



C

OFFICIAL BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED
GENERAL ELECTION
COUNTY OF EL DORADO
TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 7, 2000

This ballot stub shall be removed
and retained by the voter.

MEASURES SUBMITTED TO THE VOTERS

STATE

32 VETERANS' BOND ACT OF 2000. This act provides for a bond issue of five hundred million dollars (\$500,000,000) to provide farm and home aid for California veterans. Fiscal Impact: Costs of about \$858 million over 25 years (average cost of about \$34 million per year); costs paid by participating veterans.

YES +
NO +

33 LEGISLATURE. PARTICIPATION IN PUBLIC EMPLOYEES' RETIREMENT SYSTEM. LEGISLATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Allows Legislative members to participate in the Public Employees' Retirement System plans in which a majority of state employees may participate. Fiscal Impact: Annual state costs under \$1 million to provide retirement benefits to legislators, with these costs replacing other spending from the fixed annual amount provided in support of the Legislature.

YES +
NO +

34 CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTIONS AND SPENDING. LIMITS. DISCLOSURE. LEGISLATIVE INITIATIVE AMENDMENT. Limits campaign contributions and loans to state candidates and political parties. Provides voluntary spending limits; expands public disclosure requirements and increases penalties. Fiscal Impact: Additional net costs to the state, potentially up to several million dollars annually, and unknown but probably not significant costs to local government.

YES +
NO +

35 PUBLIC WORKS PROJECTS. USE OF PRIVATE CONTRACTORS FOR ENGINEERING AND ARCHITECTURAL SERVICES. INITIATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT AND STATUTE. Amends constitution eliminating existing restrictions on state, local contracting with private entities for engineering, architectural services; contracts awarded by competitive selection; bidding permitted, not required. Fiscal Impact: Unknown impact on state spending for architectural and engineering services and construction project delivery. Actual impact will depend on how the state uses the contracting flexibility under the proposition.

YES +
NO +

36 DRUGS. PROBATION AND TREATMENT PROGRAM. INITIATIVE STATUTE. Requires probation and drug treatment, not incarceration, for possession, use, transportation of controlled substances and similar parole violations, except sale or manufacture. Authorizes dismissal of charges after completion of treatment. Fiscal Impact: Net annual savings of \$100 million to \$150 million to the state and about \$40 million to local governments. Potential avoidance of one-time capital outlay costs to the state of \$450 million to \$550 million.

YES +
NO +

09-307C



C

I HAVE VOTED-HAVE YOU?

37 FEES. VOTE REQUIREMENTS. TAXES. INITIATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Requires two-thirds vote of State Legislature, majority or two-thirds of local electorate to impose future state, local fees on activity to study or mitigate its environmental, societal or economic effects. Defines such fees as taxes except property, development, certain other fees. Fiscal Impact: Unknown, potentially significant, reduction in future state and local government revenues from making it more difficult to approve certain regulatory charges.

YES +
NO +

38 SCHOOL VOUCHERS. STATE-FUNDED PRIVATE AND RELIGIOUS EDUCATION. PUBLIC SCHOOL FUNDING. INITIATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Authorizes annual state payments of at least \$4000 per pupil for private/religious schools. Permits replacement of current constitutional public school funding formula. Fiscal Impact: Near-term state costs from zero to \$1.1 billion annually. Long-term state impact from \$2 billion in annual costs to \$3 billion in annual savings, depending on how many public school students shift to private schools.

YES +
NO +

39 SCHOOL FACILITIES. 55% LOCAL VOTE. BONDS, TAXES. ACCOUNTABILITY REQUIREMENTS. INITIATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT AND STATUTE. Authorizes bonds for repair, construction or replacement of school facilities, classrooms, if approved by 55% local vote. Fiscal Impact: Increased bond debt for many school districts. Long-term costs statewide could total in the hundreds of millions of dollars annually. Potential longer-term state savings to the extent school districts assume greater responsibility for funding school facilities.

YES +
NO +

COUNTY

EL DORADO COUNTY
MEASURE H

H Shall Measure H, entitled "An Initiative Ordinance Requiring the Expenditure of at Least One-Half of the 'Vehicle In-Lieu Tax' Revenues Received by the County of El Dorado Annually on Roads, Ways and Highways for Specified Purposes," be adopted?

