

**WHAT'S NEXT CALIFORNIA?
A CALIFORNIA STATEWIDE DELIBERATIVE POLL
FOR CALIFORNIA'S FUTURE**

REPORT

**PREPARED BY
THE CENTER FOR DELIBERATIVE DEMOCRACY AT
STANFORD UNIVERSITY*
OCTOBER 2011**

***James S. Fishkin, Alice Siu, Robert C. Luskin, Nuri Kim, Andreas Katsanevas, and Yushu Zhou. With special thanks to Joyce Ichinose. And, acknowledgements to Angela Duckworth, Breeshia Turner, Olivia Hu, and Shelley Xu**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

OVERVIEW	1
SECTION A. SUMMARY RESULTS	
COMPLETE BEFORE AND AFTER RESPONSES, WITH MEANS	2
INITIAL PHONE SURVEY WITH PRE AND POST DELIBERATION RESULTS	17
REPRESENTATIVENESS OF SAMPLE	21
KNOWLEDGE GAINS	30
EVALUATIONS	32
SECTION B. REGRESSION ANALYSES	
REGRESSION ANALYSES: EXAMINING VALUES	4
REGRESSION ANALYSES: EXAMINING BASIC ORIENTATIONS	38
REGRESSION ANALYSES: EXAMINING EMPIRICAL PREMISES	105
SECTION C. SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT ON TRANSCRIPTS	
A BRIEF QUALITATIVE REPORT OF THE DELIBERATIVE POLLING EVENT: FROM THE PERSPECTIVE OF TWO PARTICIPANTS	2
INITIATIVE PROCESS	13
LEGISLATIVE REPRESENTATION	54
STATE AND LOCAL REFORM	91
TAXATION	126
SECTION D. APPENDICES	
CROSSTABS: PARTY AFFILIATION	
CROSSTABS: ETHNICITY	
CROSSTABS: REGION	
CROSSTABS: AGE	
CROSSTABS: INCOME	
CROSSTABS: EDUCATION	
CROSSTABS: GENDER	

Overview: “What’s Next California” Deliberative Pollⁱ

For the first time ever, a scientific sample of California’s registered voters was convened to deliberate in depth about the problems facing the state. They considered 30 proposals from a broad coalition of reform groups, vetted by an extensive advisory group. The sample was demonstrably representative in its demographics, as well as in political party and ideology. Over the course of the weekend’s deliberations it became dramatically more informed and changed its views in surprising ways.

The fundamental idea of the project was to set an agenda for possible reforms that could be put before the voters or the legislature. This report assesses the success of the undertaking. The analyses detailed here offer a route to responsible advocacy. These are the proposals that the voters of California would support (or would not support) on the basis of actually listening to the competing arguments and getting the best information we could make available, in a transparent and balanced way. In this process the people have been given the opportunity to set a reform agenda under the best and most transparent conditions this broad coalition of sponsors could muster. The results hold many surprises, both about which proposals have weight with the public after discussion, and which do not. In addition, the reasons for support at the end are detailed here for each proposal.

In this overview we draw on the quantitative data from questionnaire results before and after deliberation. We also make use of a separate data set, put together by the Center for Deliberative Democracy, of transcriptions of the small group discussions. This data is reported on in a supplement to the report and quoted at points in this overview. In addition to the extensive results already made available on the web, this report also makes use of regressions to identify the levers of opinion change as people discuss and become more informed about the proposals.

What is a Deliberative Poll?

Ordinary polls provide a snap shot of the public’s impressions of sound bites and headlines. Most citizens most of the time are not well informed about complex public issues. Deliberative Polling addresses the question: what would a scientific sample of the public think about policy issues if it could be engaged in good conditions for thinking about them? Those good conditions include balanced briefing materials, small group discussions with trained moderators, questions composed in small groups to panels of competing experts in plenary sessions and an opportunity to register one’s opinions in confidential questionnaires both before and after this process of deliberation. As this report will detail, there were very substantial changes in opinion after deliberation in this project.

Deliberative Polls have been conducted in 18 countries under the direction of the team at the Center for Deliberative Democracy at Stanford University. *What’s Next California* was the first statewide Deliberative Poll in California.

Why a Deliberative Poll?

A Deliberative Poll reveals which proposals the public would support on the basis of good information and which ones they would not. Further, it shows the reasons that have weight with the public supporting or opposing various reforms, once the public is really engaged in thinking about them. This Deliberative Poll should spark a thoughtful dialogue about the kinds of reforms that are seriously worth pursuing.

The Sample Gathered in Torrance, CA

A random sample of registered voters from throughout the state was recruited to travel to Torrance for the weekend. 435 were committed and 412 showed up on the day, an exceptionally high turnout compared to previous Deliberative Polls throughout the world. The 412 were compared to a separate sample of 300 registered voters who were never invited to Torrance. The 300 in the comparison group were weighted to reflect the population of registered voters. In both samples there were up to ten call backs to reach those initially drawn in the sample. Participants were paid an honorarium for the weekend participation plus all travel expenses.

There were no significant differences between the 412 and the 300 in gender, age, education, employment status, ethnicity, political party or political ideology. There were, however, small differences in income and religious attendance and some significant differences in attitudes toward some specific policy proposals. To ensure that any differences in specific policy attitudes did not affect our results, we conducted a further matching analysis to establish weightings for the participant sample and then reanalyzed the changes in attitudes. The results remained substantially unchanged as detailed in the section on representativeness in this report. Hence, we report the unweighted results for the participants here and we only note significant changes for those questions which yielded similar results whether the sample was weighted or unweighted.

Questionnaires were administered in three waves—T1 at home by telephone survey, T2 on arrival and T3 on departure. Mobile phones were included in the sample in order to include those without land lines. Since the advisory group process continued during the initial recruitment period, many of the final proposal questions could not be asked at T1. Results below are presented as before and after deliberation. When a T1 measurement is available we supply it as the “before deliberation” response in our presentation of the summary results. Otherwise, the results are from comparing the arrival questionnaire, before the weekend deliberation, with the final questionnaire on departure. The full questionnaires and the responses to all three waves are posted online at <http://cdd.stanford.edu>. The weighted and unweighted results for participants will also be posted there as well.

Agenda

The weekend discussions focused on specific reform proposals in four areas: the structure of the legislature, the initiative process, state-local reform and taxes (and related fiscal issues). A total of 30 proposals were considered under these four headings. An initial briefing document of nearly 100 pages was developed by the coalition of partner organizations, led by the Lane Center for the Study of the American West at Stanford University. An extensive state-wide Advisory Group passed on the balance and accuracy of the briefing materials. The weekend discussions alternated small group and plenary sessions on the four topic areas. Moderators, recruited by the Davenport Institute at Pepperdine University, were trained by the Center for Deliberative Democracy at Stanford.

Reforming the Initiative Process

Participants showed overwhelming support for initiative process reforms that would empower voters to better understand the consequences of initiatives they are asked to evaluate, and showed little interest in options that would have enabled the Legislature to affect their content in any way. Support for “creating a formal review process to allow an initiative’s proponents to amend an initiative following public input” increased 17 points from 59% to 76%. “Publishing the top five contributors for and against each ballot measure in the ballot pamphlet” increased its support

from 82% to 91%. “Allowing an initiative’s proponents to withdraw it after it qualifies for the ballot” increased from 50% (at home on first contact) to 57% after deliberation.

There were four proposals suggesting ways in which the legislature might remove or amend an initiative, or place a counter measure on the ballot. None of these achieved support above 37% after deliberation. “Allowing the Legislature to amend an initiative that has already passed, subject to two-thirds vote, even if an initiative’s proponents do not agree” sank 6 points to only 18%. A similar proposition with public review and the agreement of the initiative’s proponents sank from 43% to 37%. Allowing the Legislature to place a countermeasure on the ballot to an already qualified initiative ended up at 30%. Allowing the Legislature to remove an initiative from the ballot by enacting it into law ended up at 35% after deliberation. Participants wanted the initiative to remain the people’s process. They wanted to keep it away from the Legislature, to which they gave low approval ratings.

Reforming the Legislature

Participants began with a low regard for the legislature and its efficacy (close to 70% questioned whether the legislature was able “to get important things done” and about the same percentage disapproved of the Assembly and the State Senate). Participants thought the ability of the Legislature “to get things done” was affected by “tensions between the political parties” a view that increased from 64% to 72% after deliberation.

Despite these difficulties, they were willing to support major structural changes in the legislature to improve its performance. For example, there was a dramatic increase in support for “lengthening Assembly terms from 2 years to 4 and Senate terms from 4 years to 6.” When first interviewed at home, this reform received support from only 33% of the participants. By the end of the weekend, the support had climbed 47 points to 80%. An explanation can be found in two other questions. Before deliberation, 68% agreed that “increasing State Legislators’ terms will let them spend less time fundraising and campaigning and more time legislating.” After deliberation agreement with this proposition climbed 14 points to 82%. The contrasting argument against increased terms, that “increasing State Legislator’s terms will make them less responsive to their districts” dropped 23 points, from 41% agreeing initially to only 18% agreeing after deliberation. The participants clearly thought that legislators needed to spend less time campaigning and more time legislating if they were to represent their districts effectively. These connections and others like them are explored in the regressions presented later in the report.

As deliberators came to support longer terms, they also moved sharply against proposals for a part time legislature. Before deliberation there was majority support for “reducing the length of the state legislative session and requiring legislators to spend more time in their districts.” This proposal dropped 11 points, from 57% to 46%. There was an even larger drop in support for a related part time legislature proposal “making the state legislature part-time and paying legislators part-time salaries.” This proposal dropped 18 points from 45% to only 27%. Some clues to their reasoning, supported by the regressions, is suggested by two other questions. Agreement that “part-time legislators will tend to represent their districts more closely” dropped 9 points from 43% to 32%. And agreement that “part-time legislators will tend to be more open to corruption” increased 9 points from 45% to 54%.

Participants strongly supported reforms that would empower the public by making good data available to them for public oversight and increasing government accountability, including requiring the Legislature to establish performance goals and track and report progress (86% before and 90% after), requiring economic impact analysis of major legislation (89% before and 90% after).

Lastly, participants addressed the issue of the size of the legislature. There was strong support both before and after for “increasing the number of Assembly districts from 80 to 120” (support increasing from 61% to 63%). When asked about the fundamental trade-off between “having fewer Legislators, even if that means that each legislator represents more people” and the alternative, a situation where “each Legislator should represent fewer people, even if that means that the Legislature contains more Legislators” there was a sharp increase in support for having more legislators each representing fewer people. This option increased 14 points from 57% to 71% after deliberation. Given the low regard the participants had for the job the legislature is doing, this support for increasing the number of representatives is noteworthy.

State-Local Restructuring

Participants supported giving local governments (cities and counties) greater control over financing of local programs, in exchange for establishing performance goals, monitoring and public reporting. “Transferring from the state to local governments control and financing of services at the local level and requiring minimum standards for delivering them” increased from 67% to 73%. “Allowing local governments to raise taxes for local services in exchange for increased coordination of service delivery and public reporting of performance” increased 9 points from 54% to 63%. “Requiring state and local governments to identify policy goals and publish their progress toward meeting them” increased from 89% to 92%. After deliberation, 77% of participants supported allowing local governments to maintain control of savings from successful program management, in exchange for strong public accountability. After deliberation, 68% also supported specific funding for regional policy priorities extending beyond the borders of a single city or county.

At the same time, slightly more participants after deliberation thought the state should be responsible for “the most important policy decisions” (state-48%; local-26%; undecided-26%), and were evenly split on the question of how much taxation authority should be at the state vs. local level (local-33%; state-35%; undecided-33%). Yet when asked whether “decision-making authority” should be mostly at the local level or at the state level, 43% chose the local level after deliberation and only 27% chose the state level (with 29% in the middle). Clearly there is some receptiveness to local control for many aspects of policy, a conclusion supported by the support for state-local restructuring.

Tax and Fiscal Reforms

Most of the proposals for increased revenue received little support. A notable exception was the proposal for “reassessing non-residential property more frequently than now.” This rose 20 points from 52% to 72%. Another revenue proposal increased significantly but failed to achieve majority support. “Applying the sales tax to services as well as goods while reducing the sales tax rate” increased 7 points from 38% to 45%.

Proposals for limiting the home mortgage deduction, for reassessing all property more frequently (with an exemption to rise with inflation) and to allow local electorates to raise the property tax rate

above the current 1% rate cap all received minority support both before and after. However, a proposal to lower “the supermajority vote required in the Legislature to raise taxes” from two thirds to 55% rose a surprising 18 points, from 32% to 50%.

The generally low support for tax increases may be linked to a perception of government waste. Participants believed government is wasting a whopping 39 cents on the dollar. Nevertheless they believed government should provide certain benefits and services even if that required higher taxes, a position that increased 12 points from 45% to 57% after deliberation.

Participants also indicated strong support for fiscal discipline by the legislature. After deliberation, 83% supported publication of three to five year budget projections prior to budget votes. “Requiring the Governor and the Legislature to adopt two-year instead of one-year budgets” increased 16 points from 56% before deliberation to 72% afterwards. There was also increased support for paygo. “Requiring legislation creating new programs that cost \$25 million or more to indicate how they will be paid for” increased from 82% when respondents were asked at home to 90% by the end of the deliberations. Participants also supported limiting one-time revenue “spikes” to one-time expenditures or paying down state debt and filling the state rainy day fund (84% after, 80% before).

Efficacy and Mutual Respect

At the beginning only 25% of participants thought “public officials care a lot about what people like me think.” This opinion increased 12 points to 37%, a significant increase, but still a low level of external political efficacy. Similarly participants started with 42% agreeing that “people like me don’t have any say in what government does” a view that dropped 9 points to 33% after deliberation. When asked about those “who disagree strongly with you about issues like those we have been asking you about” 80% agreed before deliberation that “I respect their point of view, even though it is different from mine.” This position rose to 88% after deliberation.

Evaluations of the Process

At the end of the weekend the participants were asked a battery of evaluation questions. The process received uniformly high marks. When asked to rate it on a scale from “a waste of time” to “extremely valuable” 89% rated it on the “extremely valuable” side of the scale. 91% agreed that “my group moderator provided the opportunity for everyone to participate in the discussions.” 93% disagreed strongly with the view that “my group moderator sometimes tried to influence the group with his or her own views.” 62% agreed that “my group moderator tried to make sure that opposing arguments were considered.” 82% thought the briefing materials were mostly or completely balanced. And 88% agreed that “I learned a lot about people very different from me—about what they and their lives are like.”

Knowledge

Participants were asked a series of eight knowledge questions before and after deliberation. As in other Deliberative Polls, they provided evidence of strong knowledge gains. Overall correct answers to the eight questions increased significantly by 18 points. Some changes were even larger, such as the question about the area of the budget which takes the single largest share (K-12 education). Correct answers to this question increased 38 points to 74%. Because knowledge tends to be correlated with other knowledge, the index offers good evidence that the participants became significantly more informed about the public issues on the agenda of *What’s Next California*.

Summary Analyses of Specific Proposalsⁱⁱ

Proposal A1 Creating a Formal Review Process to allow an initiative's proponents to amend an initiative following public input.

The support for this proposal increased significantly from about 59% to 76%. The regressions show some interesting connections with fundamental values. The more participants placed a value on education and having an informed society, the more they supported this proposal. This seems compatible with the idea of public review in an effort to get the proposal right. The more the participants placed a value on government reflecting the “will of the people” and on making collective decisions even if some disagreed, the more they supported this proposal. These values also connect with getting the public’s views accurately reflected in the proposals. On the other hand, the values in the economic freedom index, which concern freedom to just decide for yourself without any interference from others, tended to produce decreased support for this proposal.

The transcripts express concerns about how to understand what is on the ballot and the hope that this proposal might lead to clearer and more understandable propositions. So there was support expressed for a review process of “*citizens to clarify the supporter’s intent and to see what it’s about if it’s not clear, so that they make it so that it is clear.*” There is a concern that “*yes means yes and no means no.*” Confusing propositions sometimes lead people to vote differently than what they actually intend.

Proposal A2c Allowing the Legislature to amend an initiative that has already passed, subject to a public review and the agreement of the initiative’s proponents.

Support for this proposal dropped significantly from 43% to 37% while opposition increased from 44% to 51%. Those who were satisfied with the state legislature tended to support this proposal as did those who thought “the California State Legislature is able to get important things done.” But these are minority views and attitude toward the state legislature is clearly a lever for opinion change on this proposal. In the regression examining empirical premises, both Republican and Democrat party identification worked in support of this proposal, except for those Republicans who also thought Government was wasting money (the interaction between Republican and Government Waste). For those Republicans, the effect is negative for this proposal.

There seemed to be real hesitation for all the proposals about giving the Legislature any power to change or second guess initiative proposals. Note this excerpt from the transcripts:

“this 2c and 2d gives the legislators power to change them, even if it’s a guess as to what the initiative initially started up with. That’s cutting into the initiative process in the sense that we’re giving the power back to them....its supposed to be about the people putting in what they want, whereas this, it’s giving ultimate power to the legislature...it sounds good but they could change it even if it’s not what we want.” Another respondent felt even more strongly about the legislature second guessing: *“it makes me furious that the legislature thinks that I’m too stupid to make the decision.”*

Proposal A4: Requiring all ballot measures that require new expenditures to indicate how they will be paid for.

This “paygo” measure had overwhelming support both before and after, (87% and 85%). The regressions show that those who value the economic freedom index (valuing people being able to make choices about economic matters) will tend to support this measure while those who think a part time legislature would have good effects tend to oppose this proposition. Those Democrats who viewed the legislature as able to get things done (not a large group) also tend to oppose. As noted there was general support across the political spectrum. The reasoning behind this proposal was expressed by one of the participants this way:

“I think what’s missing in the initiative process is the cost. Because I think the whole point of it is that the legislature gets stuck with these initiatives passing. The average citizen does not understand unintended consequences, whether it’s financial or otherwise, legal, you name it. So the point is that if you are reviewing an initiative, you’ve got to know the consequences or the cost, or where it’s going to come from. And I think there’s a disconnect there.”

Another participant put it in terms of making responsible choices now rather than obligating future generations:

“If we’re putting something on the ballot, that’s going to be paid for that we know where it’s coming from. And its not kicking it down the road, like saying we’re going to pay for this with bonds or something where we’re going to have to pay it back years from now. But if this is going to be part of our priority as a state, that we should figure out are we gonna cut other things to pay for it, or are we gonna raise taxes, or what are we gonna do so that it’s covered and not left to future generations to pick up the tab.”

Proposal A7 Publishing the top five contributors for and against each ballot measure in the ballot pamphlet

Support for this proposal rose significantly from 82% to 91%. The proposal began with overwhelming support and it went higher. The regressions show that the value of education (including the value of an educated society) was a lever of opinion change in support of this proposal. Those Republicans who also thought the legislature was competent to get things done (a small minority) tended to oppose this. Generally there was support across all sectors of the population for this proposal.

The transcripts show a consistent desire for transparency:

“When you spoke about listing who was backing certain initiatives... I think that when we look at ads on TV during the political process time, during election time, you know how you’ve actually paused your TV to see who sponsors it. And sometimes it makes a big difference on how you’re gonna vote.” And similarly:

“Somebody once told me that the straightest line to the truth is to follow the money. So, you know, maybe something should be written... whoever makes the initiative or when its presented—where is the money coming to support the initiative? And how much does it cost?”

B1 Increasing the number of Assembly districts from 80 to 120

Support for this proposal began high, and moved slightly higher to 63% after deliberation. The regressions show that those who valued low taxes and small government tended to oppose (perhaps because of the cost of more legislators), while those who valued the government providing benefits even if that meant higher taxes tended to support this proposal. Those who were satisfied with local government also tended to support.

The transcripts focused on the difficulty of effective representation with so many constituents:

“Its unbelievable to think that one senator has 1 million constituents...I could never speak for a million people....California is bigger than most countries.”

“I want to express shock at the number in Table B1 [number of constituents]. I had no idea.”

“There’s no chance you’re gonna have a one-on-one with your state representative where there’s half a million people.”

However, there was also a sensitivity to the cost issue on the other side of the argument:

“Our representatives have an enormous amount of people that they have to represent....shouldn’t this be broken a little more and maybe have a few more people involved that can get to know their constituents, too? The tax money has to pay for that. They have to pay their salaries. That’s a problem. No question about that. The last thing I want to do is raise taxes.”

And then there was the issue of how much difference the proposal would make:

“what I wonder is, is there a difference in what you can do between representing 450,000 as opposed to representing a little over 300,000. It’s 150,000 different. You’re still representing over 300,000 people. How can it make a real difference?”

B2 Expanding the size of districts and electing more than one legislative representative from each district

Support for this proposal was just under 50% both before and after. A significant lever of opposition comes from those want low taxes and small government. Or conversely those who are willing to support higher taxes and benefits provide a source of support. The equality index (equal opportunity, minimizing the gap between rich and poor and making sure no one suffers from lack of food or shelter) is a significant lever of support both before and after deliberation. After deliberation those placing a value on government reflecting “the will of the people” also tended to support this proposal. Participants who came to support this proposal may have concluded that multi member districts might allow for groups to get representation they might not have otherwise and hence have their interests represented.

The transcripts suggest that the public best understood this proposal by comparing it to proportional representation with multiple parties on the European model. Obviously, multi member districts do not amount to a system of proportional representation but the likelihood of multiple parties with multi member districts is what caught their attention:

“In proportional representation systems, overseas anyway, how it’s played out is you get smaller parties represented. So you get Green Party, you get far right parties. You get people who could never muster a majority from any district because just too far out there or too specialized.”

Another suggestion was that the need for multi-party cooperation might end up a good thing:
“But if you had a coalition where you had the Green party... and the Tea Party over here and all that, then you’d have to negotiate because the Democrat(s) don’t have a majority and the Republican(s) don’t have a majority....”

*But generally the transcripts express skepticism as to how it would work:
“If you look at Europe where that’s very common in all these countries, it doesn’t appear to work better than our system at all. They spend a lot of time starting all over, reconvening, forming new coalitions.”*

And people bring their own experience to the discussion:

“As a former Canadian, three party system, or multiple party system, as far as I can see, never worked up there. That’s the reason Canada can never get anything done. British Columbia, I used to live up there, and all they would do is gang up on each other.... Multiple parties don’t work.”

Proposal B3 Replacing the current State Senate and Assembly with a single house of 120 members

Support for this proposal increased significantly from 32 to 43%, but still well short of majority. A single house index of two questions was highly significant in identifying the levers of opinion change. On the one hand those who thought “a single house would make it easier to pass important legislation” tended to support the proposal. On the other hand, those who thought “a single house would deprive the system of important checks and balances” tended to oppose. In addition independents who thought local decisions were dominated by special interests tended to move against this proposal. The two key arguments—breaking the log jam of decision with a unicameral design, seen as an advantage, and losing checks and balances, seen as a disadvantage, were supported by the discussions in the transcripts:

“I personally think we probably at this point a unicameral House would be beneficial for California because they have such difficulty operating together anyway.”

“One thing I really want to talk about is the unicameral legislature. It’s really interesting to me... Get rid of both houses and you know, instead of having 40 Senators and 80 Assemblymen, have 120 Representatives. I mean I see that as being able to get more done.”

“Nebraska...I was there in 69, but Nebraska is a pretty efficient state and they seem to get things done. I like the idea of smaller districts and being able to talk to your specific legislator...I would prefer having maybe a unicameral, but having more members, where you can, where they’re in your community and you can actually speak with them...”

On the other hand, there was also discussion of checks and balances from two houses in almost a classic Madisonian argument about tyranny of the majority:

“The way our system is set up is on checks and balances. We need two groups, that’s necessary.”

“So they give each other a check. You can’t do one without the other. If you have one group, that’s almost like a dictatorship in the legislature.”

Proposal B4 Making the State Legislature part-time and paying legislators part-time salaries.

Support for this proposal dropped significantly from 45% at time 2 to 27% at time 3. The Part Time Legislature Index was highly significant. Those who thought “part-time legislators will represent their districts more closely” and those who thought “part-time legislators will be less likely to be career politicians” tended to support the proposal. But those who thought “part-time legislators will be more open to corruption” and “will be less informed about policy issues” tended to oppose. After deliberation, Democrats who thought the Legislature was able to get things done also tended to oppose this proposal. As for fundamental values, those concerned with equality and equal opportunity in policy outcomes (the equality index) moved to oppose this proposal as did those who valued education and an educated society (the importance of education index). Advocates of low taxes and small government tended to support this proposal as did those who were satisfied with the performance of local government.

The argument in favor was that they could get closer to their districts if they were part time. They could use technology and perhaps save money:

“You benefit two ways: one, you’re spending more time at your district and you’re actually involved with your area; two, you’re reducing the cost of the travel. And that’s a lot of money right there. I mean they have to kinda keep up with technology in a sense.”

“when I’m saying part-time is get them out of Sacramento. Let them be home. They could do their job on the internet.”

On the other hand with the common perception that the Legislature was not functioning well now and that the state had big problems, there was a greater sense that the state might get an even less effective legislature if it was part-time:

“I don’t want somebody part-time handling the decisions that’s gonna affect my life during the long term. There’s no such thing as half way crooked. You’re either all in or you’re not.”

“I feel very uncomfortable with taking work part-time because I feel---and just my opinion, a lot of people are doing part-time work...So when you give them that part-time, how much more part-time are they gonna be doing if you gave him that title already. Now, they’re gonna be doing even less work.”

Proposal B7 Lengthening Assembly terms from 2 years to 4, and Senate terms from 4 years to 6

Support for this proposal increased from 45.5% to 81% over the weekend. This large increase actually understates the overall change since this was one of the proposals asked at time 1, when the support was only 33%. An index of two empirical premises about this proposal, the Increasing State Legislator’s Terms Index was highly significant in the regressions and sheds light on the reasoning behind this change. Counting in favor of this proposal, those who agreed that “increasing state legislators’ terms will let them spend more time legislating” tended to support this proposal. Those who felt that “increasing state legislator’s terms will make them less responsive to their districts” tended to move against this proposal. These conclusions apply to Independents (decline to state) voters and to Republicans. In addition the interaction with Republicans for the Terms Index was also significant, indicating that Republicans who felt that increasing terms would give legislators more time to legislate and do their job also tended to support this proposal. On the other hand, Democrats who thought the Legislature was now able to get things done did not tend to support this proposal. And those independents who thought a part-time Legislature would work well did not tend to support this proposal for longer terms.

In the transcripts the arguments tended to back up the position that longer terms would allow more time for legislating rather than just campaigning and raising money:

“I think we need to expect from them that they have a long term. That they don’t get into office, like they do now, with a two year term and the first item of business is how can I get re-elected?”

“I think it’s really a good idea if they don’t have to run every two years. Because every two years they’re out there handing out their hands. You have to be influenced by who you get your money from.”

“Maybe longer term limits is the idea, but I don’t like the fact that they are constantly campaigning”

Longer terms might also give legislators the freedom from campaigning that might allow them to come to some agreements:

“If people aren’t worrying about being re-elected in six months, maybe they’ll compromise more and get the budget passed. But it’s like if I cave on this, I won’t get elected and people will remember because the election is coming up. .. Maybe a longer term will get people more likely to stay at the table and compromise and get something done.”

Proposal B9 Establishing clear goals for each government program and assessing whether progress is being made toward these goals at least once every ten years.

Support for this proposal started very high at 86% and increased to 90% after deliberation. The value of education, including the value of an educated society is highly significant as a lever of opinion change. Democrats who thought the legislature was deadlocked by party conflict also tended to support this proposal.

The basic idea of making the decisions adhere to standards over time had broad support in the transcripts: “I would like...some way of reviewing if programs work; and if they don’t, I’d like for them to stop. And if they do, I’d like for them to have more funding.”

Some of the participants offered a business analogy:

“I think there’s a good argument..for holding government to the same procedural and performance based standards as companies, especially public ones..”

“In business you have your three to five year business plan set and sure you might need to make some adjustments ...but three to five years out, you kind of have a framework for what your working on.”

But the business analogy suggests a twist on the proposal: the idea of an independent audit to strengthen confidence that the goals are adhered to:

“I would like B9 better if it included the audit independence concept somehow in there and the same for B8 economic impact analysis...someone who’s really competent to do that and is gonna present the numbers independently.”

Proposal C1 Transferring from the state to local governments control and financing of services provided at the local level and requiring minimum standards for delivering them

Support for this proposal started high and rose significantly from 67% to 73%. Satisfaction with local government was a significant lever of opinion change in support of this proposition. On the other hand, those who valued state over local authority tended to oppose this proposal. Independents who believed that decisions at the local level are likely to be dominated by special interests also tended to oppose this proposal.

The transcripts show support for the general concept of this proposal but also concerns about local corruption and disparities between communities that might result from local control. These concerns suggest areas that the various proposals need to address.

“If you are going to give power back to the local level...you need standards.”

“In my head I would much rather have the decisions on what streets get repaired or what happens here to the local government but playing devil’s advocate, I would say look at the Bell city situation.”

“If the money flows more to the locality and they have authority to spend it more than they have now, how do we as a state in the whole make sure that that money is being spent in a way that people get equal access and get equal treatment. Because that’s the struggle in passing—it’s the struggle between the federal government and the states....the issue is how do you pass the money and the authority down and still maintain your standards.”

“All communities will be required to set minimum standards. What I’m talking about is the con for that..may not address the current issue of wealthier areas of the state being better able to provide quality services...”

Proposal C2 Allowing local governments to raise taxes for local services in exchange for increased coordination of service delivery and public reporting of performance

Support for this proposal increased significantly from 54% to 63%. In the regressions, satisfaction with local government was a strong lever of opinion change in favor of this proposal as was the value of making public decisions together even when some disagree. Levers of opinion change against this proposal included the value of having a low tax/low service

government and the value of supporting state authority over local government. Those valuing equality and equal opportunity also tended to support this proposal.

The transcripts show openness to the idea of local governments taxing themselves when combined with transparent accountability:

“Maybe these services that are offered to our local government, in our local government, maybe in the past we have been too reliant on the state government or on the federal government. And now at this point, communities need to kind of shift their way of thinking and start thinking about how they can generate that income to provide those services.”

“I think this whole idea...I’ll say decentralizing and allowing, if you will, allowing money to stop at the community level rather than going back up to Sacramento and back down, should ultimately be a reflection of the services that we want our communities to provide. And I personally believe that communities should be allowed to determine the services they want. And ultimately, the effect of some of the tax limitations that came about in Prop 13, in many respects, limit the ability of...cities to exercise their independent discretion...can they get the money back from Sacramento to use it the way they want?”

There is also an idea that local officials can be held more accountable for how local taxes are spent:

“Well, I think it allows citizens to be more empowered and see where their money goes. People talked about that before, too. Like I support a tax when I know that that money’s actually being spent on fixing the pothole that’s on my street. If I can see the result of where that money goes, and I can feel confident about it, then I’m much more likely to support it...then you have local government officials who are right there accountable who you could run into in the supermarket.”

Proposal C4 Direct any savings resulting from successful local management of state resources to those local governments, in exchange for monitoring their own performance and being accountable and innovative in their operations

Support for this proposal was high both before and after deliberation (going from 74% to 76%). Satisfaction with local government and with the legislature were both levers of opinion change after deliberation. If you were satisfied with local government you tended to support this proposal. If you were satisfied with the legislature, you tended to oppose it. And if you valued collective decisions even when some disagree, then you tended to oppose. One key result: Independents who felt that decisions of local government were currently dominated by special interests tended to support this proposal.

In the transcripts, participants found the idea generally appealing:

“I like the idea of we give the money to the local government to do what they will with the services, and if they’re able to find a more efficient, effective way to do it, then whatever money that’s left over, they can use too. Like they don’t have to send that back to the state.”

However, they also worried that if the surpluses became substantial, they could generate further inequalities between communities:

“The problem I see with this is that some communities are more wealthy than others. If they..go about saving money, if they build their wealth and build their wealthy communities, rather than giving the money back to the state, the other communities are going to suffer.”

[comparing Glendale and Beverly Hills] “How are you gonna prevent that kind of pattern of inequality from developing across communities when.. richer communities tend to realize a greater surplus?”

“If you really decentralized, you could really end up with huge gaps in the quality of education because rich districts put their money in their districts and poor districts have less money to put in.”

Proposal C5 Requiring state and local governments to identify policy goals and publish their progress toward meeting them.

Support for this proposal rose from 89% to 92%. The value of education (including the value of an educated society) was a positive lever of opinion change for this proposal. The Economic Freedom index (which concerns people being able to decide for themselves how they will spend money) similarly had a positive effect. The only interaction of interest was that Democrats who thought that local government was likely to be dominated by special interests tended to oppose this proposal.

The transcripts show support for transparency and accountability:

“I see the fact that there’s no disclosure of anything. When you ask someone, they stonewall you. They hide everything...”

“Here’s C5, what I like about it is because they would be required to publish an annual report.”

And respondents also see synergy with C1:

“C1 combined with C5 would increase the accountability, where the government needs to set standards and goals and show how their decisions are meeting those goals.”

The hope is that the accountability would lead to action if goals were not met:

“They can set up a mechanism of review. If certain levels of performance weren’t achieved, the the city or government, local government, would have to come up with an action plan they could present to the state or whatever agency they’re under...then have a review sooner..within a couple years if you corrected it.”

But some questioned whether it was necessary:

“Proposal [C] 5 says they should identify explicitly the results they seek...Now you said yourself, the people that run efficiently, they already do that.”

Proposal D1 Requiring legislation creating new programs or tax cuts that cost \$25 million or more to indicate how they will be paid for

This proposal rose from 84% to 88% after deliberation. The regressions identify three of our basic values as positive levers of opinion change on this proposal—concern for equality, economic freedom (people being able to make their own choices with respect to money) and the notion that government needs to reflect “the will of the people.”

The transcripts show an awareness of the need for the state to find some means of controlling its finances:

“The current balanced budget requirement does not impose enough fiscal discipline because we have seen budget gimmicks in the past years that allow the state to spend more than income revenues cover.”

[comparing this proposal to:] *what did Arnold do? He couldn’t balance the budget so he just borrowed.”*

On the other hand, the pay go requirement may render vulnerable programs that do not have powerful supporters:

“I like the transparency and seeing how much something’s going to cost, but I’m concerned about the third point on the con side. When they are looking for funding sources, they can delve into budget areas that do not have this powerful support entity and say “okay that’s where we’re going to take the money.”

Respondents see the logic of both the revenue and spending sides of the proposal:

“when I look at this pay as you go, if you have an idea for a new program, or you wanna say I wanna implement this tax cut, you have to say, well, what’s gonna change? What program are we gonna eliminate in order to have that tax cut, or what are we gonna do to make sure that we have enough to cover our expenses, which is what you would do with your own money, right, like you pay as you go.”

“It’s a double negative. It’s sort of an odd way of phrasing it, but yeah, if you’re gonna cut down in revenue, you have to figure out how that new gap in revenue is gonna be met by anything else.”

Proposal D5 Reassessing non-residential property more frequently than now

Support for this proposal increased significantly from 52% to 72%.

The equality index is a strong lever of opinion change in favor of this proposal. The economic freedom index, focused on people being able to make their own individual choices about their money, counts against it. In the regression on basic orientations, those who favor low taxes and small government tended to move against this proposal, but those who were in favor of making collective decisions even when some disagreed tended to support it. Democrats tended to support this proposal as did those who believed in state authority rather than local decisions.

Independents who favored a part time legislature tended to move against as did Republicans. Democrats who thought the legislature was in partisan deadlock tended to favor.

The transcripts show an awareness of fairness and equality arguments in support of this idea:

“It’s a split roll where commercial property gets reassessed every five years or something instead of never. Commercial property, technically, can never change hands even though the company that runs it can change or its owned by a holding company that leases it out to the people who actually operate it, so it will never change hands. They enjoy all the benefits and it’s the homeowners who have to shoulder the burden.”

“I have a problem with it in that it hurts small businesses the most. And small businesses are a big part of the economy and one reason why the economy is in such bad shape right now.”

“Right now you have (mention of a big aerospace company) owns a huge tract of land in the middle of LA. The same people basically own it...that hundreds of millions of dollars piece of property is still being taxed at 1976 rates.”

“I like how it says it increases fairness between residential and non-residential property.”

Proposal D7 Decreasing the super-majority vote required in the Legislature to raise taxes (about 67%) to 55%

Support for this proposal rose from 32% to 50%. The regressions show some basic values as levers of opinion change. The equality index works in favor while the economic freedom index (which may lead to opposition to most tax increases) lessens support. Those who believe in low

taxes and small government tend to oppose as do Republicans in general. But those who believe in the need for collective decisions even when some disagree tend to support this proposal. Independents who agree to the part-time legislature index (that part-time legislators will represent their districts more closely and will be less likely to be career politicians) tended to be against this proposal. The more independents thought the government wasted money, the more they opposed this proposal. Interestingly, Republicans who supported the part-time legislature index tended to support this proposal as did Democrats who thought there was government waste.

The transcripts focus on the deadlock in government balanced against some protection for minority points of view. The question they debate is what is the right threshold?

“I think that threshold is just too high. Because the way things are now you can’t get enough cooperation in both parties with a two-thirds rule to get the revenue that we need. So I think it’s just too high right now, two thirds.”

“Two-thirds is really difficult to get something passed. I mean I worked on two different tax increase things on property taxes, one for schools and one for that we actually passed for the fire department. And to get two thirds majority on those votes is a really difficult threshold to meet.”

“The reason for some higher percentage is that the higher you go, the more it’s okay, acceptable, to force whatever the position, whether it’s taxes or whatever, on an objecting minority. That principle is just basic in founding this country. The reason I could never support a 51 per cent vote on revenue issues. I just think it’s too oppressive. But I could say you could go from 66 to 60.”

“When people talk about the gridlock and removing the two-thirds majority, I cringe. Because basically what you are saying is we want a one-party rule and it doesn’t matter what party is in power. Just the principle of taking away the bargaining chip from the other party. When you but heads you force people to compromise. But if everything passed on a simple majority then you’re just giving power to one party.”

ⁱ Deliberative Polling is a trade mark of James S. Fishkin. Any fees from the trade mark go to support research at the Center for Deliberative Democracy at Stanford University. For more on Deliberative Polling see <http://cdd.stanford.edu>.

ⁱⁱ Detailed quantitative results for every proposal are presented in the body of the report.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. COMPLETE BEFORE AND AFTER RESPONSES, WITH MEANS2

2. INITIAL PHONE SURVEY WITH PRE AND POST DELIBERATION RESULTS 17

3. REPRESENTATIVENESS ANALYSIS: PARTICIPANTS VS. COMPARISON GROUP (NON-PARTICIPANTS) 21

4. KNOWLEDGE GAINS 30

5. EVALUATIONS 32

1. COMPLETE BEFORE AND AFTER RESPONSES, WITH MEANS

What's Next California Report: Summary Results

Attitude Change Results (** $p < .01$, * $p < .05$, + $p < .10$; Valid percentages are reported for valid responses. Raw percentages are reported for DK/NA responses.)

	T2	T3	T3-T2
1. To begin with, all in all, on a 0 to 10 scale, where 0 is "extremely poorly", 10 is "extremely well," and 5 is exactly in the middle, how well or poorly would you say the system of democracy in California works these days?	0.406	0.475	0.069**
0-4	61.3	47.0	
5	17.9	14.4	
6-10	20.8	38.7	
(DK/NA)	(16)	(12.1)	
2. On a 0 to 10 scale, where 0 is "extremely undesirable", 10 is "extremely desirable," and 5 is exactly in the middle, how desirable or undesirable would you say each of the following is?	0.609	0.692	0.084**
a. Creating a formal review process to allow an initiative's proponents to amend an initiative following public input			
0-4	21.6	15.8	
5	19.0	8.6	
6-10	59.3	75.7	
(DK/NA)	(9.2)	(1.5)	
b. Allowing the Legislature to remove an initiative from the ballot by enacting it into law	0.442	0.449	0.012
0-4	49.5	48.6	
5	13.4	16.8	
6-10	37.2	34.6	
(DK/NA)	(9.7)	(3.4)	
c. Allowing a simple majority of the State Legislature to place a countermeasure to an already qualified initiative on the ballot next to that initiative	0.423	0.389	-0.035*
0-4	50.1	56.9	
5	17.2	12.9	
6-10	32.6	30.2	
(DK/NA)	(8.5)	(1.9)	
d. Allowing the Legislature to amend an initiative that has already passed, subject to a public review and the agreement of the initiative's proponents	0.467	0.421	-0.049*
0-4	44.0	50.6	
5	13.5	12.5	
6-10	42.6	36.8	
(DK/NA)	(8.3)	(1.2)	
e. Allowing the Legislature to amend an initiative that has already passed, subject to a two-thirds vote, even if an initiative's proponents do not agree with the amendment	0.346	0.283	-0.065**
0-4	61.2	72.6	
5	14.7	9.2	
6-10	24.2	18.2	
(DK/NA)	(7.5)	(2.7)	
f. Allowing an initiative's proponents to withdraw it after it qualifies for the ballot	0.556	0.613	0.059**
0-4	31.6	26.1	
5	21.0	16.8	
6-10	47.3	56.9	

	(DK/NA)	(8.7)	(3.4)	
g. Requiring all ballot measures that require new expenditures to indicate how they will be paid for		0.843	0.806	-0.034**
	0-4	5.2	8.7	
	5	6.3	6.8	
	6-10	88.6	84.5	
	(DK/NA)	(6.8)	(3.9)	
h. Requiring the ballot pamphlet to provide an analysis by the Legislative Analyst of how new initiative programs will likely be paid for		0.826	0.857	0.031*
	0-4	6.2	4.1	
	5	7.2	4.5	
	6-10	86.6	91.4	
	(DK/NA)	(6.1)	(2.2)	
i. Making the vote threshold needed to pass an initiative the same as any vote threshold that the initiative itself requires of the public in the future		0.677	0.697	0.018
	0-4	13.2	13.8	
	5	20.7	19.0	
	6-10	66.3	67.2	
	(DK/NA)	(18.9)	(8.3)	
j. Publishing the top five contributors for and against each ballot measure in the ballot pamphlet		0.815	0.885	0.072**
	0-4	8.4	4.7	
	5	9.2	4.0	
	6-10	82.4	91.3	
	(DK/NA)	(7.3)	(2.2)	
k. Increasing the number of Assembly districts from 80 to 120		0.622	0.653	0.031+
	0-4	22.8	21.0	
	5	16.7	16.4	
	6-10	60.5	62.6	
	(DK/NA)	(12.9)	(3.9)	
l. electing more than one representative from each assembly and senate district with the winners receiving seats proportional to votes		0.528	0.537	0.007
	0-4	33.8	34.6	
	5	18.2	16.6	
	6-10	48.0	48.9	
	(DK/NA)	(14.8)	(6.6)	
m. Replacing the current State Senate and Assembly with a single house of 120 members		0.439	0.469	0.030
	0-4	42.7	43.0	
	5	25.3	14.2	
	6-10	32.0	42.7	
	(DK/NA)	(13.6)	(2.7)	
n. Making the State Legislature part-time and paying legislators part-time salaries		0.505	0.353	-0.154**
	0-4	41.8	63.9	
	5	12.9	9.1	
	6-10	45.3	26.9	
	(DK/NA)	(11.7)	(1.7)	
o. Reducing the length of the state legislative session and requiring legislators to spend more time in their districts		0.620	0.538	-0.083**
	0-4	24.0	35.6	
	5	18.7	18.2	
	6-10	57.4	46.2	
	(DK/NA)	(9.0)	(1.2)	

What's Next California Report: Summary Results

p. Allowing voters to rank the candidates in order of preference, so that the winner can be decided without a second election	0.614	0.583	-0.031+
0-4	26.2	30.1	
5	12.7	12.5	
6-10	61.0	57.6	
(DK/NA)	(8.3)	(4.6)	
q. Lengthening Assembly terms from 2 years to 4, and Senate terms from 4 years to 6	0.501	0.774	0.277**
0-4	40.4	10.9	
5	14.2	8.4	
6-10	45.5	80.7	
(DK/NA)	(9.2)	(1.9)	
r. Requiring economic impact analyses of major legislation before passage	0.824	0.837	0.012
0-4	3.5	4.8	
5	8.2	5.3	
6-10	88.5	89.8	
(DK/NA)	(7.8)	(2.2)	
s. Establishing clear goals for each government program and assessing whether progress is being made toward these goals at least once every ten years	0.806	0.847	0.040**
0-4	5.6	4.4	
5	8.8	5.9	
6-10	85.7	89.7	
(DK/NA)	(6.6)	(1.2)	
t. Requiring the Governor and the Legislature to adopt two-year instead of one-year budgets	0.617	0.717	0.100**
0-4	18.8	13.3	
5	25.3	14.8	
6-10	56.0	72.1	
(DK/NA)	(11.9)	(2.9)	
u. Requiring the Governor and the Legislature to publish three and five year budget projections prior to the budget vote each year	0.736	0.777	0.042**
0-4	7.5	7.7	
5	12.1	10.0	
6-10	80.3	82.7	
(DK/NA)	(10.0)	(2.9)	
v. Transferring from the state to local governments control and financing of services provided at the local level <i>and</i> requiring minimum standards for delivering them	0.635	0.697	0.066**
0-4	17.1	13.1	
5	16.1	13.7	
6-10	66.7	73.2	
(DK/NA)	(9.5)	(2.4)	
w. Allowing local governments to raise taxes for local services in exchange for increased coordination of service delivery and public reporting of performance	0.542	0.621	0.080**
0-4	30.7	21.6	
5	15.2	15.3	
6-10	54.2	63.1	
(DK/NA)	(9.0)	(3.4)	
x. Creating a stable source of funds for regional priorities by dedicating a portion of tax revenue from economic growth to those priorities	0.659	0.667	0.010
0-4	11.6	11.0	

5	21.6	21.1	
6-10	66.7	67.9	
(DK/NA)	(14.6)	(7.0)	
y. Direct any savings resulting from successful local management of state resources to those local governments, in exchange for monitoring their own performance and being accountable and innovative in their operations	0.718	0.721	0.003
0-4	12.7	11.9	
5	12.8	11.5	
6-10	74.4	76.7	
(DK/NA)	(9.0)	(3.2)	
z. Requiring state and local governments to identify policy goals and publish their progress toward meeting them	0.811	0.841	0.028**
0-4	4.5	2.9	
5	6.8	5.0	
6-10	88.8	92.0	
(DK/NA)	(6.8)	(1.9)	
aa. Requiring legislation creating new programs that cost \$25 million or more to indicate how they will be paid for	0.850	0.851	-0.001
0-4	4.2	4.7	
5	5.2	5.2	
6-10	90.7	90.0	
(DK/NA)	(6.3)	(1.9)	
ab. Requiring legislation creating tax cuts that cost \$25 million or more to indicate how they will be paid for	0.800	0.812	0.009
0-4	10.1	7.9	
5	6.3	7.6	
6-10	83.5	84.6	
(DK/NA)	(7.0)	(3.6)	
ac. Requiring legislation creating new programs or tax cuts that cost \$25 million or more to indicate how they will be paid for	0.800	0.830	0.029*
0-4	7.8	5.6	
5	8.1	6.5	
6-10	84.2	87.8	
(DK/NA)	(6.8)	(2.7)	
ad. Requiring that one-time revenue spikes only be spent on one-time projects, paying off debt, and filling the state rainy-day fund	0.777	0.803	0.020+
0-4	8.0	9.3	
5	11.9	6.8	
6-10	79.9	84.1	
(DK/NA)	(12.6)	(2.9)	
ae. Increasing the size of the State's rainy-day fund from 5% to 10% of the State budget	0.692	0.710	0.014
0-4	13.8	14.3	
5	20.8	18.1	
6-10	65.4	67.7	
(DK/NA)	(12.4)	(4.9)	
af. Applying the sales tax to services as well as goods while reducing the sales tax rate	0.447	0.497	0.049*
0-4	44.8	40.3	
5	17.2	14.3	
6-10	38.1	45.4	
(DK/NA)	(9.5)	(1.7)	
ag. Applying the sales tax to services as well as goods while keeping the current sales tax rate	0.332	0.312	-0.022
0-4	60.7	69.6	

What's Next California Report: Summary Results

	5	15.3	10.0	
	6-10	24.0	20.6	
	(DK/NA)	(9.7)	(2.9)	
ah. Limiting the current California state income tax deduction for home mortgage interest payments to \$25,000 per year		0.494	0.507	0.012
	0-4	37.1	39.9	
	5	20.5	16.3	
	6-10	42.4	43.8	
	(DK/NA)	(18.2)	(7.5)	
ai. Reassessing non-residential property more frequently than now		0.558	0.697	0.139**
	0-4	27.2	15.7	
	5	20.6	12.4	
	6-10	52.4	71.9	
	(DK/NA)	(15.0)	(2.2)	
aj. Reassessing all property values more frequently while adjusting the current property tax exemption for inflation to about \$28,000 <i>and</i> allowing the exemption to rise with property values going forward		0.433	0.404	-0.030
	0-4	40.0	47.8	
	5	25.4	19.3	
	6-10	34.6	32.9	
	(DK/NA)	(23.5)	(12.1)	
ak. Allowing local electorates to raise the property tax rate above the current 1% rate cap		0.345	0.352	0.007
	0-4	61.9	58.8	
	5	10.6	12.6	
	6-10	27.6	28.6	
	(DK/NA)	(12.6)	(3.4)	
al. Lowering local vote requirement to adopt taxes dedicated to specific purposes, to a simple majority so that it is the same as the vote requirement to adopt taxes for general purposes		0.486	0.483	-0.001
	0-4	38.1	40.8	
	5	16.3	16.3	
	6-10	45.8	42.9	
	(DK/NA)	(11.9)	(3.2)	
am. Decreasing the super-majority vote required in the Legislature to raise taxes (about 67%) to 55%		0.385	0.489	0.106**
	0-4	59.1	42.5	
	5	9.4	7.8	
	6-10	31.6	49.9	
	(DK/NA)	(9.5)	(2.9)	
3. If the Legislature is allowed to amend an initiative that has already passed, by what sort of majority should it be able to do so?		0.774	0.782	0.008
	A simple majority (50% plus 1)	13.2	8.9	
	55%	17.8	26.4	
	A two-thirds majority	69.1	64.7	
	(DK/NA)	(26.1)	(19.1)	
4. Some people think that the Legislature should contain fewer Legislators, even if that means that each Legislator represents more people. Suppose these people are at one end of a 1-to-7 scale, at point 1. Other people think that each Legislator should represent fewer people, even if that means that the Legislature contains more Legislators. Suppose these people are at the other end of the scale, at point 7. People who are exactly in the middle are at point 4, and of		0.659	0.764	0.059**

course other people have opinions at other points between 1 and 7. Where would you place yourself on this scale, or wouldn't you have any opinion about that?			
Fewer legislators (1-3)	19.2	9.6	
Exactly in the middle (4)	23.2	19.5	
More legislators (5-7)	57.6	70.9	
(DK/NA)	(10.2)	(3.2)	
5. On a 0 to 10 scale, where 0 is "not at all", 10 is "as much as could reasonably be expected," and 5 is exactly in the middle, how much or little would you say the California State Legislature is able to get important things done?	0.346	0.354	0.008
0-4	67.5	69.2	
5	15.9	10.3	
6-10	16.6	20.4	
(DK/NA)	(6.8)	(1.5)	
6. On another 0 to 10 scale, where 0 is "not at all", 10 is "completely", and 5 is exactly in the middle, to what extent is the ability of the State Legislature to get things done affected by tensions between the political parties?	0.646	0.683	0.031*
0-4	27.7	21.7	
5	8.5	5.9	
6-10	63.7	72.5	
(DK/NA)	(6.3)	(1.5)	
7. And, on another 0 to 10 scale, where 0 is completely at the local level, 10 is completely at the State level, and 5 is exactly in the middle, how much decision-making authority should there be at the local level versus the State level?	0.467	0.471	0.005
0-4	42.2	43.3	
5	31.3	29.7	
6-10	26.5	27.0	
(DK/NA)	(6.8)	(1.9)	
8. And, on the same scale, how much taxation power should there be at the local level versus State level?	0.498	0.508	0.010
0-4	33.7	33.2	
5	39.1	32.5	
6-10	27.2	34.6	
(DK/NA)	(8.7)	(2.9)	
9. On the same scale, where would you say the most important public policy decisions should be made?	0.554	0.570	0.016
0-4	26.1	25.8	
5	29.7	26.3	
6-10	44.3	48.0	
(DK/NA)	(6.8)	(1.2)	
10. On another 0 to 10 scale, where 0 is "completely by voters in referendums", 10 is "completely by the State Legislature", and 5 is exactly in the middle, how many of the State's major decisions should be made by voters in referendums versus by the State Legislature?	0.547	0.547	0.000
0-4	31.1	28.9	
5	24.3	26.5	
6-10	44.6	44.8	
(DK/NA)	(10.2)	(2.9)	
11. Some people think that decisions made at the local level reflect the will of the local community more closely than decisions made at the state level. Suppose these people are at one end of a 1-to-7 scale, at point 1. Other people think that decisions made at the local level are more dominated by powerful special interests than decisions made at	0.465	0.408	-0.027**

What's Next California Report: Summary Results

the state level. Suppose these people are at the other end of the scale, at point 7. People who are exactly in the middle are at point 4, and of course other people have opinions at other points between 1 and 7. Where would you place yourself on this scale, or wouldn't you have any opinion about that?			
Reflect local community (1-3)	47.7	56.6	
Exactly in the middle (4)	24.2	22.5	
Dominated by special interests (5-7)	28.1	21.0	
(DK/NA)	(11.9)	(5.1)	
12. Out of every \$100 that government raises in additional taxes, how many dollars would you say are wasted? Please write a number between 0 and 100.	\$ 45.110	\$ 39.280	-5.873**
(DK/NA)			
13. How strongly would you agree or disagree that replacing the current State Senate and Assembly with a single house would...	0.579	0.644	0.068**
a. make it easier to pass important legislation			
Agree strongly (1)	17.3	24.6	
Agree somewhat	34.8	38.1	
Neither agree nor disagree	19.7	15.3	
Disagree somewhat	16.7	13.6	
Disagree strongly (0)	11.5	8.4	
(DK/NA)	(11.4)	(5.1)	
b. deprive the system of important checks and balances	0.647	0.637	-0.010
Agree strongly (1)	31.4	29.1	
Agree somewhat	27.0	29.1	
Neither agree nor disagree	19.4	13.8	
Disagree somewhat	13.1	18.4	
Disagree strongly (0)	9.0	9.7	
(DK/NA)	(11.2)	(4.9)	
14. And, how strongly would you agree or disagree with each of the following statements about making the State Legislature part-time and paying State Legislators part-time salaries?	0.498	0.402	-0.098**
a. Part-time legislators will tend to represent their districts more closely.			
Agree strongly (1)	15.9	9.9	
Agree somewhat	27.0	22.1	
Neither agree nor disagree	17.5	16.1	
Disagree somewhat	20.6	25.3	
Disagree strongly (0)	19.0	26.6	
(DK/NA)	(8.3)	(2.2)	
b. Part-time legislators will be less likely to be career politicians.	0.696	0.659	-0.037*
Agree strongly (1)	30.4	25.4	
Agree somewhat	41.0	41.7	
Neither agree nor disagree	11.6	11.9	
Disagree somewhat	9.5	11.4	
Disagree strongly (0)	7.4	9.6	
(DK/NA)	(8.3)	(1.7)	
c. Part-time legislators will tend to be more open to corruption.	0.448	0.494	0.047**
Agree strongly (1)	9.7	11.3	
Agree somewhat	17.2	20.4	
Neither agree nor disagree	33.8	34.0	

Disagree somewhat	21.9	21.2	
Disagree strongly (0)	17.5	13.1	
(DK/NA)	(12.4)	(3.6)	
d. Part-time legislators will tend to be less well informed about policy issues.	0.525	0.615	0.090**
Agree strongly (1)	14.9	24.3	
Agree somewhat	30.1	29.8	
Neither agree nor disagree	19.5	19.9	
Disagree somewhat	20.5	15.6	
Disagree strongly (0)	14.9	10.4	
(DK/NA)	(9.0)	(2.2)	
15. And how strongly would you agree or disagree with each of the following statements about the length of legislative terms?	0.502	0.324	-0.175**
a. Increasing State Legislators' terms will make them less responsive to their districts.			
Agree strongly (1)	11.4	3.7	
Agree somewhat	29.2	13.8	
Neither agree nor disagree	20.7	16.8	
Disagree somewhat	26.3	38.8	
Disagree strongly (0)	12.5	26.9	
(DK/NA)	(8.5)	(1.7)	
b. Increasing State Legislators' terms will let them spend less time fundraising and campaigning and more time legislating.	0.667	0.786	0.119**
Agree strongly (1)	25.4	42.6	
Agree somewhat	42.3	39.4	
Neither agree nor disagree	13.2	9.2	
Disagree somewhat	11.1	5.2	
Disagree strongly (0)	7.9	3.5	
(DK/NA)	(8.3)	(2.7)	
16. Next we'd like to get your ratings of performance of some California political leaders and institutions. On a 0 to 10 scale, where 0 is completely dissatisfied, 10 is completely satisfied, and 5 is exactly in the middle, how satisfied or dissatisfied are you with each of the following in office?	0.276	0.268	-0.008
a. Arnold Schwarzenegger			
0-4	75.0	74.5	
5	12.0	13.5	
6-10	13.0	12.2	
(DK/NA)	(6.8)	(3.2)	
b. Jerry Brown	0.528	0.567	0.039**
0-4	31.2	25.5	
5	19.8	20.8	
6-10	48.9	53.7	
(DK/NA)	(11.7)	(7.8)	
c. California State Senate	0.325	0.331	0.005
0-4	69.2	68.4	
5	18.9	18.4	
6-10	11.9	13.2	
(DK/NA)	(16.5)	(7.5)	
d. California State Assembly	0.326	0.332	0.005
0-4	67.9	70.9	
5	19.7	16.1	
6-10	12.4	13.0	

What's Next California Report: Summary Results

	(DK/NA)	(13.8)	(6.8)	
e. California State Legislature		0.308	0.322	0.014
	0-4	71.2	70.5	
	5	18.9	17.6	
	6-10	9.9	11.9	
	(DK/NA)	(13.8)	(6.3)	
f. California's initiative/referendum process		0.422	0.501	0.078**
	0-4	50.1	37.4	
	5	20.9	18.6	
	6-10	29.0	44.0	
	(DK/NA)	(11.9)	(3.4)	
g. California's State government		0.320	0.356	0.037**
	0-4	71.9	64.5	
	5	15.6	18.8	
	6-10	12.5	16.8	
	(DK/NA)	(8.5)	(1.9)	
h. Your city/town and county's government		0.502	0.549	0.047**
	0-4	37.3	28.6	
	5	19.3	19.4	
	6-10	43.4	52.0	
	(DK/NA)	(8.3)	(2.4)	
i. California's local governments generally		0.463	0.511	0.049**
	0-4	39.0	30.3	
	5	29.2	32.4	
	6-10	31.9	37.4	
	(DK/NA)	(15.3)	(10.2)	
17. Next, we'd like to get your feelings toward some of California political parties, offices, and institutions, using what is sometimes called a "feeling thermometer." Ratings between 50 degrees and 100 degrees mean that you feel favorable or warm toward a party, person, or institution. Ratings between 0 degrees and 50 degrees mean that you feel unfavorable or cold toward it. Ratings at exactly 50 degrees mean you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward it. If you don't know the party, person, or institution well enough to rate it, just bubble in "can't say."				
a. Democratic party		51.58	51.08	-0.505
	(DK/NA)			
b. Republican party		38.38	38.34	-0.040
	(DK/NA)			
18. Some people think that local communities should be able to decide their own taxes and services, even if that means big differences between communities. Suppose these people are at one end of a 1-to-7 scale, at point 1. Other people think that taxes and services should be the same throughout the state, even if that means less local control. Suppose these people are at the other end of the scale, at point 7. People who are exactly in the middle are at point 4. Where would you place yourself on this scale, or wouldn't you have any opinion about that?		0.514	0.508	0.036

Local communities (1-3)	39.9	42.3	
Exactly in the middle (4)	20.4	20.0	
Same throughout the state (5-7)	39.8	37.7	
(DK/NA)	(8.5)	(1.9)	
19. Some people think that government should provide certain benefits and services, even if that means higher taxes. Suppose these people are at one end of a 1-to-7 scale, at point 1. Other people think that government should lower taxes, even if that means reduced benefits and services. Suppose these people are at the other end of the scale, at point 7. People who are exactly in the middle are at point 4. Where would you place yourself on this scale, or wouldn't you have any opinion about that?	0.474	0.409	-0.084**
Provide services (1-3)	45.4	57.0	
Exactly in the middle (4)	17.3	15.0	
Lower taxes (5-7)	37.3	28.1	
(DK/NA)	(6.1)	(1.5)	
20. Some people think that majorities should always have their way no matter how big the minorities are or how strongly they feel. Suppose these people are at one end of a 1-to-7 scale, at point 1. Other people think that minorities should have their way when they are large enough or feel strongly enough. Suppose these people are at the other end of the scale, at point 7. People who are exactly in the middle are at point 4. Where would you place yourself on this scale, or wouldn't you have any opinion about that?	0.504	0.499	-0.012
Majorities have their way (1-3)	34.5	36.9	
Exactly in the middle (4)	32.9	32.6	
Minorities have their way (5-7)	32.7	30.5	
(DK/NA)	(11.4)	(6.1)	
21. Some people think that the best society is one in which nobody can tell anybody else what to do, even if there is a cost to others. Suppose these people are at one end of a 1-to-7 scale, at point 1. Other people think that the best society is one in which the community can decide together what people can and cannot do, even if some people object. Suppose these people are at the other end of the scale, at point 7. People who are exactly in the middle are at point 4. Where would you place yourself on this scale, or wouldn't you have any opinion about that?	0.653	0.608	-0.018**
Nobody can tell anybody else what to do (1-3)	17.7	20.1	
Exactly in the middle (4)	19.0	22.4	
Community can decide (5-7)	63.4	57.5	
(DK/NA)	(8.0)	(1.2)	
22. Some people think that the best government is one in which everyone gets to vote directly on making the laws. Suppose these people are at one end of a 1-to-7 scale, at point 1. Other people think that the best government is one in which everyone gets to vote for representatives who then vote on making the laws. Suppose these people are at the other end of the scale, at point 7. People who are exactly in the middle are at point 4. Where would you place yourself on this scale, or wouldn't you have any opinion about that?	0.524	0.545	0.016
Everyone votes on laws (1-3)	35.0	34.2	
Exactly in the middle (4)	19.3	16.3	
Representatives vote on laws (5-7)	45.6	49.5	
(DK/NA)	(7.0)	(1.9)	
23. Here are some things that people find more or less important for themselves or society to have. On a 0 to 10 scale, where 0 is extremely unimportant, 10 is extremely important, and 5 is exactly in the middle, how important or unimportant would you say each of the	0.798	0.807	0.005

What's Next California Report: Summary Results

23. Here are some things that people find more or less important for themselves or society to have. On a 0 to 10 scale, where 0 is extremely unimportant, 10 is extremely important, and 5 is exactly in the middle, how important or unimportant would you say each of the following is to you?	0.798	0.807	0.005
a. Seeing to it that everyone has equal opportunities			
0-4	10.5	11.5	
5	8.5	6.1	
6-10	80.9	82.5	
(DK/NA)	(5.8)	(0.5)	
b. Leaving people and companies free to compete economically	0.677	0.687	0.009
0-4	19.9	17.2	
5	16.0	14.0	
6-10	64.1	68.8	
(DK/NA)	(7.3)	(1.5)	
c. Making one's own choices	0.808	0.826	0.016+
0-4	4.3	3.2	
5	10.8	5.0	
6-10	84.8	91.9	
(DK/NA)	(5.6)	(1.9)	
d. Not having to worry about being fired	0.537	0.562	0.026*
0-4	37.9	36.4	
5	19.3	16.5	
6-10	43.0	47.2	
(DK/NA)	(6.8)	(2.9)	
e. Making sure that nobody suffers from lack of food or shelter	0.750	0.808	0.059**
0-4	14.5	11.2	
5	12.0	6.3	
6-10	73.6	82.5	
(DK/NA)	(4.6)	(0.5)	
f. Earning as much money as possible	0.594	0.612	0.018+
0-4	26.5	30.2	
5	21.6	12.7	
6-10	51.9	56.9	
(DK/NA)	(4.6)	(0.7)	
g. Getting to decide exactly what to do with everything I earn	0.696	0.699	0.001
0-4	19.3	19.5	
5	12.8	11.5	
6-10	68.0	69.0	
(DK/NA)	(5.1)	(0.5)	
h. Making sure that government does what the people want	0.795	0.844	0.050**
0-4	5.9	2.6	
5	10.2	4.9	
6-10	83.8	92.5	
(DK/NA)	(4.9)	(0.5)	
i. Minimizing the gap between rich and poor	0.645	0.638	-0.006

j. Promoting economic growth	0.824	0.840	0.016+
0-4	5.2	3.1	
5	5.4	3.7	
6-10	89.3	93.1	
(DK/NA)	(6.1)	(1.2)	
k. Being able to get a good education	0.890	0.905	0.014
0-4	3.1	1.9	
5	4.1	1.7	
6-10	92.8	96.3	
(DK/NA)	(4.4)	(0.7)	
l. Having a well educated society	0.893	0.902	0.008
0-4	2.7	1.8	
5	3.6	1.7	
6-10	93.9	96.4	
(DK/NA)	(4.6)	(0.7)	
m. Having a safe community	0.914	0.917	0.003
0-4	1.8	0.8	
5	2.5	0.7	
6-10	95.7	98.2	
(DK/NA)	(4.6)	(1.7)	
n. Making sure everybody has clean air and water	0.896	0.913	0.017+
0-4	4.4	0.9	
5	3.6	2.9	
6-10	92.0	96.0	
(DK/NA)	(4.6)	(1.0)	
24. And how strongly would you agree or disagree with the following statements?	0.364	0.459	0.093**
a. Public officials care a lot about what people like me think.			
Agree strongly (1)	2.6	4.7	
Agree somewhat	22.7	32.4	
Neither agree nor disagree	14.7	15.7	
Disagree somewhat	38.1	34.4	
Disagree strongly (0)	21.9	12.8	
(DK/NA)	(5.8)	(1.2)	
b. Most public policy issues are so complicated that a person like me can't really understand what's going on.	0.438	0.455	0.018
Agree strongly (1)	13.4	14.7	
Agree somewhat	24.5	27.9	
Neither agree nor disagree	12.9	10.3	
Disagree somewhat	22.7	20.1	
Disagree strongly (0)	26.5	27.0	
(DK/NA)	(5.8)	(1.0)	
c. People like me don't have any say about what the government does.	0.501	0.416	-0.086**
Agree strongly (1)	14.6	6.8	
Agree somewhat	27.1	25.9	
Neither agree nor disagree	17.8	14.6	
Disagree somewhat	26.8	33.8	
Disagree strongly (0)	13.8	18.9	
(DK/NA)	(8.5)	(3.6)	
d. I have opinions about politics that are worth listening to.	0.806	0.798	-0.008

What's Next California Report: Summary Results

d. I have opinions about politics that are worth listening to.	0.806	0.798	-0.008
Agree strongly (1)	46.8	48.0	
Agree somewhat	37.1	34.0	
Neither agree nor disagree	9.9	9.9	
Disagree somewhat	3.1	3.7	
Disagree strongly (0)	3.1	4.4	
(DK/NA)	(6.6)	(1.5)	
25. Now we'd like you to think about the people who <i>disagree strongly</i> with you about issues like those we've been asking you about. How strongly would you agree or disagree with each of the following statements about those people?	0.570	0.537	-0.035*
a. They just don't know enough			
0-4	25.5	29.6	
5	25.5	23.4	
6-10	49.0	46.8	
(DK/NA)	(8.7)	(2.7)	
b. They believe some things that aren't true	0.670	0.651	-0.021
0-4	12.2	16.4	
5	19.6	15.4	
6-10	68.2	68.3	
(DK/NA)	(8.3)	(2.2)	
c. They are not thinking clearly	0.534	0.489	-0.044**
0-4	28.3	38.7	
5	32.9	25.0	
6-10	38.8	36.4	
(DK/NA)	(10.0)	(5.8)	
d. They have good reasons; there just are better ones on the other side	0.604	0.609	0.004
0-4	18.2	18.8	
5	26.3	24.9	
6-10	55.5	56.3	
(DK/NA)	(9.5)	(4.4)	
e. They are looking out for their own interests	0.728	0.708	-0.021
0-4	7.4	12.9	
5	17.6	13.2	
6-10	75.0	73.8	
(DK/NA)	(7.5)	(2.4)	
26. And how strongly would you agree or disagree with each of the following statements, also referring to people who disagree strongly with you about issues like those we've been asking you about?	0.190	0.172	-0.018**
a. I respect their point of view, even though it is different from mine.			
Agree strongly (1)	41.3	48.5	
Agree somewhat	39.0	39.2	
Neither agree nor disagree	9.7	5.4	
Disagree somewhat	8.4	4.9	
Disagree strongly (0)	1.5	2.0	
(DK/NA)	(4.9)	(1.0)	
b. It is hopeless to reach agreement with them.	0.321	0.331	0.009
Agree strongly (1)	4.4	5.4	

Neither agree nor disagree	32.1	23.1	
Disagree somewhat	30.1	31.2	
Disagree strongly (0)	11.3	15.7	
(DK/NA)	(5.6)	(1.2)	
c. I would be willing to compromise to find a solution we both can support.	0.193	0.187	-0.006
Agree strongly (1)	37.3	40.3	
Agree somewhat	43.3	44.0	
Neither agree nor disagree	10.9	8.1	
Disagree somewhat	6.5	5.2	
Disagree strongly (0)	2.1	2.5	
(DK/NA)	(6.3)	(1.2)	

2. INITIAL PHONE SURVEY WITH PRE AND POST DELIBERATION RESULTS

Attitude Change Results (** $p < .01$, * $p < .05$, + $p < .10$; Valid percentages are reported for valid responses. Raw percentages are reported for DK/NA responses.) *The following analyses are conducted for questions that were asked at T1 (telephone survey), T2 (upon arrival), and T3 (upon departure). The analyses include only participants who answered these questions at all three time points.

