

9-20-1980

Two States

Follow this and additional works at: http://repository.uchastings.edu/ca_ballot_inits

Recommended Citation

Two States California Initiative 254 (1980).
http://repository.uchastings.edu/ca_ballot_inits/415

This Initiative is brought to you for free and open access by the California Ballot Propositions and Initiatives at UC Hastings Scholarship Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Initiatives by an authorized administrator of UC Hastings Scholarship Repository. For more information, please contact marcusc@uchastings.edu.



Office of the Secretary of State
March Fong Eu

1230 J Street
Sacramento, California 95814

Elections Division
(916) 445-0820

January 12, 1981

TO: ALL REGISTRARS OF VOTERS/COUNTY CLERKS/PROPONENT
FROM: CASHMERE M. APPERSON - ELECTIONS TECHNICIAN

Your are hereby notified that the proponent of the hereinafter named proposed Initiative Constitutional Amendment has discontinued signature gathering. Therefore, the petition has failed. See attached letter.

TITLE: TWO STATES
SUMMARY DATE: SEPTEMBER 29, 1980
PROPONENT: DOUG F. CARTER

TWO CALIFORNIAS COMMITTEE

Post Office Box 1236
Sacramento, California 95806

December, 1980

An Update

The following developments are of great interest to Two Californias supporters:

1. Effective January 10, 1981, we have a new mailing address: Two Californias c/o Shear-Feldman Associates, 965 Mission St., Suite 511, San Francisco, CA 94103, (415-777-2344). Our Sacramento and Stockton mailing addresses will be closed.
 2. Effective immediately, this initiative (Phase One) is discontinued. This effort waited too long, trying to assist the referendum on the Peripheral Canal. We held our own organizational and fund-raising efforts in obedience and concentrated on using the media to publicize the anti-canal cause. At the time we began, the chances of the referendum qualifying were not great. Now, they have qualified and Proposition 8 has put cracks in the pro-canal lobby. Accordingly, the Peripheral Canal fight is a new ballgame and it is time for us to separate ourselves from it. PLEASE SEND ALL PETITIONS IN TO THE NEW S. F. ADDRESS, however, as we need all the informational-leads possible for PHASE II of our cause.
 3. A San Francisco lawyer has done a great deal of research and is drawing up a new initiative to split California. It will NOT have any reference to the Peripheral Canal, as it is no longer necessary. The water differences in this state are now obviously only part of a larger picture of two distinct regions.
 4. A San Francisco-based public relations firm (Shear-Feldman) will take over the new Two Californias campaign, fund-raisers, developing a celebrity and governmental letterhead etc. You are on the mailing list and will be contacted in the next few weeks. Donations to "Two Californias" at their address are needed to get this effort off to a strong start.
- Remember, Proposition 13 was the product of many earlier unsuccessful tax initiatives. Of the 11 previous attempts to split California, ours was the first to go to the people for signature-gathering. We have now shown the way, and built the organizational framework and mailing list to eventually place this issue before the people of California.
5. The committee backing the effort just ended will merge and support the Bay Area group. We developed 350 workers in the Bay Area and it is only logical the two-state effort be based in San Francisco.

Leon Pierce Chairman and Doug Carter, spokesman, for the first group in countless radio and television interviews and talk shows in urban areas noted "Our two-state concept, based upon a central anti-Peripheral Canal theme reached and educated hundreds of thousands of California voters, who otherwise would not have been aware of the dimensions and perils the canal poses to the Delta region. We have helped make the anti-canal fight less of an uphill effort and having done so, it is time to put the two-California concept in the hands of a broader perspective. We have done so and urge your continuing support."



Office of the Secretary of State
March Fong Eu

1230 J Street
Sacramento, California 95814

Elections Division
(916) 445-0820

September 29, 1980

TO ALL COUNTY CLERKS/REGISTRARS OF VOTERS

Pursuant to Section 3513 of the Elections Code, there is transmitted herewith a copy of the Title and Summary prepared by the Attorney General on a proposed Initiative Measure entitled:

TWO STATES

INITIATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT

Circulating and Filing Schedule

- 1. Minimum number of signatures required 553,790
Constitution II, 8(b).
- 2. Official Summary Date Monday, 9/29/80
Elections Code section 3513.
- 3. Petition Sections:
 - a. First day Proponent can circulate Sections
for signatures Monday, 9/29/80
Elections Code section 3513
 - b. Last day Proponent can circulate and file
with the county. All Sections are to be
filed at the same time within each county Thursday, 2/26/81
Elections Code sections 3513, 3520(a).
 - c. Last day for county to determine total number
of signatures affixed to petition and to
transmit total to the Secretary of State Thursday, 3/05/81

(If the Proponent files the petition with the county on a date prior to 2/26/81, the county has five working days from the filing of the petition to determine the total number of signatures affixed to the petition and to transmit this total to the Secretary of State).
Elections Code section 3520(b).

- d. Last day for county to determine number of qualified electors who have signed the petition, and to transmit certificate with a blank copy of the petition to the Secretary of State Friday, 3/20/81

(If the Secretary of State notifies the counties to determine the number of qualified electors who signed the petition on a date prior to 3/05/81, the last day is not later than the fifteenth day after the notification). Elections Code section 3520(d), (e).

