

# Progressive Voter Guide

November 4, 2008



**Berkeley Local Elections**

**California State Propositions**

**Presidential Candidates**

\*\*note: information compiled from community members, UCSA, Daily Cal, Democratic Party Endorsements, etc.  
Also, these views do not necessarily reflect everyone in the CalSERVE community. This is meant to be  
a useful guide for your own research and formulating YOUR voice, YOUR VOTE!

---

**Find your polling location at:**

**[smartvoter.org](http://smartvoter.org)**

**FIND OUT MORE ABOUT CalSERVE at [calserve.org](http://calserve.org)**

---

# Overview

## Local Berkeley Elections

**Mayor:** Tom Bates

### **City Council --**

District 2: Darryl Moore

District 5: Laurie Capitelli

District 3: Max Anderson

District 6: Susan Wengraf

District 4: Jesse Arreguin

### **Rent Board:**

Igor Tregub

Nicole Drake

Judy Shelton

Jesse Townley

**Superior Court Judge:** Dennis Hayashi

### **Berkeley Local Measures:**

- **Measure FF** (Safe, Accessible Branch Libraries): **YES**
- **Measure GG** (Fire Stations and Paramedics): **YES**
- **Measure HH** (Continues Funding for Libraries and Parks): **YES**
- **Measure II** (Redistricting Timelines): **YES**
- **Measure JJ** (Medical Marijuana): **YES**
- **Measure KK** (Transit/HOV/Bus Only Lanes): **NEUTRAL\***
- **Measure LL** (Landmarks Preservation): **NO**
- **Measure VV** (Affordable Transit for Seniors & Students): **YES**
- **Measure WW** (Protect & Preserve Regional Parks): **YES**

## California State Propositions

*Prop 1A: NEUTRAL\**

**Prop 2: YES**

*Prop 3: NEUTRAL\**

**Prop 4: NO**

**Prop 5: YES**

**Prop 6: NO**

**Prop 7: NO**

**Prop 8: NO**

**Prop 9: NO**

**Prop 10: NO**

**Prop 11: NO**

**Prop 12: YES**

\*Measure KK, Prop 1A and Prop 3 had mixed recommendations from different sources. Please refer to the information below to make your decision on these.

## President

**Barack Obama/Joe Biden (Democrat)**

# Proposition Information:

From UCSA (Leg Committee) and Daily Cal

Resources:

- <http://www.californiapropositions.org>
- [http://ballotpedia.org/wiki/index.php/Main\\_Page](http://ballotpedia.org/wiki/index.php/Main_Page)
- <http://www.voterguide.sos.ca.gov/>

<p><b>1A. Safe, Reliable High-Speed Passenger Train Bond Act</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>NEUTRAL</b></p>	<p><b>Summary:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Provides long-distance commuters with a safe, convenient, affordable, and reliable alternative to driving and high gas prices.</li> <li>- Reduces traffic congestion on the state's highways and at the state's airports.</li> <li>- Reduces California's dependence on foreign oil.</li> <li>- Reduces air pollution and global warming greenhouse gases.</li> <li>- Establishes a clean, efficient 220 MPH transportation system.</li> <li>- Improves existing passenger rail lines serving the state's major population centers.</li> <li>- Provides for California's growing population.</li> <li>- Provides for a bond issue of \$9.95 billion to establish high-speed train service linking Southern California counties, the Sacramento/San Joaquin Valley, and the San Francisco Bay Area.</li> <li>- Provides that at least 90% of these bond funds shall be spent for specific construction projects, with private and public matching funds required, including, but not limited to, federal funds, funds from revenue bonds, and local funds.</li> <li>- Requires that use of all bond funds be subject to independent audits.</li> <li>- Appropriates money from the General Fund to pay bond principal and interest.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Student Impact:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Students potentially benefit from new alternative to commuting along the length of the state.</li> </ul> <p><b>Note:</b> I have not included prominent supporters and opponents of the bond measures. In many instances there are none to list.</p> <p><b>Fiscal Impact:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- State costs of about \$19.4 billion, assuming 30 years to pay off both principal (\$9.95 billion) and interest (\$9.5 billion) costs of the bonds. Payments of about \$647 million per year.</li> <li>- When constructed, additional unknown costs, probably in excess of \$1 billion a year, to operate and maintain a high-speed train system. The costs would be at least partially, and potentially fully, offset by passenger fare revenues, depending on rider ship.</li> </ul>
<p><b>2. Standards for Confining Farm Animals</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>YES</b></p>	<p><b>Summary:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Requires that calves raised for veal, egg-laying hens and pregnant pigs be confined only in ways that allow these animals to lie down, stand up, fully extend their limbs and turn around freely.</li> <li>- Exceptions made for transportation, rodeos, fairs, 4-H programs, lawful slaughter, research and veterinary purposes.</li> <li>- Provides misdemeanor penalties, including a fine not to exceed \$1,000</li> </ul>	<p><b>Student Impact:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Little direct student impact.</li> <li>-Students do represent our constituency, and this is an issue of potential concern to many students.</li> </ul> <p><b>Prominent Supporters:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The Farm Sanctuary - The Humane Society - Sen. Dianne Feinstein</li> </ul> <p><b>Prominent Opponents:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Californians for SAFE Food</li> </ul> <p><b>Fiscal impact:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Potential unknown decrease in state and local tax revenues from farm businesses, possibly in the range of</li> </ul>