	T1	T2	T3	T2-T1	T3-T1	T3-T2
1. To begin with, all in all, on a 0 to 10 scale, where 0 is "extremely poorly", 10 is "extremely well," and 5 is exactly in the middle, how well or poorly would you say the system of democracy in California works these days?	0.471	0.403	0.473	-0.067**	0.002	0.070**
0-4	43.2	61.4	47.6			
5	22.8	17.8	14.2			
6-10	34.0	20.7	38.4			
2. On a 0 to 10 scale, where 0 is "extremely undesirable", 10 is "extremely desirable," and 5 is exactly in the middle, how desirable or undesirable would you say each of the following is?	0.562	0.557	0.611	-0.005	0.050**	0.054**
f. Allowing an initiative's proponents to withdraw it after it qualifies for the ballot						
0-4	34.3	31.7	26.6			
5	15.6	20.5	16.2			
6-10	50.1	47.6	57.2			
q. Lengthening Assembly terms from 2 years to 4, and Senate terms from 4 years to 6	0.417	0.498	0.770	0.081**	0.353**	0.272**
0-4	50.7	41.0	10.4			
5	16.5	13.6	9.1			
6-10	32.7	45.5	80.5			
aa. Requiring legislation creating new programs that cost \$25 million or more to indicate how they will be paid for	0.795	0.849	0.847	0.054**	0.052**	-0.002
0-4	11.0	4.4	4.8			
5	6.8	5.1	5.4			
6-10	82.2	90.5	89.8			
5. On a 0 to 10 scale, where 0 is "not at all", 10 is "as much as could reasonably be expected," and 5 is exactly in the middle, how much or little would you say the California State Legislature is able to get important things done?	0.341	0.345	0.355	0.004	0.014	0.010
0-4	69.0	67.2	68.0			
5	16.3	16.0	10.9			
6-10	14.7	16.9	21.2			

What's Next California Report: Summary Results

6. On another 0 to 10 scale, where 0 is "not at all", 10 is "completely", and 5 is exactly in the middle, to what extent is the ability of the State Legislature to get things done affected by tensions between the political parties?	0.656	0.653	0.690	-0.003	0.034*	0.037*
0-4	23.6	26.9	21.4			
5	9.6	7.4	5.2			
6-10	66.8	65.7	73.4			
7. And, on another 0 to 10 scale, where 0 is completely at the local level, 10 is completely at the State level, and 5 is exactly in the middle, how much decision-making authority should there be at the local level versus the State level?	0.499	0.472	0.472	-0.028+	-0.027+	0.001
0-4	33.5	41.3	44.0			
5	35.2	31.3	27.6			
6-10	31.2	27.6	28.4			
8. And, on the same scale, how much taxation power should there be at the local level versus State level?	0.501	0.495	0.509	-0.005	0.008	0.013
0-4	31.4	34.3	32.9			
5	35.5	39.6	33.1			
6-10	33.1	26.1	34.2			
(DK/NA)						
10. On another 0 to 10 scale, where 0 is "completely by voters in referendums", 10 is "completely by the State Legislature", and 5 is exactly in the middle, how many of the State's major decisions should be made by voters in referendums versus by the State Legislature?	0.507	0.550	0.549	0.043**	0.042**	-0.001
0-4	34.9	31.1	28.3			
5	22.2	23.7	27.8			
6-10	42.9	45.2	44.1			
17. Next, we'd like to get your feelings toward some of California political parties, offices, and institutions, using what is sometimes called a "feeling thermometer." Ratings between 50 degrees and 100 degrees mean that you feel favorable or warm toward a party, person, or institution. Ratings between 0 degrees and 50 degrees mean that you feel unfavorable or cold toward it. Ratings at exactly 50 degrees mean you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward it. If you don't know the party, person, or						

institution well enough to rate it, just bubble in "can't say."						
a. Democratic party	50.410	51.590	51.010	1.180	0.599	-0.580
b. Republican party	38.630	38.000	38.100	-0.629	-0.524	0.105
24. And how strongly would you agree or disagree with the following statements?	0.366	0.363	0.458	-0.003	0.092**	0.096**
a. Public officials care a lot about what people like me think.						
Agree strongly (1)	7.8	2.4	4.6			
Agree somewhat	22.9	22.6	33.4			
Neither agree nor disagree	10.5	14.6	15.1			
Disagree somewhat	25.3	38.3	34.5			
Disagree strongly (0)	33.4	22.1	12.4			
(DK/NA)						
b. Most public policy issues are so complicated that a person like me can't really understand what's going on.	0.522	0.439	0.454	-0.083**	-0.068**	0.015
Agree strongly (1)	25.9	13.4	13.9			
Agree somewhat	25.1	24.6	28.3			
Neither agree nor disagree	5.1	13.4	10.4			
Disagree somewhat	19.5	21.7	20.1			
Disagree strongly (0)	24.3	27.0	27.3			

3. REPRESENTATIVENESS ANALYSIS: PARTICIPANTS VS. COMPARISON GROUP (NON-PARTICIPANTS)

Note: Percentages shown with cell frequencies in parentheses. All significance tests are two-sample t-tests unless otherwise noted. * $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$ *** $p < .001$.

		Participants (N)	Non-Participants (N)
Gender			
	Female	55.4% (222)	49.3% (148)
	Male	44.6% (179)	50.7% (152)
Age in years		49.07 years (401)	46.75 years (300)
Education			
	Less than high school	0.5% (2)	1.3% (4)
	High school	6.0% (24)	8.3% (25)
	Some university/college	25.4% (102)	32.7% (98)
	University/college graduate	33.9% (136)	29.7% (89)
	Some graduate work	6.7% (27)	6.0% (18)
	Graduate degree	27.2% (109)	20.7% (62)
	No answer/ Missing	0.2% (1)	1.3% (4)
Employment Status			
	Employed full-time	43.1% (173)	45.3% (136)
	Employed part-time	15.7% (63)	10.7% (32)
	Not employed, but actively looking for work	11.7% (47)	8.7% (26)
	Student	5.2% (21)	7.3% (22)
	Not actively looking for work	22.2% (89)	25.7% (77)
	No Answer/ Missing	2.0% (8)	2.3% (7)
Religious Service Attendance **			
	Every week	22.9% (92)	25.0% (75)
	Almost every week	7.5% (30)	2.7% (8)
	Once or twice a month	13.0% (52)	12.0% (36)

What's Next California Report: Summary Results

	A few times a year	28.9% (116)	25.7% (77)
	Never	26.9% (108)	30.3% (91)
	No answer	0.7% (3)	4.3% (13)
Married and living with spouse			
	Yes	58.6% (235)	61.3% (184)
	No	40.6% (163)	36.7% (110)
	No answer	0.7% (3)	2.0% (6)
Annual household income***			
	Less than \$25,000	12.0% (48)	11.0% (33)
	\$25,000 to \$49,999	14.0% (56)	13.7% (41)
	\$50,000 to \$74,999	23.9% (96)	17.3% (52)
	\$75,000 to \$99,999	15.2% (61)	12.3% (37)
	\$100,000 to \$124,999	11.7% (47)	9.0% (27)
	\$125,000 to \$149,999	4.2% (17)	5.3% (16)
	\$150,000 or more	10.2% (41)	9.7% (29)
	No answer/ don't know	8.7% (35)	21.7% (65)
Ethnicity			
	White	69.6% (279)	65.7% (197)
	Black	7.0% (28)	3.7% (11)
	Hispanic	14.0% (56)	22.0% (66)
	Asian/ Pacific islander	5.2% (21)	5.3% (16)
	Native American	1.2% (5)	1.7% (5)
	Other	2.5% (10)	1.7% (5)
	No answer	0.5% (2)	0% (0)
Political Ideology			

Liberal-leaning (0-4)	36.7%	37.7%
	(147)	(113)
Exactly in the middle (5)	17.0%	20.7%
	(68)	(62)
Conservative-leaning (6-10)	41.9%	35.7%
	(168)	(107)
No Opinion/ Missing	4.5%	6.0%
	(18)	(18)

Party Affiliation

Republican	28.9%	28.3%
	(116)	(85)
Democrat	47.1%	48.0%
	(189)	(144)
Other	4.7%	3.0%
	(19)	(9)
Independent	19.2%	20.7%
	(77)	(62)

Region

LA County	25.4%	20.7%
	(102)	(62)
Orange County	10.0%	8.0%
	(40)	(24)
Inland Empire	9.7%	11.7%
	(39)	(35)
San Diego County	10.2%	8.7%
	(41)	(26)
Central Coast	7.0%	7.7%
	(28)	(23)
Central/ Fresno	6.0%	7.0%
	(24)	(21)
Greater Sacramento	9.0%	14.3%
	(36)	(43)
Bay Area	19.2%	18.0%
	(77)	(54)
North	3.5%	4.0%
	(14)	(12)

What's Next California Report: Summary Results

Attitude Comparison Results (** $p < .001$, ** $p < .01$, * $p < .05$; Valid percentages are reported for valid responses. Raw percentages are reported for DK/NA responses.)

	Participants	Non-Participants	t-Test
1. To begin with, all in all, on a 0 to 10 scale, where 0 is "extremely poorly", 10 is "extremely well," and 5 is exactly in the middle, how well or poorly would you say the system of democracy in California works these days?	0.460	0.434	
0-4	44.6	47.7	
5	24.1	22.5	
6-10	31.4	29.9	
(DK/NA)	(1.5)	(0.7)	
On a 0 to 10 scale, where 0 is "extremely undesirable", 10 is "extremely desirable," and 5 is exactly in the middle, how desirable or undesirable would you say each of the following is?	0.577	0.475	***
2. Increasing the number of legislative districts so that each legislator represents fewer people			
0-4	28.6	38.2	
5	14.4	27.3	
6-10	56.9	34.5	
(DK/NA)	(10.2)	(11.0)	
3. Making the State Legislature a single house, instead of its current Senate and Assembly	0.390	0.339	*
0-4	53.8	59.5	
5	18.2	21.0	
6-10	28.0	19.4	
(DK/NA)	(19.0)	(16.0)	
4. Increasing Assembly terms from 2 years to 4, and Senate terms from 4 years to 6	0.421	0.337	**
0-4	49.9	61.5	
5	17.8	13.4	
6-10	32.4	25.1	
(DK/NA)	(6.0)	(5.7)	
5. Allowing initiative proponents to amend an initiative following public input	0.622	0.538	**
0-4	23.7	30.4	
5	14.8	18.7	
6-10	61.6	50.9	
(DK/NA)	(7.2)	(9.0)	
6. Allowing initiative proponents to withdraw an initiative it even after it qualifies for the ballot	0.562	0.481	**
0-4	34.5	36.6	
5	15.5	26.0	
6-10	50.0	37.4	
(DK/NA)	(8.2)	(12.7)	
7. Allowing the Legislature to enact into law an initiative that has already qualified for the ballot so it doesn't need to be included on the ballot	0.455	0.379	**
0-4	44.7	54.8	
5	16.3	15.1	
6-10	39.0	30.1	

	(DK/NA)	(8.5)	(9.3)	
8. Putting all initiative dealing with the same subject next to one another on the ballot		0.790	0.771	
	0-4	8.3	8.3	
	5	8.0	14.1	
	6-10	83.7	77.6	
	(DK/NA)	(3.7)	(3.3)	
9. Allowing signatures for initiatives to be gathered electronically		0.496	0.440	*
	0-4	42.4	47.1	
	5	15.0	14.1	
	6-10	42.6	38.8	
	(DK/NA)	(5.2)	(3.0)	
10. Requiring that initiatives say how they will be paid for if they would cost taxpayers more than \$25 million to implement		0.799	0.719	***
	0-4	10.9	18.1	
	5	6.8	10.9	
	6-10	82.3	71.0	
	(DK/NA)	(4.0)	(8.0)	
11. Prohibiting initiatives that require the State to spend a substantial portion of its budget for a specific purpose		0.558	0.478	**
	0-4	32.8	40.1	
	5	20.1	27.3	
	6-10	47.2	32.6	
	(DK/NA)	(8.0)	(11.0)	
12. Requiring election campaign contributions to be disclosed more frequently		0.844	0.822	
	0-4	5.4	7.2	
	5	6.9	10.0	
	6-10	87.7	82.8	
	(DK/NA)	(2.5)	(3.3)	
13. Allowing voters to rank their top three candidates, so that the winner can be decided in a single election without a second election		0.661	0.607	*
	0-4	20.6	30.6	
	5	13.5	11.0	
	6-10	66.0	58.4	
	(DK/NA)	(5.5)	(6.3)	
14. Permitting petitions for ballot initiatives to be distributed electronically, then printed and signed		0.638	0.594	
	0-4	22.4	28.5	
	5	15.8	14.6	
	6-10	61.8	56.9	
	(DK/NA)	(5.2)	(6.3)	
15. Reducing the number of bills a legislator can introduce during a two-year session		0.477	0.508	
	0-4	43.0	38.6	
	5	23.2	22.4	
	6-10	33.8	39.0	
	(DK/NA)	(10.7)	(9.3)	
16. Reducing the length of the state legislative session and making the job of State Legislator a part-time position		0.492	0.495	
	0-4	44.0	44.2	
	5	16.2	17.5	
	6-10	39.8	38.3	
	(DK/NA)	(9.2)	(10.3)	
17. Appointing all California judges for lifetime terms, subject only to		0.349	0.338	

What's Next California Report: Summary Results

recall election				
	0-4	62.6	61.6	
	5	15.0	12.7	
	6-10	22.4	25.7	
	(DK/NA)	(8.7)	(5.3)	
18. Applying the sales tax to services in addition to goods		0.345	0.295	*
	0-4	60.3	64.5	
	5	15.3	15.8	
	6-10	24.5	19.8	
	(DK/NA)	(5.2)	(9.0)	
19. Flattening the state income tax rates, so that everyone pays closer to the same rate (while continuing to exempt low income individuals)		0.549	0.541	
	0-4	35.2	38.0	
	5	13.1	12.2	
	6-10	51.7	49.8	
	(DK/NA)	(5.0)	(7.0)	
20. Taxing non-residential property at a higher rate than residential property		0.529	0.457	**
	0-4	33.6	41.8	
	5	17.3	21.4	
	6-10	49.1	36.8	
	(DK/NA)	(6.5)	(6.7)	
21. Increasing the vehicle license fee from 0.65% to 2% and distribute that additional revenue locally for local purposes		0.423	0.378	
	0-4	49.2	59.4	
	5	13.9	9.9	
	6-10	36.9	30.7	
	(DK/NA)	(3.2)	(2.3)	
22. Requiring that changes in commercial ownership trigger tax reassessments on the same way they do for residential property		0.688	0.616	**
	0-4	13.6	25.4	
	5	15.8	20.1	
	6-10	70.6	54.5	
	(DK/NA)	(10.3)	(12.0)	
23. Requiring the same 55 percent majority for all local tax proposals		0.653	0.629	
	0-4	19.5	21.5	
	5	16.5	16.3	
	6-10	64.0	62.2	
	(DK/NA)	(8.0)	(10.0)	
24. Assign responsibility for service delivery to the level of government that is best suited to carry it out		0.737	0.679	**
	0-4	8.0	14.0	
	5	13.9	18.1	
	6-10	78.1	67.9	
	(DK/NA)	(6.5)	(9.7)	
25. Giving control of the funding for a service to the level of government that is responsible for delivering it		0.659	0.613	*
	0-4	16.2	18.6	
	5	14.9	22.7	
	6-10	68.9	58.7	
	(DK/NA)	(7.7)	(10.3)	
26. Making it easier for local governments to levy taxes for services		0.530	0.498	

26. Making it easier for local governments to levy taxes for services they are responsible for providing	0.530	0.498	
0-4	33.4	36.9	
5	15.0	18.3	
6-10	51.6	44.8	
(DK/NA)	(5.2)	(7.0)	
27. Allow local governments to raise taxes for local services in exchange for requiring greater accountability for program performance	0.560	0.504	*
0-4	29.6	35.0	
5	14.8	19.7	
6-10	55.6	45.3	
(DK/NA)	(5.7)	(8.7)	
28. Establishing a process to consolidate similar services provided by different parts of local governments and special districts	0.704	0.656	*
0-4	8.2	17.9	
5	21.2	16.3	
6-10	70.6	65.8	
(DK/NA)	(11.7)	(12.3)	
29. On a 0 to 10 scale, where 0 is "not at all", 10 is "as much as could reasonably be expected," and 5 is exactly in the middle, how much or little would you say the California State Legislature is able to get things done? IF N/A, REFUSED, then 98; IF NO OPINION, then 99.	0.339	0.300	*
0-4	69.0	73.6	
5	16.8	13.6	
6-10	14.2	12.9	
(DK/NA)	(2.0)	(1.7)	
30. On another 0 to 10 scale, where 0 is "not at all", 10 is "completely", and 5 is exactly in the middle, to what extent is the ability of the State Legislature to get things done affected by tensions between political parties? IF N/A, REFUSED, then 98; IF NO OPINION, then 99.	0.663	0.601	*
0-4	23.3	31.3	
5	9.0	14.6	
6-10	67.7	54.1	
(DK/NA)	(2.7)	(2.0)	
31. And, on a 0 to 10 scale, where 0 is completely at the local level, 10 is completely at the State level, and 5 is exactly in the middle, how much decision-making authority should there be at the local level versus the State level? IF N/A, REFUSED, then 98; IF NO OPINION, then 99.	0.496	0.468	
0-4	33.9	35.5	
5	35.4	37.6	
6-10	30.7	26.8	
(DK/NA)	(5.7)	(4.3)	
32. And, on the same scale, how much taxation power should there be at the local versus State level? IF N/A, REFUSED, then 98; IF NO OPINION, then 99.	0.497	0.498	
0-4	31.5	33.3	
5	36.0	35.4	
6-10	32.5	31.2	
(DK/NA)	(6.5)	(5.0)	
33. On another 0 to 10 scale, where 0 is "completely by voters in referendum", 10 is "completely by the State Legislature", and 5 is exactly in the middle, how much of the State's major decisions should be made by voters in referendums versus by the State Legislature?	0.503	0.457	*

What's Next California Report: Summary Results

	0-4	35.6	42.4	
	5	22.0	25.7	
	6-10	42.4	31.9	
	(DK/NA)	(4.7)	(4.0)	
34. People with views very different from mine often have good reasons for their views even when they are wrong. Would you strongly agree, somewhat agree, neither agree nor disagree, somewhat disagree, or strongly disagree?		0.750	0.666	***
Agree strongly (1)	33.5		39.9	
Agree somewhat	38.1		34.9	
Neither agree nor disagree	9.5		8.7	
Disagree somewhat	9.0		11.4	
Disagree strongly (0)	10.0		5.0	
(DK/NA)	(2.5)		(0.7)	
35. Public officials care a lot about what people like me think. Would you strongly agree, somewhat agree, neither agree nor disagree, somewhat disagree, or strongly disagree?		0.376	0.349	
Agree strongly (1)	7.3		8.1	
Agree somewhat	21.6		23.9	
Neither agree nor disagree	9.0		12.5	
Disagree somewhat	26.6		23.2	
Disagree strongly (0)	35.6		32.3	
(DK/NA)	(0.5)		(1.0)	
36. Most public policy issues are so complicated that a person like me can't really understand what's going on. Would you strongly agree, somewhat agree, neither agree nor disagree, somewhat disagree, or strongly disagree?		0.520	0.510	
Agree strongly (1)	27.5		25.8	
Agree somewhat	24.0		25.4	
Neither agree nor disagree	5.0		5.7	
Disagree somewhat	16.8		18.7	
Disagree strongly (0)	26.8		24.4	
(DK/NA)	(0.2)		(0.3)	

4. KNOWLEDGE GAINS

What's Next California Report: Summary Results

NOTE: Entries are percentages answering correctly. The correct answers are given in parentheses.

*significant at the .05 level; **significant at the .01 level, ***significant at the .001 level.

Item	Before Deliberation	After Deliberation	Change
27. Which political party holds the majority in the California State Senate? (Democratic)	75.8% (316)	85.1% (355)	+9.3%*
28. How about the California State Assembly? (Democratic)	69.5% (290)	80.1% (334)	+10.6%
29. How large a majority of the State Legislature is needed to approve a proposed constitutional amendment? (two-thirds of both houses)	61.9% (258)	81.3% (339)	+19.4%**
30. How large a majority of the State Legislature is needed to increase taxes? (two-thirds of both houses)	60.7% (253)	86.8% (362)	+26.1%**
31. Ballot measures can be signed by...(anyone who is registered to vote in California)	63.1% (263)	70.0% (292)	+6.9%
32. Which state has the most residents per member of the state legislature? (California)	62.1% (259)	79.1% (330)	+17.-%
33. On average, which state has the highest total tax burden? (New York)	30.7% (128)	49.4% (206)	+18.7%***
34. In Governor Brown's most recent budget proposal, the largest single share of spending goes to which of the following? (K-12 education)	36.0% (150)	73.6% (307)	+37.6%***
Knowledge Index	57.5%	75.7	+18.2%***

5. EVALUATIONS

**What's Next California
Report: Summary Results**

Questions	Percent (%)
43. On a scale of 0 to 10, where 0 is "a waste of time", 10 is "extremely valuable" and 5 is exactly in the middle, how valuable was each of the following in helping you clarify your positions on the issues?	
a. The overall process	
0-4	3.6
5	7.1
6-10	89.1
(DK/NA)	(13.8)
b. Participating in the small group discussions	
0-4	4.4
5	2.9
6-10	92.6
(DK/NA)	(13.6)
c. Meeting and talking to other delegates outside of the group discussions	
0-4	6.8
5	10.2
6-10	82.9
(DK/NA)	(15.0)
d. The large group plenary sessions	
0-4	9.2
5	6.6
6-10	84.1
(DK/NA)	(13.3)

Questions	Percent (%)
44. How strongly would you agree or disagree with each of the following statements?	
a. My group moderator provided the opportunity for everyone to participate in the discussion.	
Agree strongly (1)	75.3
Agree somewhat	15.4
Neither agree nor disagree	3.9
Disagree somewhat	3.2
Disagree strongly (0)	2.2
b. The members of my group participated relatively equally in the discussions.	
Agree strongly (1)	26.7
Agree somewhat	36.2
Neither agree nor disagree	5.9

	Disagree somewhat	21.8
	Disagree strongly (0)	9.5
c. My group moderator sometimes tried to influence the group with his or her own views.		
	Agree strongly (1)	1.5
	Agree somewhat	0.7
	Neither agree nor disagree	1.7
	Disagree somewhat	3
	Disagree strongly (0)	93.1
d. My group moderator tried to make sure that opposing arguments were considered.		
	Agree strongly (1)	40.7
	Agree somewhat	20.9
	Neither agree nor disagree	19.6
	Disagree somewhat	5.4
	Disagree strongly (0)	13.4
e. The important aspects of the issues were covered in the group discussions.		
	Agree strongly (1)	45.8
	Agree somewhat	38.6
	Neither agree nor disagree	4.7
	Disagree somewhat	7.2
	Disagree strongly (0)	3.7
f. I learned a lot about people very different from me - about what they and their lives are like.		
	Agree strongly (1)	50
	Agree somewhat	38.1
	Neither agree nor disagree	8.2
	Disagree somewhat	2.5
	Disagree strongly (0)	1.2
g. Few members dominated discussions.		
	Agree strongly (1)	16
	Agree somewhat	36.9
	Neither agree nor disagree	17.5
	Disagree somewhat	18
	Disagree strongly (0)	11.7
h. The members of my small group respected each other's views		
	Agree strongly (1)	65.7
	Agree somewhat	27.7
	Neither agree nor disagree	3.4
	Disagree somewhat	1.7
	Disagree strongly (0)	1.5
45. How much time would you say you spent reading the briefing material before today's event?		
	None	3.7
	About a half hour	15.1
	About an hour	16.6
	About an hour and a half	14.6
	About two hours	19.8
	More than two hours	30.2
46. Before the discussions started, how much of the assigned briefing material would you say you had read, on average?		

What's Next California Report: Summary Results

i	Just glanced at the materials	13.2
	Read less than half of the materials	11
	Read about half of the materials	17.8
	Read more than half of the materials	17.6
	Read most or all of the materials	40.3
47. And by the end of the last discussion, how much of the briefing materials would you say you had read?		
i	Just glanced at the materials	3.9
	Read less than half of the materials	3.9
	Read about half of the materials	8.8
	Read more than half of the materials	18.1
	Read most or all of the materials	65.3
48. Would you say that the briefing material was mostly balanced, or that it clearly favored some positions over others?		
	Completely balanced	23.3
	Mostly balanced	59
	Favored some position over others	17.7

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. REGRESSION ANALYSES, EXAMINING VALUES 4

Regression Analyses: Examining Values	5
Explanatory Variables	5
Initiative Process: Proposal A1	7
Proposal A2a	8
Proposal A2b	9
Proposal A2c.....	10
Proposal A2d	11
Proposal A3.....	12
Proposal A4.....	13
Proposal A5.....	14
Proposal A6.....	15
Proposal A7.....	16
Legislative Representation: Proposal B1	17
Proposal B2.....	18
Proposal B3.....	18
Proposal B4.....	19
Proposal B5.....	20
Proposal B6.....	21
Proposal B7.....	22
Proposal B8.....	23
Proposal B9.....	24
Proposal B10a.....	25
Proposal B10b	25
State and Local Reform: Proposal C1	25
Proposal C2.....	26
Proposal C3.....	27
Proposal C4.....	27
Proposal C5.....	28
Taxation: Proposal D1.....	29
Proposal D2.....	31
Proposal D3.....	32
Proposal D4.....	33
Proposal D5.....	34
Proposal D6.....	36
Proposal D7.....	37

2. REGRESSION ANALYSES: EXAMINING BASIC ORIENTATIONS 38

Regression Analyses: Examining Basic Orientations.....	39
Explanatory Variables	39
Initiative Process: Proposal A1	42
Proposal A2a	44

Proposal A2b	46
Proposal A2c.....	48
Proposal A2d	50
Proposal A3.....	52
Proposal A4.....	53
Proposal A5.....	54
Proposal A6.....	56
Proposal A7.....	58
Legislative Representation: Proposal B1	60
Proposal B2.....	62
Proposal B3.....	63
Proposal B4.....	64
Proposal B5.....	66
Proposal B6.....	68
Proposal B7.....	70
Proposal B8.....	72
Proposal B9.....	72
Proposal B10a.....	72
Proposal B10b	73
State and Local Reform: Proposal C1	75
Proposal C2.....	77
Proposal C3.....	79
Proposal C4.....	81
Proposal C5.....	83
Taxation: Proposal D1.....	85
Proposal D2.....	89
Proposal D3.....	91
Proposal D4.....	94
Proposal D5.....	96
Proposal D6.....	101
Proposal D7.....	103
3. REGRESSION ANALYSES: EXAMINING EMPIRICAL PREMISES	105
Regression Analyses: Examining Empirical Premises.....	106
Explanatory Variables	106
Initiative Process: Proposal A1	110
Proposal A2a	112
Proposal A2b	115
Proposal A2c.....	118
Proposal A2d	121
Proposal A3.....	124
Proposal A4.....	126
Proposal A5.....	127
Proposal A6.....	127
Proposal A7.....	130
Legislative Representation: Proposal B1	131
Proposal B2.....	131
Proposal B3.....	132

What's Next California Report

Proposal B4.....	134
Proposal B5.....	136
Proposal B6.....	138
Proposal B7.....	140
Proposal B8.....	141
Proposal B9.....	142
Proposal B10a.....	143
Proposal B10b	144
State and Local Reform: Proposal C1	144
Proposal C2.....	146
Proposal C3.....	148
Proposal C4.....	150
Proposal C5.....	153
Taxation: Proposal D1.....	155
Proposal D2.....	159
Proposal D3.....	159
Proposal D4.....	163
Proposal D5.....	165
Proposal D6.....	170
Proposal D7.....	173

1. REGRESSION ANALYSES, EXAMINING VALUES

What's Next California Report

Regression Analyses: Examining Values

Explanatory Variables

The Values Indices are created based on selected values questions from the arrival (t2) and departure (t3) questionnaires. The telephone questionnaire (t1) did not include any questions on values. Three indices were created from the values questions, all questions were asked on a 0 to 10 scale, where 0 is extremely unimportant, 5 is exactly in the middle and 10 is extremely important. The questions were rescaled on a 0 to 1 scale, where 0 is extremely unimportant and 1 is extremely important.

- 1) Equality Index:
 - i. Importance: a. Seeing to it that everyone has equal opportunities
 - ii. Importance: e. Making sure that nobody suffers from lack of food or shelter
 - iii. Importance: i. Minimizing the gap between rich and poor
 - Cronbach's Alpha: 0.783
- 2) Economic Freedom Index
 - i. Importance: b. Leaving people and companies free to compete economically
 - ii. Importance: c. Making one's own choices
 - iii. Importance: f. Earning as much money as possible
 - iv. Importance: g. Getting to decide exactly what to do with everything I earn
 - v. Importance: j. Promoting economic growth
 - Cronbach's Alpha: 0.779
- 3) Value of Education Index
 - i. Importance: k. Being able to get a good education
 - ii. Importance: l. Having a well educated society
 - Correlation: 0.791***
- 4) Importance: h. Making sure that government does what the people want (aka *Gov should reflect the will of the people*) – Single Item Index

For the regressions in this section of the report, only the four values indices will be included in the regressions. From the t2 and t3 questionnaires, there were 39 attitude questions on the 35 proposals. The discussion below selects dependent variables with statistically significant regressions (above 0.05 level) at both t2 and t3.

Each proposal discussions begin with *predictions* for explanatory variables. Predictions were not made for all explanatory variables or dependent variables. The predictions are not intended to truly predict the results of the regressions; rather they should be seen as expectations of how variables could perform in theory. The purpose of the predictions is to more accurately interpret the results and their significance. That is, explanatory variables with predictions will have one-tailed p-values or the *sig.* column in the regressions tables will have the † symbol, p-values without this symbol indicates two-tailed p-values. A one-tailed p-value is more accurate for variables with certain expectations than a two-tailed p-value.

The regression tables below have three block columns. The first block column shows the t2 results with the coefficient (B), standard error (std. error) and p-value or significance (sig.), the

second block column reports the same values at t3 and the last column reports the p-value for the comparison between the t2 and t3 corresponding coefficients. A significant difference would indicate the coefficients are different pre and post deliberation.

For each proposal the disturbance terms (the explanatory variables not explicitly included) at times 2 and 3 figure to be correlated. This is a case of “Seemingly Unrelated Regressions.” The estimates are therefore from the suitable form of feasible generalized least squares. This point applies to all the regression analyses presented for this project.

What's Next California Report

Initiative Process: Proposal A1

Dependent Variable: t2q2a_r; creating a formal review process to allow an initiative's proponents to amend an initiative following public input

Predictions for Explanatory Variables:

- 1) Equality Index: No prediction
- 2) Economic Freedom Index: No prediction
- 3) Importance of Education Index: positive coefficient; this index captures those interested in having an informed society, this proposal would seek to educate the public about initiatives
- 4) Government should reflect the will of the people: positive coefficient; this proposal involves the public in the initiative process and seeks to reflect the will of the people

VALUES (1/39)	Dependent Variable: Q2a_r; Creating a formal review process to allow an initiative's proponents to amend an initiative following public input						
	T2			T3			Difference
	B	Std. Error	Sig.	B	Std. Error	Sig.	Sig.
(Constant)	0.509	0.075	0.000	0.541	0.086	0.000	-
Equality Index (a, e, i)	0.059	0.060	0.324	-0.057	0.066	0.393	0.133
Economic Freedom Index (b, c, f, g, j)	-0.129	0.079	0.101	-0.195	0.079	0.015	0.496
Importance of Education Index (k, l)	0.102	0.084	0.114 [†]	0.232	0.094	0.007 [†]	0.264
Gov should reflect the will of the people (h)	0.070	0.063	0.132 [†]	0.140	0.076	0.032 [†]	0.444
R ²	.041			.028			-
(p)	(.051)			(.010)			-

Results

The predictions made for the explanatory variables in this regression were accurate. Prior to deliberations, the predictions were accurate, but none of the coefficients were statistically significant at the 0.05 level. In the t3 regression, the predictions were accurate and both coefficients were statistically significant. The remaining explanatory variables had significant movements as well. The equality index were statistically insignificant at both time points, but the sign on the coefficient switched from positive to negative. It is possible that participants, prior to deliberations, that this proposal had an element of equality – that is, the proposal suggests a method for allowing the public to provide input, perhaps giving the public an equal opportunity to participate in the initiative process. After deliberations, those who supported the equality index no longer felt this proposal reflected equal opportunity. The economic freedom index had a negative coefficient at both time points, but moved from statistically insignificant to significant. This particular index reflects the freedom of being able to make choices and this proposal, possibly, hinders initiative's proponents from being able to freely amend their initiative as they wish. Note the attitude change results show support for this proposal increased from about 59 percent to 76 percent.

Proposal A2a

Dependent Variable: t2q2b_r; allowing the Legislature to remove an initiative from the ballot by enacting it into law

Predictions for Explanatory Variables:

- 1) Equality Index: No prediction
- 2) Economic Freedom Index: negative coefficient; higher numbers of this index reflect those who value being able to make one's choices, this proposal would allow the Legislature to make a significant choice in the initiative process, rather than sending it to the ballot
- 3) Importance of Education Index: No prediction
- 4) Government should reflect the will of the people: negative coefficient; this variable reflects how strongly people want the government to reflect the will of the people and if the people are taken out of the process, those who support this index would tend to not agree with this proposal

VALUES (2/39)	Dependent Variable: Q2b_r; Allowing the Legislature to remove an initiative from the ballot by enacting it into law						
	T2			T3			Difference
	B	Std. Error	Sig.	B	Std. Error	Sig.	Sig.
(Constant)	0.609	0.087	0.000	0.465	0.102	0.000	-
Equality Index (a, e, i)	0.055	0.070	0.880	-0.012	0.079	0.432	0.452
Economic Freedom Index (b, c, f, g, j)	-0.388	0.092	0.001†	-0.325	0.095	0.000†	0.573
Importance of Education Index (k, l)	0.044	0.098	0.357	0.102	0.111	0.651	0.669
Gov should reflect the will of the people (h)	0.044	0.073	0.039†	0.157	0.089	0.271†	0.289
R ²	.053			.030			-
(p)	(.000)			(.008)			-

Results

One of the predictions was accurate for this regression. The economic freedom index was negative and significant at both time points, while the government should reflect the will of the people item was positive and significant at t2, but lost its significance at t3. The remaining explanatory variables were not close to being significant at either time points. For this regression, participants felt the Legislature's ability to remove an initiative could infringe on the people's ability to make their own choices, perhaps it was not compatible with representing the will of the people. Support for this proposal did not change significantly post deliberation, in fact opposition to this proposal hovered around 50 percent pre and post deliberation.

What's Next California Report

Proposal A2b

Dependent Variable: t2q2c_r; Allowing a simple majority of the State Legislature to place a countermeasure to an already qualified initiative on the ballot next to that initiative

Predictions for Explanatory Variables:

- 1) Equality Index: No prediction
- 2) Economic Freedom Index: negative coefficient; this proposal permits the Legislature to take part in the initiative process without the people, perhaps taking away the people's ability to do what they want
- 3) Importance of Education Index: No prediction
- 4) Government should reflect the will of the people: No prediction

VALUES (3/39)	Dependent Variable: Q2c_r; Allowing a simple majority of the State Legislature to place a countermeasure to an already qualified initiative on the ballot next to that initiative						
	T2			T3			Difference
	B	Std. Error	Sig.	B	Std. Error	Sig.	Sig.
(Constant)	0.429	0.085	0.000	0.465	0.102	0.000	-
Equality Index (a, e, i)	0.162	0.068	0.017	0.045	0.078	0.564	0.180
Economic Freedom Index (b, c, f, g, j)	-0.266	0.090	0.002 [†]	-0.277	0.094	0.002 [†]	0.917
Importance of Education Index (k, l)	0.107	0.096	0.264	0.060	0.111	0.588	0.726
Gov should reflect the will of the people (h)	-0.031	0.071	0.662	0.046	0.089	0.601	0.461
R ²	.059			.020			-
(p)	(.000)			(.019)			-

Results

The prediction for this regression was accurately predicted at both t2 and t3. The regression coefficients were negative and statistically significant. Participants may have felt that this proposal would get in the way of them making their own choices on the ballot. The equality index was positive and significant at t2, but lost its significance at t3. This proposal, at first glance, could appeal to those interested who rated the equality index higher as the proposal suggests putting a countermeasure on the ballot. After deliberation, participants no longer thought this initiative was related to equality. The attitude change results for this proposal showed significant increase in opposition from 50 to 57 percent.

Proposal A2c

Dependent Variable: Q2d_r; Allowing the Legislature to amend an initiative that has already passed, subject to a public review and the agreement of the initiative's proponents

Predictions for Explanatory Variables:

- 1) Equality Index: positive coefficient, this proposal seeks the input of the Legislature, the public and the initiative's proponents
- 2) Economic Freedom Index: No prediction
- 3) Importance of Education Index: No prediction
- 4) Government should reflect the will of the people: No prediction

VALUES (4/39)	Dependent Variable: Q2d_r; Allowing the Legislature to amend an initiative that has already passed, subject to a public review and the agreement of the initiative's proponents						
	T2			T3			Difference
	B	Std. Error	Sig.	B	Std. Error	Sig.	Sig.
(Constant)	0.440	0.089	0.000	0.379	0.108	0.000	-
Equality Index (a, e, i)	0.215	0.071	0.001†	0.220	0.082	0.004†	0.955
Economic Freedom Index (b, c, f, g, j)	-0.254	0.093	0.007	-0.193	0.099	0.052	0.614
Importance of Education Index (k, l)	0.076	0.101	0.451	-0.060	0.118	0.611	0.349
Gov should reflect the will of the people (h)	-0.016	0.075	0.835	0.088	0.095	0.352	0.361
R ²	.073			.056			-
(p)	(.000)			(.002)			-

Results

The prediction made for this regression was accurate for t2 and t3 regressions. At both time points, the coefficient for the equality index was positive and statistically significant. There was no prediction made for the economic freedom index, but the index was negative and statistically significant at both time points. Participants may have felt that although the process involves a number of parties, ultimately the freedom of making their own choices is still being taken away at some level. The remaining two explanatory variables were not statistically significant at either time points. The attitude change results for this proposal showed about 50 percent of participants were in opposition to this proposal.

What's Next California Report

Proposal A2d

Dependent Variable: Q2e_r; Allowing the Legislature to amend an initiative that has already passed, subject to a two-thirds vote, even if an initiative's proponents do not agree with the amendment

Predictions for Explanatory Variables:

- 1) Equality Index: No prediction
- 2) Economic Freedom Index: No prediction
- 3) Importance of Education Index: No prediction
- 4) Government should reflect the will of the people: No prediction

VALUES (5/39)	Dependent Variable: Q2e_r; Allowing the Legislature to amend an initiative that has already passed, subject to a two-thirds vote, even if an initiative's proponents do not agree with the amendment						
	T2			T3			Difference
	B	Std. Error	Sig.	B	Std. Error	Sig.	Sig.
(Constant)	0.461	0.081	0.000	0.281	0.094	0.003	-
Equality Index (a, e, i)	0.175	0.065	0.007	0.159	0.073	0.029	0.838
Economic Freedom Index (b, c, f, g, j)	-0.188	0.086	0.029	-0.086	0.087	0.323	0.328
Importance of Education Index (k, l)	-0.079	0.091	0.389	0.012	0.103	0.904	0.469
Gov should reflect the will of the people (h)	-0.040	0.068	0.560	-0.068	0.082	0.409	0.773
R ²	.041			.026			-
(p)	(.001)			(.038)			-

Results

There are no predictions for this proposal. The equality index was positive and statistically significant at both time points, although not as statistically significant at t3. However, the coefficient was not so different, as the p-value for the equality index coefficients was 0.838. The economic freedom index was negative and statistically significant at t2, but not at t3. And, the remaining two explanatory variables were not significant at either time points. Opposition for this proposal was close to 73 percent post deliberation; this opposition increased 12 percent, from 61 percent before deliberation.

Proposal A3

Dependent Variable: Q2f_r; Allowing an initiative's proponents to withdraw it after it qualifies for the ballot

Predictions for Explanatory Variables:

- 1) Equality Index: No prediction
- 2) Economic Freedom Index: No prediction
- 3) Importance of Education Index: No prediction
- 4) Government should reflect the will of the people: No prediction

VALUES (6/39)	Dependent Variable: Q2f_r; Allowing an initiative's proponents to withdraw it after it qualifies for the ballot						
	T2			T3			Difference
	B	Std. Error	Sig.	B	Std. Error	Sig.	Sig.
(Constant)	0.678	0.092	0.000	0.743	0.099	0.000	-
Equality Index (a, e, i)	0.069	0.073	0.343	-0.002	0.076	0.977	0.432
Economic Freedom Index (b, c, f, g, j)	-0.236	0.097	0.014	-0.249	0.092	0.007	0.913
Importance of Education Index (k, l)	0.007	0.104	0.943	-0.047	0.109	0.662	0.692
Gov should reflect the will of the people (h)	-0.017	0.077	0.825	0.105	0.087	0.227	0.259
R ²	.027			.031			-
(p)	(.029)			(.066)			-

There are no predictions for these regressions. The only explanatory variable with statistical significance was the economic freedom index. At both time points, the index was negative. Participants may have felt that although initiative's proponents are permitted to withdraw their initiative, it actually denies the public the ability to decide whether this is a good initiative. Support for this proposal increased from 47 percent to 57 percent after deliberation.

What's Next California Report

Proposal A4

Dependent Variable: Q2g_r; Requiring all ballot measures that require new expenditures to indicate how they will be paid for

Predictions for Explanatory Variables:

- 1) Equality Index: No prediction
- 2) Economic Freedom Index: positive coefficient; one component in this index is to be able to “decided exactly what to do with everything I earn”, this proposal would allow supporters of this index the ability to make those choices
- 3) Importance of Education Index: No prediction
- 4) Government should reflect the will of the people: No prediction

VALUES (7/39)	Dependent Variable: Q2g_r; Requiring all ballot measures that require new expenditures to indicate how they will be paid for						
	T2			T3			Difference
	B	Std. Error	Sig.	B	Std. Error	Sig.	Sig.
(Constant)	0.681	0.062	0.000	0.715	0.082	0.000	-
Equality Index (a, e, i)	-0.073	0.050	0.143	-0.071	0.063	0.259	0.979
Economic Freedom Index (b, c, f, g, j)	0.117	0.065	0.038†	0.156	0.076	0.020†	0.649
Importance of Education Index (k, l)	0.119	0.070	0.088	0.015	0.089	0.862	0.321
Gov should reflect the will of the people (h)	0.017	0.052	0.745	0.004	0.071	0.959	0.872
R ²	.032			.025			-
(p)	(.013)			(.075)			-

Results

The prediction made for this regression was accurate and was the only statistically significant explanatory variable for these regressions. Participants who felt strongly about being able to make their own choices about their money supported this proposal. This proposal had strong support before and after deliberations, close to 85 percent supported this proposal post deliberation.

Proposal A5

Dependent Variable: Q2h_r; Requiring the ballot pamphlet to provide an analysis by the Legislative Analyst of how new initiative programs will likely be paid for

Predictions for Explanatory Variables:

- 1) Equality Index: No prediction
- 2) Economic Freedom Index: positive coefficient; in line with the previous proposal, this proposal will explain how money will be spent for new initiative programs, which in theory those wanting to know exactly how their money will be used would support
- 3) Importance of Education Index: No prediction
- 4) Government should reflect the will of the people: No prediction

VALUES (8/39)	Dependent Variable: Q2h_r; Requiring the ballot pamphlet to provide an analysis by the Legislative Analyst of how new initiative programs will likely be paid for						
	T2			T3			Difference
	B	Std. Error	Sig.	B	Std. Error	Sig.	Sig.
(Constant)	0.801	0.066	0.000	0.666	0.070	0.000	-
Equality Index (a, e, i)	0.012	0.052	0.818	-0.027	0.053	0.614	0.561
Economic Freedom Index (b, c, f, g, j)	0.060	0.069	0.190 [†]	0.055	0.064	0.196 [†]	0.950
Importance of Education Index (k, l)	-0.048	0.075	0.516	0.061	0.077	0.432	0.282
Gov should reflect the will of the people (h)	0.007	0.056	0.903	0.128	0.062	0.039	0.125
R ²	.002			.033			-
(p)	(.885)			(.038)			-

Results

The prediction for these regressions was accurate in predicting the sign of the coefficient at t2 and t3, however, the coefficients were not statistically significant. The only statistically significant variable was at t3 for the government should reflect the will of the people. There was no prediction for this variable. After deliberations, participants supported this proposal as they felt this proposal would more closely reflect the will of the people. Support for this proposal was high pre and post deliberation and reached 91 percent post deliberations.

What's Next California Report

Proposal A6

Dependent Variable: Q2i_r; Making the vote threshold needed to pass an initiative the same as any vote threshold that the initiative itself requires of the public in the future

Predictions for Explanatory Variables:

- 1) Equality Index: No prediction
- 2) Economic Freedom Index: No prediction
- 3) Importance of Education Index: No prediction
- 4) Government should reflect the will of the people: No prediction

VALUES (9/39)	Dependent Variable: Q2i_r; Making the vote threshold needed to pass an initiative the same as any vote threshold that the initiative itself requires of the public in the future						
	T2			T3			Difference
	B	Std. Error	Sig.	B	Std. Error	Sig.	Sig.
(Constant)	0.633	0.074	0.000	0.545	0.092	0.000	-
Equality Index (a, e, i)	-0.028	0.059	0.629	0.155	0.070	0.027	0.026
Economic Freedom Index (b, c, f, g, j)	-0.196	0.078	0.012	-0.108	0.085	0.202	0.399
Importance of Education Index (k, l)	0.138	0.084	0.102	-0.001	0.101	0.992	0.264
Gov should reflect the will of the people (h)	0.062	0.063	0.322	0.115	0.081	0.159	0.593
R ²	.023			.038			-
(p)	(.071)			(.009)			-

Results

There were no predictions for these regressions. At t2, the economic freedom index is negative and statistically significant, but this index loses its significance at t3. The only explanatory variable to be significant at t3 is the equality index, with p at 0.027. Before deliberations, the equality index had a negative coefficient and insignificant. The movement of this index is significant, seen in the last column, at 0.026. The more participants valued equal opportunity the higher they rated this proposal after deliberations. The attitude change results showed this proposal was supported by about 66 percent participants pre and post deliberations.

Proposal A7

Dependent Variable: Q2j_r; Publishing the top five contributors for and against each ballot measure in the ballot pamphlet

Predictions for Explanatory Variables:

- 1) Equality Index: No prediction
- 2) Economic Freedom Index: No prediction
- 3) Importance of Education Index: positive coefficient; this index seeks to have a better informed society and this proposal would serve this purpose
- 4) Government should reflect the will of the people: No prediction

VALUES (10/39)	Dependent Variable: Q2j_r; Publishing the top five contributors for and against each ballot measure in the ballot pamphlet						
	T2			T3			Difference
	B	Std. Error	Sig.	B	Std. Error	Sig.	Sig.
(Constant)	0.703	0.074	0.000	0.685	0.069	0.000	-
Equality Index (a, e, i)	0.014	0.059	0.815	0.099	0.053	0.060	0.200
Economic Freedom Index (b, c, f, g, j)	-0.023	0.078	0.763	-0.035	0.064	0.584	0.893
Importance of Education Index (k, l)	0.152	0.083	0.033 [†]	0.124	0.075	0.050 [†]	0.779
Gov should reflect the will of the people (h)	-0.036	0.061	0.556	0.036	0.060	0.545	0.361
R ²	.010			.047			-
(p)	(.305)			(.004)			-

Results

The prediction made for this regression was accurate at both time points, positive and statistically significant. Other explanatory variables were not significant at the 0.05 level.

According to the attitude change results, support for this proposal started at 82 percent before deliberations and increased almost 10 percent to 91 percent after deliberations.

What's Next California Report

Legislative Representation: Proposal B1

Dependent Variable: Q2k_r; Increasing the number of Assembly districts from 80 to 120

Predictions for Explanatory Variables:

- 1) Equality Index: No prediction
- 2) Economic Freedom Index: No prediction
- 3) Importance of Education Index: No prediction
- 4) Government should reflect the will of the people: No prediction

VALUES (11/39)	Dependent Variable: Q2k_r; Increasing the number of Assembly districts from 80 to 120						
	T2			T3			Difference
	B	Std. Error	Sig.	B	Std. Error	Sig.	Sig.
(Constant)	0.441	0.086	0.000	0.459	0.101	0.000	-
Equality Index (a, e, i)	0.183	0.069	0.008	0.138	0.078	0.077	0.606
Economic Freedom Index (b, c, f, g, j)	-0.057	0.091	0.528	-0.017	0.094	0.856	0.712
Importance of Education Index (k, l)	0.093	0.096	0.337	0.206	0.110	0.061	0.393
Gov should reflect the will of the people (h)	-0.006	0.072	0.932	-0.111	0.088	0.208	0.314
R ²	.038			.038			-
(p)	(.006)			(.009)			-

Results

There were no predictions for these regressions. At t2, the equality index is positive and significant and the coefficient maintains its sign at t3 as well. As participants rated equal opportunity more highly, they became more supportive of increasing the number of Assembly districts before and after deliberations. Other explanatory variables were not significant at the 0.05 level. This proposal had majority support before and after deliberations, about 60 percent before and 63 percent after deliberations.

Proposal B2

Dependent Variable: Q2l_r; Expanding the size of districts and electing more than one legislative representative from each district

Predictions for Explanatory Variables:

- 1) Equality Index: positive coefficient; those favoring equality and equal opportunity would be more supportive of proportioned representation
- 2) Economic Freedom Index: No prediction
- 3) Importance of Education Index: No prediction
- 4) Government should reflect the will of the people: No prediction

VALUES (12/39)	Dependent Variable: Q2l_r; Expanding the size of districts and electing more than one legislative representative from each district						
	T2			T3			Difference
	B	Std. Error	Sig.	B	Std. Error	Sig.	Sig.
(Constant)	0.447	0.083	0.000	0.283	0.100	0.004	-
Equality Index (a, e, i)	0.123	0.067	0.033 [†]	0.162	0.077	0.013 [†]	0.643
Economic Freedom Index (b, c, f, g, j)	-0.158	0.088	0.074	-0.150	0.093	0.107	0.938
Importance of Education Index (k, l)	0.094	0.093	0.314	0.116	0.108	0.282	0.862
Gov should reflect the will of the people (h)	0.026	0.069	0.707	0.163	0.086	0.059	0.174
R ²	.032			.057			-
(p)	(.014)			(.000)			-

Results

This proposal would create proportioned representation and participants who rate equality and equal opportunity highly would tend to support this proposal. The coefficient for the equality index is positive and statistically significant at t2 and t3. The last explanatory variable, government should reflect the will of the people, is marginally significant at t3. Participants who feel strongly about having the will of the people represented feel that proportioned representation could represent the people better. Other explanatory variables are not statistically significant at 0.05 level and there are no predictions for these variables either. Support for this proposal was below 50 percent before and after deliberations, there was no significant movement.

Proposal B3

Dependent Variable: Q2m_r; Replacing the current State Senate and Assembly with a single house of 120 members

Regressions were not significant at 0.05 level.

What's Next California Report

Proposal B4

Dependent Variable: Q2n_r; Making the State Legislature part-time and paying legislators part-time salaries

Predictions for Explanatory Variables:

- 1) Equality Index: No prediction
- 2) Economic Freedom Index: No prediction
- 3) Importance of Education Index: No prediction
- 4) Government should reflect the will of the people: No prediction

VALUES (14/39)	Dependent Variable: Q2n_r; Making the State Legislature part-time and paying legislators part-time salaries						
	T2			T3			Difference
	B	Std. Error	Sig.	B	Std. Error	Sig.	Sig.
(Constant)	0.433	0.086	0.000	0.579	0.098	0.000	-
Equality Index (a, e, i)	-0.420	0.070	0.000	-0.227	0.076	0.003	0.459
Economic Freedom Index (b, c, f, g, j)	0.408	0.092	0.000	0.289	0.092	0.002	0.920
Importance of Education Index (k, l)	-0.091	0.096	0.342	-0.298	0.105	0.005	0.098
Gov should reflect the will of the people (h)	0.215	0.071	0.002	-0.006	0.084	0.947	0.807
R ²	.191			.098			-
(p)	(.000)			(.000)			-

Results

There are no predictions for these regressions. At t2, three of the four explanatory variables had significant coefficients. The equality index had a negative coefficient, meaning the participants who feel strongly about equality are less likely to support a part-time legislature and part-time salaries. Whereas, participants who support economic freedom and the will of the people, at t2, support this proposal; that is, participants who value greater freedom to make their own choices find this proposal attractive and participants feel that this proposal will more accurately reflect the will of the people. At t3, again, three of the four explanatory variables are statistically significant, but not the same three variables. The equality index maintains its negative coefficient and the economic freedom index maintains its positive coefficient. The importance of education index continues to have a negative coefficient, but, at t3, the coefficient is very significant; showing that participants who value an informed society are less inclined to support this proposal. And, the last variable, loses its significance and has a negative coefficient. That is, after deliberations, participants who rate the need for government to represent the will of the people highly found that this proposal does not actually represent the people. The attitude change results show that opposition for this proposal increases significantly after deliberations – from 42 percent to 63 percent.

Proposal B5

Dependent Variable: Q2o_r; Reducing the length of the state legislative session and requiring legislators to spend more time in their districts

Predictions for Explanatory Variables:

- 1) Equality Index: No prediction
- 2) Economic Freedom Index: No prediction
- 3) Importance of Education Index: No prediction
- 4) Government should reflect the will of the people: No prediction

VALUES (15/39)	Dependent Variable: Q2o_r; Reducing the length of the state legislative session and requiring legislators to spend more time in their districts						
	T2			T3			Difference
	B	Std. Error	Sig.	B	Std. Error	Sig.	Sig.
(Constant)	0.454	0.079	0.000	0.449	0.101	0.000	-
Equality Index (a, e, i)	-0.161	0.063	0.011	-0.139	0.078	0.076	0.787
Economic Freedom Index (b, c, f, g, j)	0.336	0.084	0.000	0.427	0.094	0.000	0.378
Importance of Education Index (k, l)	-0.138	0.088	0.116	-0.228	0.109	0.036	0.477
Gov should reflect the will of the people (h)	0.204	0.065	0.002	0.095	0.087	0.278	0.274
R ²	.118			.098			-
(p)	(.000)			(.000)			-

Results

There were no predictions for these regressions. At t2, the equality index, economic freedom index, and government should reflect the will of the people index were statistically significant. Of the three, the equality index had a negative coefficient meaning the participants who felt strongly about equality did not support reducing the length of the state legislative session and requiring legislators to spend more time in their districts. The other two explanatory variables had positive coefficients. Participants who felt strongly about having freedom to make one's own choices wanted the state legislature and legislators to have more freedom as well. And, participants felt this proposal would lead to government better representing the will of the people. At t3, the economic freedom index and education index were significant. The economic freedom index maintains its positive coefficient and the education index maintains its negative index. Those who reported feeling strongly about having an informed society felt this proposal would be contrary to having a better-informed public. The attitude change results for this proposal showed that support and opposition for this proposal was below the 50 percent mark – 46 percent of participants supported this proposal after deliberations, while 57 percent of participants support before deliberations.

What's Next California Report

Proposal B6

Dependent Variable: Q2p_r; Allowing voters to rank the candidates in order of preference, so that the winner can be decided without a second election

Predictions for Explanatory Variables:

- 1) Equality Index: No prediction
- 2) Economic Freedom Index: No prediction
- 3) Importance of Education Index: No prediction
- 4) Government should reflect the will of the people: No prediction

VALUES (16/39)	Dependent Variable: Q2p_r; Allowing voters to rank the candidates in order of preference, so that the winner can be decided without a second election						
	T2			T3			Difference
	B	Std. Error	Sig.	B	Std. Error	Sig.	Sig.
(Constant)	0.587	0.087	0.000	0.488	0.101	0.000	-
Equality Index (a, e, i)	0.087	0.070	0.216	0.123	0.079	0.119	0.672
Economic Freedom Index (b, c, f, g, j)	-0.076	0.092	0.411	-0.193	0.095	0.042	0.274
Importance of Education Index (k, l)	-0.066	0.097	0.498	-0.023	0.109	0.832	0.330
Gov should reflect the will of the people (h)	0.090	0.072	0.210	0.190	0.088	0.030	0.330
R ²	.017			.048			-
(p)	(.387)			(.011)			-

Results

There were no predictions for these regressions. No explanatory variables were significant at t2. At t3, the economic freedom index and government should reflect the people indices were significant at 0.05 level. The economic freedom index has a negative coefficient, indicating that participants thought instant runoff voting would hamper the ability of people to make their own choices. While the government should reflect the will of the people index has a positive coefficient and participants who rated this explanatory variable highly felt that this proposal would more accurately reflect the will of the people. The attitude change results for this proposal had a simple majority support of 58 percent post deliberations.

