

PROPOSITION 37

"TWO-THIRDS VOTE PRESERVATION ACT OF 2000"

Staff Briefing Paper For A Joint Informational Hearing Of The Senate Committee On Revenue & Taxation, Senate Committee On Environmental Quality, and the Assembly Committee On Revenue & Taxation

SEPTEMBER 29, 2000

ROOM 112, STATE CAPITOL
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA

INTRODUCTION

Proposition 37, the "Two-Thirds Vote Preservation Act of 2000", an initiative constitutional amendment, will appear on the ballot for the upcoming November 7, 2000, general election. In summary, Proposition 37 amends the California Constitution to redefine certain fees imposed by state and local governments as "taxes". Pursuant to Elections Code Section 9034, the Legislature is required to hold public hearings on the subject of the measure at least 30 days prior to the election. It should be noted that nothing in Section 9034 may "be construed as authority for the Legislature to alter the initiative measure or prevent it from appearing on the ballot."

As background for the public hearing, this briefing paper provides information on current law governing state and local fees and taxes, a discussion of the court case that gave rise to the initiative, and an analysis of what the proposition does and its potential impact on state and local finance and governance. Also included in the paper is a summary of the potential fiscal impact of Proposition 37 written by the Legislative Analyst's Office, as well as lists of groups in support and opposition.

BACKGROUND

The governments of California, including the state, counties, cities, special districts and school districts, levy taxes, assessments, fees and service charges pursuant to their taxing, regulatory and licensing powers, subject to applicable vote and voter requirements. The revenues raised from these sources are used to fund programs, provide services, and regulate activities.

State Taxes, Fees, Licenses, and Service Charges. Major taxes levied by the state include the personal income tax, the sales and use tax, and the bank and corporation tax. Other significant state taxes include the alcoholic beverage tax, estate tax, cigarette/tobacco products tax, insurance gross premiums tax, and motor vehicle fuel tax.

Regulatory fees, licenses and service charges imposed by the state include the energy resources surcharge; genetic disease testing fees; fish and game license tag permits; beverage container redemption fees; hazardous waste control fees; abandoned vehicle fees; vehicle theft program fees; vehicle fees to support the California Highway Patrol; vehicle fees for air pollution programs; vessel fees to fund oil spill and contingency planning program requirements; vessel fees to fund ballast water discharge requirements; hazardous materials environmental fees to fund the scientific, public-health, and toxic waste cleanup activities of the Department of Toxic Substances Control; state beach and park service fees; emergency telephone users surcharge; and consumer services licensing fees.

Local Taxes, Fees, Licenses, and Service Charges. Major taxes levied by local governments include the sales and use tax, transactions and use tax, business license tax, transient occupancy tax, and utility user

tax. Property taxes, levied pursuant to constitutional requirements, also provide a major source of funding for local governments and schools.

Regulatory fees, licenses and service charges imposed by local governments include planning and subdivision fees, plan checking fees, engineering charges, housing code enforcement fees, animal shelter fees and charges, street and sidewalk repair charges, sewer service charges and connection fees, solid waste fees, first aid and ambulance charges, library fines and fees, park and recreation fees, golf course fees, water services charges and connection fees, and airport fees.

Vote Requirements for State Taxes and Fees. Section 3 of Article XIII A of the California Constitution, (added by Proposition 13, an initiative measure adopted by the voters in 1978), provides that changes in state taxes enacted for the purpose of increasing revenues must be passed by a two-thirds vote of the Legislature.

Regulatory, license, service or user charges and fees are generally approved by majority vote of the Legislature.

Vote Requirements for Local Taxes and Fees. Section 4 of Article XIII A of the California Constitution, (added by Proposition 13) requires a two-thirds vote of the electorate for local special taxes. Section 2 of Article XIII C of the California Constitution, (added by Proposition 218, an initiative measure adopted by the voters in 1996), deems all taxes imposed by any local government to be either general taxes or special taxes. Section 2 requires a new or increased general tax to be approved by a majority vote of the electorate and a new or increased special tax to be approved by a two-thirds vote of the electorate.

Article XIII D of the California Constitution, (added by Proposition 218), imposes additional requirements on local agencies regarding property-related fees and charges, including notice, public hearing, and voting requirements.

Local agencies generally levy and increase fees and service charges by adopting an ordinance or a resolution at a public hearing. State law requires local agencies to hold noticed public hearings before levying or raising a fee, but does not require voter approval.

