

## November 2008 Election Ballot Measure Summaries and Considerations

*As you consider the Ballot Measures in the November Election on November 4, JERICHO offers this summary and some facts and questions for your consideration. As you look at each of the ballot measures it might help to ask a couple of general questions: What problem is the Proposition trying to solve? Do you agree that it's a problem? If not the best solution, is the measure a reasonable and fair solution to the problem? Are there better solutions that would be prohibited or by-passed with the passage of the Proposition? Are significant "bad ideas" included in a measure that looks on surface to be a "good idea"? Is it a statute (creating law) or a Constitutional Amendment (which should require a higher standard). From a faith perspective, we need to consider the common good and potential impact on the least among us. (Support or opposition listed is current as of 9/25/08 and can be updated on the Secretary of State website.)*

### **Proposition 1A: Bonds for High-Speed Rail (Bond)**

This \$9.95 billion dollar bond would use \$9 billion for implementing a high-speed train system and \$950 million for improvements to other rail services that connect to the main line. When completed, the 800-mile high-speed train system is anticipated to serve Sacramento, the San Francisco Bay Area, the Central Valley, Los Angeles, the Inland Empire, Orange County and San Diego. Trains would be capable of maximum speeds of 220 miles per hour with an expected trip time from San Francisco to Los Angeles in 2 hours and 40 minutes and would potentially carry over 100 million passengers per year by 2030. Proponents estimate the cost to build the 800-mile system will be about \$40 billion.

**Background:** The California High-Speed Rail Authority was created in 1996 to plan and build an electric-powered, high-speed rail system linking California's major cities using funds from federal, state, local government and private sources. The Bond Act, originally scheduled for the 2004 General Election, has been postponed 4 times. Proposition 1A was passed by the legislature as AB 3034 and signed by the Governor in late August of this year with an agreement that all high speed rail corridors would have equal opportunity to compete for a share of the \$9 billion the bill would provide.

**Pro and Cons:** Proponents say that this project will increase mobility while cutting air pollution and reducing greenhouse gas emissions that cause global warming. They say that to serve the same number of travelers as the proposed train system, California would have to build miles of new freeway, additional airport runways and departure gates in the next 20 years at a cost of \$82 billion.

Opponents say that the time is not right since our budget crisis is already forcing cuts to schools, healthcare and more. They maintain that these funds could be better spent improving our existing roads and transit systems, that there is no guarantee this high-speed rail system will ever be finished, and that existing transit systems should be expanded instead of starting from scratch.

**Considerations:** Is the fast train a good idea for California? Is it a good time to begin? Is the impact on the state budget reasonable?

### **Proposition 2: Treatment of Farm Animals (Statute)**

This measure would make it illegal, beginning in 2015, to keep certain farm animals in a way that does not allow them to turn around freely, lie down, stand up, and fully extend their limbs. Prop 2 covers pregnant pigs, calves raised for veal, and hens that lay eggs. Those who would break the law could be fined up to \$1,000 or sent to jail or both.

**Background:** It is hard to sort out how current California law—which makes it illegal to be cruel to animals—relates to large-scale farm practices. For example, by current law, animals in enclosed areas must have shelter, food, water and room to exercise. People who break these laws may be fined or sent to jail or both. There is great debate within the agricultural community about the safety and humaneness of current practices in California. Of the three groups included in the ballot

measure, the most common group would be egg-laying chickens.

**Pros and Cons:** Proponents say that egg-laying hens in modern housing systems are placed into “battery cages”, where the space given to each bird is no larger than a single sheet of notebook paper. Proponents say that the banning of battery cages for egg-laying chickens in Europe has already led to the creation of innovative housing systems for egg-laying hens in those countries. Known as “furnished” or “enriched” cages, they include perches and nests for the birds in addition to wire flooring which protects the eggs from contamination. The proponents describe and object to confinement conditions for raising veal and for pregnant pigs.

