1,000 and/or imprisonment in county jail for up to six months.

### **Arguments For:**

Prevents cruelty to animals.

Improves food safety by eliminating a practice that confines animals close together, fostering the spread of animal diseases.

Does not go into effect until 2015, allowing time for affected business to change their practices.

### **Arguments Against:**

Nearly all California farmers follow the California Department of Food and Agriculture’s California Egg Quality Assurance Program, assuring the highest standards for FOOD SAFETY and PUBLIC HEALTH

Harms consumers by raising prices on California eggs, possibly forcing Californians to purchase eggs shipped from other states or Mexico.

Will cost state \$600 million in “economic activity,” from added expense and possible job losses.

Puts Californians at increased risk of Avian Influenza and Salmonella contamination, as modern animal housing systems limit contact with migratory and wild birds.

### **Notes:**

### **Proposition 3 – “Childrens Hospital Bond Act. Grand Program. Initiative Statute.”**

#### **Summary:**

This measure authorizes the state to sell \$980 million in general obligation bonds for capital improvement projects at children’s hospitals. The measure specifically identifies the five University of California children’s hospitals as eligible bond fund recipients. There are additional children’s hospitals that are likely to meet other eligibility criteria specified in the measure. Eighty percent of the monies would be available to nonprofit children’s hospitals and the remaining 20 percent would be available to University of California children’s hospitals.

#### **Arguments For:**

Children’s Hospitals do not have enough room to handle the growing number of seriously ill and injured children sent to them.

Will allow Childrens’ Hospitals to purchase the latest medical technologies, and build more bed capacity.

#### **Arguments Against:**

Proposition 61, which voters approved at the November 2004 statewide general election, authorized the sale of \$750 million in general obligation bonds to provide funding for children’s hospitals. As of June 1, 2008, about \$403 million of the funds from Proposition 61 had been awarded to eligible hospitals.

Will cost \$2 billion in principle and interest (estimated debt service on the bonds is \$64 million/year), not including on-going maintenance.

General Obligation bonds are paid for out of the General Fund, meaning while this bond does not directly raise new taxes, paying for it could result in either tax increases or spending cuts from other State budget items to repay the bonds.

The state already has over \$100 billion in bond debt.

#### **Notes:**

**Proposition 4 – “Waiting Period and Parental Notification Before Termination of Minor’s Pregnancy. Initiative Constitutional Amendment.”**

**Summary:**

This measure amends the State Constitution to require, with certain exceptions, a physician (or his or her representative) to *notify* the parent or legal guardian of a pregnant minor at least 48 hours before performing an abortion involving that minor. (This measure does not require a physician or a minor to obtain the consent of a parent or guardian.)

Exceptions to Notification Requirements: Medical Emergencies, Waivers Approved by Parent/Guardian, Notice to Adult Family Member and Report of Abuse, Waivers Approved by Courts.

**Arguments For:**

New California law requires a parent to provide written consent in person before a minor can use a tanning salon, yet a young girl can get an abortion without a family member being notified and this could endanger her safety.

When abortions are kept secret, adult sexual predators go free.

**Arguments Against:**

May drive scared, pregnant teens that cannot go to parents to choose unsafe, illegal abortions.

Not all teens live in homes where communication is possible, and forces teens to go to court.

**Notes:**

**Proposition 5 – “Nonviolent Drug Offenses. Sentencing. Parole and Rehabilitation. Initiative Statute.”**

**Summary:**

This measure allocates \$460,000,000 annually to improve and expand treatment programs for persons convicted of drug and other offenses

Limits court authority to incarcerate offenders who commit certain drug crimes, break drug treatment rules or violate parole.

Substantially shortens parole for certain drug offenses; increases parole for serious and violent felonies.

Divides Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation authority between two Secretaries, one with six year fixed term and one serving at pleasure of Governor. Provides five year fixed terms for deputy secretaries.

Creates 19 member board to direct parole and rehabilitation policy.

