

There are 12 state propositions in this election. Any proposition that gets more than 50% “yes” votes will become a new law for California. Propositions 1A and 12 were placed on the ballot by the state legislature. The rest of the propositions are “**initiatives**” that were placed on the ballot by their supporters who collected enough signatures to qualify them. Some of these propositions are also **Constitutional Amendments**. This means they would change the State Constitution if passed.

Propositions 1A, 3, 10 and 12 on the November 4, 2008 ballot ask voters to allow the state to sell **bonds** to raise money for certain purposes. Bonds are a way that governments borrow money to pay for things that will last a long time, like schools and bridges. Here's how Bonds work: the government sells bonds to get the money now and then pays the bonds back with interest, usually over 30 years. Every \$1 billion in bonds costs the state about \$2 billion total: one billion to pay back the money borrowed and nearly one billion in interest. To pay back \$1 billion in bonds, the state must spend an average of \$65 million every year for 30 years.

November 4 election: presidential, state, city, county and special districts

Key dates and deadlines:

Sept. 25: Mailing of sample ballots begins

Oct. 6: First day to apply for vote-by-mail ballot

Oct. 20: Last day to register

Oct. 28: Last day to apply for vote-by-mail ballot

Nov. 4: Election Day

Dec. 15: Electoral college convenes

PROPOSITION

What it does: Authorizes \$9.95 billion in bonds to build an electric train to get people from Los Angeles to San Francisco in just over 2 1/2 hours.

1A

VICA - oppose

Back story: This is the governor's and the Legislature's baby, years in the making. They pulled similar measures off ballots in 2004 and 2006 because the stars didn't align for a win. An earlier version (Proposition 1) also got pulled from the 2008 ballot, this time for a revise (that's why it's now designated 1A). Lawmakers were arguing about, among other things, whether the train would run through Altamont Pass (the site of a deadly 1969 Rolling Stones concert) or Pacheco Pass (site of the hokey but fun tourist stop Casa de Fruta). They went with Pacheco.

PRO California's transportation system is broken: skyrocketing gasoline prices, gridlocked freeways, and airports. High-speed trains are the new transportation option that reduces greenhouse gases that cause global warming and dependence on foreign oil. High-speed trains are cheaper than building new highways, airports, and runways to meet population growth without NEW TAXES.

CON This political boondoggle will cost taxpayers \$19,200,000,000 in principal and interest. We need that money for schools, healthcare, and public safety. The bureaucrats could waste billions of taxpayer dollars before we see one inch of track. During California's biggest budget crisis we can't afford to spend billions on a pipedream.

PROPOSITION

2

VICA - oppose
LAACC - oppose

What it does: Bars use of pens and cages that don't give farm animals room to turn around, stretch, stand or lie down.

Back story: This is all about chickens. The language on veal calves and sows tugs on voters' heartstrings, but it's moot; California produces virtually no commercial pork or veal. Chief opponents -- egg producers -- argue that without tight cages, their chickens will eat each other and their own droppings. No matter what, the caged chickens are doomed: After a short life laying eggs, they are too spent even for the soup pot.

PRO YES on Prop. 2 protects animals, consumers, family farmers, and our environment. Animals deserve humane treatment. Denying them space to turn around or stretch their limbs is cruel and wrong. Supporters: Humane Society of the United States, California Veterinary Medical Association, Consumer Federation of America, Center for Food Safety.

CON Proposition 2 is too RISKY. Californians enjoy safe, local, affordable eggs. A UC Davis study says Proposition 2 eliminates California egg production. Instead, our eggs will come from out-of-state and Mexico. Public health experts oppose Proposition 2 because it THREATENS increased human exposure to Salmonella and Bird Flu.

What it does: Authorizes the sale of \$980 million in bonds to upgrade and expand children's hospitals in California.

PROPOSITION

3

Back story: With interest, the measure would cost about \$2 billion over 30 years. Backers are (no surprise) the state's children's hospitals. California voters authorized \$750 million in bonds for this cause in 2004; just under half of those bonds have yet to be sold. But how can voters say no to sick kids?

VICA - Support
LAACC - Support

PRO Every day, California Children's Hospitals save lives. Children with leukemia, cancer, cystic fibrosis, heart disease, traumatic injury. 80% with leukemia are making it. 90% are coming through delicate heart surgery. Proposition 3 doesn't raise taxes. It gives the sickest kids in California the chance for a better life. Imagine that.

CON Diverts nearly \$2 Billion (principal & interest) of *your* tax dollars to medical special interests promoting this bond, while Millions from a similar 2004 Measure remain unspent. "It's for the Children" is their lure; but it's our children we're saddling with debt. More debt Californians can't afford.