*Proponents and/or major contributors include the California Veterinary Medical Association, Center for Food Safety, Center for Science in the Public Interest, Consumer Federation of America, Sierra Club, Union of Concerned Scientists, Farm Sanctuary (\$150,000), The Humane Society of the United States, (\$1,360,000) and other Human Societies, The Fund for Animals (\$250,000), Leslie Alexander (\$100,000) and several animal welfare groups.*

Opponents say that current methods of confining chickens better prevents disease when compared to free-range chickens who lay eggs on dirt. They say that Prop 2 is extreme and not needed and that there are already laws in place to stop cruel treatment of animals. Changing production practices will increase grocery prices of California eggs and other farm products, put farmers out of business, and cost us much-needed jobs.

*Opponents include Californians for Safe Food (formed to oppose the initiative), UNITE HERE, United Food and Commercial Workers, Ca Farm Bureau Federation, Foster Poultry Farms (\$250,000), Rose Acre Farms, (\$517,256), Moark, LLC (\$504,313), Midwest Poultry Services (\$250,000), Gemperle Enterprises (\$216,287), numerous egg producers, and Southern Christian Leadership Conference.*

**Considerations:** One thing to consider is that the food safety comparison between battery cage eggs and free range eggs laid on dirt does not take into account eggs from the “furnished” or “enriched” cages as an option or eggs from free range chickens which lay in nests. If passage of Prop 2 increases the cost of eggs or farms move out of state as opponents say, do you think this is a bad or good trade-off for animal protection?

### **Proposition 3: Bonds for Children’s Hospitals (Bond)**

This bond would allow state government to sell \$980 million in bonds for expansion, remodeling, and updating equipment of children’s hospitals in California. Eighty percent would go to eight non-profit regional children’s hospitals and 20% would go to the University of California children’s hospitals

**Background:** Children’s hospitals in California treat thousands of children facing life-threatening illnesses or injuries each year without regard for a family’s ability to pay. The majority of children are low-income. In 2004 voters approved \$750 million in bonds for children’s hospitals—about \$400 million of which have been sold. Payments would be about \$64 million per year.

**Pros and Cons:** Proponents say that the increasing costs of health care and the amount of care they offer for which they are not compensated seriously impede their ability to update and expand their facilities. The bond would allow hospitals to buy up-to-date equipment to treat babies born early or with defective organs. As teaching hospitals they would be in a better position to train with up-to-date equipment and facilities.

*Proponents include the University of California Board of Regents, American Academy of Pediatrics, California, California Medical Association, California Association of Physician Groups, Children’s Specialty Care Coalition, California Hospital Association, Children’s Defense Fund, The California Federation of Teachers, The California Parent Teacher Association (PTA), League of Women Voters, California Chamber of Commerce.*

Opponents say that there are still \$350 million for children’s hospitals unspent from bonds passed in 2004.

*Opponent listed is the National Tax Limitation Committee. There are no contributors listed on the Secretary of State website as of 9/25/08.*

**Considerations:** Is the value of the project worth bond money? What is the impact on the state budget and other services?

#### **Proposition 4: Parental Notification About Abortion (Constitutional Amendment)**

Proposition 4 would amend the state Constitution to require a doctor, except in the case of a medical emergency, to notify an un-emancipated minor's parent or legal guardian at least 48 hours before performing an abortion. The measure would allow the required notification to be made to other adult family members, such as a grandparent or sibling, if the attending physician reports known or suspected child abuse by the parent to lawfull authorities. The juvenile court could also issue a waiver on parental notification based on the pregnant minor's petition, providing sufficient evidence that the pregnant minor is well informed and mature and that parental notification would not be in her best interest.

**Background:** A California law was ratified in 1953 allowing minors to have an abortion without parental consent or notification. That law was amended in 1987 to require minors to obtain parental consent, but it was never implemented due to legal challenges and was eventually struck down by the California Supreme Court in 1997. The U. S. Supreme Court has upheld parental involvement laws that include judicial bypass provisions. Currently, a pregnant girl under 18 years old can get an abortion in California without telling her parents. As of 2006, 6 states have no restrictive laws—down from 28 states in 1999.