Proposal B7

Dependent Variable: Q2q_r; Lengthening Assembly terms from 2 years to 4, and Senate terms from 4 years to 6

Predictions for Explanatory Variables:

- 1) Equality Index: No prediction
- 2) Economic Freedom Index: No prediction
- 3) Importance of Education Index: No prediction
- 4) Government should reflect the will of the people: No prediction

VALUES (17/39)	Dependent Variable: Q2q_r; Lengthening Assembly terms from 2 years to 4, and Senate terms from 4 years to 6						
	T2			T3			Difference
	B	Std. Error	Sig.	B	Std. Error	Sig.	Sig.
(Constant)	0.582	0.088	0.000	0.416	0.079	0.000	-
Equality Index (a, e, i)	0.198	0.070	0.005	0.050	0.061	0.417	0.060
Economic Freedom Index (b, c, f, g, j)	-0.503	0.093	0.000	-0.224	0.074	0.002	0.006
Importance of Education Index (k, l)	0.176	0.099	0.075	0.565	0.087	0.000	0.001
Gov should reflect the will of the people (h)	-0.031	0.074	0.678	-0.040	0.069	0.566	0.921
R ²	.126			.136			-
(p)	(.000)			(.000)			-

Results

There were no predictions for these regressions. The regression at t2 had two statistically significant explanatory variables: the equality index and economic freedom index. The equality index had positive coefficient, indicating participants who supported equality and equal opportunity favored this proposal, while participants who wanted value more freedom in making one's choices tended to oppose this proposal. At t3, the equality index lost its significance and participants no longer felt this proposal supports equality and equal opportunity. The economic freedom index maintained its negative coefficient and significance. The education index became significant at t3, as participants felt that this proposal would lead to a better-informed public. The attitude change results showed substantial shifts in opinion from t2 to t3 – support for this proposal increased from 46 percent to 81 percent.

What's Next California Report

Proposal B8

Dependent Variable: Q2r_r; Requiring economic impact analyses of major legislation before passage

Predictions for Explanatory Variables:

- 1) Equality Index: No prediction
- 2) Economic Freedom Index: No prediction
- 3) Importance of Education Index: positive coefficient; this proposal would generate more information for the public and enable the public to gain more information about major legislation, which could lead to a more informed society
- 4) Government should reflect the will of the people: No prediction

VALUES (18/39)	Dependent Variable: Q2r_r; Requiring economic impact analyses of major legislation before passage						
	T2			T3			Difference
	B	Std. Error	Sig.	B	Std. Error	Sig.	Sig.
(Constant)	0.789	0.058	0.000	0.586	0.067	0.000	-
Equality Index (a, e, i)	-0.078	0.047	0.094	-0.071	0.052	0.170	0.907
Economic Freedom Index (b, c, f, g, j)	0.023	0.062	0.713	0.083	0.063	0.187	0.419
Importance of Education Index (k, l)	0.102	0.066	0.060 [†]	0.166	0.074	0.012 [†]	0.479
Gov should reflect the will of the people (h)	-0.038	0.049	0.441	0.097	0.059	0.100	0.057
R ²	.005			.057			-
(p)	(.311)			(.002)			-

Results

The importance of education index prediction was accurate at t2 and t3 and the variable was significant at t3, but not t2, based on one-tailed p-values. The t2 regression was not significant and the rest of the explanatory variables were not significant either. At t3, the three other explanatory variables were not significant. The attitude change results did not show significant change between t2 and t3, but support for this proposal received more than super-majority support before and after deliberations, as it reach 90 percent post deliberation.

Proposal B9

Dependent Variable: Q2s_r; Establishing clear goals for each government program and assessing whether progress is being made toward these goals at least once every ten years

Predictions for Explanatory Variables:

- 1) Equality Index: No prediction
- 2) Economic Freedom Index: No prediction
- 3) Importance of Education Index: No prediction
- 4) Government should reflect the will of the people: No prediction

VALUES (19/39)	Dependent Variable: Q2s_r; Establishing clear goals for each government program and assessing whether progress is being made toward these goals at least once every ten years						
	T2			T3			Difference
	B	Std. Error	Sig.	B	Std. Error	Sig.	Sig.
(Constant)	0.598	0.065	0.000	0.539	0.068	0.000	-
Equality Index (a, e, i)	0.040	0.052	0.434	-0.054	0.052	0.302	0.133
Economic Freedom Index (b, c, f, g, j)	0.024	0.068	0.728	0.003	0.063	0.963	0.794
Importance of Education Index (k, l)	0.097	0.073	0.184	0.323	0.074	0.000	0.018
Gov should reflect the will of the people (h)	0.086	0.054	0.114	0.057	0.059	0.335	0.702
R ²	.033			.070			-
(p)	(.017)			(.000)			-

Results

There were no predictions for these regressions. The t2 explanatory variables were not significant and among the t3 explanatory variables, only the importance of education variable yielded significance. The coefficient was positive at t2 and t3. Participants felt this proposal would be compatible with having a well-educated society. The attitude change results for this proposal increased from 86 to 90 percent, post deliberations.

What's Next California Report

Proposal B10a

Dependent Variable: Q2t_r; Requiring the Governor and the Legislature to adopt two-year instead of one-year budgets

Predictions for Explanatory Variables:

- 1) Equality Index: No prediction
- 2) Economic Freedom Index: No prediction
- 3) Importance of Education Index: No prediction
- 4) Government should reflect the will of the people: No prediction

VALUES (20/39)	Dependent Variable: Q2t_r; Requiring the Governor and the Legislature to adopt two-year instead of one-year budgets						
	T2			T3			Difference
	B	Std. Error	Sig.	B	Std. Error	Sig.	Sig.
(Constant)	0.767	0.077	0.000	0.679	0.086	0.000	-
Equality Index (a, e, i)	0.042	0.062	0.498	0.085	0.067	0.203	0.565
Economic Freedom Index (b, c, f, g, j)	-0.203	0.082	0.013	-0.144	0.080	0.073	0.527
Importance of Education Index (k, l)	-0.004	0.086	0.966	0.046	0.093	0.623	0.666
Gov should reflect the will of the people (h)	-0.054	0.064	0.403	0.032	0.075	0.665	0.338
R ²	.025			.023			-
(p)	(.014)			(.087)			-

Results

There were no predictions for these regressions. At t2, the economic freedom index had a negative and significant coefficient, but at t3 the significance went above the 0.05 level. Participants who valued the freedom to make one's own choices were less inclined to support this proposal after deliberations. The attitude change results showed support for this proposal went from a simple majority of 56 percent to 72 percent, even pass a super majority.

Proposal B10b

Dependent Variable: Q2u_r; Requiring the Governor and the Legislature to publish three and five year budget projections prior to the budget vote each year

Regressions were not significant at 0.05 level.

State and Local Reform: Proposal C1

Dependent Variable: Q2v_r; Transferring from the state to local governments control and financing of services provided at the local level and requiring minimum standards for delivering them

Regressions were not significant at 0.05 level.

Proposal C2

Dependent Variable: Q2w_r; Allowing local governments to raise taxes for local services in exchange for increased coordination of service delivery and public reporting of performance

Predictions for Explanatory Variables:

- 1) Equality Index: No prediction
- 2) Economic Freedom Index: No prediction
- 3) Importance of Education Index: No prediction
- 4) Government should reflect the will of the people: No prediction

Dependent Variable: Q2w_r; Allowing local governments to raise taxes for local services in exchange for increased coordination of service delivery and public reporting of performance							
VALUES (23/39)	T2			T3			Difference
	B	Std. Error	Sig.	B	Std. Error	Sig.	Sig.
(Constant)	0.501	0.081	0.000	0.443	0.086	0.000	-
Equality Index (a, e, i)	0.107	0.065	0.102	0.131	0.067	0.050	0.750
Economic Freedom Index (b, c, f, g, j)	-0.307	0.086	0.000	-0.111	0.081	0.170	0.043
Importance of Education Index (k, l)	0.101	0.091	0.267	0.098	0.094	0.297	0.980
Gov should reflect the will of the people (h)	0.110	0.067	0.101	0.078	0.075	0.298	0.726
R ²	.058			.032			-
(p)	(.000)			(.005)			-

Results

There were no predictions for these regressions. At t2, the economic freedom index was the only statistically significant explanatory variable. The coefficient for this index was negative, meaning that participants who favored being able to make their own choices about their finances are less inclined to favor this proposal. At t3, this index maintained its negative coefficient, but the index was no longer significant. This shift from significance to insignificance of the coefficients was large enough to produce a significant p-value in the difference column. The only other significant explanatory variable at t3 was the equality index. The equality index had a positive coefficient, as participants that felt strongly about seeing that people had equal opportunities were more inclined to support this proposal. The attitude change between t2 and t3 showed increase in support from 54 to 63 percent.

What's Next California Report

Proposal C3

Dependent Variable: Q2x_r; Creating a stable source of funds for regional priorities by dedicating a portion of tax revenue from economic growth to those priorities

Predictions for Explanatory Variables:

- 1) Equality Index: No prediction
- 2) Economic Freedom Index: No prediction
- 3) Importance of Education Index: No prediction
- 4) Government should reflect the will of the people: No prediction

Dependent Variable: Q2x_r; Creating a stable source of funds for regional priorities by dedicating a portion of tax revenue from economic growth to those priorities							
VALUES (24/39)	T2			T3			Difference
	B	Std. Error	Sig.	B	Std. Error	Sig.	Sig.
(Constant)	0.466	0.065	0.000	0.426	0.073	0.000	-
Equality Index (a, e, i)	0.171	0.052	0.001	0.203	0.056	0.000	0.640
Economic Freedom Index (b, c, f, g, j)	-0.044	0.069	0.519	-0.024	0.067	0.718	0.818
Importance of Education Index (k, l)	0.081	0.074	0.275	0.070	0.080	0.386	0.913
Gov should reflect the will of the people (h)	0.013	0.055	0.813	0.039	0.065	0.549	0.751
R ²	.059			.066			-
(p)	(.000)			(.000)			-

Results

There were no predictions for these regressions. The only explanatory variable that was significant at both time points was the equality index. The coefficients for the equality index at both time points were positive, showing that participants that favored seeing that people had equal opportunity were more inclined to support this proposal. The attitude change between t2 and t3 for this proposal did not change significantly and maintained a super majority support, at 68 percent.

Proposal C4

Dependent Variable: Q2y_r; Direct any savings resulting from successful local management of state resources to those local governments, in exchange for monitoring their own performance and being accountable and innovative in their operations

Regressions were not significant at 0.05 level.

Proposal C5

Dependent Variable: Q2z_r; Requiring state and local governments to identify policy goals and publish their progress toward meeting them and innovative in their operations

Predictions for Explanatory Variables:

- 1) Equality Index: No prediction
- 2) Economic Freedom Index: No prediction
- 3) Importance of Education Index: positive coefficient; this proposal would make efforts to a more educated society
- 4) Government should reflect the will of the people: No prediction

VALUES (26/39)	Dependent Variable: Q2z_r; Requiring state and local governments to identify policy goals and publish their progress toward meeting them and innovative in their operations						
	T2			T3			Difference
	B	Std. Error	Sig.	B	Std. Error	Sig.	Sig.
(Constant)	0.594	0.057	0.000	0.367	0.059	0.000	-
Equality Index (a, e, i)	0.011	0.046	0.804	-0.025	0.045	0.583	0.519
Economic Freedom Index (b, c, f, g, j)	0.072	0.060	0.232	0.136	0.054	0.012	0.370
Importance of Education Index (k, l)	0.065	0.065	0.158†	0.367	0.064	0.000†	0.000†
Gov should reflect the will of the people (h)	0.113	0.048	0.019	0.065	0.052	0.211	0.462
R ²	.055			.136			-
(p)	(.001)			(.000)			-

Results

At t2, this proposal has one significant coefficient; government should reflect the will of the people. The coefficient on this variable is positive – people think this proposal would better reflect the will of the people. At t3, the economic freedom index and importance of education index has positive and significant coefficients. Participants felt this proposal would provide people freedom to make their own choices and enable people to become better educated. The attitude change between t2 and t3 yielded significant change and support for this proposal increased from 89 to 92 percent.

What's Next California Report

Taxation: Proposal D1

Dependent Variable: Q2aa_r; Requiring legislation **creating new programs** that cost \$25 million or more to indicate how they will be paid for

Dependent Variable: Q2ab_r; Requiring legislation **creating tax cuts** that cost \$25 million or more to indicate how they will be paid for

Dependent Variable: Q2ac_r; Requiring legislation **creating new programs or tax cuts** that cost \$25 million or more to indicate how they will be paid for

Predictions for Explanatory Variables:

- 1) Equality Index: No prediction
- 2) Economic Freedom Index: No prediction
- 3) Importance of Education Index: positive coefficient; this proposal would make efforts to a more educated society
- 4) Government should reflect the will of the people: No prediction

VALUES (27/39)	Dependent Variable: Q2aa_r; Requiring legislation creating new programs that cost \$25 million or more to indicate how they will be paid for						
	T2			T3			Difference
	B	Std. Error	Sig.	B	Std. Error	Sig.	Sig.
(Constant)	0.700	0.058	0.000	0.528	0.062	0.000	-
Equality Index (a, e, i)	-0.056	0.046	0.228	-0.099	0.048	0.041	0.435
Economic Freedom Index (b, c, f, g, j)	0.084	0.061	0.171	0.287	0.058	0.000	0.004
Importance of Education Index (k, l)	0.031	0.064	0.316†	0.174	0.068	0.005†	0.090
Gov should reflect the will of the people (h)	0.121	0.048	0.012	0.024	0.054	0.652	0.145
R ²	.048			.129			-
(p)	(.002)			(.000)			-

VALUES (28/39)	Dependent Variable: Q2ab_r; Requiring legislation creating tax cuts that cost \$25 million or more to indicate how they will be paid for						
	T2			T3			Difference
	B	Std. Error	Sig.	B	Std. Error	Sig.	Sig.
(Constant)	0.579	0.074	0.000	0.334	0.077	0.000	-
Equality Index (a, e, i)	0.219	0.059	0.067	0.092	0.060	0.124	0.072
Economic Freedom Index (b, c, f, g, j)	-0.143	0.078	0.352	0.021	0.072	0.773	0.069
Importance of Education Index (k, l)	0.078	0.083	0.043†	0.266	0.084	0.001†	0.083
Gov should reflect the will of the people (h)	0.107	0.062	0.000	0.167	0.068	0.014	0.477
R ²	.099			.110			-
(p)	(.000)			(.000)			-

VALUES (29/39)	Dependent Variable: Q2ac_r; Requiring legislation creating new programs or tax cuts that cost \$25 million or more to indicate how they will be paid for						
	T2			T3			Difference
	B	Std. Error	Sig.	B	Std. Error	Sig.	Sig.
(Constant)	0.582	0.074	0.000	0.453	0.074	0.000	-
Equality Index (a, e, i)	0.144	0.059	0.015	0.004	0.056	0.052	0.049
Economic Freedom Index (b, c, f, g, j)	-0.111	0.078	0.155	0.132	0.068	0.004	0.007
Importance of Education Index (k, l)	0.109	0.084	0.096†	0.234	0.081	0.142†	0.248
Gov should reflect the will of the people (h)	0.110	0.062	0.077	0.069	0.065	0.000	0.627
R ²	.068			.082			-
(p)	(.000)			(.000)			-

Results

The following three dependent variables examine proposal D1, the first proposal in the taxation section of the discussion guide. This proposal was separated into three dependent variables to examine the participants' attitude toward *creating new programs*, *tax cuts*, and the combination of the two, which is used in the proposal. This first dependent variables yielded one significant explanatory variable at t2, government should reflect the will of the people. This variable lost its significance at t3, but remained positive. That is, after deliberations, participants felt this proposal no longer would reflect the will of the people. At t3, the variables that were statistically significant were the economic freedom index and important of education index. Both variables had positive coefficients, as people who favored those indices were more inclined to support requiring legislation to indicate how new programs would be paid for, if they were over \$25 million. The proposal had high support before and after deliberations, slightly over 90 percent before and 90 percent afterwards.

For the second table on tax cuts, at t2, in comparison to the previous dependent variable on creating new programs, the same explanatory variable is positive and significant; government should reflect the will of the people. In these regressions, at t3, this explanatory variable remained positive and significant, whereas in the previous table, this variable became insignificant. That is, participants who favored having government reflect the will of the people felt that having legislation for tax cuts would reflect the will of the people more than having legislation for creating new programs. The importance of education variable is positive and significant at both time points, as predicted. As with the proposal, support for this proposal was high before and after deliberations, it reached 85 percent post deliberation.

Unlike the previous two tables, the importance of education index did not yield statistically significant results, although the coefficient is positive as predicted. The equality index at both time points are positive and significant and the government should reflect the will of the people index is also positive and significant at t3. The economic freedom index is positive and significant at t3 and also important to point out that the difference between the t2 and t3 coefficients is significant at .007. The coefficient at t2 started at -0.111 and moved to +0.132. That is, before deliberations participants felt this proposal would lessen people's ability to make their own choices, but after deliberations, participants felt the opposite, that this proposal could actually increase people's ability to make their own choices. As with the previous two results for attitude change, this proposal had high support before and after deliberations, this proposal had 88 percent support after deliberations.

What's Next California Report

Proposal D2

Dependent Variable: Q2ad_r; Requiring that one-time revenue spikes only be spent on one-time projects, paying off debt, and filling the state rainy-day fund

Dependent Variable: Q2ae_r; Increasing the size of the State's rainy-day fund from 5% to 10% of the State budget

Predictions for Explanatory Variables:

- 1) Equality Index: No prediction
- 2) Economic Freedom Index: No prediction
- 3) Importance of Education Index: No prediction
- 4) Government should reflect the will of the people: No prediction

VALUES (30/39)	Dependent Variable: Q2ad_r; Requiring that one-time revenue spikes only be spent on one-time projects, paying off debt, and filling the state rainy-day fund						
	T2			T3			Difference
	B	Std. Error	Sig.	B	Std. Error	Sig.	Sig.
(Constant)	0.521	0.073	0.000	0.452	0.081	0.000	-
Equality Index (a, e, i)	0.052	0.059	0.372	-0.007	0.062	0.914	0.420
Economic Freedom Index (b, c, f, g, j)	0.078	0.077	0.311	0.115	0.075	0.126	0.694
Importance of Education Index (k, l)	0.099	0.083	0.231	0.165	0.089	0.062	0.554
Gov should reflect the will of the people (h)	0.062	0.062	0.313	0.124	0.071	0.081	0.478
R ²	.022			.044			-
(p)	(.029)			(.001)			-

VALUES (31/39)	Dependent Variable: Q2ae_r; Increasing the size of the State's rainy-day fund from 5% to 10% of the State budget						
	T2			T3			Difference
	B	Std. Error	Sig.	B	Std. Error	Sig.	Sig.
(Constant)	0.515	0.078	0.000	0.503	0.092	0.000	-
Equality Index (a, e, i)	0.137	0.062	0.027	0.032	0.071	0.647	0.197
Economic Freedom Index (b, c, f, g, j)	0.221	0.082	0.007	0.124	0.085	0.148	0.342
Importance of Education Index (k, l)	-0.078	0.088	0.376	0.067	0.101	0.510	0.243
Gov should reflect the will of the people (h)	-0.037	0.066	0.577	0.021	0.081	0.794	0.552
R ²	.021			.014			-
(p)	(.042)			(.286)			-

Results

These two dependent variables are a part of one proposal. There were no predictions for these regressions. The first table for one-time revenue spikes did not have explanatory variables that were statistically significantly at t2 or t3. The attitude change between t2 and t3 were not statistically significant either, but the support for this proposal started and ended high, from 80 percent to 84 percent.

The second table on the rainy-day fund had significant explanatory variables at t2, but none at t3. The equality index and economic freedom index were both positive, indicating those who favored these indices were more likely to support increasing the rainy-day fund. But, after deliberations, participants were less inclined to favor the rainy-day fund, although the coefficients remained positive.

Proposal D3

Dependent Variable: Q2af_r; Applying the sales tax to services as well as goods **while reducing the sales tax rate**

Dependent Variable: Q2ag_r; Applying the sales tax to services as well as goods **while keeping the current sales tax rate**

Predictions for Explanatory Variables:

- 1) Equality Index: No prediction
- 2) Economic Freedom Index: No prediction
- 3) Importance of Education Index: No prediction
- 4) Government should reflect the will of the people: No prediction

VALUES (32/39)	Dependent Variable: Q2af_r; Applying the sales tax to services as well as goods while reducing the sales tax rate						
	T2			T3			Difference
	B	Std. Error	Sig.	B	Std. Error	Sig.	Sig.
(Constant)	0.457	0.097	0.000	0.399	0.109	0.000	-
Equality Index (a, e, i)	0.295	0.077	0.000	0.202	0.083	0.015	0.349
Economic Freedom Index (b, c, f, g, j)	-0.127	0.102	0.215	-0.173	0.100	0.085	0.715
Importance of Education Index (k, l)	-0.229	0.110	0.037	0.074	0.119	0.537	0.045
Gov should reflect the will of the people (h)	0.096	0.082	0.239	0.004	0.096	0.969	0.433
R ²	.050			.039			-
(p)	(.000)			(.002)			-

VALUES (33/39)	Dependent Variable: Q2ag_r; Applying the sales tax to services as well as goods while keeping the current sales tax rate						
	T2			T3			Difference
	B	Std. Error	Sig.	B	Std. Error	Sig.	Sig.
(Constant)	0.326	0.086	0.000	0.283	0.099	0.004	-
Equality Index (a, e, i)	0.252	0.069	0.000	0.349	0.076	0.000	0.264
Economic Freedom Index (b, c, f, g, j)	-0.187	0.091	0.040	-0.055	0.092	0.547	0.228
Importance of Education Index (k, l)	-0.048	0.097	0.622	-0.097	0.108	0.368	0.710
Gov should reflect the will of the people (h)	0.013	0.072	0.239	-0.114	0.086	0.188	0.222
R ²	.066			.069			-
(p)	(.000)			(.000)			-

Results

There were no predictions for these regressions. These two dependent variables were a part of proposal D3 from the discussion guide. At t2, when asked about applying sales tax to services and goods while reducing the sales tax rate, participants who felt strongly about the equality index favored this proposal, while participants who favored the education index opposed this proposal. However, at t3, participants who favored the education index no longer felt opposed to the proposal, as it lost its negative coefficient and its significance, and participants who favored the equality index remained in favor of this proposal. This dependent variable had less than 50 percent support before and after deliberation, it reached 45 percent after deliberations. While at t2 when asked about applying sales tax to services and goods while keeping the current sales tax, participants who favored the equality index had the same inclination as before (with reducing the sales tax rate), but those who favored the economic freedom index felt this proposal would get in the way of people making their own choices. Post deliberation, only the equality index was significant. This dependent variable had opposition of 70 percent post deliberation.

What's Next California Report

Proposal D4

Dependent Variable: Q2ah_r; Limiting the current California state income tax deduction for home mortgage interest payments to \$25,000 per year

Predictions for Explanatory Variables:

- 1) Equality Index: No prediction
- 2) Economic Freedom Index: No prediction
- 3) Importance of Education Index: No prediction
- 4) Government should reflect the will of the people: No prediction

VALUES (34/39)	Dependent Variable: Q2ah_r; Limiting the current California state income tax deduction for home mortgage interest payments to \$25,000 per year						
	T2			T3			Difference
	B	Std. Error	Sig.	B	Std. Error	Sig.	Sig.
(Constant)	0.648	0.090	0.000	0.521	0.102	0.000	-
Equality Index (a, e, i)	0.267	0.071	0.000	0.196	0.078	0.012	0.436
Economic Freedom Index (b, c, f, g, j)	-0.244	0.095	0.010	-0.652	0.094	0.000	0.000
Importance of Education Index (k, l)	-0.153	0.101	0.132	0.068	0.111	0.540	0.112
Gov should reflect the will of the people (h)	-0.051	0.075	0.496	0.293	0.089	0.001	0.002
R ²	.078			.168			-
(p)	(.000)			(.000)			-

Results

There were no predictions for these regressions. At t2 and t3, the equality index had a positive and significant coefficient. The economic freedom index also had a positive and significant coefficient at both time points. Note that the coefficients at t2 and t3 change significantly, as the p-value of the difference is 0.000. The participants at t3 who favored economic freedom were even more opposed to this proposal than they were at t2. And, the government should reflect the will of the people index became positive and significant at t3, while at time 2 it was negative and insignificant. This variable had a significant difference between t2 and t3, as seen in the difference column. The attitude change between t2 and t3 for this proposal was not significant; participants did not support this proposal highly, as support only reached 44 percent after deliberations.

Proposal D5

Dependent Variable: Q2ai_r; Reassessing non-residential property more frequently than now

Dependent Variable: Q2aj_r; Reassessing all property values more frequently while adjusting the current property tax exemption for inflation to about \$28,000 and allowing the exemption to rise with property values going forward

Dependent Variable: Q2ak_r; Allowing local electorates to raise the property tax rate above the current 1% rate cap

Predictions for Explanatory Variables:

- 1) Equality Index: No prediction
- 2) Economic Freedom Index: No prediction
- 3) Importance of Education Index: No prediction
- 4) Government should reflect the will of the people: No prediction

VALUES (35/39)	Dependent Variable: Q2ai_r; Reassessing non-residential property more frequently than now						
	T2			T3			Difference
	B	Std. Error	Sig.	B	Std. Error	Sig.	Sig.
(Constant)	0.569	0.080	0.000	0.440	0.089	0.000	-
Equality Index (a, e, i)	0.247	0.064	0.000	0.388	0.068	0.000	0.087
Economic Freedom Index (b, c, f, g, j)	-0.478	0.084	0.000	-0.403	0.082	0.000	0.470
Importance of Education Index (k, l)	0.258	0.091	0.004	0.314	0.098	0.001	0.658
Gov should reflect the will of the people (h)	-0.110	0.068	0.104	-0.029	0.078	0.715	0.405
R ²	.195			.252			-
(p)	(.000)			(.000)			-

VALUES (36/39)	Dependent Variable: Q2aj_r; Reassessing all property values more frequently while adjusting the current property tax exemption for inflation to about \$28,000 and allowing the exemption to rise with property values going forward						
	T2			T3			Difference
	B	Std. Error	Sig.	B	Std. Error	Sig.	Sig.
(Constant)	0.400	0.081	0.000	0.324	0.097	0.001	-
Equality Index (a, e, i)	0.233	0.064	0.000	0.415	0.074	0.000	0.043
Economic Freedom Index (b, c, f, g, j)	-0.290	0.085	0.001	-0.131	0.089	0.139	0.164
Importance of Education Index (k, l)	0.121	0.092	0.191	-0.076	0.107	0.476	0.146
Gov should reflect the will of the people (h)	-0.027	0.069	0.692	-0.050	0.086	0.557	0.826
R ²	.110			.122			-
(p)	(.000)			(.000)			-

VALUES (37/39)	Dependent Variable: Q2ak_r; Allowing local electorates to raise the property tax rate above the current 1% rate cap						
	T2			T3			Difference
	B	Std. Error	Sig.	B	Std. Error	Sig.	Sig.
(Constant)	0.417	0.081	0.000	0.324	0.097	0.000	-
Equality Index (a, e, i)	0.417	0.065	0.000	0.373	0.075	0.000	0.595
Economic Freedom Index (b, c, f, g, j)	-0.465	0.086	0.000	-0.327	0.090	0.000	0.178
Importance of Education Index (k, l)	-0.054	0.091	0.555	-0.067	0.104	0.522	0.915
Gov should reflect the will of the people (h)	0.018	0.067	0.790	0.430	0.096	0.540	0.480
R ²	.220			.140			-
(p)	(.000)			(.000)			-

What's Next California Report

Results

These dependent variables are under one proposal, D5, to keep the spirit of Proposition 13 (protection of reassessment of homeowners), but modifying its tax provisions. The first dependent variable proposes to reassessment non-residential property more frequently. At both t2 and t3, three of the four explanatory variables were statistically significant. Participants who favored the equality index and the importance of education index supported this proposal, while participants who favored the economic freedom index opposed this index. The second dependent variable included more provisions for assessing property and participants who favored the equality index similarly favored this dependent variable. However, participants who favored economic freedom after deliberations did not strongly oppose these changes in provisions than they did to the reassessment non-residential property more frequently. Finally, the last dependent variable asked participants to allow local electorates to raise property taxes above the one percent rate cap. The directionality of the equality index and economic freedom index remained the same, positive and negative respectively, and the strength of the coefficients' significance held strong pre and post deliberation for this dependent variable. In terms of attitude change between t2 and t3, only the first dependent variable, reassessment non-residential property more frequently, had strong support, this proposal started at 52 percent and ended at 72 percent, a 20 percent increase. While the other two proposals, only had about 30 percent support post deliberations.

Proposal D6

Dependent Variable: Q2a1_r; Lowering local vote requirement to adopt taxes dedicated to specific purposes, to a simple majority so that it is the same as the vote requirement to adopt taxes for general purposes

Predictions for Explanatory Variables:

- 1) Equality Index: No prediction
- 2) Economic Freedom Index: No prediction
- 3) Importance of Education Index: No prediction
- 4) Government should reflect the will of the people: No prediction

VALUES (38/39)	Dependent Variable: Q2a1_r; Lowering local vote requirement to adopt taxes dedicated to specific purposes, to a simple majority so that it is the same as the vote requirement to adopt taxes for general purposes						
	T2			T3			Difference
	B	Std. Error	Sig.	B	Std. Error	Sig.	Sig.
(Constant)	0.436	0.088	0.000	0.292	0.100	0.003	-
Equality Index (a, e, i)	0.382	0.070	0.000	0.398	0.076	0.000	0.858
Economic Freedom Index (b, c, f, g, j)	-0.409	0.092	0.000	-0.362	0.092	0.000	0.685
Importance of Education Index (k, l)	0.102	0.100	0.305	0.042	0.109	0.701	0.664
Gov should reflect the will of the people (h)	-0.031	0.074	0.673	0.145	0.088	0.000	0.105
R ²	.191			.173			-
(p)	(.000)			(.000)			-

Results

There were no predictions for these regressions. Similar to the results within taxation, at both time points, participants who favored the equality index supported this proposal and participants who favored the economic freedom index opposed this proposal. For this proposal, participants who favored the government reflecting the will of the people supported this proposal after deliberations. The attitude change for this proposal was not significant and support for this proposal was under 50 percent before and after deliberations.

What's Next California Report

Proposal D7

Dependent Variable: Q2am_r; Decreasing the super-majority vote required in the Legislature to raise taxes (about 67%) to 55%

Predictions for Explanatory Variables:

- 1) Equality Index: No prediction
- 2) Economic Freedom Index: No prediction
- 3) Importance of Education Index: No prediction
- 4) Government should reflect the will of the people: No prediction

VALUES (39/39)	Dependent Variable: Q2am_r; Decreasing the super-majority vote required in the Legislature to raise taxes (about 67%) to 55%						
	T2			T3			Difference
	B	Std. Error	Sig.	B	Std. Error	Sig.	Sig.
(Constant)	0.408	0.090	0.000	0.438	0.109	0.000	-
Equality Index (a, e, i)	0.464	0.072	0.000	0.484	0.084	0.000	0.826
Economic Freedom Index (b, c, f, g, j)	-0.563	0.095	0.000	-0.651	0.101	0.000	0.459
Importance of Education Index (k, l)	0.146	0.102	0.149	0.088	0.119	0.459	0.686
Gov should reflect the will of the people (h)	-0.104	0.075	0.168	0.101	0.095	0.288	0.069
R ²	.263			.251			-
(p)	(.000)			(.000)			-

Results

There were no predictions for these regressions. The equality index and economic freedom index have opposite signs, where those who support the equality index support the proposal and those who support the economic freedom index oppose the proposal. The remaining explanatory variables were not significant for this proposal. The change in attitude for this proposal increased from 32 percent to 50 percent after deliberations.

2. REGRESSION ANALYSES: EXAMINING BASIC ORIENTATIONS

Regression Analyses: Examining Basic Orientations

Explanatory Variables

The Basic Orientation Indices are created based on selected questions from the arrival (t2) and departure (t3) questionnaires. Some of these questions were not asked at the telephone questionnaire (t1) therefore for a consistent basis for comparison these regression analyses use only t2 and t3 variables. Seven indices were created from the selected questions, some are single item indices and others indices are created with several questions, and two party dummies are included – republican and democrat.

- 2) Single Item Index: Some people think that government should provide certain benefits and services, even if that means higher taxes (1). Other people think that government should lower taxes, even if that means reduced benefits and services (7). This question was originally a seven-point question with 4 exactly in the middle as the midpoint. For the analyses, this question was rescaled onto a 0 to 1 scale.
- 3) Single Item Index: Some people think that majorities should always have their way no matter how big the minorities are or how strongly they feel (1). Other people think that minorities should have their way when they are large enough or feel strongly enough (7). This question was also originally a seven-point question with 4 exactly in the middle as the midpoint. For the analyses, this question was rescaled onto a 0 to 1 scale.
- 4) Single Item Index: Some people think that the best society is one in which nobody can tell anybody else what to do, even if there is a cost to others (1). Other people think that the best society is one in which the community can decide together what people can and cannot do, even if some people object (7). This question was also originally a seven-point question with 4 exactly in the middle as the midpoint. For the analyses, this question was rescaled onto a 0 to 1 scale.
- 5) State Authority (over local) Index
 - i. Decision-making authority: Local level (0) vs. State level (10)
 - ii. Taxation power: Local level (0) vs. State level (10)
 - iii. Public policy decisions: Local level (0) vs. the State level (10)
 - a. The above three questions were asked on a 0 to 10 scale, where 0 is completely at the local level, 5 is exactly in the middle and 10 is completely at the State level. The questions were rescaled on a 0 to 1 scale, where 0 is completely at the local level and 1 is completely at the State level.
 - iv. Decisions made at local level reflect the will of the local community more closely (1) vs. Decisions made at local level are dominated by powerful special interests (7)
 - v. Local communities should be able to decide their own taxes and services (1) vs. Taxes and services should be the same throughout the state (7)
 - a. The two questions were originally seven-point questions with 4 exactly in the middle as the midpoint. For the analyses, this question was rescaled onto a 0 to 1 scale.

i. Cronbach's Alpha: 0.720

6) Representative Democracy (over direct democracy) Index

- a. State's major decisions should be made by: Voters in referendums (0) vs. State Legislature (10). This question was asked on a 0 to 10 scale, where 0 is completely by voters in referendums, 5 is exactly in the middle and 10 is completely by the State Legislature. The question was rescaled on a 0 to 1 scale, where 0 is completely by voters in referendums and 1 is completely by the State Legislature.
- b. Best government is: One in which everyone gets to vote directly on making the laws (1) vs. One in which everyone gets to vote for representatives who then vote on making the laws (7). This question was originally a seven-point question with 4 exactly in the middle as the midpoint. For the analyses, this question was rescaled onto a 0 to 1 scale.
 - i. Correlation: .541***

7) Satisfaction with State Legislature Index

- i. Satisfaction with: c. CA State Senate
- ii. Satisfaction with: d. CA State Assembly
- iii. Satisfaction with: e. CA State Legislature
 - The above three questions were asked on a 0 to 10 scale, where 0 is completely dissatisfied, 5 is exactly in the middle and 10 is completely satisfied. The questions were rescaled on a 0 to 1 scale, where 0 is completely dissatisfied and 1 is completely satisfied.
 - i. Cronbach's Alpha: 0.956

8) Satisfaction with Local Government Index

- iv. Satisfaction with: h. Your city/town and county's government
- v. Satisfaction with: i. CA's local governments generally
 - The above two questions were asked on a 0 to 10 scale, where 0 is completely dissatisfied, 5 is exactly in the middle and 10 is completely satisfied. The questions were rescaled on a 0 to 1 scale, where 0 is completely dissatisfied and 1 is completely satisfied.
 - 1. Correlation: 0.686***

9) Republican Dummy: 1 = Republican

10) Democrat Dummy: 1 = Democrat

For the regressions in this section of the report, 9 explanatory variables will be included in the regressions. From the t2 and t3 questionnaires, there were 39 attitude questions on the 35 proposals. The discussion below selects dependent variables with statistically significant regressions (above 0.05 level) at both t2 and t3.

Each proposal discussions begin with *predictions* for explanatory variables. Predictions were not made for all explanatory variables or dependent variables. The predictions are not intended to

What's Next California Report

truly predict the results of the regressions; rather they should be seen as expectations of how variables could perform in theory. The purpose of the predictions is to more accurately interpret the results and their significance. That is, explanatory variables with predictions will have one-tailed p-values or the *sig.* column in the regressions tables will have the † symbol, p-values without this symbol indicates two-tailed p-values. A one-tailed p-value is more accurate for variables with certain expectations than a two-tailed p-value.

The regression tables below have three block columns. The first block column shows the t2 results with the coefficient (B), standard error (std. error) and p-value or significance (sig.), the second block column reports the same values at t3 and the last column reports the p-value for the comparison between the t2 and t3 corresponding coefficients. A significant difference would indicate the coefficients are different pre and post deliberation.

Initiative Process: Proposal A1

Dependent Variable: t2q2a_r; creating a formal review process to allow an initiative's proponents to amend an initiative following public input

Predictions for Explanatory Variables:

1. Single Item Index: Some people think that government should provide certain benefits and services, even if that means higher taxes (1). Other people think that government should lower taxes, even if that means reduced benefits and services (7).
2. Single Item Index: Some people think that majorities should always have their way no matter how big the minorities are or how strongly they feel (1). Other people think that minorities should have their way when they are large enough or feel strongly enough (7).
3. Single Item Index: Some people think that the best society is one in which nobody can tell anybody else what to do, even if there is a cost to others (1). Other people think that the best society is one in which the community can decide together what people can and cannot do, even if some people object (7).
4. State Authority (over local) Index
5. Representative Democracy (over direct democracy) Index
6. Satisfaction with State Legislature Index
7. Satisfaction with Local Government Index
8. Republican Dummy: 1 = Republican
9. Democrat Dummy: 1 = Democrat

Results

There were no predictions for these regressions. At t2, only one explanatory variable yielded a significant coefficient, relating to the trade offs between government providing benefits and taxes. This coefficient was negative and statistically significant at .007 at t2, but lost its negative sign and significance at t3. The difference of this coefficient between t2 and t3 was significant at .018 indicating a substantial shift. That is, participants who favor the government providing certain benefits and services, even if it means higher taxes, tended to oppose this proposal. At t3, a different explanatory variable became significant, relating to whether decisions in society should be made at costs to others or even if some object. Before deliberations, this coefficient was negative, but after deliberations, the coefficient became positive, indicating that participants that favored decisions made by a community were more inclined to favor this proposal. There was significant attitude change between t2 and t3 for this proposal, increased from 60 to 76 percent.

What's Next California Report

BASIC ORIENTATION (1/39)	Dependent Variable: Q2a_r; Creating a formal review process to allow an initiative's proponents to amend an initiative following public input						
	T2			T3			Difference
	B	Std. Error	Sig.	B	Std. Error	Sig.	Sig.
Some people think that government should provide certain benefits and services, even if that means higher taxes (1). Other people think that government should lower taxes, even if that means reduced benefits and services (7).	-0.107	0.040	0.007	0.015	0.043	0.724	0.018
Some people think that majorities should always have their way no matter how big the minorities are or how strongly they feel (1). Other people think that minorities should have their way when they are large enough or feel strongly enough (7).	-0.008	0.048	0.873	0.023	0.051	0.654	0.646
Some people think that the best society is one in which nobody can tell anybody else what to do, even if there is a cost to others (1). Other people think that the best society is one in which the community can decide together what people can and cannot do, even if some people object (7).	-0.043	0.047	0.366	0.150	0.048	0.002	0.001
State Authority (over local) Index	0.083	0.074	0.266	0.138	0.078	0.075	0.568
Representative Democracy (over direct democracy) Index	-0.056	0.050	0.266	-0.070	0.054	0.198	0.824
Satisfaction w/ State Legislature Index	0.105	0.072	0.144	-0.031	0.068	0.647	0.109
Satisfaction w/ Local Government Index	0.046	0.061	0.447	0.076	0.064	0.233	0.696
Republican	0.046	0.035	0.190	0.008	0.035	0.832	0.316
Democrat	0.023	0.033	0.485	0.040	0.033	0.230	0.640
(Constant)	0.593	0.071	0.000	0.492	0.071	0.000	-
R ²	.042			.038			-
(p)	.024			.015			-

Proposal A2a

Dependent Variable: t2q2b_r; allowing the Legislature to remove an initiative from the ballot by enacting it into law

Predictions for Explanatory Variables:

1. Single Item Index: Some people think that government should provide certain benefits and services, even if that means higher taxes (1). Other people think that government should lower taxes, even if that means reduced benefits and services (7).
2. Single Item Index: Some people think that majorities should always have their way no matter how big the minorities are or how strongly they feel (1). Other people think that minorities should have their way when they are large enough or feel strongly enough (7).
3. Single Item Index: Some people think that the best society is one in which nobody can tell anybody else what to do, even if there is a cost to others (1). Other people think that the best society is one in which the community can decide together what people can and cannot do, even if some people object (7).
4. State Authority (over local) Index
5. Representative Democracy (over direct democracy) Index
6. *Satisfaction with State Legislature Index: positive coefficient; the more satisfied you are with the State Legislature, the more inclined you should be to allowing the Legislature be a part of the process*
7. Satisfaction with Local Government Index
8. Republican Dummy: 1 = Republican
9. Democrat Dummy: 1 = Democrat

Results

The prediction for the satisfaction with the State Legislature index was accurately predicted. At t2 and t3, the coefficient was positive and statistically significant. The other statistically significant explanatory variable, also present in both t2 and t3, was the representative democracy index, as the more one supported representative democracy, the more support one had for this proposal. This proposal did not have significant attitude change between t2 and t3, support and opposition for this proposal was below 50 percent before and after deliberations.

What's Next California Report

BASIC ORIENTATION (2/39)	Dependent Variable: Q2b_r; Allowing the Legislature to remove an initiative from the ballot by enacting it into law						
	T2			T3			Difference
	B	Std. Error	Sig.	B	Std. Error	Sig.	Sig.
Some people think that government should provide certain benefits and services, even if that means higher taxes (1). Other people think that government should lower taxes, even if that means reduced benefits and services (7).	-0.063	0.046	0.171	-0.023	0.051	0.651	0.513
Some people think that majorities should always have their way no matter how big the minorities are or how strongly they feel (1). Other people think that minorities should have their way when they are large enough or feel strongly enough (7).	0.092	0.056	0.099	0.077	0.060	0.203	0.842
Some people think that the best society is one in which nobody can tell anybody else what to do, even if there is a cost to others (1). Other people think that the best society is one in which the community can decide together what people can and cannot do, even if some people object (7).	-0.062	0.055	0.258	0.067	0.056	0.231	0.070
State Authority (over local) Index	-0.096	0.086	0.269	0.053	0.092	0.563	0.195
Representative Democracy (over direct democracy) Index	0.298	0.058	0.000	0.167	0.064	0.009	0.081
Satisfaction w/ State Legislature Index	0.198	0.084	0.009†	0.196	0.081	0.008†	0.984
Satisfaction w/ Local Government Index	0.010	0.071	0.886	0.027	0.075	0.723	0.854
Republican	0.003	0.041	0.943	0.049	0.041	0.238	0.314
Democrat	0.042	0.038	0.264	0.056	0.039	0.150	0.752
(Constant)	0.269	0.082	0.001	0.136	0.084	0.105	-
R ²	.120			.076			-
(p)	(.000)			(.000)			-

Proposal A2b

Dependent Variable: t2q2c_r; Allowing a simple majority of the State Legislature to place a countermeasure to an already qualified initiative on the ballot next to that initiative

Predictions for Explanatory Variables:

1. Single Item Index: Some people think that government should provide certain benefits and services, even if that means higher taxes (1). Other people think that government should lower taxes, even if that means reduced benefits and services (7).
2. Single Item Index: Some people think that majorities should always have their way no matter how big the minorities are or how strongly they feel (1). Other people think that minorities should have their way when they are large enough or feel strongly enough (7).
3. Single Item Index: Some people think that the best society is one in which nobody can tell anybody else what to do, even if there is a cost to others (1). Other people think that the best society is one in which the community can decide together what people can and cannot do, even if some people object (7).
4. State Authority (over local) Index
5. Representative Democracy (over direct democracy) Index
6. *Satisfaction with State Legislature Index: positive coefficient; the more satisfied you are with the State Legislature, the more inclined you should be to allowing the Legislature be a part of the process*
7. Satisfaction with Local Government Index
8. Republican Dummy: 1 = Republican
9. Democrat Dummy: 1 = Democrat

Results

The prediction for satisfaction for the State Legislature index had a positive and significant coefficient at t2 and t3. The regression at t2 yielded a significant and positive coefficient for the Democrat dummy as well, that is Democrats tended to support this proposal. At t3, the single item index relating to majorities and minorities had a positive and significant coefficient, which showed that participants that felt minorities should have they way when they are large enough or feel strongly enough supported this proposal as well. This proposal experienced a decrease in support, as opposition for this proposal increased from 50 to 57 percent.

What's Next California Report

BASIC ORIENTATION (3/39)	Dependent Variable: Q2c_r; Allowing a simple majority of the State Legislature to place a countermeasure to an already qualified initiative on the ballot next to that initiative						
	T2			T3			Difference
	B	Std. Error	Sig.	B	Std. Error	Sig.	Sig.
Some people think that government should provide certain benefits and services, even if that means higher taxes (1). Other people think that government should lower taxes, even if that means reduced benefits and services (7).	-0.056	0.046	0.219	-0.029	0.051	0.566	0.653
Some people think that majorities should always have their way no matter how big the minorities are or how strongly they feel (1). Other people think that minorities should have their way when they are large enough or feel strongly enough (7).	0.093	0.055	0.093	0.138	0.060	0.021	0.564
Some people think that the best society is one in which nobody can tell anybody else what to do, even if there is a cost to others (1). Other people think that the best society is one in which the community can decide together what people can and cannot do, even if some people object (7).	0.021	0.054	0.695	0.095	0.056	0.090	0.300
State Authority (over local) Index	-0.127	0.086	0.139	-0.009	0.091	0.923	0.297
Representative Democracy (over direct democracy) Index	0.087	0.058	0.134	0.065	0.063	0.302	0.775
Satisfaction w/ State Legislature Index	0.306	0.083	0.000†	0.252	0.080	0.001†	0.582
Satisfaction w/ Local Government Index	-0.089	0.070	0.207	-0.024	0.075	0.749	0.467
Republican	0.072	0.040	0.076	0.037	0.041	0.368	0.444
Democrat	0.087	0.038	0.021	0.031	0.039	0.422	0.188
(Constant)	0.292	0.082	0.000	0.147	0.083	0.077	-
R ²	.089			.073			-
(p)	(.000)			(.001)			-

Proposal A2c

Dependent Variable: Q2d_r; Allowing the Legislature to amend an initiative that has already passed, subject to a public review and the agreement of the initiative's proponents

Predictions for Explanatory Variables:

1. Single Item Index: Some people think that government should provide certain benefits and services, even if that means higher taxes (1). Other people think that government should lower taxes, even if that means reduced benefits and services (7).
2. Single Item Index: Some people think that majorities should always have their way no matter how big the minorities are or how strongly they feel (1). Other people think that minorities should have their way when they are large enough or feel strongly enough (7).
3. Single Item Index: Some people think that the best society is one in which nobody can tell anybody else what to do, even if there is a cost to others (1). Other people think that the best society is one in which the community can decide together what people can and cannot do, even if some people object (7).
4. State Authority (over local) Index
5. Representative Democracy (over direct democracy) Index
6. *Satisfaction with State Legislature Index: positive coefficient; the more satisfied you are with the State Legislature, the more inclined you should be to allowing the Legislature be a part of the process*
7. Satisfaction with Local Government Index
8. Republican Dummy: 1 = Republican
9. Democrat Dummy: 1 = Democrat

Results

For this proposal, the index for satisfaction with State Legislature had a positive and significant coefficient at t2 and t3. The regression at t2 had one other significant explanatory variable. The first single item index about tradeoffs between government benefits and services and taxes had a negative coefficient. But, this coefficient lost its significance at t3 and the difference of the two coefficients was not large enough to have a significant p-value. At t3, aside from the satisfaction of the State Legislature index, the Democrat dummy also had a positive and significant coefficient. This proposal did not have strong support after deliberations, as 50 percent of participants opposed this proposal.

What's Next California Report

BASIC ORIENTATION (4/39)	Dependent Variable: Q2d_r; Allowing the Legislature to amend an initiative that has already passed, subject to a public review and the agreement of the initiative's proponents						
	T2			T3			Difference
	B	Std. Error	Sig.	B	Std. Error	Sig.	Sig.
Some people think that government should provide certain benefits and services, even if that means higher taxes (1). Other people think that government should lower taxes, even if that means reduced benefits and services (7).	-0.146	0.047	0.002	-0.082	0.053	0.126	0.321
Some people think that majorities should always have their way no matter how big the minorities are or how strongly they feel (1). Other people think that minorities should have their way when they are large enough or feel strongly enough (7).	0.070	0.057	0.220	0.077	0.063	0.219	0.925
Some people think that the best society is one in which nobody can tell anybody else what to do, even if there is a cost to others (1). Other people think that the best society is one in which the community can decide together what people can and cannot do, even if some people object (7).	-0.038	0.056	0.491	0.079	0.059	0.178	0.116
State Authority (over local) Index	-0.145	0.088	0.098	-0.075	0.096	0.434	0.558
Representative Democracy (over direct democracy) Index	0.091	0.059	0.121	0.035	0.066	0.597	0.477
Satisfaction w/ State Legislature Index	0.375	0.085	0.000†	0.243	0.084	0.002†	0.212
Satisfaction w/ Local Government Index	0.005	0.072	0.944	-0.052	0.078	0.506	0.546
Republican	0.026	0.041	0.522	0.027	0.043	0.520	0.976
Democrat	0.044	0.038	0.248	0.106	0.040	0.008	0.171
(Constant)	0.397	0.083	0.000	0.278	0.087	0.001	-
R ²	.124			.094			-
(p)	(.000)			(.000)			-

Proposal A2d

Dependent Variable: Q2e_r; Allowing the Legislature to amend an initiative that has already passed, subject to a two-thirds vote, even if an initiative's proponents do not agree with the amendment

Predictions for Explanatory Variables:

1. Single Item Index: Some people think that government should provide certain benefits and services, even if that means higher taxes (1). Other people think that government should lower taxes, even if that means reduced benefits and services (7).
2. Single Item Index: Some people think that majorities should always have their way no matter how big the minorities are or how strongly they feel (1). Other people think that minorities should have their way when they are large enough or feel strongly enough (7).
3. Single Item Index: Some people think that the best society is one in which nobody can tell anybody else what to do, even if there is a cost to others (1). Other people think that the best society is one in which the community can decide together what people can and cannot do, even if some people object (7).
4. State Authority (over local) Index
5. Representative Democracy (over direct democracy) Index
6. *Satisfaction with State Legislature Index: positive coefficient; the more satisfied you are with the State Legislature, the more inclined you should be to allowing the Legislature be a part of the process*
7. Satisfaction with Local Government Index
8. Republican Dummy: 1 = Republican
9. Democrat Dummy: 1 = Democrat

Results

The prediction of the index for satisfaction with State Legislature had a positive and significant coefficient. The regression at t2 has two other significant explanatory variables. The first single item index relating to tradeoffs between government benefits and services and taxes had a negative and significant coefficient and the Republican dummy had a positive and significant coefficient. The index relating to government benefits and services and taxes lost its significance at t3 and the difference between the t2 and t3 coefficient for this proposal was significant at .01. That is, participants made a substantial movement from a negative coefficient, not supporting this proposal, to a positive coefficient, supporting this proposal. The democrat dummy also had a positive and significant coefficient at t3. Opposition to this proposal increased from 61 to 73 percent.

What's Next California Report

BASIC ORIENTATION (5/39)	Dependent Variable: Q2e_r; Allowing the Legislature to amend an initiative that has already passed, subject to a two-thirds vote, even if an initiative's proponents do not agree with the amendment						
	T2			T3			Difference
	B	Std. Error	Sig.	B	Std. Error	Sig.	Sig.
Some people think that government should provide certain benefits and services, even if that means higher taxes (1). Other people think that government should lower taxes, even if that means reduced benefits and services (7).	-0.091	0.043	0.036	0.054	0.047	0.243	0.010
Some people think that majorities should always have their way no matter how big the minorities are or how strongly they feel (1). Other people think that minorities should have their way when they are large enough or feel strongly enough (7).	0.084	0.052	0.107	0.034	0.055	0.532	0.488
Some people think that the best society is one in which nobody can tell anybody else what to do, even if there is a cost to others (1). Other people think that the best society is one in which the community can decide together what people can and cannot do, even if some people object (7).	-0.081	0.051	0.111	-0.024	0.051	0.634	0.384
State Authority (over local) Index	0.036	0.081	0.658	0.090	0.083	0.279	0.603
Representative Democracy (over direct democracy) Index	0.044	0.054	0.418	0.107	0.058	0.066	0.361
Satisfaction w/ State Legislature Index	0.260	0.078	0.001†	0.333	0.073	0.000†	0.429
Satisfaction w/ Local Government Index	-0.114	0.066	0.084	-0.066	0.069	0.333	0.561
Republican	0.004	0.038	0.924	0.018	0.038	0.631	0.728
Democrat	0.076	0.036	0.033	0.078	0.036	0.028	0.950
(Constant)	0.297	0.077	0.000	0.042	0.076	0.585	-
R ²	.104			.096			-
(p)	(.000)			(.000)			-

Proposal A3

Dependent Variable: Q2f_r; Allowing an initiative's proponents to withdraw it after it qualifies for the ballot

Predictions for Explanatory Variables:

1. Single Item Index: Some people think that government should provide certain benefits and services, even if that means higher taxes (1). Other people think that government should lower taxes, even if that means reduced benefits and services (7).
2. Single Item Index: Some people think that majorities should always have their way no matter how big the minorities are or how strongly they feel (1). Other people think that minorities should have their way when they are large enough or feel strongly enough (7).
3. Single Item Index: Some people think that the best society is one in which nobody can tell anybody else what to do, even if there is a cost to others (1). Other people think that the best society is one in which the community can decide together what people can and cannot do, even if some people object (7).
4. State Authority (over local) Index
5. Representative Democracy (over direct democracy) Index
6. Satisfaction with State Legislature Index
7. Satisfaction with Local Government Index
8. Republican Dummy: 1 = Republican
9. Democrat Dummy: 1 = Democrat

Results

There were no predictions for these regressions. The first single item index relating to government benefits and services and taxes had a negative and significant coefficient at t2, but lost its significance at t3. The difference between the t2 and t3 coefficients was not large, as evident in the insignificant p-value in the difference column. The representative democracy index was significant and had positive coefficient at both time points. Participants who favored representative democracy supported this ability of initiative's proponents to withdraw initiatives after it had qualified for the ballot. The satisfaction with local government index became significant in support of this proposal as well. The attitude change for this proposal increased to 57 percent after deliberations.

What's Next California Report

BASIC ORIENTATION (6/39)	Dependent Variable: Q2f_r; Allowing an initiative's proponents to withdraw it after it qualifies for the ballot						
	T2			T3			Difference
	B	Std. Error	Sig.	B	Std. Error	Sig.	Sig.
Some people think that government should provide certain benefits and services, even if that means higher taxes (1). Other people think that government should lower taxes, even if that means reduced benefits and services (7).	-0.133	0.048	0.006	-0.082	0.050	0.102	0.410
Some people think that majorities should always have their way no matter how big the minorities are or how strongly they feel (1). Other people think that minorities should have their way when they are large enough or feel strongly enough (7).	0.015	0.058	0.796	0.069	0.059	0.242	0.495
Some people think that the best society is one in which nobody can tell anybody else what to do, even if there is a cost to others (1). Other people think that the best society is one in which the community can decide together what people can and cannot do, even if some people object (7).	0.014	0.057	0.811	0.073	0.055	0.185	0.412
State Authority (over local) Index	-0.017	0.090	0.848	-0.055	0.090	0.542	0.747
Representative Democracy (over direct democracy) Index	0.256	0.060	0.000	0.135	0.062	0.031	0.110
Satisfaction w/ State Legislature Index	-0.094	0.087	0.281	-0.136	0.079	0.085	0.680
Satisfaction w/ Local Government Index	0.123	0.074	0.094	0.181	0.074	0.014	0.527
Republican	0.007	0.042	0.859	0.052	0.040	0.195	0.335
Democrat	0.000	0.039	0.998	0.024	0.038	0.525	0.582
(Constant)	0.442	0.086	0.000	0.441	0.082	0.000	-
R ²	.097			.052			-
(p)	(.000)			(.006)			-

Proposal A4

Dependent Variable: Q2g_r; Requiring all ballot measures that require new expenditures to indicate how they will be paid for

Regressions were not significant at 0.05 level.

Proposal A5

Dependent Variable: Q2h_r; Requiring the ballot pamphlet to provide an analysis by the Legislative Analyst of how new initiative programs will likely be paid for

Predictions for Explanatory Variables:

1. *Single Item Index: Some people think that government should provide certain benefits and services, even if that means higher taxes (1). Other people think that government should lower taxes, even if that means reduced benefits and services (7): positive coefficient; those interested in lowering taxes would likely want detailed analyses of how new programs would be paid for*
2. *Single Item Index: Some people think that majorities should always have their way no matter how big the minorities are or how strongly they feel (1). Other people think that minorities should have their way when they are large enough or feel strongly enough (7).*
3. *Single Item Index: Some people think that the best society is one in which nobody can tell anybody else what to do, even if there is a cost to others (1). Other people think that the best society is one in which the community can decide together what people can and cannot do, even if some people object (7).*
4. *State Authority (over local) Index*
5. *Representative Democracy (over direct democracy) Index*
6. *Satisfaction with State Legislature Index*
7. *Satisfaction with Local Government Index*
8. *Republican Dummy: 1 = Republican: positive coefficient; Republicans would likely like to know how new programs would be paid for*
9. *Democrat Dummy: 1 = Democrat*

Results

The first prediction was inaccurate, as the results showed that the coefficients at both time points were negative. The coefficient at t3 became less significant, but still the coefficient was negative. The second prediction was inaccurate at t2, but correct at t3. However, the coefficients were not statistically significant. At t2, the indices satisfaction for State Legislature and local government had a negative and positive coefficient, respectively, and both coefficients with statistically significant. But, at t3, both of these indices had insignificant coefficients. The attitude change between t2 and t3 for this proposal was not significant, but the support of this proposal was very strong, at 91 percent post deliberations.

What's Next California Report

BASIC ORIENTATION (8/39)	Dependent Variable: Q2h_r; Requiring the ballot pamphlet to provide an analysis by the Legislative Analyst of how new initiative programs will likely be paid for						
	T2			T3			Difference
	B	Std. Error	Sig.	B	Std. Error	Sig.	Sig.
Some people think that government should provide certain benefits and services, even if that means higher taxes (1). Other people think that government should lower taxes, even if that means reduced benefits and services (7).	-0.057	0.035	0.049†	-0.036	0.036	0.157†	0.637
Some people think that majorities should always have their way no matter how big the minorities are or how strongly they feel (1). Other people think that minorities should have their way when they are large enough or feel strongly enough (7).	0.038	0.042	0.373	-0.037	0.042	0.384	0.196
Some people think that the best society is one in which nobody can tell anybody else what to do, even if there is a cost to others (1). Other people think that the best society is one in which the community can decide together what people can and cannot do, even if some people object (7).	-0.060	0.041	0.143	0.007	0.039	0.868	0.207
State Authority (over local) Index	0.044	0.065	0.501	-0.062	0.064	0.332	0.213
Representative Democracy (over direct democracy) Index	0.076	0.043	0.082	0.073	0.044	0.101	0.956
Satisfaction w/ State Legislature Index	-0.154	0.063	0.014	-0.004	0.056	0.944	0.048
Satisfaction w/ Local Government Index	0.119	0.053	0.025	-0.077	0.052	0.139	0.004
Republican	-0.039	0.030	0.094†	0.031	0.028	0.137†	0.043
Democrat	-0.043	0.028	0.127	0.010	0.026	0.716	0.108
(Constant)	0.826	0.062	0.000	0.898	0.058	0.000	-
R ²	.050			.023			-
(p)	(.016)			(.541)			-

Proposal A6

Dependent Variable: Q2i_r; Making the vote threshold needed to pass an initiative the same as any vote threshold that the initiative itself requires of the public in the future

Predictions for Explanatory Variables:

1. Single Item Index: Some people think that government should provide certain benefits and services, even if that means higher taxes (1). Other people think that government should lower taxes, even if that means reduced benefits and services (7)
2. Single Item Index: Some people think that majorities should always have their way no matter how big the minorities are or how strongly they feel (1). Other people think that minorities should have their way when they are large enough or feel strongly enough (7).
3. Single Item Index: Some people think that the best society is one in which nobody can tell anybody else what to do, even if there is a cost to others (1). Other people think that the best society is one in which the community can decide together what people can and cannot do, even if some people object (7).
4. State Authority (over local) Index
5. Representative Democracy (over direct democracy) Index
6. Satisfaction with State Legislature Index
7. Satisfaction with Local Government Index
8. Republican Dummy: 1 = Republican
9. Democrat Dummy: 1 = Democrat

Results

There were no predictions for these regressions. Reviewing the t2 and t3 regressions, the only explanatory variable with a 0.05 p-value or below is the Republican dummy at t3. The dummy has a negative coefficient, indicating the opposition of Republicans for this proposal. This coefficient also had a significant different between t2 and t3, as before deliberations Republicans supported this proposal, a positive coefficient and borderline p-value, but after deliberations, Republicans can to oppose this proposal. There was no significant change in the percentage of support or opposition for this proposal; support remained about 66 percent post deliberations.