PROPOSITION

4

What it does: Amends the state Constitution to require a physician to notify a minor patient's parent or other adult family member 48 hours before performing an abortion.

VICA -
LAACC -

Back story: Déjà vu. Californians defeated parental consent or notification for abortion measures in 2005 and 2006, but had last year off. (There is no limit on how often failed ballot measures may be resubmitted to voters.) Proposition 4 adds the "other adult family member" alternative to answer critics of earlier propositions. It also would require a girl who chooses that alternative to allege parental abuse. The Legislature passed a parental consent law in 1987, but it never took effect. The state Supreme Court upheld it in 1996, but on rehearing -- after court membership changed -- struck it down. Which is why Proposition 4 is a constitutional amendment.

PRO Doctors, nurses, teachers, and LAW ENFORCEMENT endorse Proposition 4—Sarah's Law. Notification laws in thirty other states are reducing teen pregnancy and sexually transmitted diseases and protecting young girls from being victimized by older men. *STOP SEXUAL PREDATORS.*

CON Prop. 4 is dangerous. Mandatory reporting laws can't force scared, pregnant teenagers to talk to parents, but may force them into back alleys, or worse. Prop. 4 won't protect teens from predators. Prop. 4 won't work, fosters more lawsuits, and puts teens at risk.

PROPOSITION

5

VICA - Oppose
LAACC - pending

What it does: Mandates probation with treatment instead of jail or prison for many drug crimes and diminishes sentences and shortens parole for many nonviolent property crimes when drugs are involved.

Back story: This measure pits two well-known liberals against each other -- activist and actor Martin Sheen and billionaire philanthropist George Soros. Sheen, whose son Charlie had high-profile drug problems in the 1990s, leads the opposition because, he has said, "successful rehabilitation requires accountability." Soros and former Soros executive Jacob Goldfied are Proposition 5's top financial backers. If voters pass Proposition 5 and Proposition 6, they would simultaneously loosen and stiffen penalties for drug offenses.

YES A YES vote on this measure means: Drug treatment diversion programs available primarily for persons charged or convicted for a nonviolent drug possession crime would be expanded. Some parole violators would be diverted from state prison and parole terms would be reduced for others. New rehabilitation programs would be expanded for offenders before and after they leave prison. Some inmates might receive additional credits to reduce the time they stay in state prison. Possession of less than 28.5 grams of marijuana would have a lesser penalty than under current law.

NO A NO vote on this measure means: State and local governments would determine whether to expand existing drug treatment diversion programs in the future. State correctional officials would continue to have the discretion to return various categories of parole violators to state prison, and parole terms would remain at three years for most parolees. The state would not be obligated to further expand rehabilitation programs for inmates, parolees, and other offenders. The current rules for awarding credits to inmates to reduce their time in prison would continue. The penalty for possession of less than 28.5 grams of marijuana would remain unchanged.

PROPOSITION

6

VICA -
LAACC -

What it does: Commits close to 1% of the state's annual general fund budget for anti-crime programs. The state Legislative Analyst's Office estimates costs of \$500 million for additional prison space.

Back story: This is the Son of Three Strikes and Jessica's Law. It's sponsored in part by Mike Reynolds, author of the 1994 Three Strikes Initiative, and state Sen. George Runner (R-Lancaster), whose anti-sex-offender Proposition 83 -- Jessica's Law -- won 71% of the vote in 2006. The top donor is Henry T. Nicholas III, who gave \$1 million (see Proposition 9).

YES A YES vote on this measure means: The state would be required to increase spending for specified state and local criminal justice programs to at least \$965 million in 2009–10, an increase of \$365 million, growing in future years. Sentences also would be increased for certain crimes—such as crimes related to gangs, methamphetamine sales, and vehicle theft—

resulting in more offenders being sent to state prison and for longer periods of time. The measure would make various other criminal justice changes related to such things as parole agent caseloads and use of hearsay evidence.

NO A NO vote on this measure means: The state Legislature and Governor would continue to have their current authority over the state funding levels provided for specified criminal justice programs. Criminal penalties would not be increased. Parole caseloads and use of hearsay evidence would remain unchanged.

PROPOSITION

7

VICA - Oppose
LAACC - Oppose

What it does: Increases the clean-generation requirement on investor-owned utilities and extends them to municipal companies, like the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power.

Back story: The primary backer (with a donation of \$3 million) is Peter Sperling, son of University of Phoenix founder, cat-cloner and octogenarian liberal proposition-meister John Sperling (who in 2000 gave California Proposition 36, mandating treatment instead of prison for drug convictions, a failed initiative to soften three strikes, and several others besides). Caveat for green voters: This measure is intended to advance green power and improve the environment but is opposed by a host of high-profile environmental groups, who say it will undermine many green-power efforts.