	and/or imprisonment in jail for up to 180 days.	several million dollars annually. - Potential minor local and state enforcement and prosecution costs, partly offset by increased fine revenue.
<b>3. Children's Hospital Bond Act</b>  <b>NEUTRAL</b>	<b>Summary:</b> - Authorizes \$980,000,000 in bonds, to be repaid from state's General Fund, to fund the construction, expansion, remodeling, renovation, furnishing and equipping of children's hospitals. - Designates that 80 percent of bond proceeds go to hospitals that focus on children with illnesses such as leukemia, cancer, heart defects, diabetes, sickle cell anemia and cystic fibrosis. - Requires that qualifying children's hospitals provide comprehensive services to a high volume of children eligible for governmental programs and meet other requirements. - Designates that 20 percent of bond proceeds go to University of California general acute care hospitals.	<b>Student Impact:</b> -Affects several University of California Hospitals. -Potentially improves quality of University of California student experience through improved healthcare opportunities.  <b>Fiscal impact:</b> State cost of about \$2 billion over 30 years to pay off both the principal (\$980 million) and the interest (\$933 million) costs of the bonds. Payments of about \$64 million per year.
<b>4. Waiting Period and Parental Notification Before Termination of Minor's Pregnancy</b>  <b>NO</b>	<b>Summary:</b> - Changes California Constitution to prohibit abortion for unemancipated minor until 48 hours after physician notifies minor's parent or legal guardian. - Permits notification to certain adult relatives if doctor reports parent to law enforcement or Child Protective Services. - Provides notification exceptions for medical emergency or parental waiver. - Permits courts to waive notice based on clear and convincing evidence of minor's maturity or best interests. - Mandates reporting requirements, including reports from physicians regarding abortions on minors. - Authorizes damages against physicians for violation. - Requires minor's consent to abortion, with exceptions.	<b>Student Impact:</b> -Affects unemancipated minors within the UC system. <i>Note:</i> Defeated in different forms twice before. <b>Prominent Supporters:</b> -Friends of Sarah (Don Sabastiani, Jim Holman, others) <b>Prominent Opponents:</b> * American Academy of Pediatrics, California District * American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists, District IX * California Academy of Family Physicians * California Family Health Council * California Nurses Association * California School Counselors Association * California Teachers Association * Planned Parenthood Affiliates of California  <b>Fiscal Impact:</b> Potential unknown net state costs of several million dollars annually for health and social services programs, court administration, and state health agency administration combined.
<b>5. Nonviolent Drug Offenses</b>	<b>Summary:</b> - Allocates \$460,000,000 annually	<b>Student Impact:</b> -Could potentially increase access