**Pros and Cons:** Proponents say that a pregnant minor needs the support of a parent or guardian before and after she decides what to do about her pregnancy. Minors hiding an abortion from their parents may delay getting help for medical problems after the abortion. In California, a girl under age 18 can't even get a tan at a tanning salon, a cavity filled, or an aspirin dispensed by the school nurse without a parent knowing.

*Supporters include the California Catholic Conference, James Holman (\$1,375,590—some of which is listed as a loan), Don Sebastiani (\$530,000), The Lenawee Trust (\$100,000), The Caster Family Trust (\$100,000). Knights of Columbus (\$200,000).*

Opponents say that minors who are afraid to tell their parents, or are too scared to go to a juvenile court judge, may try to get unsafe abortions. They maintain that laws cannot force good communication in families and a written notification will do nothing to promote good communication. In order to use the alternate "family notification" provision a minor must report her parents of physical or emotional abuse which then requires a doctor to report the abuse to the authorities.

*Those in opposition include The American Academy of Pediatrics, The California School Counselors Assoc., The California Academy of Family Physicians, The California Teachers Association, Planned Parenthood Affiliates of California (\$3,525,000), California Family Health Council (\$80,000), Committee for a New Economy (\$25,000), ACLU (\$35,000), The American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists, District IX, John P. Morgridge (\$100,000, No on Prop 4 Campaign for Teen Health and Safety (\$100,000),*

**Considerations:** How do you balance parents' right to the information they need to carry out their responsibilities as parents with a pregnant teen's right to privacy? Will notification give parents and legal guardians what they need to advise and provide necessary support and health protection to their minor daughters as proponents maintain, or will health risks, illegal abortions, and traveling to states without notification requirements result from this measure, as opponents argue?

#### **Proposition 5: Rehabilitation of Nonviolent Criminal Offenders (Statute)**

This measure would expand the types of offenders that are eligible for drug treatment diversion programs and increase the services that nonviolent drug offenders receive while they are in prison, on parole and afterwards. It would shorten parole for most drug offenses, including sales, and for nonviolent property crimes. It would reduce certain marijuana misdemeanors to infractions. Among its provisions it would limit the court's authority to incarcerate offenders who violate probation or parole. The measure allows inmates to earn additional time off sentences for participation in rehabilitation programs.

**Background:** Currently, the state has drug treatment programs for some nonviolent criminal offenders and some offenders can enter "diversion programs" where they can get drug treatment instead of going to jail. The state also has rehabilitation programs, but those services are often not available to inmates and parolees due to lack of money or space.

**Pros and Cons:** Proponents say that Prop 5 will get nonviolent offenders and drug addicts into programs that will help them stay out of our overcrowded jails and prisons. California inmates and parolees are not getting enough rehabilitation services

to help them re-enter society successfully. Proponents see Prop 5 as a positive shift from a criminal model to a medical model, as much of Europe has done.

*Prop 5 has the endorsement of a long list of California individuals and groups, from the League of Women Voters and organizations representing physicians and drug and alcohol abuse counselors to labor unions, the former warden of San Quentin Prison and former director of the state Department of Corrections to conservative libertarians like former Secretary of State George Shultz. Billionaire George Soros among others has joined the Drug Policy Alliance in funding this measure.*

Opponents say that if passed, people convicted of other crimes get out of going to jail by going into drug treatment programs instead. This measure shortens the parole time for methamphetamine dealers and other drug felons.

*Opponents include 32 district attorneys and the leaders of the National Association of Drug Court Professionals. Former governors Pete Wilson and Gray Davis had petitioned the California Supreme Court to remove Prop 5 from the ballot in the contention that it attempts to alter the constitution via statute.*

**Considerations:** Does Proposition 5 improve the current balance between incarceration and rehabilitation? Are there elements so objectionable to you that require you to vote “no”? How is the common good fostered? Hindered?