- e. If the signature count is between 498,411 and 609,169, then the Secretary of State notifies the counties using the random sampling technique to determine the validity of all signatures.

Last day for county to determine actual number of all qualified electors who signed the petition, and to transmit certificate with a blank copy of the petition to the Secretary of State Sunday, 4/19/81

(If the Secretary of State notifies the counties to determine the number of qualified electors who have signed the petition on a date prior to 3/20/81, the last day is not later than the thirtieth day after the notification). Elections Code section 3521(b), (c).

4. Campaign Statements:

Last day for Proponent to file a Campaign Statement of Receipts and Expenditures for period ending 3/26/81 Thursday, 4/02/81

(If the Secretary of State finds that the measure has either qualified or failed to qualify on a date earlier than 2/26/81, the last date to file is the 35th calendar day after the date of notification by the Secretary of State that the measure has either qualified or failed to qualify. The closing date for the campaign statement is seven days prior to the filing deadline). Government Code section 84204.

5. The Proponent of the above named measure is:

Office (209) 478-2923 Doug F. Carter
1045 N. Center Street Home (209) 464-2735
Stockton, CA 95202

Sincerely,

WILLIAM N. DURLEY
Assistant to the Secretary of State
Elections and Political Reform



CASHMERE M. APPERSON
Elections Technician

WND:ash



State of California
 Department of Justice
 George Deukmejian
 (PRONOUNCED DUKE-MAY-GIN)
 Attorney General

555 CAPITOL MALL, SUITE 350
 SACRAMENTO 95814
 (916) 445-9555

September 29, 1980

FILED
 In the office of the Secretary of State
 of the State of California

SEP 29 1980

MARCH FONG EU, Secretary of State
 By *Cashman*
 Deputy

Honorable March Fong Eu
 Secretary of State
 1230 J Street
 Sacramento, California 95814

RE: Initiative Proposing Amendment to: Constitution
 Subject: Two States
 Our File No.: SA80RF0022

Dear Mrs. Eu:

Pursuant to the provisions of section 3503 and 3513 of the Elections Code, you are hereby notified that on this day we mailed to the proponent(s) of the above identified proposed initiative our title and summary by sending a true copy of this letter.

Enclosed is a copy of our transmittal letter to the proponent(s), a declaration of mailing thereof, a copy of our title and summary, and a copy of the proposed measure.

According to information available in our records, the name(s) and address(es) of the proponent(s) is as stated on the declaration of mailing.

Very truly yours,

George Deukmejian
 Attorney General

Robert Burton

Robert Burton
 Deputy Attorney General

Enclosure



Date: September 29, 1980
File No.: SA 80RF0022

The Attorney General of California has prepared the following title and summary of the chief purpose and points of the proposed measure:

TWO STATES. INITIATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Provides for a separation of California into two states, North California and South California, and describes boundaries of the two new states. Provides the Peripheral Canal shall not be within the physical boundaries of North California, nor of the single state of California if Congress or any other entity fails to follow through on the two-state provisions. Provides the California State Legislature shall guarantee the sanctity and rights of existing agreements and contracts, unless otherwise prohibited by the act. Provides the Legislature shall take the necessary actions to implement the act. Fiscal impact on state or local governments: The fiscal implications of separating California into two states are impossible to estimate and would depend on the requirements of future implementing legislation. The initial costs of setting up two governmental operations are likely to be substantial and exceed any savings.

"INITIATIVE MEASURE TO BE SUBMITTED DIRECTLY TO THE VOTERS"
State Boundaries - Initiative Constitutional Amendment

TWO CALIFORNIAS INITIATIVE:

Article LI is added to the State Constitution.

Section 1. The purpose of this initiative is to make state government more responsive to the people, to encourage governmental efficiency, to ensure local control, to protect the physical and economic environment, and to increase representation in the United States Senate.

Section 2. Would provide for a separation of California into two states, North California and South California, and describes boundaries of the two new states.

The dividing line between the two new states is particularly described as follows:

Beginning at the intersection of the boundary of the County of Ventura with the Pacific Ocean; thence northerly along said last mentioned boundary to the point at which it intersects with the boundary of the County of Kern; thence easterly along the southern boundary of the County of Kern, to the point at which such boundary intersects with the boundary of the County of San Bernardino; thence northerly along the eastern boundary of the County of Kern to the point at which it intersects with the County of Inyo; and thence easterly along the common boundary of the County of Inyo and County of San Bernardino to the point at which it intersects with the eastern boundary of the State of California.

The Peripheral Canal shall not be within the physical boundaries of North California, nor of the single state of California if Congress or any other entity fails to follow-through on the two-state provisions.

Section 3. The California State Legislature shall guarantee the sanctity and rights of existing agreements and contracts, unless otherwise prohibited by this act. The Legislature shall take the necessary actions to implement this act.

Section 4. If any provision hereof, or the application thereof, is held invalid, such invalidity shall not affect other provisions or applications of this section which can be given effect without the invalid provision of application, and to this end the provisions of this section are severable.