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>YES</b></p>	<p>to improve and expand treatment programs for persons convicted of drug and other offenses.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Limits court authority to incarcerate offenders who commit certain drug crimes, break drug treatment rules or violate parole.</li> <li>- Substantially shortens parole for certain drug offenses; increases parole for serious and violent felonies.</li> <li>- Divides Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation authority between two Secretaries, one with six year fixed term and one serving at pleasure of Governor. Provides five year fixed terms for deputy secretaries.</li> <li>- Creates 19-member board to direct parole and rehabilitation policy.</li> </ul>	<p>to UC system to students who otherwise would be restricted from the system due to drug offenses.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Provides more funding to drug offenders to improve treatment programs, creating a better system of support for students who may face drug offenses.</li> </ul> <p><b>Prominent Supporters:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* George Soros</li> <li>* Jacob Goldfield</li> <li>* Bob Wilson</li> <li>* John Sperling</li> <li>* The Drug Policy Alliance Network</li> </ul> <p><b>Prominent Opponents:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>*Martin Sheen</li> <li>*LA Times Editorial Board</li> </ul> <p><b>Fiscal Impact:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increased state costs over time potentially exceeding \$1 billion annually primarily for expanding drug treatment and rehabilitation programs for offenders in state prisons, on parole, and in the community.</li> <li>- State savings over time potentially exceeding \$1 billion annually due primarily to reduced prison and parole operating costs.</li> <li>- Net one-time state savings on capital outlay costs for prison facilities that eventually could exceed \$2.5 billion.</li> <li>- Unknown net fiscal effect on county operations and capital outlay.</li> </ul>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>NO</b></p>	<p><b>6. Police and Law Enforcement Funding</b></p> <p><b>Summary:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Requires minimum of \$965,000,000 each year to be allocated from state General Fund for police, sheriffs, district attorneys, adult probation, jails and juvenile probation facilities. Some of this funding will increase in following years according to California Consumer Price Index.</li> <li>- Makes approximately 30 revisions to California criminal law, many of which cover gang-related offenses. Revisions create multiple new crimes and additional penalties, some with the potential for new life sentences.</li> <li>- Increases penalties for violating a gang-related injunction and for felons carrying guns under certain conditions.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Student Impact:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Potentially helps allay crime that affects student population.</li> <li>-Locks money in the budget process that cannot be accessed for the UC system in future budget negotiations.</li> </ul> <p><b>Prominent Supporters:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- California State Sheriffs' Association</li> <li>- California District Attorneys Association</li> <li>- Association for Los Angeles Deputy Sheriffs</li> <li>-Senator George Runner</li> </ul> <p><b>Prominent Opponents:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Communities for Safe Neighborhoods and Fiscal Responsibility</li> <li>- California Democratic Party</li> <li>- California Professional Firefighters</li> <li>- California Labor Federation</li> <li>- Bernard Parks</li> <li>- California Teachers Association</li> <li>- California National Organization for Women</li> <li>- Los Angeles City Council</li> <li>- League of Women Voters</li> <li>- California Church IMPACT</li> </ul>

