

California Democratic Party Recommendations: February 5, 2008 Ballot Propositions

Proposition	Description	Position
<p>Proposition 91 Proponent: James Earp, c/o Richard D. Martland</p>	<p>Transportation Funding. Initiative Constitutional Amendment and Statute. Prohibits retention of funds earmarked for the Transportation Investment Fund in the General Fund for use unrelated to transportation after 7/1/08. Requires repayment by 6/30/17 of transportation funds retained in the General Fund in years prior to 2007-08. Eliminates General Fund borrowing of specified transportation funds, except for cash-flow purposes (repayment required within 30 days of adoption of budget); current law allows borrowing for three years where Governor declares transfer would cause significant negative fiscal impact on governmental functions and Legislature enacts authorizing statute.</p> <p>Summary of estimate by Legislative Analyst and Director of Finance of fiscal impact on state and local governments: No revenue or cost effects. Increases stability of funding to transportation in 2007-08 and thereafter; reduces somewhat the state's flexibility to use specified transportation funds for other (nontransportation) activities.</p>	<p>Oppose</p>
<p>Proposition 92 Proponents: Dennis Smith and Scott Lay c/o Eugene Hill</p>	<p>Community Colleges. Funding. Governance. Fees. Initiative Constitutional Amendment and Statute. Establishes in state constitution a system of independent public community college districts and Board of Governors. Generally, requires minimum levels of state funding for school districts and community college districts to be calculated separately, using different criteria and separately appropriated. Allocates 10.46 percent of current Proposition 98 school funding maintenance factor to community colleges. Sets community college fees at \$15/unit per semester; limits future fee increases. Provides formula for allocation by Legislature to community college districts that would not otherwise receive general fund revenues through community college apportionment.</p> <p>Summary of estimate by Legislative Analyst and Director of Finance of fiscal impact on state and local governments: Potential increases in state spending on K-14 education of about \$135 million in 2007-08, \$275 million in 2008-09, and \$470 million in 2009-2010, with unknown impact annually thereafter. Annual loss of fee revenues to community colleges of about \$71 million in 2007-08, with unknown impacts annually thereafter.</p>	<p>Neutral</p>
<p>Proposition 93 Proponents: Robin B. Johansen and Kari Krogseng c/o James C. Harrison</p>	<p>Limits on Legislators' Terms in Office. Initiative Constitutional Amendment. Reduces the total amount of time a person may serve in the state legislature from 14 years to 12 years. Allows a person to serve a total of 12 years either in the Assembly, the Senate, or a combination of both. Provides a transition period to allow current members to serve a total of 12 consecutive years in the house in which they are currently serving, regardless of any prior service in another house.</p> <p>Summary of estimate by Legislative Analyst and Director of Finance of fiscal impact on state and local governments: This measure would have no direct fiscal effect on state or local governments.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Proposition 94</p>	<p>Referendum Petition to Overturn Amendment to Indian Gaming Compact. If this petition is signed by the required number of registered voters and timely filed with the Secretary of State, it will stop the law (Chapter 40, Statutes of 2007) from going into effect, unless a majority of voters at the next statewide election vote in its favor. The challenged law ratifies an amendment to an existing gaming compact between the state and Pechanga Band of Luiseño Mission Indians; exempts certain projects from the California Environmental Quality Act; requires that revenue paid by tribe be deposited in the General Fund.</p>	<p>Neutral</p>
<p>Proposition 95 Proponent: Jack Gribbon</p>	<p>Referendum Petition to Overturn Amendment to Indian Gaming Compact. If this petition is signed by the required number of registered voters and timely filed with the Secretary of State, it will stop the law (Chapter 38, Statutes of 2007) from going into effect, unless a majority of voters at the next statewide election vote in its favor. The challenged law ratifies an amendment to an existing gaming compact between the state and Morongo Band of Mission Indians; exempts certain projects from the California Environmental Quality Act; requires that revenue paid by the tribe be deposited in the General Fund.</p>	<p>Neutral</p>
<p>Proposition 96 Proponent: Jack Gribbon</p>	<p>Referendum Petition to Overturn Amendment to Indian Gaming Compact. If this petition is signed by the required number of registered voters and timely filed with the Secretary of State, it will stop the law (Chapter 39, Statutes of 2007) from going into effect, unless a majority of voters at the next statewide election vote in its favor. The challenged law ratifies an amendment to an existing gaming compact between the state and Sycuan Band of the Kumeyaay Nation; exempts certain projects from the California Environmental Quality Act; specifies where revenue paid by tribe pursuant to the amendment is deposited.</p>	<p>Neutral</p>
<p>Proposition 97 Proponent: Jack Gribbon</p>	<p>Referendum Petition to Overturn Amendment to Indian Gaming Compact. If this petition is signed by the required number of registered voters and timely filed with the Secretary of State, it will stop the law (Chapter 41, Statutes of 2007) from going into effect, unless a majority of voters at the next statewide election vote in its favor. The challenged law ratifies an amendment to an existing gaming compact between the state and Agua Caliente Band of Cahuilla Indians; exempts certain projects from the California Environmental Quality Act; requires that revenue paid by tribe be deposited in the General Fund.</p>	<p>Neutral</p>