

**November 2006 Ballot Measures (partial list)**  
Key Provisions, Support and Opposition, Staff Analysis and Recommendations

**Proposition 1A -- Use of sales tax revenues from sales of gasoline**

**Key Provisions:** Increases restrictions upon the legislature's and governor's use for general fund purposes of sales tax dollars generated from sales of gasoline; Specifies process by which the governor, via proclamation, and the legislature, with a subsequent 2/3 vote in each house, can together suspend transfers of these revenues from the general fund to a transportation fund; Establishes that these transfers are loans that must be repaid in full within three years; Limits such transfers to two over any ten-year period; Requires payment from general fund to a transportation fund of a portion of previous transfers.

**Staff Analysis:** By making it more difficult for the legislature and governor to suspend the transfer of sales tax revenues from the general fund to transportation funding, Proposition 1A will increase stress upon the state's general fund, making it more difficult for local air districts to increase subvention funding via the budgetary process.

**Supported by:** See attached Rebuild California document

**Opposed by:** Assemblymember Jackie Goldberg, Chair, Assembly Transportation Committee

**Recommended position: NEUTRAL**

**Proposition 1B -- Transportation Bond -- \$19.925 billion**

**Key Provisions:**

**Highway and transit infrastructure: \$16.250 billion**

- \$4.5 billion for high priority corridor improvements
- \$1 billion for State Highway 99 Enhancement Plan
- \$2 billion for STIP augmentation
- \$2 billion for trade infrastructure
- \$4 billion for rail, bus, transit, and improvements
- \$750 million for SHOPP, including \$250 million for ITS
- \$1 billion for State-Local Partnership Program
- \$1 billion to cities for local roads
- \$1 billion to counties for local roads

**Safety, security, disaster preparedness: \$1.475 billion**

\$1 billion for transit safety and disaster response

\$100 million for Port Security Program

\$125 million for local bridge seismic retrofit

\$250 million for grade separations and railroad crossing safety

**Air quality: \$1.2 billion**

\$1 billion for port air quality (cleaner port and corridor trucks, switcher engines, harbor craft, port electrification)

\$200 million for school bus retrofit and replacement

**Staff Analysis:** Proposition 1B continues the state's decades-long pattern of favoring automobile-oriented transportation investments. Increasing roadway capacity will increase vehicles miles traveled, with resultant impacts upon air quality. Transit and air quality programs receive less than one-third of the funds, while walking and bicycling are ignored entirely. The air quality investments are focused primarily on ports, while our region's lungs will bear the burden of increased emissions from additional goods movement and other driving made possible by new roadway capacity. It's difficult to foresee how Proposition 1B would either benefit air quality in the Sacramento region or reduce greenhouse gas emissions statewide.

**Supported by:** See attached Rebuild California document

**Opposed by:** Assemblymember Michael Villines

**Recommended position: NEUTRAL**

**Proposition 1C -- Housing and Land Use Bond -- \$2.85 billion**

**Key Provisions:**

**Supporting Smart Growth: \$1.35 billion**

\$850 million for regional planning, housing and infill incentives

\$200 million for urban, suburban and rural parks

\$300 million for transit-oriented development

**Affordable housing: \$1.5 billion**

\$345 million for multi-family housing

\$300 million for Cal Home homeownership program

\$200 million for CHADAP down payment assistance program

\$195 million for supportive housing

\$135 million for farm worker housing

\$125 million for the Building Equity and Growth in Neighborhoods (BEGIN) Program

\$100 million for affordable housing innovation

\$50 million for homeless youth housing  
\$50 million for emergency housing.

**Staff Analysis:** Proposition 1C will advance smart growth in California, with resultant air quality benefits. If passed by voters in November, Proposition 1C will allocate \$1.35 billion (nearly 50% of the initiative's \$2.85 billion total) for infill housing and related infrastructure.

**Supported by:** See attached Rebuild California document

**Opposed by:** Assemblymember Chuck Devore

**Recommended position: SUPPORT**

### **Proposition 1D -- Education Bond -- \$10.416 billion**

#### **Key Provisions:**

##### **K-12 facilities: \$7.329 billion**

\$3.3 billion for rehabilitation and modernization of existing schools

\$1.9 billion for new school construction

(\$200 million for small high schools is included in new construction and modernization above)

\$1 billion for overcrowded schools

\$500 million for charter schools

\$500 million for career technical education facilities

\$100 million for energy-efficient schools

\$29 million for joint use facilities

##### **Higher Education: \$3.087 billion**

\$1.58 billion for UC and CSU

\$1.5 billion for community colleges

#### **Staff Analysis:**

Proposition 1D would **significantly shift spending priorities for K-12 school construction** in favor of rehabilitating and modernizing schools in existing neighborhoods (\$3.3 billion) versus investing in new school construction (\$1.9 billion).