YES A YES vote on this measure means: Electricity providers in California, including publicly owned utilities, would be required to increase their proportion of electricity generated from renewable resources, such as solar and wind power, beyond the current requirement of 20 percent by 2010, to 40 percent by 2020 and 50 percent by 2025, or face specified penalties. The requirement for privately owned electricity providers to acquire renewable electricity would be limited by a cost cap requiring such acquisitions only when the cost is no more than 10 percent above a specified market price for electricity. Electricity providers who fail to meet the renewable resources requirements would potentially be subject to a 1 cent per kilowatt hour penalty rate set in statute, without a cap on the total annual penalty amount. The required time frames for approving new renewable electricity plants would be shortened.

NO A NO vote on this measure means: Electricity providers in California, except publicly owned ones, would continue to be required to increase their proportion of electricity generated from renewable resources to 20 percent by 2010. The current requirements on privately owned utilities to purchase renewable electricity would continue to be limited by an annual cost cap on the total amount of such purchases. Electricity providers would continue to be subject to the existing penalty process, in which the penalty rate (currently 5 cents per kilowatt-hour) and a total annual penalty cap (currently \$25 million per provider) are set administratively. The required time frames for approving new renewable electricity plants would not be shortened.

PROPOSITION

8

VICA -
LAACC -

What it does: Outlaws same-sex marriage by adding the following words to the state Constitution: "Only marriage between a man and a woman is valid or recognized in California."

Back story: More déjà vu. Californians expressly outlawed same-sex marriage in a voter initiative in 2000. But that was mere law, which the state Supreme Court struck down earlier this year in a case that found that the right to marry is fundamental -- the state can't deny marriage to a couple based on their sex. Proposition 8 opponents tried (but failed) to get the court to also strike the measure from the ballot on the argument that voters cannot strip citizens of their state constitutional rights. If the initiative passes, they will be back.

YES A YES vote on this measure means: The California Constitution will specify that only marriage between a man and a woman is valid or recognized in California.

NO A NO vote on this measure means: Marriage between individuals of the same sex would continue to be valid or recognized in California.

PROPOSITION

9

What it does: Amends the state Constitution to give enforceable rights to the families of crime victims.

Back story: This is the centerpiece of a law-and-order campaign by billionaire businessman and engineer Henry T. Nicholas III and is called "Marsy's Law" in memory of his murdered sister. It qualified for the ballot on June 6 -- the day after indictments were unsealed against Nicholas for a variety of drug charges and for allegedly violating securities laws. Nicholas gave \$4.8 million to the campaign but distanced himself after the charges against him were reported. Among other things, Proposition 9 would limit the number of chances for parole for many convicted criminals.

YES A YES vote on this measure means: Crime victims would have additional constitutionally guaranteed rights, such as the right to participate in any public criminal proceedings. Payments of restitution to crime victims would be required without exception, and any funds collected from offenders ordered to pay restitution would go to pay that obligation before any other. Inmates with life sentences who were denied parole would generally have to wait longer before being considered again for release. Some parolees facing revocation and return to prison may no longer be represented by legal counsel. Early release of inmates to reduce prison or jail overcrowding would be restricted in certain circumstances.

NO A NO vote on this measure means: Victims will continue to have the statutory right to be notified of certain criminal justice proceedings, such as sentencing and parole proceedings. Whether victim restitution would be ordered would remain subject to a judge's discretion, and the manner in which money collected from defendants is distributed would remain unchanged. Current waiting periods for parole revocation hearings and parole consideration would remain unchanged. All parolees would continue to be entitled to receive legal representation at parole hearings. State and local governments could take steps to release inmates early to reduce jail and prison overcrowding.

PROPOSITION

10

VICA - Oppose
LAACC - Oppose

What it does: Authorizes the sale of \$5 billion in bonds (\$9.8 billion when interest is included) to provide rebates to buyers of natural gas and other alternative fuel vehicles.

Back story: Uncle T. Boone Pickens wants you: The Texas oilman is underwriting Proposition 10, which will likely drum up buyers for cars that run on natural gas. His company, Clean Energy Fuels Corp., produces and markets ... natural gas.

PRO YES on 10: ENERGY INDEPENDENCE AND CLEAN AIR. PRODUCES more electricity from renewable sources, including solar and wind. GIVES Californians rebates to purchase clean alternative fuel vehicles. GETS polluting diesels off roads. INCREASES grants to California universities to develop cheaper alternatives to gasoline. REQUIRES strict accountability/audits. No new taxes.

CON Proposition 10 is special interest legislation which gives away \$10 billion in taxpayer dollars to primarily benefit one company with little accountability and NO guarantees of environmental benefit. Don't hurt our schools and services in a time of budget crisis.