		<p>- Ella Baker Center for Human Rights</p> <p><b>Fiscal Impact:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Net increase in state costs that are likely within a few years to exceed \$500 million annually, primarily due to increasing state spending for various criminal justice programs to at least \$965 million, as well as for increased costs for prison and parole operations. These costs would increase by tens of millions of dollars annually in subsequent years.</li> <li>- Potential one-time state capital outlay costs for prison facilities that could exceed \$500 million due to increases in the prison population.</li> </ul>
<p><b>7. Renewable Energy Generation</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>NO</b></p>	<p><b>Summary:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Requires utilities, including government-owned utilities, to generate 20% of their power from renewable energy by 2010, a standard currently applicable only to private electrical corporations.</li> <li>- Raises requirement for utilities to 40% by 2020 and 50% by 2025.</li> <li>- Imposes penalties, subject to waiver, for noncompliance.</li> <li>- Transfers some jurisdiction of regulatory matters from Public Utilities Commission to Energy Commission.</li> <li>- Fast-tracks approval for new renewable energy plants.</li> <li>- Requires utilities to sign longer contracts (20 year minimum) to procure renewable energy.</li> <li>- Creates account to purchase rights-of-way and facilities for the transmission of renewable energy.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Student Impact:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Potentially raises short-term energy costs of universities.</li> <li>-Issues of great concern to student constituency.</li> </ul> <p><b>Prominent Supporters:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Martha Escutia</li> <li>- James Gollin</li> <li>- Neil Eisenberg</li> </ul> <p><b>Prominent Opponents:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Californians Against Another Costly Energy Scheme</li> <li>- PG&amp;E</li> <li>- Southern California Edison</li> <li>- Sempra</li> </ul> <p><b>Fiscal impact:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increased state administrative costs of up to \$3.4 million annually for the regulatory activities of the California Energy Resources Conservation and Development Commission and the California Public Utilities Commission, paid for by fee revenues.</li> <li>- Unknown impact on state and local government costs and revenues due to the measure's uncertain impact on retail electricity rates. In the short term, the prospects for higher rates—and therefore higher costs, lower sales and income tax revenues, and higher local utility tax revenues—are more likely. In the long term, the impact on electricity rates, and therefore state and local government costs and revenues, is unknown.</li> </ul>
<p><b>8. Eliminates Right of Same-Sex Couples to Marry</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>NO</b></p>	<p><b>Summary:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Changes the California Constitution to eliminate the right of same-sex couples to marry in California.</li> <li>- Provides that only marriage between a man and a woman is valid or recognized in California</li> </ul>	<p><b>Student Impact:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Denies thousand of gay students within the UC system the potential right to marry.</li> <li>-Issue of concern to constituents.</li> </ul> <p><b>Prominent Supporters:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints</li> </ul> <p><b>Prominent Opponents:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Let California Ring</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Equality for All</li> <li>- Equality California</li> <li>- Human Rights Campaign</li> </ul> <p><b>Fiscal Impact:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Over the next few years, potential revenue loss, mainly from sales taxes, totaling in the several tens of millions of dollars, to state and local governments.</li> <li>- In the long run, likely little fiscal impact on state and local governments.</li> </ul>
<p><b>9. Criminal Justice System: Victims' Rights, Parole</b></p> <p style="text-align: center; font-size: 2em; font-weight: bold;">NO</p>	<p><b>Summary:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Requires notification to victim and opportunity for input during phases of criminal justice process, including bail, pleas, sentencing and parole.</li> <li>- Establishes victim safety as consideration in determining bail or release on parole.</li> <li>- Increases the number of people permitted to attend and testify on behalf of victims at parole hearings.</li> <li>- Reduces the number of parole hearings to which prisoners are entitled.</li> <li>- Requires that victims receive written notification of their constitutional rights.</li> <li>- Establishes timelines and procedures concerning parole revocation hearings</li> </ul>	<p><b>Student Impact:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Changes criminal justice system regarding victims and parole standards. Affects university members who are in the criminal justice system.</li> </ul> <p><b>Prominent Supporters:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Henry Nicholas</li> </ul> <p><b>Prominent Opponents:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Communities for Safe Neighborhoods and Fiscal Responsibility</li> <li>- California Democratic Party</li> <li>- California Professional Firefighters</li> <li>- California Teachers Association</li> <li>- California Church IMPACT</li> <li>- Ella Baker Center for Human Rights</li> </ul> <p><b>Fiscal Impact:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Potential loss of future state savings on prison operations and potential increased county jail operating costs that could collectively amount to hundreds of millions of dollars annually, due to restricting the early release of inmates to reduce facility overcrowding.</li> <li>- Net savings in the low tens of millions of dollars annually for the administration of parole hearings and revocations, unless the changes in parole revocation procedures were found to conflict with federal legal requirements.</li> </ul>
<p><b>10. Alternative Fuel Vehicles and Renewable Energy</b></p> <p style="text-align: center; font-size: 2em; font-weight: bold;">NO</p>	<p><b>Summary:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Provides \$3.425 billion to help consumers and others purchase certain high fuel economy or alternative fuel vehicles, including natural gas vehicles, and to fund research into alternative fuel technology.</li> <li>- Provides \$1.25 billion for research, development and production of renewable energy technology, primarily solar energy with additional funding for other forms of renewable energy; incentives for purchasing solar and renewable</li> </ul>	<p><b>Student Impact:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Increases sales tax, which can place a burden on low-income citizens of California.</li> <li>-May provide grants and other funding for research to the UC system to develop alternative energy.</li> <li>-Issue of concern to constituents.</li> </ul> <p><b>Prominent Supporters:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Clean Energy Fuels Corp</li> <li>- T. Boone Pickens</li> <li>- Aubrey McClendon</li> </ul> <p><b>Prominent Opponents:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Consumer Federation of California</li> </ul> <p><b>Fiscal impact:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- State costs of about \$10 billion over</li> </ul>

	<p>energy technology.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Provides grants to cities for renewable energy projects and to colleges for training in renewable and energy efficiency technologies.</li> <li>- Total funding provided is \$5 billion from general obligation bonds.</li> </ul>	<p>30 years to pay off both the principal (\$5 billion) and interest (\$5 billion) costs of the bonds. Payments of about \$335 million per year.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increase in state sales tax revenues of an unknown amount, potentially totaling in the tens of millions of dollars, over the period from 2009 to about 2019.</li> <li>- Increase in local sales tax and vehicle license fee revenues of an unknown amount, potentially totaling in the tens of millions of dollars, over the period from 2009 to about 2019.</li> <li>- Potential state costs of up to about \$10 million annually, through about 2019, for state agency administrative costs not funded by the measure.</li> </ul>
--	---	---