What's Next California Report

BASIC ORIENTATION (9/39)	Dependent Variable: Q2i_r; Making the vote threshold needed to pass an initiative the same as any vote threshold that the initiative itself requires of the public in the future						
	T2			T3			Difference
	B	Std. Error	Sig.	B	Std. Error	Sig.	Sig.
Some people think that government should provide certain benefits and services, even if that means higher taxes (1). Other people think that government should lower taxes, even if that means reduced benefits and services (7).	-0.048	0.040	0.229	-0.034	0.046	0.459	0.803
Some people think that majorities should always have their way no matter how big the minorities are or how strongly they feel (1). Other people think that minorities should have their way when they are large enough or feel strongly enough (7).	-0.003	0.049	0.945	0.096	0.055	0.079	0.159
Some people think that the best society is one in which nobody can tell anybody else what to do, even if there is a cost to others (1). Other people think that the best society is one in which the community can decide together what people can and cannot do, even if some people object (7).	-0.001	0.048	0.983	0.060	0.051	0.242	0.353
State Authority (over local) Index	0.030	0.075	0.689	-0.045	0.083	0.593	0.477
Representative Democracy (over direct democracy) Index	-0.013	0.050	0.793	0.040	0.058	0.485	0.442
Satisfaction w/ State Legislature Index	0.067	0.072	0.352	0.060	0.073	0.410	0.936
Satisfaction w/ Local Government Index	-0.069	0.061	0.260	-0.014	0.068	0.833	0.511
Republican	0.011	0.034	0.757	-0.077	0.036	0.035	0.041
Democrat	0.058	0.032	0.071	0.017	0.034	0.612	0.310
(Constant)	0.643	0.071	0.000	0.609	0.075	0.000	-
R ²	.030			.052			-
(p)	(.198)			(.014)			-

Proposal A7

Dependent Variable: Q2j_r; Publishing the top five contributors for and against each ballot measure in the ballot pamphlet

Predictions for Explanatory Variables:

1. Single Item Index: Some people think that government should provide certain benefits and services, even if that means higher taxes (1). Other people think that government should lower taxes, even if that means reduced benefits and services (7)
2. Single Item Index: Some people think that majorities should always have their way no matter how big the minorities are or how strongly they feel (1). Other people think that minorities should have their way when they are large enough or feel strongly enough (7)
3. Single Item Index: Some people think that the best society is one in which nobody can tell anybody else what to do, even if there is a cost to others (1). Other people think that the best society is one in which the community can decide together what people can and cannot do, even if some people object (7).
4. State Authority (over local) Index
5. Representative Democracy (over direct democracy) Index
6. Satisfaction with State Legislature Index
7. Satisfaction with Local Government Index
8. Republican Dummy: 1 = Republican
9. Democrat Dummy: 1 = Democrat

Results

There were no predictions for these regressions. At t2 and t3, the first index on the tradeoff between government providing benefits and services and higher taxes had a negative and significant coefficient. Participants who felt government should provide certain benefits and services, even if that meant higher taxes tended to oppose publishing the top five contributors for and against each ballot measure in the ballot pamphlet. No other explanatory variables were significant in these regressions. This proposal had strong support before and after deliberations – 84 percent before and 91 percent after deliberations.

What's Next California Report

BASIC ORIENTATION (10/39)	Dependent Variable: Q2j_r; Publishing the top five contributors for and against each ballot measure in the ballot pamphlet						
	T2			T3			Difference
	B	Std. Error	Sig.	B	Std. Error	Sig.	Sig.
Some people think that government should provide certain benefits and services, even if that means higher taxes (1). Other people think that government should lower taxes, even if that means reduced benefits and services (7).	-0.117	0.039	0.003	-0.080	0.035	0.023	0.420
Some people think that majorities should always have their way no matter how big the minorities are or how strongly they feel (1). Other people think that minorities should have their way when they are large enough or feel strongly enough (7).	0.002	0.047	0.961	0.038	0.041	0.348	0.537
Some people think that the best society is one in which nobody can tell anybody else what to do, even if there is a cost to others (1). Other people think that the best society is one in which the community can decide together what people can and cannot do, even if some people object (7).	0.057	0.046	0.217	0.048	0.039	0.215	0.870
State Authority (over local) Index	0.062	0.072	0.394	0.053	0.063	0.398	0.920
Representative Democracy (over direct democracy) Index	0.046	0.049	0.345	-0.039	0.044	0.376	0.130
Satisfaction w/ State Legislature Index	-0.108	0.070	0.123	-0.062	0.055	0.261	0.547
Satisfaction w/ Local Government Index	-0.036	0.059	0.544	-0.046	0.052	0.377	0.886
Republican	-0.019	0.034	0.573	-0.023	0.029	0.419	0.910
Democrat	0.023	0.032	0.476	0.008	0.027	0.773	0.638
(Constant)	0.814	0.069	0.000	0.903	0.057	0.000	-
R ²	.063			.030			-
(p)	.004			.044			-

Legislative Representation: Proposal B1

Dependent Variable: Q2k_r; Increasing the number of Assembly districts from 80 to 120

Predictions for Explanatory Variables:

1. Single Item Index: Some people think that government should provide certain benefits and services, even if that means higher taxes (1). Other people think that government should lower taxes, even if that means reduced benefits and services (7)
2. Single Item Index: Some people think that majorities should always have their way no matter how big the minorities are or how strongly they feel (1). Other people think that minorities should have their way when they are large enough or feel strongly enough (7):
3. Single Item Index: Some people think that the best society is one in which nobody can tell anybody else what to do, even if there is a cost to others (1). Other people think that the best society is one in which the community can decide together what people can and cannot do, even if some people object (7).
4. State Authority (over local) Index
5. Representative Democracy (over direct democracy) Index
6. Satisfaction with State Legislature Index
7. Satisfaction with Local Government Index
8. Republican Dummy: 1 = Republican
9. Democrat Dummy: 1 = Democrat

Results

At t2 and t3, participants who felt government should provide certain benefits and services even if that meant higher taxes had a negative and significant coefficient, meaning these participants tended to not support increasing the number of Assembly districts. At t2, no other explanatory variables were significant, but, at t3, the satisfaction with local government index was positive and significant, as those who expressed more satisfaction with local government were more likely to support this proposal. Support for this proposal reached 63 percent post deliberation, a 3 percent increase from before deliberations.

What's Next California Report

BASIC ORIENTATION (11/39)	Dependent Variable: Q2k_r; Increasing the number of Assembly districts from 80 to 120						
	T2			T3			Difference
	B	Std. Error	Sig.	B	Std. Error	Sig.	Sig.
Some people think that government should provide certain benefits and services, even if that means higher taxes (1). Other people think that government should lower taxes, even if that means reduced benefits and services (7).	-0.109	0.046	0.018	-0.159	0.051	0.002	0.409
Some people think that majorities should always have their way no matter how big the minorities are or how strongly they feel (1). Other people think that minorities should have their way when they are large enough or feel strongly enough (7).	-0.049	0.056	0.377	0.088	0.060	0.141	0.075
Some people think that the best society is one in which nobody can tell anybody else what to do, even if there is a cost to others (1). Other people think that the best society is one in which the community can decide together what people can and cannot do, even if some people object (7).	0.089	0.055	0.103	-0.013	0.056	0.822	0.147
State Authority (over local) Index	-0.023	0.086	0.787	0.057	0.091	0.531	0.474
Representative Democracy (over direct democracy) Index	-0.003	0.058	0.963	0.035	0.064	0.583	0.607
Satisfaction w/ State Legislature Index	-0.043	0.084	0.611	-0.084	0.081	0.297	0.674
Satisfaction w/ Local Government Index	0.069	0.071	0.332	0.227	0.075	0.003	0.074
Republican	-0.050	0.041	0.226	-0.038	0.042	0.373	0.780
Democrat	0.003	0.039	0.928	-0.020	0.040	0.616	0.576
(Constant)	0.637	0.083	0.000	0.552	0.084	0.000	-
R ²	.059			.058			-
(p)	(.021)			(.002)			-

Proposal B2

Dependent Variable: Q21_r; Expanding the size of districts and electing more than one legislative representative from each district

Predictions for Explanatory Variables:

1. Single Item Index: Some people think that government should provide certain benefits and services, even if that means higher taxes (1). Other people think that government should lower taxes, even if that means reduced benefits and services (7)
2. Single Item Index: Some people think that majorities should always have their way no matter how big the minorities are or how strongly they feel (1). Other people think that minorities should have their way when they are large enough or feel strongly enough (7):
3. Single Item Index: Some people think that the best society is one in which nobody can tell anybody else what to do, even if there is a cost to others (1). Other people think that the best society is one in which the community can decide together what people can and cannot do, even if some people object (7).
4. State Authority (over local) Index
5. Representative Democracy (over direct democracy) Index
6. Satisfaction with State Legislature Index
7. Satisfaction with Local Government Index
8. Republican Dummy: 1 = Republican
9. Democrat Dummy: 1 = Democrat

Results

There were no predictions for these regressions. At t2, two explanatory variables were significant at the 0.05 level – the single item index on majorities vs. minorities and the representative democracy index. Participants who felt minorities should have their way, when they are large enough or feel strongly enough tended to support expanding the size of districts and electing more than one legislative representative from each district. This explanatory variable lost its significance at t3, but the coefficient remained positive. The representative democracy index had an opposite coefficient, meaning that participants who favored representative democracy were inclined to oppose this proposal. At t3, the only statistically significant explanatory variable was the single item index on taxes. For this variable, participants who felt the government should provide certain benefits and services even if that meant higher taxes favored this proposal. This proposal did not receive strong support; support for this proposal was below 50 percent before and after deliberations.

What's Next California Report

BASIC ORIENTATION (12/39)	Dependent Variable: Q2l_r; Expanding the size of districts and electing more than one legislative representative from each district						
	T2			T3			Difference
	B	Std. Error	Sig.	B	Std. Error	Sig.	Sig.
Some people think that government should provide certain benefits and services, even if that means higher taxes (1). Other people think that government should lower taxes, even if that means reduced benefits and services (7).	-0.082	0.044	0.064	-0.108	0.051	0.034	0.659
Some people think that majorities should always have their way no matter how big the minorities are or how strongly they feel (1). Other people think that minorities should have their way when they are large enough or feel strongly enough (7).	0.113	0.053	0.033	0.087	0.059	0.142	0.727
Some people think that the best society is one in which nobody can tell anybody else what to do, even if there is a cost to others (1). Other people think that the best society is one in which the community can decide together what people can and cannot do, even if some people object (7).	0.085	0.052	0.104	0.033	0.056	0.558	0.438
State Authority (over local) Index	-0.022	0.083	0.787	0.045	0.091	0.616	0.532
Representative Democracy (over direct democracy) Index	-0.131	0.056	0.019	-0.090	0.064	0.156	0.565
Satisfaction w/ State Legislature Index	0.090	0.081	0.264	0.083	0.081	0.301	0.942
Satisfaction w/ Local Government Index	-0.043	0.068	0.528	0.036	0.075	0.629	0.351
Republican	-0.064	0.040	0.113	-0.073	0.043	0.087	0.828
Democrat	-0.008	0.038	0.827	-0.024	0.040	0.550	0.696
(Constant)	0.548	0.079	0.000	0.528	0.083	0.000	-
R ²	.073			.054			-
(p)	(.001)			(.022)			-

Proposal B3

Dependent Variable: Q2m_r; Replacing the current State Senate and Assembly with a single house of 120 members

Regressions were not significant at 0.05 level.

Proposal B4

Dependent Variable: Q2n_r; Making the State Legislature part-time and paying legislators part-time salaries

Predictions for Explanatory Variables:

1. Single Item Index: Some people think that government should provide certain benefits and services, even if that means higher taxes (1). Other people think that government should lower taxes, even if that means reduced benefits and services (7)
2. Single Item Index: Some people think that majorities should always have their way no matter how big the minorities are or how strongly they feel (1). Other people think that minorities should have their way when they are large enough or feel strongly enough (7):
3. Single Item Index: Some people think that the best society is one in which nobody can tell anybody else what to do, even if there is a cost to others (1). Other people think that the best society is one in which the community can decide together what people can and cannot do, even if some people object (7).
4. State Authority (over local) Index
5. Representative Democracy (over direct democracy) Index
6. Satisfaction with State Legislature Index
7. Satisfaction with Local Government Index
8. *Republican Dummy: 1 = Republican: positive coefficient; Republicans tend to be in support of this proposal for smaller government*
9. Democrat Dummy: 1 = Democrat

Results

Republicans are typically in support of smaller government and thus, a part-time Legislature and part-time salaries would be appealing. The coefficient on the Republican dummy is positive at both t2 and t3, in the right direction, although not significant. The single item index on taxes is positive and significant at both time points, showing that participants who favor lowering taxes are in support of this proposal. Going down the list of explanatory variables in order, the single item index on making decisions in a community has a negative relationship with this proposal, although significance is only borderline, that is, participants who favor making some societal decisions at cost to others are in support of this proposal. Participants who favor local authority over State authority also are more inclined to favor this proposal. The representative democracy index had a negative coefficient at both time points, but, at t3, the significance was lost significantly as the change between t2 and t3 had a 0.034 p-value. The following variable on satisfaction with State Legislature about experienced significant coefficient change between t2 and t3. Although the coefficient on the satisfaction with State Legislature remained negative at t3, the strength of the coefficient was weaker. This proposal had significant opposition as it increased significantly after deliberations – from 42 percent to 63 percent.

What's Next California Report

BASIC ORIENTATION (14/39)	Dependent Variable: Q2n_r; Making the State Legislature part-time and paying legislators part-time salaries						
	T2			T3			Difference
	B	Std. Error	Sig.	B	Std. Error	Sig.	Sig.
Some people think that government should provide certain benefits and services, even if that means higher taxes (1). Other people think that government should lower taxes, even if that means reduced benefits and services (7).	0.202	0.047	0.000	0.197	0.050	0.000	0.941
Some people think that majorities should always have their way no matter how big the minorities are or how strongly they feel (1). Other people think that minorities should have their way when they are large enough or feel strongly enough (7).	0.030	0.056	0.587	0.072	0.058	0.216	0.581
Some people think that the best society is one in which nobody can tell anybody else what to do, even if there is a cost to others (1). Other people think that the best society is one in which the community can decide together what people can and cannot do, even if some people object (7).	-0.095	0.055	0.086	-0.106	0.055	0.055	0.871
State Authority (over local) Index	-0.204	0.087	0.019	-0.167	0.090	0.063	0.736
Representative Democracy (over direct democracy) Index	-0.205	0.059	0.001	-0.051	0.063	0.419	0.034
Satisfaction w/ State Legislature Index	-0.335	0.085	0.000	-0.020	0.080	0.804	0.001
Satisfaction w/ Local Government Index	0.004	0.072	0.953	0.161	0.074	0.030	0.071
Republican	0.044	0.042	0.151†	0.063	0.042	0.067†	0.655
Democrat	-0.029	0.040	0.464	-0.010	0.040	0.799	0.643
(Constant)	0.783	0.084	0.000	0.317	0.082	0.000	-
R ²	.259			.154			-
(p)	(.000)			(.000)			-

Proposal B5

Dependent Variable: Q2o_r; Reducing the length of the state legislative session and requiring legislators to spend more time in their districts

Predictions for Explanatory Variables:

1. Single Item Index: Some people think that government should provide certain benefits and services, even if that means higher taxes (1). Other people think that government should lower taxes, even if that means reduced benefits and services (7)
2. Single Item Index: Some people think that majorities should always have their way no matter how big the minorities are or how strongly they feel (1). Other people think that minorities should have their way when they are large enough or feel strongly enough (7):
3. Single Item Index: Some people think that the best society is one in which nobody can tell anybody else what to do, even if there is a cost to others (1). Other people think that the best society is one in which the community can decide together what people can and cannot do, even if some people object (7).
4. State Authority (over local) Index
5. Representative Democracy (over direct democracy) Index
6. Satisfaction with State Legislature Index
7. Satisfaction with Local Government Index
8. Republican Dummy: 1 = Republican
9. Democrat Dummy: 1 = Democrat

Results

There were no predictions for these regressions. At t2, participants who favored lower taxes over having government provide certain benefits and services favored this proposal. This explanatory variable was also highly significant at t3. As for the representative democracy index, participants who favored direct democracy tended to favor this proposal at t2, but the coefficient lost its significance at t3. That is, after deliberations, participants did not feel that this proposal would achieve direct democracy. The index for satisfaction with State Legislature had a negative and significant coefficient at t2 and the coefficient became positive at t3, although not significant. Prior to deliberations, participants who were dissatisfied with the State Legislature were more inclined to support this proposal, but after deliberations the tendency was not as strong. At t3, two of the explanatory variables became significant – the state authority index and Republican dummy. Participants who favored more local authority supported this proposal even more at t3 than at t2 and Republicans supported this proposal more at t3 than at t2 as well. 57 percent of participants supported this proposal before deliberations and 46 percent of participants supported this proposal after deliberations.

What's Next California Report

BASIC ORIENTATION (15/39)	Dependent Variable: Q2o_r; Reducing the length of the state legislative session and requiring legislators to spend more time in their districts						
	T2			T3			Difference
	B	Std. Error	Sig.	B	Std. Error	Sig.	Sig.
Some people think that government should provide certain benefits and services, even if that means higher taxes (1). Other people think that government should lower taxes, even if that means reduced benefits and services (7).	0.156	0.043	0.000	0.228	0.051	0.000	0.219
Some people think that majorities should always have their way no matter how big the minorities are or how strongly they feel (1). Other people think that minorities should have their way when they are large enough or feel strongly enough (7).	-0.061	0.051	0.236	0.026	0.060	0.664	0.244
Some people think that the best society is one in which nobody can tell anybody else what to do, even if there is a cost to others (1). Other people think that the best society is one in which the community can decide together what people can and cannot do, even if some people object (7).	0.019	0.051	0.715	-0.026	0.056	0.640	0.512
State Authority (over local) Index	-0.076	0.080	0.339	-0.282	0.091	0.002	0.060
Representative Democracy (over direct democracy) Index	-0.176	0.054	0.001	-0.069	0.064	0.277	0.136
Satisfaction w/ State Legislature Index	-0.213	0.078	0.006	0.016	0.081	0.840	0.017
Satisfaction w/ Local Government Index	0.032	0.066	0.627	0.105	0.075	0.161	0.393
Republican	0.044	0.038	0.252	0.086	0.042	0.040	0.328
Democrat	0.003	0.036	0.922	0.020	0.039	0.607	0.682
(Constant)	0.736	0.076	0.000	0.529	0.083	0.000	-
R ²	.165			.158			-
(p)	(.000)			(.000)			-

Proposal B6

Dependent Variable: Q2p_r; Allowing voters to rank the candidates in order of preference, so that the winner can be decided without a second election

Predictions for Explanatory Variables:

1. Single Item Index: Some people think that government should provide certain benefits and services, even if that means higher taxes (1). Other people think that government should lower taxes, even if that means reduced benefits and services (7)
2. Single Item Index: Some people think that majorities should always have their way no matter how big the minorities are or how strongly they feel (1). Other people think that minorities should have their way when they are large enough or feel strongly enough (7):
3. Single Item Index: Some people think that the best society is one in which nobody can tell anybody else what to do, even if there is a cost to others (1). Other people think that the best society is one in which the community can decide together what people can and cannot do, even if some people object (7).
4. State Authority (over local) Index
5. Representative Democracy (over direct democracy) Index
6. Satisfaction with State Legislature Index
7. Satisfaction with Local Government Index
8. Republican Dummy: 1 = Republican
9. Democrat Dummy: 1 = Democrat

Results

There were no predictions for these regressions. At t2, the two statistically significant variables were the representative democracy index and the Democrat dummy. Those who favored direct democracy were opposed to instant runoff voting and Democrats were in support of IRV. At t3, however, the support from Democrats decreased as the coefficient lost its significance. However, the representative democracy index maintained its negative coefficient and statistical strength. At t3, the other statistically significant variable was the single item index on majorities vs. minorities. This coefficient was positive, indicating that those who felt minorities should have their way if they are large enough or feel strongly enough favored IRV. After deliberations, 58 percent of participants were in support of IRV.

What's Next California Report

BASIC ORIENTATION (16/39)	Dependent Variable: Q2p_r; Allowing voters to rank the candidates in order of preference, so that the winner can be decided without a second election						
	T2			T3			Difference
	B	Std. Error	Sig.	B	Std. Error	Sig.	Sig.
Some people think that government should provide certain benefits and services, even if that means higher taxes (1). Other people think that government should lower taxes, even if that means reduced benefits and services (7).	-0.015	0.046	0.747	-0.074	0.051	0.148	0.304
Some people think that majorities should always have their way no matter how big the minorities are or how strongly they feel (1). Other people think that minorities should have their way when they are large enough or feel strongly enough (7).	0.074	0.054	0.170	0.154	0.059	0.009	0.283
Some people think that the best society is one in which nobody can tell anybody else what to do, even if there is a cost to others (1). Other people think that the best society is one in which the community can decide together what people can and cannot do, even if some people object (7).	-0.096	0.054	0.074	0.061	0.056	0.273	0.020
State Authority (over local) Index	0.001	0.085	0.989	0.018	0.091	0.843	0.877
Representative Democracy (over direct democracy) Index	-0.149	0.058	0.010	-0.158	0.064	0.014	0.894
Satisfaction w/ State Legislature Index	-0.025	0.083	0.766	-0.009	0.081	0.914	0.865
Satisfaction w/ Local Government Index	0.004	0.070	0.959	0.024	0.076	0.751	0.809
Republican	-0.041	0.043	0.339	-0.057	0.044	0.200	0.708
Democrat	0.082	0.040	0.040	0.034	0.041	0.412	0.226
(Constant)	0.700	0.082	0.000	0.563	0.084	0.000	-
R ²	.051			.038			-
(p)	(.009)			(.003)			-

Proposal B7

Dependent Variable: Q2q_r; Lengthening Assembly terms from 2 years to 4, and Senate terms from 4 years to 6

Predictions for Explanatory Variables:

1. Single Item Index: Some people think that government should provide certain benefits and services, even if that means higher taxes (1). Other people think that government should lower taxes, even if that means reduced benefits and services (7)
2. Single Item Index: Some people think that majorities should always have their way no matter how big the minorities are or how strongly they feel (1). Other people think that minorities should have their way when they are large enough or feel strongly enough (7):
3. Single Item Index: Some people think that the best society is one in which nobody can tell anybody else what to do, even if there is a cost to others (1). Other people think that the best society is one in which the community can decide together what people can and cannot do, even if some people object (7).
4. State Authority (over local) Index
5. *Representative Democracy (over direct democracy) Index: positive coefficient; those in favor of representative democracy should favor increasing terms for representatives in the Assembly and Senate*
6. *Satisfaction with State Legislature Index: positive coefficient; those more satisfied with the State Legislature would be more inclined to have the Legislature increase its terms*
7. Satisfaction with Local Government Index
8. Republican Dummy: 1 = Republican
9. Democrat Dummy: 1 = Democrat

Results

The predictions for these regressions were accurate for the representative democracy index, but not for the satisfaction with State Legislature index. The representative democracy index was positive and significant at both time points. But, the satisfaction with the State Legislature index was positive and significant at t2, in line with the prediction, but became negative and insignificant at t3. That is, after deliberations, satisfaction with the State Legislature was no longer a strong predictor for this regression. At t3, the strongest explanatory variable was the single item index on taxes, where people who favored more government and taxes were in opposition to this proposal. This variable was negative and significant at t2 as well. The attitude change results showed that from t2 to t3 support for this proposal increased from 46 percent to 81 percent.

What's Next California Report

BASIC ORIENTATION (17/39)	Dependent Variable: Q2q_r; Lengthening Assembly terms from 2 years to 4, and Senate terms from 4 years to 6						
	T2			T3			Difference
	B	Std. Error	Sig.	B	Std. Error	Sig.	Sig.
Some people think that government should provide certain benefits and services, even if that means higher taxes (1). Other people think that government should lower taxes, even if that means reduced benefits and services (7).	-0.097	0.047	0.038	-0.201	0.042	0.000	0.065
Some people think that majorities should always have their way no matter how big the minorities are or how strongly they feel (1). Other people think that minorities should have their way when they are large enough or feel strongly enough (7).	0.091	0.057	0.107	0.022	0.049	0.656	0.337
Some people think that the best society is one in which nobody can tell anybody else what to do, even if there is a cost to others (1). Other people think that the best society is one in which the community can decide together what people can and cannot do, even if some people object (7).	0.044	0.055	0.425	-0.065	0.046	0.161	0.101
State Authority (over local) Index	0.088	0.087	0.314	0.010	0.075	0.889	0.466
Representative Democracy (over direct democracy) Index	0.250	0.059	0.000†	0.096	0.052	0.033†	0.027
Satisfaction w/ State Legislature Index	0.202	0.084	0.008†	-0.036	0.066	0.291†	0.012
Satisfaction w/ Local Government Index	0.145	0.071	0.042	0.082	0.062	0.185	0.452
Republican	0.027	0.040	0.496	0.056	0.034	0.094	0.502
Democrat	0.119	0.038	0.002	0.057	0.032	0.071	0.127
(Constant)	0.094	0.083	0.256	0.746	0.069	0.000	-
R ²	.214			.112			-
(p)	(.000)			(.000)			-

Proposal B8

Dependent Variable: Q2r_r; Requiring economic impact analyses of major legislation before passage

Regressions were not significant at 0.05 level.

Proposal B9

Dependent Variable: Q2s_r; Establishing clear goals for each government program and assessing whether progress is being made toward these goals at least once every ten years

Regressions were not significant at 0.05 level.

Proposal B10a

Dependent Variable: Q2t_r; Requiring the Governor and the Legislature to adopt two-year instead of one-year budgets

Regressions were not significant at 0.05 level.

What's Next California Report

Proposal B10b

Dependent Variable: Q2u_r; Requiring the Governor and the Legislature to publish three and five year budget projections prior to the budget vote each year

Predictions for Explanatory Variables:

1. Single Item Index: Some people think that government should provide certain benefits and services, even if that means higher taxes (1). Other people think that government should lower taxes, even if that means reduced benefits and services (7)
2. Single Item Index: Some people think that majorities should always have their way no matter how big the minorities are or how strongly they feel (1). Other people think that minorities should have their way when they are large enough or feel strongly enough (7):
3. Single Item Index: Some people think that the best society is one in which nobody can tell anybody else what to do, even if there is a cost to others (1). Other people think that the best society is one in which the community can decide together what people can and cannot do, even if some people object (7).
4. State Authority (over local) Index
5. Representative Democracy (over direct democracy) Index
6. Satisfaction with State Legislature Index
7. Satisfaction with Local Government Index
8. Republican Dummy: 1 = Republican
9. Democrat Dummy: 1 = Democrat

Results

There were no predictions for these regressions. At t2, two explanatory variables were statistically significant - the single item index on making decisions at the cost of or objection to others and the satisfaction with local government index. Both of these indices had a positive coefficient, which indicates that those in support of these indices favored these proposals. That is, participants who felt having the community decide together what it can and cannot do favored having the Governor and Legislature publish these three and five year budget predictions prior to the budget vote each year. At t3, both of these explanatory variables lost their statistical significance. The explanatory variables at t3 did not yield any statistically significant coefficients. This proposal had strong support before and after deliberations, 80 percent before and 82 percent after deliberations.

BASIC ORIENTATION (21/39)	Dependent Variable: Q2u_r; Requiring the Governor and the Legislature to publish three and five year budget projections prior to the budget vote each year						
	T2			T3			Difference
	B	Std. Error	Sig.	B	Std. Error	Sig.	Sig.
Some people think that government should provide certain benefits and services, even if that means higher taxes (1). Other people think that government should lower taxes, even if that means reduced benefits and services (7).	0.032	0.036	0.367	0.002	0.037	0.955	0.506
Some people think that majorities should always have their way no matter how big the minorities are or how strongly they feel (1). Other people think that minorities should have their way when they are large enough or feel strongly enough (7).	0.037	0.043	0.389	-0.029	0.044	0.511	0.256
Some people think that the best society is one in which nobody can tell anybody else what to do, even if there is a cost to others (1). Other people think that the best society is one in which the community can decide together what people can and cannot do, even if some people object (7).	0.118	0.042	0.005	0.030	0.041	0.460	0.097
State Authority (over local) Index	0.074	0.067	0.269	0.062	0.067	0.350	0.893
Representative Democracy (over direct democracy) Index	-0.045	0.045	0.322	-0.017	0.047	0.710	0.622
Satisfaction w/ State Legislature Index	-0.096	0.065	0.141	-0.083	0.059	0.162	0.862
Satisfaction w/ Local Government Index	0.229	0.055	0.000	0.067	0.055	0.221	0.015
Republican	0.010	0.032	0.746	0.012	0.031	0.695	0.959
Democrat	0.020	0.030	0.501	-0.025	0.029	0.384	0.152
(Constant)	0.507	0.064	0.000	0.740	0.061	0.000	-
R ²	.055			.021			--
(p)	(.001)			(.723)			

What's Next California Report

State and Local Reform: Proposal C1

Dependent Variable: Q2v_r; Transferring from the state to local governments control and financing of services provided at the local level and requiring minimum standards for delivering them

Predictions for Explanatory Variables:

1. Single Item Index: Some people think that government should provide certain benefits and services, even if that means higher taxes (1). Other people think that government should lower taxes, even if that means reduced benefits and services (7)
2. Single Item Index: Some people think that majorities should always have their way no matter how big the minorities are or how strongly they feel (1). Other people think that minorities should have their way when they are large enough or feel strongly enough (7):
3. Single Item Index: Some people think that the best society is one in which nobody can tell anybody else what to do, even if there is a cost to others (1). Other people think that the best society is one in which the community can decide together what people can and cannot do, even if some people object (7).
4. *State Authority (over local) Index: negative coefficient; supporters of this proposal would favor local authority*
5. Representative Democracy (over direct democracy) Index
6. Satisfaction with State Legislature Index
7. *Satisfaction with Local Government Index: positive coefficient; greater satisfaction in local government who indicate more support for this proposal*
8. Republican Dummy: 1 = Republican
9. Democrat Dummy: 1 = Democrat

Results

The predictions on the state authority index and the satisfaction with local government index were accurate. Participants who favored local authority over State authority supported this proposal at both time points and participants who were more satisfied with local government favored this proposal at both time points as well. In terms of movement from t2 to t3, participants who felt the community should decide together on what people can and cannot do favored this proposal strongly at t3. This proposal had strong support post deliberation, at 73 percent.

BASIC ORIENTATION (22/39)	Dependent Variable: Q2v_r; Transferring from the state to local governments control and financing of services provided at the local level and requiring minimum standards for delivering them						
	T2			T3			Difference
	B	Std. Error	Sig.	B	Std. Error	Sig.	Sig.
Some people think that government should provide certain benefits and services, even if that means higher taxes (1). Other people think that government should lower taxes, even if that means reduced benefits and services (7).	0.037	0.037	0.313	-0.020	0.040	0.619	0.241
Some people think that majorities should always have their way no matter how big the minorities are or how strongly they feel (1). Other people think that minorities should have their way when they are large enough or feel strongly enough (7).	0.085	0.045	0.057	-0.021	0.047	0.651	0.085
Some people think that the best society is one in which nobody can tell anybody else what to do, even if there is a cost to others (1). Other people think that the best society is one in which the community can decide together what people can and cannot do, even if some people object (7).	0.066	0.044	0.136	0.099	0.044	0.023	0.553
State Authority (over local) Index	-0.392	0.069	0.000†	-0.429	0.071	0.000†	0.687
Representative Democracy (over direct democracy) Index	-0.003	0.047	0.956	-0.038	0.050	0.439	0.550
Satisfaction w/ State Legislature Index	-0.182	0.067	0.004†	-0.061	0.063	0.165†	0.134
Satisfaction w/ Local Government Index	0.169	0.057	0.003	0.234	0.058	0.000	0.364
Republican	-0.032	0.032	0.326	0.010	0.032	0.761	0.257
Democrat	-0.003	0.030	0.916	0.021	0.030	0.493	0.488
(Constant)	0.714	0.066	0.000	0.779	0.065	0.000	-
R ²	.132			.150			-
(p)	(.000)			(.000)			-

What's Next California Report

Proposal C2

Dependent Variable: Q2w_r; Allowing local governments to raise taxes for local services in exchange for increased coordination of service delivery and public reporting of performance

Predictions for Explanatory Variables:

1. Single Item Index: Some people think that government should provide certain benefits and services, even if that means higher taxes (1). Other people think that government should lower taxes, even if that means reduced benefits and services (7)
2. Single Item Index: Some people think that majorities should always have their way no matter how big the minorities are or how strongly they feel (1). Other people think that minorities should have their way when they are large enough or feel strongly enough (7):
3. Single Item Index: Some people think that the best society is one in which nobody can tell anybody else what to do, even if there is a cost to others (1). Other people think that the best society is one in which the community can decide together what people can and cannot do, even if some people object (7).
4. *State Authority (over local) Index: negative coefficient; supporters of this proposal would favor local authority*
5. Representative Democracy (over direct democracy) Index
6. Satisfaction with State Legislature Index
7. *Satisfaction with Local Government Index: positive coefficient; greater satisfaction in local government who indicate more support for this proposal*
8. Republican Dummy: 1 = Republican
9. Democrat Dummy: 1 = Democrat

Results

Both of the predictions for these regressions were accurate; those who supported local authority over State authority had negative and significant coefficients at both time points and those satisfied with local government had positive and significant coefficients at both time points. In addition, at both t2 and t3, participants who favored more taxes, in order to provide certain benefits and services, and participants who felt the community is best at deciding what people can and cannot do favored this proposal. Participants also felt that this proposal was in line with representative democracy. More than half of participants supported this proposal before and after deliberations – about 54 percent before and 63 percent afterwards.

BASIC ORIENTATION (23/39)	Dependent Variable: Q2w_r; Allowing local governments to raise taxes for local services in exchange for increased coordination of service delivery and public reporting of performance						
	T2			T3			Difference
	B	Std. Error	Sig.	B	Std. Error	Sig.	Sig.
Some people think that government should provide certain benefits and services, even if that means higher taxes (1). Other people think that government should lower taxes, even if that means reduced benefits and services (7).	-0.181	0.042	0.000	-0.184	0.040	0.000	0.950
Some people think that majorities should always have their way no matter how big the minorities are or how strongly they feel (1). Other people think that minorities should have their way when they are large enough or feel strongly enough (7).	0.030	0.051	0.555	-0.021	0.047	0.663	0.443
Some people think that the best society is one in which nobody can tell anybody else what to do, even if there is a cost to others (1). Other people think that the best society is one in which the community can decide together what people can and cannot do, even if some people object (7).	0.157	0.050	0.002	0.145	0.044	0.001	0.843
State Authority (over local) Index	-0.287	0.079	0.000†	-0.482	0.072	0.000†	0.045
Representative Democracy (over direct democracy) Index	0.183	0.053	0.001	0.103	0.050	0.042	0.210
Satisfaction w/ State Legislature Index	0.016	0.076	0.839	0.101	0.064	0.114	0.326
Satisfaction w/ Local Government Index	0.155	0.065	0.009†	0.234	0.060	0.000†	0.301
Republican	-0.052	0.037	0.158	0.062	0.033	0.057	0.277
Democrat	-0.002	0.035	0.962	0.038	0.031	0.214	0.277
(Constant)	0.490	0.075	0.000	0.611	0.066	0.000	-
R ²	.202			.241			-
(p)	(.000)			(.000)			-

What's Next California Report

Proposal C3

Dependent Variable: Q2x_r; Creating a stable source of funds for regional priorities by dedicating a portion of tax revenue from economic growth to those priorities

Predictions for Explanatory Variables:

1. Single Item Index: Some people think that government should provide certain benefits and services, even if that means higher taxes (1). Other people think that government should lower taxes, even if that means reduced benefits and services (7)
2. Single Item Index: Some people think that majorities should always have their way no matter how big the minorities are or how strongly they feel (1). Other people think that minorities should have their way when they are large enough or feel strongly enough (7):
3. Single Item Index: Some people think that the best society is one in which nobody can tell anybody else what to do, even if there is a cost to others (1). Other people think that the best society is one in which the community can decide together what people can and cannot do, even if some people object (7).
4. *State Authority (over local) Index: negative coefficient; supporters of this proposal would favor local authority*
5. Representative Democracy (over direct democracy) Index
6. Satisfaction with State Legislature Index
7. *Satisfaction with Local Government Index: positive coefficient; greater satisfaction in local government who indicate more support for this proposal*
8. Republican Dummy: 1 = Republican
9. Democrat Dummy: 1 = Democrat

Results

The two indices on local government were not as accurate predictors for this proposal. Participants in favor of local authority had a negative coefficient at t2; participants who favored local authority supported this proposal for creating funds for regional priorities. But, at t3, the coefficient became positive and significant, showing that participants favoring State authority actually supported this proposal after deliberations. As for the satisfaction with local government index, the coefficient had the correct sign at t2 and t3, but only became statistically significant at t3. The only other statistically significant variable between the two time points was the Republican dummy at t3. Republicans tended to be in opposition of this proposal before and after deliberations, but the strength of opposition was stronger at t3. About the same percentage of participants supported this proposal before and after deliberations, 67 and 68 percent, respectively.

BASIC ORIENTATION (24/39)	Dependent Variable: Q2x_r; Creating a stable source of funds for regional priorities by dedicating a portion of tax revenue from economic growth to those priorities						
	T2			T3			Difference
	B	Std. Error	Sig.	B	Std. Error	Sig.	Sig.
Some people think that government should provide certain benefits and services, even if that means higher taxes (1). Other people think that government should lower taxes, even if that means reduced benefits and services (7).	-0.075	0.036	0.034	-0.061	0.037	0.097	0.758
Some people think that majorities should always have their way no matter how big the minorities are or how strongly they feel (1). Other people think that minorities should have their way when they are large enough or feel strongly enough (7).	0.051	0.043	0.244	0.051	0.043	0.242	0.996
Some people think that the best society is one in which nobody can tell anybody else what to do, even if there is a cost to others (1). Other people think that the best society is one in which the community can decide together what people can and cannot do, even if some people object (7).	0.080	0.042	0.058	0.058	0.041	0.151	0.687
State Authority (over local) Index	-0.033	0.067	0.311†	0.118	0.066	0.037†	0.085
Representative Democracy (over direct democracy) Index	-0.013	0.044	0.771	-0.079	0.046	0.082	0.253
Satisfaction w/ State Legislature Index	0.016	0.064	0.801	0.037	0.058	0.525	0.794
Satisfaction w/ Local Government Index	0.031	0.054	0.285†	0.136	0.054	0.006†	0.132
Republican	-0.051	0.030	0.093	-0.058	0.029	0.043	0.831
Democrat	0.002	0.028	0.951	-0.002	0.027	0.945	0.915
(Constant)	0.617	0.063	0.000	0.535	0.060	0.000	-
R ²	.061			.091			-
(p)	(.003)			(.000)			-

What's Next California Report

Proposal C4

Dependent Variable: Q2y_r; Direct any savings resulting from successful local management of state resources to those local governments, in exchange for monitoring their own performance and being accountable and innovative in their operations

Predictions for Explanatory Variables:

1. Single Item Index: Some people think that government should provide certain benefits and services, even if that means higher taxes (1). Other people think that government should lower taxes, even if that means reduced benefits and services (7)
2. Single Item Index: Some people think that majorities should always have their way no matter how big the minorities are or how strongly they feel (1). Other people think that minorities should have their way when they are large enough or feel strongly enough (7):
3. Single Item Index: Some people think that the best society is one in which nobody can tell anybody else what to do, even if there is a cost to others (1). Other people think that the best society is one in which the community can decide together what people can and cannot do, even if some people object (7).
4. *State Authority (over local) Index: negative coefficient; supporters of this proposal would favor local authority*
5. Representative Democracy (over direct democracy) Index
6. Satisfaction with State Legislature Index
7. *Satisfaction with Local Government Index: positive coefficient; greater satisfaction in local government who indicate more support for this proposal*
8. Republican Dummy: 1 = Republican
9. Democrat Dummy: 1 = Democrat

Results

The predictions for these regressions were accurate for the satisfaction with local government index, but not for the state authority index. Participants who were more satisfied with local government supported this proposal strongly at t2 and t3. But, participants who favored local authority over State authority favored this proposal strongly at t2, but not at t3. The shift in opinion, or the weights the placed on this proposal was substantially less after deliberations. In terms of movement from t2 to t3, the community decision index switched signs and became significant after deliberations. Participants who favored having the community make decisions together were less likely to support this proposal. Those less satisfied with the State Legislature also became less supportive of this proposal. In terms of the party dummies, Republicans came to support this proposal after deliberations. This shift for Republicans was quite large as the difference in the t2 and t3 coefficients had a p-value of 0.001. This proposal had strong support before and after deliberations, 74 percent before and 76 percent afterwards.

BASIC ORIENTATION (25/39)	Dependent Variable: Q2y_r; Direct any savings resulting from successful local management of state resources to those local governments, in exchange for monitoring their own performance and being accountable and innovative in their operations						
	T2			T3			Difference
	B	Std. Error	Sig.	B	Std. Error	Sig.	Sig.
Some people think that government should provide certain benefits and services, even if that means higher taxes (1). Other people think that government should lower taxes, even if that means reduced benefits and services (7).	-0.020	0.039	0.604	-0.017	0.041	0.681	0.947
Some people think that majorities should always have their way no matter how big the minorities are or how strongly they feel (1). Other people think that minorities should have their way when they are large enough or feel strongly enough (7).	0.034	0.047	0.467	0.017	0.048	0.721	0.791
Some people think that the best society is one in which nobody can tell anybody else what to do, even if there is a cost to others (1). Other people think that the best society is one in which the community can decide together what people can and cannot do, even if some people object (7).	0.022	0.046	0.628	-0.121	0.045	0.007	0.017
State Authority (over local) Index	-0.313	0.073	0.000†	-0.077	0.073	0.147†	0.014
Representative Democracy (over direct democracy) Index	0.046	0.049	0.341	-0.014	0.051	0.789	0.343
Satisfaction w/ State Legislature Index	-0.143	0.070	0.041	-0.140	0.064	0.029	0.966
Satisfaction w/ Local Government Index	0.183	0.060	0.001†	0.179	0.060	0.002†	0.957
Republican	-0.053	0.033	0.110	0.071	0.032	0.028	0.001
Democrat	-0.013	0.031	0.687	0.036	0.030	0.235	0.183
(Constant)	0.799	0.069	0.000	0.748	0.067	0.000	-
R ²	.085			.062			-
(p)	(.000)			(.001)			-

What's Next California Report

Proposal C5

Dependent Variable: Q2z_r; Requiring state and local governments to identify policy goals and publish their progress toward meeting them and innovative in their operations

Predictions for Explanatory Variables:

1. Single Item Index: Some people think that government should provide certain benefits and services, even if that means higher taxes (1). Other people think that government should lower taxes, even if that means reduced benefits and services (7)
2. Single Item Index: Some people think that majorities should always have their way no matter how big the minorities are or how strongly they feel (1). Other people think that minorities should have their way when they are large enough or feel strongly enough (7):
3. Single Item Index: Some people think that the best society is one in which nobody can tell anybody else what to do, even if there is a cost to others (1). Other people think that the best society is one in which the community can decide together what people can and cannot do, even if some people object (7).
4. State Authority (over local) Index
5. Representative Democracy (over direct democracy) Index
6. *Satisfaction with State Legislature Index: negative coefficient; less satisfaction in State government who indicate more support for this proposal*
7. *Satisfaction with Local Government Index: negative coefficient; less satisfaction in local government who indicate more support for this proposal*
8. Republican Dummy: 1 = Republican
9. Democrat Dummy: 1 = Democrat

Results

The predictions for these regressions were not entirely accurate. The satisfaction with State Legislature index had a negative and significant coefficient at t2, but the coefficient was no longer significant at t3. The satisfaction with local government index had a positive and significant coefficient at t2 and the coefficient also lost its significance at t3. No explanatory variables were actually significant at t3. This proposal was supported by 92 percent of participants post deliberations.

BASIC ORIENTATION (26/39)	Dependent Variable: Q2z_r; Requiring state and local governments to identify policy goals and publish their progress toward meeting them and innovative in their operations						
	T2			T3			Difference
	B	Std. Error	Sig.	B	Std. Error	Sig.	Sig.
Some people think that government should provide certain benefits and services, even if that means higher taxes (1). Other people think that government should lower taxes, even if that means reduced benefits and services (7).	0.004	0.031	0.906	0.004	0.032	0.901	0.994
Some people think that majorities should always have their way no matter how big the minorities are or how strongly they feel (1). Other people think that minorities should have their way when they are large enough or feel strongly enough (7).	0.018	0.038	0.626	0.031	0.037	0.404	0.798
Some people think that the best society is one in which nobody can tell anybody else what to do, even if there is a cost to others (1). Other people think that the best society is one in which the community can decide together what people can and cannot do, even if some people object (7).	0.058	0.037	0.115	0.025	0.035	0.473	0.476
State Authority (over local) Index	0.078	0.058	0.179	-0.022	0.057	0.704	0.179
Representative Democracy (over direct democracy) Index	-0.095	0.039	0.015	-0.069	0.040	0.084	0.585
Satisfaction w/ State Legislature Index	-0.117	0.056	0.019†	-0.045	0.050	0.186†	0.270
Satisfaction w/ Local Government Index	0.128	0.048	0.004†	0.031	0.047	0.255†	0.098
Republican	-0.019	0.027	0.481	0.003	0.026	0.908	0.458
Democrat	0.014	0.025	0.578	-0.015	0.024	0.536	0.299
(Constant)	0.741	0.055	0.000	0.853	0.052	0.000	-
R ²	.048			.016			-
(p)	(.040)			(.594)			-

What's Next California Report

Taxation: Proposal D1

Dependent Variable: Q2aa_r; Requiring legislation **creating new programs** that cost \$25 million or more to indicate how they will be paid for

Dependent Variable: Q2ab_r; Requiring legislation **creating tax cuts** that cost \$25 million or more to indicate how they will be paid for

Dependent Variable: Q2ac_r; Requiring legislation **creating new programs or tax cuts** that cost \$25 million or more to indicate how they will be paid for

Predictions for Explanatory Variables:

1. Single Item Index: Some people think that government should provide certain benefits and services, even if that means higher taxes (1). Other people think that government should lower taxes, even if that means reduced benefits and services (7)
2. Single Item Index: Some people think that majorities should always have their way no matter how big the minorities are or how strongly they feel (1). Other people think that minorities should have their way when they are large enough or feel strongly enough (7):
3. Single Item Index: Some people think that the best society is one in which nobody can tell anybody else what to do, even if there is a cost to others (1). Other people think that the best society is one in which the community can decide together what people can and cannot do, even if some people object (7).
4. State Authority (over local) Index
5. Representative Democracy (over direct democracy) Index
6. Satisfaction with State Legislature Index
7. Satisfaction with Local Government Index
8. Republican Dummy: 1 = Republican
9. Democrat Dummy: 1 = Democrat

Results

There were no predictions for these regressions. When asked about legislation on creating new programs, participants who favored local authority were more likely to support this proposal. But, when asked about tax cuts or the combination of creating new programs or tax cuts, participants did not have the same viewpoint. Opposition to the proposal referring only to tax cuts came from those who felt government should provide certain benefits and services, even if that meant higher taxes. But, although this coefficient was negative on the combined version of this proposal, the coefficient was not statistically significant. All three of these dependent variables had over 80 percent support from participants before and after deliberations.

BASIC ORIENTATION (27/39)	Dependent Variable: Q2aa_r; Requiring legislation creating new programs that cost \$25 million or more to indicate how they will be paid for						
	T2			T3			Difference
	B	Std. Error	Sig.	B	Std. Error	Sig.	Sig.
Some people think that government should provide certain benefits and services, even if that means higher taxes (1). Other people think that government should lower taxes, even if that means reduced benefits and services (7).	-0.061	0.030	0.044	0.041	0.032	0.199	0.006
Some people think that majorities should always have their way no matter how big the minorities are or how strongly they feel (1). Other people think that minorities should have their way when they are large enough or feel strongly enough (7).	-0.062	0.036	0.083	-0.040	0.037	0.283	0.638
Some people think that the best society is one in which nobody can tell anybody else what to do, even if there is a cost to others (1). Other people think that the best society is one in which the community can decide together what people can and cannot do, even if some people object (7).	-0.052	0.036	0.146	-0.002	0.035	0.958	0.251
State Authority (over local) Index	0.091	0.056	0.104	-0.123	0.057	0.031	0.002
Representative Democracy (over direct democracy) Index	-0.009	0.038	0.823	0.055	0.040	0.171	0.160
Satisfaction w/ State Legislature Index	-0.230	0.055	0.000	-0.042	0.051	0.411	0.002
Satisfaction w/ Local Government Index	0.142	0.047	0.002	-0.052	0.048	0.273	0.000
Republican	-0.030	0.028	0.297	0.017	0.028	0.539	0.089
Democrat	-0.056	0.026	0.033	-0.018	0.026	0.493	0.133
(Constant)	0.937	0.054	0.000	0.922	0.053	0.000	-
R ²	.062			.058			-
(p)	(.000)			(.024)			-

What's Next California Report

BASIC ORIENTATION (28/39)	Dependent Variable: Q2ab_r; Requiring legislation creating tax cuts that cost \$25 million or more to indicate how they will be paid for						
	T2			T3			Difference
	B	Std. Error	Sig.	B	Std. Error	Sig.	Sig.
Some people think that government should provide certain benefits and services, even if that means higher taxes (1). Other people think that government should lower taxes, even if that means reduced benefits and services (7).	-0.229	0.039	0.000	-0.086	0.040	0.032	0.003
Some people think that majorities should always have their way no matter how big the minorities are or how strongly they feel (1). Other people think that minorities should have their way when they are large enough or feel strongly enough (7).	0.002	0.046	0.967	-0.016	0.046	0.733	0.773
Some people think that the best society is one in which nobody can tell anybody else what to do, even if there is a cost to others (1). Other people think that the best society is one in which the community can decide together what people can and cannot do, even if some people object (7).	-0.034	0.046	0.459	0.022	0.044	0.615	0.321
State Authority (over local) Index	0.160	0.072	0.026	0.002	0.071	0.980	0.078
Representative Democracy (over direct democracy) Index	-0.051	0.049	0.293	-0.014	0.050	0.783	0.521
Satisfaction w/ State Legislature Index	0.068	0.070	0.332	0.060	0.063	0.340	0.919
Satisfaction w/ Local Government Index	0.052	0.059	0.384	-0.058	0.059	0.322	0.118
Republican	-0.011	0.035	0.763	0.033	0.033	0.318	0.217
Democrat	0.001	0.033	0.967	0.056	0.031	0.073	0.101
(Constant)	0.819	0.069	0.000	0.808	0.065	0.000	-
R ²	.135			.042			-
(p)	(.000)			(.065)			-

BASIC ORIENTATION (29/39)	Dependent Variable: Q2ac_r; Requiring legislation creating new programs or tax cuts that cost \$25 million or more to indicate how they will be paid for						
	T2			T3			Difference
	B	Std. Error	Sig.	B	Std. Error	Sig.	Sig.
Some people think that government should provide certain benefits and services, even if that means higher taxes (1). Other people think that government should lower taxes, even if that means reduced benefits and services (7).	-0.179	0.039	0.000	-0.020	0.038	0.604	0.001
Some people think that majorities should always have their way no matter how big the minorities are or how strongly they feel (1). Other people think that minorities should have their way when they are large enough or feel strongly enough (7).	-0.038	0.047	0.412	-0.073	0.044	0.096	0.566
Some people think that the best society is one in which nobody can tell anybody else what to do, even if there is a cost to others (1). Other people think that the best society is one in which the community can decide together what people can and cannot do, even if some people object (7).	-0.040	0.046	0.387	0.035	0.041	0.393	0.178
State Authority (over local) Index	0.211	0.072	0.004	-0.083	0.067	0.215	0.001
Representative Democracy (over direct democracy) Index	-0.017	0.049	0.732	0.022	0.047	0.640	0.506
Satisfaction w/ State Legislature Index	0.012	0.070	0.862	0.045	0.059	0.447	0.677
Satisfaction w/ Local Government Index	0.092	0.060	0.123	-0.095	0.055	0.086	0.008
Republican	-0.016	0.034	0.645	0.030	0.031	0.322	0.191
Democrat	-0.018	0.032	0.568	0.038	0.029	0.190	0.091
(Constant)	0.788	0.069	0.000	0.883	0.061	0.000	-
R ²	.096			.027			-
(p)	(.000)			(.337)			-

What's Next California Report

Proposal D2

Dependent Variable: Q2ad_r; Requiring that one-time revenue spikes only be spent on one-time projects, paying off debt, and filling the state rainy-day fund

Regressions were not significant at 0.05 level.

Dependent Variable: Q2ae_r; Increasing the size of the State's rainy-day fund from 5% to 10% of the State budget

Predictions for Explanatory Variables:

1. Single Item Index: Some people think that government should provide certain benefits and services, even if that means higher taxes (1). Other people think that government should lower taxes, even if that means reduced benefits and services (7)
2. Single Item Index: Some people think that majorities should always have their way no matter how big the minorities are or how strongly they feel (1). Other people think that minorities should have their way when they are large enough or feel strongly enough (7):
3. Single Item Index: Some people think that the best society is one in which nobody can tell anybody else what to do, even if there is a cost to others (1). Other people think that the best society is one in which the community can decide together what people can and cannot do, even if some people object (7).
4. State Authority (over local) Index
5. Representative Democracy (over direct democracy) Index
6. Satisfaction with State Legislature Index
7. Satisfaction with Local Government Index
8. Republican Dummy: 1 = Republican
9. Democrat Dummy: 1 = Democrat

Results

There were no predictions for these regressions. After deliberations, only the index for satisfaction with local government was statistically significant. This coefficient was positive and strongly significant, indicating participants more satisfied with local government were more inclined to support increasing the size of the rainy-day fund. At t2, those favoring state authority had a positive and significant coefficient, but at t3 this coefficient not only lost its significance, but the coefficient became negative. This t2 and t3 coefficient for this index had a substantial shift as the difference produced a significant p-value of 0.32. That is, participants who favored the state authority moved away from favoring this proposal. This proposal had about two-thirds of participants' support before and after deliberations.

BASIC ORIENTATION (31/39)	Dependent Variable: Q2ae_r; Increasing the size of the State's rainy-day fund from 5% to 10% of the State budget						
	T2			T3			Difference
	B	Std. Error	Sig.	B	Std. Error	Sig.	Sig.
Some people think that government should provide certain benefits and services, even if that means higher taxes (1). Other people think that government should lower taxes, even if that means reduced benefits and services (7).	-0.032	0.042	0.440	-0.038	0.047	0.411	0.916
Some people think that majorities should always have their way no matter how big the minorities are or how strongly they feel (1). Other people think that minorities should have their way when they are large enough or feel strongly enough (7).	-0.003	0.051	0.954	-0.035	0.055	0.521	0.651
Some people think that the best society is one in which nobody can tell anybody else what to do, even if there is a cost to others (1). Other people think that the best society is one in which the community can decide together what people can and cannot do, even if some people object (7).	0.020	0.050	0.683	0.024	0.051	0.634	0.950
State Authority (over local) Index	0.168	0.078	0.033	-0.058	0.084	0.488	0.032
Representative Democracy (over direct democracy) Index	0.102	0.053	0.052	0.053	0.058	0.364	0.472
Satisfaction w/ State Legislature Index	-0.207	0.076	0.006	-0.042	0.073	0.565	0.077
Satisfaction w/ Local Government Index	0.119	0.064	0.065	0.190	0.068	0.005	0.389
Republican	-0.014	0.036	0.706	0.067	0.037	0.072	0.055
Democrat	0.005	0.034	0.893	0.025	0.035	0.473	0.604
(Constant)	0.553	0.075	0.000	0.598	0.076	0.000	-
R ²	.057			.040			-
(p)	(.021)			(.086)			-

What's Next California Report

Proposal D3

Dependent Variable: Q2af_r; Applying the sales tax to services as well as goods **while reducing the sales tax rate**

Dependent Variable: Q2ag_r; Applying the sales tax to services as well as goods **while keeping the current sales tax rate**

Predictions for Explanatory Variables:

1. *Single Item Index: Some people think that government should provide certain benefits and services, even if that means higher taxes (1). Other people think that government should lower taxes, even if that means reduced benefits and services (7): negative coefficient, this proposal directly speaks to increasing taxes*
2. *Single Item Index: Some people think that majorities should always have their way no matter how big the minorities are or how strongly they feel (1). Other people think that minorities should have their way when they are large enough or feel strongly enough (7):*
3. *Single Item Index: Some people think that the best society is one in which nobody can tell anybody else what to do, even if there is a cost to others (1). Other people think that the best society is one in which the community can decide together what people can and cannot do, even if some people object (7).*
4. *State Authority (over local) Index*
5. *Representative Democracy (over direct democracy) Index*
6. *Satisfaction with State Legislature Index*
7. *Satisfaction with Local Government Index*
8. *Republican Dummy: 1 = Republican: negative coefficient; Republicans typically favor lowering taxes*
9. *Democrat Dummy: 1 = Democrat*

Results

The first prediction for the single item index on taxes was accurately predicted for the regressions before and after deliberations. The second prediction for the Republican dummy was not entirely accurate. For the first regression on applying sales tax to services and goods while reducing taxes, the coefficient was negative for Republicans, but Republicans did not feel so strongly in opposition of this proposal to warrant a statistically significant coefficient for either t2 or t3. For the second regression, Republicans again had negative coefficients as predicted, but Republicans did not feel strongly enough to produce statistical significance.

In the first regression, one other explanatory variable had statistically significant coefficients – satisfaction with local government. Before deliberations, participants less satisfied with local government favored this proposal, however, after deliberations, participants *more* satisfied with local government favored this proposal. There was a dramatic shift in opinion for this index. This dramatic shift was not seen in the second regression and in fact, this index was not even significant in the second regression. But, in the second regression, participants who had greater satisfaction with *State Legislature* favored applying sales tax to services and goods while keeping the same rate. Neither of these proposals had strong support before or after deliberations, in fact, the second proposal had strong opposition of close to 70 percent after deliberations.

BASIC ORIENTATION (32/39)	Dependent Variable: Q2af_r; Applying the sales tax to services as well as goods while reducing the sales tax rate						
	T2			T3			Difference
	B	Std. Error	Sig.	B	Std. Error	Sig.	Sig.
Some people think that government should provide certain benefits and services, even if that means higher taxes (1). Other people think that government should lower taxes, even if that means reduced benefits and services (7).	-0.164	0.052	0.001†	-0.132	0.055	0.008†	0.649
Some people think that majorities should always have their way no matter how big the minorities are or how strongly they feel (1). Other people think that minorities should have their way when they are large enough or feel strongly enough (7).	0.030	0.063	0.634	0.039	0.064	0.546	0.920
Some people think that the best society is one in which nobody can tell anybody else what to do, even if there is a cost to others (1). Other people think that the best society is one in which the community can decide together what people can and cannot do, even if some people object (7).	0.020	0.062	0.748	-0.075	0.060	0.212	0.234
State Authority (over local) Index	-0.085	0.098	0.383	-0.058	0.098	0.552	0.832
Representative Democracy (over direct democracy) Index	0.095	0.066	0.147	0.123	0.068	0.071	0.742
Satisfaction w/ State Legislature Index	0.216	0.094	0.022	0.135	0.086	0.115	0.475
Satisfaction w/ Local Government Index	-0.186	0.080	0.020	0.156	0.080	0.051	0.001
Republican	-0.003	0.045	0.472†	-0.030	0.043	0.244†	0.602
Democrat	0.001	0.042	0.989	0.025	0.041	0.539	0.614
(Constant)	0.513	0.093	0.000	0.406	0.089	0.000	-
R ²	.075			.073			-
(p)	(.001)			(.000)			-

What's Next California Report

BASIC ORIENTATION (33/39)	Dependent Variable: Q2ag_r; Applying the sales tax to services as well as goods while keeping the current sales tax rate						
	T2			T3			Difference
	B	Std. Error	Sig.	B	Std. Error	Sig.	Sig.
Some people think that government should provide certain benefits and services, even if that means higher taxes (1). Other people think that government should lower taxes, even if that means reduced benefits and services (7).	-0.125	0.046	0.004†	-0.119	0.050	0.008†	0.925
Some people think that majorities should always have their way no matter how big the minorities are or how strongly they feel (1). Other people think that minorities should have their way when they are large enough or feel strongly enough (7).	0.040	0.055	0.475	0.019	0.058	0.748	0.783
Some people think that the best society is one in which nobody can tell anybody else what to do, even if there is a cost to others (1). Other people think that the best society is one in which the community can decide together what people can and cannot do, even if some people object (7).	-0.006	0.055	0.916	-0.057	0.055	0.296	0.462
State Authority (over local) Index	0.086	0.086	0.318	0.073	0.089	0.410	0.911
Representative Democracy (over direct democracy) Index	0.037	0.058	0.524	-0.026	0.062	0.677	0.392
Satisfaction w/ State Legislature Index	0.204	0.083	0.014	0.209	0.079	0.008	0.965
Satisfaction w/ Local Government Index	0.038	0.071	0.592	-0.023	0.073	0.758	0.492
Republican	-0.037	0.041	0.184†	-0.044	0.041	0.138†	0.863
Democrat	0.042	0.038	0.276	0.056	0.038	0.144	0.734
(Constant)	0.228	0.082	0.005	0.299	0.081	0.000	-
R ²	.109			.098			-
(p)	(.000)			(.000)			-

Proposal D4

Dependent Variable: Q2ah_r; Limiting the current California state income tax deduction for home mortgage interest payments to \$25,000 per year

Predictions for Explanatory Variables:

1. *Single Item Index: Some people think that government should provide certain benefits and services, even if that means higher taxes (1). Other people think that government should lower taxes, even if that means reduced benefits and services (7): positive coefficient, this proposal directly speaks to limiting taxes*
2. *Single Item Index: Some people think that majorities should always have their way no matter how big the minorities are or how strongly they feel (1). Other people think that minorities should have their way when they are large enough or feel strongly enough (7):*
3. *Single Item Index: Some people think that the best society is one in which nobody can tell anybody else what to do, even if there is a cost to others (1). Other people think that the best society is one in which the community can decide together what people can and cannot do, even if some people object (7).*
4. *State Authority (over local) Index*
5. *Representative Democracy (over direct democracy) Index*
6. *Satisfaction with State Legislature Index*
7. *Satisfaction with Local Government Index*
8. *Republican Dummy: 1 = Republican: negative coefficient; Republicans typically favor limiting taxes*
9. *Democrat Dummy: 1 = Democrat*

Results

The predictions for these regressions were accurate in terms of directionality, but not for significance. The first prediction for the taxes item was accurately predicted and the coefficients with statistically significant. The second prediction for the Republican dummy were accurate for the coefficients' directionality, but the coefficients were not close to being statistically significant. The only other explanatory variable with statistical significance at t3 was satisfaction with local government; participants who were more satisfied with local government were more inclined to support this proposal. A few other explanatory variables had significance at t2, but were no longer significant at t3; however, these movements were not substantial and did not produce any statistical significance. This proposal did not have strong support before or after deliberations, resulting support at the end of deliberations was 44 percent.

