

2012

TEMPORARY TAXES TO FUND
EDUCATION. GUARANTEED LOCAL
PUBLIC SAFETY FUNDING.

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

Recommended Citation

TEMPORARY TAXES TO FUND EDUCATION. GUARANTEED LOCAL PUBLIC SAFETY FUNDING. California Proposition 30 (2012).
http://repository.uchastings.edu/ca_ballot_props/1309

This Proposition 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 Propositions by an authorized administrator of UC Hastings Scholarship Repository. For more information, please contact marcusc@uchastings.edu.

TEMPORARY TAXES TO FUND EDUCATION. GUARANTEED LOCAL PUBLIC SAFETY FUNDING. INITIATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT.

OFFICIAL TITLE AND SUMMARY

PREPARED BY THE ATTORNEY GENERAL

TEMPORARY TAXES TO FUND EDUCATION. GUARANTEED LOCAL PUBLIC SAFETY FUNDING. INITIATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT.

- Increases personal income tax on annual earnings over \$250,000 for seven years.
- Increases sales and use tax by ¼ cent for four years.
- Allocates temporary tax revenues 89% to K–12 schools and 11% to community colleges.
- Bars use of funds for administrative costs, but provides local school governing boards discretion to decide, in open meetings and subject to annual audit, how funds are to be spent.
- Guarantees funding for public safety services realigned from state to local governments.

Summary of Legislative Analyst’s Estimate of Net State and Local Government Fiscal Impact:

- Additional state tax revenues of about \$6 billion annually from 2012–13 through 2016–17. Smaller amounts of additional revenue would be available in 2011–12, 2017–18, and 2018–19.
- These additional revenues would be available to fund programs in the state budget. Spending reductions of about \$6 billion in 2012–13, mainly to education programs, would not take effect.

ANALYSIS BY THE LEGISLATIVE ANALYST

OVERVIEW

This measure temporarily increases the state sales tax rate for all taxpayers and the personal income tax (PIT) rates for upper-income taxpayers. These temporary tax increases provide additional revenues to pay for programs funded in the state budget. The state’s 2012–13 budget plan—approved by the Legislature and the Governor in June 2012—assumes

passage of this measure. The budget, however, also includes a backup plan that requires spending reductions (known as “trigger cuts”) in the event that voters reject this measure. This measure also places into the State Constitution certain requirements related to the recent transfer of some state program responsibilities to local governments. Figure 1 summarizes the main provisions of this proposition, which are discussed in more detail below.

Figure 1

Overview of Proposition 30

State Taxes and Revenues

- Increases sales tax rate by one-quarter cent for every dollar for four years.
- Increases personal income tax rates on upper-income taxpayers for seven years.
- Raises about \$6 billion in additional annual state revenues from 2012–13 through 2016–17, with smaller amounts in 2011–12, 2017–18, and 2018–19.

State Spending

- If approved by voters, additional revenues available to help balance state budget through 2018–19.
- If rejected by voters, 2012–13 budget reduced by \$6 billion. State revenues lower through 2018–19.

Local Government Programs

- Guarantees local governments receive tax revenues annually to fund program responsibilities transferred to them by the state in 2011.

STATE TAXES AND REVENUES

Background

The General Fund is the state’s main operating account. In the 2010–11 fiscal year (which ran from July 1, 2010 to June 30, 2011), the General Fund’s total revenues were \$93 billion. The General Fund’s three largest revenue sources are the PIT, the sales tax, and the corporate income tax.

Sales Tax. Sales tax rates in California differ by locality. Currently, the average sales tax rate is just over 8 percent. A portion of sales tax revenues goes to the state, while the rest is allocated to local governments. The state General Fund received \$27 billion of sales tax revenues during the 2010–11 fiscal year.

Personal Income Tax. The PIT is a tax on wage, business, investment, and other income of individuals and families. State PIT rates range from 1 percent to 9.3 percent on the portions of a taxpayer’s income in each of several income brackets. (These are referred to as marginal tax rates.) Higher marginal tax rates are charged as income increases. The tax revenue generated from this tax—totaling \$49.4 billion during the 2010–11 fiscal year—is deposited into the state’s General Fund. In addition, an extra 1 percent tax applies to annual income over \$1 million (with the associated revenue dedicated to mental health services).

Proposal

Increases Sales Tax Rate From 2013 Through 2016. This measure temporarily increases the statewide sales tax rate by one-quarter cent for every dollar of goods purchased. This higher tax rate would be in effect for four years—from January 1, 2013 through the end of 2016.

Increases Personal Income Tax Rates From 2012 Through 2018. As shown in Figure 2, this measure increases the existing 9.3 percent PIT rates on higher incomes. The additional marginal tax rates would increase as taxable income increases. For joint filers, for example, an additional 1 percent marginal tax rate would be imposed on income between \$500,000 and \$600,000 per year, increasing the total rate to 10.3 percent. Similarly, an additional 2 percent marginal tax rate would be imposed on income between \$600,000 and \$1 million, and an additional 3 percent marginal tax rate would be imposed on income above \$1 million, increasing the total rates on these income brackets to 11.3 percent and 12.3 percent, respectively. These new tax rates would affect about 1 percent of California PIT filers. (These taxpayers currently pay about 40 percent of state personal income taxes.) The tax rates would be in effect for seven years—

Figure 2

Current and Proposed Personal Income Tax Rates Under Proposition 30

Single Filer's Taxable Income ^a	Joint Filers' Taxable Income ^a	Head-of-Household Filer's Taxable Income ^a	Current Marginal Tax Rate ^b	Proposed Additional Marginal Tax Rate ^b
\$0–\$7,316	\$0–\$14,632	\$0–\$14,642	1.0%	—
7,316–17,346	14,632–34,692	14,642–34,692	2.0	—
17,346–27,377	34,692–54,754	34,692–44,721	4.0	—
27,377–38,004	54,754–76,008	44,721–55,348	6.0	—
38,004–48,029	76,008–96,058	55,348–65,376	8.0	—
48,029–250,000	96,058–500,000	65,376–340,000	9.3	—
250,000–300,000	500,000–600,000	340,000–408,000	9.3	1.0%
300,000–500,000	600,000–1,000,000	408,000–680,000	9.3	2.0
Over 500,000	Over 1,000,000	Over 680,000	9.3	3.0

^a Income brackets shown were in effect for 2011 and will be adjusted for inflation in future years. Single filers also include married individuals and registered domestic partners (RDPs) who file taxes separately. Joint filers include married and RDP couples who file jointly, as well as qualified widows or widowers with a dependent child.