Definition of "Proceeds of Taxes". Section 8 (c) of Article XIII B of the California Constitution defines "proceeds of taxes" as all tax revenues and the proceeds to an entity of government, from (1) regulatory licenses, user charges, and user fees to the extent that those proceeds exceed the costs reasonably borne by that entity in providing the regulation, product or service, and (2) the investment of tax revenues.

Sinclair Paint Company v. State Board of Equalization (1997) 15 Cal.4th 866 [64 Cal.Rptr. 2d 447]. Proposition 37 proponents believe that the California Supreme Court decision in *Sinclair* "unreasonably broaden[s] the purposes for which fees can be imposed" and will "encourage the use of fees to avoid the vote requirements" of Propositions 13 and 218 and "significantly weaken the tax protections created by these propositions". This court case provides context for Proposition 37. Following is a description of the court case.

AB 2038 (Connelly) Chapter 799, Statutes of 1991, enacted the Childhood Lead Poisoning Act of 1991 (Health and Safety Code §105275 et seq.). The act provides for evaluating and screening children determined to be at risk for lead poisoning, and ensuring and monitoring appropriate case management.

The Childhood Lead Poisoning Act of 1991 is funded by a fee on manufacturers that presently or formerly contributed to the environmental lead contamination. The fees must be based on certain criteria, such as the past and present responsibility for environmental lead contamination, as well as the "market share" responsibility for the contamination. The fee is established by the Department of Health Services, annually assessed and collected by the State Board of Equalization, and may be adjusted based on certain factors.

Sinclair Paint Company paid fees of \$97,825.26 for the program in 1991. After the Board of Equalization denied Sinclair's administrative claim for refund, Sinclair brought suit against the state, claiming that the fees were actually taxes and thereby required a two-thirds vote of the Legislature, pursuant to Proposition 13.

Sinclair asserted that "because the present fees have been imposed solely to defray the cost of the state's program of evaluation, screening, and follow-up services for children determined to be at risk for lead poisoning, they are not analogous to either special assessments or development fees, for they neither reimburse the state for special benefits conferred on manufacturers of lead-based products nor compensate the state for governmental privileges granted to those manufacturers."

The trial court ruled that the Act imposed an unconstitutional tax because it was not passed by a two-thirds majority vote of the Legislature. The Court of Appeal affirmed the trial court judgment.

The California Supreme Court reversed the Court of Appeal's judgment and upheld the charge as a valid fee and not a tax, concluding that the Childhood Lead Poisoning Act of 1991 set regulatory fees, not taxes, to mitigate the actual or anticipated adverse effects of the fee payers' operations. In a unanimous decision, the Court held that the act "requires manufacturers and other persons whose products have exposed children to lead contamination to bear a fair share of the cost of mitigating the adverse health effects their products created in the community. Viewed as a 'mitigating effects' measure, it is comparable in character to similar police power measures imposing fees to defray the actual or anticipated adverse effects of various business operations."

According to the Court, "From the viewpoint of general police power authority, we see no reason why statutes or ordinances calling on polluters or producers of contaminating products to help in mitigation or cleanup efforts should be deemed less 'regulatory' in nature than the initial permit or licensing programs that allowed them to operate" and that imposition of these fees 'regulates' future conduct by deterring future manufacture, distribution, or sale of dangerous products, and by stimulating research and development efforts to produce safer or alternative products."

Sinclair disputed the state's authority to impose industry-wide fees to compensate for the adverse societal effects generated by an industry's products. According to the Court, "To the contrary, the case law previously cited or discussed clearly indicates that the police power is broad enough to include mandatory remedial measures to mitigate the past, present, or future adverse impact of the fee payer's operations . . ."

The Court also cited a previous decision that regulatory fees are an outcome of Proposition 13: "Proposition 13's goal of providing effective property tax relief is not subverted by the increase in fees or the emissions-based apportionment formula. A reasonable way to achieve Proposition 13's goal of

tax relief is to shift the costs of controlling stationary sources of pollution from the tax-paying public to the pollution-causing industries themselves . . ." (San Diego Gas & Electric Co. v. San Diego County Air Pollution Control District (1988) 203 Cal.App.3d 1148 [250 Cal.Rptr. 420]).