**Arguments For:**

Reduces the number of nonviolent drug offenders going into prison by providing drug treatment programs.

**Arguments Against:**

Establishes two new bureaucracies which will cost hundreds of millions in taxpayer dollars. Estimates are up to \$1 billion annually to maintain programs.

Allows for early release of up to 45,000 inmates from California prisons; shortens parole for drug dealers.

**Notes:**

**Proposition 6 – “Police and Law Enforcement Funding. Criminal Penalties and Laws. Initiative Statute.**

**Summary:**

Requires minimum of \$965,000,000 each year to be allocated from state General Fund for police, sheriffs, district attorneys, adult probation, jails and juvenile probation facilities. Some of this funding will increase in following years.

Makes approximately 30 revisions to California criminal law, many of which cover gang-related offenses. Revisions create multiple new crimes and additional penalties, some with the potential for new life sentences.

Increases penalties for violating a gang-related injunction and for felons carrying guns under certain conditions.

**Arguments For:**

Returns taxpayers’ money to local law enforcement without raising taxes.

Increases penalties for gang-related crimes, creates a registry of gang members, provides for GPS monitoring of convicted gang members and other violent offenders, among others.

**Arguments Against:**

Creates a minimum allocation of funding from the state’s general fund, irrespective of state’s financial conditions. This could create hardship for the state in leaner years, or allow the state only to fund the minimum amount in years of future growth.

**Notes:**

## **Proposition 7 – Renewable Energy Generation. Initiative Statute.**

### **Summary:**

Requires utilities, including government-owned utilities, to generate 20% of their power from renewable energy by 2010, a standard currently applicable only to private electrical corporations. Raises requirement for utilities to 40% by 2020 and 50% by 2025.

Imposes penalties, subject to waiver, for noncompliance.

Transfers some jurisdiction of regulatory matters from Public Utilities Commission to Energy Commission.

Fast-tracks approval for new renewable energy plants.

Requires utilities to sign longer contracts (20 year minimum) to procure renewable energy.

Creates account to purchase rights-of-way and facilities for the transmission of renewable energy.

### **Arguments For:**

Moves us away from emissions-causing energy production such as oil, natural gas and nuclear to more solar, wind, geothermal, biomass, tidal, and small hydroelectric energy.

Renewable energy standards are increased 2% per year, over seventeen years, so that half of our electricity will come from cleaner and cheaper sources by 2025.

### **Arguments Against:**

Renewable power from plants under 30 megawatts won't count toward meeting the law. Today, nearly 60 percent of contracts under California's renewable requirements are with these small providers.

Allows power providers to always charge 10% above the market price of power, stifling competition for renewable power.

Nothing in Prop. 7 limits increases in electric bills. It will disrupt renewable power development, unnecessarily drive up costs, and stall efforts to substitute clean power for more expensive energy sources.

### **Notes:**

## **Proposition 8 – “Eliminates Right of Same-Sex Couples to Marry. Initiative Constitutional Amendment.”**

### **Summary:**

This measure amends the California Constitution to specify that only marriage between a man and a woman is valid or recognized in California. As a result, notwithstanding the California Supreme Court ruling of May 2008, marriage would be limited to individuals of the opposite sex, and individuals of the same sex would not have the right to marry in California.

### **Arguments For:**

It contains the same 14 words that were previously approved in 2000 by over 61% of California voters: “Only marriage between a man and a woman is valid or recognized in California.”

Proposition 8 doesn't take away any rights or benefits of gay or lesbian domestic partnerships. Under California law, “domestic partners shall have the same rights, protections, and benefits” as married spouses.

It overturns the outrageous decision of four activist Supreme Court judges who ignored the will of the people.

It protects our children from being taught in public schools that “same-sex marriage” is the same as traditional marriage.

Proposition 8 protects marriage as an essential institution of society. While death, divorce, or other circumstances may prevent the ideal, the best situation for a child is to be raised by a married mother and father

### **Arguments Against:**

Our law and Constitution should guarantee the same freedoms and rights to everyone.