^b Marginal tax rates apply to taxable income in each tax bracket listed. The proposed additional tax rates would take effect beginning in 2012 and end in 2018. Current tax rates listed exclude the mental health tax rate of 1 percent for taxable income in excess of \$1 million.

ANALYSIS BY THE LEGISLATIVE ANALYST

CONTINUED

starting in the 2012 tax year and ending at the conclusion of the 2018 tax year. (Because the rate increase would apply as of January 1, 2012, affected taxpayers likely would have to make larger payments in the coming months to account for the full-year effect of the rate increase.) The additional 1 percent rate for mental health services would still apply to income in excess of \$1 million. Proposition 30's rate changes, therefore, would increase these taxpayers' marginal PIT rate from 10.3 percent to 13.3 percent. Proposition 38 on this ballot would also increase PIT rates. The nearby box describes what would happen if both measures are approved.

What Happens if Voters Approve Both Proposition 30 and Proposition 38?

State Constitution Specifies What Happens if Two Measures Conflict. If provisions of two measures approved on the same statewide ballot conflict, the Constitution specifies that the provisions of the measure receiving more "yes" votes prevail. Proposition 30 and Proposition 38 on this statewide ballot both increase personal income tax (PIT) rates and, as such, could be viewed as conflicting.

Measures State That Only One Set of Tax Increases Goes Into Effect. Proposition 30 and Proposition 38 both contain sections intended to clarify which provisions are to become effective if both measures pass:

- **If Proposition 30 Receives More Yes Votes.** Proposition 30 contains a section indicating that its provisions would prevail in their entirety and none of the provisions of any other measure increasing PIT rates—in this case Proposition 38—would go into effect.
- **If Proposition 38 Receives More Yes Votes.** Proposition 38 contains a section indicating that its provisions would prevail and the tax rate provisions of any other measure affecting sales or PIT rates—in this case Proposition 30—would not go into effect. Under this scenario, the spending reductions known as the "trigger cuts" would take effect as a result of Proposition 30's tax increases not going into effect.

Fiscal Effect

Additional State Revenues Through 2018–19. Over the five fiscal years in which both the sales tax and PIT increases would be in effect (2012–13 through 2016–17), the average annual state revenue gain resulting from this measure's tax increases is estimated at around \$6 billion. Smaller revenue increases are likely in 2011–12, 2017–18, and 2018–19 due to the phasing in and phasing out of the higher tax rates.

Revenues Could Change Significantly From Year to Year. The revenues raised by this measure could be subject to multibillion-dollar swings—either above or below the revenues projected above. This is because the vast majority of the additional revenue from this measure would come from the PIT rate increases on upper-income taxpayers. Most income reported by upper-income taxpayers is related in some way to their investments and businesses, rather than wages and salaries. While wages and salaries for upper-income taxpayers fluctuate to some extent, their investment income may change significantly from one year to the next depending upon the performance of the stock market, housing prices, and the economy. For example, the current mental health tax on income over \$1 million generated about \$730 million in 2009–10 but raised more than twice that amount in previous years. Due to these swings in the income of these taxpayers and the uncertainty of their responses to the rate increases, the revenues raised by this measure are difficult to estimate.

STATE SPENDING

Background

State General Fund Supports Many Public Programs. Revenues deposited into the General Fund support a variety of programs—including public schools, public universities, health programs, social services, and prisons. School spending is the largest part of the state budget. Earlier propositions passed by state voters require the state to provide a minimum annual amount—commonly called the Proposition 98 minimum guarantee—for schools (kindergarten through high school) and community colleges (together referred to as K–14 education). The minimum guarantee is funded through a combination of state General Fund and local property tax revenues. In many years, the calculation of the minimum guarantee is highly sensitive to changes in state General Fund revenues. In years when General Fund revenues grow by a large amount, the guarantee is likely to increase by a large amount. A large share of the state and local funding that is allocated to schools and community colleges is "unrestricted," meaning that they may use the funds for any educational purpose.

Proposal

New Tax Revenues Available to Fund Schools and Help Balance the Budget. The revenue generated by the measure's temporary tax increases would be included in the calculations of the Proposition 98 minimum guarantee—raising the guarantee by billions of dollars each year. A portion of the new revenues therefore would be used to support higher school funding, with the remainder helping

ANALYSIS BY THE LEGISLATIVE ANALYST

CONTINUED

to balance the state budget. From an accounting perspective, the new revenues would be deposited into a newly created state account called the Education Protection Account (EPA). Of the funds in the account, 89 percent would be provided to schools and 11 percent to community colleges. Schools and community colleges could use these funds for any educational purpose. The funds would be distributed the same way as existing unrestricted per-student funding, except that no school district would receive less than \$200 in EPA funds per student and no community college district would receive less than \$100 in EPA funds per full-time student.

Fiscal Effect if Measure Is Approved

2012–13 Budget Plan Relies on Voter Approval of This Measure. The Legislature and the Governor adopted a budget plan in June to address a substantial projected budget deficit for the 2012–13 fiscal year as well as projected budget deficits in future years. The 2012–13 budget plan (1) assumes that voters approve this measure and (2) spends the resulting revenues on various state programs. A large share of the revenues generated by this measure is spent on schools and community colleges. This helps explain the large increase in funding for schools and community colleges in 2012–13—a \$6.6 billion increase (14 percent) over 2011–12. Almost all of this increase is used to pay K–14 expenses from the previous year and

reduce delays in some state K–14 payments. Given the large projected budget deficit, the budget plan also includes actions to constrain spending in some health and social services programs, decrease state employee compensation, use one-time funds, and borrow from other state accounts.

Effect on Budgets Through 2018–19. This measure’s additional tax revenues would be available to help balance the state budget through 2018–19. The additional revenues from this measure provide several billion dollars annually through 2018–19 that would be available for a wide range of purposes—including funding existing state programs, ending K–14 education payment delays, and paying other state debts. Future actions of the Legislature and the Governor would determine the use of these funds. At the same time, due to swings in the income of upper-income taxpayers, potential state revenue fluctuations under this measure could complicate state budgeting in some years. After the proposed tax increases expire, the loss of the associated tax revenues could create additional budget pressure in subsequent years.