The Supreme Court held, "the shifting of costs of providing evaluation, screening, and medically necessary follow-up services for potential child victims of lead poisoning from the public to those persons deemed responsible for that poisoning is likewise a reasonable police power decision." The Supreme Court also indicated that " . . . Sinclair should be permitted to attempt to prove at trial that the amount of fees assessed and paid exceeded the reasonable cost of providing the protective services for which the fees were charged, or that the fees were levied for unrelated revenue purposes." However, Sinclair has not done so.

Sponsors. Proposition 37 is sponsored by the California Taxpayers Association, the California Chamber of Commerce and the California Manufacturers and Technology Association.

PROVISIONS OF PROPOSITION 37:

TWO-THIRDS VOTE PRESERVATION ACT OF 2000

Proposition 37 amends Article XIII A, Section 3 (Proposition 13) and Article XIII C, Section 1 (Proposition 218) of the California Constitution to redefine certain fees imposed by state and local government as taxes. The following pages provide a detailed analysis of the provisions of Proposition 37, including the proposed changes to Article XIII A and Article XIII C, relating to state and local taxation respectively; a fiscal analysis; and groups in support and opposition.

SECTION 1 of Proposition 37 states that it shall be known as the "Two-Thirds Vote Preservation Act of 2000".

SECTION 2 of Proposition 37 contains the findings and declaration of purpose.

The People of the State of California find and declare that:

- (a) Article XIII A, section 3 of the California Constitution, prohibits the California Legislature from imposing a state tax without approval by a two-thirds vote of the members of each house.
- (b) Article XIII C, sections 2(b) and 2(d) of the California Constitution prohibit local governments from imposing a general tax without approval by a majority vote of the people or a special tax without approval by a two-thirds vote of the people.
- (c) These vote requirements do not apply to the imposition of legitimate fees.
- (d) There have been increasing attempts by the state and local governments to disguise new taxes as fees in order to avoid the vote requirements.
- (e) In 1997 the California Supreme Court in the case of Sinclair Paint Company v. State Board of Equalization defined a fee in such manner as to unreasonably broaden the purposes for which fees can be imposed.
- (f) The breadth of the Supreme Court's decision will encourage the use of fees to avoid the vote requirements of Articles XIII A and XIII C and significantly weaken the tax protections created by these propositions.
- (g) The distinction between a fee and a tax was reasonably clear before the Supreme Court decision.
- (h) In order to preserve that distinction and prevent avoidance of the two-thirds legislative vote requirement of Article XIII A and the majority and two-thirds popular vote requirements of Article XIII C, it is necessary to amend the Constitution.

SECTIONS 3 and 4 of Proposition 37 amend Articles XIII A (Proposition 13) and XIII C (Proposition 218) of the California Constitution relating to state fees and taxes and local fees and taxes, respectively.

Specifically, they provide that:

A. The definitions of "state taxes," "general tax," and "special tax" found in Section 3 of Article XIII A and Section 1 of Article XIII C of the State Constitution respectively, do not include:

1. An "assessment" or "fee" as defined in Article XIII D, sections 2 (b) and 2 (e),
2. Real property development fees, or
3. Regulatory fees that do not exceed the reasonable cost of regulating the activity for which the fee is charged.

"Provided, however," that the following fees shall be deemed either state taxes subject to the two-thirds vote requirement of the Legislature, or local general or special taxes subject to the majority or two-thirds vote requirement of the electorate:

1. Compulsory fees enacted after July 1, 1999 to monitor, study or mitigate the societal or economic effects of an activity, and which impose no significant regulatory obligation on the fee payer's activity other than the payment of the fee, and
2. Regulatory fees that exceed the reasonable cost of regulating the activity for which the fee is charged.

B. Monies recoverable as damages, remedial expenses or penalties arising from a specific event shall not be deemed taxes or fees.

C. The above changes would not apply to:

1. Any fee authorized by law prior to July 1, 1999,
2. Any increase in such fee attributable to inflation, or
3. Any fee increase attributable to increased workload that is not the result of expansion of the activity/activities to which the fee applied prior to July 1, 1999.

SECTION 5 of Proposition 37 provides that if any of its provisions are held to be invalid, the remaining provisions shall not be affected, but shall remain in effect, and to this end the provisions of Proposition 37 are severable.

COMMENTS

1. Key issues in *Sinclair Paint Company v. State Board of Equalization*: Sinclair Paint Company believed that fees to fund the state Childhood Lead Poisoning Act of 1991 were "actually taxes imposed by the California [L]egislature in violation of Proposition 13 . . ." and that the act was invalid because it was not passed by a two-thirds vote of the Legislature.