What's Next California Report

BASIC ORIENTATION (34/39)	Dependent Variable: Q2ah_r; Limiting the current California state income tax deduction for home mortgage interest payments to \$25,000 per year						
	T2			T3			Difference
	B	Std. Error	Sig.	B	Std. Error	Sig.	Sig.
Some people think that government should provide certain benefits and services, even if that means higher taxes (1). Other people think that government should lower taxes, even if that means reduced benefits and services (7).	-0.082	0.048	0.044†	-0.314	0.051	0.000†	0.000
Some people think that majorities should always have their way no matter how big the minorities are or how strongly they feel (1). Other people think that minorities should have their way when they are large enough or feel strongly enough (7).	0.177	0.058	0.002	0.040	0.059	0.499	0.082
Some people think that the best society is one in which nobody can tell anybody else what to do, even if there is a cost to others (1). Other people think that the best society is one in which the community can decide together what people can and cannot do, even if some people object (7).	0.044	0.057	0.439	-0.004	0.056	0.939	0.504
State Authority (over local) Index	0.257	0.089	0.004	0.155	0.091	0.088	0.379
Representative Democracy (over direct democracy) Index	0.066	0.060	0.271	-0.012	0.063	0.854	0.304
Satisfaction w/ State Legislature Index	0.071	0.087	0.414	0.042	0.080	0.599	0.779
Satisfaction w/ Local Government Index	0.169	0.073	0.022	0.272	0.075	0.000	0.255
Republican	-0.021	0.042	0.307†	-0.046	0.041	0.131†	0.588
Democrat	0.012	0.039	0.752	0.009	0.039	0.817	0.936
(Constant)	0.143	0.085	0.094	0.390	0.083	0.000	-
R ²	.103			.192			-
(p)	(.000)			(.000)			-

Proposal D5

Dependent Variable: Q2ai_r; Reassessing non-residential property more frequently than now

Dependent Variable: Q2aj_r; Reassessing all property values more frequently while adjusting the current property tax exemption for inflation to about \$28,000 and allowing the exemption to rise with property values going forward

Dependent Variable: Q2ak_r; Allowing local electorates to raise the property tax rate above the current 1% rate cap

Predictions for Explanatory Variables:

1. *Single Item Index: Some people think that government should provide certain benefits and services, even if that means higher taxes (1). Other people think that government should lower taxes, even if that means reduced benefits and services (7): negative coefficient, this proposal directly speaks to increasing taxes*
2. *Single Item Index: Some people think that majorities should always have their way no matter how big the minorities are or how strongly they feel (1). Other people think that minorities should have their way when they are large enough or feel strongly enough (7):*
3. *Single Item Index: Some people think that the best society is one in which nobody can tell anybody else what to do, even if there is a cost to others (1). Other people think that the best society is one in which the community can decide together what people can and cannot do, even if some people object (7).*
4. *State Authority (over local) Index*
5. *Representative Democracy (over direct democracy) Index*
6. *Satisfaction with State Legislature Index*
7. *Satisfaction with Local Government Index*
8. *Republican Dummy: 1 = Republican: negative coefficient; Republicans typically favor lowering taxes*
9. *Democrat Dummy: 1 = Democrat*

Results

For all of the regressions, the coefficients on the single item index on taxes were accurately predicted. The coefficients were negative and statistically significant before and after deliberations. The coefficients on the Republican dummy were all negative but none of the coefficients were significant at t3. Republicans did not feel strongly enough against these three proposals.

In the first regression, the community decision index had positive coefficients at both time points, but only became statistically significant at t3. This index was only significant in the first regression, not in the latter two regressions. After deliberations, participants who favored state authority over local authority also favored the first proposal of reassessing all non-residential property more frequently than now. But, when it came to allowing local electorates the ability to raise the property tax above the current one percent cap, participants who favored state authority did not support this proposal.

As for the satisfaction indices, participants who were more satisfied with local government tended to favor reassessing all non-residential property more frequently than now, before and after deliberations. But, this satisfaction did not translate to support for the other two proposals

What's Next California Report

on proposition 13. The reassessing of all non-residential property more frequently than now had high support after deliberations, at 72 percent, but the latter two proposals only had about 30 percent support after deliberations.

BASIC ORIENTATION (35/39)	Dependent Variable: Q2ai_r; Reassessing non-residential property more frequently than now						
	T2			T3			Difference
	B	Std. Error	Sig.	B	Std. Error	Sig.	Sig.
Some people think that government should provide certain benefits and services, even if that means higher taxes (1). Other people think that government should lower taxes, even if that means reduced benefits and services (7).	-0.177	0.044	0.000†	-0.240	0.045	0.000†	0.280
Some people think that majorities should always have their way no matter how big the minorities are or how strongly they feel (1). Other people think that minorities should have their way when they are large enough or feel strongly enough (7).	0.044	0.053	0.411	-0.040	0.054	0.451	0.248
Some people think that the best society is one in which nobody can tell anybody else what to do, even if there is a cost to others (1). Other people think that the best society is one in which the community can decide together what people can and cannot do, even if some people object (7).	0.033	0.052	0.522	0.128	0.050	0.011	0.163
State Authority (over local) Index	0.027	0.082	0.743	0.162	0.081	0.046	0.211
Representative Democracy (over direct democracy) Index	0.063	0.055	0.254	-0.023	0.056	0.680	0.229
Satisfaction w/ State Legislature Index	0.306	0.079	0.000	0.132	0.071	0.063	0.071
Satisfaction w/ Local Government Index	-0.151	0.067	0.024	0.035	0.066	0.600	0.030
Republican	-0.082	0.037	0.015†	-0.048	0.036	0.088†	0.449
Democrat	0.026	0.035	0.460	0.074	0.033	0.026	0.240
(Constant)	0.524	0.078	0.000	0.580	0.074	0.000	-
R ²	.202			.265			-
(p)	(.000)			(.000)			-

What's Next California Report

BASIC ORIENTATION (36/39)	Dependent Variable: Q2aj_r; Reassessing all property values more frequently while adjusting the current property tax exemption for inflation to about \$28,000 and allowing the exemption to rise with property values going forward						
	T2			T3			Difference
	B	Std. Error	Sig.	B	Std. Error	Sig.	Sig.
Some people think that government should provide certain benefits and services, even if that means higher taxes (1). Other people think that government should lower taxes, even if that means reduced benefits and services (7).	-0.114	0.043	0.004†	-0.156	0.048	0.001†	0.497
Some people think that majorities should always have their way no matter how big the minorities are or how strongly they feel (1). Other people think that minorities should have their way when they are large enough or feel strongly enough (7).	0.067	0.053	0.202	0.118	0.058	0.040	0.504
Some people think that the best society is one in which nobody can tell anybody else what to do, even if there is a cost to others (1). Other people think that the best society is one in which the community can decide together what people can and cannot do, even if some people object (7).	0.013	0.051	0.799	0.035	0.054	0.509	0.753
State Authority (over local) Index	-0.149	0.081	0.066	0.083	0.087	0.341	0.041
Representative Democracy (over direct democracy) Index	0.047	0.054	0.387	0.015	0.060	0.804	0.674
Satisfaction w/ State Legislature Index	0.355	0.077	0.000	0.180	0.076	0.017	0.084
Satisfaction w/ Local Government Index	-0.022	0.066	0.739	-0.061	0.071	0.391	0.667
Republican	-0.033	0.036	0.182†	-0.016	0.038	0.333†	0.721
Democrat	0.026	0.034	0.449	0.086	0.035	0.015	0.172
(Constant)	0.399	0.077	0.000	0.296	0.079	0.000	-
R ²	.143			.148			-
(p)	(.000)			(.000)			-

BASIC ORIENTATION (37/39)	Dependent Variable: Q2ak_r; Allowing local electorates to raise the property tax rate above the current 1% rate cap						
	T2			T3			Difference
	B	Std. Error	Sig.	B	Std. Error	Sig.	Sig.
Some people think that government should provide certain benefits and services, even if that means higher taxes (1). Other people think that government should lower taxes, even if that means reduced benefits and services (7).	-0.175	0.044	0.000†	-0.204	0.046	0.000†	0.606
Some people think that majorities should always have their way no matter how big the minorities are or how strongly they feel (1). Other people think that minorities should have their way when they are large enough or feel strongly enough (7).	0.012	0.053	0.818	0.006	0.053	0.904	0.935
Some people think that the best society is one in which nobody can tell anybody else what to do, even if there is a cost to others (1). Other people think that the best society is one in which the community can decide together what people can and cannot do, even if some people object (7).	0.109	0.052	0.037	0.016	0.050	0.754	0.151
State Authority (over local) Index	0.049	0.082	0.550	-0.217	0.081	0.008	0.010
Representative Democracy (over direct democracy) Index	0.224	0.056	0.000	0.286	0.057	0.000	0.359
Satisfaction w/ State Legislature Index	0.175	0.080	0.029	0.241	0.072	0.001	0.468
Satisfaction w/ Local Government Index	0.019	0.068	0.782	0.019	0.067	0.779	0.999
Republican	-0.041	0.039	0.150†	-0.011	0.038	0.336†	0.464
Democrat	0.105	0.037	0.004	0.146	0.035	0.000	0.294
(Constant)	0.114	0.079	0.148	0.239	0.075	0.001	-
R ²	.248			.281			-
(p)	(.000)			(.000)			-

What's Next California Report

Proposal D6

Dependent Variable: Q2a1_r; Lowering local vote requirement to adopt taxes dedicated to specific purposes, to a simple majority so that it is the same as the vote requirement to adopt taxes for general purposes

Predictions for Explanatory Variables:

1. *Single Item Index: Some people think that government should provide certain benefits and services, even if that means higher taxes (1). Other people think that government should lower taxes, even if that means reduced benefits and services (7): negative coefficient, this proposal directly speaks to increasing taxes*
2. *Single Item Index: Some people think that majorities should always have their way no matter how big the minorities are or how strongly they feel (1). Other people think that minorities should have their way when they are large enough or feel strongly enough (7):*
3. *Single Item Index: Some people think that the best society is one in which nobody can tell anybody else what to do, even if there is a cost to others (1). Other people think that the best society is one in which the community can decide together what people can and cannot do, even if some people object (7).*
4. *State Authority (over local) Index: positive coefficient; more interest in giving local government authority should put you in favor of this proposal*
5. *Representative Democracy (over direct democracy) Index*
6. *Satisfaction with State Legislature Index*
7. *Satisfaction with Local Government Index: positive coefficient; more satisfaction with the local government should put you in favor of this proposal*
8. *Republican Dummy: 1 = Republican: negative coefficient; Republicans typically favor lowering taxes*
9. *Democrat Dummy: 1 = Democrat*

Results

Overall, the predictions for these regressions were not accurate. The first single item index on taxes was accurately predicted; participants who favored higher taxes favored this proposal, as the coefficient was negative and statistically significant at both t2 and t3. The state authority index had the accurate sign, but the coefficient at t3 was not significant, even with a one-tailed test the coefficient was not close to significance. The satisfaction with local government index had a negative coefficient and was not significant at all. In terms of the Republican dummy, the directionality of the coefficient was correct, but Republicans did not feel strongly opposed to this proposal. This proposal did not have strong support after deliberations; support hovered around 40 percent after deliberations.

BASIC ORIENTATION (38/39)	Dependent Variable: Q2a1_r; Lowering local vote requirement to adopt taxes dedicated to specific purposes, to a simple majority so that it is the same as the vote requirement to adopt taxes for general purposes						
	T2			T3			Difference
	B	Std. Error	Sig.	B	Std. Error	Sig.	Sig.
Some people think that government should provide certain benefits and services, even if that means higher taxes (1). Other people think that government should lower taxes, even if that means reduced benefits and services (7).	-0.312	0.046	0.000†	-0.358	0.046	0.000†	0.449
Some people think that majorities should always have their way no matter how big the minorities are or how strongly they feel (1). Other people think that minorities should have their way when they are large enough or feel strongly enough (7).	0.112	0.056	0.046	0.056	0.054	0.304	0.459
Some people think that the best society is one in which nobody can tell anybody else what to do, even if there is a cost to others (1). Other people think that the best society is one in which the community can decide together what people can and cannot do, even if some people object (7).	0.147	0.055	0.007	0.178	0.051	0.000	0.665
State Authority (over local) Index	0.104	0.087	0.116†	-0.115	0.082	0.081†	0.054
Representative Democracy (over direct democracy) Index	0.122	0.058	0.035	0.127	0.057	0.026	0.948
Satisfaction w/ State Legislature Index	0.153	0.083	0.065	0.243	0.072	0.001	0.378
Satisfaction w/ Local Government Index	-0.059	0.070	0.202†	-0.024	0.067	0.359†	0.703
Republican	-0.009	0.039	0.406†	-0.011	0.036	0.375†	0.965
Democrat	0.057	0.037	0.119	0.065	0.034	0.051	0.848
(Constant)	0.320	0.082	0.000	0.390	0.075	0.000	-
R ²	.273			.345			-
(p)	(.000)			(.000)			-

What's Next California Report

Proposal D7

Dependent Variable: Q2am_r; Decreasing the super-majority vote required in the Legislature to raise taxes (about 67%) to 55%

Predictions for Explanatory Variables:

1. *Single Item Index: Some people think that government should provide certain benefits and services, even if that means higher taxes (1). Other people think that government should lower taxes, even if that means reduced benefits and services (7): negative coefficient, this proposal directly speaks to increasing taxes*
2. *Single Item Index: Some people think that majorities should always have their way no matter how big the minorities are or how strongly they feel (1). Other people think that minorities should have their way when they are large enough or feel strongly enough (7):*
3. *Single Item Index: Some people think that the best society is one in which nobody can tell anybody else what to do, even if there is a cost to others (1). Other people think that the best society is one in which the community can decide together what people can and cannot do, even if some people object (7).*
4. *State Authority (over local) Index*
5. *Representative Democracy (over direct democracy) Index*
6. *Satisfaction with State Legislature Index*
7. *Satisfaction with Local Government Index*
8. *Republican Dummy: 1 = Republican: negative coefficient; Republicans typically favor lowering taxes*
9. *Democrat Dummy: 1 = Democrat*

Results

The predictions for these regressions were accurate. The single item index on taxes showed that those who favored higher taxes supported this proposal significantly before and after deliberations. In fact, support for this proposal increased substantially after deliberations as the difference between the t2 and t3 coefficients yielded a significant difference. Participants were even more supportive of this proposal after deliberations. The second prediction on the Republican dummy was accurate for directionality and significance. The coefficients were negative and statistically significant at both time points, using the one-tailed test. At t3, the coefficient became more significant given the better p-value, but the shift from t2 to t3 was not large enough to produce significant difference. In terms of movement from t2 to t3, the item on community decisions became significant at t3, that is, participants who felt the community should make decisions favored the proposal more. And, along similar vein, participants who favored representative democracy also favored this proposal significantly. However, support from this index decreased between t2 and t3, as the difference was statistically significant. After deliberations, this proposal just reached the 50 percent mark for support of this proposal.

BASIC ORIENTATION (39/39)	Dependent Variable: Q2am_r; Decreasing the super-majority vote required in the Legislature to raise taxes (about 67%) to 55%						
	T2			T3			Difference
	B	Std. Error	Sig.	B	Std. Error	Sig.	Sig.
Some people think that government should provide certain benefits and services, even if that means higher taxes (1). Other people think that government should lower taxes, even if that means reduced benefits and services (7).	-0.291	0.048	0.000†	-0.454	0.051	0.000†	0.011
Some people think that majorities should always have their way no matter how big the minorities are or how strongly they feel (1). Other people think that minorities should have their way when they are large enough or feel strongly enough (7).	0.001	0.058	0.991	-0.032	0.061	0.598	0.687
Some people think that the best society is one in which nobody can tell anybody else what to do, even if there is a cost to others (1). Other people think that the best society is one in which the community can decide together what people can and cannot do, even if some people object (7).	0.083	0.057	0.143	0.147	0.057	0.010	0.395
State Authority (over local) Index	0.066	0.089	0.457	-0.014	0.092	0.883	0.504
Representative Democracy (over direct democracy) Index	0.322	0.060	0.000	0.136	0.064	0.032	0.018
Satisfaction w/ State Legislature Index	0.105	0.086	0.219	0.151	0.080	0.060	0.665
Satisfaction w/ Local Government Index	-0.001	0.073	0.992	-0.045	0.075	0.553	0.643
Republican	-0.072	0.041	0.038†	-0.124	0.040	0.001†	0.290
Democrat	0.099	0.038	0.009	0.047	0.038	0.218	0.250
(Constant)	0.211	0.085	0.013	0.521	0.084	0.000	-
R ²	.340			.390			-
(p)	(.000)			(.000)			-

3. REGRESSION ANALYSES: EXAMINING EMPIRICAL PREMISES

Regression Analyses: Examining Empirical Premises

Explanatory Variables

The Empirical Premises Indices are created based on selected questions from the arrival (t2) and departure (t3) questionnaires. Some of these questions were not asked at the telephone questionnaire (t1) therefore for a consistent basis for comparison these regression analyses use only t2 and t3 variables. Seven indices were created from the selected questions, some are single item indices and others indices are created with several questions, and two party dummies are included – republican and democrat. In addition, the two party dummies are interacted with all seven of the indices to determine whether identifying with a particular political party predicts one's attitudes toward the dependent variables differently.

11) Single House Index

- a. Agree-Disagree: A single house would make it easier to pass important legislation
- b. Agree-Disagree: A single house would deprive the system of important checks and balances (-)
 - i. The above two questions were originally asked on a five point scale. For these regressions, the questions are rescaled onto 0 to 1 scale, where higher numbers represent agreement and lower numbers represent disagreement. The index was constructed so that higher numbers would indicate *support* for a single house.
 1. Correlation: .202**

12) Part-time Legislature Index

- a. Agree-Disagree: Part-time legislators will represent their districts more closely.
- b. Agree-Disagree: Part-time legislators will be less likely to be career politicians.
- c. Agree-Disagree: Part-time legislators will be more open to corruption. (-)
- d. Agree-Disagree: Part-time legislators will be less informed about policy issues. (-)
 - i. The above four questions were originally asked on a five point scale. For these regressions, the questions are rescaled onto 0 to 1 scale, where higher numbers represent agreement and lower numbers represent disagreement. The index was constructed so that higher numbers would indicate *support* for a part-time legislature.
 1. Cronbach's Alpha: .53

13) Increasing State Legislature Terms

- a. Agree-Disagree: Increasing SL terms will let them spend ... more time legislating.
- b. Agree-Disagree: Increasing SL terms will make them less responsive to their districts. (-)
 - i. The above two questions were originally asked on a five point scale. For these regressions, the questions are rescaled onto 0 to 1 scale, where higher numbers represent agreement and lower numbers represent

What's Next California Report

disagreement. The index was constructed so that higher numbers would indicate *support* for increasing State Legislature terms.

1. Correlation: .250**

14) Single Item Index: Decisions made at local level reflect the will of the local community more closely vs. Decisions made at local level are dominated by powerful special interests

- a. The above question was originally a question using a seven-point scale, where 1 meant that decisions made at the local level are reflect the will of the local community more closely and 7 meant that decisions made at the local level are dominated by powerful special interests. The question was rescaled on a 0 to 1 scale, where higher numbers reflect the local level are dominated by powerful special interests.

15) Single Item Index

- a. California State Legislature is able to get important things done. This question was originally a eleven-point question, where 0 is "not at all", 10 is "as much as could reasonably be expected," and 5 is exactly in the middle, and the questions asked "how much or little would you say the California State Legislature is able to get important things done?" The question is rescaled on a 0 to 1 scale, where higher numbers reflect, "as much as could reasonably be expected."

16) Single Item Index

- a. State Legislature's ability to get things done is affected by tensions between the political parties. This question was originally a eleven-point question, where 0 is "not at all", 10 is "completely", and 5 is exactly in the middle, to what extent is the ability of the State Legislature to get things done affected by tensions between the political parties?" The question is rescaled on a 0 to 1 scale, where higher numbers reflect, "completely."

17) Single Item Index

- a. This item asked participants to fill in "Out of every \$100 that government raises in additional taxes, how many dollars would you say are wasted?" This question was not rescaled.

18) Republican Dummy: 1 = Republican

19) Democrat Dummy: 1 = Democrat

20) Interaction: Republican & Single House Index

21) Interaction: Republican & Part time Legislature Index

22) Interaction: Republican & Increasing State Legislature Terms

- 23) Interaction: Republican & *Local special interests* (Decisions made at the local level are dominated by powerful special interests.)
- 24) Interaction: Republican & *CA Legislature competent* (California State Legislature is able to get important things done)
- 25) Interaction: Republican & *CA Legislature affected by political parties* (State Legislature's ability to get things done is affected by tensions between the political parties)
- 26) Interaction: Republican & *Dollars wasted* (Out of every \$100 that government raises in additional taxes, how many dollars would you say are wasted?)
- 27) Interaction: Democrat & Single House Index
- 28) Interaction: Democrat & Part time Legislature Index
- 29) Interaction: Democrat & Increasing State Legislature Terms
- 30) Interaction: Democrat & *Local special interests* (Decisions made at the local level are dominated by powerful special interests.)
- 31) Interaction: Democrat & *CA Legislature competent* (California State Legislature is able to get important things done)
- 32) Interaction: Democrat & *CA Legislature affected by political parties* (State Legislature's ability to get things done is affected by tensions between the political parties)
- 33) Interaction: Democrat & *Dollars wasted* (Out of every \$100 that government raises in additional taxes, how many dollars would you say are wasted?)

For the regressions in this section of the report, 23 explanatory variables will be included in the regressions. From the t2 and t3 questionnaires, there were 39 attitude questions on the 35 proposals. The discussion below selects dependent variables with statistically significant regressions (above 0.05 level) at both t2 and t3.

Each proposal discussions begin with *predictions* for explanatory variables. Predictions were not made for all explanatory variables or dependent variables. The predictions are not intended to truly predict the results of the regressions; rather they should be seen as expectations of how variables could perform in theory. The purpose of the predictions is to more accurately interpret the results and their significance. That is, explanatory variables with predictions will have one-tailed p-values or the *sig.* column in the regressions tables will have the † symbol, p-values without this symbol indicates two-tailed p-values. A one-tailed p-value is more accurate for variables with certain expectations than a two-tailed p-value.

The regression tables below have three block columns. The first block column shows the t2 results with the coefficient (B), standard error (std. error) and p-value or significance (sig.), the

What's Next California Report

second block column reports the same values at t3 and the last column reports the p-value for the comparison between the t2 and t3 corresponding coefficients. A significant difference would indicate the coefficients are different pre and post deliberation.

The regressions in this section of the report include interaction variables because the interaction variables will shed light on how political party in combination with the indices will change the predictions for the dependent variables. There are only two sets of interactions with two political party dummies, because the results without the dummies can be interpreted as results for the remaining category, independents.

Initiative Process: Proposal A1

Dependent Variable: t2q2a_r; creating a formal review process to allow an initiative's proponents to amend an initiative following public input

Predictions for Explanatory Variables:

- 1) Single House Index
- 2) Part-time Legislature Index
- 3) Increasing State Legislature Terms
- 4) Single Item Index: Decisions made at the local level are dominated by powerful special interests.
- 5) Single Item Index: California State Legislature is able to get important things done.
Single Item Index: State Legislature's ability to get things done is affected by tensions between the political parties.
- 6) Single Item Index: Out of every \$100 that government raises in additional taxes, how many dollars would you say are wasted
- 7) Republican Dummy: 1 = Republican
- 8) Democrat Dummy: 1 = Democrat
- 9) Interaction: Republican & Single House Index
- 10) Interaction: Republican & Part time Legislature Index
- 11) Interaction: Republican & Increasing State Legislature Terms
- 12) Interaction: Republican & Local special interests
- 13) Interaction: Republican & CA Legislature competent
- 14) Interaction: Republican & CA Legislature affected by political parties
- 15) Interaction: Republican & Dollars wasted
- 16) Interaction: Democrat & Single House Index
- 17) Interaction: Democrat & Part time Legislature Index
- 18) Interaction: Democrat & Increasing State Legislature Terms
- 19) Interaction: Democrat & Local special interests
- 20) Interaction: Democrat & CA Legislature competent
- 21) Interaction: Democrat & CA Legislature affected by political parties
- 22) Interaction: Democrat & Dollars wasted

Results

There were no predictions for these regressions. Overall, these regressions did not yield any significant differences between t2 and t3. The regression at t3 was not significant and the only significant explanatory variable at t3 came from an interaction between Democrat and the part time legislature index. Participants who identified themselves as Democrats and also supported a part time legislature were more inclined to support this proposal. The attitude change for this proposal was significant with a 17 percent gain after deliberations, from 59 to 76 percent.

What's Next California Report

EMPIRICAL PREMISES (1/39)	Dependent Variable: Q2a_r; Creating a formal review process to allow an initiative's proponents to amend an initiative following public input						
	T2			T3			Difference
	B	Std. Error	Sig.	B	Std. Error	Sig.	Sig.
Single House Index	0.064	0.049	0.187	0.047	0.050	0.344	0.792
Part-time Legislatures Index	-0.088	0.065	0.177	-0.100	0.059	0.093	0.880
Increasing State Legislatures Terms Index	-0.013	0.056	0.816	0.031	0.066	0.635	0.588
Decisions made at the <u>local level</u> are dominated by powerful <u>special interests</u> .	0.037	0.088	0.676	0.136	0.082	0.097	0.377
California State Legislature is able to get important things done.	0.047	0.119	0.693	0.036	0.119	0.764	0.943
State Legislature's ability to get things done is affected by tensions between the political parties.	-0.003	0.073	0.965	0.095	0.081	0.242	0.340
Dollars wasted out of every \$100 that government raises in additional taxes.	-0.001	0.001	0.109	0.000	0.001	0.677	0.103
Republican	0.005	0.136	0.973	0.145	0.127	0.252	0.403
Democrat	0.075	0.124	0.544	0.192	0.115	0.096	0.441
Rep X Single House	-0.101	0.068	0.137	0.037	0.070	0.595	0.129
Rep X Part-time Legislatures	0.027	0.083	0.749	0.120	0.084	0.152	0.374
Rep X Increasing State Legislatures Terms	-0.065	0.074	0.379	-0.065	0.085	0.441	0.995
Rep X Local special interests	-0.081	0.121	0.501	-0.233	0.127	0.065	0.347
Rep X CA legislature competent	0.068	0.155	0.662	0.065	0.163	0.689	0.990
Rep X CA legislature affected by parties	0.044	0.101	0.664	-0.036	0.110	0.743	0.560
Rep X Dollars wasted	0.000	0.001	0.985	0.000	0.001	0.938	0.962
Dem X Single House	-0.070	0.061	0.248	-0.103	0.063	0.099	0.679
Dem X Part-time Legislatures	0.095	0.080	0.238	0.171	0.076	0.025	0.453
Dem X Increasing State Legislatures Terms	0.091	0.069	0.183	-0.006	0.080	0.935	0.322
Dem X Local special interests	-0.244	0.109	0.025	-0.146	0.105	0.163	0.487
Dem X CA legislature competent	0.015	0.146	0.918	-0.177	0.146	0.225	0.304
Dem X CA legislature affected by parties	0.027	0.097	0.782	0.009	0.106	0.933	0.891
Dem X Dollars wasted	0.000	0.001	0.826	0.000	0.001	0.932	0.807
(Constant)	0.644	0.100	0.000	0.491	0.088	0.000	-
R ²	.071			.074			-
(p)	(.010)			(.093)			-

Proposal A2a

Dependent Variable: t2q2b_r; allowing the Legislature to remove an initiative from the ballot by enacting it into law

Predictions for Explanatory Variables:

- 1) Single House Index
- 2) Part-time Legislature Index
- 3) *Increasing State Legislature Terms: positive coefficient; those willing to increase State Legislature terms would likely support allowing the Legislature to be apart of the initiative process*
- 4) Single Item Index: Decisions made at the local level are dominated by powerful special interests.
- 5) *Single Item Index: California State Legislature is able to get important things done: positive coefficient; those feeling the Legislature is able to get things done would likely support allowing the Legislature to be apart of the initiative process*
- 6) Single Item Index: State Legislature's ability to get things done is affected by tensions between the political parties: *negative coefficient; those feeling the State Legislature is gridlocked would likely not support the Legislature being apart of the initiative process*
- 7) Single Item Index: Out of every \$100 that government raises in additional taxes, how many dollars would you say are wasted
- 8) Republican Dummy: 1 = Republican
- 9) Democrat Dummy: 1 = Democrat
- 10) Interaction: Republican & Single House Index
- 11) Interaction: Republican & Part time Legislature Index
- 12) Interaction: Republican & Increasing State Legislature Terms
- 13) Interaction: Republican & Local special interests
- 14) Interaction: Republican & CA Legislature competent
- 15) Interaction: Republican & CA Legislature affected by political parties
- 16) Interaction: Republican & Dollars wasted
- 17) Interaction: Democrat & Single House Index
- 18) Interaction: Democrat & Part time Legislature Index
- 19) Interaction: Democrat & Increasing State Legislature Terms
- 20) Interaction: Democrat & Local special interests
- 21) Interaction: Democrat & CA Legislature competent
- 22) Interaction: Democrat & CA Legislature affected by political parties
- 23) Interaction: Democrat & Dollars wasted

Results

The prediction for the increasing state legislature index was not accurate. The coefficient was accurately predicted at t2, positive coefficient, but, at t3, the coefficient became negative and statistically significant with a one-tailed test. Participants who did not favor increasing state legislative terms were more likely to support this proposal. There was also a significant shift in the coefficient between t2 and t3, as the p-value was 0.23. The single item index about whether the State Legislature can get things done had the coefficient predicted, positive, but the coefficient was not significant. The last prediction on whether tensions between political parties

What's Next California Report

get in the way of getting things done has the predicted coefficient at t2, but, at t3, the coefficient flips to become positive, although the coefficient remains insignificant. According to the attitude change results, this proposal did not have majority support pre or post deliberation.

EMPIRICAL PREMISES (2/39)	Dependent Variable: Q2b_r; Allowing the Legislature to remove an initiative from the ballot by enacting it into law						
	T2			T3			Difference
	B	Std. Error	Sig.	B	Std. Error	Sig.	Sig.
Single House Index	0.028	0.058	0.624	0.057	0.060	0.343	0.896
Part-time Legislatures Index	-0.109	0.077	0.158	-0.096	0.072	0.181	0.896
Increasing State Legislatures Terms Index	0.085	0.066	0.100†	-0.139	0.080	0.041†	0.023
Decisions made at the <u>local level</u> are dominated by powerful <u>special interests</u> .	0.009	0.104	0.934	0.016	0.099	0.874	0.959
California State Legislature is able to get important things done.	-0.017	0.141	0.451†	0.064	0.144	0.329†	0.662
State Legislature's ability to get things done is affected by tensions between the political parties.	-0.181	0.087	0.019†	0.009	0.098	0.464†	0.123
Dollars wasted out of every \$100 that government raises in additional taxes.	-0.002	0.001	0.068	-0.002	0.001	0.107	0.937
Republican	-0.061	0.161	0.707	-0.036	0.153	0.814	0.903
Democrat	-0.095	0.147	0.518	-0.159	0.139	0.254	0.727
Rep X Single House	0.007	0.080	0.928	-0.059	0.085	0.483	0.541
Rep X Part-time Legislatures	0.047	0.099	0.631	0.076	0.101	0.451	0.819
Rep X Increasing State Legislatures Terms	-0.068	0.087	0.438	0.067	0.103	0.515	0.287
Rep X Local special interests	-0.133	0.143	0.355	-0.033	0.153	0.829	0.608
Rep X CA legislature competent	-0.023	0.184	0.901	0.027	0.197	0.893	0.843
Rep X CA legislature affected by parties	0.260	0.120	0.030	0.008	0.133	0.951	0.128
Rep X Dollars wasted	-0.001	0.002	0.661	0.001	0.002	0.454	0.343
Dem X Single House	0.041	0.072	0.569	0.022	0.076	0.771	0.846
Dem X Part-time Legislatures	0.079	0.095	0.407	0.014	0.092	0.879	0.593
Dem X Increasing State Legislatures Terms	-0.035	0.081	0.666	0.181	0.096	0.060	0.069
Dem X Local special interests	-0.051	0.129	0.694	-0.014	0.126	0.914	0.827
Dem X CA legislature competent	-0.001	0.174	0.996	0.125	0.176	0.477	0.575
Dem X CA legislature affected by parties	0.229	0.116	0.048	0.038	0.128	0.769	0.230
Dem X Dollars wasted	0.001	0.001	0.690	0.002	0.001	0.140	0.369
(Constant)	0.636	0.118	0.000	0.492	0.106	0.000	-
R ²	.110			.060			-
(p)	(.002)			(.356)			-

What's Next California Report

Proposal A2b

Dependent Variable: t2q2c_r; Allowing a simple majority of the State Legislature to place a countermeasure to an already qualified initiative on the ballot next to that initiative

Predictions for Explanatory Variables:

- 1) Single House Index
- 2) Part-time Legislature Index
- 3) *Increasing State Legislature Terms: positive coefficient; those willing to increase State Legislature terms would likely support allowing the Legislature to be apart of the initiative process*
- 4) Single Item Index: Decisions made at the local level are dominated by powerful special interests.
- 5) *Single Item Index: California State Legislature is able to get important things done: positive coefficient; those feeling the Legislature is able to get things done would likely support allowing the Legislature to be apart of the initiative process*
- 6) Single Item Index: State Legislature's ability to get things done is affected by tensions between the political parties: *negative coefficient; those feeling the State Legislature is gridlocked would likely not support the Legislature being apart of the initiative process*
- 7) Single Item Index: Out of every \$100 that government raises in additional taxes, how many dollars would you say are wasted
- 8) Republican Dummy: 1 = Republican
- 9) Democrat Dummy: 1 = Democrat
- 10) Interaction: Republican & Single House Index
- 11) Interaction: Republican & Part time Legislature Index
- 12) Interaction: Republican & Increasing State Legislature Terms
- 13) Interaction: Republican & Local special interests
- 14) Interaction: Republican & CA Legislature competent
- 15) Interaction: Republican & CA Legislature affected by political parties
- 16) Interaction: Republican & Dollars wasted
- 17) Interaction: Democrat & Single House Index
- 18) Interaction: Democrat & Part time Legislature Index
- 19) Interaction: Democrat & Increasing State Legislature Terms
- 20) Interaction: Democrat & Local special interests
- 21) Interaction: Democrat & CA Legislature competent
- 22) Interaction: Democrat & CA Legislature affected by political parties
- 23) Interaction: Democrat & Dollars wasted

Results

The same predictions were made for these regressions. For the increasing State Legislature terms index, the coefficient at t2 was as predicted, negative, but the coefficient at t3 became positive and significant. However, the change of sign did not produce a significant difference between the t2 and t3 coefficients. The second prediction on the competency of the State Legislature had the correct directionality of the coefficient, but the coefficient was not significant at either time point. The last prediction on political gridlock in the State Legislature had the correct predicted sign at t3, but the coefficient was not significant. Of the interaction variables at t3, one

explanatory variable was significant – the interaction between Democrats and local special interests. The variable coefficient was positive, indicating Democrats who felt that the state level was dominated by special interests favored this proposal. Post deliberation, a majority, 57 percent opposed this proposal.

What's Next California Report

EMPIRICAL PREMISES (3/39)	Dependent Variable: Q2c_r; Allowing a simple majority of the State Legislature to place a countermeasure to an already qualified initiative on the ballot next to that initiative						
	T2			T3			Difference
	B	Std. Error	Sig.	B	Std. Error	Sig.	Sig.
Single House Index	0.119	0.057	0.036	0.024	0.059	0.679	0.216
Part-time Legislatures Index	-0.140	0.076	0.064	-0.036	0.070	0.609	0.275
Increasing State Legislatures Terms Index	-0.017	0.065	0.395†	-0.145	0.078	0.032†	0.185
Decisions made at the <u>local</u> level are dominated by powerful <u>special interests</u> .	-0.126	0.102	0.218	-0.108	0.097	0.264	0.893
California State Legislature is able to get important things done.	0.149	0.139	0.141†	0.127	0.141	0.198†	0.902
State Legislature's ability to get things done is affected by tensions between the political parties.	-0.036	0.085	0.386†	0.132	0.096	0.084†	0.164
Dollars wasted out of every \$100 that government raises in additional taxes.	0.001	0.001	0.500	-0.001	0.001	0.416	0.224
Republican	0.051	0.158	0.746	0.077	0.149	0.607	0.897
Democrat	0.132	0.144	0.359	-0.156	0.136	0.253	0.107
Rep X Single House	-0.102	-1.300	0.195	-0.099	0.083	0.234	0.971
Rep X Part-time Legislatures	0.058	0.600	0.551	0.017	0.099	0.867	0.740
Rep X Increasing State Legislatures Terms	0.063	0.740	0.462	0.168	0.101	0.094	0.398
Rep X Local special interests	0.154	0.141	0.274	0.151	0.150	0.311	0.988
Rep X CA legislature competent	-0.116	0.181	0.523	-0.293	0.193	0.129	0.467
Rep X CA legislature affected by parties	-0.024	0.118	0.842	-0.072	0.130	0.581	0.765
Rep X Dollars wasted	-0.001	0.002	0.606	-0.001	0.002	0.709	0.911
Dem X Single House	-0.132	-1.860	0.062	0.028	0.074	0.708	0.094
Dem X Part-time Legislatures	0.169	1.800	0.072	-0.091	0.090	0.315	0.030
Dem X Increasing State Legislatures Terms	0.065	0.810	0.417	0.120	0.094	0.204	0.639
Dem X Local special interests	0.122	0.127	0.337	0.336	0.124	0.007	0.199
Dem X CA legislature competent	-0.163	0.171	0.341	0.047	0.172	0.784	0.340
Dem X CA legislature affected by parties	0.060	0.114	0.598	-0.079	0.125	0.528	0.372
Dem X Dollars wasted	-0.002	0.001	0.100	0.001	0.001	0.544	0.075
(Constant)	0.391	0.116	0.001	0.364	0.104	0.000	-
R ²	.096			.086			-
(p)	(.050)			(.026)			-

Proposal A2c

Dependent Variable: Q2d_r; Allowing the Legislature to amend an initiative that has already passed, subject to a public review and the agreement of the initiative's proponents

Predictions for Explanatory Variables:

- 1) Single House Index
- 2) Part-time Legislature Index
- 3) *Increasing State Legislature Terms: positive coefficient; those willing to increase State Legislature terms would likely support allowing the Legislature to be apart of the initiative process*
- 4) Single Item Index: Decisions made at the local level are dominated by powerful special interests.
- 5) *Single Item Index: California State Legislature is able to get important things done: positive coefficient; those feeling the Legislature is able to get things done would likely support allowing the Legislature to be apart of the initiative process*
- 6) Single Item Index: State Legislature's ability to get things done is affected by tensions between the political parties: *negative coefficient; those feeling the State Legislature is gridlocked would likely not support the Legislature being apart of the initiative process*
- 7) Single Item Index: Out of every \$100 that government raises in additional taxes, how many dollars would you say are wasted
- 8) Republican Dummy: 1 = Republican
- 9) Democrat Dummy: 1 = Democrat
- 10) Interaction: Republican & Single House Index
- 11) Interaction: Republican & Part time Legislature Index
- 12) Interaction: Republican & Increasing State Legislature Terms
- 13) Interaction: Republican & Local special interests
- 14) Interaction: Republican & CA Legislature competent
- 15) Interaction: Republican & CA Legislature affected by political parties
- 16) Interaction: Republican & Dollars wasted
- 17) Interaction: Democrat & Single House Index
- 18) Interaction: Democrat & Part time Legislature Index
- 19) Interaction: Democrat & Increasing State Legislature Terms
- 20) Interaction: Democrat & Local special interests
- 21) Interaction: Democrat & CA Legislature competent
- 22) Interaction: Democrat & CA Legislature affected by political parties
- 23) Interaction: Democrat & Dollars wasted

Results

The same predictions were made for these regressions. For increasing State Legislature terms, the coefficient is correctly predicted at t3, but the coefficient is not significant. For the competency of the State Legislature, the coefficient is correctly predicted and the coefficient is statistically significant at both time points. For the index on political gridlock in the State Legislature, the coefficients are correctly predicted, but the coefficients are not significant. The political party dummies, Republican and Democrat, both had positive coefficients and very significant coefficients at t3. As for the interaction variables, Republicans who did not support

What's Next California Report

increasing the State Legislature terms, thought the State Legislature was not competent and thought the government wasted too much money did not support this proposal. Similarly, Democrats who did not think the State Legislature was not competent did not support this proposal either.

There were also some substantial changes in coefficients between t2 and t3. The part time legislature index had a negative and very significant coefficient at t2, but, at t3, the coefficient lost its significance completely. The three of the seven interaction variables for Republicans had substantial shifts in its coefficients between t2 and t3. Among them, the interaction with part time legislature index, increasing State Legislature terms index, and whether the State Legislature is competent to get important things done. All three of these interactions started with very positive coefficients and after deliberations, the coefficients became negative and two reached statistical significance. For the Democrats, two of the seven interactions variables had substantial shifts between t2 and t3, and they overlap with the just mentioned Republican interactions as well. The part time legislature index and increasing State Legislature terms index started out very positive and significant, but, after deliberations, the coefficient on the part time legislature index lost its significance and the coefficient on increasing State Legislature terms index became negative. The attitude change results showed, that post deliberations, about half of participants opposed this proposal.

EMPIRICAL PREMISES (4/39)	Dependent Variable: Q2d_r; Allowing the Legislature to amend an initiative that has already passed, subject to a public review and the agreement of the initiative's proponents						
	T2			T3			Difference
	B	Std. Error	Sig.	B	Std. Error	Sig.	Sig.
Single House Index	0.050	0.056	0.378	0.059	0.061	0.334	0.901
Part-time Legislatures Index	-0.276	0.075	0.000	-0.004	0.073	0.955	0.005
Increasing State Legislatures Terms Index	-0.032	0.065	0.310†	0.112	0.082	0.085†	0.144
Decisions made at the local level are dominated by powerful special interests.	0.031	0.101	0.763	0.020	0.101	0.840	0.940
California State Legislature is able to get important things done.	0.072	0.137	0.300†	0.391	0.147	0.004†	0.086
State Legislature's ability to get things done is affected by tensions between the political parties.	-0.049	0.085	0.282†	-0.061	0.100	0.271†	0.923
Dollars wasted out of every \$100 that government raises in additional taxes.	-0.001	0.001	0.531	0.002	0.001	0.102	0.061
Republican	0.045	0.157	0.772	0.454	0.156	0.004	0.043
Democrat	0.037	0.143	0.794	0.425	0.142	0.003	0.034
Rep X Single House	0.015	0.078	0.852	-0.164	0.086	0.057	0.102
Rep X Part-time Legislatures	0.277	0.096	0.004	-0.111	0.103	0.282	0.002
Rep X Increasing State Legislatures Terms	0.175	0.085	0.041	-0.206	0.105	0.049	0.003
Rep X Local special interests	-0.084	0.140	0.549	-0.107	0.156	0.491	0.903
Rep X CA legislature competent	0.165	0.180	0.357	-0.419	0.201	0.037	0.019
Rep X CA legislature affected by parties	-0.059	0.117	0.612	0.107	0.136	0.430	0.315
Rep X Dollars wasted	-0.002	0.002	0.236	-0.005	0.002	0.002	0.097
Dem X Single House	-0.083	0.070	0.234	-0.084	0.077	0.279	0.998
Dem X Part-time Legislatures	0.357	0.093	0.000	0.013	0.094	0.893	0.005
Dem X Increasing State Legislatures Terms	0.185	0.079	0.019	-0.154	0.098	0.116	0.004
Dem X Local special interests	0.001	0.126	0.995	-0.029	0.129	0.825	0.863
Dem X CA legislature competent	-0.006	0.169	0.971	-0.365	0.179	0.042	0.111
Dem X CA legislature affected by parties	-0.049	0.113	0.661	0.003	0.131	0.982	0.743
Dem X Dollars wasted	0.000	0.001	0.984	-0.002	0.002	0.264	0.344
(Constant)	0.511	0.115	0.000	0.123	0.108	0.254	-
R ²	.160			.104			-
(p)	(.000)			(.002)			-

What's Next California Report

Proposal A2d

Dependent Variable: Q2e_r; Allowing the Legislature to amend an initiative that has already passed, subject to a two-thirds vote, even if an initiative's proponents do not agree with the amendment

Predictions for Explanatory Variables:

- 1) Single House Index
- 2) Part-time Legislature Index
- 3) *Increasing State Legislature Terms: positive coefficient; those willing to increase State Legislature terms would likely support allowing the Legislature to be apart of the initiative process*
- 4) Single Item Index: Decisions made at the local level are dominated by powerful special interests.
- 5) *Single Item Index: California State Legislature is able to get important things done: positive coefficient; those feeling the Legislature is able to get things done would likely support allowing the Legislature to be apart of the initiative process*
- 6) Single Item Index: State Legislature's ability to get things done is affected by tensions between the political parties: *negative coefficient; those feeling the State Legislature is gridlocked would likely not support the Legislature being apart of the initiative process*
- 7) Single Item Index: Out of every \$100 that government raises in additional taxes, how many dollars would you say are wasted
- 8) Republican Dummy: 1 = Republican
- 9) Democrat Dummy: 1 = Democrat
- 10) Interaction: Republican & Single House Index
- 11) Interaction: Republican & Part time Legislature Index
- 12) Interaction: Republican & Increasing State Legislature Terms
- 13) Interaction: Republican & Local special interests
- 14) Interaction: Republican & CA Legislature competent
- 15) Interaction: Republican & CA Legislature affected by political parties
- 16) Interaction: Republican & Dollars wasted
- 17) Interaction: Democrat & Single House Index
- 18) Interaction: Democrat & Part time Legislature Index
- 19) Interaction: Democrat & Increasing State Legislature Terms
- 20) Interaction: Democrat & Local special interests
- 21) Interaction: Democrat & CA Legislature competent
- 22) Interaction: Democrat & CA Legislature affected by political parties
- 23) Interaction: Democrat & Dollars wasted

Results

The same predictions were made for these regressions. For the increasing State Legislature terms index, the coefficients were incorrectly predicted and the coefficients were not significant. For the competency of the Legislature index, the coefficients were accurately predicted, positive, and the coefficient was significant at t3. And, for the gridlock index, the coefficients were accurately predicted, but the coefficient was not significant at t3. The interaction variables for these regressions did not produce any statistically significant results and the difference of the

coefficients were, in general, not significant. The attitude change results showed that this proposal had strong opposition, at 73 percent, after deliberations.

What's Next California Report

EMPIRICAL PREMISES (5/39)	Dependent Variable: Q2e_r; Allowing the Legislature to amend an initiative that has already passed, subject to a two-thirds vote, even if an initiative's proponents do not agree with the amendment						
	T2			T3			Difference
	B	Std. Error	Sig.	B	Std. Error	Sig.	Sig.
Single House Index	0.034	0.052	0.505	0.083	0.054	0.123	0.480
Part-time Legislatures Index	-0.057	0.069	0.406	-0.022	0.065	0.731	0.685
Increasing State Legislatures Terms Index	-0.030	0.059	0.307†	-0.096	0.072	0.091†	0.449
Decisions made at the <u>local level</u> are dominated by powerful <u>special interests</u> .	0.061	0.093	0.509	-0.038	0.089	0.666	0.405
California State Legislature is able to get important things done.	0.187	0.126	0.070†	0.228	0.129	0.039†	0.803
State Legislature's ability to get things done is affected by tensions between the political parties.	-0.167	0.078	0.016†	-0.038	0.088	0.334†	0.239
Dollars wasted out of every \$100 that government raises in additional taxes.	-0.001	0.001	0.557	0.001	0.001	0.394	0.228
Republican	0.129	0.144	0.371	-0.085	0.137	0.535	0.230
Democrat	-0.088	0.132	0.504	0.083	0.126	0.510	0.290
Rep X Single House	0.072	0.072	0.318	-0.097	0.076	0.199	0.080
Rep X Part-time Legislatures	-0.091	0.089	0.303	0.014	0.091	0.879	0.348
Rep X Increasing State Legislatures Terms	0.057	0.078	0.462	0.060	0.092	0.512	0.979
Rep X Local special interests	-0.084	0.128	0.511	0.233	0.137	0.090	0.066
Rep X CA legislature competent	-0.188	0.165	0.253	-0.154	0.177	0.384	0.877
Rep X CA legislature affected by parties	0.033	0.107	0.757	0.144	0.120	0.228	0.447
Rep X Dollars wasted	-0.001	0.001	0.480	-0.001	0.001	0.480	0.993
Dem X Single House	-0.035	0.064	0.590	-0.082	0.068	0.225	0.579
Dem X Part-time Legislatures	0.097	0.085	0.254	-0.118	0.083	0.153	0.045
Dem X Increasing State Legislatures Terms	0.071	0.073	0.332	-0.035	0.086	0.683	0.316
Dem X Local special interests	0.089	0.115	0.442	0.153	0.113	0.176	0.669
Dem X CA legislature competent	-0.054	0.156	0.730	-0.135	0.158	0.395	0.685
Dem X CA legislature affected by parties	0.211	0.103	0.041	0.027	0.115	0.814	0.192
Dem X Dollars wasted	0.000	0.001	0.939	-0.001	0.001	0.706	0.799
(Constant)	0.370	0.106	0.000	0.206	0.096	0.031	-
R ²	.139			.079			-
(p)	(.000)			(.005)			-

Proposal A3

Dependent Variable: Q2f_r; Allowing an initiative's proponents to withdraw it after it qualifies for the ballot

Predictions for Explanatory Variables:

- 1) Single House Index
- 2) Part-time Legislature Index
- 3) Increasing State Legislature Terms
- 4) Single Item Index: Decisions made at the local level are dominated by powerful special interests.
- 5) Single Item Index: California State Legislature is able to get important things done
- 6) Single Item Index: State Legislature's ability to get things done is affected by tensions between the political parties
- 7) Single Item Index: Out of every \$100 that government raises in additional taxes, how many dollars would you say are wasted
- 8) Republican Dummy: 1 = Republican
- 9) Democrat Dummy: 1 = Democrat
- 10) Interaction: Republican & Single House Index
- 11) Interaction: Republican & Part time Legislature Index
- 12) Interaction: Republican & Increasing State Legislature Terms
- 13) Interaction: Republican & Local special interests
- 14) Interaction: Republican & CA Legislature competent
- 15) Interaction: Republican & CA Legislature affected by political parties
- 16) Interaction: Republican & Dollars wasted
- 17) Interaction: Democrat & Single House Index
- 18) Interaction: Democrat & Part time Legislature Index
- 19) Interaction: Democrat & Increasing State Legislature Terms
- 20) Interaction: Democrat & Local special interests
- 21) Interaction: Democrat & CA Legislature competent
- 22) Interaction: Democrat & CA Legislature affected by political parties
- 23) Interaction: Democrat & Dollars wasted

Results

There were no predictions for these regressions. The part time legislature index had a negative and significant coefficient at both time points; participants that did not support the part time legislature supported this proposal. In addition, Republicans and Democrats who supported the part time legislature index also supported the proposal. Other explanatory variables were not statistically significant in these regressions. The attitude change results showed this proposal had majority support, 57 percent, after deliberations.

What's Next California Report

EMPIRICAL PREMISES (6/39)	Dependent Variable: Q2f_r; Allowing an initiative's proponents to withdraw it after it qualifies for the ballot						
	T2			T3			Difference
	B	Std. Error	Sig.	B	Std. Error	Sig.	Sig.
Single House Index	-0.006	0.060	0.914	0.056	0.058	0.336	0.426
Part-time Legislatures Index	-0.157	0.080	0.050	-0.152	0.069	0.029	0.958
Increasing State Legislatures Terms Index	-0.049	0.069	0.476	0.051	0.077	0.509	0.309
Decisions made at the local level are dominated by powerful special interests.	-0.053	0.108	0.621	-0.101	0.095	0.290	0.725
California State Legislature is able to get important things done.	0.006	0.146	0.966	-0.057	0.139	0.681	0.734
State Legislature's ability to get things done is affected by tensions between the political parties.	0.045	0.090	0.620	-0.052	0.094	0.581	0.433
Dollars wasted out of every \$100 that government raises in additional taxes.	-0.001	0.001	0.586	0.000	0.001	0.823	0.536
Republican	0.134	0.167	0.420	-0.012	0.147	0.932	0.471
Democrat	-0.030	0.152	0.845	-0.052	0.134	0.700	0.904
Rep X Single House	0.121	0.083	0.145	-0.102	0.082	0.214	0.042
Rep X Part-time Legislatures	0.139	0.102	0.172	0.215	0.098	0.028	0.555
Rep X Increasing State Legislatures Terms	0.094	0.091	0.298	-0.019	0.099	0.848	0.371
Rep X Local special interests	-0.072	0.148	0.627	0.199	0.148	0.177	0.164
Rep X CA legislature competent	0.012	0.191	0.950	0.084	0.190	0.657	0.772
Rep X CA legislature affected by parties	0.026	0.124	0.834	0.033	0.128	0.800	0.968
Rep X Dollars wasted	-0.003	0.002	0.117	-0.002	0.002	0.328	0.598
Dem X Single House	0.039	0.075	0.603	0.006	0.073	0.939	0.734
Dem X Part-time Legislatures	0.228	0.099	0.021	0.195	0.089	0.028	0.789
Dem X Increasing State Legislatures Terms	0.131	0.084	0.122	0.031	0.093	0.742	0.400
Dem X Local special interests	0.083	0.134	0.537	0.031	0.122	0.800	0.763
Dem X CA legislature competent	-0.169	0.180	0.349	-0.058	0.170	0.732	0.625
Dem X CA legislature affected by parties	0.103	0.120	0.392	0.169	0.124	0.172	0.678
Dem X Dollars wasted	-0.001	0.001	0.667	0.000	0.001	0.937	0.778
(Constant)	0.587	0.122	0.000	0.625	0.102	0.000	-
R ²	.096			.068			-
(p)	(.018)			(.226)			-

Proposal A4

Dependent Variable: Q2g_r; Requiring all ballot measures that require new expenditures to indicate how they will be paid for

Predictions for Explanatory Variables:

- 1) Single House Index
- 2) Part-time Legislature Index
- 3) Increasing State Legislature Terms
- 4) Single Item Index: Decisions made at the local level are dominated by powerful special interests.
- 5) Single Item Index: California State Legislature is able to get important things done
- 6) Single Item Index: State Legislature's ability to get things done is affected by tensions between the political parties
- 7) *Single Item Index: Out of every \$100 that government raises in additional taxes, how many dollars would you say are wasted; positive coefficient; those who feel the government wastes money will likely support this proposal*
- 8) Republican Dummy: 1 = Republican
- 9) Democrat Dummy: 1 = Democrat
- 10) Interaction: Republican & Single House Index
- 11) Interaction: Republican & Part time Legislature Index
- 12) Interaction: Republican & Increasing State Legislature Terms
- 13) Interaction: Republican & Local special interests
- 14) Interaction: Republican & CA Legislature competent
- 15) Interaction: Republican & CA Legislature affected by political parties
- 16) *Interaction: Republican & Dollars wasted; positive coefficient; those who feel the government wastes money will likely support this proposal*
- 17) Interaction: Democrat & Single House Index
- 18) Interaction: Democrat & Part time Legislature Index
- 19) Interaction: Democrat & Increasing State Legislature Terms
- 20) Interaction: Democrat & Local special interests
- 21) Interaction: Democrat & CA Legislature competent
- 22) Interaction: Democrat & CA Legislature affected by political parties
- 23) *Interaction: Democrat & Dollars wasted; positive coefficient; those who feel the government wastes money will likely support this proposal*

Results

The prediction for the index *dollars wasted* was not proven correct. The index, on its own, had a negative coefficient, which meant that participants who felt the government did not waste a lot of money supported this proposal. However, when interacted with the political party parties, the coefficients were positive, but not statistically significant at t3. The explanatory variable with statistical significance at t3 and also had a substantial shift between t2 and t3 was the interaction between Democrat and the single house index. The coefficient was negative, meaning these participants were in opposition of this proposal. The attitude change results showed this proposal had strong support before and after deliberations, 87 and 85 percent, respectively.

What's Next California Report

EMPIRICAL PREMISES (7/39)	Dependent Variable: Q2g_r; Requiring all ballot measures that require new expenditures to indicate how they will be paid for						
	T2			T3			Difference
	B	Std. Error	Sig.	B	Std. Error	Sig.	Sig.
Single House Index	-0.035	0.041	0.386	0.078	0.047	0.096	0.050
Part-time Legislatures Index	0.044	0.054	0.421	0.080	0.056	0.152	0.614
Increasing State Legislatures Terms Index	-0.020	0.047	0.672	-0.155	0.062	0.013	0.066
Decisions made at the <u>local level</u> are dominated by powerful <u>special interests</u> .	-0.125	0.073	0.088	-0.117	0.077	0.127	0.938
California State Legislature is able to get important things done.	-0.158	0.099	0.112	0.155	0.112	0.166	0.023
State Legislature's ability to get things done is affected by tensions between the political parties.	0.020	0.061	0.740	-0.043	0.076	0.574	0.492
Dollars wasted out of every \$100 that government raises in additional taxes.	-0.002	0.001	0.008†	-0.001	0.001	0.240†	0.238
Republican	-0.230	0.113	0.042	-0.125	0.119	0.294	0.478
Democrat	-0.212	0.103	0.040	-0.010	0.109	0.928	0.133
Rep X Single House	0.093	0.057	0.102	0.027	0.066	0.687	0.414
Rep X Part-time Legislatures	-0.026	0.070	0.704	-0.069	0.079	0.382	0.650
Rep X Increasing State Legislatures Terms	0.049	0.062	0.430	0.166	0.080	0.037	0.213
Rep X Local special interests	0.143	0.101	0.156	0.026	0.119	0.825	0.418
Rep X CA legislature competent	0.175	0.130	0.177	0.007	0.153	0.964	0.363
Rep X CA legislature affected by parties	0.045	0.084	0.593	-0.008	0.104	0.940	0.667
Rep X Dollars wasted	0.002	0.001	0.056†	0.002	0.001	0.075†	0.986
Dem X Single House	0.033	0.051	0.511	-0.142	0.059	0.016	0.015
Dem X Part-time Legislatures	0.008	0.067	0.904	-0.064	0.072	0.374	0.424
Dem X Increasing State Legislatures Terms	0.029	0.057	0.614	0.109	0.075	0.143	0.364
Dem X Local special interests	0.168	0.091	0.065	0.076	0.098	0.440	0.463
Dem X CA legislature competent	-0.055	0.122	0.652	-0.347	0.137	0.011	0.079
Dem X CA legislature affected by parties	0.067	0.081	0.409	0.015	0.100	0.884	0.656
Dem X Dollars wasted	0.002	0.001	0.025†	0.001	0.001	0.118†	0.671
(Constant)	1.025	0.083	0.000	0.902	0.083	0.000	-
R ²	.086			.086			-
(p)	(.091)			(.008)			-

Proposal A5

Dependent Variable: Q2h_r; Requiring the ballot pamphlet to provide an analysis by the Legislative Analyst of how new initiative programs will likely be paid for

Regressions were not significant at 0.05 level.

Proposal A6

Dependent Variable: Q2i_r; Making the vote threshold needed to pass an initiative the same as any vote threshold that the initiative itself requires of the public in the future

Predictions for Explanatory Variables:

- 1) Single House Index
- 2) Part-time Legislature Index
- 3) Increasing State Legislature Terms
- 4) Single Item Index: Decisions made at the local level are dominated by powerful special interests.
- 5) Single Item Index: California State Legislature is able to get important things done
- 6) Single Item Index: State Legislature's ability to get things done is affected by tensions between the political parties
- 7) Single Item Index: Out of every \$100 that government raises in additional taxes, how many dollars would you say are wasted
- 8) Republican Dummy: 1 = Republican
- 9) Democrat Dummy: 1 = Democrat
- 10) Interaction: Republican & Single House Index
- 11) Interaction: Republican & Part time Legislature Index
- 12) Interaction: Republican & Increasing State Legislature Terms
- 13) Interaction: Republican & Local special interests
- 14) Interaction: Republican & CA Legislature competent
- 15) Interaction: Republican & CA Legislature affected by political parties
- 16) Interaction: Republican & Dollars wasted
- 17) Interaction: Democrat & Single House Index
- 18) Interaction: Democrat & Part time Legislature Index
- 19) Interaction: Democrat & Increasing State Legislature Terms
- 20) Interaction: Democrat & Local special interests
- 21) Interaction: Democrat & CA Legislature competent
- 22) Interaction: Democrat & CA Legislature affected by political parties
- 23) Interaction: Democrat & Dollars wasted

Results

There were no predictions for these regressions. Of all the explanatory variables, only two explanatory variables had substantial shifts between t2 and t3. The first explanatory variable was the interaction between Republican and the amount of dollars wasted. The coefficient on this index was positive and highly significant at t2, but the coefficient at t3 was negative and insignificant. The shift in opinion between t2 and t3 yielded a p-value of 0.037. The second explanatory variable was the interaction between Democrat and the single house index. The coefficient was positive and highly significant at t2 and at t3, the coefficient became negative and insignificant. Here, the shift in opinion had an even stronger p-value of 0.018. The attitude change results showed a two-thirds support for this proposal before and after deliberations.

What's Next California Report

EMPIRICAL PREMISES (9/39)	Dependent Variable: Q2i_r; Making the vote threshold needed to pass an initiative the same as any vote threshold that the initiative itself requires of the public in the future						
	T2			T3			Difference
	B	Std. Error	Sig.	B	Std. Error	Sig.	Sig.
Single House Index	-0.026	0.048	0.595	0.076	0.054	0.159	0.140
Part-time Legislatures Index	0.041	0.064	0.524	-0.049	0.064	0.446	0.295
Increasing State Legislatures Terms Index	0.046	0.055	0.404	-0.017	0.072	0.812	0.468
Decisions made at the <u>local level</u> are dominated by powerful <u>special interests</u> .	-0.041	0.086	0.635	-0.005	0.089	0.959	0.758
California State Legislature is able to get important things done.	-0.055	0.117	0.637	0.184	0.129	0.155	0.145
State Legislature's ability to get things done is affected by tensions between the political parties.	0.059	0.072	0.418	0.010	0.087	0.912	0.653
Dollars wasted out of every \$100 that government raises in additional taxes.	0.000	0.001	0.630	0.001	0.001	0.570	0.411
Republican	-0.215	0.134	0.108	0.084	0.136	0.537	0.093
Democrat	0.084	0.122	0.489	0.153	0.124	0.218	0.670
Rep X Single House	0.013	0.067	0.845	-0.033	0.076	0.663	0.632
Rep X Part-time Legislatures	-0.154	0.082	0.059	-0.070	0.090	0.435	0.454
Rep X Increasing State Legislatures Terms	-0.131	0.073	0.071	-0.010	0.092	0.917	0.277
Rep X Local special interests	0.164	0.119	0.168	-0.061	0.137	0.657	0.189
Rep X CA legislature competent	0.128	0.153	0.403	-0.115	0.176	0.514	0.270
Rep X CA legislature affected by parties	-0.010	0.100	0.923	-0.059	0.119	0.620	0.736
Rep X Dollars wasted	0.003	0.001	0.032	-0.001	0.001	0.531	0.037
Dem X Single House	0.137	0.060	0.022	-0.066	0.068	0.331	0.018
Dem X Part-time Legislatures	-0.023	0.079	0.776	0.006	0.082	0.943	0.790
Dem X Increasing State Legislatures Terms	0.015	0.068	0.822	0.018	0.086	0.836	0.981
Dem X Local special interests	0.054	0.108	0.617	0.010	0.113	0.931	0.768
Dem X CA legislature competent	0.044	0.144	0.762	-0.198	0.157	0.209	0.225
Dem X CA legislature affected by parties	-0.033	0.096	0.730	-0.010	0.114	0.931	0.868
Dem X Dollars wasted	-0.001	0.001	0.397	-0.001	0.001	0.279	0.785
(Constant)	0.625	0.098	0.000	0.595	0.094	0.000	-
R ²	.100			.063			-
(p)	(.002)			(.212)			-

Proposal A7

Dependent Variable: Q2j_r; Publishing the top five contributors for and against each ballot measure in the ballot pamphlet

Predictions for Explanatory Variables:

- 1) Single House Index
- 2) Part-time Legislature Index
- 3) Increasing State Legislature Terms
- 4) Single Item Index: Decisions made at the local level are dominated by powerful special interests.
- 5) Single Item Index: California State Legislature is able to get important things done
- 6) Single Item Index: State Legislature's ability to get things done is affected by tensions between the political parties
- 7) Single Item Index: Out of every \$100 that government raises in additional taxes, how many dollars would you say are wasted
- 8) Republican Dummy: 1 = Republican
- 9) Democrat Dummy: 1 = Democrat
- 10) Interaction: Republican & Single House Index
- 11) Interaction: Republican & Part time Legislature Index
- 12) Interaction: Republican & Increasing State Legislature Terms
- 13) Interaction: Republican & Local special interests
- 14) Interaction: Republican & CA Legislature competent
- 15) Interaction: Republican & CA Legislature affected by political parties
- 16) Interaction: Republican & Dollars wasted
- 17) Interaction: Democrat & Single House Index
- 18) Interaction: Democrat & Part time Legislature Index
- 19) Interaction: Democrat & Increasing State Legislature Terms
- 20) Interaction: Democrat & Local special interests
- 21) Interaction: Democrat & CA Legislature competent
- 22) Interaction: Democrat & CA Legislature affected by political parties
- 23) Interaction: Democrat & Dollars wasted

Results

There were no predictions for these regressions. The regression at t3 only had one statistically significant coefficient – the interaction between Republican and competency of the State Legislature. The coefficient was positive and highly significant at t2, but, after deliberations, the coefficient became negative and significant. The coefficient on the Democrat and competency of the State Legislature interaction also had a similar pattern, positive and significant at t2, and negative at t3. There was a substantial shift in opinion before and after deliberations for this interaction. There were a few other indices and interactions that had substantial shifts in opinions in these regressions. The first was the competency of the State Legislature, on its own. The coefficient was negative and highly significant, but after deliberations the coefficient became positive, but not significant. The second variable was the amount of dollars wasted. This variable started negative and highly significant as well, but after deliberations, became positive and insignificant. The attitude change results showed this proposal had strong support before and after deliberations, 82 and 91 percent, respectively.