Fiscal Effect if Measure Is Rejected

Backup Budget Plan Reduces Spending if Voters Reject This Measure. If this measure fails, the state would not receive the additional revenues generated by the proposition’s tax increases. In this situation, the 2012–13 budget plan requires that its spending be reduced by \$6 billion. These trigger cuts, as currently scheduled in state law, are shown in Figure 3. Almost all the reductions are to education programs—\$5.4 billion to K–14 education and \$500 million to public universities. Of the K–14 reductions, roughly \$3 billion is a cut in unrestricted funding. Schools and community colleges could respond to this cut in various ways, including drawing down reserves, shortening the instructional year for schools, and reducing enrollment for community colleges. The remaining \$2.4 billion reduction would increase the amount of late payments to schools and community colleges back to the 2011–12 level. This could affect the cash needs of schools and community colleges late in the fiscal year, potentially resulting in greater short-term borrowing.

Effect on Budgets Through 2018–19. If this measure is rejected by voters, state revenues would be billions of dollars lower each year through 2018–19 than if the measure were approved. Future actions of the Legislature and the Governor would determine how to balance the state budget at this lower level of revenues. Future state budgets could be balanced through cuts to schools or other programs, new revenues, and one-time actions.

Figure 3	
2012–13 Spending Reductions if Voters Reject Proposition 30	
<i>(In Millions)</i>	
Schools and community colleges	\$5,354
University of California	250
California State University	250
Department of Developmental Services	50
City police department grants	20
CalFire	10
DWR flood control programs	7
Local water safety patrol grants	5
Department of Fish and Game	4
Department of Parks and Recreation	2
DOJ law enforcement programs	1
Total	\$5,951

DWR = Department of Water Resources; DOJ = Department of Justice.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROGRAMS

Background

In 2011, the state transferred the responsibility for administering and funding several programs to local governments (primarily counties). The transferred program responsibilities include incarcerating certain adult offenders, supervising parolees, and providing substance abuse treatment services. To pay for these new obligations, the Legislature passed a law transferring about \$6 billion of state tax revenues to local governments annually. Most of these funds come from a shift of a portion of the sales tax from the state to local governments.

Proposal

This measure places into the Constitution certain provisions related to the 2011 transfer of state program responsibilities.

Guarantees Ongoing Revenues to Local Governments. This measure requires the state to continue providing the tax revenues redirected in 2011 (or equivalent funds) to local governments to pay for the transferred program responsibilities. The measure also permanently excludes the sales tax revenues redirected to local governments from the calculation of the minimum funding guarantee for schools and community colleges.

Restricts State Authority to Expand Program

Requirements. Local governments would not be required to implement any future state laws that increase local costs to administer the program responsibilities transferred in 2011, unless the state provided additional money to pay for the increased costs.

Requires State to Share Some Unanticipated Program Costs. The measure requires the state to pay part of any new local costs that result from certain court actions and changes in federal statutes or regulations related to the transferred program responsibilities.

Eliminates Potential Mandate Funding Liability.

Under the Constitution, the state must reimburse local governments when it imposes new responsibilities or “mandates” upon them. Under current law, the state could be required to provide local governments with additional funding (mandate reimbursements) to pay for some of the transferred program responsibilities. This measure specifies that the state would not be required to provide such mandate reimbursements.

Ends State Reimbursement of Open Meeting Act Costs.

The Ralph M. Brown Act requires that all meetings of local legislative bodies be open and public. In the past, the state has reimbursed local governments for costs resulting from certain provisions of the Brown Act (such as the requirement to prepare and post agendas for public meetings). This measure specifies that the state would not be responsible for paying local agencies for the costs of following the open meeting procedures in the Brown Act.

Fiscal Effects

State Government. State costs could be higher for the transferred programs than they otherwise would have been because this measure (1) guarantees that the state will continue providing funds to local governments to pay for them, (2) requires the state to share part of the costs associated with future federal law changes and court cases, and (3) authorizes local governments to refuse to implement new state laws and regulations that increase their costs unless the state provides additional funds. These potential costs would be offset in part by the measure's provisions eliminating any potential state mandate liability from the 2011 program transfer and Brown Act procedures. The net fiscal effect of these provisions is not possible to determine and would depend on future actions by elected officials and the courts.

Local Government. The factors discussed above would have the opposite fiscal effect on local governments. That is, local government revenues could be higher than they otherwise would have been because the state would be required to (1) continue providing funds to local governments to pay for the program responsibilities transferred in 2011 and (2) pay all or part of the costs associated with future federal and state law changes and court cases. These increased local revenues would be offset in part by the measure's provisions eliminating local government authority to receive mandate reimbursements

for the 2011 program shift and Brown Act procedures. The net fiscal effect of these provisions is not possible to determine and would depend on future actions by elected officials and the courts.

SUMMARY

If voters approve this measure, the state sales tax rate would increase for four years and PIT rates would increase for seven years, generating an estimated \$6 billion annually in additional state revenues, on average, between 2012–13 and 2016–17. (Smaller revenue increases are likely for the 2011–12, 2017–18, and 2018–19 fiscal years.) These revenues would be used to help fund the state's 2012–13 budget plan and would be available to help balance the budget over the next seven years. The measure also would guarantee that local governments continue to annually receive the share of state tax revenues transferred in 2011 to pay for the shift of some state program responsibilities to local governments.

If voters reject this measure, state sales tax and PIT rates would not increase. Because funds from these tax increases would not be available to help fund the state's 2012–13 budget plan, state spending in 2012–13 would be reduced by about \$6 billion, with almost all the reductions related to education. In future years, state revenues would be billions of dollars lower than if the measure were approved.

PROP 30 TEMPORARY TAXES TO FUND EDUCATION.
GUARANTEED LOCAL PUBLIC SAFETY FUNDING.
INITIATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT.

★ ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION 30 ★

A Message from the League of Women Voters of California and California Teachers and Law Enforcement Professionals Fellow Californians,

After years of cuts, California's public schools, universities, and public safety services are at the breaking point.

In the last four years alone, our schools have been hit with \$20 billion in cuts, over 30,000 fewer teachers, and class sizes that are among the largest in the country. Our children deserve better.

It's time to take a stand and get California back on track.

Proposition 30, the Schools & Local Public Safety Protection Act, is supported by Governor Jerry Brown, the League of Women Voters and a statewide coalition of leaders from education, law enforcement and business.

There is broad support for Prop. 30 because it's the only initiative that will protect school and safety funding and help address the state's chronic budget mess:

- *Prevents deep school cuts.* Without Prop. 30, our schools and colleges face an additional \$6 billion in devastating cuts this year. Prop. 30 is the *only* initiative that prevents those cuts and provides billions in new funding for our schools starting this year—money that can be spent on smaller class sizes, up-to-date textbooks and rehiring teachers.
- *Guarantees local public safety funding.* Prop. 30 is the *only* measure that establishes a guarantee for public safety funding in our state's constitution, where it can't be touched without voter approval. Prop. 30 keeps cops on the street.
- *Helps balance the budget.* Prop. 30 balances our budget and helps pay down California's debt—built up by years of gimmicks and borrowing. It is a critical step in stopping the budget shortfalls that plague California.