<p><b>11. Redistricting</b></p> <p><b>NO</b></p>	<p><b>Summary:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Changes authority for establishing Assembly, Senate, and Board of Equalization district boundaries from elected representatives to 14-member commission.</li> <li>- Requires government auditors to select 60 registered voters from applicant pool. Permits legislative leaders to reduce pool, then the auditors pick eight commission members by lottery, and those commissioners pick six additional members for 14 total.</li> <li>- Requires commission of five Democrats, five Republicans and four of neither party. Commission shall hire lawyers and consultants as needed.</li> <li>- For approval, district boundaries need votes from three Democratic commissioners, three Republican commissioners and three commissioners from neither party.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Student Impact:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Proponents argue that it will create a more responsive legislature, potentially benefiting students (who have not always benefited in recent years during legislative processes).</li> <li>-Opponents argue that the commission is not representative of the population, creating an even number of commissioners from each party, which does not reflect actual political trends within the state.</li> </ul> <p><b>Prominent supporters:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• AARP</li> <li>• The Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce</li> <li>• The League of Women Voters</li> <li>• Gov. Arnold Schwarzenegger</li> <li>• Gray Davis, Former Governor (Democrat)</li> <li>• ACLU - Southern California</li> <li>• Bay Area Council</li> <li>• Bay Area Leadership Council</li> <li>• California Black Chamber of Commerce</li> <li>• California Democratic Council</li> <li>• California Police Chiefs Association</li> <li>• California Republican Assembly</li> <li>• California Small Business Association</li> <li>• California Taxpayers' Association</li> <li>• Central California Hispanic Chamber of Commerce</li> </ul> <p><b>Prominent opponents:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• U.S. Senator Barbara Boxer,</li> <li>• House Speaker Nancy Pelosi,</li> <li>• the California Democratic Party,</li> <li>• the Mexican American Legal Defense and Education Fund,</li> <li>• the NAACP Defense Fund</li> <li>• the Asian-American Pacific Legal Center.</li> </ul> <p><b>Fiscal impact:</b></p>
--	--	--

		Potential increase in state redistricting costs once every ten years due to two entities performing redistricting. Any increase in costs probably would not be significant.
<b>12. Veterans' Bond Act of 2008</b>	<b>Summary:</b> - This act provides for a bond issue of nine hundred million dollars (\$900,000,000) to provide loans to California veterans to purchase farms and homes. - Appropriates money from the state General Fund to pay off the bonds, if loan payments from participating veterans are insufficient for that purpose.	<b>Student Impact:</b> -Potentially benefits veteran participants of the UC system. <b>Fiscal impact:</b> - Costs of about \$1.8 billion to pay off both the principal (\$900 million) and interest (\$856 million) on the bonds; costs paid by participating veterans. - Average payment for principal and interest of about \$59 million per year for 30 years.
<b>YES</b>		

### Additional Arguments for/against Prop 1A

<b>YES on Prop 1A</b>	<b>NO on Prop 1A</b>
<p>Proposition 1A does have problems. However, Prop 1A gives California voters the chance to live an even more environmentally friendly state.</p> <p>Prop 1A may be costly, but it will create new jobs. One of the reasons why we are in this financial crisis, is because there was an increase in unemployment for construction workers. If people are not buying houses, then there is no need for constructing new houses.</p> <p>Prop 1A will help California, especially the Central Valley. The Central Valley is in need of more infrastructure. Right now, many employers commute from the Central Valley to their jobs in the Bay area on a daily basis. Think about how nice it would be if those commuters got off the road and onto an environmentally friendly train. The Central Valley needs more connectivity to other urban areas in California. The high speed rail might actually raise house prices in the Central Valley.</p> <p>Prop 1A will need a large corporation to build the railway. That is because they have the capital to do so. Also the Legislator recently placed in the passage AB3034 which will limit the amount of money spent on anything that is unrelated to construction. Also the construction must secure funding before starting any segment of the project.</p> <p>Prop 1A... it is pretty much now or never.</p>	<p>It is attractive alternatives to driving, but the promises in Proposition 1A are simply too good to be true. Prop 1A would issue about \$10 billion in bonds (costing taxpayers about \$25 billion including interest) for a high-speed rail construction project between San Francisco and Anaheim and for repairs and modernization of existing equipment and facilities.</p> <p>The cogent reason for taxpayers to oppose the high-speed rail project is that it is a public works fraud scheme specifically designed to appeal to gullible California environmentalists. If we vote for Proposition 1A, the only guarantee is that billions of dollars will be spent on planning, engineering, land acquisition, demolition, and construction of part of a guide-way. Trains may never run, as the \$10 billion bond is only a small fraction of the total amount required!</p> <p>The idea is apparently to start a very big hole in the ground, then come back and ask for \$30 to \$50 billion more from taxpayers. Federal funding for this proj-ect is as imaginary as private investment. The firm which has been prime contractor for all work authorized to date by the High Speed Rail Authority is Parsons Brinckerhoff, notorious for choosing the wrong concrete epoxy for the tunnel in Boston's way-out-of-control Big Dig that bal-looned in cost from \$2 billion to \$22 billion. They think Californians are far enough away that they didn't notice.</p> <p>The Rail Authority is guilty of overpromising on ridership, energy, and pollution benefits. It bases</p>