What's Next California Report

EMPIRICAL PREMISES (10/39)	Dependent Variable: Q2j_r; Publishing the top five contributors for and against each ballot measure in the ballot pamphlet						
	T2			T3			Difference
	B	Std. Error	Sig.	B	Std. Error	Sig.	Sig.
Single House Index	-0.057	0.046	0.218	0.016	0.039	0.680	0.194
Part-time Legislatures Index	-0.165	0.061	0.007	-0.047	0.047	0.317	0.096
Increasing State Legislatures Terms Index	-0.081	0.053	0.126	-0.050	0.052	0.343	0.657
Decisions made at the local level are dominated by powerful <u>special</u> interests.	-0.017	0.083	0.835	-0.003	0.065	0.969	0.880
California State Legislature is able to get important things done.	-0.490	0.112	0.000	0.022	0.094	0.818	0.000
State Legislature's ability to get things done is affected by tensions between the political parties.	0.149	0.069	0.031	0.113	0.064	0.077	0.684
Dollars wasted out of every \$100 that government raises in additional taxes.	-0.002	0.001	0.006	0.000	0.001	0.864	0.011
Republican	-0.348	0.129	0.007	-0.027	0.100	0.790	0.028
Democrat	-0.226	0.117	0.054	0.027	0.091	0.769	0.056
Rep X Single House	0.062	0.064	0.332	0.049	0.055	0.377	0.867
Rep X Part-time Legislatures	0.080	0.079	0.311	-0.015	0.067	0.820	0.297
Rep X Increasing State Legislatures Terms	-0.017	0.070	0.809	0.109	0.067	0.104	0.161
Rep X Local special interests	0.178	0.114	0.120	0.169	0.100	0.091	0.950
Rep X CA legislature competent	0.465	0.147	0.002	-0.262	0.129	0.042	0.000
Rep X CA legislature affected by parties	-0.076	0.095	0.428	-0.024	0.087	0.786	0.660
Rep X Dollars wasted	0.003	0.001	0.051	0.000	0.001	0.943	0.096
Dem X Single House	0.071	0.057	0.213	-0.001	0.050	0.978	0.298
Dem X Part-time Legislatures	0.147	0.076	0.053	-0.002	0.060	0.968	0.090
Dem X Increasing State Legislatures Terms	0.047	0.065	0.469	0.088	0.063	0.163	0.627
Dem X Local special interests	0.135	0.103	0.189	0.065	0.083	0.433	0.569
Dem X CA legislature competent	0.383	0.139	0.006	-0.178	0.115	0.122	0.001
Dem X CA legislature affected by parties	-0.038	0.092	0.684	-0.041	0.084	0.623	0.974
Dem X Dollars wasted	0.001	0.001	0.260	0.000	0.001	0.643	0.529
(Constant)	1.025	0.094	0.000	0.807	0.070	0.000	-
R ²	.137			.100			-
(p)	(.000)			(.006)			-

Legislative Representation: Proposal B1

Dependent Variable: Q2k_r; Increasing the number of Assembly districts from 80 to 120

Proposal B2

Dependent Variable: Q2l_r; Expanding the size of districts and electing more than one legislative representative from each district

The above two regressions were not significant at 0.05 level.

Proposal B3

Dependent Variable: Q2m_r; Replacing the current State Senate and Assembly with a single house of 120 members

Predictions for Explanatory Variables:

- 1) *Single House Index: positive coefficient*
- 2) Part-time Legislature Index
- 3) Increasing State Legislature Terms
- 4) Single Item Index: Decisions made at the local level are dominated by powerful special interests.
- 5) Single Item Index: California State Legislature is able to get important things done
- 6) Single Item Index: State Legislature's ability to get things done is affected by tensions between the political parties
- 7) Single Item Index: Out of every \$100 that government raises in additional taxes, how many dollars would you say are wasted
- 8) Republican Dummy: 1 = Republican
- 9) Democrat Dummy: 1 = Democrat
- 10) Interaction: Republican & Single House Index
- 11) Interaction: Republican & Part time Legislature Index
- 12) Interaction: Republican & Increasing State Legislature Terms
- 13) Interaction: Republican & Local special interests
- 14) Interaction: Republican & CA Legislature competent
- 15) Interaction: Republican & CA Legislature affected by political parties
- 16) Interaction: Republican & Dollars wasted
- 17) Interaction: Democrat & Single House Index
- 18) Interaction: Democrat & Part time Legislature Index
- 19) Interaction: Democrat & Increasing State Legislature Terms
- 20) Interaction: Democrat & Local special interests
- 21) Interaction: Democrat & CA Legislature competent
- 22) Interaction: Democrat & CA Legislature affected by political parties
- 23) Interaction: Democrat & Dollars wasted

Results

The single house index is highly significant before and after deliberations, as predicted. Aside from the single house index, no other explanatory variables were statistically significant at t2. However, at t3, there were a few significant variables. The part time legislature index had a negative coefficient, indicating its opposition to this proposal. While the interaction of this index with the Democrat dummy produced a positive and borderline significant coefficient. The special interests index also had a negative and significant coefficient, indicating that participants who supported this proposal felt decisions made at the local level more closely reflect the will of the local community. But, the interaction of this index with the Democrat dummy had the opposite effect, as participants who supported this proposal felt decisions at the local level have more powerful special interests. The attitude change results showed this proposal did not see much movement and did not have majority support before or after deliberations.

What's Next California Report

EMPIRICAL PREMISES (13/39)	Dependent Variable: Q2m_r; Replacing the current State Senate and Assembly with a single house of 120 members						
	T2			T3			Difference
	B	Std. Error	Sig.	B	Std. Error	Sig.	Sig.
Single House Index	0.328	0.051	0.000†	0.361	0.056	0.000†	0.658
Part-time Legislatures Index	0.031	0.068	0.648	-0.135	0.066	0.039	0.070
Increasing State Legislatures Terms Index	-0.078	0.059	0.184	-0.103	0.074	0.162	0.786
Decisions made at the <u>local level</u> are dominated by powerful <u>special interests</u> .	0.002	0.092	0.979	-0.218	0.091	0.017	0.082
California State Legislature is able to get important things done.	0.150	0.124	0.227	0.117	0.133	0.379	0.850
State Legislature's ability to get things done is affected by tensions between the political parties.	-0.003	0.077	0.966	-0.038	0.090	0.674	0.765
Dollars wasted out of every \$100 that government raises in additional taxes.	0.000	0.001	0.851	0.000	0.001	0.978	0.878
Republican	0.080	0.141	0.570	-0.100	0.140	0.476	0.348
Democrat	0.076	0.129	0.555	-0.091	0.127	0.471	0.336
Rep X Single House	-0.006	0.071	0.932	0.060	0.078	0.444	0.523
Rep X Part-time Legislatures	-0.001	0.086	0.994	0.147	0.092	0.112	0.225
Rep X Increasing State Legislatures Terms	0.105	0.078	0.175	0.105	0.095	0.267	1.000
Rep X Local special interests	-0.015	0.127	0.903	0.158	0.141	0.262	0.346
Rep X CA legislature competent	-0.143	0.163	0.380	0.244	0.182	0.180	0.103
Rep X CA legislature affected by parties	-0.079	0.106	0.454	-0.044	0.122	0.718	0.823
Rep X Dollars wasted	0.000	0.001	0.868	-0.001	0.002	0.582	0.766
Dem X Single House	0.023	0.064	0.718	0.095	0.070	0.176	0.438
Dem X Part-time Legislatures	-0.043	0.084	0.605	0.162	0.084	0.055	0.075
Dem X Increasing State Legislatures Terms	0.101	0.072	0.164	0.072	0.089	0.419	0.797
Dem X Local special interests	0.030	0.114	0.792	0.256	0.117	0.028	0.157
Dem X CA legislature competent	-0.227	0.153	0.137	-0.136	0.162	0.402	0.669
Dem X CA legislature affected by parties	-0.102	0.102	0.321	0.054	0.117	0.644	0.303
Dem X Dollars wasted	0.001	0.001	0.558	0.001	0.001	0.389	0.801
(Constant)	0.430	0.104	0.000	0.552	0.096	0.000	-
R ²	.346			.406			-
(p)	(.000)			(.000)			-

Proposal B4

Dependent Variable: Q2n_r; Making the State Legislature part-time and paying legislators part-time salaries

Predictions for Explanatory Variables:

- 1) Single House Index
- 2) *Part-time Legislature Index: positive coefficient*
- 3) Increasing State Legislature Terms
- 4) Single Item Index: Decisions made at the local level are dominated by powerful special interests.
- 5) Single Item Index: California State Legislature is able to get important things done
- 6) Single Item Index: State Legislature's ability to get things done is affected by tensions between the political parties
- 7) Single Item Index: Out of every \$100 that government raises in additional taxes, how many dollars would you say are wasted
- 8) *Republican Dummy: 1 = Republican: positive coefficient; Republicans tend to prefer smaller government*
- 9) Democrat Dummy: 1 = Democrat
- 10) Interaction: Republican & Single House Index
- 11) *Interaction: Republican & Part time Legislature Index: positive coefficient*
- 12) Interaction: Republican & Increasing State Legislature Terms
- 13) Interaction: Republican & Local special interests
- 14) Interaction: Republican & CA Legislature competent
- 15) Interaction: Republican & CA Legislature affected by political parties
- 16) Interaction: Republican & Dollars wasted
- 17) Interaction: Democrat & Single House Index
- 18) Interaction: Democrat & Part time Legislature Index
- 19) Interaction: Democrat & Increasing State Legislature Terms
- 20) Interaction: Democrat & Local special interests
- 21) Interaction: Democrat & CA Legislature competent
- 22) Interaction: Democrat & CA Legislature affected by political parties
- 23) Interaction: Democrat & Dollars wasted

Results

The part time legislature index is positive and highly significant before and after deliberations. However, the Republican dummy is not positive or significant, contrary to the prediction. And, the interaction of the Republican dummy with the part time legislature index is also not significant, although it is positive. At t3, aside from the part time legislature index, the regression yields a negative and significant coefficient for the interaction of Democrat and competency of Legislature. This interaction also experienced a substantial shift before and after deliberation, as the coefficient went from positive to negative. The attitude change results showed majority opposition to this proposal after deliberation, 64 percent.

What's Next California Report

EMPIRICAL PREMISES (14/39)	Dependent Variable: Q2n_r; Making the State Legislature part-time and paying legislators part-time salaries						
	T2			T3			Difference
	B	Std. Error	Sig.	B	Std. Error	Sig.	Sig.
Single House Index	-0.023	0.049	0.641	-0.010	0.049	0.833	0.849
Part-time Legislatures Index	0.405	0.065	0.000†	0.456	0.058	0.000†	0.525
Increasing State Legislatures Terms Index	-0.140	0.056	0.012	-0.091	0.065	0.164	0.545
Decisions made at the local level are dominated by powerful special interests.	-0.131	0.088	0.135	0.042	0.080	0.606	0.126
California State Legislature is able to get important things done.	-0.257	0.119	0.030	0.147	0.117	0.210	0.009
State Legislature's ability to get things done is affected by tensions between the political parties.	-0.041	0.073	0.577	-0.128	0.079	0.108	0.397
Dollars wasted out of every \$100 that government raises in additional taxes.	0.000	0.001	0.796	0.001	0.001	0.571	0.509
Republican	-0.057	0.135	0.338†	-0.092	0.124	0.230†	0.837
Democrat	-0.162	0.123	0.189	0.118	0.113	0.295	0.067
Rep X Single House	0.044	0.068	0.514	0.093	0.069	0.174	0.590
Rep X Part-time Legislatures	0.000	0.083	0.499†	0.098	0.082	0.115†	0.355
Rep X Increasing State Legislatures Terms	0.045	0.074	0.538	0.143	0.084	0.088	0.356
Rep X Local special interests	0.133	0.121	0.269	0.113	0.124	0.363	0.900
Rep X CA legislature competent	0.252	0.155	0.105	-0.130	0.160	0.419	0.067
Rep X CA legislature affected by parties	-0.083	0.101	0.411	0.122	0.108	0.258	0.137
Rep X Dollars wasted	0.000	0.001	0.983	0.000	0.001	0.955	0.952
Dem X Single House	0.049	0.061	0.422	0.018	0.062	0.765	0.710
Dem X Part-time Legislatures	0.040	0.080	0.617	-0.024	0.075	0.749	0.530
Dem X Increasing State Legislatures Terms	0.140	0.069	0.041	-0.019	0.078	0.803	0.106
Dem X Local special interests	0.090	0.109	0.408	0.037	0.103	0.718	0.710
Dem X CA legislature competent	0.154	0.146	0.293	-0.281	0.143	0.049	0.021
Dem X CA legislature affected by parties	-0.147	0.097	0.132	-0.034	0.104	0.743	0.397
Dem X Dollars wasted	0.003	0.001	0.029	0.000	0.001	0.721	0.156
(Constant)	0.677	0.099	0.000	0.376	0.086	0.000	-
R ²	.534			.477			-
(p)	(.000)			(.000)			-

Proposal B5

Dependent Variable: Q2o_r; Reducing the length of the state legislative session and requiring legislators to spend more time in their districts

Predictions for Explanatory Variables:

- 1) Single House Index
- 2) *Part-time Legislature Index: positive coefficient*
- 3) Increasing State Legislature Terms
- 4) Single Item Index: Decisions made at the local level are dominated by powerful special interests.
- 5) Single Item Index: California State Legislature is able to get important things done
- 6) Single Item Index: State Legislature's ability to get things done is affected by tensions between the political parties
- 7) Single Item Index: Out of every \$100 that government raises in additional taxes, how many dollars would you say are wasted
- 8) *Republican Dummy: 1 = Republican: positive coefficient; Republicans tend to prefer smaller government*
- 9) Democrat Dummy: 1 = Democrat
- 10) Interaction: Republican & Single House Index
- 11) *Interaction: Republican & Part time Legislature Index: positive coefficient*
- 12) Interaction: Republican & Increasing State Legislature Terms
- 13) Interaction: Republican & Local special interests
- 14) Interaction: Republican & CA Legislature competent
- 15) Interaction: Republican & CA Legislature affected by political parties
- 16) Interaction: Republican & Dollars wasted
- 17) Interaction: Democrat & Single House Index
- 18) Interaction: Democrat & Part time Legislature Index
- 19) Interaction: Democrat & Increasing State Legislature Terms
- 20) Interaction: Democrat & Local special interests
- 21) Interaction: Democrat & CA Legislature competent
- 22) Interaction: Democrat & CA Legislature affected by political parties
- 23) Interaction: Democrat & Dollars wasted

Results

The part time legislature index is positive and highly significant at both time points, as predicted. The Republic dummy and the interaction term with this index did not produce significant coefficients, although the coefficients were positive. The interaction with Republican and increasing State Legislature terms had a positive and significant coefficient, although Republicans want a reduce session; they would support longer terms for the Legislature. Other variables in these regressions did not yield statistically significant results. This attitude change results showed this proposal had a 11 percent decrease in support, from 57 to 46 percent.

What's Next California Report

EMPIRICAL PREMISES (15/39)	Dependent Variable: Q2o_r; Reducing the length of the state legislative session and requiring legislators to spend more time in their districts						
	T2			T3			Difference
	B	Std. Error	Sig.	B	Std. Error	Sig.	Sig.
Single House Index	0.080	0.049	0.102	0.014	0.056	0.801	0.349
Part-time Legislatures Index	0.261	0.065	0.000†	0.259	0.067	0.000†	0.983
Increasing State Legislatures Terms Index	-0.062	0.056	0.271	-0.090	0.075	0.230	0.756
Decisions made at the local level are dominated by powerful special interests.	0.010	0.088	0.907	-0.116	0.092	0.208	0.298
California State Legislature is able to get important things done.	-0.076	0.120	0.527	0.180	0.135	0.182	0.130
State Legislature's ability to get things done is affected by tensions between the political parties.	-0.049	0.074	0.509	0.037	0.091	0.685	0.444
Dollars wasted out of every \$100 that government raises in additional taxes.	0.001	0.001	0.413	0.002	0.001	0.076	0.359
Republican	-0.098	0.136	0.138†	0.119	0.142	0.202†	0.236
Democrat	0.028	0.124	0.823	0.219	0.130	0.091	0.247
Rep X Single House	-0.019	0.068	0.780	-0.123	0.079	0.119	0.292
Rep X Part-time Legislatures	0.005	0.084	0.475†	0.099	0.094	0.147†	0.417
Rep X Increasing State Legislatures Terms	0.009	0.074	0.899	0.200	0.096	0.038	0.100
Rep X Local special interests	0.123	0.122	0.311	0.158	0.143	0.269	0.845
Rep X CA legislature competent	0.114	0.156	0.465	-0.179	0.184	0.330	0.196
Rep X CA legislature affected by parties	-0.026	0.102	0.801	-0.110	0.124	0.373	0.573
Rep X Dollars wasted	0.001	0.001	0.306	-0.001	0.002	0.464	0.176
Dem X Single House	-0.011	0.061	0.851	0.018	0.071	0.802	0.741
Dem X Part-time Legislatures	-0.084	0.081	0.296	0.050	0.086	0.564	0.223
Dem X Increasing State Legislatures Terms	-0.055	0.069	0.427	-0.047	0.090	0.602	0.941
Dem X Local special interests	-0.120	0.110	0.276	0.174	0.118	0.140	0.056
Dem X CA legislature competent	0.033	0.147	0.823	-0.257	0.164	0.117	0.155
Dem X CA legislature affected by parties	-0.045	0.098	0.650	-0.175	0.119	0.143	0.370
Dem X Dollars wasted	0.002	0.001	0.154	-0.001	0.001	0.554	0.128
(Constant)	0.604	0.100	0.000	0.425	0.099	0.000	-
R ²	.336			.303			-
(p)	(.000)			(.000)			-

Proposal B6

Dependent Variable: Q2p_r; Allowing voters to rank the candidates in order of preference, so that the winner can be decided without a second election

Predictions for Explanatory Variables:

- 1) Single House Index
- 2) Part-time Legislature Index
- 3) Increasing State Legislature Terms
- 4) Single Item Index: Decisions made at the local level are dominated by powerful special interests.
- 5) Single Item Index: California State Legislature is able to get important things done
- 6) Single Item Index: State Legislature's ability to get things done is affected by tensions between the political parties
- 7) Single Item Index: Out of every \$100 that government raises in additional taxes, how many dollars would you say are wasted
- 8) Republican Dummy: 1 = Republican
- 9) Democrat Dummy: 1 = Democrat
- 10) Interaction: Republican & Single House Index
- 11) Interaction: Republican & Part time Legislature Index
- 12) Interaction: Republican & Increasing State Legislature Terms
- 13) Interaction: Republican & Local special interests
- 14) Interaction: Republican & CA Legislature competent
- 15) Interaction: Republican & CA Legislature affected by political parties
- 16) Interaction: Republican & Dollars wasted
- 17) Interaction: Democrat & Single House Index
- 18) Interaction: Democrat & Part time Legislature Index
- 19) Interaction: Democrat & Increasing State Legislature Terms
- 20) Interaction: Democrat & Local special interests
- 21) Interaction: Democrat & CA Legislature competent
- 22) Interaction: Democrat & CA Legislature affected by political parties
- 23) Interaction: Democrat & Dollars wasted

Results

There were no predictions for these regressions. At t3, participants who identified themselves as Democrats and supported the part time legislature index support instant runoff voting. Democrats who also thought the legislature were incompetent also support this proposal. The single house index was significant at t2 and after deliberations, participants no longer felt this index related to IRV. The attitude change results showed majority support for this proposal after deliberation, 58 percent.

What's Next California Report

EMPIRICAL PREMISES (16/39)	Dependent Variable: Q2p_r; Allowing voters to rank the candidates in order of preference, so that the winner can be decided without a second election						
	T2			T3			Difference
	B	Std. Error	Sig.	B	Std. Error	Sig.	Sig.
Single House Index	0.131	0.055	0.018	-0.028	0.059	0.641	0.032
Part-time Legislatures Index	-0.117	0.074	0.116	-0.113	0.071	0.111	0.968
Increasing State Legislatures Terms Index	-0.167	0.063	0.008	-0.031	0.078	0.690	0.147
Decisions made at the <u>local level</u> are dominated by powerful <u>special interests</u> .	-0.041	0.100	0.679	-0.008	0.097	0.931	0.797
California State Legislature is able to get important things done.	0.070	0.136	0.606	0.187	0.142	0.186	0.503
State Legislature's ability to get things done is affected by tensions between the political parties.	-0.113	0.083	0.173	-0.014	0.096	0.887	0.398
Dollars wasted out of every \$100 that government raises in additional taxes.	0.001	0.001	0.338	0.000	0.001	0.684	0.678
Republican	0.004	0.156	0.979	-0.028	0.151	0.852	0.865
Democrat	0.114	0.142	0.422	0.166	0.138	0.232	0.766
Rep X Single House	-0.041	0.077	0.590	0.135	0.083	0.103	0.087
Rep X Part-time Legislatures	0.069	0.096	0.472	0.032	0.101	0.754	0.756
Rep X Increasing State Legislatures Terms	0.161	0.084	0.054	0.051	0.101	0.611	0.361
Rep X Local special interests	0.064	0.138	0.644	-0.019	0.150	0.899	0.653
Rep X CA legislature competent	-0.306	0.177	0.084	-0.156	0.194	0.419	0.526
Rep X CA legislature affected by parties	0.006	0.115	0.957	-0.033	0.131	0.803	0.803
Rep X Dollars wasted	-0.001	0.002	0.741	0.001	0.002	0.529	0.421
Dem X Single House	-0.083	0.069	0.227	0.069	0.074	0.353	0.099
Dem X Part-time Legislatures	0.160	0.092	0.081	0.230	0.091	0.012	0.547
Dem X Increasing State Legislatures Terms	0.124	0.078	0.112	-0.079	0.094	0.400	0.073
Dem X Local special interests	-0.020	0.124	0.870	0.077	0.124	0.535	0.547
Dem X CA legislature competent	-0.178	0.168	0.288	-0.341	0.173	0.049	0.441
Dem X CA legislature affected by parties	0.037	0.111	0.739	0.024	0.126	0.850	0.931
Dem X Dollars wasted	-0.001	0.001	0.707	0.001	0.001	0.684	0.513
(Constant)	0.661	0.114	0.000	0.512	0.105	0.000	-
R ²	.105			.087			-
(p)	(.001)			(.017)			-

Proposal B7

Dependent Variable: Q2q_r; Lengthening Assembly terms from 2 years to 4, and Senate terms from 4 years to 6

Predictions for Explanatory Variables:

- 1) Single House Index
- 2) Part-time Legislature Index
- 3) *Increasing State Legislature Terms: positive coefficient*
- 4) Single Item Index: Decisions made at the local level are dominated by powerful special interests.
- 5) *Single Item Index: California State Legislature is able to get important things done: positive coefficient; those feeling the Legislature can get important things done are more likely to support lengthening terms*
- 6) *Single Item Index: State Legislature's ability to get things done is affected by tensions between the political parties: negative coefficient; those feeling the Legislature is in gridlock will likely not support this proposal*
- 7) Single Item Index: Out of every \$100 that government raises in additional taxes, how many dollars would you say are wasted
- 8) Republican Dummy: 1 = Republican
- 9) Democrat Dummy: 1 = Democrat
- 10) Interaction: Republican & Single House Index
- 11) Interaction: Republican & Part time Legislature Index
- 12) Interaction: Republican & Increasing State Legislature Terms
- 13) Interaction: Republican & Local special interests
- 14) Interaction: Republican & CA Legislature competent
- 15) Interaction: Republican & CA Legislature affected by political parties
- 16) Interaction: Republican & Dollars wasted
- 17) Interaction: Democrat & Single House Index
- 18) Interaction: Democrat & Part time Legislature Index
- 19) Interaction: Democrat & Increasing State Legislature Terms
- 20) Interaction: Democrat & Local special interests
- 21) Interaction: Democrat & CA Legislature competent
- 22) Interaction: Democrat & CA Legislature affected by political parties
- 23) Interaction: Democrat & Dollars wasted

Results

The increasing State Legislature terms index was positive and highly significant at both time points, as predicted. Republicans who rated this index highly also supported this proposal. If participants thought the Legislature was more competent and able to get important things done, participants were more likely to support this proposal at t3. The coefficient on the t2 explanatory was not significant at t2. The index relating to gridlock had a positive coefficient at t3, contrary to prediction. Participants who supported the single house index supported the proposal before and after deliberations, but those who supported the part time legislature index were in opposition to this proposal. Furthermore, the interaction between Democrats and competency of the Legislature also produced a negative and significant coefficient. The attitude change results showed this proposal had significant gains from 46 to 81 percent.

What's Next California Report

EMPIRICAL PREMISES (17/39)	Dependent Variable: Q2q_r; Lengthening Assembly terms from 2 years to 4, and Senate terms from 4 years to 6						
	T2			T3			Difference
	B	Std. Error	Sig.	B	Std. Error	Sig.	Sig.
Single House Index	0.093	0.052	0.070	0.088	0.043	0.041	0.930
Part-time Legislatures Index	-0.142	0.068	0.037	-0.116	0.051	0.022	0.748
Increasing State Legislatures Terms Index	0.240	0.059	0.000†	0.190	0.057	0.001†	0.531
Decisions made at the <u>local</u> <u>level</u> are dominated by powerful <u>special interests</u> .	0.084	0.092	0.364	-0.117	0.070	0.096	0.072
California State Legislature is able to get important things done.	0.115	0.125	0.119†	0.215	0.103	0.018†	0.515
State Legislature's ability to get things done is affected by tensions between the political parties.	-0.054	0.077	0.244†	0.066	0.069	0.170†	0.230
Dollars wasted out of every \$100 that government raises in additional taxes.	0.001	0.001	0.492	-0.001	0.001	0.311	0.196
Republican	0.260	0.143	0.069	-0.018	0.108	0.866	0.099
Democrat	0.199	0.130	0.125	0.110	0.098	0.262	0.560
Rep X Single House	-0.062	0.072	0.391	-0.095	0.060	0.113	0.705
Rep X Part-time Legislatures	0.082	0.087	0.350	0.122	0.071	0.088	0.701
Rep X Increasing State Legislatures Terms	0.158	0.078	0.043	0.178	0.073	0.015	0.848
Rep X Local special interests	-0.084	0.127	0.509	0.088	0.109	0.421	0.282
Rep X CA legislature competent	-0.080	0.164	0.627	-0.107	0.140	0.445	0.893
Rep X CA legislature affected by parties	0.003	0.106	0.977	0.001	0.094	0.994	0.986
Rep X Dollars wasted	-0.004	0.001	0.011	-0.001	0.001	0.607	0.075
Dem X Single House	-0.015	0.064	0.813	-0.078	0.054	0.150	0.435
Dem X Part-time Legislatures	0.078	0.085	0.356	0.052	0.065	0.428	0.795
Dem X Increasing State Legislatures Terms	0.027	0.073	0.707	0.011	0.069	0.877	0.862
Dem X Local special interests	-0.136	0.115	0.239	0.072	0.090	0.425	0.140
Dem X CA legislature competent	-0.046	0.154	0.763	-0.287	0.125	0.022	0.197
Dem X CA legislature affected by parties	0.110	0.103	0.283	-0.024	0.091	0.791	0.302
Dem X Dollars wasted	-0.002	0.001	0.210	0.001	0.001	0.340	0.089
(Constant)	0.335	0.105	0.001	0.604	0.075	0.000	-
R ²	.408			.356			-
(p)	(.000)			(.000)			-

Proposal B8

Dependent Variable: Q2r_r; requiring economic impact analyses of major legislation before passage

Regressions were not significant at 0.05 level.

Proposal B9

Dependent Variable: Q2s_r; Establishing clear goals for each government program and assessing whether progress is being made toward these goals at least once every ten years

Predictions for Explanatory Variables:

- 1) Single House Index
- 2) Part-time Legislature Index
- 3) Increasing State Legislature Terms
- 4) Single Item Index: Decisions made at the local level are dominated by powerful special interests.
- 5) Single Item Index: California State Legislature is able to get important things done
- 6) Single Item Index: State Legislature's ability to get things done is affected by tensions between the political parties
- 7) *Single Item Index: Out of every \$100 that government raises in additional taxes, how many dollars would you say are wasted: positive coefficient; those feeling many dollars are wasted would support this proposal*
- 8) Republican Dummy: 1 = Republican
- 9) Democrat Dummy: 1 = Democrat
- 10) Interaction: Republican & Single House Index
- 11) Interaction: Republican & Part time Legislature Index
- 12) Interaction: Republican & Increasing State Legislature Terms
- 13) Interaction: Republican & Local special interests
- 14) Interaction: Republican & CA Legislature competent
- 15) Interaction: Republican & CA Legislature affected by political parties
- 16) Interaction: Republican & Dollars wasted
- 17) Interaction: Democrat & Single House Index
- 18) Interaction: Democrat & Part time Legislature Index
- 19) Interaction: Democrat & Increasing State Legislature Terms
- 20) Interaction: Democrat & Local special interests
- 21) Interaction: Democrat & CA Legislature competent
- 22) Interaction: Democrat & CA Legislature affected by political parties
- 23) Interaction: Democrat & Dollars wasted

Results

The prediction that participants who think government wastes too much money would support this proposal was not proven. Instead, Democrats who feel that the Legislature is affected by political gridlock supported this proposal after deliberations. The competency of the State Legislature had a negative and significant coefficient at t2, but, after deliberations, participants who felt the Legislature was competent rated this proposal more highly. The attitude change results showed this proposal was rated highly before and after deliberations, close to 90 percent afterwards.

What's Next California Report

EMPIRICAL PREMISES (19/39)	Dependent Variable: Q2s_r; Establishing clear goals for each government program and assessing whether progress is being made toward these goals at least once every ten years						
	T2			T3			Difference
	B	Std. Error	Sig.	B	Std. Error	Sig.	Sig.
Single House Index	0.044	0.041	0.285	0.022	0.040	0.591	0.676
Part-time Legislatures Index	0.094	0.055	0.086	0.082	0.048	0.089	0.854
Increasing State Legislatures Terms Index	-0.016	0.047	0.730	0.011	0.053	0.840	0.687
Decisions made at the <u>local level</u> are dominated by powerful <u>special interests</u> .	0.152	0.074	0.039	0.022	0.066	0.741	0.159
California State Legislature is able to get important things done.	-0.244	0.100	0.014	0.114	0.096	0.237	0.005
State Legislature's ability to get things done is affected by tensions between the political parties.	-0.010	0.061	0.868	-0.099	0.065	0.130	0.291
Dollars wasted out of every \$100 that government raises in additional taxes.	0.000	0.001	0.282†	-0.001	0.001	0.100†	0.554
Republican	0.157	0.114	0.170	0.062	0.102	0.545	0.490
Democrat	0.063	0.104	0.546	-0.086	0.093	0.359	0.234
Rep X Single House	-0.099	0.057	0.080	-0.072	0.056	0.201	0.713
Rep X Part-time Legislatures	-0.134	0.070	0.056	-0.029	0.068	0.668	0.225
Rep X Increasing State Legislatures Terms	-0.094	0.062	0.130	-0.034	0.068	0.623	0.484
Rep X Local special interests	-0.235	0.102	0.021	-0.078	0.102	0.446	0.234
Rep X CA legislature competent	0.115	0.131	0.378	-0.083	0.131	0.527	0.243
Rep X CA legislature affected by parties	0.048	0.085	0.571	0.033	0.089	0.712	0.892
Rep X Dollars wasted	-0.003	0.001	0.027	0.000	0.001	0.978	0.064
Dem X Single House	-0.029	0.051	0.575	-0.050	0.050	0.325	0.750
Dem X Part-time Legislatures	-0.056	0.068	0.408	-0.084	0.062	0.170	0.732
Dem X Increasing State Legislatures Terms	-0.036	0.058	0.529	0.018	0.064	0.779	0.501
Dem X Local special interests	-0.263	0.092	0.004	-0.111	0.084	0.187	0.191
Dem X CA legislature competent	0.030	0.123	0.811	-0.157	0.117	0.182	0.224
Dem X CA legislature affected by parties	0.132	0.082	0.107	0.176	0.085	0.039	0.683
Dem X Dollars wasted	0.000	0.001	0.921	0.002	0.001	0.104	0.164
(Constant)	0.836	0.084	0.000	0.886	0.071	0.000	-
R ²	.132			.052			-
(p)	(.000)			(.419)			-

Proposal B10a

Dependent Variable: Q2t_r; Requiring the Governor and the Legislature to adopt two-year instead of one-year budgets

Regressions were not significant at 0.05 level.

Proposal B10b

Dependent Variable: Q2u_r; Requiring the Governor and the Legislature to publish three and five year budget projections prior to the budget vote each year

Regressions were not significant at 0.05 level.

State and Local Reform: Proposal C1

Dependent Variable: Q2v_r; Transferring from the state to local governments control and financing of services provided at the local level and requiring minimum standards for delivering them

Predictions for Explanatory Variables:

- 1) Single House Index
- 2) Part-time Legislature Index
- 3) Increasing State Legislature Terms
- 4) *Single Item Index: Decisions made at the local level are dominated by powerful special interests: negative coefficient; people who feel the local level reflect the will of the local community more closely would support this proposal*
- 5) Single Item Index: California State Legislature is able to get important things done:
- 6) Single Item Index: State Legislature's ability to get things done is affected by tensions between the political parties
- 7) Single Item Index: Out of every \$100 that government raises in additional taxes, how many dollars would you say are wasted
- 8) Republican Dummy: 1 = Republican
- 9) Democrat Dummy: 1 = Democrat
- 10) Interaction: Republican & Single House Index
- 11) Interaction: Republican & Part time Legislature Index
- 12) Interaction: Republican & Increasing State Legislature Terms
- 13) Interaction: Republican & Local special interests
- 14) Interaction: Republican & CA Legislature competent
- 15) Interaction: Republican & CA Legislature affected by political parties
- 16) Interaction: Republican & Dollars wasted
- 17) Interaction: Democrat & Single House Index
- 18) Interaction: Democrat & Part time Legislature Index
- 19) Interaction: Democrat & Increasing State Legislature Terms
- 20) Interaction: Democrat & Local special interests
- 21) Interaction: Democrat & CA Legislature competent
- 22) Interaction: Democrat & CA Legislature affected by political parties
- 23) Interaction: Democrat & Dollars wasted

Results

The predictions on the special interests index were accurate. The regressions showed that participants who felt that local interests reflect the will of the local community supported this proposal. Other explanatory variables at t3 did not yield statistically significant results and there were no substantial changes of coefficients between t2 and t3. The attitude change results showed this proposal had strong support after deliberations, 73 percent.

What's Next California Report

EMPIRICAL PREMISES (22/39)	Dependent Variable: Q2v_r; Transferring from the state to local governments control and financing of services provided at the local level and requiring minimum standards for delivering them						
	T2			T3			Difference
	B	Std. Error	Sig.	B	Std. Error	Sig.	Sig.
Single House Index	0.001	0.046	0.976	0.026	0.047	0.587	0.694
Part-time Legislatures Index	0.100	0.062	0.106	0.089	0.056	0.114	0.894
Increasing State Legislatures Terms Index	-0.010	0.053	0.843	-0.035	0.063	0.578	0.753
Decisions made at the <u>local</u> level are dominated by powerful <u>special interests</u> .	-0.130	0.083	0.054†	-0.162	0.078	0.019†	0.764
California State Legislature is able to get important things done.	0.079	0.113	0.485	0.112	0.113	0.323	0.820
State Legislature's ability to get things done is affected by tensions between the political parties.	0.013	0.069	0.849	-0.030	0.077	0.701	0.662
Dollars wasted out of every \$100 that government raises in additional taxes.	0.002	0.001	0.027	0.001	0.001	0.386	0.307
Republican	0.218	0.129	0.090	0.082	0.120	0.496	0.397
Democrat	0.122	0.117	0.299	-0.052	0.110	0.633	0.231
Rep X Single House	-0.021	0.064	0.746	-0.011	0.067	0.865	0.913
Rep X Part-time Legislatures	-0.015	0.079	0.852	0.003	0.080	0.972	0.862
Rep X Increasing State Legislatures Terms	-0.049	0.070	0.479	-0.071	0.081	0.378	0.828
Rep X Local special interests	0.130	0.115	0.255	0.158	0.120	0.190	0.859
Rep X CA legislature competent	-0.149	0.147	0.311	-0.061	0.155	0.692	0.658
Rep X CA legislature affected by parties	0.004	0.096	0.971	0.042	0.105	0.687	0.768
Rep X Dollars wasted	-0.005	0.001	0.000	-0.002	0.001	0.073	0.146
Dem X Single House	0.091	0.057	0.113	0.049	0.060	0.416	0.583
Dem X Part-time Legislatures	-0.100	0.076	0.187	-0.138	0.072	0.058	0.701
Dem X Increasing State Legislatures Terms	0.007	0.065	0.910	0.082	0.076	0.277	0.427
Dem X Local special interests	-0.085	0.103	0.409	-0.026	0.100	0.794	0.662
Dem X CA legislature competent	-0.046	0.139	0.738	-0.137	0.138	0.323	0.613
Dem X CA legislature affected by parties	0.071	0.092	0.439	0.130	0.101	0.196	0.642
Dem X Dollars wasted	-0.003	0.001	0.020	0.000	0.001	0.826	0.046
(Constant)	0.555	0.094	0.000	0.699	0.083	0.000	-
R ²	.125			.111			-
p	(.000)			(.002)			-

Proposal C2

Dependent Variable: Q2w_r; Allowing local governments to raise taxes for local services in exchange for increased coordination of service delivery and public reporting of performance

Predictions for Explanatory Variables:

- 1) Single House Index
- 2) Part-time Legislature Index
- 3) Increasing State Legislature Terms
- 4) *Single Item Index: Decisions made at the local level are dominated by powerful special interests: negative coefficient; people who feel the local level is more capable of reflecting the will of the community would support this proposal*
- 5) Single Item Index: California State Legislature is able to get important things done:
- 6) Single Item Index: State Legislature's ability to get things done is affected by tensions between the political parties
- 7) *Single Item Index: Out of every \$100 that government raises in additional taxes, how many dollars would you say are wasted: negative coefficient; people who feel government wastes dollars would not support raising taxes*
- 8) *Republican Dummy: 1 = Republican: negative coefficient; Republicans typically do not support raising taxes*
- 9) Democrat Dummy: 1 = Democrat
- 10) Interaction: Republican & Single House Index
- 11) Interaction: Republican & Part time Legislature Index
- 12) Interaction: Republican & Increasing State Legislature Terms
- 13) Interaction: Republican & Local special interests
- 14) Interaction: Republican & CA Legislature competent
- 15) Interaction: Republican & CA Legislature affected by political parties
- 16) Interaction: Republican & Dollars wasted
- 17) Interaction: Democrat & Single House Index
- 18) Interaction: Democrat & Part time Legislature Index
- 19) Interaction: Democrat & Increasing State Legislature Terms
- 20) Interaction: Democrat & Local special interests
- 21) Interaction: Democrat & CA Legislature competent
- 22) Interaction: Democrat & CA Legislature affected by political parties
- 23) Interaction: Democrat & Dollars wasted

Results

Participants who feel that the local level reflect the will of the community supported this proposal. The prediction on amount of dollars wasted was accurate; as participants felt the government wastes money, thus it would not support the government raising taxes. At t2, participants who were in favor of increasing the State Legislative term index supported this proposal, but after deliberations, the support diminished substantially as the difference in the t2 and t3 coefficient had a p-value of .005. Prior to deliberations, participants who supported this proposal also felt the Legislature was able to get important things done. But, democrats who felt political parties affected the Legislature also supported this proposal. Much of this support diminished at t3, as only the dollars wasted index was significant. The attitude change results showed this proposal had majority support after deliberations, 63 percent.

What's Next California Report

EMPIRICAL PREMISES (23/39)	Dependent Variable: Q2w_r; Allowing local governments to raise taxes for local services in exchange for increased coordination of service delivery and public reporting of performance						
	T2			T3			Difference
	B	Std. Error	Sig.	B	Std. Error	Sig.	Sig.
Single House Index	0.075	0.051	0.141	-0.028	0.049	0.569	0.115
Part-time Legislatures Index	0.051	0.068	0.456	-0.026	0.059	0.663	0.351
Increasing State Legislatures Terms Index	0.193	0.058	0.001	-0.035	0.065	0.590	0.005
Decisions made at the <u>local level</u> are dominated by powerful <u>special interests</u> .	0.030	0.092	0.370†	-0.170	0.081	0.018†	0.078
California State Legislature is able to get important things done.	0.261	0.124	0.036	0.068	0.118	0.565	0.213
State Legislature's ability to get things done is affected by tensions between the political parties.	-0.038	0.076	0.618	-0.026	0.080	0.749	0.904
Dollars wasted out of every \$100 that government raises in additional taxes.	-0.001	0.001	0.092†	-0.002	0.001	0.007†	0.329
Republican	-0.020	0.142	0.445†	0.058	0.126	0.322†	0.644
Democrat	0.040	0.130	0.757	-0.103	0.115	0.369	0.348
Rep X Single House	-0.140	0.071	0.048	-0.047	0.069	0.500	0.307
Rep X Part-time Legislatures	0.040	0.088	0.648	0.120	0.084	0.151	0.446
Rep X Increasing State Legislatures Terms	-0.135	0.077	0.079	0.005	0.084	0.956	0.184
Rep X Local special interests	-0.126	0.126	0.318	0.011	0.125	0.931	0.398
Rep X CA legislature competent	-0.269	0.162	0.098	-0.023	0.161	0.887	0.236
Rep X CA legislature affected by parties	0.154	0.106	0.145	-0.023	0.109	0.834	0.199
Rep X Dollars wasted	0.000	0.001	0.977	0.000	0.001	0.830	0.845
Dem X Single House	-0.073	0.063	0.251	0.043	0.062	0.491	0.156
Dem X Part-time Legislatures	0.020	0.084	0.813	0.018	0.076	0.817	0.981
Dem X Increasing State Legislatures Terms	-0.133	0.072	0.063	0.086	0.079	0.276	0.027
Dem X Local special interests	-0.149	0.114	0.191	-0.001	0.103	0.991	0.302
Dem X CA legislature competent	-0.278	0.154	0.070	-0.064	0.144	0.659	0.252
Dem X CA legislature affected by parties	0.285	0.102	0.005	0.191	0.105	0.069	0.479
Dem X Dollars wasted	0.000	0.001	0.875	0.001	0.001	0.553	0.539
(Constant)	0.490	0.105	0.000	0.740	0.087	0.000	-
R ²	.195			.115			-
(p)	(.000)			(.000)			-

Proposal C3

Dependent Variable: Q2x_r; Creating a stable source of funds for regional priorities by dedicating a portion of tax revenue from economic growth to those priorities

Predictions for Explanatory Variables:

- 1) Single House Index
- 2) Part-time Legislature Index
- 3) Increasing State Legislature Terms
- 4) Single Item Index: Decisions made at the local level are dominated by powerful special interests.
- 5) Single Item Index: California State Legislature is able to get important things done:
- 6) Single Item Index: State Legislature's ability to get things done is affected by tensions between the political parties
- 7) Single Item Index: Out of every \$100 that government raises in additional taxes, how many dollars would you say are wasted
- 8) Republican Dummy: 1 = Republican
- 9) Democrat Dummy: 1 = Democrat
- 10) Interaction: Republican & Single House Index
- 11) Interaction: Republican & Part time Legislature Index
- 12) Interaction: Republican & Increasing State Legislature Terms
- 13) Interaction: Republican & Local special interests
- 14) Interaction: Republican & CA Legislature competent
- 15) Interaction: Republican & CA Legislature affected by political parties
- 16) Interaction: Republican & Dollars wasted
- 17) Interaction: Democrat & Single House Index
- 18) Interaction: Democrat & Part time Legislature Index
- 19) Interaction: Democrat & Increasing State Legislature Terms
- 20) Interaction: Democrat & Local special interests
- 21) Interaction: Democrat & CA Legislature competent
- 22) Interaction: Democrat & CA Legislature affected by political parties
- 23) Interaction: Democrat & Dollars wasted

Results

There were no predictions for these regressions. At t3, the part time Legislature index was positive and borderline significant, indicating those who supported the part time Legislature index also support this proposal. Participants who felt the State Legislature is able to get important things done also strongly supported this proposal. In terms of opposition for this proposal, Republicans and Democrats who felt the Legislature was not competent in handling important things did not support this proposal. The attitude change results showed this proposal had two-thirds support of participants before and after deliberations.

What's Next California Report

EMPIRICAL PREMISES (24/39)	Dependent Variable: Q2x_r; Creating a stable source of funds for regional priorities by dedicating a portion of tax revenue from economic growth to those priorities						
	T2			T3			Difference
	B	Std. Error	Sig.	B	Std. Error	Sig.	Sig.
Single House Index	-0.032	0.043	0.455	-0.016	0.042	0.708	0.773
Part-time Legislatures Index	-0.031	0.058	0.588	0.096	0.050	0.055	0.078
Increasing State Legislatures Terms Index	-0.042	0.050	0.398	-0.015	0.056	0.794	0.704
Decisions made at the <u>local level</u> are dominated by powerful <u>special interests</u> .	0.046	0.078	0.551	0.009	0.070	0.901	0.705
California State Legislature is able to get important things done.	-0.086	0.106	0.413	0.282	0.101	0.005	0.007
State Legislature's ability to get things done is affected by tensions between the political parties.	-0.066	0.065	0.310	-0.051	0.069	0.461	0.862
Dollars wasted out of every \$100 that government raises in additional taxes.	-0.001	0.001	0.269	-0.001	0.001	0.151	0.795
Republican	-0.106	0.120	0.380	-0.221	0.107	0.038	0.442
Democrat	-0.002	0.110	0.988	-0.053	0.097	0.585	0.706
Rep X Single House	0.005	0.060	0.938	-0.006	0.059	0.916	0.892
Rep X Part-time Legislatures	0.023	0.074	0.756	-0.075	0.071	0.288	0.298
Rep X Increasing State Legislatures Terms	0.058	0.066	0.379	0.065	0.072	0.366	0.936
Rep X Local special interests	-0.001	0.107	0.993	0.200	0.107	0.062	0.162
Rep X CA legislature competent	0.257	0.138	0.063	-0.075	0.139	0.591	0.073
Rep X CA legislature affected by parties	-0.040	0.090	0.657	0.089	0.093	0.342	0.293
Rep X Dollars wasted	0.000	0.001	0.768	0.001	0.001	0.618	0.543
Dem X Single House	0.027	0.054	0.623	0.049	0.053	0.353	0.750
Dem X Part-time Legislatures	0.029	0.071	0.686	-0.082	0.064	0.201	0.218
Dem X Increasing State Legislatures Terms	0.028	0.061	0.652	0.018	0.068	0.786	0.916
Dem X Local special interests	-0.200	0.097	0.039	-0.021	0.089	0.815	0.155
Dem X CA legislature competent	-0.028	0.130	0.830	-0.274	0.123	0.026	0.140
Dem X CA legislature affected by parties	0.159	0.087	0.068	0.127	0.090	0.155	0.792
Dem X Dollars wasted	0.001	0.001	0.536	0.002	0.001	0.040	0.275
(Constant)	0.745	0.088	0.000	0.653	0.074	0.000	-
R ²	.091			.113			-
(p)	(.015)			(.001)			-

Proposal C4

Dependent Variable: Q2y_r; Direct any savings resulting from successful local management of state resources to those local governments, in exchange for monitoring their own performance and being accountable and innovative in their operations

Predictions for Explanatory Variables:

- 1) Single House Index
- 2) Part-time Legislature Index
- 3) Increasing State Legislature Terms
- 4) *Single Item Index: Decisions made at the local level are dominated by powerful special interests: negative coefficient; those who are at the lower end of this index would likely support this proposal*
- 5) Single Item Index: California State Legislature is able to get important things done:
- 6) Single Item Index: State Legislature's ability to get things done is affected by tensions between the political parties
- 7) Single Item Index: Out of every \$100 that government raises in additional taxes, how many dollars would you say are wasted
- 8) Republican Dummy: 1 = Republican
- 9) Democrat Dummy: 1 = Democrat
- 10) Interaction: Republican & Single House Index
- 11) Interaction: Republican & Part time Legislature Index
- 12) Interaction: Republican & Increasing State Legislature Terms
- 13) Interaction: Republican & Local special interests
- 14) Interaction: Republican & CA Legislature competent
- 15) Interaction: Republican & CA Legislature affected by political parties
- 16) Interaction: Republican & Dollars wasted
- 17) Interaction: Democrat & Single House Index
- 18) Interaction: Democrat & Part time Legislature Index
- 19) Interaction: Democrat & Increasing State Legislature Terms
- 20) Interaction: Democrat & Local special interests
- 21) Interaction: Democrat & CA Legislature competent
- 22) Interaction: Democrat & CA Legislature affected by political parties
- 23) Interaction: Democrat & Dollars wasted

Results

The regressions shows that the special interests index has a positive coefficient at t2 and a negative coefficient at t3, that is, participants who think the local level more capable of reflecting the will of the people tended to support this proposal. At t2 and t3, the part time legislature index is positive and significant; participants who support the part time legislature tend to support this proposal. In terms of the interaction variables, Democrats who felt the local level is dominated by powerful special interests tended to support this proposal after deliberations. The coefficient for this interaction is contrary to the prediction given for the special interests index without the interaction. This interaction was not significant, but the difference between the t2 and t3 coefficients was significant, as prior to deliberations this interaction felt the local community would reflect the will of the community more closely, but, after deliberations, support for this index came from the opposite view. This attitude change results showed this proposal had strong

What's Next California Report

support before and after deliberations, 74 and 77 percent, respectively.

EMPIRICAL PREMISES (25/39)	Dependent Variable: Q2y_r; Direct any savings resulting from successful local management of state resources to those local governments, in exchange for monitoring their own performance and being accountable and innovative in their operations						
	T2			T3			Difference
	B	Std. Error	Sig.	B	Std. Error	Sig.	Sig.
Single House Index	0.025	0.048	0.603	-0.010	0.047	0.825	0.579
Part-time Legislatures Index	0.209	0.064	0.001	0.150	0.056	0.007	0.457
Increasing State Legislatures Terms Index	-0.047	0.055	0.393	0.007	0.062	0.905	0.495
Decisions made at the local level are dominated by powerful <u>special</u> interests.	0.078	0.086	0.183†	-0.191	0.077	0.007†	0.015
California State Legislature is able to get important things done.	0.175	0.116	0.132	0.022	0.112	0.846	0.310
State Legislature's ability to get things done is affected by tensions between the political parties.	-0.137	0.072	0.056	-0.057	0.076	0.454	0.421
Dollars wasted out of every \$100 that government raises in additional taxes.	0.001	0.001	0.239	0.000	0.001	0.773	0.248
Republican	0.114	0.133	0.391	-0.087	0.119	0.465	0.224
Democrat	-0.031	0.121	0.798	-0.112	0.108	0.301	0.588
Rep X Single House	-0.011	0.067	0.869	0.025	0.066	0.701	0.683
Rep X Part-time Legislatures	-0.188	0.081	0.021	-0.047	0.078	0.549	0.173
Rep X Increasing State Legislatures Terms	0.043	0.072	0.550	-0.018	0.080	0.825	0.552
Rep X Local special interests	-0.195	0.118	0.100	0.155	0.119	0.194	0.027
Rep X CA legislature competent	-0.162	0.152	0.288	0.196	0.154	0.202	0.078
Rep X CA legislature affected by parties	0.140	0.099	0.156	0.048	0.103	0.639	0.493
Rep X Dollars wasted	-0.001	0.001	0.277	0.000	0.001	0.961	0.406
Dem X Single House	0.034	0.060	0.563	0.048	0.059	0.420	0.867
Dem X Part-time Legislatures	-0.152	0.079	0.053	-0.085	0.072	0.234	0.499
Dem X Increasing State Legislatures Terms	0.109	0.067	0.105	0.051	0.075	0.500	0.542
Dem X Local special interests	-0.165	0.107	0.122	0.115	0.099	0.243	0.043
Dem X CA legislature competent	-0.181	0.143	0.206	-0.056	0.137	0.684	0.494
Dem X CA legislature affected by parties	0.307	0.096	0.001	0.111	0.099	0.266	0.129
Dem X Dollars wasted	-0.001	0.001	0.597	0.000	0.001	0.759	0.514
(Constant)	0.632	0.097	0.000	0.796	0.082	0.000	-
R ²	.106			.096			-
(p)	(.001)			(.006)			-

What's Next California Report

Proposal C5

Dependent Variable: Q2z_r; Requiring state and local governments to identify policy goals and publish their progress toward meeting them and innovative in their operations

Predictions for Explanatory Variables:

- 1) Single House Index
- 2) Part-time Legislature Index
- 3) Increasing State Legislature Terms
- 4) Single Item Index: Decisions made at the local level are dominated by powerful special interests:
- 5) Single Item Index: California State Legislature is able to get important things done
- 6) Single Item Index: State Legislature's ability to get things done is affected by tensions between the political parties
- 7) Single Item Index: Out of every \$100 that government raises in additional taxes, how many dollars would you say are wasted
- 8) Republican Dummy: 1 = Republican
- 9) Democrat Dummy: 1 = Democrat
- 10) Interaction: Republican & Single House Index
- 11) Interaction: Republican & Part time Legislature Index
- 12) Interaction: Republican & Increasing State Legislature Terms
- 13) Interaction: Republican & Local special interests
- 14) Interaction: Republican & CA Legislature competent
- 15) Interaction: Republican & CA Legislature affected by political parties
- 16) Interaction: Republican & Dollars wasted
- 17) Interaction: Democrat & Single House Index
- 18) Interaction: Democrat & Part time Legislature Index
- 19) Interaction: Democrat & Increasing State Legislature Terms
- 20) Interaction: Democrat & Local special interests
- 21) Interaction: Democrat & CA Legislature competent
- 22) Interaction: Democrat & CA Legislature affected by political parties
- 23) Interaction: Democrat & Dollars wasted

Results

There were no predictions for these regressions. Overall, the regressions did not produce notable results. The only statistically significant result was at t3 where the interaction for Democrats and special interests had a negative and significant coefficient. The attitude change results showed the support for this proposal was high before and after deliberations, 89 and 92 percent, respectively.

EMPIRICAL PREMISES (26/39)	Dependent Variable: Q2z_r; Requiring state and local governments to identify policy goals and publish their progress toward meeting themable and innovative in their operations						
	T2			T3			Difference
	B	Std. Error	Sig.	B	Std. Error	Sig.	Sig.
Single House Index	-0.051	0.037	0.174	0.000	0.036	0.995	0.294
Part-time Legislatures Index	0.073	0.050	0.143	0.023	0.043	0.592	0.415
Increasing State Legislatures Terms Index	0.009	0.043	0.836	0.036	0.048	0.455	0.658
Decisions made at the <u>local level</u> are dominated by powerful <u>special interests</u> .	0.116	0.067	0.084	0.035	0.059	0.550	0.339
California State Legislature is able to get important things done.	-0.121	0.091	0.184	0.000	0.086	0.998	0.298
State Legislature's ability to get things done is affected by tensions between the political parties.	-0.125	0.056	0.026	0.000	0.059	0.995	0.104
Dollars wasted out of every \$100 that government raises in additional taxes.	-0.001	0.001	0.420	0.000	0.001	0.936	0.472
Republican	-0.072	0.104	0.486	0.069	0.091	0.452	0.263
Democrat	-0.131	0.095	0.166	0.037	0.083	0.654	0.140
Rep X Single House	-0.003	0.052	0.961	-0.044	0.051	0.389	0.545
Rep X Part-time Legislatures	0.005	0.064	0.941	-0.008	0.061	0.892	0.870
Rep X Increasing State Legislatures Terms	-0.084	0.056	0.137	-0.026	0.062	0.671	0.461
Rep X Local special interests	-0.091	0.092	0.326	-0.136	0.092	0.137	0.707
Rep X CA legislature competent	0.085	0.119	0.472	0.085	0.118	0.474	0.996
Rep X CA legislature affected by parties	0.137	0.077	0.076	-0.044	0.080	0.579	0.077
Rep X Dollars wasted	0.000	0.001	0.896	0.000	0.001	0.966	0.940
Dem X Single House	0.067	0.046	0.146	0.041	0.045	0.369	0.660
Dem X Part-time Legislatures	0.013	0.061	0.832	-0.028	0.055	0.607	0.585
Dem X Increasing State Legislatures Terms	0.018	0.053	0.739	-0.029	0.058	0.614	0.527
Dem X Local special interests	-0.091	0.083	0.275	-0.216	0.076	0.004	0.241
Dem X CA legislature competent	0.027	0.112	0.811	-0.070	0.105	0.503	0.488
Dem X CA legislature affected by parties	0.216	0.075	0.004	0.048	0.077	0.528	0.091
Dem X Dollars wasted	0.001	0.001	0.149	0.001	0.001	0.183	0.909
(Constant)	0.869	0.076	0.000	0.806	0.063	0.000	-
R ²	.115			.072			-
(p)	(.002)			(.045)			-

What's Next California Report

Taxation: Proposal D1

Dependent Variable: Q2aa_r; Requiring legislation **creating new programs** that cost \$25 million or more to indicate how they will be paid for

Regressions were not significant at 0.05 level.

Dependent Variable: Q2ab_r; Requiring legislation **creating tax cuts** that cost \$25 million or more to indicate how they will be paid for

Dependent Variable: Q2ac_r; Requiring legislation **creating new programs or tax cuts** that cost \$25 million or more to indicate how they will be paid for

Predictions for Explanatory Variables:

- 1) Single House Index
- 2) Part-time Legislature Index
- 3) Increasing State Legislature Terms
- 4) Single Item Index: Decisions made at the local level are dominated by powerful special interests:
- 5) Single Item Index: California State Legislature is able to get important things done
- 6) Single Item Index: State Legislature's ability to get things done is affected by tensions between the political parties
- 7) Single Item Index: Out of every \$100 that government raises in additional taxes, how many dollars would you say are wasted
- 8) Republican Dummy: 1 = Republican
- 9) Democrat Dummy: 1 = Democrat
- 10) Interaction: Republican & Single House Index
- 11) Interaction: Republican & Part time Legislature Index
- 12) Interaction: Republican & Increasing State Legislature Terms
- 13) Interaction: Republican & Local special interests
- 14) Interaction: Republican & CA Legislature competent
- 15) Interaction: Republican & CA Legislature affected by political parties
- 16) Interaction: Republican & Dollars wasted
- 17) Interaction: Democrat & Single House Index
- 18) Interaction: Democrat & Part time Legislature Index
- 19) Interaction: Democrat & Increasing State Legislature Terms
- 20) Interaction: Democrat & Local special interests
- 21) Interaction: Democrat & CA Legislature competent
- 22) Interaction: Democrat & CA Legislature affected by political parties
- 23) Interaction: Democrat & Dollars wasted

Results

There were no predictions for these regressions. The dependent variable on tax cuts had a few significant coefficients at t3. Participants who supported the part time legislature index opposed this proposal. Among the interactions, Republicans interacted with supporting the single house index and Democrats interacted with having a competent Legislature both had negative and significant coefficients.

For the third dependent variable, combining creation of programs and tax cuts, the regression at t3 was not significant and none of the explanatory variables had a statistically significant coefficient. In looking at the movement between t2 and t3 coefficients, a couple coefficients had significant p-values. The Republican dummy moved from a negative and significant coefficient to positive and insignificant coefficient. That is, Republicans started the discussions against this proposal, but, after deliberations, they were not as opposed to it. The second coefficient with significant movement between t2 and t3 was the interaction between Republican and political gridlock in the Legislature. The coefficient was moved from positive to negative, but the coefficients were never significant at either time points. All three of these dependent variables had strong support from participants, over 80 percent for all three dependent variables.