To protect schools and safety, Prop. 30 temporarily increases personal income taxes on the highest earners—couples with incomes over \$500,000 a year—and establishes the sales tax at a rate lower than it was last year.

Prop. 30's taxes are temporary, balanced and necessary to protect schools and safety:

- *Only highest-income earners pay more income tax:* Prop. 30 asks those who earn the most to temporarily pay more income taxes. Couples earning below \$500,000 a year will pay *no* additional income taxes.
- *All new revenue is temporary:* Prop. 30's taxes are temporary, and this initiative *cannot be modified without a vote of the people.* The very highest earners will pay more for seven years. The sales tax provision will be in effect for four years.
- *Money goes into a special account the legislature can't touch:* The money raised for schools is directed into a special fund the legislature can't touch and can't be used for state bureaucracy.
- *Prop. 30 provides for mandatory audits:* Mandatory, independent annual audits will insure funds are spent **ONLY** for schools and public safety.

Join with the League of Women Voters and California teachers and public safety professionals.

Vote YES on Proposition 30.

Take a stand for schools and public safety.

To learn more, visit YesOnProp30.com.

JENNIFER A. WAGGONER, President
League of Women Voters of California
DEAN E. VOGEL, President
California Teachers Association
KEITH ROYAL, President
California State Sheriffs' Association

★ REBUTTAL TO ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION 30 ★

Supporters of Prop. 30 say we either have to approve a huge tax hike or schools get cut.

We all want excellent schools in California, but raising taxes isn't the only way to accomplish this.

The politicians would rather raise taxes instead of streamlining thousands of state funded programs, massive bureaucracy and waste.

Look at what they just did: politicians authorized nearly \$5 billion in California bonds for the "bullet train to nowhere," costing taxpayers \$380 million per year. Let's use those dollars for schools!

Instead, the politicians give us a false choice—raise sales taxes by \$1 billion per year and raise income taxes on small business OR cut schools.

PROP. 30 IS NOT WHAT IT SEEMS: It doesn't guarantee even one new dollar of funding for classrooms.

No on Prop. 30: It allows the politicians to take money currently earmarked for education and spend it on other programs. We'll never know where the money really goes.

No on Prop. 30: It gives the Sacramento politicians a blank check without requiring budget, pension or education reform.

No on Prop. 30: It hurts small businesses and kills jobs.

No on Prop. 30: It's just more money for the Sacramento politicians to keep on spending.

Don't be misled, Prop. 30 is not what it seems. It is just an excuse for Sacramento politicians to take more of your money, while hurting the economy and doing nothing to help education.

Californians are too smart to be fooled: *Vote No on Prop. 30!*

JOEL FOX, President
Small Business Action Committee
JOHN KABATECK, Executive Director
National Federation of Independent Business/California
KENNETH PAYNE, President
Sacramento Taxpayers Association

★ ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION 30 ★

NO on Prop. 30: It is just a \$50 Billion Political “Shell Game”—But Doesn’t Guarantee New Funds for Schools

The politicians behind Prop. 30 want us to believe that if voters approve Prop. 30’s seven years of massive tax hikes, the new money will go to classrooms. Nothing could be further from the truth.

Prop. 30 allows the politicians to play a “shell game” instead of providing new funding for schools:

- They can take existing money for schools and use it for other purposes and then replace that money with the money from the new taxes. They take it away with one hand and put it back with the other hand. No matter how you move it around, Prop. 30 does not guarantee one penny of new funding for schools.
- Many educators have exposed this flaw and even the California School Boards Association stated that “. . . the Governor’s initiative does not provide new funding for schools.” (May 20, 2012)
- The Wall Street Journal identified the same flaw, stating that “California Governor Jerry Brown is trying to sell his tax hike to voters this November by saying it will go to schools. The dirty little secret is that the new revenues are needed to backfill the insolvent teacher’s pension fund.” Wall Street Journal Editorial, April 22, 2012
- Even the official Title and Summary of Prop. 30 says the money can be used for “. . . paying for other spending commitments.”

In addition, there are no requirements or assurances that any more money actually gets to the classroom and nothing in Prop. 30 reforms our education system to cut waste, eliminate bureaucracy or cut administrative overhead.

NO on Prop. 30—No Reforms

The politicians and special interests behind Prop. 30 want to raise taxes to pay for their out of control spending, but refuse to pass meaningful reforms:

- Special interests and the politicians they control have blocked pension reforms. We have \$500 billion in unfunded pension liabilities in California and still the politicians refuse to enact real reforms.
- The same people have blocked budget reform. The politicians continue to spend more than the state has. Prop. 30 rewards this dangerous behavior by giving them billions of dollars more to spend with no reforms, no guarantee the money won’t be wasted or that it will really get to the classroom.

NO on Prop. 30—Stop the Politician’s Threats

The Governor, politicians and special interests behind Prop. 30 threaten voters. They say “vote for our massive tax increase or we’ll take it out on schools,” but at the same time, they refuse to reform the education or pension systems to save money.

We need to grow our economy to create jobs and cut waste, clean up government, reform our budget process and hold the politicians accountable instead of approving a \$50 billion tax hike on small businesses and working families that doesn’t provide any accountability or guarantee new funding for schools.

NO on Prop. 30—Reforms and Jobs First, Not Higher Taxes

JON COUPAL, President

Howard Jarvis Taxpayers’ Association

TOM BOGETICH, Executive Director (Retired)

California State Board of Education

DOUG BOYD, Member

Los Angeles County Board of Education

★ REBUTTAL TO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION 30 ★

After years of cuts, it’s time to draw a line to protect schools and local public safety.

Prop. 30’s **TOUGH FISCAL CONTROLS** insure money is spent **ONLY** on schools and public safety:

- Revenue is guaranteed in the constitution to go into a special account for schools that the *legislature can’t touch*.
- Money will be audited *every year* and can’t be spent on administration or Sacramento bureaucracy.
- Prop. 30 authorizes criminal prosecution for misuse of money.

Our kids deserve better than the most crowded classrooms in the country. Prop. 30 asks the very wealthy to pay their **FAIR SHARE** to keep classrooms open and cops on the street.