### **Proposition 6: Public Safety Spending and Criminal Penalties (Statute)**

This measure requires that a minimum of \$695 million be allocated from the state General Fund each year for police, sheriffs, district attorneys, adult probation, jails and juvenile probation facilities—and that funding would increase in subsequent years according to the California Consumer Price Index. This amount is about \$365 million over the amount included in the 2007-08 State Budget Act. The measure increases penalties for gang related crimes including the requirement (except in some circumstances) that juveniles 14 year olds and older accused of a gang-related felony be tried in adult court.

**Background:** Currently the state spends about \$10 billion per year to run the prison system, which has about 171,000 inmates. Local governments are primarily responsible for funding community law enforcement. The state supports some criminal justice programs that have traditionally been local responsibilities. In 2007-08 the state allocated hundreds of millions of dollars for local programs, including the Citizens’ Option for Public Safety, the Juvenile Justice Crime Prevention Act, and Juvenile Probation and Camps Funding.

**Pros and Cons:** Proponents say that Prop 6 will bring more police and increased safety to our streets, along with more juvenile crime prevention. Gang members who commit violent felony crimes will spend more time in prison, and we will have better ways to track them when they are released.

*Supporters of Prop 6 include Senator George Runner, California Police Chiefs’ Association, California State Sheriffs’ Association, California District Attorneys Association, Chief Probation Officers’ of California, California Peace Officers Association, Angie Vargas, Mother’s Taking Action Against Gang Violence. many individual sheriffs and police officers.*

Opponents say that Prop 6 will waste billions on unproven programs, taking money away from other important programs like schools and fire protection. Several anti-gang programs were started in local communities around the state in 2007, and we need to give them more time to work. The crime penalty provisions can be authorized through legislation after more careful consideration than ballot measures afford.

*Opponents of Prop 6 include California Teachers Association, California Federation of Teachers, California State Conference of the NAACP, Mexican American Bar Association, California National Organization for Women, California Children’s Defense Fund, Center on Juvenile and Criminal Justice, League of Women Voters of California, California Tax Reform Association, California Church IMPACT, California Catholic Conference, California Democratic Party, California Attorneys for Criminal Justice*

**Considerations:** The California Legislative Analyst estimates Prop. 6 will cost at least \$965 million to implement in the 2009-10 fiscal year, with more one-time costs of over \$500 million for prison facilities. California already spends more than 4 times per prisoner than per public school student. Prop. 6 is an example of “ballot box budgeting” which would automatically increase funding for its new programs every year regardless of the need, and forever locks-in the funding. Even in the

case of a fiscal emergency or if the programs are unsuccessful, Prop. 6 requires a “super majority” vote of 3/4 of the Legislature to make a change—a higher vote threshold than even the 2/3 which the state budget requires.

Complex ballot measures that contain more than one consideration are often best served through the legislative process.

### **Proposition 7: Renewable Energy Generation (Statute)**

By this measure, all electric utility companies, including those owned by a government, would be required to generate at least 20% of the electricity they sell from renewable resources by 2010. The measure sets higher goals for all electric utility companies in California: 40% of electricity from renewable resources by 2020 and 50% by 2025. It changes the penalties companies must pay when they fail to meet the renewable energy goals and provides exceptions that allow electric utility companies to avoid penalties when they fail to meet the renewable energy goals.

**Background:** Electric utility companies in California generate most of the electricity they sell from “nonrenewable” resources (such as coal and natural gas). They generate a small amount of the electricity they sell from “renewable” resources (such as solar and wind). Current state law sets the goal of using renewable energy resources to generate 20% of California’s electricity by the year 2010. That law does not apply to electric utility companies that are owned by a local government.

**Pros and Cons:** Proponents say that Prop 7 would make California the world leader in clean power technology and would help create over 370,000 new high wage jobs. They maintain that using more renewable resources will help the environment. Proponents say that Prop 7 will have no negative impact on small-scale renewable providers and will very likely benefit small-scale producers.