PROPOSITION

11

VICA - Support
LAACC - pending

What it does: Strips the Legislature of its power to draw the lines of Assembly and Senate districts (every 10 years, after new census figures come out) and turns the job over to a 14-member citizens' commission.

Back story: Do Californians care that most of the time district boundaries are drawn to consolidate incumbent power? If they do, why did they reject reform in 2005 and eight times before that? In a political sop to Nancy Pelosi, this measure leaves out congressional districts -- a fact that has alienated some Republicans. Minority advocates are alienated because there is no guarantee that anyone on the commission will speak for their constituents.

PRO YES on 11 ends the conflict of interest of politicians drawing their own election districts. 11 means *fair districts drawn by a citizens commission following clear rules and open to the public*. It holds *politicians accountable for solving problems like gas prices, healthcare, and education*.

CON Politicians paid millions to put Prop. 11 on the ballot to change the Constitution, create a costly new bureaucracy, and give the power of drawing districts to people who are *never elected and never accountable to voters*.

PROPOSITION 12 **What it does:** Authorizes a bond to extend a state program allowing veterans access to low-interest mortgages.

12
VICA - Support
LAACC - *pending*

Back story: The 27th time's a charm: Voters have already approved bonds for Cal-Vet mortgages 26 times since the program was established for World War I veterans in 1921. Opposition is hard to come by -- the "con" ballot argument was written by Gary B. Wesley, a Mountain View lawyer who for many years has taken for himself the task of writing against measures when no one else will. The current Cal-Vet program only covers veterans who served before 1977.

PRO The time-honored Cal-Vet Home Loan Program helps veterans to purchase homes in California at no expense to taxpayers. Voter approved bonds finance the Program and are repaid, along with all program costs, by the loan holders. This measure would replenish the program's funding.

CON Proposition 12 would authorize the sale of another \$900 million in bonds to provide low-interest home (and farm) loans to "veterans." Voters may wish to end the program or insist that it be limited to the most needy and deserving veterans—such as those injured in combat.

City/County of Los Angeles ballot measures:

Measure A: Parcel tax. A tax of \$3 per month on each parcel of property in the City of Los Angeles to fund anti-gang programs.

Measure B: Affordable housing. A measure to remove some height restrictions on low-rent housing that is fully or partially funded with state money.

Measure R: Sales tax. Metropolitan Transportation Authority 1/2-cent sales tax to fund transportation.

Measure U: Utility users tax. Los Angeles County measure to extend the utility user tax in unincorporated county areas to telecommunications equipment not covered by the present telephone tax, while reducing the rate from 5% to 4.5%.

Measure J: Los Angeles Community College District. \$3.5 billion bond measure for construction and education (to be repaid with a property tax increase).

Measure Q: Los Angeles Unified School District. \$7 billion construction bond (to be repaid with a property tax increase).

S.F. VALLEY CANDIDATES FOR STATE ASSEMBLY:

District 37 Ferial Masry, Democratic Audra Strickland, Republican

District 38 Carole Lutness, Democratic Cameron Smyth, Republican

District 39 Grady Martine, Republican Felipe Fuentes, Democratic

District 40 Armineh Chelebian, Republican Bob Blumenfield, Democratic

District 41 Julia Brownley, Democratic Mark Bernsley, Republican

District 42 Steven Sion, Republican Mike Feuer, Democratic

S.F. VALLEY CANDIDATES FOR STATE ASSEMBLY:

Senate District 21 Carol Liu, Democratic Teddy Choi, Republican

Senate District 23 Rick Montaine, Republican Fran Pavley, Democratic

VICA

**Oppose*

Support

Support

Oppose

Support

**Oppose*

*LA
Chamber
took
opposite
position

Los Angeles County supervisor:

(Second District voters only)



Bernard C. Parks



Mark Ridley-Thomas

Los Angeles Superior Court judge:

Office No. 72



Hilleri Grossman Merritt

Ballot designation: Criminal Trial Prosecutor



Steven A. Simons

Ballot designation: Consumer Rights Attorney

Office No. 82



Cynthia Loo

Ballot designation: Superior Court Referee



Thomas Rubinson

Ballot designation: Criminal Prosecutor

Office No. 84



Pat Connolly

Ballot designation: Criminal Gang Prosecutor



Lori-Ann C. Jones

Ballot designation: Superior Court Commissioner

Office No. 94



Michael O'Gara

Ballot designation: Criminal Prosecutor



C. Edward Mack

Ballot designation: Criminal Trial Attorney

Office No. 154



Michael V. Jesic

Ballot designation: Criminal Gang Prosecutor



Rocky L. Crabb

Ballot designation: Superior Court Commissioner