- **PREVENTS DEEP SCHOOL CUTS THIS YEAR:** Prop. 30 is the only initiative that prevents \$6 billion in automatic cuts to schools and universities this year. Without Prop. 30, we face a shortened school year, teacher layoffs and steep tuition increases this year.

- **PROVIDES BILLIONS IN NEW SCHOOL FUNDING:** Prop. 30 provides billions in additional funds to reduce class sizes and restore programs like art and PE.
- **PROTECTS LOCAL PUBLIC SAFETY:** Prop. 30 guarantees local public safety funding in the State Constitution and helps save billions in future prison costs.
- **HELPS BALANCE THE BUDGET:** Prop. 30 is part of a long-term solution to balance the state budget.

Teachers, law enforcement, business leaders and Governor Jerry Brown all support Proposition 30 because it’s the only measure that will put California on the road to recovery.

Learn more at www.YesOnProp30.com.

JENNIFER A. WAGGONER, President

League of Women Voters of California

JOSHUA PECHTHALT, President

California Federation of Teachers

SCOTT R. SEAMAN, President

California Police Chiefs Association

PROPOSITION 30

This initiative measure is submitted to the people in accordance with the provisions of Section 8 of Article II of the California Constitution.

This initiative measure adds a section to the California Constitution; therefore, new provisions proposed to be added are printed in *italic type* to indicate that they are new.

PROPOSED LAW

THE SCHOOLS AND LOCAL PUBLIC SAFETY PROTECTION ACT OF 2012

SECTION 1. Title.

This measure shall be known and may be cited as “The Schools and Local Public Safety Protection Act of 2012.”

SEC. 2. Findings.

(a) Over the past four years alone, California has had to cut more than \$56 billion from education, police and fire protection, healthcare, and other critical state and local services. These funding cuts have forced teacher layoffs, increased school class sizes, increased college fees, reduced police protection, increased fire response times, exacerbated dangerous overcrowding in prisons, and substantially reduced oversight of parolees.

(b) These cuts in critical services have hurt California’s seniors, middle-class working families, children, college students, and small businesses the most. We cannot afford more cuts to education and the other services we need.

(c) After years of cuts and difficult choices, it is necessary to turn the state around. Raising new tax revenue is an investment in our future that will put California back on track for growth and success.

(d) The Schools and Local Public Safety Protection Act of 2012 will make California’s tax system more fair. With working families struggling while the wealthiest among us enjoy record income growth, it is only right to ask the wealthy to pay their fair share.

(e) The Schools and Local Public Safety Protection Act of 2012 raises the income tax on those at the highest end of the income scale — those who can most afford it. It also temporarily restores some sales taxes in effect last year, while keeping the overall sales tax rate lower than it was in early 2011.

(f) The new taxes in this measure are temporary. Under the California Constitution the 1/4-cent sales tax increase expires in four years, and the income tax increases for the wealthiest taxpayers end in seven years.

(g) The new tax revenue is guaranteed in the California Constitution to go directly to local school districts and community colleges. Cities and counties are guaranteed ongoing funding for public safety programs such as local police and child protective services. State money is freed up to help balance the budget and prevent even more devastating cuts to services for seniors, working families, and small businesses. Everyone benefits.

(h) To ensure these funds go where the voters intend, they are put in special accounts that the Legislature cannot touch. None of these new revenues can be spent on state bureaucracy

or administrative costs.

(i) These funds will be subject to an independent audit every year to ensure they are spent only for schools and public safety. Elected officials will be subject to prosecution and criminal penalties if they misuse the funds.

SEC. 3. Purpose and Intent.

(a) The chief purpose of this measure is to protect schools and local public safety by asking the wealthy to pay their fair share of taxes. This measure takes funds away from state control and places them in special accounts that are exclusively dedicated to schools and local public safety in the state Constitution.

(b) This measure builds on a broader state budget plan that has made billions of dollars in permanent cuts to state spending.

(c) The measure guarantees solid, reliable funding for schools, community colleges, and public safety while helping balance the budget and preventing further devastating cuts to services for seniors, middle-class working families, children, and small businesses.

(d) This measure gives constitutional protection to the shift of local public safety programs from state to local control and the shift of state revenues to local government to pay for those programs. It guarantees that schools are not harmed by providing even more funding than schools would have received without the shift.

(e) This measure guarantees that the new revenues it raises will be sent directly to school districts for classroom expenses, not administrative costs. This school funding cannot be suspended or withheld no matter what happens with the state budget.

(f) All revenues from this measure are subject to local audit every year, and audit by the independent Controller to ensure that they will be used only for schools and local public safety.

SEC. 4. Section 36 is added to Article XIII of the California Constitution, to read:

SEC. 36. (a) For purposes of this section:

(1) “Public Safety Services” includes the following:

(A) Employing and training public safety officials, including law enforcement personnel, attorneys assigned to criminal proceedings, and court security staff.

(B) Managing local jails and providing housing, treatment, and services for, and supervision of, juvenile and adult offenders.

(C) Preventing child abuse, neglect, or exploitation; providing services to children and youth who are abused, neglected, or exploited, or who are at risk of abuse, neglect, or exploitation, and the families of those children; providing adoption services; and providing adult protective services.

(D) Providing mental health services to children and adults to reduce failure in school, harm to self or others, homelessness, and preventable incarceration or institutionalization.

(E) Preventing, treating, and providing recovery services for substance abuse.

(2) “2011 Realignment Legislation” means legislation enacted on or before September 30, 2012, to implement the state budget plan, that is entitled 2011 Realignment and provides for the assignment of Public Safety Services responsibilities to

local agencies, including related reporting responsibilities. The legislation shall provide local agencies with maximum flexibility and control over the design, administration, and delivery of Public Safety Services consistent with federal law and funding requirements, as determined by the Legislature. However, 2011 Realignment Legislation shall include no new programs assigned to local agencies after January 1, 2012, except for the early periodic screening, diagnosis, and treatment (EPSDT) program and mental health managed care.

(b) (1) Except as provided in subdivision (d), commencing in the 2011–12 fiscal year and continuing thereafter, the following amounts shall be deposited into the Local Revenue Fund 2011, as established by Section 30025 of the Government Code, as follows:

(A) All revenues, less refunds, derived from the taxes described in Sections 6051.15 and 6201.15 of the Revenue and Taxation Code, as those sections read on July 1, 2011.

(B) All revenues, less refunds, derived from the vehicle license fees described in Section 11005 of the Revenue and Taxation Code, as that section read on July 1, 2011.

(2) On and after July 1, 2011, the revenues deposited pursuant to paragraph (1) shall not be considered General Fund revenues or proceeds of taxes for purposes of Section 8 of Article XVI of the California Constitution.