*As of September 18, two major donors have contributed \$5,000 or more to support Prop. 7: Peter Sperling (\$5,250,000) and Jim Gonzalez & Associates (\$101,500), John L. Burton - Past President pro Tem California State Senate, and former Chair, California Democratic Party, David S Freeman - Eco Pioneer, Herbert Kroemer, Professor of Electrical and Computer Engineering (Nobel Laureate in Physics 2000), Alan J. Heeger - Professor of Physics and Professor of Materials (Nobel Laureate in Chemistry 2000), Walter Kohn - Research Professor of Physics and Chemistry (Nobel Laureate in Chemistry 1998)*

Opponents say that Prop 7 will shut small renewable energy electric utility companies out of California’s market and disrupt the renewable energy work in progress. They argue it will increase our electricity bills and taxpayer costs without achieving its stated goals.

*The formal group opposing Prop. 7 is called Californians Against Another Costly Energy Scheme. The coalition includes the California Democratic Party, the California Republican Party, the California Labor Federation, the California Taxpayers' Association, the League of California Cities and the California Solar Energy Industries Association. The No on Prop 7 website also states that "A separate and independent coalition" of environmental organizations has been formed. Funding for the No on prop 7 campaign (as of August 2) has primarily come from Pacific Gas & Electric (\$12,895,250), Southern California Edison (\$10,720,250) and Sempra Energy (\$104,000).*

**Considerations:** Does the process in Prop 7 which outlines its goals make sense and seem fair? There is controversy over the real eventual cost to consumers—3% or 10%—and there is no cap on rates that use non-renewal sources. It is curious that the proponents maintain that there is no harm to small alternative energy producers and yet they have teamed up with the big electric companies to oppose the bill.

### **Proposition 8: Ban on Gay Marriage (Constitutional Amendment)**

This measure would change the State Constitution to say that only marriage between a man and a woman is valid or recognized in California. This would mean that same-sex couples do not have a right to marry.

**Background:** In 2000, voters passed a law stating that marriage between a man and a woman was the only legal kind of mar-

riage in California. In a May 2008 ruling, the California Supreme Court said the State Constitution gives same-sex couples the right to marry.

**Pros and Cons:** Proponents say that Prop 8 restores the definition of marriage approved by the voters in 2000 and puts it in the State Constitution. California still has a “domestic partners” law that gives same-sex couples the same rights and benefits as married spouses.

*Major supporters of Prop 8 include the Mormon Church, California Conference of Catholic Bishops, Knights of Columbus, numerous Evangelical Christian Churches, Natl Organization for Marriage (\$785,750), Focus on the Family (\$411,000), American Family Association (\$400,000), Fieldstead & Company (\$400,000), Traditional Values Coalition.*

Opponents say that California’s Constitution guarantees the same rights for everyone, and marriage is a right. Domestic partnerships are not the same as marriage. It’s unfair that some people can enjoy the dignity and responsibility of marriage and others cannot. They point out that the state Supreme Court decision outlined nine areas in which domestic partnership law lacks the protections of marriage.

*Opposition groups include Equality California, California Federation of Teachers, California Labor Federation, California Nurses Association, California Faith for Equality, Catholic Democrats of California, Clergy United, Inc., Mormons for Marriage, Unitarian Universalist Churches, Metropolitan Community Churches, Progressive Jewish Alliance, SEIU California State Council, United Farm Workers.*

**Considerations:** What best promotes the common good in this measure? It is relevant to note that this measure does not require churches to do anything different regarding marriage (e.g. the sacrament of marriage in the Catholic Church).

### **Proposition 9: Victims’ Rights (Constitutional Amendment)**

This proposed Constitutional amendment would add some new rights for victims of crime and strengthen the rights they now have. For example, every convicted criminal who has caused a loss would have to pay restitution to the victim. The victim’s safety would have to be taken into account when deciding bail or parole. Prop 9 also changes the State Constitution to stop prisons and jails from letting offenders out early to reduce overcrowding. Prop 9 would also make changes to the state’s parole process, such as increasing the time some prisoners wait for their parole hearing.