According to Sinclair, as noted by the Supreme Court, "the challenged fees were in effect 'taxes' because the compulsory revenue measure that imposed them was not part of a regulatory effort. The Court of Appeal agreed, relying on prior cases indicating that where payments are exacted solely for revenue purposes and give the right to carry on the business with no further conditions, they are taxes." Sinclair also asserted that "because the present fees have been imposed solely to defray the cost of the state's program of evaluation, screening, and follow-up services for children determined to be at risk for lead poisoning, they are not analogous to either special assessments or development fees, for they neither reimburse the state for special benefits conferred on manufacturers of lead-based products nor compensate the state for governmental privileges granted to those manufacturers."

According to the Supreme Court, however, the act "imposes bona fide regulatory fees. It requires manufacturers and other persons whose products have exposed children to lead contamination to bear a fair share of the cost of mitigating the adverse health effects their products created in the community.

Viewed as a 'mitigating effects' measure, it is comparable in character to similar police power measures imposing fees to defray the actual or anticipated adverse effects of various business operations." The Supreme Court also indicated that ". . . all regulatory fees are necessarily aimed at raising 'revenue' to defray the cost of the regulatory program in question, but that fact does not automatically render those fees 'taxes.' As stated in *United Business*, if regulation is the primary purpose of the fee measure, the mere fact that the measure also generates revenue does not make the imposition a tax . . . "

2. Taxes or regulation?: The ballot argument in favor of Proposition 37 states, "Current law makes it easy for politicians to raise your taxes by calling them fees . . . POLITICIANS CAN RAISE YOUR TAXES without a two-thirds vote of the Legislature or a vote of the people."

However, a regulatory fee is imposed, not on the general public, but on the entity responsible for the activity being regulated. The consumer only pays if the regulated entity chooses to pass the cost of the fee on to the consumer rather than absorbing it as a cost of doing business. If Proposition 37 is approved, voters will not be voting on increasing their own taxes, but will be voting on imposing regulatory fees (reclassified as "taxes") on a particular business, industry, or person involved in the regulated activity.

3. A fee by any other name is still a fee (not a tax): Taxes are generally imposed for revenue purposes. There are two basic types of taxes, general and special. General taxes provide revenue for the general operation of government. Special taxes are local taxes that provide revenues for specified purposes. Tax structures are characterized by key economic principles, including equity, neutrality, and efficiency. Tax structures with broad bases and low rates tend to minimize interference with economic and market dynamics.

Fees, on the other hand, are charges to recover the cost of a use, authorization, service, or regulatory function provided to or imposed on an individual or business. Fees are targeted to certain circumstances or activities, and in the case of regulatory fees, are generally imposed to address environmental and public health and safety concerns related to the fee payer's activity.

4. Constitutional restrictions on police powers: The police power is the general authority of government to regulate behavior. Proposition 37 imposes the two-thirds vote requirement of the Legislature and a local vote of the electorate, for certain fees enacted after July 1, 1999. By imposing stricter voting requirements, Proposition 37 limits the ability of the Legislature and local government to impose certain fees, including fees that address environmental and public health and safety concerns.

In *Sinclair Paint Company v. State Board of Equalization*, the Supreme Court found that regulatory fees may constitute a legitimate exercise of police power. "Sinclair disputes the state's authority to impose industry-wide 'remediation fees' to compensate for the adverse societal effects generated by an industry's products. To the contrary, the case law previously cited or discussed clearly indicates that the police power is broad enough to include mandatory remedial measures to mitigate the past, present or future adverse impact of the fee payer's operations . . . "

5. Representative vs. direct democracy: Representative government enables a local legislative body, such as a city council or county board of supervisors, to make decisions on behalf of all of its residents, thus balancing competing views and demands. A local legislative body also determines funding methods to finance local programs and projects. By contrast, direct democracy places these decisions in the hands of the voters.

Propositions 13 and 218 added vote requirements for certain taxes and assessments, thereby replacing representative democracy with direct democracy for those taxes and assessments.

Proposition 37 will require a vote of the local electorate, rather than a vote of local elected officials, to approve fees reclassified as "taxes", thereby further shifting local representative democracy to direct democracy. By also requiring a two-thirds vote in most cases, this measure enables a minority of the voters to affect fee decisions impacting all residents.