California's high-speed rail network requires NO TAX INCREASE and is subject to strict fiscal controls and oversight.

It's simple and fair - Once completed, THE USERS OF THE SYSTEM PAY FOR THE SYSTEM. That's why taxpayer watchdog groups support Proposition 1A.

Electric High-Speed Trains will give Californians a real alternative to skyrocketing gasoline prices and dependence on foreign oil while reducing greenhouse gases. Building high-speed rail is cheaper than expanding highways and airports to meet California's population growth.

Gridlock, hassles of flying and long-distance auto travel have become very onerous. Proposition 1A will save time. Travel intercity downtown to downtown throughout California on High-Speed Trains faster than automobile or air - AT A CHEAPER COST!

California's transportation system is out-of-date and deteriorating. We need options to poorly maintained roads, jammed runways and congested highways. Californians need what most of the civilized world has - high-speed rail. We've fallen so far behind other states and nations that our crumbling infrastructure threatens our economy.

A 220-mile-an-hour statewide rail system will give Californians a faster, environmentally friendly alternative for travel.

Proposition 1A will create 160,000 construction-related jobs and 450,000 permanent jobs.

Proposition 1A is endorsed by law enforcement experts, business leaders, environmentalists and Californians looking for safe, affordable and reliable transportation.

Signers of the ballot argument against Proposition 1A are habitual opponents of transportation improvements. Their claims and data are wrong and simply made up.

Californians need to invest in modern,

these benefits on a prediction that 117 million passengers will use this service annually. No European train is that popular. As a reality check, France's most popular high-speed train, the TGV-Southeast, carried only 18 million passengers in its 10th year on a route that already had 12 million annual train passengers before high-speed service started. It is simply unbelievable that California trains could outperform European routes with more population.

The Authority claims that the project will have no operating deficit, but the Legislative Analyst says the operating cost would be about \$1 billion annually, and suggests that some portion of this would have to be subsidized (likely in the hundreds of millions annually). Where would the money for this subsidy come from? Probably by draining state public transit funds that currently underwrite buses and trains.

Public transportation and environmentally friendly modes of transportation are important, but they should not be implemented in a way that exploits a power imbalance and the underrepresentation of low-income communities in government. When it comes to the environment it's not only sustainability, but also justice that is of concern.

If the state uses its right of eminent domain to kick people out of their homes (especially in this economy where it may be more difficult for them to find new homes, not to mention that losing a home is more than an economic loss but a humanitarian and sentimental one as well), or if the rail is built in a way that results in a plummet in home values in those areas, as will likely happen since I doubt they'd even think about let alone succeed at ripping through Beverly Hills to build this, then it is definitely not a progressive measure.

Once the money is in their hands we basically put vulnerable communities in a weak position where they have to defend and react against potential plans put together by a decision making process they are probably excluded from, rather than making sure the plan exists and is discussed before the money is handed over.

If this measure passes, we may NEVER get high-speed rail due to the predictably huge cost overruns this project will inevitably create.

From Taymyr:

I've been no on 1 almost longer than I've been no on 6 and 9. My family works with the Bus Riders Union in Los Angeles... I dont know if y'all have heard of them, but they are a grassroots civil rights and environmental justice organization. They are the ones responsible for the monthly bus

effective transportation.

**Vote Yes on Proposition**

**1A.** [www.CaliforniaHighSpeedTrains.com](http://www.CaliforniaHighSpeedTrains.com)

pass, the rapid buses in Los Angeles, and the student discounted bus passes, and a lot of other stuff. We at the Bus Rider's Union are NO on 1 because once again California is taking money out of the public transportation system of the masses.. i.e people of color who have to get to work everyday on the BUS... and putting it into 'public' transportation that would only serve a select few.