Office of the Secretary of State
March Fong Eu

1230 J Street
Sacramento, California 95814

Elections Division
(916) 445-0820

October 1, 1980

Doug F. Carter
1045 N. Center Street
Stockton, CA 95202

Dear Mr. Carter:

The following was inadvertently omitted from the calendar mailed to you earlier regarding your initiative entitled "Two States":

NOTE TO PROPONENT: Your attention is directed to Elections Code sections 41, 44, 3501, 3507, 3508, 3516, 3517, and 3519 for appropriate format and type considerations in printing, typing, and otherwise preparing your initiative petition for circulation and signatures. Your attention is further directed to the campaign disclosure requirements of the Political Reform Act of 1974, Government Code section 81000 et seq.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM N. DURLEY
Assistant to the Secretary of State
Elections and Political Reform

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Cashmere M. Apperson".

CASHMERE M. APPERSON
Elections Technician

WND/CA/slh

TWO CALIFORNIAS COMMITTEE

Post Office Box 1236
Sacramento, California 95896

August 27, 1980

*Delivered personally
at 4:45 PM
September 29, 1980*

Attorney General George Deukmejian
555 Capitol Mall
Sacramento, California

Dear Mr. Deukmejian:

This is to submit an initiative (attached) to your office for a Constitutional Amendment to divide the state.

As a spokesman and proponent of the two-state idea, I am a registered elector at 1045 N. Center St., Stockton, California 95202.

Thank you for the courtesy and cooperation of your office.

Sincerely,

Doug F. Carter

Doug F. Carter



State of California
Department of Justice
George Deukmejian
(PRONOUNCED DUKE-MAY-GIN)
Attorney General

555 CAPITOL MALL, SUITE 350
SACRAMENTO 95814
(916) 445-9555

September 29, 1980

Doug F. Carter
1045 N. Center Street
Stockton, California 95202

RE: Initiative Proposing Amendment to: Constitution
Subject: Two States
Our File No.: SA80RF0022

Pursuant to your request, we have prepared a title and summary of the chief purposes and points of the above identified proposed initiative. The title and summary are set forth in a letter sent to the Secretary of State, as required by Elections Code sections 3503 and 3513. A copy of this letter and our declaration of mailing is attached.

Please send us a copy of the petition after you have it printed. This copy is not for our review or approval, but to supplement our file in this matter.

Very truly yours,

George Deukmejian
Attorney General

GENERAL COUNSEL BY
ROBERT BURTON

Robert Burton
Deputy Attorney General

Attachment

DECLARATION OF MAILING

The undersigned Declarant, states as follows:

I am over the age of 18 years and not a proponent of the within matter; my place of employment and business address is 555 Capitol Mall, Suite 350, Sacramento, California 95814.

On the date shown below, I mailed a copy or copies of the attached letter to the Honorable March Fong Eu, Secretary of State, by placing a true copy thereof in an envelope addressed to each proponent named below at the address set out immediately below each name, and by sealing and depositing said envelope or envelopes in the United States Mail at Sacramento, California, with postage prepaid. There is delivery service by United States Mail at each of the places so addressed, or there is regular communication by mail between the place of mailing and each of the places so addressed.

Date of Mailing: September 29, 1980

Date of Attached Letter to Secretary of State: September 29, 1980

Subject: Initiative Proposing Amendment to: Constitution
Short Title: Two States
Our File No.: SA80RF0022

Name of Proponent(s) and Address(es):

Doug F. Carter
1045 N. Center Street
Stockton, California 95202

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed at Sacramento, California on September 29, 1980.



Jackie Short
Declarant

Cashie App#2054

For Immediate Release
September 30, 1980

Contact: Caren Daniels

INITIATIVE TO DIVIDE CALIFORNIA IN TWO LAUNCHED

SACRAMENTO -- An initiative drive aimed at dividing California into two states has been officially launched, Secretary of State March Fong Eu's office announced today (Sept. 30).

The drive, a constitutional amendment sponsored by former Assemblyman Doug Carter of Stockton, needs 553,790 registered voter signatures by Feb. 26 to qualify for the June 1982 ballot.

Carter is reachable at (209) 464-2735 (home) or (209) 478-2923 (office)

Should the measure qualify for the ballot, it would "provide for a separation of California into two states, North California and South California, and describes boundaries of the two new states." It would further provide that "the Peripheral Canal shall not be within the physical boundaries of North California, nor of the single state of California if Congress or any other entity fails to follow through on the two-state provisions." The Legislature would be directed to "take the necessary actions to implement the act" and would be ordered to "guarantee the sanctity and rights of existing agreements and contracts, unless otherwise prohibited by the act."

Several proposals to split California in two have been pursued in the past, but this is the first initiative attempt to do so. The idea goes back to almost California's statehood days, with one proposal, the Pico Act in 1859, actually having been approved by both houses of the Legislature, the Governor, and 2/3 of the electors within the boundaries of the proposed territory. Congress foiled the idea, however. Between 1907 and 1921 there were several other legislative attempts, and the most recent occurred in 1970. The consent of Congress would be required to ultimately divide California into two states.

###