**Background:** Victims of crime have certain rights under California’s Constitution and laws. These include the right to speak up at sentencing and parole hearings. Victims also have the right to be paid back for their losses (called “restitution”), although current law allows some convicted criminals not to pay if determined by a judge.

**Pros and Cons:** Proponents say that with Prop 9 crime victims would get the same rights to due process as the rights criminals have. Prop 9 will keep politicians from letting dangerous prisoners out early in order to lower over-crowding problems in prisons and jails.

*Henry Nicholas donated \$4,845,000 in support for Prop 9. The Prop 9 website says: we do not ask for money. There is no list of supporters on the Secretary of State website as of 9/25/08.*

Opponents say that the rights of victims are already protected, and the way they are enforced should not be added to the State Constitution. Prop 9 is unnecessary and would take money away from other government programs like education and healthcare.

*Opponents include the California Nurses Association, California Teachers Association (\$72,805), California Federation of Teachers (\$100,000), Ella Baker Center for Human Rights (\$25,000), California State Council of Service Employees Issues PAC (\$222,805), American Friends Service Committee.*

**Considerations:** Is there a clear problem that warrants a constitutional amendment? The victim’s rights already secured by law include (but are not limited to): notification if their offender is released, having the public’s safety as well as the victim considered when a court sets or denies bail, being notified and allowed to participate in the legal process including sentenc-

ing, being notified in advance of parole hearings and assured the right to be heard, receiving restitution unless a judge decides otherwise, being notified of their rights. Both the Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation and the Attorney General's office maintain websites with victim resources and the Victims of Crime Resource Center is mandated to maintain a toll-free information service and has operated since 1984.

Prop 9 makes changes to the timing of parole hearings by delaying some up to 15 years between hearings. Changes to any part of this ballot measure would require a 2/3 vote of the legislature or another ballot initiative.

### **Proposition 10: Bonds for Alternative Energy (Bond)**

Prop 10 would allow the state to sell \$5 billion in bonds to raise money for more programs to support alternative fuels and renewable energy. Much of this money would be spent on rebates to encourage Californians to buy vehicles that use less gasoline or use some other fuel. Some of this money would be used for research and development of new kinds of power that are better for the environment.

**Background:** The state has a number of programs to help reduce California's use of "nonrenewable" energy sources (such as coal and oil). The programs encourage energy efficiency and use of "renewable" energy (such as solar and wind) and alternative fuels (such as natural gas). The California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006 requires California to reduce greenhouse gas emissions to 1990 levels by 2020. Governor Schwarzenegger's Executive Order established the standard of reducing carbon emissions at least 20% by 2020.

**Pros and Cons:** Proponents say that Prop 10 rebates will help more Californians afford cars and trucks that are better for the environment and cost less to run. They maintain that this reduces California's need for foreign oil and helps our state base more of its economy on clean power.

*All the donors listed on the Secretary of State website are natural gas producers and/or distributors: Westport Fuel Systems, Inc (\$250,000), Aubrey McClendon—Chesapeake Energy (\$500,000), Clean Energy (\$3,247,250) Clean Energy is the largest natural gas producer and is controlled by T. Boone Pickens.*

Opponents say that Prop 10 takes taxpayer dollars from other budget priorities when we already have several programs in place to encourage clean power. They say that bonds should be saved for long-term investments like bridges and buildings, not short-term programs like car rebates. The opponents maintain that the measure is written to exclude hybrids in the rebates and most of the money will go to vehicles powered by natural gas which is the reason T. Boone Pickens is funding the measure.