**New schools have long been the advance scouts for sprawl,** launching greenfield development and making walking and bicycling impractical for a growing number of students. The National Association of Realtors

<http://www.realtor.org/sq3.nsf/Pages/winter05sprawl?OpenDocument>

notes that "the phenomenon of building spreadout schools in unwalkable environments is so common it now has a name: "school sprawl". Auto

trips to schools significantly worsen morning congestion and increase emissions.

The National Historic Trust listed “Eliminate funding biases that favor new construction over school renovation and good stewardship” as its first policy recommendation in its October 2002 report entitled “Why Johnny Can’t Walk to School.”

[http://www.nationaltrust.org/issues/downloads/schools\\_why\\_johnny.pdf](http://www.nationaltrust.org/issues/downloads/schools_why_johnny.pdf)  
(page 49).

Proposition 1D is strongly supported by New Schools, Better Neighborhoods <http://www.nsbns.org/about/index.php> , a highly respected California nonprofit organization linking school construction funding with neighborhood revitalization.

Proposition 1D also contains an indoor air quality provision, requiring a school using initiative funds to “certify that that it has considered the feasibility of using designs and materials for the construction or modernization project that promote the efficient use of energy and water, the maximum use of natural lighting **and indoor air quality**...(emphasis added)”

**Supported by:** See attached Rebuild California document

**Opposed by:** No significant opposition

**Recommended position: SUPPORT**

### **Proposition 1E -- Flood Protection -- \$4.09 billion**

#### **Key Provisions:**

\$3 billion for levee inspection, repair, flood control improvements, and delta levee protection

\$500 million for flood control subventions

\$290 million for flood corridors, bypasses, and flood plain mapping

\$300 million for storm flood management

**Staff Analysis:** This measure has little or no impact upon air quality, but it addresses a compelling regional need

**Supported by:** See attached Rebuild California document

**Opposed by:** No significant opposition

**Recommended position: SUPPORT**

## **Proposition 87 – Alternative Energy/Oil Extraction Fee**

### **Key Provisions:**

Establishes a \$4 billion program with goal of reducing petroleum consumption by 25%, with research and production incentives for alternative energy, alternative energy vehicles, energy efficient technologies, and for education and training.

Funded by tax of 1.5% to 6% (depending on oil price per barrel) on producers of oil extracted in California.

**Supported by:** Senator Dianne Feinstein, Assembly Speaker Fabian Nunez, and hundreds of political, business, environmental and nonprofit organizations or their leaders. “Proposition 87 is the funding stream we need to make [AB32] a reality,” says Nunez.

<http://www.yeson87.org/index.php/pages/endorsements>

**Opposed by:** California Chamber of Commerce, California State Association of Counties and hundreds of business, political and nonprofit organizations <http://www.nooiltax.com/keyfacts/whoopposes.htm>

**Staff analysis:** There is no free lunch. However, if Proposition 87 is successful, the programs and projects it creates will likely move California to the very forefront of alternative energy and clean fuels research and development, with a variety of new technologies emerging related to reducing greenhouse gas emissions or improving air quality.

**Recommended position: SUPPORT**

## **Proposition 90 – Gov’t Acquisition, Regulation of Private Property**

### **Key Provisions:**

If Proposition 90 were approved, the California Constitution would be amended to include new laws and rules requiring property owners to be compensated for substantial economic losses resulting from government’s taking ownership of the property; governmental authority to take ownership of private property would be limited.

**Supported by:** Official ballot arguments in support are signed by: Manuel Romero, Eminent Domain Abuse Victim; Bob Blue, Eminent Domain Abuse Victim; Pastor Roem Agustin, Eminent Domain Abuse Victim; Mimi Walters, Honorary Chair, California Protect Our Homes Coalition; Martyn

B. Hopper, California Director, National Federation of Independent Business (NFIB); John M. Revelli, Eminent Domain Abuse Victim

Supporters cite a need for property owners to receive increased compensation from eminent domain proceedings.

**Opposed by:** Official ballot arguments in opposition are signed by: Chief Michael Warren, President, California Fire Chiefs Association; Chief Steve Krull, President, California Police Chiefs Association; Edward Thompson, Jr., California Director, American Farmland Trust; Kenneth W. Willis, President, League of California Homeowners; Jacqueline Jacobberger, President, League of Women Voters of California

Opponents say Proposition 90 is a poorly-written proposal that will be costly to taxpayers, prevents localities from promoting infill development and includes provisions that may be used to impact the implementation of laws in the areas of consumer protection and employment, all leading to increased litigation.

**Staff analysis:** The passage of Proposition 90 could lead to unchecked, sprawling growth and a more litigious environment for infill development, thus worsening air quality.

**Recommended position: OPPOSE**

---

Sources: Transportation California, Sierra Club, Housing California, California Chamber of Commerce, California Air Resources Board, CA Secretary of State, California League of Women Voters Education Fund, California Voter Foundation, Rebuild California.