(c) (1) Funds deposited in the Local Revenue Fund 2011 are continuously appropriated exclusively to fund the provision of Public Safety Services by local agencies. Pending full implementation of the 2011 Realignment Legislation, funds may also be used to reimburse the State for program costs incurred in providing Public Safety Services on behalf of local agencies. The methodology for allocating funds shall be as specified in the 2011 Realignment Legislation.

(2) The county treasurer, city and county treasurer, or other appropriate official shall create a County Local Revenue Fund 2011 within the treasury of each county or city and county. The money in each County Local Revenue Fund 2011 shall be exclusively used to fund the provision of Public Safety Services by local agencies as specified by the 2011 Realignment Legislation.

(3) Notwithstanding Section 6 of Article XIII B, or any other constitutional provision, a mandate of a new program or higher level of service on a local agency imposed by the 2011 Realignment Legislation, or by any regulation adopted or any executive order or administrative directive issued to implement that legislation, shall not constitute a mandate requiring the State to provide a subvention of funds within the meaning of that section. Any requirement that a local agency comply with Chapter 9 (commencing with Section 54950) of Part 1 of Division 2 of Title 5 of the Government Code, with respect to performing its Public Safety Services responsibilities, or any other matter, shall not be a reimbursable mandate under Section 6 of Article XIII B.

(4) (A) Legislation enacted after September 30, 2012, that has an overall effect of increasing the costs already borne by a local agency for programs or levels of service mandated by the 2011 Realignment Legislation shall apply to local agencies only to the extent that the State provides annual funding for the cost increase. Local agencies shall not be obligated to provide

programs or levels of service required by legislation, described in this subparagraph, above the level for which funding has been provided.

(B) Regulations, executive orders, or administrative directives, implemented after October 9, 2011, that are not necessary to implement the 2011 Realignment Legislation, and that have an overall effect of increasing the costs already borne by a local agency for programs or levels of service mandated by the 2011 Realignment Legislation, shall apply to local agencies only to the extent that the State provides annual funding for the cost increase. Local agencies shall not be obligated to provide programs or levels of service pursuant to new regulations, executive orders, or administrative directives, described in this subparagraph, above the level for which funding has been provided.

(C) Any new program or higher level of service provided by local agencies, as described in subparagraphs (A) and (B), above the level for which funding has been provided, shall not require a subvention of funds by the State nor otherwise be subject to Section 6 of Article XIII B. This paragraph shall not apply to legislation currently exempt from subvention under paragraph (2) of subdivision (a) of Section 6 of Article XIII B as that paragraph read on January 2, 2011.

(D) The State shall not submit to the federal government any plans or waivers, or amendments to those plans or waivers, that have an overall effect of increasing the cost borne by a local agency for programs or levels of service mandated by the 2011 Realignment Legislation, except to the extent that the plans, waivers, or amendments are required by federal law, or the State provides annual funding for the cost increase.

(E) The State shall not be required to provide a subvention of funds pursuant to this paragraph for a mandate that is imposed by the State at the request of a local agency or to comply with federal law. State funds required by this paragraph shall be from a source other than those described in subdivisions (b) and (d), ad valorem property taxes, or the Social Services Subaccount of the Sales Tax Account of the Local Revenue Fund.

(5) (A) For programs described in subparagraphs (C) to (E), inclusive, of paragraph (1) of subdivision (a) and included in the 2011 Realignment Legislation, if there are subsequent changes in federal statutes or regulations that alter the conditions under which federal matching funds as described in the 2011 Realignment Legislation are obtained, and have the overall effect of increasing the costs incurred by a local agency, the State shall annually provide at least 50 percent of the nonfederal share of those costs as determined by the State.

(B) When the State is a party to any complaint brought in a federal judicial or administrative proceeding that involves one or more of the programs described in subparagraphs (C) to (E), inclusive, of paragraph (1) of subdivision (a) and included in the 2011 Realignment Legislation, and there is a settlement or judicial or administrative order that imposes a cost in the form of a monetary penalty or has the overall effect of increasing the costs already borne by a local agency for programs or levels of service mandated by the 2011 Realignment Legislation, the State shall annually provide at least 50 percent of the nonfederal share of those costs as determined by the State. Payment by the

State is not required if the State determines that the settlement or order relates to one or more local agencies failing to perform a ministerial duty, failing to perform a legal obligation in good faith, or acting in a negligent or reckless manner.

(C) The state funds provided in this paragraph shall be from funding sources other than those described in subdivisions (b) and (d), ad valorem property taxes, or the Social Services Subaccount of the Sales Tax Account of the Local Revenue Fund.

(6) If the State or a local agency fails to perform a duty or obligation under this section or under the 2011 Realignment Legislation, an appropriate party may seek judicial relief. These proceedings shall have priority over all other civil matters.

(7) The funds deposited into a County Local Revenue Fund 2011 shall be spent in a manner designed to maintain the State's eligibility for federal matching funds, and to ensure compliance by the State with applicable federal standards governing the State's provision of Public Safety Services.

(8) The funds deposited into a County Local Revenue Fund 2011 shall not be used by local agencies to supplant other funding for Public Safety Services.

(d) If the taxes described in subdivision (b) are reduced or cease to be operative, the State shall annually provide moneys to the Local Revenue Fund 2011 in an amount equal to or greater than the aggregate amount that otherwise would have been provided by the taxes described in subdivision (b). The method for determining that amount shall be described in the 2011 Realignment Legislation, and the State shall be obligated to provide that amount for so long as the local agencies are required to perform the Public Safety Services responsibilities assigned by the 2011 Realignment Legislation. If the State fails to annually appropriate that amount, the Controller shall transfer that amount from the General Fund in pro rata monthly shares to the Local Revenue Fund 2011. Thereafter, the Controller shall disburse these amounts to local agencies in the manner directed by the 2011 Realignment Legislation. The state obligations under this subdivision shall have a lower priority claim to General Fund money than the first priority for money to be set apart under Section 8 of Article XVI and the second priority to pay voter-approved debts and liabilities described in Section 1 of Article XVI.

(e) (1) To ensure that public education is not harmed in the process of providing critical protection to local Public Safety Services, the Education Protection Account is hereby created in the General Fund to receive and disburse the revenues derived from the incremental increases in taxes imposed by this section, as specified in subdivision (f).