In Los Angeles, the overwhelming majority of people who use public transportation ride the buses. Yet, the majority of MTA's money is being shuffled into the metro rail and now, California wants to build a highspeed rail to spend billions of dollars on even more rail systems, when what they should be doing is fixing the bus system.. which is the vehicle of the masses. How bout lets get enough clean air buses out on the streets that acutally work so wheelchair passengers arent passed up over and over again because the buses are broken.. and so the tired masses getting off work can have a seat on the bus... before we spend billions on rail systems that will serve a particular demographic.

For more information please go to [www.noonthesix.org](http://www.noonthesix.org) .. I know it says no on 6, but there is a link for NO on 1 as well.

**Additional Arguments for/against Prop 3**

**YES on Prop 3**

Parents of seriously ill children, like us, appreciate the value of California's Children's Hospitals. Our children received the specialized care they needed and couldn't get anywhere else.

Over 1 MILLION times each year, California Children's Hospitals treat children with the most serious illnesses and injuries. Children facing life-threatening diseases like LEUKEMIA, CANCER, HEART DEFECTS, SICKLE CELL ANEMIA, DIABETES, CYSTIC FIBROSIS and countless other rare conditions are cared for at regional Children's Hospitals every day, without regard to a family's income or ability to pay.

Children are referred to these pediatric centers of excellence by other hospitals and physicians from throughout California for the specialized treatment they need.

**NO on Prop 3**

If this passes, almost one billion dollars in bonds will be sold by the state to be paid back with interest over 30 years from the general fund, to expand capacity in California's Children's Hospitals. The total cost is expected to be about \$2 billion in taxpayer funds. At first glance, who could be against improving and expanding hospitals for children? Looking deeper however, it is evident that Prop 3 has serious problems.

First, this is essentially the same measure as Proposition 61 on the 2004 ballot, which passed giving \$750 million to the same hospitals. Only \$403 million (53.7%) of that money has been used. Shouldn't the prior fund be depleted before asking the taxpayers to fund another round?

Children's Hospitals provide

88% of the inpatient care for children who need heart surgery;  
97% of all surgery for children who need organ transplants;  
71% of inpatient care for children with cancer.  
Imagine that.

Children's Hospitals save hundreds of children's lives EVERY DAY. Many children are cured. Others have their young lives extended for many years. And all have the quality of their lives improved. Today, almost 90% OF CHILDREN BORN WITH HEART DEFECTS can be cured or helped considerably by surgery. The SURVIVAL RATE OF CHILDREN WITH LEUKEMIA IS 80%. Imagine that.

The nation's premier pediatric research centers are in Regional Children's Hospitals making them the source of medical discoveries and advancements that benefit all children. PROPOSITION 3 WILL ALLOW CHILDREN'S HOSPITALS TO PURCHASE THE LATEST MEDICAL TECHNOLOGIES and special equipment for sick babies born prematurely, seriously underweight, or with defective organs.

PROPOSITION 3 DOES NOT RAISE TAXES. The bonds are an investment in the lives of millions of children who will be cared for over the next 30 years.

Children's Hospitals do not have enough room to handle the growing number of seriously ill and injured children sent to them every day. PROPOSITION 3 FUNDS WILL HELP CHILDREN'S HOSPITALS BUILD MORE BED CAPACITY AND BUY ESSENTIAL EQUIPMENT TO ENSURE THAT ALL CALIFORNIA CHILDREN can get the same excellent care our children got.

These University and nonprofit, charitable hospitals need our help! Children with Heart Disease or Cystic Fibrosis or Cancer have to be admitted over and over to a Children's Hospital to stabilize and treat their life threatening and debilitating illnesses. Children's Hospitals have the specialists to improve the quality of kids' lives, helping them stay at home and stay in

Second, it is unclear if this taxpayer money is being used in the public interest. Eighty percent of the money will go to private hospitals (the other 20% goes to University of California facilities). Just looking at one of these private institutions, Children's Hospital of Oakland, one finds that the President/CEO was paid \$673,000 in compensation in 2006, and the Chief Operation Officer was paid \$420,000 that year.

Third, this campaign represents an abuse of the Initiative process. These private hospitals, crying poor, actually have substantial assets and are using them to get additional public subsidies. Moreover, these institutions have hired Richie Ross, the high priced Sacramento political consultant, to run their slick campaign to tap into the taxpayers to fund their private hospitals.