The freedom to marry is fundamental to our society, just like the freedoms of religion and speech.

The government has no business telling people who can and cannot get married.

Domestic Partnerships are not enough. Only marriage provides the same guarantees.

### **Notes:**

**Proposition 9 – “Criminal Justice System. Victims’ Rights. Parole. Initiative Constitutional Amendment and Statute.”**

**Summary:**

This measure amends the State Constitution and various state laws to (1) expand the legal rights of crime victims and the payment of restitution by criminal offenders, (2) restrict the early release of inmates, and (3) change the procedures for granting and revoking parole. These changes are discussed in more detail below

**Arguments For:**

Requires that a victim and their family’s safety must be considered by judges making bail decisions for accused criminals, and mandates that crime victims be notified if their offender is released.

Requires that victims be notified of parole hearings in advance to ensure they can attend and have a right to be heard.

Prevents politicians from releasing dangerous inmates early to alleviate prison overcrowding.

**Arguments Against:**

Many of the components in Prop. 9—including the requirements that victims be notified of critical points in an offender’s legal process as well as the rights for victims to be heard throughout the legal process—were already approved by voters in Prop. 8 in 1982, the Victims’ Bill of Rights.

Anything approved in Prop. 9 regarding prisoners and parole is subject to federal legal challenges.

**Notes:**

**Proposition 10 – “Alternative Fuel Vehicles and Renewable Energy. Bonds. Initiative Statute.”**

**Summary:**

This measure allows the state to sell \$5 billion in General Obligation bonds for various renewable energy, alternative fuel, energy efficiency, and air emissions reduction purposes, such as purchasing higher fuel economy or alternative fuel vehicles, research and development of renewable energy technology, and providing grants for cities and colleges for renewable energy projects and training in them.

**Key Terms:**

Clean Alternative Fuel: natural gas or any fuel that achieves at least at 10% reduction in carbon emissions.

Clean Alternative Fuel Vehicle: A vehicle powered by a clean alternative fuel.

Dedicated Clean Alternative Fuel Vehicle: A vehicle powered exclusively by a specified clean alternative fuel (biomethane, electricity, hydrogen, natural gas, propane).

**Arguments For:**

- Will increase our energy independence through the production of electricity from wind, solar, and other renewable sources and by giving California motorists the choice to buy vehicles that run on electricity produced from renewable sources and cheaper domestic alternative fuels.
- Will also provide rebates for consumers who purchase more fuel efficient vehicles and vehicles which run on clean alternative fuels.
- Cleaner air through expanded alternative fuel vehicle usage

**Arguments Against:**

- It takes taxpayer dollars away from education, healthcare, public safety, and universities in order to provide fleet operators, including very large and profitable corporations, a subsidy for buying or leasing natural gas trucks.
- Not all cities can apply for grants – 8 specific cities are named in the initiative language, with funds allotted.
- The state already has a \$200 million clean fuels program, paid for by fees.
- Most of our home heating and much of our electricity comes from natural gas. So increasing demand on natural gas through subsidizing natural gas vehicles may greatly increase costs.
- Initiative is written that it may actually exclude hybrids, plug-in hybrids, electric cars, and other clean vehicles.
- Will cost \$10 billion in principle and interest (estimated debt service on the bonds is \$10 million/year). *\*\*See general arguments against in Props 1A and 3*

**Notes:**

## **Proposition 11 – Redistricting. Initiative Constitutional Amendment and Statute.**

### **Summary:**

This measure amends the California Constitution to change the redistricting process for the state Legislature, BOE, and California members of the U.S. House of Representatives, beginning with the 2010 census. Instead of the State Legislature, Redistricting Commissioners, in the past ten years could not have:

- Been a political candidate for state or federal office.
- Been a lobbyist.
- Contributed \$2,000 or more in any year to a political candidate.