6. Does Proposition 37 undermine Proposition 13's goal of tax relief?: As indicated in court decisions relating to regulatory fees discussed above, "Proposition 13's goal of providing effective property tax relief is not subverted by the increase in fees . . . A reasonable way to achieve Proposition 13's goal of tax relief is to shift the costs of controlling stationary sources of pollution from the tax-paying public to the pollution-causing industries themselves . . ."

By limiting the ability of state and local governments to levy fees to address environmental and public health and safety issues, the financial burden of mitigating these issues may fall more broadly on the general public in the form of either increased state or local taxes or reduced public services, or both.

7. Proposition 37 contains ambiguities and lacks definitions: Proposition 37 is ambiguous in several respects. For example, it is unclear whether a compulsory fee that imposes a significant regulatory obligation, and exceeds the reasonable cost of regulating the activity for which the fee is charged, would be a fee or a tax. In addition, the sentence that begins with the phrase "Provided, however," could be read as either an exception to, or in addition to, the preceding sentence.

Proposition 37 uses, but does not define, such terms and concepts as "compulsory fee", "monitor, study or mitigate", "societal or economic effects of an activity", and "significant regulatory obligation". These ambiguities and omissions invite multiple interpretations and litigation.

8. Proposition 37 may increase regulatory obligations imposed on business: Proposition 37 increases the Legislature's vote requirements, and adds local electorate vote requirements, for a compulsory fee (reclassified as a "tax") that is imposed to monitor, study or mitigate the societal or economic effects of an activity and which imposes no significant regulatory obligation on the fee payer's activity other than payment of the fee.

It does not change the vote requirement for (or reclassify as a tax) such a fee that does impose a significant regulatory obligation on the fee payer's activity. Thus, Proposition 37, if approved, could create an incentive for government to impose significant regulatory obligations on a fee payer.

9. Project delays, deferral or absence of mitigation: By requiring local voter approval of a fee for mitigation of an activity such as a housing development, in certain cases, Proposition 37 may cause delays in completion of those activities until voters have an opportunity to vote on the fee at the next local election. If the voters do not approve a fee reclassified as a "tax" under Proposition 37, then developers may be unable to proceed with an activity that is conditioned on payment of a fee for mitigation.

10. Taxes can be a tough vote: By reclassifying certain fees as "taxes", a two-thirds vote will be required for passage by the Legislature and voter approval will be required for the adoption of local fees. Since

some voters oppose tax increases, their elected representatives may be reluctant to vote for these fees when reclassified as "taxes".

11. Continuation of an existing fee could be subject to Proposition 37: If Proposition 37 is approved, a measure to extend or re-enact a fee originally enacted prior to July 1, 1999, may be a "tax levy", subject to the two-thirds vote requirement of the Legislature at the state level and voter approval at the local level.

12. Fees that could become taxes under Proposition 37: It is unclear which local and state fees would be affected by Proposition 37. The California Taxpayers' Association, one of the sponsors of Proposition 37, lists some examples of fees that, in their view, would be reclassified as "taxes" under Proposition 37.

Following are a few examples:

1. Fees to mitigate potential damage to existing infrastructure.
2. Fees to finance alternative energy research and generation.
3. Fees to fund accident response, reduction and investigation.
4. Fees to support poison control centers.
5. Fees to support education programs on the proper use, storage and disposal of household chemicals.
6. Fees to pay for drug education, screening, testing and treatment programs.
7. Fees on cell phones to subsidize the state's 911 service.
8. Location mitigation fees relating to traffic, clean-up, public safety and emergency services.

In a paper entitled "The Local Government Fiscal Landscape: What's Next from the Ballot Box?", Betsy Strauss, Special Counsel, League of California Cities, cites the following types of locally-imposed fees that, if there is no other significant regulatory obligation imposed on the fee payer, in her view, may be reclassified as taxes under Proposition 37:

1. Mitigation fees imposed as part of the CEQA process related to the societal or economic effects of a project.
2. Substandard housing fees which pay for the cost of inspecting and mitigating the effects of substandard housing.
3. Downtown improvement district assessments which raise funds, at the request of business owners, to pay for needed capital improvements and business promotion.
4. Fees imposed on a waste hauler at the landfill to encourage recycling.
5. Rental unit fees imposed on landlords to recover the actual costs of providing and administering a rental dispute hearing process.
6. Fees based upon emissions-based formula for recovering direct and indirect costs of pollution emission permit programs.
7. Fees for inspecting and inventorying on-premises advertising signs.