Fourth, if the taxpayers are going to fund the expansion of privately owned hospitals, the taxpayers should get a share of the ownership and control of these institutions, including board seats and watchdog positions, something, of course, not part of this proposition.

Finally, it is far past time that we have democratic discussion, debate and action about how to fix our broken health care system, which leaves almost 50 million people without health care in this country.

A single payer health care system for all, similar to the Medicare system, should be central to this discussion, which must include how to fund and improve our stressed public hospitals. This is likely a much better use of our scarce tax dollars. Prop 3 simply perpetuates the existing and unfair privately dominated medical system.

school.

**THE MOST SERIOUSLY ILL AND INJURED CHILDREN ARE BEING SAVED EVERY DAY AT A CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL!** The doctors, nurses, and staff at Children's Hospitals are unlike any other people you will ever meet. Their lives are dedicated to a mission. And that mission is to treat children with the most serious and deadly diseases like Leukemia, Cancer, Heart Defects, Sickle Cell Anemia, Diabetes, and Cystic Fibrosis.

### **Additional Arguments for/against Measure KK**

#### **YES on Measure KK**

Vote for democracy -- YES on Measure KK.

Petition circulators reported overwhelming support for this measure and gathered 3240 signatures in just 6 weeks. Measure KK requires voter approval before Berkeley streets can be dedicated to bus-only use. Telegraph, Shattuck, University and Solano Avenues are threatened with massive reconstruction followed by major congestion.

**Financial Implications:** The claim that this measure will be costly is false. Simply leave our streets alone -- and this measure will cost zero.

Dedication of traffic lanes means losing use of portions of our streets without compensation. We pay for our streets. We should be allowed to use them.

AC Transit's current proposal benefits only AC Transit, which aims to spend hundreds of millions of taxpayers' dollars. By requiring voter approval, transit plans will have to benefit the public.

#### **NO on Measure KK**

Berkeley is known for our commitment to protecting the environment, including a General Plan policy to put "Transit First." But Measure KK would change that. Major transit projects are reviewed at many public meetings before the City Council decides whether or not to approve them. California law requires a detailed environmental impact statement, and Berkeley's numerous boards and commissions give our elected officials many opportunities to consider all points of view. On top of this Measure KK would mandate an expensive election.

Requiring voters to second-guess our elected representatives on transportation decisions is a significant waste of time and money: up to two years of delay before a vote could be taken, plus the cost (up to \$1.2 million) of a possible special election and additional Measure KK planning, in addition to the planning already done.

Measure KK will produce costly delays, not better decisions.

That's why The League of Women Voters says No on KK. Measure KK sets up a roadblock to transit improvements that will help us cut down on traffic and reduce

AC Transit's proposal for Telegraph Avenue eliminates local bus stops. This would create a hardship for many bus-riders, particularly the elderly and disabled. Ridership might actually decrease.

Most of the parking would be removed. The only suggested "replacement" has been metered spaces in neighborhoods. Local businesses would lose customers and some might be forced to close.

Travel time saved by dedicated lanes would be insignificant; energy savings nonexistent (Draft EIR). The proposed system is NOT "green."

A major redesign of our transit system should provide a clear benefit to the community; it should not occur merely because funding is available.

Berkeley has a strong tradition of requiring voter approval for major transit infrastructure.

Of Bay Area cities, only Berkeley voted to underground BART. Berkeley rejected the plan for aerial tracks as "blighting" and detrimental to local businesses, and held an election to get it right. We should choose transit that would actually work before relinquishing rights to our streets. Vote yes on Measure KK.

emissions of the harmful greenhouse gases that cause global warming. That's why the Sierra Club says No on KK.

Measure KK would also undercut implementation of Berkeley's "Green Initiative" (Measure G), approved by 81% of Berkeley voters in 2006. At a time when improved public transportation is one of the most important ways to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, we need to keep all transit options available, not create costly obstacles.

Berkeley is a world leader in protecting our environment.

Let's keep it that way. No matter what you think about the proposed BRT project, Measure KK goes too far. Join Mayor Tom Bates and City Councilmembers Max Anderson, Laurie Capitelli, Linda Maio, and Kriss Worthington by voting No on Measure KK.  
[www.NoOnMeasureKK.com](http://www.NoOnMeasureKK.com)

**HAPPY VOTING!**

**-CalSERVE**