Districts would have to be geographically compact, maintain “communities of interest,” and comprise Senate Districts of two adjacent Assembly Districts.

### **Arguments For:**

There is a serious conflict of interest when legislators are allowed to draw their own district boundaries. They divide up neighborhoods and communities to create districts where they are virtually guaranteed reelection.

Will end this conflict of interest by establishing an independent citizens commission to draw districts so that they are fair. Standards required by this measure will assure that districts are drawn so they don't divide neighborhoods and communities.

The commission will include Democrats, Republicans, and independents, and the process will be open to the public.

### **Arguments Against:**

Prop. 11 gives the final say for the entire state to a 14-member “redistricting commission” never elected by the people, so are unaccountable.

Prop. 11 sets aside 10 of the 14 commission seats for *partisan members* of the two biggest political parties—and gives them veto power over almost every decision.

Commissioners are compensated \$300/day, with no limit on time; also no limits on consultants, attorneys, etc., allowing for unlimited costs.

### **Notes:**

## **Proposition 12 – “Veterans’ Bond Act of 2008.”**

### **Summary:**

This measure authorizes the state to sell \$900 million in general obligation bonds for the Cal-Vet program. These bonds would provide sufficient funds for at least 3,600 additional veterans to receive loans.

### **Arguments For:**

All costs of the program, including all administration costs, are paid for by veterans holding loans. There have never been any costs to the taxpayers of California, so this is a fiscally sound way to assist veteran men and women as they return to civilian life.

As these bonds are repaid by the veterans, new bonds must be authorized to continue this self-supporting program serving our veterans.

### **Arguments Against:**

Cal-Vet loans are limited to veterans who served in the *time* of a war—including the Korean and Vietnam conflicts and the current campaigns in Afghanistan and Iraq. There is no requirement for the veteran to have served in combat or even in a combat zone

California voters could reasonably insist that the Cal-Vet Loan Program be limited to veterans who served in combat or a combat zone before they approve more borrowing to fund the Program.

Will cost \$1.8 billion in principle and interest (estimated debt service on the bonds is \$59 million/year). *\*\*See general arguments against in Props 1A, 3, and 10.*

However, throughout its history, the Cal-Vet program has been totally supported by the participating veterans, at no direct cost to the taxpayer. Because general obligation bonds are backed by the state, if the payments made by those veterans participating in the program do not fully cover the amount owed on the bonds, the state’s taxpayers would pay the difference.

### **Notes:**

**Measure S – County Charter Amendment #39 – Proposed County Charter Amendment Thirty-Nine to Establish a Higher Standard of Ethics for Staff Members of County Elected Officers.**

**Summary:**

Requires County Supervisors staff members and department heads to undergo the same ethics training Supervisors receive.

Requires all staff members be employed via contracts approved by four-fifth votes of the Board of Supervisors, and allows Board to terminate staff members by same vote.

Requires the three elected County department heads (Assessor, Treasurer-Tax Collector, & Auditor/Controller) establish minimum qualifications of their unclassified staff, subject to Board of Supervisors Approval.

**Arguments For:**

The Grand Jury called for the establishment of minimum job qualifications for top assistants, and for increased ethics training.

Measure S forces the Board to do its hiring in public view, and allows the Board to fire staff members; the four-fifths vote is intended to prevent political firings.

**Arguments Against:**

No formal arguments against have been received or published by the San Bernardino County Registrar of Voters.

Staff members to the Board are already contract, this merely makes it a four-fifths vote as opposed to a simple majority vote. The super majority vote still allows the Supervisors to “gang up” on one Supervisor and fire his/her staff.

Ethics training already exists, and staff members are very aware of what they may and may not do legally in their positions and on County-paid time.

The County Charter is the County’s Constitution, making it difficult to make changes which would be subject to another Amendment vote, as opposed to accomplishing the same thing by ordinance.

Other than the minimum job qualifications, this Charter Amendment changes very little.

**Notes:**