FISCAL IMPACT

The Office of the Legislative Analyst provides the following fiscal analysis of Proposition 37:

"This proposition's primary fiscal effect would be to make it more difficult for government to impose new regulatory charges on businesses and individuals to pay for certain programs. Some charges which government currently may impose as fees would be considered taxes. To the extent that a newly defined tax does not obtain the higher level of approval required for a tax, government would receive less revenue than otherwise would have been the case."

"The amount of future revenues potentially reduced due to the more difficult approval requirement cannot be estimated. This revenue reduction could range from minor to significant." The amount would depend on certain factors, including resolution of legal questions, actions by the Legislature and public, and actions by the state and local governments. See the Legislative Analyst's analysis in the Secretary of State ballot pamphlet for the complete discussion of these factors.

In addition to the issues raised by the Legislative Analyst, in the event that there are legal challenges regarding Proposition 37, there may be litigation costs associated with those challenges.

SUPPORT AND OPPOSITION

Support: According to the "Yes on 37" web site (www.yesonprop37.org) updated as of August 24, 2000, the following groups support Proposition 37.

Chambers of Commerce
California Chamber of Commerce
Sacramento Metro Chamber of Commerce
Hollywood Chamber of Commerce
Hayward Chamber of Commerce
Visalia Chamber of Commerce
Imperial Chamber of Commerce
Tuolumne County Chamber of Commerce
Atwater Chamber of Commerce
Taxpayer Groups
California Taxpayers' Association
Howard Jarvis Taxpayers Association
Shasta County Taxpayers Association
Ethnic Organizations
Latin Business Association
Businesses
Time Warner Communications
Cox Communications of Orange County
Union Pacific Railroad Company
Aera Energy LLC
Aero Products Company
Equilon Services LLC
Neill Aircraft Co.
Redman Equipment and Manufacturing Co.
Certainteed Corp.
U.S. Borax, Inc.
Crown Cork & Seal
Watson Land Company
California Portland Cement Co.
Individual Supporters
Scott Perlmutter, Vice President, Sony Pictures Entertainment
Roy C. Comer, Operations Manager, Waste Solutions Group of Humboldt
Agriculture

California Farm Bureau Federation
Western Growers
California Association of Wine Grape Growers
Small Businesses
Young's Market Co.
Herman Goelitz Candy Co.
TDI Custom Packaging, Inc.
Occidental of Elk Hills
Island Paperboard and Packaging, Inc.
Lulu's Desserts
Tri-J-Metal Heat Treating Co.
Mills Iron Works, Inc.
Betts Spring Co.
Behr Process Corporation
Packaging Innovators Corp.
Office Chairs, Inc.
Burdick Painting
Superdeck, Duckback Products, Inc.
Peter Young, DDS, Inc.
Other Groups/Organizations
Calif. Council on Environmental and Economic Balance
Calif. Manufacturers & Technology Assoc.
Calif. Business Roundtable
Nat'l Federation of Independent Business
Calif. Cable Television Association
National Federation of Business
Assoc. of CA Life and Health Ins. Co.
New United Motor Manufacturer, Inc.
Wine Institute
Waste Solutions Group of Humboldt
California Small Brewers Association
California Business PAC
Family Winemakers of California
Consulting Engineers and Land Surveyors of Calif.
Painting and Decorating Contractors of Calif.

Opposition: According to the "No on 37!" web site (www.polluterprotection.com) as of September 12, 2000, the following groups oppose Proposition 37:

Action for Better Cities
American Academy of Pediatrics
American Cancer Society
Americans for Nonsmokers Rights
California Association of Professional Scientists
California Democratic Party
California Common Cause
California Labor Federation
California League of Conservation Voters
California Nurses Association

California Oak Foundation
California Professional Firefighters
California School Employees Association
California State Association of Counties
California Tax Reform Association
Californians Against Waste
Childrens Advocacy Institute
Clean Water Action
Coalition for Clean Air
Communities for a Better Environment
Community Economics, Incorporated
Community Health Education Institute
Congress of California Seniors
Consumer Federation of California
Endangered Habitats League
Environmental Tax Policy Institute
Friends of the River
Green Capitol Project
League of California Cities
League of Women Voters
Natural Resources Defense Council
Neighbor to Neighbor
Planning and Conservation League
Peace Officers Research Association of California
San Francisco League of Conservation Voters
Service Employees International Union
Sierra Club
Steven and Michele Kirsch Foundation
United Farm Workers

Written by: Jeanette Rapp
Randy Pestor
Jennifer Swenson