YES +
NO +

EL DORADO COUNTY
MEASURE J

J Shall the County be authorized to use that portion of its sales tax revenues generated by new development to pay for building road capacity improvements to offset the impacts of traffic generated by non-residential development as allowed under Policy 3.2.2.5 of Measure Y, enacted by the voters on November 3, 1998?

YES +
NO +

09-306C

VOTE BOTH SIDES

C



Sample Ballot

Sample Ballot

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF MEASURE J

Passage of Measure J will break the financing barrier that now prevents creating new roadways for needed retail/commercial goods within El Dorado County.

Measure J will allow El Dorado County to capture sales taxes presently collected by Sacramento County or its cities from our shopping there. It will also reduce the frustration, stress, time, gasoline, and air pollution that come with travel to Sacramento.

Measure J is not a sales tax increase! In fact, instead of paying the 7.75% sales tax collected by Sacramento County, purchases in El Dorado County will remain at the present tax rate of 7.25%.

Note: The developers of new retail shopping will continue to pay all of the traffic impact fees needed for their stores. Consistent with the protections spelled out in 1998 by Measure Y, none of these development costs will be borne by other County taxes. Measure J is needed to provide funds where new commercial road capacity is needed.

Stated differently, Measure J will allow use of County sales taxes that do not now exist to help bring about new retail/commercial roads and stores desperately needed for present residents of El Dorado County.

Your "YES" vote for Measure J will bring shopping and local jobs to El Dorado County!

s/ Brett W. McFadden s/ Mark Nielsen
President, EDHCSD El Dorado County Supervisor

s/ Sam Bradley, El Dorado County Supervisor
Member of Measure Y Committee

s/ Joe Harn, CPA
El Dorado County Auditor/Controller

s/ W. Jeanne Hall, President
El Dorado County Chamber of Commerce

REBUTTAL TO ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF MEASURE J

Supporters claim that Measure J is needed to break a "financing barrier". But the only "financing barrier" that Measure J breaks is the one that prevents the Supervisors from financing private development with public dollars.

Supporters also claim that Measure J will only give away "sales taxes that do not now exist. But this claim is based on the false assumption that Wal-Mart and other "big boxes" at Missouri Flat will only capture sales taxes that would otherwise go to Sacramento.

This is just wishful thinking. The reality is that these "big boxes" at Missouri Flat and the supermarkets and little stores around them will also take away business and sales taxes currently generated by local stores in El Dorado County and Placerville.

No one knows how much existing business and existing sales taxes will be lost to the massive Missouri Flat development that Measure J will help finance. And no one has explained how we will pay for lost services in Placerville, or for additional needed services in the county (law enforcement, road maintenance, sewer and storm drains, parks & recreation, building, planning, finance, administration, animal control, elections, emergency services, etc.) if Measure J gives away future sales taxes.

We don't know the answers because the Supervisors have refused to ask the questions.

Unlike other measures that go to a public vote, the Supervisors have refused to order any study of the impacts of their own Measure J. This one we're supposed to approve on faith.

Refuse to give your sales tax away to private developers. Vote "NO" on Measure J.

s/ Patricia L. Moore
s/ Keith Johnson
s/ Marilyn Ferguson
s/ Carol A. Patton

ARGUMENT AGAINST MEASURE J

The bottom line: Measure J is a sales tax give away that serves no useful public purpose.

Measure J gives the Supervisors power to divert all new sales tax revenues into the hands of developers who claim they "need it". This power would be permanent, without any need to ever go back to the voters in the future.

If all new sales tax is given away to build developer's roads, it will not be available to pay for vital community services such as law enforcement and road maintenance as the county grows.

Measure J is written in general terms to hide its real and narrow purpose: TO ALLOW THE SUPERVISORS TO GIVE AWAY \$4 MILLION OF PUBLIC TAX DOLLARS TO LAND DEVELOPERS TO PAY FOR AN ACCESS ROAD TO THEIR PROPERTY BEHIND K-MART. (This is based on estimates listed in the County's Missouri Flat Financing Plan.)

This access road does nothing to solve existing traffic problems. If it did, sales tax could be used to pay for it without Measure J.