(2) (A) Before June 30, 2013, and before June 30 of each year from 2014 to 2018, inclusive, the Director of Finance shall estimate the total amount of additional revenues, less refunds, that will be derived from the incremental increases in tax rates made in subdivision (f) that will be available for transfer into the Education Protection Account during the next fiscal year. The Director of Finance shall make the same estimate by January 10, 2013, for additional revenues, less refunds, that will be received by the end of the 2012–13 fiscal year.

(B) During the last 10 days of the quarter of each of the first

three quarters of each fiscal year from 2013–14 to 2018–19, inclusive, the Controller shall transfer into the Education Protection Account one-fourth of the total amount estimated pursuant to subparagraph (A) for that fiscal year, except as this amount may be adjusted pursuant to subparagraph (D).

(C) In each of the fiscal years from 2012–13 to 2020–21, inclusive, the Director of Finance shall calculate an adjustment to the Education Protection Account, as specified by subparagraph (D), by adding together the following amounts, as applicable:

(i) In the last quarter of each fiscal year from 2012–13 to 2018–19, inclusive, the Director of Finance shall recalculate the estimate made for the fiscal year pursuant to subparagraph (A), and shall subtract from this updated estimate the amounts previously transferred to the Education Protection Account for that fiscal year.

(ii) In June 2015 and in every June from 2016 to 2021, inclusive, the Director of Finance shall make a final determination of the amount of additional revenues, less refunds, derived from the incremental increases in tax rates made in subdivision (f) for the fiscal year ending two years prior. The amount of the updated estimate calculated in clause (i) for the fiscal year ending two years prior shall be subtracted from the amount of this final determination.

(D) If the sum determined pursuant to subparagraph (C) is positive, the Controller shall transfer an amount equal to that sum into the Education Protection Account within 10 days preceding the end of the fiscal year. If that amount is negative, the Controller shall suspend or reduce subsequent quarterly transfers, if any, to the Education Protection Account until the total reduction equals the negative amount herein described. For purposes of any calculation made pursuant to clause (i) of subparagraph (C), the amount of a quarterly transfer shall not be modified to reflect any suspension or reduction made pursuant to this subparagraph.

(3) All moneys in the Education Protection Account are hereby continuously appropriated for the support of school districts, county offices of education, charter schools, and community college districts as set forth in this paragraph.

(A) Eleven percent of the moneys appropriated pursuant to this paragraph shall be allocated quarterly by the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges to community college districts to provide general purpose funding to community college districts in proportion to the amounts determined pursuant to Section 84750.5 of the Education Code, as that code section read upon voter approval of this section. The allocations calculated pursuant to this subparagraph shall be offset by the amounts specified in subdivisions (a), (c), and (d) of Section 84751 of the Education Code, as that section read upon voter approval of this section, that are in excess of the amounts calculated pursuant to Section 84750.5 of the Education Code, as that section read upon voter approval of this section, provided that no community college district shall receive less than one hundred dollars (\$100) per full time equivalent student.

(B) Eighty-nine percent of the moneys appropriated pursuant to this paragraph shall be allocated quarterly by the Superintendent of Public Instruction to provide general purpose

funding to school districts, county offices of education, and state general-purpose funding to charter schools in proportion to the revenue limits calculated pursuant to Sections 2558 and 42238 of the Education Code and the amounts calculated pursuant to Section 47633 of the Education Code for county offices of education, school districts, and charter schools, respectively, as those sections read upon voter approval of this section. The amounts so calculated shall be offset by the amounts specified in subdivision (c) of Section 2558 of, paragraphs (1) through (7) of subdivision (h) of Section 42238 of, and Section 47635 of, the Education Code for county offices of education, school districts, and charter schools, respectively, as those sections read upon voter approval of this section, that are in excess of the amounts calculated pursuant to Sections 2558, 42238, and 47633 of the Education Code for county offices of education, school districts, and charter schools, respectively, as those sections read upon voter approval of this section, provided that no school district, county office of education, or charter school shall receive less than two hundred dollars (\$200) per unit of average daily attendance.

(4) This subdivision is self-executing and requires no legislative action to take effect. Distribution of the moneys in the Education Protection Account by the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges and the Superintendent of Public Instruction shall not be delayed or otherwise affected by failure of the Legislature and Governor to enact an annual budget bill pursuant to Section 12 of Article IV, by invocation of paragraph (h) of Section 8 of Article XVI, or by any other action or failure to act by the Legislature or Governor.

(5) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the moneys deposited in the Education Protection Account shall not be used to pay any costs incurred by the Legislature, the Governor, or any agency of state government.

(6) A community college district, county office of education, school district, or charter school shall have sole authority to determine how the moneys received from the Education Protection Account are spent in the school or schools within its jurisdiction, provided, however, that the appropriate governing board or body shall make these spending determinations in open session of a public meeting of the governing board or body and shall not use any of the funds from the Education Protection Account for salaries or benefits of administrators or any other administrative costs. Each community college district, county office of education, school district, and charter school shall annually publish on its Internet Web site an accounting of how much money was received from the Education Protection Account and how that money was spent.

(7) The annual independent financial and compliance audit required of community college districts, county offices of education, school districts, and charter schools shall, in addition to all other requirements of law, ascertain and verify whether the funds provided from the Education Protection Account have been properly disbursed and expended as required by this section. Expenses incurred by those entities to comply with the additional audit requirement of this section may be paid with funding from the Education Protection Account, and shall not be considered administrative costs for purposes of this section.

(8) Revenues, less refunds, derived pursuant to subdivision (f) for deposit in the Education Protection Account pursuant to this section shall be deemed "General Fund revenues," "General Fund proceeds of taxes," and "moneys to be applied by the State for the support of school districts and community college districts" for purposes of Section 8 of Article XVI.

(f) (1) (A) In addition to the taxes imposed by Part 1 (commencing with Section 6001) of Division 2 of the Revenue and Taxation Code, for the privilege of selling tangible personal property at retail, a tax is hereby imposed upon all retailers at the rate of 1/4 percent of the gross receipts of any retailer from the sale of all tangible personal property sold at retail in this State on and after January 1, 2013, and before January 1, 2017.

(B) In addition to the taxes imposed by Part 1 (commencing with Section 6001) of Division 2 of the Revenue and Taxation Code, an excise tax is hereby imposed on the storage, use, or other consumption in this State of tangible personal property purchased from any retailer on and after January 1, 2013, and before January 1, 2017, for storage, use, or other consumption in this state at the rate of 1/4 percent of the sales price of the property.

(C) The Sales and Use Tax Law, including any amendments enacted on or after the effective date of this section, shall apply to the taxes imposed pursuant to this paragraph.

(D) This paragraph shall become inoperative on January 1, 2017.