*Those listed at opposed include the Consumer Federation of California, California League of Conservation Voters (CLCV), The Sierra Club, The Alliance for Responsible Energy Policy (AREP), League of Women Voters of California, California Council of Churches/California Church IMPACT, California Chamber of Commerce, The Howard Jarvis Taxpayers Association, California Tax Reform Association, some unions.*

**Considerations:** Do the benefits that this bond measure outlines balance out the apparent self-serving of the proponents? How does the annual interest payment of about \$335 million taken from the state budget compete with other projects or services you care about?

### **Proposition 11: Redistricting (Constitutional Amendment)**

Prop 11 would change the State Constitution to give a 14-member citizens redistricting commission the job of drawing district maps for seats in the State Assembly and State Senate. The commission would be made up of registered voters (5 Democrats, 5 Republicans and 4 members who do not belong to either major party). Prop 11 includes rules for selecting the commission members and for a public process for drawing new district maps for state offices. Prop 11 leaves the state legislature in charge of redrawing the district maps for California's U.S. Congress seats.

**Background:** Every 10 years, maps outlining the borders for legislative and congressional districts must be redrawn to make sure each district continues to have about the same number of people. This process is called “redistricting.” The state legislature has the job of drawing district maps for the 80 seats in the State Assembly, the 40 seats in the State Senate and California’s seats in the United States Congress. Currently, most of the districts are so-called “safe seats” for the political party which holds the seat at the time of an election.

**Pros and Cons:** Proponents maintain that Prop 11 ends the current system of politicians drawing district maps in ways that make it very easy for them to get reelected. If we have more competitive elections, politicians will be more accountable to the voters.

*Jeannine English, California State President, AARP, Janis R. Hirobama, President, League of Women Voters of California, Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger, Allan Zaremberg, President/CEO, California Chamber of Commerce, Kathay Feng, Executive Director, California Common Cause, Zabrae Valentine, Executive Director, California Forward Action Fund, Bill Hauck, President, California Business Roundtable, ACLU - Southern California, California Black Chamber of Commerce, California Democratic Council.*

Opponents say that instead of districts being drawn by legislators who are elected by the people, they will be drawn by commissioners picked by state administrators. Because it does not cover U.S. Congress, Prop 11 sets up two different processes for drawing district maps.

*U. S. Senator Barbara Boxer, California State Senate President Don Perata, California Federation of Teachers, California State Firefighters Association, California Democratic Party, American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees, AFL-CIO, Teamsters Joint Council 42, Ted Costa, CEO, People’s Advocate Inc., California Labor Federation, Stonewall Democratic Club, California Young Democrats, and Democratic Clubs.*

**Considerations:** Do you think the current system needs fixing? Does this process have a good chance of improving the current system? The proponents are a group who don’t always come together—some have endorsed this plan because they believe it will create a fairer system of electing our legislators and, perhaps, more moderate leaning legislators. Others may see a chance to increase Republican chances to obtain more seats. Some Democrats are lined up against the measure for fear of losing seats they see as critical—especially at state budget voting time. Some research suggests that most of the legislative seats are influenced by the demographics of various parts of the state and that few would change hands. Voters have resisted several previous redistricting measures. Is it time for this one?

## **Proposition 12: Bonds for Veterans’ Home Loans (Bond)**

This bond measure would allow the state to sell \$900 million in bonds to provide more money for the Cal-Vet program. This amount would be enough for loans to at least 3,600 veterans.

**Background:** California veterans can buy homes and farms with low-interest loans provided by the Cal-Vet program. The money for these loans is raised by selling state bonds. Monthly payments from veterans have covered all costs of the Cal-Vet program—including the administration of the program, costs of issuing the bonds, and interest on the bonds. The only financial risk to the state would be if veterans defaulted on their payment.

**Pros and Cons:** Proponents say that this bond gives veterans low-interest loans to buy homes, which is a way to show our appreciation for their service and sacrifice. We have a solid history of repayment from veteran borrowers.

Opponents say that veterans who served in combat or in a combat zone should be given loans before other veterans since funds are limited.

**Considerations:** There are no listed proponents or opponents for this Bond measure. It was put on the ballot by the legislature to continue the Cal-Vet program.