Before the voters approved Measure Y (the traffic initiative) in 1998, the Supervisors could have given away this money without asking the public for permission. Now they are forced to ask. We think the answer should be "No".

Many residents may welcome having "big box" stores like Wal-Mart near Placerville. But we don't need to give away public dollars to steer these stores to a particular spot. If there is market demand for these stores, they can and will be built without the public paying any private development costs.

We urge you to join us in saying "NO" to Measure J, the sales tax give away.

s/ Carol A. Patton s/ Keith Johnson
s/ Marilyn Ferguson s/ Patricia L. Moore

REBUTTAL TO ARGUMENT AGAINST MEASURE J

New commercial opportunities are desperately needed for existing El Dorado County residents. These businesses will benefit everyone here.

Measure J opponents are deliberately misrepresenting its intent. To say Measure J "...serves no useful public purpose..." is to say new roads serving new stores is not a public benefit! We disagree. READ MEASURE J! It simply provides a mechanism for new businesses coming to this county to use sales taxes *generated by those businesses* to fix local roads – as voters mandated in Measure Y. Measure J is one solution to *existing* road problems.

Contrary to opponent's claims, no developer will be given anything! Taxpayers will gain improved roadways via sales taxes using only "...that portion of sales tax revenues generated ..." by new commercial development.

Opponents say supervisors could have already funded these roads, but that's impossible without additional funding sources!

Measure J is clear and straightforward. It simply asks your permission for new commercial projects to fund their road improvements through their own sales taxes – just as voters demand. Vote yes on Measure J.

s/ W. Jeanne Hall, President – El Dorado County Chamber of Commerce
s/ Brett W. McFadden, President, El Dorado Hills Community Services District
s/ Sam Bradley – El Dorado County Supervisor
Member of Measure Y Committee
s/ Virginia W. Crespo, President, Taxpayers Association of El Dorado County
s/ Joe Harn, CPA, El Dorado County Auditor/Controller



**IMPARTIAL ANALYSIS BY COUNTY COUNSEL
EL DORADO COUNTY MEASURE J**

If approved by the voters, Measure J would allow the County to use sales tax revenues generated by new development to pay for road capacity improvements needed to offset the traffic impacts of new, non-residential development.

Measure Y was adopted by the voters on November 3, 1998. It includes Policy 3.2.2.5, which prohibits the use of County tax revenues to pay for road capacity improvements to offset the impacts of new development unless voter approval is obtained. Measure J seeks such voter approval for limited purposes. It would allow the use of sales tax revenues generated on property which is developed after the approval of Measure J (November 7, 2000) to pay for road capacity improvements needed to offset the impacts of new, non-residential development. Measure J authorizes the use of only a portion of the sales tax revenues - only those revenues generated from newly developed property - to be used for these road capacity improvements. Use of sales tax revenues from facilities which existed prior to approval of Measure J are not affected. Also, the road capacity improvements must serve new, non-residential development.

Measure J authorizes, but does not require, the use of these new sales tax revenues for road capacity improvements. Measure J is neither project-specific, nor geographically limited. New sales tax revenues could be used for any road project to serve new, non-residential development. If Measure J is approved, it would be up to the Board of Supervisors to decide whether to use these new sales tax revenues for road capacity improvements and, if so, for which road projects. The Board of Supervisors could elect to use all or only a portion of those revenues for these purposes.

The County receives a portion of the sales tax charged on retail sales within the County. Some of these revenues are unrestricted and can be used for any County purpose, subject to the restriction of Policy 3.2.2.5. Measure J would affect only those unrestricted sales tax revenues. The County also receives certain restricted sales tax revenues which can be used only for specified purposes. For example, some sales tax revenues are received under "Proposition 172" specifically to support public safety services. These "Proposition 172" revenues, and any other restricted sales tax revenues received, would not be affected by Measure J, and any such restricted sales tax revenues generated by new development would remain committed to those restricted purposes such as public safety.

A "YES" vote is a vote in favor of Measure J.

A "NO" vote is a vote against Measure J.

s/ Louis B. Green
County Counsel

**ARGUMENTS
FOLLOW
ON NEXT
PAGE**