(2) For any taxable year beginning on or after January 1, 2012, and before January 1, 2019, with respect to the tax imposed pursuant to Section 17041 of the Revenue and Taxation Code, the income tax bracket and the rate of 9.3 percent set forth in paragraph (1) of subdivision (a) of Section 17041 of the Revenue and Taxation Code shall be modified by each of the following:

(A) (i) For that portion of taxable income that is over two hundred fifty thousand dollars (\$250,000) but not over three hundred thousand dollars (\$300,000), the tax rate is 10.3 percent of the excess over two hundred fifty thousand dollars (\$250,000).

(ii) For that portion of taxable income that is over three hundred thousand dollars (\$300,000) but not over five hundred thousand dollars (\$500,000), the tax rate is 11.3 percent of the excess over three hundred thousand dollars (\$300,000).

(iii) For that portion of taxable income that is over five hundred thousand dollars (\$500,000), the tax rate is 12.3 percent of the excess over five hundred thousand dollars (\$500,000).

(B) The income tax brackets specified in clauses (i), (ii), and (iii) of subparagraph (A) shall be recomputed, as otherwise provided in subdivision (h) of Section 17041 of the Revenue and Taxation Code, only for taxable years beginning on and after January 1, 2013.

(C) (i) For purposes of subdivision (g) of Section 19136 of the Revenue and Taxation Code, this paragraph shall be considered to be chaptered on the date it becomes effective.

(ii) For purposes of Part 10 (commencing with Section 17001) of, and Part 10.2 (commencing with Section 18401) of, Division 2 of the Revenue and Taxation Code, the modified tax brackets and tax rates established and imposed by this

30

paragraph shall be deemed to be established and imposed under Section 17041 of the Revenue and Taxation Code.

(D) This paragraph shall become inoperative on December 1, 2019.

31

(3) For any taxable year beginning on or after January 1, 2012, and before January 1, 2019, with respect to the tax imposed pursuant to Section 17041 of the Revenue and Taxation Code, the income tax bracket and the rate of 9.3 percent set forth in paragraph (1) of subdivision (c) of Section 17041 of the Revenue and Taxation Code shall be modified by each of the following:

(A) (i) For that portion of taxable income that is over three hundred forty thousand dollars (\$340,000) but not over four hundred eight thousand dollars (\$408,000), the tax rate is 10.3 percent of the excess over three hundred forty thousand dollars (\$340,000).

(ii) For that portion of taxable income that is over four hundred eight thousand dollars (\$408,000) but not over six hundred eighty thousand dollars (\$680,000), the tax rate is 11.3 percent of the excess over four hundred eight thousand dollars (\$408,000).

(iii) For that portion of taxable income that is over six hundred eighty thousand dollars (\$680,000), the tax rate is 12.3 percent of the excess over six hundred eighty thousand dollars (\$680,000).

(B) The income tax brackets specified in clauses (i), (ii), and (iii) of subparagraph (A) shall be recomputed, as otherwise provided in subdivision (h) of Section 17041 of the Revenue and Taxation Code, only for taxable years beginning on and after January 1, 2013.

(C) (i) For purposes of subdivision (g) of Section 19136 of the Revenue and Taxation Code, this paragraph shall be considered to be chaptered on the date it becomes effective.

(ii) For purposes of Part 10 (commencing with Section 17001) of, and Part 10.2 (commencing with Section 18401) of, Division 2 of the Revenue and Taxation Code, the modified tax brackets and tax rates established and imposed by this paragraph shall be deemed to be established and imposed under Section 17041 of the Revenue and Taxation Code.

(D) This paragraph shall become inoperative on December 1, 2019.

(g) (1) The Controller, pursuant to his or her statutory authority, may perform audits of expenditures from the Local Revenue Fund 2011 and any County Local Revenue Fund 2011, and shall audit the Education Protection Account to ensure that those funds are used and accounted for in a manner consistent with this section.

(2) The Attorney General or local district attorney shall expeditiously investigate, and may seek civil or criminal penalties for, any misuse of moneys from the County Local Revenue Fund 2011 or the Education Protection Account.

SEC. 5. Effective Date.

Subdivision (b) of Section 36 of Article XIII of the California Constitution, as added by this measure, shall be operative as of July 1, 2011. Paragraphs (2) and (3) of subdivision (f) of Section 36 of Article XIII of the California Constitution, as added by this measure, shall be operative as of January 1, 2012. All other provisions of this measure shall become operative the day after

the election in which it is approved by a majority of the voters voting on the measure provided.

SEC. 6. Conflicting Measures.

In the event that this measure and another measure that imposes an incremental increase in the tax rates for personal income shall appear on the same statewide ballot, the provisions of the other measure or measures shall be deemed to be in conflict with this measure. In the event that this measure receives a greater number of affirmative votes than a measure deemed to be in conflict with it, the provisions of this measure shall prevail in their entirety, and the other measure or measures shall be null and void.

SEC. 7. This measure provides funding for school districts and community college districts in an amount that equals or exceeds that which would have been provided if the revenues deposited pursuant to Sections 6051.15 and 6201.15 of the Revenue and Taxation Code pursuant to Chapter 43 of the Statutes of 2011 had been considered "General Fund revenues" or "General Fund proceeds of taxes" for purposes of Section 8 of Article XVI of the California Constitution.

PROPOSITION 31

This initiative measure is submitted to the people of California in accordance with the provisions of Section 8 of Article II of the California Constitution.

This initiative measure amends and adds sections to the California Constitution and adds sections to the Education Code and the Government Code; therefore, existing provisions proposed to be deleted are printed in ~~strikeout type~~ and new provisions proposed to be added are printed in *italic type* to indicate that they are new.

PROPOSED LAW

The Government Performance and Accountability Act

SECTION 1. Findings and Declarations

The people of the State of California hereby find and declare that government must be:

1. Trustworthy. California government has lost the confidence of its citizens and is not meeting the needs of Californians. Taxpayers are entitled to a higher return on their investment and the public deserves better results from government services.

2. Accountable for Results. To restore trust, government at all levels must be accountable for results. The people are entitled to know how tax dollars are being spent and how well government is performing. State and local government agencies must set measurable outcomes for all expenditures and regularly and publicly report progress toward those outcomes.

3. Cost-Effective. California must invest its scarce public resources wisely to be competitive in the global economy. Vital public services must therefore be delivered with increasing effectiveness and efficiency.

4. Transparent. It is essential that the public's business be public. Honesty and openness promote and preserve the integrity of democracy and the relationship between the people and their government.