What's Next California Report

EMPIRICAL PREMISES (28/39)	Dependent Variable: Q2ab_r; Requiring legislation creating tax cuts that cost \$25 million or more to indicate how they will be paid for						
	T2			T3			Difference
	B	Std. Error	Sig.	B	Std. Error	Sig.	Sig.
Single House Index	-0.028	0.047	0.550	0.062	0.045	0.167	0.132
Part-time Legislatures Index	-0.093	0.064	0.145	-0.108	0.054	0.045	0.839
Increasing State Legislatures Terms Index	0.042	0.054	0.445	-0.021	0.060	0.730	0.411
Decisions made at the <u>local level</u> are dominated by powerful <u>special</u> interests.	0.135	0.086	0.115	-0.028	0.074	0.702	0.119
California State Legislature is able to get important things done.	0.183	0.116	0.115	0.203	0.108	0.060	0.893
State Legislature's ability to get things done is affected by tensions between the political parties.	-0.085	0.071	0.235	-0.074	0.073	0.314	0.908
Dollars wasted out of every \$100 that government raises in additional taxes.	-0.002	0.001	0.015	-0.001	0.001	0.154	0.374
Republican	-0.331	0.133	0.013	0.034	0.115	0.767	0.019
Democrat	0.048	0.122	0.691	-0.015	0.105	0.887	0.654
Rep X Single House	0.038	0.066	0.562	-0.144	0.063	0.023	0.030
Rep X Part-time Legislatures	-0.024	0.082	0.769	0.009	0.077	0.903	0.732
Rep X Increasing State Legislatures Terms	0.021	0.072	0.769	0.094	0.077	0.222	0.455
Rep X Local special interests	0.014	0.118	0.905	0.073	0.114	0.521	0.691
Rep X CA legislature competent	-0.049	0.152	0.745	-0.273	0.147	0.064	0.243
Rep X CA legislature affected by parties	0.141	0.099	0.153	-0.037	0.100	0.712	0.161
Rep X Dollars wasted	0.005	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.457	0.023
Dem X Single House	0.024	0.059	0.690	-0.044	0.057	0.434	0.365
Dem X Part-time Legislatures	0.144	0.079	0.067	0.042	0.069	0.545	0.277
Dem X Increasing State Legislatures Terms	0.008	0.067	0.909	0.042	0.072	0.559	0.706
Dem X Local special interests	-0.255	0.106	0.017	0.003	0.094	0.972	0.051
Dem X CA legislature competent	-0.258	0.144	0.072	-0.310	0.132	0.019	0.766
Dem X CA legislature affected by parties	0.166	0.095	0.082	0.149	0.096	0.121	0.890
Dem X Dollars wasted	0.002	0.001	0.123	0.002	0.001	0.126	0.947
(Constant)	0.827	0.098	0.000	0.810	0.080	0.000	-
R ²	.143			.100			-
(p)	(.000)			(.005)			-

EMPIRICAL PREMISES (29/39)	Dependent Variable: Q2ac_r; Requiring legislation creating new programs or tax cuts that cost \$25 million or more to indicate how they will be paid for						
	T2			T3			Difference
	B	Std. Error	Sig.	B	Std. Error	Sig.	Sig.
Single House Index	-0.012	0.048	0.809	0.076	0.044	0.083	0.150
Part-time Legislatures Index	-0.073	0.064	0.255	-0.054	0.052	0.297	0.809
Increasing State Legislatures Terms Index	0.007	0.055	0.903	-0.069	0.058	0.237	0.319
Decisions made at the local level are dominated by powerful special interests.	0.075	0.086	0.386	-0.068	0.072	0.345	0.176
California State Legislature is able to get important things done.	0.121	0.117	0.302	0.133	0.105	0.204	0.933
State Legislature's ability to get things done is affected by tensions between the political parties.	-0.038	0.072	0.601	0.015	0.071	0.835	0.581
Dollars wasted out of every \$100 that government raises in additional taxes.	-0.003	0.001	0.001	-0.001	0.001	0.226	0.075
Republican	-0.338	0.134	0.012	0.003	0.111	0.980	0.031
Democrat	-0.027	0.122	0.824	-0.038	0.101	0.706	0.938
Rep X Single House	0.000	0.067	0.995	-0.103	0.061	0.094	0.222
Rep X Part-time Legislatures	-0.034	0.082	0.682	-0.031	0.074	0.671	0.981
Rep X Increasing State Legislatures Terms	0.061	0.073	0.399	0.125	0.075	0.094	0.514
Rep X Local special interests	-0.004	0.119	0.973	0.062	0.111	0.577	0.661
Rep X CA legislature competent	-0.056	0.153	0.715	-0.144	0.143	0.314	0.647
Rep X CA legislature affected by parties	0.158	0.099	0.111	-0.110	0.097	0.256	0.035
Rep X Dollars wasted	0.005	0.001	0.001	0.002	0.001	0.150	0.074
Dem X Single House	0.058	0.060	0.333	-0.061	0.055	0.271	0.116
Dem X Part-time Legislatures	0.099	0.079	0.213	0.036	0.067	0.591	0.509
Dem X Increasing State Legislatures Terms	0.044	0.068	0.516	0.079	0.070	0.259	0.702
Dem X Local special interests	-0.208	0.107	0.053	0.043	0.092	0.639	0.059
Dem X CA legislature competent	-0.206	0.144	0.153	-0.181	0.128	0.156	0.887
Dem X CA legislature affected by parties	0.089	0.096	0.354	0.047	0.093	0.613	0.733
Dem X Dollars wasted	0.003	0.001	0.010	0.001	0.001	0.208	0.237
(Constant)	0.900	0.098	0.000	0.839	0.077	0.000	
R ²	.118			.051			-
(p)	(.000)			(.539)			

What's Next California Report

Proposal D2

Dependent Variable: Q2ad_r; Requiring that one-time revenue spikes only be spent on one-time projects, paying off debt, and filling the state rainy-day fund

Dependent Variable: Q2ae_r; Increasing the size of the State's rainy-day fund from 5% to 10% of the State budget

The two regressions above were not significant at 0.05 level.

Proposal D3

Dependent Variable: Q2af_r; Applying the sales tax to services as well as goods **while reducing the sales tax rate**

Dependent Variable: Q2ag_r; Applying the sales tax to services as well as goods **while keeping the current sales tax rate**

Predictions for Explanatory Variables:

- 1) Single House Index
- 2) Part-time Legislature Index
- 3) Increasing State Legislature Terms
- 4) Single Item Index: Decisions made at the local level are dominated by powerful special interests
- 5) Single Item Index: California State Legislature is able to get important things done
- 6) Single Item Index: State Legislature's ability to get things done is affected by tensions between the political parties
- 7) Single Item Index: Out of every \$100 that government raises in additional taxes, how many dollars would you say are wasted
- 8) Republican Dummy: 1 = Republican
- 9) Democrat Dummy: 1 = Democrat
- 10) Interaction: Republican & Single House Index
- 11) Interaction: Republican & Part time Legislature Index
- 12) Interaction: Republican & Increasing State Legislature Terms
- 13) Interaction: Republican & Local special interests
- 14) Interaction: Republican & CA Legislature competent
- 15) Interaction: Republican & CA Legislature affected by political parties
- 16) Interaction: Republican & Dollars wasted
- 17) Interaction: Democrat & Single House Index
- 18) Interaction: Democrat & Part time Legislature Index
- 19) Interaction: Democrat & Increasing State Legislature Terms
- 20) Interaction: Democrat & Local special interests
- 21) Interaction: Democrat & CA Legislature competent
- 22) Interaction: Democrat & CA Legislature affected by political parties
- 23) Interaction: Democrat & Dollars wasted

Results

There were no predictions for there regressions. When asked about applying the sales tax to services and goods while reducing the sales tax rate, the first two indices – single house index and part time legislature index were significant at both t2 and t3. The single house index was

positive and the part time legislature index was negative. Among the interactions, at t3, Democrats who supported the part time legislature index actually supported this proposal, while the index without the interaction opposed this proposal.

When asked about applying the sales tax to services and goods while keeping the current sales tax rate, the first two indices were only significant after deliberations and the direction of the coefficients were maintained from the previous dependent variable. At t2, the three single item indices were significant, but lost their significance at t3. The attitude change results showed support for these dependent variables were not strong, 45 percent for reducing the sales tax rate and 21 percent for keeping the current sales tax rate, while increasing sales tax for services and goods.

What's Next California Report

EMPIRICAL PREMISES (32/39)	Dependent Variable: Q2af_r; Applying the sales tax to services as well as goods while reducing the sales tax rate						
	T2			T3			Difference
	B	Std. Error	Sig.	B	Std. Error	Sig.	Sig.
Single House Index	0.135	0.064	0.034	0.141	0.062	0.023	0.947
Part-time Legislatures Index	-0.186	0.085	0.028	-0.210	0.074	0.004	0.822
Increasing State Legislatures Terms Index	0.059	0.073	0.421	-0.067	0.082	0.419	0.232
Decisions made at the <u>local level</u> are dominated by powerful <u>special interests</u> .	0.101	0.115	0.379	-0.084	0.102	0.410	0.203
California State Legislature is able to get important things done.	0.115	0.155	0.460	0.156	0.148	0.292	0.834
State Legislature's ability to get things done is affected by tensions between the political parties.	-0.203	0.096	0.034	-0.036	0.101	0.717	0.206
Dollars wasted out of every \$100 that government raises in additional taxes.	0.001	0.001	0.558	-0.001	0.001	0.234	0.155
Republican	-0.095	0.177	0.593	-0.164	0.157	0.298	0.751
Democrat	0.132	0.161	0.414	-0.153	0.143	0.286	0.149
Rep X Single House	-0.081	0.089	0.360	-0.157	0.087	0.072	0.517
Rep X Part-time Legislatures	0.041	0.109	0.705	0.142	0.104	0.171	0.458
Rep X Increasing State Legislatures Terms	-0.108	0.096	0.263	0.108	0.106	0.307	0.110
Rep X Local special interests	-0.006	0.158	0.972	0.272	0.157	0.084	0.182
Rep X CA legislature competent	0.005	0.203	0.979	-0.044	0.203	0.829	0.854
Rep X CA legislature affected by parties	0.164	0.132	0.214	0.122	0.137	0.372	0.813
Rep X Dollars wasted	-0.001	0.002	0.740	-0.002	0.002	0.287	0.586
Dem X Single House	-0.164	0.079	0.039	-0.066	0.078	0.399	0.348
Dem X Part-time Legislatures	0.146	0.105	0.163	0.194	0.095	0.041	0.718
Dem X Increasing State Legislatures Terms	0.051	0.090	0.572	0.054	0.099	0.587	0.980
Dem X Local special interests	-0.110	0.142	0.439	0.027	0.130	0.834	0.453
Dem X CA legislature competent	-0.123	0.191	0.521	0.002	0.181	0.991	0.606
Dem X CA legislature affected by parties	0.138	0.127	0.279	0.184	0.132	0.163	0.789
Dem X Dollars wasted	-0.003	0.002	0.047	0.001	0.002	0.506	0.036
(Constant)	0.481	0.130	0.000	0.568	0.109	0.000	-
R ²	.102			.113			-
(p)	(.001)			(.000)			-

EMPIRICAL PREMISES (33/39)	Dependent Variable: Q2ag_r; Applying the sales tax to services as well as goods while keeping the current sales tax rate						
	T2			T3			Difference
	B	Std. Error	Sig.	B	Std. Error	Sig.	Sig.
Single House Index	0.058	0.057	0.312	0.138	0.057	0.016	0.287
Part-time Legislatures Index	-0.097	0.076	0.203	-0.142	0.068	0.038	0.634
Increasing State Legislatures Terms Index	0.042	0.065	0.519	-0.112	0.076	0.140	0.104
Decisions made at the <u>local level</u> are dominated by powerful special interests.	0.201	0.103	0.050	0.018	0.094	0.852	0.160
California State Legislature is able to get important things done.	0.320	0.139	0.021	0.135	0.137	0.322	0.303
State Legislature's ability to get things done is affected by tensions between the political parties.	-0.173	0.086	0.044	-0.152	0.093	0.101	0.865
Dollars wasted out of every \$100 that government raises in additional taxes.	0.000	0.001	0.844	0.000	0.001	0.856	0.758
Republican	-0.049	0.159	0.757	-0.128	0.145	0.378	0.687
Democrat	0.206	0.145	0.155	-0.053	0.132	0.688	0.143
Rep X Single House	0.006	0.079	0.941	-0.076	0.080	0.344	0.437
Rep X Part-time Legislatures	0.047	0.097	0.629	0.047	0.096	0.623	0.998
Rep X Increasing State Legislatures Terms	-0.023	0.086	0.789	0.035	0.098	0.721	0.636
Rep X Local special interests	-0.095	0.141	0.503	0.206	0.145	0.156	0.109
Rep X CA legislature competent	-0.265	0.182	0.144	-0.129	0.187	0.490	0.572
Rep X CA legislature affected by parties	0.185	0.118	0.117	0.169	0.126	0.181	0.921
Rep X Dollars wasted	0.000	0.002	0.896	-0.002	0.002	0.306	0.362
Dem X Single House	-0.073	0.071	0.301	-0.180	0.072	0.012	0.257
Dem X Part-time Legislatures	0.162	0.094	0.085	0.095	0.088	0.277	0.572
Dem X Increasing State Legislatures Terms	-0.010	0.080	0.896	0.018	0.091	0.846	0.805
Dem X Local special interests	-0.101	0.127	0.429	0.133	0.120	0.269	0.156
Dem X CA legislature competent	-0.442	0.171	0.010	-0.187	0.167	0.262	0.241
Dem X CA legislature affected by parties	0.209	0.114	0.066	0.232	0.122	0.056	0.882
Dem X Dollars wasted	-0.002	0.001	0.259	0.000	0.001	0.830	0.470
(Constant)	0.229	0.117	0.049	0.395	0.101	0.000	-
R ²	.128			.138			-
(p)	(.000)			(.000)			-

What's Next California Report

Proposal D4

Dependent Variable: Q2ah_r; Limiting the current California state income tax deduction for home mortgage interest payments to \$25,000 per year

Predictions for Explanatory Variables:

- 1) Single House Index
- 2) Part-time Legislature Index
- 3) Increasing State Legislature Terms
- 4) Single Item Index: Decisions made at the local level are dominated by powerful special interests
- 5) Single Item Index: California State Legislature is able to get important things done
- 6) Single Item Index: State Legislature's ability to get things done is affected by tensions between the political parties
- 7) Single Item Index: Out of every \$100 that government raises in additional taxes, how many dollars would you say are wasted
- 8) *Republican Dummy: 1 = Republican: positive coefficient; Republicans are typically in favor of tax reductions*
- 9) Democrat Dummy: 1 = Democrat
- 10) Interaction: Republican & Single House Index
- 11) Interaction: Republican & Part time Legislature Index
- 12) Interaction: Republican & Increasing State Legislature Terms
- 13) Interaction: Republican & Local special interests
- 14) Interaction: Republican & CA Legislature competent
- 15) Interaction: Republican & CA Legislature affected by political parties
- 16) Interaction: Republican & Dollars wasted
- 17) Interaction: Democrat & Single House Index
- 18) Interaction: Democrat & Part time Legislature Index
- 19) Interaction: Democrat & Increasing State Legislature Terms
- 20) Interaction: Democrat & Local special interests
- 21) Interaction: Democrat & CA Legislature competent
- 22) Interaction: Democrat & CA Legislature affected by political parties
- 23) Interaction: Democrat & Dollars wasted

Results

The prediction for the directionality of Republican dummy at t3 was correct, but the coefficient was not significant. However, Republicans who were also in favor of the part time legislature index supported this proposal significantly, although with borderline significance. At t3, participants who felt the State Legislature's ability to get things done is affected by political parties were in favor of this proposal. In terms of interaction variables, Democrats who were also supportive of increasing State Legislature terms supported this proposal. The attitude change results showed this proposal was not strongly supported, with only 44 percent after deliberations.

EMPIRICAL PREMISES (34/39)	Dependent Variable: Q2ah_r; Limiting the current California state income tax deduction for home mortgage interest payments to \$25,000 per year						
	T2			T3			Difference
	B	Std. Error	Sig.	B	Std. Error	Sig.	Sig.
Single House Index	-0.078	0.059	0.190	0.086	0.062	0.162	0.041
Part-time Legislatures Index	0.096	0.079	0.224	-0.103	0.074	0.164	0.047
Increasing State Legislatures Terms Index	-0.024	0.068	0.723	-0.127	0.082	0.122	0.309
Decisions made at the local level are dominated by powerful special interests.	0.098	0.107	0.356	0.061	0.101	0.546	0.788
California State Legislature is able to get important things done.	0.248	0.144	0.086	0.209	0.148	0.157	0.838
State Legislature's ability to get things done is affected by tensions between the political parties.	-0.078	0.089	0.378	0.207	0.100	0.039	0.024
Dollars wasted out of every \$100 that government raises in additional taxes.	-0.001	0.001	0.391	-0.002	0.001	0.072	0.399
Republican	-0.042	0.165	0.400†	0.058	0.157	0.335†	0.629
Democrat	0.132	0.150	0.380	0.096	0.143	0.500	0.849
Rep X Single House	0.107	0.082	0.195	-0.099	0.087	0.251	0.065
Rep X Part-time Legislatures	-0.154	0.101	0.129	0.203	0.104	0.050	0.006
Rep X Increasing State Legislatures Terms	0.168	0.090	0.062	0.160	0.105	0.128	0.955
Rep X Local special interests	-0.103	0.147	0.485	-0.073	0.157	0.640	0.883
Rep X CA legislature competent	-0.264	0.189	0.162	-0.228	0.202	0.260	0.888
Rep X CA legislature affected by parties	0.222	0.123	0.071	-0.164	0.136	0.229	0.023
Rep X Dollars wasted	0.001	0.002	0.636	0.000	0.002	0.911	0.642
Dem X Single House	0.182	0.074	0.013	-0.072	0.078	0.353	0.011
Dem X Part-time Legislatures	-0.097	0.098	0.321	0.097	0.094	0.307	0.121
Dem X Increasing State Legislatures Terms	0.018	0.083	0.824	0.210	0.099	0.033	0.115
Dem X Local special interests	-0.110	0.132	0.407	0.009	0.130	0.947	0.498
Dem X CA legislature competent	-0.076	0.178	0.669	-0.159	0.180	0.377	0.718
Dem X CA legislature affected by parties	0.103	0.119	0.385	-0.157	0.131	0.232	0.111
Dem X Dollars wasted	-0.001	0.001	0.499	0.001	0.002	0.521	0.293
(Constant)	0.417	0.121	0.001	0.395	0.109	0.000	-
R ²	.117			.127			-
(p)	(.003)			(.000)			-

What's Next California Report

Proposal D5

Dependent Variable: Q2ai_r; Reassessing non-residential property more frequently than now
Dependent Variable: Q2aj_r; Reassessing all property values more frequently while adjusting the current property tax exemption for inflation to about \$28,000 and allowing the exemption to rise with property values going forward

Dependent Variable: Q2ak_r; Allowing local electorates to raise the property tax rate above the current 1% rate cap

Predictions for Explanatory Variables:

- 1) Single House Index
- 2) Part-time Legislature Index
- 3) Increasing State Legislature Terms
- 4) *Single Item Index: Decisions made at the local level are dominated by powerful special interests: negative coefficient; those feeling the local level is capable of representing the will of the public would support this proposal (only for q2ak_r)*
- 5) Single Item Index: California State Legislature is able to get important things done
- 6) Single Item Index: State Legislature's ability to get things done is affected by tensions between the political parties
- 7) Single Item Index: Out of every \$100 that government raises in additional taxes, how many dollars would you say are wasted
- 8) *Republican Dummy: 1 = Republican: negative coefficient; Republicans are typically in opposition of more taxation*
- 9) Democrat Dummy: 1 = Democrat
- 10) Interaction: Republican & Single House Index
- 11) Interaction: Republican & Part time Legislature Index
- 12) Interaction: Republican & Increasing State Legislature Terms
- 13) Interaction: Republican & Local special interests
- 14) Interaction: Republican & CA Legislature competent
- 15) Interaction: Republican & CA Legislature affected by political parties
- 16) Interaction: Republican & Dollars wasted
- 17) Interaction: Democrat & Single House Index
- 18) Interaction: Democrat & Part time Legislature Index
- 19) Interaction: Democrat & Increasing State Legislature Terms
- 20) Interaction: Democrat & Local special interests
- 21) Interaction: Democrat & CA Legislature competent
- 22) Interaction: Democrat & CA Legislature affected by political parties
- 23) Interaction: Democrat & Dollars wasted

Results

The predictions for the Republican dummy were accurate at t3 for all three of the regressions – the Republicans and a negative and significant coefficient, meaning they were in opposition of these proposals. At t3, for reassessing non-residential property more frequently than now, participants who favored the single house index supported this proposal, while participants who favored the part time Legislature index were in opposition to this proposal. For the interaction variables, at t3, Republicans who favored the part time Legislature index and who thought the Legislature was competent in being able to get important things done favored this proposal. And,

Democrats, at t3, favored this proposal if they also thought the Legislature's ability to get things done was affected by political parties. The attitude change results showed this proposal had strong support of 72 percent after deliberations.

When asked about reassessing all property values more frequently while adjusting the current property tax exemption for inflation to about \$28,000 and allowing the exemption to rise with property values going forward, the first two indices had the same results – the single house index had a positive and significant coefficient and the part time Legislature index had a negative and significant coefficient. Again, for the interaction at t3, Republicans who favored the part time Legislature index supported this proposal. The attitude change results showed this proposal did not have strong support after deliberations, 33 percent.

The prediction for the local special interests index was correct in directionality for the coefficient, but the coefficient was not significant. The part time Legislature index was also negative and significant for this proposal, consistent with the previous two tables. Participants who thought the Legislature is capable of doing important things favored allowing local electorates to raise the property tax rate above the current 1% rate cap. But, the interaction variable for Republicans and the single house index and competency of the Legislature had a negative and significant coefficient. Note Republicans at t2 were in opposition to this proposal, but, after deliberations, the coefficient became positive, although not significant. The attitude change results for this proposal showed majority opposition at 59 percent after deliberations.

What's Next California Report

EMPIRICAL PREMISES (35/39)	Dependent Variable: Q2ai_r; Reassessing non-residential property more frequently than now						
	T2			T3			Difference
	B	Std. Error	Sig.	B	Std. Error	Sig.	Sig.
Single House Index	-0.029	0.054	0.599	0.106	0.052	0.042	0.837
Part-time Legislatures Index	-0.081	0.072	0.261	-0.215	0.062	0.001	0.369
Increasing State Legislatures Terms Index	0.050	0.062	0.418	0.110	0.069	0.114	0.425
Decisions made at the local level are dominated by powerful special interests.	0.164	0.098	0.094	-0.014	0.086	0.875	0.036
California State Legislature is able to get important things done.	0.237	0.132	0.073	0.004	0.125	0.976	0.757
State Legislature's ability to get things done is affected by tensions between the political parties.	-0.034	0.082	0.678	-0.042	0.085	0.621	0.865
Dollars wasted out of every \$100 that government raises in additional taxes.	-0.001	0.001	0.309	0.000	0.001	0.667	0.626
Republican	-0.086	0.151	0.285†	-0.342	0.132	0.005†	0.531
Democrat	0.105	0.138	0.444	-0.133	0.120	0.270	0.135
Rep X Single House	0.088	0.076	0.244	-0.058	0.073	0.430	0.813
Rep X Part-time Legislatures	0.022	0.093	0.812	0.249	0.088	0.005	0.155
Rep X Increasing State Legislatures Terms	-0.104	0.082	0.206	-0.100	0.089	0.262	0.095
Rep X Local special interests	-0.013	0.135	0.922	0.140	0.133	0.292	0.036
Rep X CA legislature competent	-0.067	0.173	0.700	0.505	0.171	0.003	0.672
Rep X CA legislature affected by parties	0.025	0.113	0.823	0.062	0.115	0.591	0.392
Rep X Dollars wasted	0.000	0.002	0.972	0.001	0.001	0.507	0.991
Dem X Single House	0.028	0.068	0.679	-0.096	0.066	0.145	0.871
Dem X Part-time Legislatures	0.099	0.090	0.269	0.120	0.080	0.131	0.683
Dem X Increasing State Legislatures Terms	-0.057	0.077	0.456	-0.081	0.084	0.332	0.514
Dem X Local special interests	-0.135	0.122	0.266	0.027	0.110	0.803	0.076
Dem X CA legislature competent	-0.221	0.163	0.177	0.078	0.152	0.607	0.712
Dem X CA legislature affected by parties	0.208	0.109	0.057	0.308	0.111	0.005	0.651
Dem X Dollars wasted	-0.001	0.001	0.502	0.001	0.001	0.391	0.172
(Constant)	0.468	0.111	0.000	0.652	0.092	0.000	-
R ²	.188			.269			-
(p)	(.000)			(.000)			-

EMPIRICAL PREMISES (36/39)	Dependent Variable: Q2aj_r; Reassessing all property values more frequently while adjusting the current property tax exemption for inflation to about \$28,000 and allowing the exemption to rise with property values going forward						
	T2			T3			Difference
	B	Std. Error	Sig.	B	Std. Error	Sig.	Sig.
Single House Index	-0.061	0.054	0.261	0.143	0.056	0.011	0.007
Part-time Legislatures Index	0.012	0.072	0.866	-0.181	0.067	0.007	0.039
Increasing State Legislatures Terms Index	0.081	0.062	0.188	0.017	0.075	0.822	0.492
Decisions made at the <u>local</u> level are dominated by powerful <u>special</u> interests.	-0.033	0.097	0.736	-0.017	0.093	0.857	0.902
California State Legislature is able to get important things done.	0.469	0.131	0.000	0.036	0.135	0.788	0.016
State Legislature's ability to get things done is affected by tensions between the political parties.	-0.062	0.081	0.442	-0.085	0.091	0.352	0.848
Dollars wasted out of every \$100 that government raises in additional taxes.	0.000	0.001	0.818	-0.001	0.001	0.487	0.704
Republican	0.100	0.149	0.251†	-0.264	0.142	0.031†	0.062
Democrat	0.103	0.136	0.447	0.027	0.129	0.833	0.667
Rep X Single House	0.098	0.075	0.191	-0.117	0.079	0.140	0.041
Rep X Part-time Legislatures	-0.073	0.091	0.423	0.181	0.094	0.053	0.038
Rep X Increasing State Legislatures Terms	-0.023	0.082	0.774	-0.054	0.096	0.571	0.799
Rep X Local special interests	-0.036	0.133	0.786	0.148	0.143	0.300	0.325
Rep X CA legislature competent	-0.304	0.171	0.076	0.257	0.184	0.163	0.020
Rep X CA legislature affected by parties	0.021	0.111	0.849	0.164	0.124	0.184	0.368
Rep X Dollars wasted	-0.001	0.002	0.679	0.000	0.002	0.879	0.669
Dem X Single House	0.030	0.067	0.650	-0.110	0.071	0.120	0.133
Dem X Part-time Legislatures	0.040	0.088	0.652	0.072	0.086	0.403	0.786
Dem X Increasing State Legislatures Terms	-0.020	0.076	0.796	-0.088	0.090	0.329	0.549
Dem X Local special interests	0.093	0.120	0.437	0.050	0.118	0.674	0.789
Dem X CA legislature competent	-0.349	0.161	0.030	0.101	0.164	0.538	0.039
Dem X CA legislature affected by parties	0.121	0.108	0.260	0.090	0.119	0.452	0.837
Dem X Dollars wasted	-0.001	0.001	0.407	0.001	0.001	0.708	0.368
(Constant)	0.326	0.109	0.003	0.447	0.098	0.000	-
R ²	.139			.161			-
(p)	(.000)			(.000)			-

What's Next California Report

EMPIRICAL PREMISES (37/39)	Dependent Variable: Q2ak_r; Allowing local electorates to raise the property tax rate above the current 1% rate cap						
	T2			T3			Difference
	B	Std. Error	Sig.	B	Std. Error	Sig.	Sig.
Single House Index	0.047	0.055	0.393	0.100	0.055	0.069	0.460
Part-time Legislatures Index	-0.110	0.073	0.131	-0.158	0.065	0.015	0.592
Increasing State Legislatures Terms Index	0.037	0.063	0.559	-0.008	0.073	0.917	0.625
Decisions made at the local level are dominated by powerful special interests.	0.030	0.098	0.379†	-0.120	0.090	0.091†	0.227
California State Legislature is able to get important things done.	0.046	0.133	0.731	0.289	0.131	0.028	0.155
State Legislature's ability to get things done is affected by tensions between the political parties.	-0.165	0.082	0.044	0.015	0.089	0.869	0.113
Dollars wasted out of every \$100 that government raises in additional taxes.	-0.003	0.001	0.014	-0.001	0.001	0.312	0.250
Republican	-0.303	0.153	0.024†	0.170	0.139	0.111†	0.011
Democrat	-0.148	0.139	0.289	0.146	0.127	0.252	0.081
Rep X Single House	-0.005	0.076	0.948	-0.151	0.077	0.049	0.144
Rep X Part-time Legislatures	0.048	0.094	0.608	0.079	0.093	0.396	0.793
Rep X Increasing State Legislatures Terms	0.008	0.083	0.919	-0.030	0.093	0.747	0.740
Rep X Local special interests	0.067	0.136	0.622	0.093	0.139	0.506	0.885
Rep X CA legislature competent	0.134	0.174	0.443	-0.348	0.179	0.052	0.035
Rep X CA legislature affected by parties	0.182	0.113	0.109	-0.061	0.121	0.614	0.109
Rep X Dollars wasted	0.001	0.002	0.433	-0.002	0.002	0.233	0.110
Dem X Single House	-0.014	0.068	0.833	-0.092	0.069	0.180	0.382
Dem X Part-time Legislatures	0.120	0.090	0.184	0.103	0.084	0.222	0.877
Dem X Increasing State Legislatures Terms	0.063	0.077	0.413	0.015	0.088	0.865	0.659
Dem X Local special interests	-0.085	0.122	0.484	0.112	0.115	0.330	0.208
Dem X CA legislature competent	0.153	0.165	0.353	-0.179	0.160	0.264	0.108
Dem X CA legislature affected by parties	0.317	0.109	0.004	0.127	0.117	0.277	0.194
Dem X Dollars wasted	0.001	0.001	0.370	-0.001	0.001	0.390	0.154
(Constant)	0.505	0.112	0.000	0.276	0.097	0.004	-
R ²	.255			.245			-
(p)	(.000)			(.000)			-

Proposal D6

Dependent Variable: Q2al_r; Lowering local vote requirement to adopt taxes dedicated to specific purposes, to a simple majority so that it is the same as the vote requirement to adopt taxes for general purposes

Predictions for Explanatory Variables:

- 1) Single House Index
- 2) Part-time Legislature Index
- 3) Increasing State Legislature Terms
- 4) *Single Item Index: Decisions made at the local level are dominated by powerful special interests: negative coefficient; those feeling the local level is capable of representing the will of the public would support this proposal*
- 5) Single Item Index: California State Legislature is able to get important things done
- 6) Single Item Index: State Legislature's ability to get things done is affected by tensions between the political parties
- 7) Single Item Index: Out of every \$100 that government raises in additional taxes, how many dollars would you say are wasted
- 8) *Republican Dummy: 1 = Republican: negative coefficient; Republicans are typically in opposition of more taxation*
- 9) Democrat Dummy: 1 = Democrat
- 10) Interaction: Republican & Single House Index
- 11) Interaction: Republican & Part time Legislature Index
- 12) Interaction: Republican & Increasing State Legislature Terms
- 13) Interaction: Republican & Local special interests
- 14) Interaction: Republican & CA Legislature competent
- 15) Interaction: Republican & CA Legislature affected by political parties
- 16) Interaction: Republican & Dollars wasted
- 17) Interaction: Democrat & Single House Index
- 18) Interaction: Democrat & Part time Legislature Index
- 19) Interaction: Democrat & Increasing State Legislature Terms
- 20) Interaction: Democrat & Local special interests
- 21) Interaction: Democrat & CA Legislature competent
- 22) Interaction: Democrat & CA Legislature affected by political parties
- 23) Interaction: Democrat & Dollars wasted

Results

The predictions made were not statistically significant. The first two indices – single house index and part time Legislature index – were significant at t3 with the same signs as previous tables within taxation proposals, participants who favored the single house index supported the proposal, while participants in favor of the part time Legislature index opposed this proposal. Participants who felt the Legislature is capable of getting important things done strongly supported this proposal, before and after deliberations. Participants who felt the government wastes a lot of money tended to be in opposition to this proposal. In terms of interactions, the coefficient on the Democrat dummy interaction with *CA Legislature affected by political parties* was negative and with *dollars wasted* the coefficient was positive and significant at t3, but not at t2. The attitude change results showed this proposal did not have strong support before or after

What's Next California Report

deliberations, 46 percent before and 43 percent after deliberations.

EMPIRICAL PREMISES (38/39)	Dependent Variable: Q2a1_r; Lowering local vote requirement to adopt taxes dedicated to specific purposes, to a simple majority so that it is the same as the vote requirement to adopt taxes for general purposes						
	T2			T3			Difference
	B	Std. Error	Sig.	B	Std. Error	Sig.	Sig.
Single House Index	0.110	0.058	0.058	0.126	0.055	0.023	0.837
Part-time Legislatures Index	-0.070	0.077	0.369	-0.156	0.066	0.018	0.369
Increasing State Legislatures Terms Index	0.045	0.067	0.499	-0.031	0.074	0.674	0.425
Decisions made at the <u>local level</u> are dominated by powerful <u>special interests</u> .	0.151	0.104	0.075†	-0.126	0.091	0.088†	0.036
California State Legislature is able to get important things done.	0.428	0.141	0.002	0.484	0.132	0.000	0.757
State Legislature's ability to get things done is affected by tensions between the political parties.	-0.091	0.087	0.296	-0.112	0.090	0.213	0.865
Dollars wasted out of every \$100 that government raises in additional taxes.	-0.002	0.001	0.078	-0.003	0.001	0.015	0.626
Republican	-0.024	0.161	0.442†	-0.148	0.140	0.144†	0.531
Democrat	0.182	0.147	0.216	-0.088	0.127	0.492	0.135
Rep X Single House	-0.087	0.081	0.282	-0.112	0.078	0.149	0.813
Rep X Part-time Legislatures	-0.025	0.099	0.804	0.153	0.092	0.099	0.155
Rep X Increasing State Legislatures Terms	-0.057	0.088	0.514	0.148	0.094	0.118	0.095
Rep X Local special interests	-0.144	0.144	0.318	0.255	0.140	0.069	0.036
Rep X CA legislature competent	-0.156	0.185	0.398	-0.260	0.181	0.152	0.672
Rep X CA legislature affected by parties	0.157	0.120	0.193	0.019	0.122	0.878	0.392
Rep X Dollars wasted	0.000	0.002	0.938	0.000	0.002	0.921	0.991
Dem X Single House	-0.085	0.072	0.242	-0.069	0.070	0.320	0.871
Dem X Part-time Legislatures	0.062	0.096	0.517	0.013	0.084	0.876	0.683
Dem X Increasing State Legislatures Terms	0.040	0.082	0.629	0.115	0.088	0.195	0.514
Dem X Local special interests	-0.141	0.130	0.276	0.154	0.116	0.186	0.076
Dem X CA legislature competent	-0.463	0.174	0.008	-0.544	0.161	0.001	0.712
Dem X CA legislature affected by parties	0.227	0.116	0.050	0.298	0.117	0.011	0.651
Dem X Dollars wasted	0.000	0.001	0.981	0.002	0.001	0.069	0.172
(Constant)	0.386	0.118	0.001	0.507	0.097	0.000	-
R ²	.234			.281			-
(p)	(.000)			(.000)			-

What's Next California Report

Proposal D7

Dependent Variable: Q2am_r; Decreasing the super-majority vote required in the Legislature to raise taxes (about 67%) to 55%

Predictions for Explanatory Variables:

- 1) Single House Index
- 2) Part-time Legislature Index
- 3) Increasing State Legislature Terms
- 4) Single Item Index: Decisions made at the local level are dominated by powerful special interests
- 5) Single Item Index: California State Legislature is able to get important things done
- 6) Single Item Index: State Legislature's ability to get things done is affected by tensions between the political parties
- 7) Single Item Index: Out of every \$100 that government raises in additional taxes, how many dollars would you say are wasted
- 8) *Republican Dummy: 1 = Republican: negative coefficient; Republicans are typically in opposition of more taxation*
- 9) Democrat Dummy: 1 = Democrat
- 10) Interaction: Republican & Single House Index
- 11) Interaction: Republican & Part time Legislature Index
- 12) Interaction: Republican & Increasing State Legislature Terms
- 13) Interaction: Republican & Local special interests
- 14) Interaction: Republican & CA Legislature competent
- 15) Interaction: Republican & CA Legislature affected by political parties
- 16) Interaction: Republican & Dollars wasted
- 17) Interaction: Democrat & Single House Index
- 18) Interaction: Democrat & Part time Legislature Index
- 19) Interaction: Democrat & Increasing State Legislature Terms
- 20) Interaction: Democrat & Local special interests
- 21) Interaction: Democrat & CA Legislature competent
- 22) Interaction: Democrat & CA Legislature affected by political parties
- 23) Interaction: Democrat & Dollars wasted

Results

The directionality of the coefficient for the Republican dummy was correct, but the coefficient was not significant. After deliberations, participants in favor of the part time Legislature index was in opposition to this proposal, but Republicans who were in favor of this index were in favor of this proposal to decrease the super-majority vote required in the Legislature to raise taxes to 55%. After deliberations, participants who felt the government wasted a lot of money were in opposition to this proposal, but Democrats who felt the governments wasted a lot of money were in support of this proposal, although with borderline significance. In addition, Republicans who also felt that the local level is dominated by special interests also supported this proposal. The coefficient without the interaction for this index also went from positive at t2 to negative at t3, although the coefficient was not significant at t3. Lastly, Democrats who felt the Legislature has a difficult time getting things done because of political gridlock were in support of this proposal. The attitude change for this proposal did not show strong support, as after deliberations just

about 50 percent supported this proposal.

What's Next California Report

EMPIRICAL PREMISES (39/39)	Dependent Variable: Q2am_r; Decreasing the super-majority vote required in the Legislature to raise taxes (about 67%) to 55%						
	T2			T3			Difference
	B	Std. Error	Sig.	B	Std. Error	Sig.	Sig.
Single House Index	0.083	0.058	0.152	-0.010	0.060	0.863	0.229
Part-time Legislatures Index	-0.120	0.077	0.121	-0.294	0.072	0.000	0.072
Increasing State Legislatures Terms Index	-0.006	0.066	0.928	0.069	0.080	0.389	0.446
Decisions made at the local level are dominated by powerful <u>special</u> interests.	0.262	0.104	0.012	-0.111	0.098	0.260	0.005
California State Legislature is able to get important things done.	0.049	0.141	0.730	0.175	0.144	0.223	0.493
State Legislature's ability to get things done is affected by tensions between the political parties.	-0.061	0.087	0.486	-0.002	0.097	0.983	0.633
Dollars wasted out of every \$100 that government raises in additional taxes.	-0.003	0.001	0.004	-0.004	0.001	0.000	0.471
Republican	-0.174	0.161	0.142†	-0.160	0.152	0.147†	0.943
Democrat	0.113	0.147	0.441	-0.104	0.139	0.454	0.230
Rep X Single House	-0.064	0.080	0.423	0.100	0.084	0.235	0.129
Rep X Part-time Legislatures	0.013	0.099	0.899	0.274	0.101	0.007	0.038
Rep X Increasing State Legislatures Terms	-0.015	0.088	0.865	0.055	0.102	0.588	0.577
Rep X Local special interests	-0.131	0.144	0.362	0.327	0.152	0.032	0.018
Rep X CA legislature competent	0.237	0.184	0.198	-0.225	0.196	0.252	0.062
Rep X CA legislature affected by parties	0.024	0.120	0.840	-0.161	0.133	0.224	0.258
Rep X Dollars wasted	0.001	0.002	0.579	0.000	0.002	0.968	0.633
Dem X Single House	-0.032	0.072	0.655	0.074	0.075	0.325	0.271
Dem X Part-time Legislatures	0.045	0.096	0.638	0.160	0.092	0.081	0.340
Dem X Increasing State Legislatures Terms	0.112	0.081	0.168	-0.066	0.096	0.491	0.131
Dem X Local special interests	-0.300	0.129	0.020	0.110	0.126	0.384	0.015
Dem X CA legislature competent	0.027	0.174	0.876	-0.153	0.175	0.383	0.420
Dem X CA legislature affected by parties	0.232	0.116	0.046	0.207	0.128	0.105	0.876
Dem X Dollars wasted	0.000	0.001	0.776	0.003	0.001	0.053	0.069
(Constant)	0.413	0.119	0.000	0.612	0.106	0.000	-
R ²	.323			.342			-
(p)	(.000)			(.000)			-

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. A BRIEF QUALITATIVE REPORT OF THE DELIBERATIVE POLLING EVENT: FROM THE PERSPECTIVE OF TWO PARTICIPANTS	2
2. INITIATIVE PROCESS	13
3. LEGISLATIVE REPRESENTATION	54
4. STATE AND LOCAL REFORM	91
5. TAXATION	126

1. A BRIEF QUALITATIVE REPORT OF THE DELIBERATIVE POLLING EVENT: FROM THE PERSPECTIVE OF TWO PARTICIPANTS

What's Next California Supplementary Report: Transcripts

A Brief Qualitative Report of the Deliberative Polling Event: From the Perspective of Two Participants*

Jim was suspicious of a phone call he received in early May asking him to participate in a political discussion on the future of California. He ironically admitted that *somebody calls up on the phone and offers you a free trip, offers you money and transportation, how many timeshares do I have to buy?* Probably he was used to people calling him every other evening looking to sell products or even consult his political opinions. But he accepted the offer; in the end he discovered that *it was all real and legitimate*. He could hardly believe it.

Jim was interested in political issues, especially those that have to do with *Prop. 13, turbulence, pension reform, two thirds vote in the legislature and the initiative process*. In the three days of the What's Next California Deliberative Poll, Jim would meet face to face with other fellow Californians. Many of them would have opposing views while others would have opinions similar to his. The issues would evolve around (a) the initiative process, (b) legislative representation, (c) government restructuring (state and local) and (d) state tax and fiscal policy. Amongst others, he would discuss with Elaine, a participant from San Jose California, who was also interested in politics, and especially in taxation and educational issues.

Both Jim's and Elaine's opinions did not always converge. But through the deliberative process they would be required to thoughtfully consider how each other's views might collectively affect the policies in their home state. After all, the goal was not to come to a consensus, but simply to share their knowledge as participants of the deliberative democratic discourse that would unfold in front of them. They would openly discuss ideas, and near the end of the event, would be asked to cast a secret vote concerning the issues at hand.

Part I

Jim started presenting his opinions on the initiative process by saying up front: *[T]he initiative process is just subject to corruption and special interests*. He seemed wary of any initiatives that could involve funding from large corporations. He feared that the public would not have the time to think through each proposal while it was bombarded with information, and that's why he would prefer voting *no on everything* just to be sure that he is not making the wrong decision. Elaine agreed with Jim, that one of the most crucial things was to ensure that the initiatives' language was as lucid as possible. She proposed that a *judicial review* be put in place, checking the contents of each proposition before it is put to the vote. Still, she was unsure on how to go about this. Full of questions, she directed them to her fellow discussants on the table: *Can they expect to specify limitations to how an initiative can be used to change legislation [...]?* *[I]s there the capability to make that?*

While the conversation moved on, both Jim and Elaine informed the others and become informed through them. As Elaine delved into the issues, she started thinking out loud about the process of gathering signatures: *If they're not paid to collect signatures, they're going to be a lot more honest about what it is they're spending their time collecting their signatures on*. The more time she spent discussing, the more she was able to pierce the crust of uncertainty concerning the

possible manipulations of the initiative process by large funds. She began putting down ideas on how the people could change that.

She continued voicing her thoughts: *if a very specialized [...] interest gets something on the ballot, and the legislature reacts to it and thinks its not common good, they can put a countermeasure on it.* Then she followed up on an argument posed by a fellow discussant: *I think the second point is worth considering because you're getting a quid pro quo situation if somebody puts something on the initiative.* As time went by and the discussion deepened, she became immersed on the details of each proposal and attempted to figure out what can be done to better the process in her home state.

Jim posed questions as well: *I had a question about A4, page 21. Why would bonds be exempt?* The group followed up on the question and another participant, Caroline said: *I like these questions about why bonds are exempt. Ask the experts and make that question.* Her plan was to propose this as a question for the plenary. Then Jim turned to ask: *[i]f it were put to a vote and most people were opposed to the initiative, but the legislature voted it in, then that would be totally against the vote of the people.* His opinions on the initiative process stood in stark disagreement with Elaine's. Despite this, he gained new information, but even more importantly, he managed to reflect on his own attitudes on the subject, and as such, to stand on clearer grounds about what he believes is important.

At some point in the discussion, the thoughts and voices of Jim and Elaine and two other participants named Geoffrey and Rebecca, converged, but they didn't necessarily agree. In the following instance they were discussing the topic of A2d, which states: *Once a statutory initiative passes, give the Legislature the chance to amend the initiative by a 2/3rds vote, even if the initiative's proponents do not agree with the amendments:*

Jim: Then the solution is to get rid of the two-thirds majority, which would go along with this.

Geoffrey: That's exactly my point.

Elaine: Yeah, but I think this is just suggesting that if something is going to require, it has to be the same expectation [...]. I mean, the two-thirds is a just an example, but if the proposition specifies a certain requirement, isn't that more [...]?

Geoffrey: No, you're reading it correctly, it's just that I don't like it. I don't like that two-thirds. I mean, we've kinda got that going on right now. The governor wants to put something to the vote of the people and there's certain factions trying to keep that from happening.

Rebecca: They don't do it.

Geoffrey: They can't do it, so here we are, we're gridlocked because of this two-thirds super majority. To me, it's just, that's ridiculous. You could go and have people vote do they want the sun to come up tomorrow, and you're

What's Next California

Supplementary Report: Transcripts

going to have a hard time getting a two-thirds majority. It's a tough standard to get no matter what you do.

Elaine: But this is saying that if I'm going to require a certain degree of change, if I need two-thirds to make a change, it's also saying that in order for it to pass, it needs the two-thirds, too. It's just saying, isn't it?

On proposal A7, which suggested publishing *the top five contributors for and against each ballot measure in the ballot pamphlet*, Jim had a lot to say and seemed very adamant about it: *the only way around that is to publish the campaign contribution for it online in addition to the five or six hotlines, so everybody has access to it*. Then he continued: *[w]ell, this is something that's actually left off of the entire discussion of the initiative process is financing. There's no mention of it, which is one of the major problems with it*. Elaine answered with a question to Jim's straightforwardness: *can the citizens of California revise the initiative process to require financing disclosures, eliminate for-profit signature gathering and restrict out-of-state funding sources?* Not all of the participants were as fervent as Jim was on the issue, but they could still see that this was a *good, solid question* as Caroline stated. They would pose it to the expert panel for sure.

Part II

The group moved on to the next issue, which was legislative representation. Contrary to most of the participants Elaine was favorably inclined in her views towards the legislature. She thought that a major problem in the legislative procedure was the limited length of the legislative terms, which obfuscated the assembly's ability to seriously think through the state's problems and provide meaningful solutions: *a four-year term doesn't really give them a long enough time to kinda provide the tempered response that the senators would normally have, say, a six-year term*. She respected the congressmen who *will hold to a single response concerning an issue* as opposed to some congressmen who say yes to *the yes person* and no to the *no person*.

Jim on the other hand was more careful on his assessments of the same body mainly because of his fears of public opinion manipulation. He was *all for diluting the power of special interests*. But he had a solution for this that might be feasible after all: *If there were more assemblymen representing fewer people the influence of the lobbyists theoretically would be reduced. They'd have as twice as many people to try to influence, plus the people would have more direct access. The senators and the assemblymen would have more direct access to their constituents, which they should, which would result in more accountability*. In fact, he was alluding to the proposition B1, that proposes to *Revise the Legislature's Structure: Create smaller Assembly districts by increasing the size of that house to 120 seats*.

After a long discussion, Jim and Elaine agreed on the issue of longer assembly terms. Jim stated that *the longer the term, [...] the less influence special interests have. If you're in the state assembly for two years, all you're doing is raising money. You're very, very subject to the special interest lobbyists and outside influences. Plus, with a term limit, there's no institutional memory. People aren't able to form coalitions to counteract the effect of the special interests*

and the lobbyists, so I think combining the idea of longer terms with more term limits. For example, if you have four-year terms in the legislature with a four-year term limit, that would be sixteen years, which is more than enough. This was a point that many other participants made in the discussion. The same effect was shown in the after-deliberation poll measurements, which resulted in a significant increase in the approval rates of the Legislature.

The Legislature approval rates rose not through a sudden magical procedure of consensus but through deliberation, where different opinions clashed with each other, and where hard questions were posed in the process. Elaine for example had many questions regarding the Legislature's inefficiency to manage a balanced budget and particularly noted that *it seems like every year they're not doing – this whole budget thing has gotten ridiculous, not passing a budget on time. So the multi-year budget seems interesting to me, but I had a question about why couldn't we have a default that, if they haven't achieved a new budget, then they have to stick with the status quo, whatever the budget was the prior year? I mean, and we just have to take that and live with that until they – if they haven't come to agreement, there's a cutoff date, and then the budget that they have is the budget that stands for that next year.* Then Jim stepped in the conversation as well:

Elaine: Yeah, but I'm not saying not pass a budget, but if you hit July 1st and you haven't passed a budget, then you have to live with what you have. So the incentive to actually make changes for the next year, you actually have to hit it or you have to live with what you already spent.

Jim: There should also be a way of people – if they never pass another budget, basically as expenses went up, it would result in cutting programs.

Elaine: I guess it would, yeah, definitely.

At this point, the group had to figure out a question to ask in the plenary session. The discussion moderator, after having heard all the arguments summarized the discussion down to the specifics: *So it sounds like we have two different questions that are up for debate. Are there any other suggestions for what we want to ask the experts? Okay, so we can either ask about a tax on political contributions or conflict of interest provisions after office. Do you want to do a vote?* She would not interfere with the decisions made by the group. All she was responsible for was to ensure the good flow of the discussion, without interjecting her own judgments. And that's what she did.

Part III

Moving into the third issue of the weekend's event, the participants started to feel comfortable with their fellow group members and as a result they increasingly offered their personal experiences in the service of further discussion.

Elaine inevitably turned to her own personal interests, education, this time not just asking questions, but informing the others about her experiences on that particular issue: *One of the things that school districts that I've seen – again, just looking at Milpitas, versus San Jose, [...]*

What's Next California

Supplementary Report: Transcripts

[t]he amount that those school districts are able to spend per student is significantly different. They might get the same per state – per person from the state, but the parents are then – obviously, have greater means to supplement all of the things that the kids would not otherwise get. She then went on to explain in further detail what the relationships are between budget cuts and the educational system, which seemed to interest most of the participants. She talked about the specifics such as the fact that *85 percent of the kids qualified for free lunch* in school, but also brought up international paradigms of successful education, such as Finland. The group had now started to ease itself into the discussion concerning the restructuring of the government and the relationship between state and local jurisdictions.

Jim then moved on to bring the conversation a little closer to the issues at hand. He posed a question to help the others in the group focus on the specifics: *The question was, in each one of these instances, whether there's education or gay marriage, or healthcare, how do you evaluate and determine at what level of government – national, state, county, local – a particular service should be provided?* As the conversation went on, participants elaborated on their understandings of the divisions between the local authorities and the state. Geoffrey, another participant, picked up a prompt from the moderator on proposal C4 (*Direct any savings resulting from the successful local management of state resources to those local governments, in exchange for monitoring their own performance and being accountable, transparent, and innovative*) and the discussion erupted:

Moderator: Okay. Well, let's move on to Proposal C4 then.

Geoffrey: I think this is a good idea because I don't know what it's like at some of the places you work at, but I know my father used to work in the state transportation sector. At the end of the fiscal year, they used to tell him – they used to have him work overtime every day because they needed to use up their budget. They were afraid that if they did not use up their budget –

Jim: They wouldn't get it next year.

Geoffrey: They wouldn't get it next year. This is a big issue. This is really something that for the average person to look at it's unacceptable. It would be nice if instead of just maxing out your budget every fiscal year if you were rewarded somehow for being responsible with your budget.

Jim: That wouldn't solve that problem. Why would they want to give up money to a local government for not using up their budget?

Geoffrey: Well, I was just using it as an example.

Jim: It's a good example.

Geoffrey: Yeah, but I'm just saying that if somebody's – for instance, we were talking about state funding. Let's talk about your Oakland health. That's funded through the state and if instead of them maxing out that money that's given to them by the state because they're afraid they're going to get

cut the next fiscal year. If they were able to be rewarded for saving that money or being fiscally responsible, it might save some real money in this state.

Jim: That's kinda circular because it says direct any savings resulting from successful local management. So the health department saves \$1 million; does that mean that the health department gets \$1 million because they saved it, or does the \$1 million go to some other entity?

Geoffrey: Well, we were talking about not every year is the same, so –

Al.: It could go to a general fund.

Geoffrey: Yeah, they could use it –

Jim: So they're not going to give up. A regional agency or a local government isn't going to give up money to back into the state general fund.

Rebecca: They're going to go we can't keep that.

Jim: Yeah, they're going to keep that.

Elaine: How do they measure the effectiveness? That's my biggest question about it is successful local management means that you're measuring something. How do they measure? How do they effectively, to kinda say, yes, you've done the job that is expected of you with what budget you had and you have some left over. I mean, it's hard enough – clearly, just measuring school performance has been a big boondoggle of [...], so how do we do that with all these other agencies?

After a while, Elaine considered merging proposal C4 with C5 (*Require the state and local governments to identify explicitly the results they seek to produce through their policy decisions and service delivery and publish annual reports about progress towards these goals*). As she said: *They seem very – the two kinda go together. I was just curious. In order to establish a measure to be able to justify returning the savings, it seems like C5 is the way that they would actually measure the effectiveness, so that I was just curious if that's how everybody else was [...]. It's kinda results-based management and if you're getting the result, it seems like you should be able to keep the money. Zero-based budgeting has a history and I'm sure there's a reason why zero-based budgeting came into play.*

In line but not necessarily agreeing with Elaine, Jim poses another question: *I have another question on C4. Say the state gives \$1 million to the health department at Oakland. Oakland does a really bang-up job and they only spend \$800,000. This says that \$200,000 goes to Oakland. Does it go to the Oakland Health Department or does it go to the Oakland general fund? In essence, is the health department giving up \$200,000 because they were so efficient?*

What's Next California

Supplementary Report: Transcripts

It seemed as if the topic of government restructuring was the hardest of them all. Coming in to the discussion, most of the participants had opinions on this issue, but through the deliberative process they managed to refine their thoughts. The group relied on the briefing materials to get a good grasp of the questions posed to them. Jim specifically directed the group to a chart on page 49 and Elaine concurred: *That's the layers that Jim was just – on Page 49 – was talking about, and who's responsible, and who delivers the service. That's what they were talking earlier about pointing fingers when the voters are unhappy, and who was responsible. They talk about the schools and the local government, and then talk about the state government. They can each point to each other as far as who's responsible for it.* Page 49 of the briefing materials illustrated the several instances where the layers of California Government overlap. In the end, the group asked a question concerning *the limitations on local authorities to tax*. They clearly wanted more information, which they would receive after a few hours, from the panel of experts. This way they would be better prepared to cast their informed votes by the end of the weekend.

Part IV

The fourth and final part of the weekend's discussion was focused on the thorny issue of state tax and fiscal policy. Jim was once again adamant on his positions. In response to comments from other participants, and especially to the argument that higher taxes drive businesses out of California he said: *Silicon Valley is booming and the San Francisco Bay area is booming. There are a lot of established businesses who are here just because of the location, because of the intellectual capital, because of the universities. All the threats about businesses moving out [...] the corporate tax, they really don't happen. People stay. Some people move out, but generally people stay.* Elaine on the other hand added a more personal note, this time indirectly supporting what Jim had to say earlier: *My dad is a real estate appraiser in New Jersey where the reassessment is a much [...] thing, and the irony is, if this takes place now, would be the most beneficial time for commercial real estate to be reassessed because real estate is so low. Then it sets a very low bar versus later on when the economy is doing much better.*

He always used to say it's very ironic that the companies always loved having their properties reassessed downwards when times were tough, but they never came back to get them reassessed when their property values were going through the roof. They always will try to do that, yes. To me, this is the time that commercial property should be supporting this notion because they could take advantage of the bad economy in a sense.

They were both referring to one of the most heated topics of the weekend. Proposal D5: *Keep the spirit of Proposition 13's protection against reassessment for homeowners, but modifying its property tax provisions by (a) Reassess non-residential or commercial property values more frequently, (b) Reassess all property values more frequently, while adjusting the current exemption for inflation to \$28,630, and allowing it to rise with property values when they are reassessed going forward and (c) Maintain current property reassessment law, but allow the local electorate to raise the property tax rate above the current one percent rate cap.*

Those were hard questions that required deep thought, but the group had a lot to say:

Elaine: Say you could then wave that magic wand and correct Prop. 13, one of my questions is, is that sufficient? Would it solve the financial problem, the

fiscal revenue problem that we have or do we have to also consider some of these other monies?

Caroline: Even if it doesn't, it would be a big step. I think you need to do one step at a time, and it would be a big step towards additional revenue for the state. Then use that judiciously, and then look to see if they do need more, then look for other sources.

Jim: It's a philosophical question of whether you want the majority of income or, if there's a change in income, to come from privately held assets that exist versus [...] fluid. What this chart on Page 66 indicates is that the [...] tax isn't progressive enough to balance out the amount of what people pay.

One of the things that Reagan did, the first things that he did, was completely restructure the aggressive scale of income taxes, which had a huge effect on people who made the most money, they wound up paying much less in taxes.

With a prompt from the moderator, the group restarted discussing proposal D1: *Enact "pay as you go" requirements for any legislation that creates new programs or tax cuts at a cost of \$25 million or more per year.* After all, there are no limitations on how the discussion should proceed. So D1 was brought into the center of the table for the participants to deliberate. Elaine was the first to comment on the issue: *My biggest concern with the pay-as-you-go, I think it's good to understand what the cost consequences are, but it's just that its outcome – it's always in isolation from the other priorities within the government. We're not sure what we're trading, what the tradeoffs are, what we have to give up in the event that this seems compelling, or what the alternative is going to be.*

After listening to other participants, Jim entered the discussion as well: *Why can't new programs require new money as opposed to setting a situation where you're pitting programs against each other, borrowing from one to pay for the other? If new programs require new money, then that wouldn't happen.* As the conversation went on, Elaine seemed to delve into the issues in great detail: *I like the transparency and seeing how much something's going to cost, but I'm concerned about the third point that is made on the con side. When they are looking for funding sources, they can delve into budget areas that did not have this powerful support entity and say, "Okay, that's where we're going to take the money." So I guess the question is how do you give that particular element of response or how do they get to respond and protect the concerns that they have before their money gets taken away from them, if they don't have the kind of basic support that an entity coming wanting to fund something has?*

Then the discussion turned back to the issues related with property taxes. In a long conversation, the participants tried to clear out their ambiguities and refine their thoughts on what the best policy would be, for the betterment of their state:

Jim: Look what happens. You have a house and your payments are \$2,200 a month. You just got a loan. You're going to spend a little more than

What's Next California

Supplementary Report: Transcripts

\$25,000 year on interest. You're going to lose the entire deduction of that \$25,000 just because your payment is a little bit over.

Elaine: The percentage is for the first \$25,000.

Jim: Okay, so if your interest payments are \$26,000 or \$25,000.50, you're losing –

Al.: Up to \$25,000 [...].

Geoffrey: I know it seems like that's quite a bit, but like I said, I know people that are spending a lot of their money and it all goes to mortgage payments.

[...]

Geoffrey: Yeah, I know it's easy to say why don't you just move. If you have your roots, if your family lives all in that area and that's the only thing that's available. If every middle class person moved down to that community, the value of the property [is] going to drop because there's not going to be anybody there to work in that area. I mean, it's going to – you can't just tell somebody, well, if you don't like it, just move. [...]

Jim: They have to realize you have to pay above that tax because they chose to be wealthy [...].

Geoffrey: This is my point. Some of these people, and I'm not – they're living paycheck-to-paycheck. They're not wealthy. Even if they sell their \$400,000 home, they're still not wealthy because they borrowed most of that money to buy it. So they're not wealthy, they're just trying to survive like everybody else. If you take and say, well, gee, we're going to take away your tax deduction, some of these people, they're going to have to sell their homes. They will move, they'll be your neighbors over there in Clovis.

Rebecca: That's what I mean, it drives down the price of houses.

[...]

Elaine: In Clovis, the renters, one of the pro comments about the renters versus owners, there are renters who are paying \$1,200, \$1,500, \$2,000 a year, depending on what they're renting, do not benefit from the tax deduction at all. I wonder –

Al.: They never do.

Elaine: I know they never do and this is clearly [...] trying to stabilize that, and more people might have to rent rather than own again. I know we're very conditioned to be a homeownership-based society, but –

Al.: Then you get tax back into the real estate business. If nobody owns the house, you're paying the rent to the banks again. You see what I'm saying? That's what's going to happen to the houses.

Jim: Well, the banks, you always pay your mortgage –

Al.: Yeah, but they'll own the house. They'll go into the rental business.

[...]

Al.: Wherever they can make money, that's what they're going to do.

Geoffrey: The housing market in this economy doesn't need any more hits. Our housing market has taken a big jolt. If you continue to pack it – it doesn't need it. It's like [...] they're standing around right now. If you did something like this right now, it would just deliver another blow below the belt.

As the time passed, the group should once more figure out two questions to pose to the panel of experts. The moderator summed up the group's proposals by saying: *Okay, so I have for this question, why aren't pensions and their fiscal impact considered as a topic of discussion for fiscal policy and not demonstrated in the pie chart for Governor Brown's spending?* Then some of the participants stepped in to revise the question. After discussing for a few minutes, the moderator corrected herself: *Does that sound right? Okay, perfect, so we have our questions. Who's going to ask the first one? I know that Jim already asked a question yesterday.* It was already time for them to attend the plenary, where they would pose their questions to the experts. After this, they would cast their informed votes, reminding to the rest of the state what the people really think, after they have seriously considered all of the alternatives. They would then part, each one of them back to their shared Californian realities.

*Note: The original names of the participants as well as the locations and agencies mentioned have been altered in order to preserve confidentiality.

2. INITIATIVE PROCESS

No.	Proposal	Quote
1		<i>So the thing I would support is something that is flexible enough, or robust enough, that allows for changing priorities and emphases. One thing that everybody wants, or a lot of people want, now, 20 or 30 years from now may not work. So I sort of see it as a trial and error, and people – Californians interests change, too. So something that's flexible enough to deal with changing priorities.</i>
2		<i>I think I would like it to be more accessible. It seems like it's kind of a costly process. You have to have a keen knowledge for it, but you also have to go out there signing signatures on a petition. That is if you've gotten your initiative written out, so you have to hire someone to write the initiative. So it's a costly process. I kinda like the idea where you can write up something and then there's like some sort of board or something that you go in front of and kind of review it together. That way, it's something that's –</i>
3		<i>That would be why Proposition – let's just say you get rid of the initiative, which I would not approve of. I do agree with you that it's very cumbersome to try to do all the work. I think you pay them a lot of money to go up there and they should do most of the legislating. I think they should do most of it. But they have not been doing that. And so I think that _____ is cost. My real concern is cost. But if you tied this to, say, some of the other reforms later in here.</i>
4	A2-C, A2-A	<i>I favor A2-C because ... It gives the people who are writing the initiative a chance to do exactly what you said, talk about the Constitutionality of it, how to write it... You still have a chance to vote on something that they would like to vote on. And A2-A I felt like that, too. The whole of people feeling like they're directly involved in these initiatives. And I think that the cost, the administrative costs of getting it – to write the initiative in the legislature ahead of time, probably – I'm not a number cruncher, but a less than a court case is afterwards to negotiate how Constitutional the bill was in the first place, and how it's written. Because for years now they've spent arguing after the whole process has been done.</i>
5		<i>I think this defeats the purpose of initiative. Because if the legislature hasn't done _____, so you do an initiative. So then the legislature with a simple majority can undo the initiative. And, also, as long as the initiative's proponents – who is that? I mean, you can have an organization; you can have several organizations. You can have thousands of people. You can have two people. How are you going to know who the proponents are? Theoretically, the proponents are all of the people that signed the petition to get it on the ballot, and that right now is a million and – 1 million, 200 thousand. So if the legislature can just go ahead with a majority vote and then do the initiative.</i>
6		<i>And if they didn't change the purpose, and increase chances of not going to court, then I think that one would be good. But the other one, 2B (A2-B), where it says that with a two-thirds majority, they could just get rid of</i>

What's Next California

Supplementary Report: Transcripts

		<i>it. Forget that one. And this one, here, where it says, Once they get enough signatures, the counterproposal – the counterproposals are very confusing.</i>
7		<i>I think that the problem with it is that it's supposed to be a check to the legislative power, but there is no balance to it.</i>
8		<i>Making it more precise I think would be – it's good about being able to refine it after it's been first proposed. I mean, that's good. Sometimes it should be removed. Like in the last election I remember that happened. There should be more refinement to it.</i>
9		<i>So having a balance of majority of people having a chance to vote on issue, but also making sure that the people who are really well-educated on our Constitution, which is way over my head -- whether something is Constitutional. Do I have a right to vote on it? Is it my place?</i>
10		<i>But I think what we're saying is that we need somebody without a vested interest, a third party to look at whatever initiative is being proposed to clean it up. But I would be hesitant giving it to –</i>
11	A1,A2-C	<i>I was hearing A1, we needed something that's a counter balance to the Legislature, and then A2-C. Get those two together was what I was hearing everybody in some form or another talking about. I just wanted to check whether other people were hearing the same thing.</i>
12		<i>The citizens of this state we've all become somewhat cynical about the whole process. We become less and less involved because it's more and more confusing. We're less and less trusting over the years. So I think that's what has happened and we need to reverse that process.</i>
13		<i>I want to be able to find out more information, be able to see what they're doing and how they're spending, and I don't think that's available. They stall on me when I try to find it out. Oh, we don't – that's not disclosed. No. When I try to go in there, it's always, He's gone. He never answers his phone. And I feel like I can't find out that information I need to know and I want you out. Either you're hiding something, or –</i>
14		<i>Somebody tries to push an initiative, people like it, and then people with money don't like it can buy off the people who made the initiative. And that could be disaster. So are we more afraid of that type of corruption? It looks like there's a lot of wasted time, energy and money in proposals that don't to be done because another proposal was voted in.</i>
15	A1	<i>The thing that I liked about A1 is that it's still going to go on the ballot. They don't even say that it's not going to go on the ballot. They just – they refine the writing of it so that it's not – because a lot of propositions now they have loopholes and they're entangled, because they're written by people who don't write laws, at least most of the time. It's like they end up blocking things that should never be blocked.</i>
16		<i>What I thought, I don't think I read it in here, but if I was trying to get an initiative on the table, or I thought something was really unjust and I needed to do something, I would have – as a regular citizen – I would have no idea where to look for how something would pay for it. Because I don't have that type of financing degree. I don't have that kind of an</i>

		<i>education. So I think that _____ the Legislature before it comes to the table, that might be an important issue to have to address there, and not something that you talk about afterwards.</i>
17		<i>I like the idea of having the legislative analyst say how much it is, or what they think it is, and letting people be aware that this is going to cost something it's got to come out of somewhere else. So I think we're _____ the people who bring the proposal to say, hey, this is where I think it ought to come from. That seems a little too _____.</i>
18	A4	<i>They have to modify Proposal A4, yes, we want to know how much this is going to cost – an initiative starter isn't going to be able analyze the whole budget.</i>
19		<i>I find that when I'm reading the bills it says people that oppose this law will take their business elsewhere. It's vague generalities of the intent of the people who are involved and they're going to get mad and stomp off. And I don't think that satisfies my need to know when I'm voting on something. If somebody is angry about a bill that's being cast because it's going to cost them more money, there has to be more written about it.</i>
20		<i>I think that Pay/Go is really good, except the complexity. I think it's perfect, except the only thing is is the complexity. And the problem with the survey at the end – and I agree with what you say, I would like it to be more of an open discussion. But the only way, as I see it, that anything that we say here or that we do is going to be transmitted further up, is going to be through that survey. And the survey is, on a scale of 1 to 10, do you like it or not. _____ a little line underneath to write. I would say: Yes, I like Prop 4A, but I think it should be modified to find a way _____. There's not a place on the form to put that. I'd like to tell you that I think there should be by the end.</i>
21		<i>I think that something really _____ that could come out of this whole weekend is a Web site with the questions that we have, and the answer as far as – not giving opinions or something – but say how do you get an initiative on, or how do you change it now, or what does the legislature – can you view legislation and give your opinions on it before they vote on it. All these questions that we have, and then spend money giving it publicity so that everybody in the state can go there and find it – I want to know how to do this, or I want to know how to get in touch with my assemblyman, or I want to know how –</i>
22	A1,A3, A4	<i>My question was could they put on the Internet anything after 49 days. The question for Pay/Go is, How would Pay/Go slow down the system. Could that be part of the pre-planning? 1A. If we did 1A, we had it here. 1A and 3A go together – 4A.</i>
23		<i>But the big picture, once you submit all that stuff, who oversees all that stuff? The people above the legislative analyst, and then they say, okay, this is what I want done, go back and amend it; change it, make it just how I like it because I'm your boss and I'm telling you what to do. And if you don't do what I tell you to do, you're out of here. So they hire the people that agree with them and then when the new guy gets in office, the</i>

What's Next California

Supplementary Report: Transcripts

		<i>new attorney general, the new governor, whoever, they bounce all the people that aren't on their side, and they bring in their people and then those people write policies and write literature and all kinds of stuff.</i>
24	A1, A4	<i>Prop A, could it be Webcast, and I would also say Prop A1 and A4 be somewhat combined so that the community the committee that put together Prop 1. For Prop 1, if you had either a _____ commission, or maybe just a legislative sub-community on propositions, and they would be the ones under Prop A that would help the people.</i>

25		<i>I'll start. It troubles me. I think it may be overly influenced by money and outside influences; that it's no longer strictly something that's part of California, but it's being influenced by parties that are not part of California but who have vested interests in what may or may not happen in California.</i>
26	A1	<i>You don't know how to really read it. It takes someone to sit down with someone that understands legal language and analyze it really. So it was supposed to be for the people, you know, the way the people could, well, make laws, and it's not that anymore. It's influenced by a lot of big special interest.</i>
27	A7	<i>When you spoke about listing who was backing the certain initiatives, I think that when we look at ads on TV during the political process time, during election time, you know how you've actually paused your TV to see who sponsors it. And sometimes that makes a big difference on how you're gonna vote.</i>
28	A7	<i>If Exxon Mobil is sponsoring this and they're spending billions of dollars, maybe I don't wanna sing this thing</i>
29		<i>Well, I know I was brought up by a mother who had felt really strongly that we should have a vote in what happens, not just always leave it off to someone else. And the more we tend to leave it off to someone else, the more our whole country could become a communist country.</i>
30	A1	<i>For example, like Prop 8, I know a lot of people that voted yes when they meant no.</i>
31	A1	<i>And thank God for the media is dissecting it right as we speak. We have the Wall Street Journal that is ripping it apart before it even gets to the ballot. You had the L.A. Times tear it apart</i>
32	A1	<i>Well, if it wasn't for the media, then we wouldn't really know about this initiative out of the Bay area</i>
33		<i>What's concerned me most about or a big concern about the initiatives is the continual submission of bond issues. There's never a statement of how it's gonna be paid for. It all comes out of general funds, so we're adding debt. And then the proposition we passed a few years back designating a certain percentage of our general funds go to schools, and that just hamstring the legislature doing the budget because that just designate funds, whether in lean years or years of plenty that'll go to the school districts or for education. Does not allow the legislature who have or is supposed to have the control of the purse strings, it doesn't give them the</i>

		<i>ability to change. So that's a big problem when you have propositions designating these funds.</i>
34		<i>More accountability in many areas of an initiative needs to be incorporated –</i>
35		<i>So is there an initiative we can pass that would stop the multiple pensions? I'm sorry, but look at the governor right now. He's gonna be _____ collects governor pension, attorney general pension, mayor of Oakland pension, and I believe that there's one more. How many pensions can someone tap into? As a schoolteacher, I worked in the private sector for 23 years, actually 24 years, and have been a teacher for five years now. I am not gonna be allowed to tap into Social Security and the CalSTRS pension. They're not allowing it. You can pick the one that's the most.</i>
36		<i>I think going back to the proposals that are in front of us, like I think that what we were talking about is more transparency.</i>
37	<i>AI</i>	<i>And then they get invalidated or other things happen to them or then you find out people who wanted to vote yes, but they voted no because no is a yes and so forth. How confusing it is _____ our mailboxes trying to scare us about things? I hate to use the word control, but parameters or guidelines or we need something to just make it a more simple process.</i>
38	<i>AI</i>	<i>I think that's a good idea _____ review it and maybe we have some rules about consistency. So yes means yes and no means no.</i>
39	<i>A 4/5</i>	<i>I think, if I remember right, some of the proposals are also about how we pay for initiatives and kind of limiting a few. If we're putting something on the ballot, I mean, that's gonna be paid for that we know where it's coming from. And it's not kicking it down the road, like saying we're gonna pay for this with bonds or something where we're gonna have to pay it back years from now. But if this is gonna be part of our priority as a state, that we should figure out are we gonna cut other things to pay for it, or are we gonna raise taxes, or what are gonna do so that it's covered and not left to future generations to pick up the tab.</i>
40		<i>But don't you think some of those guys that are the initiative signers that get paid for every signature – I was talking to someone yesterday about it. Quite honestly, I think they skew it for the area they're in. If they're getting paid, say, two dollars for every signature, I mean, they stand there with five or six clipboards, and they say, "Are you against drug?" blah-blah-blah, and you go, "Well, yeah, I'm against that. I'm signing that." "Are you against this?" And then you realize when the actual thing is printed on your ballot and you can go through, and it tells the pros and cons, and you say, "I voted for that initiative to be put on the ballot, and that is not the way it was explained to me."</i>
41		<i>When they get you to sign those things, you don't have to prove who you are. You don't have to show ID to sign that. You could be signing Mickey Mouse, and no one would know it.</i>
42		<i>A lot of the legislators are cowards. I looked at these initiatives. I'm thinking why didn't the legislature do something? Why didn't they pass this? Why haven't they worked on this problem? And then sometimes</i>

What's Next California

Supplementary Report: Transcripts

		<i>you'll see, they even give how many are in favor of it. Well, if you're in favor of it, why didn't you put legislation board in the legislature?</i>
43	B7	<i>And I think that it's all too easy to sit back and say legislators are cowards and not look at the system and the fact that I think there are fundamental problems within the system. Some people I have to believe become legislators for good reasons, but because of the way that the system is and because the terms are so short, and you're constantly running for office.</i>
44	A5	<i>I like that, but I want to see some sort of validation or verification procedure added to that, so we don't just have somebody say, "Well, it'll be paid for by XYZ." Yeah, check it out.</i>
45	A5	<i>...also a concern being that sometimes when it's over-determined, this is how it's gonna be paid for, then we're also tying legislators' hands. A certain percent is already gonna be allocated for the general fund and then that leaves it really hard for them to make decisions when you run into tough times.</i>
46	A2	<i>One of the things I didn't know about until I read this is that proposition, once they're passed cannot be changed. I didn't realize it's not like other laws that you cannot change them.</i>
47	A2	<i>but I know Proposition 13 has been a great benefit, saved a lot of homes. And I know legislature is great about not being able to overturn. It's a good thing.</i>
48	D	<i>Well, one thing I've learned from reading this book was that the education funding is up and down because of Prop. 13 because properties taxes were something you could rely on. And we're in a district where we are – I can't remember what they call it, but we're funded through local property taxes.</i>
49	A7	<i>I'd like to bring up A7. I found myself feeling kind of emotional to that.</i>
50	A7	<i>And at the bottom here it says some mandatory disclosure provisions raise free speech concerns. I would say tough.</i>
51	A7	<i>Forty days is plenty enough time to print up more things and</i>
52	A7	<i>Look what happened with the proponents of Proposition 8. A lot of them were harassed, if you remember. Yeah, that wasn't right.</i>
53	A2d	<i>This proposal 2D, it's suggesting maybe the legislature can come in and tweak</i>
54	A2	<i>I kinda like that because other states have that ability. I think only California maybe one other state does not have the ability to change in any way proposition expanse.</i>
55	A2d	<i>Well, personally, I think 2D – if they're gonna change it, I think it's better to have a two-thirds, rather than just a simple majority, whereas 2D, it's the same thing is that it's just simple majority.</i>
56	A2	<i>Actually, and even both of them, the initiative could be one way, and this 2C and 2D gives the legislators power to change them, even if it's a guess what the initiative initially started up with. I mean, that's cutting into the initiative process in the sense that we're giving the power back to them. And is that really what the initiative process does. I mean, it's supposed to be about the people putting in what they want, whereas this, it's giving ultimate power to the legislature, even though it is two-thirds vote, that's</i>

		<i>something else to think about too. It sounds good, but they could change it even if it's not what we want.</i>
--	--	---

57		<i>I don't like the initiative process.</i>
58		<i>Gives you mob rule</i>
59		<i>So the question is not – well, actually think about it. You may not like the initiatives that are being brought forth to you at this time, but the principle that we can bypass the legislature and enact something ourselves – in other words, the principle of being able to take up another route to enact change in California – what do you think about that – just the fact that you can – we do have that opportunity?</i>
60		<i>We don't even know what they're voting on.</i>
		<i>The big thing is that you have – Proposition A says one thing, and then B says the counter to it, but the language in them is the same thing. You talk to people; you go, "Well, no, I think it means this." "Well, no, I think this one means this." You try to read up and – again you've got to be a Harvard lawyer to understand half of it.</i>
61		<i>You have to have money to get an initiative passed.</i>
62		<i>With the use of the computer and the Internet – everybody gets on it. You don't have to be rich or poor; everybody's got a computer going. Why can't the people put in their feelings of what they would like to see, and then, like this group comes together, have a group of people that investigate to see what are the issues that people are really wanting to see go on?</i>
63		<i>That touches on something that I've felt for a long time – that we, as citizens – not the government should vote on everything. We, as citizens, should vote.</i>
64		<i>I was gonna say, added to this gentleman's idea that it should be at least posted on the Internet and everywhere else, maybe it should also be broken down out of legalese into basic speak that everybody can understand.</i>

65	A1	<i>They're creating a formal review process, including – it may be even including the citizens – it should be the citizens – to clarify the supporter's intent and to let the supporter revise the text to see what it's about if it's not clear, so that they make it so that it is clear – not to listen to Channel 10, Channel 13, or whatever channels you have, and you've got a news commentator that is giving you all the _____ is giving you their viewpoint.</i>
66	A7	<i>Would look at it, and then the publishing – the Top 5 contributors for and against the ballot measures _____. So you have an idea of who's supporting it.</i>
67	A7	<i>Well, who's gonna represent the worker?</i>
68		<i>One question I would have would be how can we ensure that the content or the purpose of the initiative is really relevant and significant to people in California?</i>

What's Next California

Supplementary Report: Transcripts

69		<i>We have to define the initiative process, or you can place limits on the initiative process.</i>
70		<i>My question would be if we get lots of initiatives on the ballot, I will tend to not look at any of them. I don't have time to sort through all the ilk that sits on that ballot. I usually vote no on everything if there's more than five of them.</i>
71		<i>So with a direct democracy initiative process, where you can entrench your proposition, so that it can't be amended by the legislature unless it's written for that, that seems like it's a loophole to getting things passed that may be rather unfai</i>
72		<i>So if we push lots of initiatives, that's direct democracy. Then, does it undermine our representatives in the legislature? Because there's two bodies who are going to make laws. So that's a recipe for chaos and frustration</i>

73	<i>Direct democracy</i>	<i>my perspective is if we have a representative democracy at our city levels and our county levels and our state levels and at our national levels, why are we just focusing on the state here? You could have the same initiative process for different jurisdictions, and you could be bombarded with special interests and things that may have some relevance for your community. I think we have to have a way of focusing on what really seems critical, and we have to look at why the democracy failed.</i>
74	<i>AI</i>	<i>They put it in that legal speak, and they can push it through however they want. Then, the other bad part, I think, is you take an initiative that the electorate passes one way or another, then the other side gets ticked off and they go – the best example I can come up with right now is the gay marriage thing. So the electorate voted it one way. Well, we don't like that. We don't like the way you guys voted, so now we're gonna fight all of this in court. So there's –</i>
75	<i>AI</i>	<i>It seems like there's a parallel between the language of initiatives – the legal speak, as some have some said – and voter apathy.</i>
76	<i>A4</i>	<i>It's very easy to vote something you don't have to pay for. That's the part I worry about.</i>
77		<i>you have to limit contributions from certain entities.</i>
78		<i>So one of them is the change in the circulation period for gathering the signatures, and then the second one is really a question of what form of medias were effective in helping the citizens to improve their understanding? In other words, do people actually understand the initiatives _____ after looking at the state-produced information, or do they tend to get their information or make a decision based on TV shows, Internet, that kind of a thing? So it's just an attempt to understand what types of media are more effective in improving the citizens' understanding of the initiatives at hand</i>

79	<i>AI</i>	<i>They would know it's not in there. So then, again, my question is: How many _____ actually read the initiative</i>
----	-----------	---

		<i>before they sign it?</i>
80	A1	<i>Nobody's going to read it. ____ I almost never sign.</i>
81	A1	<i>I believe that the people that actually are doing the initiatives should be educated on that initiative so that when they present it they're presenting it with knowledge, not just: Well, this is what it says. Because now they're just reading it. ____ It would be good to have them ____ this is the impact it's gonna have, educate the person that's going to sign it so that that way they are making an informed decision.</i>
82		<i>First of all, if you're gathering signatures, and once you get the target number, who cares how many more above that you've got. The real question is where you want the floor to be to get something on the ballot</i>
83	A4	<i>Another part is how are they going to be paid for? That's the problem. Taxpayers never have to say how they're going to pay for this. That's part of the problem. Where does the money come from?</i>
84	A1	<i>The only state official that could analyze the statute as proposed, or the initiative as proposed, and offer some opinions about its enforceability would be the attorney general.</i>
85	A2	<i>I'm kind of against both of these because it seems like the initiative process was initiated because people said, oh, these legislators, they're politicians. We need a way for the public to get involved here. Both of these give a way for the politicians to get themselves back into – to override the public will. The initiative process was put into place to go against the legislature to some degree.</i>
86	A2	<i>I think it's entirely possible that you can get something passed by the voters, and it could be amended into something completely different.</i>
87	A4	<i>I think what's missing in the initiative process is the cost. Because I think the whole point of it is that the legislature gets stuck with these initiatives passing. The average citizen does not understand unintended consequences, whether it's financial or otherwise, legal, you name it. So the point is that if you're reviewing an initiative, you've got to know the consequences or the cost, or where it's going to come from. And I think there's a disconnect there.</i>
88	A2	<i>If you think about, conceptually, you're the legislature and there's some initiative that's coming out that you think is really bad if it passed. So isn't that really a challenge to you to enact a law that you think better addresses the situation, get it off the books and tell the voters: You can pick the other one in the initiative process if you want, but here's what we've done. So it's not like they're without remedies. I mean, you said, you know, they do have statutory authority to start. They don't need an initiative if they come</i>

What's Next California
Supplementary Report: Transcripts

		<i>up with an idea.</i>
89	A2	<i>I just feel like the whole initiative process seemed to me as a check on a legislature. And this is basically allowing the legislature to then undo their check. I mean, just say, hey, we don't the people; once we're elected we can do what we want.</i>
90	A3	<i>Because until the voters vote on it and pass it, it's really just an idea. So if you put an idea out there, my gut kind of tells me you ought to have the right to pull it back.</i>
91	A3	<i>I think the answer to that is, the person who actually paid the \$200, they can take it back off.</i>
92	A6	<i>I personally have a problem with taxes requiring two-thirds. It makes it almost impossible to get new taxes –</i>
93	A general	<i>I'd like to start. I see the initiative process as a safety valve, and I think it's way overused in California, and I think that it ought to be a process wherein, if there is very, very strong social consensus across the state, there is a mechanism by which the voters more specifically will rise up and _____ explanation. But otherwise, I think it's hopelessly overused here in California.</i>
94	A general	<i>My concern is that the initiative process is that the minorities need to be protected. Everything is majority rule, and everything gets controlled by the most number of people, then you overlook the rights of those that are not great in number, for example Proposition 8 last time was for, you know, to protect minorities and it got overturned because the masses didn't agree.</i>
95	A general	<i>. I think we want to keep initiatives at the two-thirds majority in order to get a full representation of the voters.</i>
96	A7	<i>But there's something that can be intrinsically unfair in influence that is, the influence that comes from all the advertising, and one side can usually afford much more public influence by buying commercials, taking out ads, the direct mail. You know, we had the initiative where mounds of money came in from out of state –</i>
97	A7	<i>. And you know, since Citizens United, we're not allowed to know where they get their money.</i>
98	A general	<i>I understand what you're saying. My kind of response or reaction to that is that the condition that precedes a level of concern or consensus is again a non-responsive legislature, a non-responsive process in our normal channels. Because really, the initiative is an end-run around our traditional structure. So what I would like to say is that to the extent that you have a highly responsive legislative process, then you can have a, you really can treat the initiatives as if it's a safety valve.</i>
99	A7	<i>. If you make it to where any of us can initiate this process, someone with money is going to be able to do that too. And so that's not about the tool or how the tool's used.</i>
100	A general	<i>When really, a lot of people don't even read those things.</i>

101	<i>A general</i>	<i>And they don't read those things because they'll be in your face, "Sign, sign, sign." Sometimes you say no and then you just get, you look at them and they might look so needy, you're like, "I'm going to sign."</i>
102	<i>Rational Ignorance</i>	<i>Not everybody is. But a lot of people don't have time, if you have children, if you have family, if you have jobs, you don't necessarily have time to educate yourself about all the propositions that we drew up or the pamphlets or whatever, and I think that there has to be a way that we can educate people because right now the people are voting based on what they've heard the most, the advertising, and I don't necessarily trust them to make the right decisions. For example, the last two elections for senator and for governor.</i>
103	<i>A7</i>	<i>Well, California's the catalyst for it. Even if it happens here, it tends to spark throughout the country other things. And that's why we get outside interests because they know that, and that's why you're saying people come in and pay against the things that happen here because they know that it'll spark more throughout the country. So they're protecting their own interests by coming into our interest too because they know what might happen here is going to happen later. Because we set the bar for a lot of things</i>
104	<i>A4</i>	<i>I think in a modern world, you simply can't have rigid standards such as a share of the state budget that goes to a given recipient, whether it's prisons or education or health and welfare, whatever the consumer of money is. I think that it is in fact, in the same way that we manage our budgets at home, and things change, good times and bad, priorities change. You know, you have tsunamis and nuclear disasters and you have tremendous social causes, all kinds of things that we need – not we – we need and our legislature needs to have the flexibility to manage, I'll say to manage money and to manage services in a way that's responsive.</i>
105	<i>A4</i>	<i>And I really do worry that when we take that alternate channel and we begin to set up mandates, that we're hamstringing ourselves in ways that are very, very difficult to anticipate. So ultimately, I'm not necessarily so much in favor of these measurements in the proposal, so to speak, or to do a pay as you go thing. What I am saying is I'm terrified of the fact that we ultimately paint ourselves into the corner because we've accounted for how 85 – we've mandated how 85 percent of the state budget must be spent, and then all of a sudden, we can't take advantage of opportunities or we can't respond to crises.</i>
106	<i>A4</i>	<i>We need to be accountable for our own actions, and so that's why, when I look at pay as you go, it looks like the most common-sense thing to end up in an initiative. Pay as you go, that makes common sense. I have a dollar, so it lets me buy this because I have a dollar. If I don't have \$2 for the item, I can't buy the item. Common sense.</i>

What's Next California
Supplementary Report: Transcripts

107		<i>I think that the initiative process sounds wonderful. It gives individuals or small groups an opportunity to make themselves heard in a way that we don't get during the legislative process.</i>
		<i>The initiative process in my mind is all about anybody who has an idea can put it on the ballot</i>
108	A1	<i>I'm more for proposal A-1 because I think there does need further clarification on the intent and the purpose</i>
109		<i>And I think that the initiative process sounds way better than the reality provides us. Every time I think about the reality of it, I find myself getting really frustrated.</i>
110		<i>The hard reality is that unless you know what you're talking about, unless you've been embedded in the issues, you are just being conned by a salesman to sign.</i>
111		<i>And it's very hard for the individual to, actually, be represented by these initiatives, because they aren't.</i>
112		<i>But I think there is an issue with that if you can't fundraise enough to get signatures that you need, you're voice won't be heard. So only people who are able to fundraise, or can seek out sponsorships, are really able to get these out and have the signatures in the first place. What I think as a concern is that the average person doesn't have the financial means.</i>
113		<i>The hearings up to date have been, you know, they're useless. They, actually, cancelled previous hearings that they had because they weren't used.</i>
114	A2a	<i>This is skirting – this proposal is putting it into law without the vote.</i>
115	A2b	<i>It just – for me it works. I mean, for anybody else, it might not; but for me it sounds like something that we can all swallow like.</i>
116	A7	<i>I think many times who the people that are for something and the people that are against something, it you see who those groups are, that tells you more than the actual initiative itself.</i>
117	A4	<i>Because helping so many people is a great and awesome endeavor, but we have not had the funds to do it for a long time. And the fact is, it's either gotta be cut or it's gotta be taxed. And no one wants either.</i>
118		<i>it's like we're trying to have our cake and eat it too if you don't have pay-go</i>
119	A5	<i>But I like A-5 better because it sounds like a good entrance step between what we have now and the pay-go</i>
120		<i>This at least lets us – like when you're at the ballot box go, okay, what is this kinda gonna do to our government?</i>
121		<i>The state keeps the funds, but they pass the mandates, as I mentioned the other day, to the counties and cities; but then they don't okay the funds for the services to be enacted. So the programs end up getting cut, but people don't know that's gonna be</i>

		<i>happening.</i>
122	A2d	<i>And then when things change, you don't have the flexibility to go back and adjust. So it's somewhat flexibility limited. We have to have some faith in the system that they're gonna act in the best interest of the people.</i>
123	A6	<i>The problem with 2-d is you have the voters vote on it and it passes. Legislature have the ability to come along and usurp the victor. So it's very unfair for both</i>

124		<i>The legislature is supposed to do what we're trying to do, and it's difficult for us to do it because we don't have the time or the resources to do it.</i>
125		<i>So I think this is one of the best things that people have to get some things that they want changed.</i>
126	A2c/d	<i>If they haven't voted already, then they're just going to want to – like they can make it look like all fine and dandy for like all the citizens, and then they can just go and change it in this hearing process.</i>
127	A3	<i>You could be paid off to withdraw.</i>

128		<i>One of the suggestions was to have the top five contributors be listed in the pamphlet. The problem with that is you have to print the pamphlet 40 days before the election, and if somebody gives _____ your money between 0 and 40 –</i>
129		<i>Fortunately, it's not just our point blank question; they're going to listen to what we have to say.</i>
130		<i>That's paying for their vote. Yeah, the government pays the bill. Like I said yesterday with elections, does the government give the airtime giving those speeches? They're doing this in other countries, this is nothing new, where the government says, okay, you, you and you are running for office. You each have an hour of the airtime throughout whatever you were running for. You do your time, you get to _____ nobody can give you a dollar. That's answer. That's how people vote. That's how it should be here. It never happens.</i>
131		<i>If you could get rid of special interest people. That's the disease behind the effect</i>
132		<i>Then it becomes special interest versus the interest of one or two people, in order to change the will of the millions of Californians who voted.</i>
133	A3	<i>Well, and I think the second point of the con is worth considering because you're getting a quid pro quo situation if somebody puts something in the initiative, and then there's some incentive. They're given an incentive to agree to pull it off in exchange for a benefit, and so you kinda have to wonder whether or not – like, what are they benefiting from that would motivate _____</i>

What's Next California
Supplementary Report: Transcripts

		<i>where it's not as clear-cut as Prop. 91 is</i>
134	A2d	<i>I'm against that. I don't see – if the supporters aren't in agreement, there's a problem. So they initially wrote it and you can't let the legislators change something that the supporters are not in agreement with.</i>
135	A4	<i>I'm a little worried about offsets with budget cuts. This would be a way for people to initiate budget cuts by introducing countermeasures that would attack particular programs. By introducing initiatives measures that would attack the particular programs that they don't like.</i>
136	A5	<i>At least the information is there, additional information for the voters to be able to use in deciding how to vote.</i>
137	A5	<i>That's the old carpenter's saying, measure twice and cut once. Have that information upfront.</i>
138	A6	<i>. You could go and have people vote do they want the sun to come up tomorrow, and you're going to have a hard time getting a two-thirds majority. It's a tough standard to get no matter what you do.</i>
139	A7	<i>The only way around that is to publish the campaign contribution for it online in addition to the five or six hotlines, so everybody has access to it.</i>
140	A7	<i>. I think they'd just be more interested in the whole process _____ more involved if they knew who the contributors are.</i>
141	A7	<i>There are already those cons in the voter pamphlet written by somebody from either side. So they already state that in all the propositions, but the problem is I think nobody even reads that that. They don't read the pamphlet; they just listen to the commercials on TV.</i>
142	A7	<i>. I actually wanted to hear from the people who haven't really said much. I know some of you came in and said I'm here to learn, I wanna know.</i>
143	A7	<i>Even though I'm here, it's still hard for me to understand. So I guess learning the language has been really helpful, for me at least.</i>
144	A7	<i>Basically, it's very hard to understand the language, and I think that voters who have not been exposed, they will just believe what they've heard, like you said, the television commercials or whatever, and then they'll vote. Then they'll find out that it's not exactly what they thought it would be</i>
145	A7/general comment	<i>Yeah. If they took the time that it takes to watch ten of those stupid commercials on TV, and actually took the voters' pamphlet and looked at the pros and cons, you could get more information out of there than watching 50 of those commercials that's on TV, I agree.</i>

146		<i>I'm in favor of the initiative process. [...] And if they believe in something, they will get out there and get the vote. And I think it forces our government to listen to what we have to say.</i>
147	A1	<i>The only thing that I would like to add differently is I think that they should give some sort of legal review to make sure that the propositions are written correctly with the format, you know. And if the people can't afford an attorney to write, you know, maybe the state could provide legal review.</i>
148	A 1/7	<i>. But I'm not in favor of having legalese wording. I like something that is acceptable for the majority of people is one. And second, I would like to see the people who support it and pay for it, they determine who they are.</i>
149		<i>it's become easy for large corporations and people of nefarious ideas to gather the signatures.</i>
150		<i>I'd have to agree with you. I mean what do we send legislators to do? Why do we vote on them? Why – if we have an initiative process, we won't even need 'em. And so I think the whole gathering of the signatures, it's really disingenuous. You have somebody in front of a liquor store, in front of a grocery store – hey, sign up. And you – they can tell you anything, generally. Just get out of my way.</i>
151		<i>I think the other thing that really the initiative process we seem to be legislating morality more than we do in actual things that's happening.</i>
152		<i>You know, my problem is kind of what you said. It's just the verbiage – it's so confusing. You start at A and you wind up back at A and you're going, what are they saying? You know, I understand a little bit of it. I'm not stupid, but the legalese and the way they say things, it's like, oh okay, I'll say yes or I'll say no. And you don't really know what you're agreeing to or voting on.</i>
153	A1	<i>You should understand it and vote on it one way or the other. But what do you do if you don't understand it? You know, why do they say here's the initiative, and they give you two sentences where who knows how long the actual written verbiage of the initiative is. Come on, give me a paragraph, you know. Give me two paragraphs.</i>
154	A1	<i>I don't think we need to be experts. For me that's a key problem. We should be able, with common sense, to read and understand and agree or disagree. If it goes into expert the formulation is wrong there</i>
155	A3	<i>I love the idea of having to explain how you're gonna pay for something.</i>
156	A2	<i>What I don't like about some of them is the ones that say once we receive all the signatures, the legislature can change things.</i>

What's Next California
Supplementary Report: Transcripts

157	A2	<i>But it makes me furious that the legislature thinks that I'm too stupid to make the decision. And that's the key part of this whole initiative thing that makes sense to me is because I don't like for people to think I can't make that choice. I can make that choice. And if I don't know enough about it, I'm interested. I will go find out. And if it's something that doesn't interest me, then I really won't go find out.</i>
158	A7	<i>sombody once told me that the straightest line to the truth is to follow the money. So, you know, maybe something should be written in the – and whoever makes the initiative or when it's presented – where is the money coming to support this initiative? And how much does it cost.</i>
159	A2	<i>I've always been a cynic because, like I said, every time I vote, I vote for something and it passes. And I'll be danged if I never see it enacted. Or if it is enacted, it's immediately reversed – not by the people, but by the legislature</i>
160		<i>I've got a better idea. Why don't we add another 100 to this group, using the same selection process, and this group becomes the governing body of thinkers for the year. And we move from southern California to central California to northern California every four months or three months or whatever.</i>
161		<i>Maybe they should put a cap on how many initiatives go on the ballot to start with.</i>
162	A1	<i>Why don't they televise these propositions that they're putting out there instead of all this campaign crap that they do, you know, slamming each other. It should be the propositions that they put on there and have somebody with knowledge explain and say this is what you're voting for.</i>
163		<i>You just hope that somebody else knows. They vote and it will get passed. It's best to let the people who are educated on that, whose passion that is; and then so I'm out. And that's not fair to me as a voter.</i>
164		<i>You know, so, you know, but I do think that process and the voice that it gives the people is beneficial and it's healthy and it's important when your government has run away from you. And I feel, and it's just my opinion, the California government has run away from me. You know, I think that there are great examples of the initiative process and the government legislature and the assembly working. And I'll use Texas as an example. That state has raised 42 percent of all of the jobs in the whole country during the recession – 255,000 jobs this year. The whole country has only raised 265.</i>
165		<i>Listen, the whole point of our government in America is that the power is supposed to be in the hands of the people. Small government – the people are the ones that vote on how the</i>

		<i>government is supposed to go. The government works for us. We don't work for them. I think the initiative system is great. Thank god for Props 13; they'd be property taxing us out of our gourd. You get into non-Prop 13 areas and, I mean, the taxes are ridiculous.</i>
166		<i>I'd say the bad thing about initiatives is you can sign a petition 100 times, but, like you said, once it gets passed to a judge's eyes, it's all up to him whether he decides to pass that initiative or not.</i>
167	AI	<i>Why don't they find out if it's constitutional so a judge won't throw it out.</i>
168		<i>In my mind, the initiative process is a good supplement to what is basically a representative form of government, but it gives another option of direct democracy. We're not doing away with representative government, but they're adding another _____. A con for me would be – I've always wondered if this doesn't make the legislators lax on their job, or not willing to take up the harder issues, waiting for someone to put an initiative before the people, rather than taking a stand and doing their job. And I think it is a double-edged sword. I wouldn't want to do away with it, but I want to look for maybe a way to not get the legislators off the hook.</i>
169		<i>What about, like Stanley was saying, you are saying, too: you sign this initiative, but you hear nothing about it. What about accountability? The initiative, what happened to that initiative? Whatever happened to it?</i>
170		<i>I think one reason is because special interests tend to control the initiative process. They drive a petition onto the ballot, and then they spend a lot of money trying to get their view put across. And a lot of times they spend a lot of ads with misinformation that either drive their point of view, or drive people away from other initiatives. I think it happens quite frequently. And if you read the ballot, and you read the initiative, it sounds good. But then you listen to all the negative advertisement and it doesn't have anything to do with what the initiative says, but they're just trying to get you to –</i>
171		<i>Those advertisements come across sounding true. But if you don't do your homework, if you're not interested enough to figure out really what's going on with the initiative, then you're going to just go with whatever they say.</i>
	AI	<i>Back in the '60s, I remember, I could read a ballot, I could read the pros and cons and understand it, and make a decent decision. And most of the time when I voted I would coincide with the populous. But now it's totally different. I don't know if it's the populous that just doesn't understand the issues, or if it's just that they're a different opinion</i>

What's Next California
Supplementary Report: Transcripts

		<i>than mine. But I do know that the way that it is written is too difficult to understand for even the educated. How can it be simple for somebody that isn't? So it's really not a good way to present a vote to the people and expect a decent result.</i>
172	A1	<i>So the conversation we had before you got here was about the fact that the language of the initiative, the title and the description, often are not what it really is.</i>
173	A1	<i>I think it's everybody's opinion that if you read just the little summary that they give you – the title of the summary – that you probably don't know what it's about, and you don't know what yes means and what no means.</i>
174	A1	<i>In other words, I think what everyone is saying is that it needs to be simple and clear. It needs to be understandable by the majority of the people, not some attorney.</i>
175		<i>So is the initiative process even really good? It bypasses the legislature and president if something is passed by legislative process. So that's a factor in deciding if it's even a good process to have. Because direct democracy – that's against representative government. We elect representatives to represent us.</i>
176		<i>This process does add in the factor of putting the power back into the hands of the people. And if we're not being represented, we still have a voice.</i>
177	A1	<i>I don't think the problem is with the initiative not being understood. It's a problem with the attorney general's analysis not being comprehensible enough, and downright misleading at times.</i>
178		<i>Right. And democracy is an experiment. It's not a final thought.</i>
179	A7	<i>The bug that I have on these things is, No. 1, who's behind these things? I'm not even sure that that top five are enough. Because people like moveon.org can put any number of people up in front. And you don't see them until they're way down here. You have to be honest about it. And that's the other thing. I don't know the solution for honesty in advertising, but the class recent case in point is showing that ad of an old person being dumped over the cliff. It's a total lie; it's a misrepresentation. Stuff like that shouldn't happen.</i>
180	A7	<i>Whoever is putting the money behind it, unless they're a non-profit organization that it's not really for any party, someone is always behind it, whether it's a good person or a bad.</i>
181	A7	<i>Even like you were saying you put the top five donors for each initiative, you can make up something that sounds really good for your organization and dump a whole bunch of money into it. They'll never know who the true</i>

		<i>donor is.</i>
182	A7	<i>The people that are against the initiatives, they'll take the time to do it. They can disclose who's really putting the money into it.</i>
183	A7	<i>Don't you think people would play games with that? People would pledge \$5 million, but don't give it yet until after the deadline to report who the funder is. So that they're spending the money, people have pledged it, but until they give it they don't have to report it. I'd bet they'd play games with that.</i>
184	A1/7	<i>I'm not an intellectual, so don't get too excited. I'll get the written material, and my wife and I will look it over and we figure we got it. Turn on the TV and you get that thing: yep, we're right there. Next night, you get the opposite. We're back to Square 1. And we have absolutely no idea if this is really good, or really bad, or who's making the money. The oil people? The tobacco people? You're up in the air.</i>
185	A7	<i>I agree with him. Five is not enough. Why not list all of the people that are paying for this?</i>
186	A7	<i>We want transparency.</i>
187	A2	<i>What do we think about Proposals A2-A, A2-B, because these are options where the initiative is brought forth by the People of California, but then the legislature acts as a check on the initiative. So it still comes from the people, but if there's something in the initiative that legislature recognizes as problematic, that maybe the people would not have been able to see, then it doesn't make it through the legislature. What are the pros and cons of that.</i>
188	A2	<i>It makes a balanced toward representative government, which is our basic form of democracy – representative democracy.</i>
189	A2	<i>What about the legislature having to look at the initiative and putting your stamp on it, and going back to the proponents of the initiative and let them decide to go with the changes or not.</i>
190	A2	<i>You could put limitations on the amount of time they have. And one of the limitations is going to be it's got to be done before it goes on the ballot. Because it is going on the ballot, regardless of what they say about it. It just gives them the opportunity to provide input, and then to have discussion groups. And to look at whether or not the language needs tweaking and make suggestions. It doesn't have to be cast in concrete.</i>
191	A1	<i>And it's kind of a waste of the legislature's time. It should be something the citizens are involved in because they're the ones who are going to have to vote on it. It shouldn't be dependent on the legislature to tell you what it means.</i>

What's Next California
Supplementary Report: Transcripts

192		<i>That's the whole purpose of the initiatives, in the first place. Because the people that we elect, we expect them to come in with a good program and we believe in them when we elect them. But once they get into the process, they're influenced by it and there's no way around that. And it's going to happen every time. So it has to be changed at that level.</i>
193	<i>A1</i>	<i>How can we ensure that the language in the initiative, itself, the law that's being proposed, is clear and understandable to the majority of citizens of California.</i>
194		<i>I think it's broken. I think it's been taken over by special interests. You know, you have enough money, you can get any issue you want on the ballot, especially with paid signature guides. And there's no responsibility because you can get an initiative on the ballot without having to pay for it.</i>
195		<i>That only makes people that don't have funds to put up an initiative. I think the initiative is working. Maybe people are not participating enough, you know. People are not actively involved in making _____.</i>
196		<i>I think the basic problem that – you have two different issues. You have social issues, and then you have fiscal thing. And when it comes to the fiscal one, you're basically asking the people in California, "Do you want more schools? Do you want better schools? Do you want firemen? Do you want police? Do you want all these great things?" There's not a single person who's going to say no. And then you're going to say, "Do you want to pay for it?" No. "Do you want the state to pay for it?" No. "Do you want the – and if they want it, do you want to be able to raise taxes?" No. So you basically said, "We want everything. We want to pay it nothing."</i>
197		<i>I think that's what they're asking us about initiating. If there's an imitative on the table, maybe we need to also put the financing, you know? So if somebody has an initiative, we want a high-speed train from Los Angeles to San Francisco, then we say this is how much it's going to cost.</i>
198		<i>We all seem to be moving towards the idea of, the fact that these things cost money needs to be emphasized more. The fact that anything that you want to do is going to mean more taxes, needs to be made clear because it's so easy for the people who are looking at the initiatives to forget that.</i>
199		<i>One more thing that you're forgetting, that we're all forgetting, is that there's always a con to an initiative. And so I know when I opened up my book to read, you know, it says, "This sounds good," but then you get something else that says, "Well, this is what it's going to do. It's going to be kids in high school and it's going to," – you know. There's always something negative that makes you say,</i>

		<i>“Well, I don’t know. Is it good?”</i>
200		<i>I think the fundamental thing is that like the checks that we traditionally had on our democracy have been voting down legislatures that we don’t, that aren’t voting in our interests. And with the initiative system, we’re sort of saying we’ll take it out of the hands of legislatures and we’ll run our democracy ourselves. However, there’s a reason why it’s a representative democracy. It’s because, you know, it’s easier that way. That way you get the expertise. That’s where you get the people that actually have _____.</i>
201		<i>If we have representative government, it should represent everyone, but they can’t represent everyone’s interests. I think the initiative would be a better way to fine tune because then you’ll have – if you can say, you know what? No outside funding from – or set a limit for outside funding, so you don’t have something –</i>
202		<i>Well, I think there’s not enough transparency in who is supporting the initiatives. I think if we had more openness. I mean you have to, if you’re getting information from TV, for instance, the commercials and stuff on TV, you don’t know who’s throwing that money at that. I mean they put those tiny little disclaimers on the bottom, and they run through it so quickly. You don’t have time to read maybe the first one. And so we need more transparency as to who’s proposing these initiatives, who’s throwing the money at them. And we can make more informed decisions that way if there’s more transparency in that.</i>
203		<i>Maybe they should, after we vote for an initiative and it votes it in, why don’t we say, put out another initiative, okay, what do you want to cut?</i>
204		<i>I want the legislative analysts to do an analysis of what will happen to state government in order to fund this thing that you’re asking me to approve through your initiative process.</i>
205		<i>But my point is, that’s what we’re being asked to do, is select amongst various different options to fix the initiative process and make it, and the writers of the options’ position, more responsive to both the fiscal needs that we have now and to our desire to see to it that if you’re going to pass something by the initiative process, it’s paid for.</i>
206		<i>Okay, but for me, again, to reach that, I want to trust the legislative process. Maybe the guy – there is a guy that does an analysis of each of these things. I forget – he’s an independent. Independent office. Does not – if it’s an independent office and it’s not a political office, maybe they can clarify.</i>
207		<i>I mean it’s politics, exactly what he said. If there’s a legislator that promised something to his constituents, he already has an agenda. And that’s not going to change that. The initiative process isn’t going to change.</i>

What's Next California
Supplementary Report: Transcripts

208		<i>I think we want the initiatives to be reviewed, just not by the legislature.</i>
209		<i>Well, I disagree. Because I can vote my legislator out of office. I can't vote you, a voter, out of office once you sign an initiative. I happen to be a very strongest believer in the initiative system. I don't think it's a good system. I like representative democracy. I like to elect people that I can throw out of office. But if we're stuck with the initiative system, I have more confidence passing review to some legislative process because I can vote them out of office. I can't vote other people out of office.</i>
210		<i>But the problem with some of these initiatives is that it takes a two-thirds majority. You know, if somebody votes for something you don't like, and you vote him out of office, fine. But the initiative stays in and it takes two-thirds of the vote to get rid of it. So even though he's gone –</i>
211	A1, A2	<i>So I guess to try to break this down to who we trust to modify our initiatives and when we trust them to do it. I mean everything, A1, you know A1 and A2 is when and who do we get modified. So _____ sort of anti, you know, letting the legislature get involved in this process.</i>
212		<i>I think you have a flawed system with – I mean my proposition would be to go vote _____ this proposition and voting on no propositions ever again. But since you can't do that, you have to at one point say, "Okay, the system's flawed. But that's our legislature. That's what we have." And you can start by saying, "Well, I hate the legislature. I don't trust any of them." You've now eliminated a major part of the government. You kind of have to deal with the idea that forget about the fact that the legislature, you don't particularly like them, although everybody likes their own individual person.</i>
213		<i>I'm on the other side. I'm the one that's saying, Right now, until we fix the legislature, which we have other proposals to do, I mean how many people really know who their legislator – I know who my representative for congress is, Lois Capps. But I just, I kind of remember now who my state assemblyman is. I don't know who my senator is. How many people really know who their local representatives are?</i>
214	A3	<i>I don't have a problem with A3 if it allows them to pull back whether the funding is not there anymore, maybe someone opened their eyes or proved a different point, a better side to what their initiative was. It does away with having – if the proponents don't even support it, why put it on the ballot? Why not just say, "This one is – we're going to take off," and have the option to do so. Instead of saying, "Well, yeah, they put it out there and they got the signatures and they did commercials, but now the proponents are, for whatever reason, see that it's probably not prudent to go with it.</i>

		<i>But we're still going to put it on there for you guys to vote for."</i>
215		<i>You know what? I think _____ if there's a proposal and the proponents is against it or something, let's just put it – if you have enough signatures, put it on the ballot and let the people say yes or no. Because for one _____ have changed his mind, but just put it on the ballot and let the people decide. You know because he's not the only person that had the idea and the signature program, and he had the 500 signatures. So why _____ the proponent. So I think if it's already been approved by the 500 signatures, put it on the ballot and let the masses decide.</i>
216		<i>Or like you said here, things change. Because they raised money – the proponents raised money to get it out there. They got the signatures, however they got them. But they, something's happened. Otherwise, if something didn't happen, they'd probably still have that.</i>
217		<i>If I sign a petition that said yes, I want this before the voters, I don't think you should be allowed to pull it off without getting my approval.</i>
218	A4, A5	<i>I think it's (A4 and A5) a big problem, the proposition, this thing. I think this is just – you know, we want to fund veterans' housing. Okay, here's a \$500 billion bond. Sounds real good, but you know, people don't understand how bonds work. They don't understand the interest on those bonds, which comes out of general fund money. And so the \$500,000 bond ends up costing \$700 billion or whatever. And you know, it's real easy to say well we like all these things, you know because we don't have to worry about paying for them.</i>
219		<i>But I think it has to be more specific in, if you want this, we're going to raise your tax 1 percent or sales tax will go up, as opposed to we're going to have to raise revenue. Don't tell me you're going to have to raise revenue. I want to know how you're going to do it or where you're going to cut. We're going to get rid of kindergarten. That's how we're going to do it. It needs to be more tied specifically. If you approve this, this is how we're doing it.</i>
220	A4	<i>So this Proposal 4A because of the last sentence, bonds would be exempt from this requirement. Yeah, we just say no. If you take that out, it's fine, and then you get to, okay, what are you going to do? How are you going to pay for it?</i>
221		<i>I have a difficult time with this. I'm kind of on the fence because I think if you put an initiative out there, you should have some type of alternative funding. You can't just say, "We're going to divert money that was going here to go to this new initiative." It might be a good initiative, but you're hurting other portions of your government. I think if you do have an initiative, you need to say where the funding should come from, a different source. Now if it is a new tax on whatever, a different thing, a service industry or something, I can work with you. But just to say, "Okay, as you pay</i>

What's Next California
Supplementary Report: Transcripts

		<i>go,” well, where’s the money coming from?</i>
222		<i>A lot of it should be- with the proposition out there that’s part of the requirement. To get the \$500 billion, we’re going to stop fixing potholes.</i>
223		<i>We seem to be generally in favor of the idea of there being better information regarding plans to pay for a particular new program or a new law or something.</i>
224		<i>I don’t think it’s right that you can implement something with a simple majority, but it requires two-thirds, which you’re probably never going to get to change it, ever. Prop 13, everybody loves Prop 13, but it has some problems. You can’t go in and change it. Commercial property, it doesn’t change hands. I mean it’s still paying taxes they were paying in the ‘70s. Everybody else’s taxes go up 1 percent a year. You know, so there are things you could fix in Prop 13, but you can’t touch it if it requires a two-thirds majority. So if you want to lock something in, it should require a two-thirds majority to lock it in in the first place.</i>
225		<i>Minimize it. Say, “ This is how much can be done for this proposition or this initiative.” Limit, if it’s a state-based proposition or initiative, you should only get so much money from outside the state.</i>
226	A4, AC	<i>For 4AC, I was going to say that the specific cuts or taxes included in the proposal, are you suggesting that like why can’t we have that as a part of the initiative, part of the proposal itself?</i>
227		<i>I seriously believe that we should have something online, an online resource that you could go to that’s established by –</i>

228		<i>I came here ‘cause I got one of those phone calls and I like politics. However, I know a lot more about national politics than I do about state politics.</i>
229		<i>I’d like to get somebody else’s opinion because I’m just – I’m all about me and what I feel, and I need to start looking on the outside and looking at what other people see and feel.</i>
230		<i>although I read the newspaper every single day, I don’t think I’m very well-informed – or as well-informed as I want to be.</i>
231		<i>And because I’m one of those frustrated voters, I’m just really mad at everybody on the state legislatures and I think the initiative process has problems, too. And I thought this would give me a good opportunity to make my opinions known – other than just complaining to my husband – and have an opportunity to talk to people from the entire state and get different viewpoints.</i>
232	A2 (all)/A6	<i>I don’t like that the Constitution can be amended by initiative, especially by a simple majority. I think there should be a really high threshold for a change in the Constitution. I’m more okay with just regular laws being changed by initiative. I see where that is useful for the process, but that you can amend the state by simple</i>

		<i>majority is very troubling to me.</i>
233	A6	<i>I think that it's undemocratic for 50 percent of the people one year to create something that takes 66 percent or 67 percent of the people ten years later to reverse or override.</i>
234	A6	<i>I know, like Thomas Jefferson – I'm paraphrasing, but he said something along the lines that a good law, today, can be a bad law, tomorrow. I think the initiative process, the whole point of that is to make our legal, or our political system responsive to the will of the people. And it seems in the points that Judy brought up it has a way of perhaps making the system perhaps less responsive as time change or as we experiment with one law or one procedure or policy and it turns out that it doesn't work or it doesn't have the effects we want it to.</i>
235	A1	<i>I struggle when initiatives are intersecting with morality. Because you get a lot of passion on both sides and there is no right or wrong.</i>
236		<i>The initiative process to me is the closest we'll ever get to a democracy.</i>
237	A2a	<i>And the general comment is: Sign. You don't have to vote for it. Sign. And you get \$1 for each signature. So we get all this BS on the ballot. They take an incredible amount of time. So you can't concentrate on things that are really important.</i>
238		<i>And I feel like if I could get, if I could be sure that I'm getting my information in a non-biased way, then I could have the tools to make a good decision. But I don't feel like I really have great access to those tools.</i>

239		<i>There's not the alternative or not the option of eliminating the initiative process entirely. Is that intentional? Is that something that we can discuss and make as a recommendation? They have the option to just leave it the way it is, but they don't have the option of totally eliminating the initiative process.</i>
240		<i>Money is not equal to speech. That gives the wealthy more voice than those without money, and that's not democracy in my way of thinking.</i>
241	A2	<i>One example of what you're speaking to is the fact that there are paid signature gatherers that are paid \$10, \$20 to collect the signatures. They may not care about, may not even know what the issue is they're getting signatures for, but the big interests are able to pay these people money to collect signatures</i>
242		<i>The problem with the initiative process is how it's misused...The problem with the initiative process is how it's misused.</i>
243	A2	<i>If it's Company X, Y, Z, well, what do they support? What do they make? What are their services? Who are they? What are they really about?</i>
244	A2	<i>I know a lot of people that have the right to vote that really aren't</i>

What's Next California

Supplementary Report: Transcripts

		<i>all the literate to understand what it is that they're voting for. They just listen to what's on television.</i>
245	A1 and A7	<i>Right, it's simplicity and transparency, that's it</i>
246	A7	<i>I'm wondering if there's a question underneath this. I think, Kenneth, you said something about – I guess the question I'm left with is to what degree can we challenge this free speech clause. What we're really talking about is creating some limits here, and that does go counter to what the Supreme Court keeps ruling with free speech.</i>

247	A1	<i>I think we need some more structure. I think it needs some checks and balances. This needs to be reviewed... If we have a chance to read the proposal, A1, I think it's called, the pros and cons, _____ a really good viewpoint of what the initiative process is and what it does for the State of California and what it does for the people. And then it give us some chances to understand what it does. I think the initiative process is a very important part of how this state is run.</i>
248		<i>I think it's important, but I don't like it particularly the way it's working _____. I stopped signing those petitions _____. I know many of them are written by special interest and lobbyists, and many of them contain a hidden agenda that people don't know about because nobody sits for a weekend and gets educated, including myself _____.</i>
249		<i>_____ is all they want you to know. They know we're only going to read the first two sentences. The one _____.</i>
250		<i>And it's about money and money is going to split a lot of these things. And I see some initiatives passed that I liked.</i>
251		<i>I think that the quantity of initiatives that we've had reflects the lack of the legislature to do their job.</i>
252		<i>Where's our confidence level in the legislature when we have to do it ourselves?</i>
253		<i>I really do believe in the initiative process.</i>
254		<i>But the thing about 13 which comes out in all this stuff we've been given, is that in a way, it's the textbook case of a problem that's solved a short-term fix, that is a long-term disaster. Because Proposition 13 is a disaster for the State of California, although it did address the short-term problem, which is we had a housing bubble start in the '70s. Housing values started to explode. And the law didn't keep up with that. And so taxes were going out of control because the structure couldn't move quick enough to keep up with the marketplace.</i>
255		<i>I love Prop 13 just because I'm one of those that feel if you have a limited amount of tax money coming in, that means you can only spend a limited amount of money. And people would say, "Oh, we shouldn't – you know, it was a big disaster." Well, just think how much money we'd be spending if we hadn't done that. And there's</i>

		<i>no –</i>
256		<i>we set up a rigid system. So the problem _____ Prop 13, we should be able to go back to _____ things that we should change and how education is run, it's too hard to fix. And that's one of my pet peeves about, was the state level versus the local level. You know, just this whole system is too unruly to work around.</i>
257		<i>as a former teacher, that sometimes these things or these programs they bring in are so wasteful. And the money doesn't go where it needs to go. And the case in point is they said we have to have all new textbooks. And I've got friends teaching algebra and geometry, and they said, "We don't need new textbooks." But because they – it's the same. It doesn't change.</i>
258		<i>I'd just like to say something that – one of the things that I'm real frustrated about _____ is it seems like the assumption is that part of our, a big part of our problem is this initiative process. And it seems like there's some kind of a, some agenda going on that is _____ spend money and not necessarily have great referendums, is the way I see it. Sometimes _____ process and it's frustrating that it made such a big issue of it in these meetings because I didn't think that was what we were going to spend so much time on.</i>
259		<i>Well, the referendum process has a lot to do with the way we spend money. Referendums _____ the state legislature has to spend, and you don't think that's part of the issue of, you know... Most of them are badly written. Most of them are by lobbyists or special interests, and they wind up being litigated afterwards anyway. It would be nice if they could do that process or something before we voted on them.</i>
260		<i>I was just going to say too it seems, it's interesting that we're not involved in the process until it's handed to us. Then it's like, "Here. Vote on this." So we don't really work a ton, just throw them out there and it's like we weren't involved in the whole thing, you know, who thought through it and why is this initiative being presented to us in the first place? I mean from my perspective</i>
261		<i>In the legislative process, you have no say whatsoever. It's all your representatives doing the work.</i>
262		<i>You only have a say when you vote for them the next election.</i>
263		<i>Well actually, you can communicate with your legislatures at any time. You can email them when you know their vote's up in the legislature. You can email them, you can write them, you can call them. So we do have a say. I think a lot of us just do not exercise and take the time to do that. And I don't think we're staying in touch with what is going on there either.</i>
264		<i>We're going to see it on the ballot. We don't care. But if we care, we're going to do something about it. And that's when the initiative process really lets the people come out and speak. And anybody who cares about it, now they're going to get involved. It can be</i>

What's Next California
Supplementary Report: Transcripts

		<i>manipulated, sure. But like you said, where is it not manipulated in politics? But the initiative process lets the common man come out and say something. It's expensive. Again, maybe special interests get involved, but I'll tell you, if it's an initiative that I care about, all of a sudden I'm a special interest because I care about it. And again, it give me a chance to say something.</i>
265		<i>providing the voters with more information about these initiatives and collecting that information into one spot that's regulated by some third party that's hopefully nonbiased. Because that way everyone can learn about it and make the best possible _____. That would be helpful.</i>
266		<i>I think who's paying and who's for it and who's paying against it definitely gives you more information about what's behind it. I mean you can present an argument, anyone can present an argument, and it sounds great until you hear the counter-argument. And so I think you have to have both sides to help understand what's really going on.</i>
267		<i>It doesn't matter who's supporting it. It's a matter of what the initiative is about.</i>
268		<i>But it's especially important when a supporter or detractor wants their identity anonymous</i>
269		<i>things have to be written in a very much more straightforward way. A lot of things are just inaccessible.</i>
270		<i>I think it's shortsighted to think that I would agree or disagree with something because of who's funding it. I mean I would agree with something because I did research and I found out, I read enough about the information. But I made my own decision. I haven't made a decision based on who's footing the bill.</i>
271		<i>I think one of the biggest things I got from it is about we as citizens need to be more educated, and I know this has definitely opened my eyes. And I thought back to something that you said last night about signing an initiative once, and then discovering later. And I did the very same thing in front of one of my supermarkets. I signed an initiative because it sounded great, and I found out later that it had something else that was totally different. I mean not even related to it.</i>
272		<i>That's where they were headed before, and transparency so that we don't run into that problem where it's like you voted for the chunk, but then they added this little part in that was actually the real agenda. It's like they'll support something because they know they can slide the, what their real agenda is.</i>
273		<i>And I disagree. Sorry, guys. I think we as a general public are not very educated. If we hear a program's going to cost \$10 million or \$100 million, in the scheme of the state budget, how much is that percent-wise? I don't think we know. And I think we have elected legislatures to take the time to dig further into how things are going</i>

		<i>to be worked out</i>
274		<i>I think it's a great idea that we have hearings once an initiative has gotten to a certain point, and it could almost – my thought would be something like a debate where each side, it's a public hearing and each side gets to go up and take questions and debate their side of the issue. But to bring the legislators into it – because they all have their reasons for – they have their reasons, whether they're going to be for it or against it, and they're not always in line with us, you know? Because what goes on in Sacramento, it's just a little voice in that situation up there</i>
275		<i>But I think what has to happen, corruption has to be stopped in order for all of this to work. I mean there is no point in all of this to be talking always, when the guys in the chairs they're more corrupt than a lot of people in the lower countries. And it's true. Look at that guy in Bell. He became a millionaire. For what?</i>
276		<i>You know, when the planning department in San Francisco _____, same with a lot of other cities and they have these discretionary hearings where everybody in the neighborhood, somebody's building something _____, I mean they should have something very similar to the initiative process.</i>
277		<i>Well, they canvass us too, but I'm saying if they're going to do that, then I think that either the canvassers should be able to hand us – if we're going to sign a petition – I don't sign petitions for the very reason that somebody brought up because you never get a chance to read the thing.</i>
278		<i>it's part of the responsibility to us as voters and people who sign initiatives, should be the fact that we should have an opportunity to be informed.</i>
279		<i>when these people come up with these initiatives, then maybe they'll look at this and okay, now we have to do this and this and this, along with the stuff that's already provided for them. Now we have to provide the public a chance to read this. The canvassers just, this is an initiative. Here's some information about it, and I'd like you to read this. If you're interested in reading it, that's your choice. But to me, the initiative producers should have the responsibility of allowing us to read it, whether it be direct mail or whether it be handed out by.</i>
280		<i>The one thing you hear about quite constantly nowadays is transparency. You know, if, and for all the talk that we hear, you don't get a lot of it. If they did really have a website, I mean you said that you could have three websites. Well yeah, you could have a link to a main site. You could say that this is an independent version of it. You have the League of Women Voters, whatever. But show them where to go every time an ad is flashed or printed in the newspaper, that link has to be there for that specific referendum.</i>
281		<i>I'm personally not in favor of any of these proposals.</i>

What's Next California
Supplementary Report: Transcripts

282		<i>The initiative process is self defense. The citizens against the government of California.</i>
283		<i>It allows people to have a voice if their representatives aren't really representing them in a way that, you know, the citizenry wants them to represent them. But I, also, see that it _____ a lot of things in our state; because there's all these initiatives and then public interest does get involved. It costs a lot of money to have people go out and ask others to sign petitions and do all those kinds of things. So all these groups get involved that maybe are a small special-interest group but have a lot of money, and it allows them to have more power.</i>
284		<i>I have this love-hate relationship with it. I really like the initiative process because, you're saying that it's like it's an opportunity for citizens to bring something to the table that we see as wrong. At the same time, I spend hours reading the issues. And then you're, actually, right too. It's like then I'm not able to get the information that I need to make an intelligent decision. And then I'm frustrated at that point. It's like here's all this time I'm spending – and then I get frustrated. It's like aren't we paying legislators to do this? Isn't that their job? Why am I going through 30 initiatives? I'm not paid to do it, but I'm doing it because I care. And I really wanna – 'cause that's why I'm like torn. There needs to be some improvement, but it shouldn't be an initiative.</i>
285		<i>We're paying them to do their job. Why are we – why are we having to do everything through the initiatives? It's just broken. It's a good system, but it's broken; and it seems like if you've got enough money, you can get anything passed.</i>
286		<i>Also, the wording sometimes, in order to pass what they may or may not – the _____ they want, it's worded negatively. So we may be voting yes for something, when really it really should be no. And I mean, that's up to you to know what you're gonna vote for before you walk into the booth. But the positive side to it is it's the citizens that can go out, they can canvass things</i>
287		<i>I have nothing against the initiative process per se. However, there's some things I think need to be added to it or clarified. One, who's behind the initiative? Because you don't always know. Who's gonna pay for it? _____ by that I mean whether it's a tax cut or a tax increase or whatever. I think if you're gonna have an initiative, and it costs money in any way, shape, or form, it should have something in the initiative that says who's gonna pay for it and how they're gonna pay for it.</i>
288		<i>I think it's a great idea, but it needs some reform. So many times initiatives pass and then they're found unconstitutional later or else the wording isn't – it's not written very well. Therefore, it's passed and it has problems. But the idea of being able to go and fix it</i>

		<i>before we vote on it I think would really be a good idea, or giving the legislature a chance to improve upon it.</i>
289		<i>That's the fault of the people who were voting then. Not the fault of the initiative. If you're not intelligent enough to read what's there, well, that's the way it goes.</i>
290		<i>the whole initiative process is supposed to be like a direct democracy thing. So it's supposed to be inclusive of all, not exclusive. And that's why I wouldn't agree with qualifying people. I think it would be better to have clear, objective information and then let people make their own choice.</i>
291		<i>But the bond issues just don't belong in the initiative process. That isn't – the initiative process was not put together to pass bond issues.</i>
292	A7	<i>So _____ the top five is a good start. You know, it's a good start. I understand that, you know, they've got time limits and got what? Forty days prior to the election so people could throw their money in after that so the general public doesn't know really who's footing the bill for the initiative, but it's a good start. You know, maybe down the road we can make some other changes to that, but you've got to start somewhere.</i>
293	A6	<i>My opinion on A-6 is I am for A-6. Okay, so if you look at the breakdown of percentage of income that the populace pays, people on the lower end of things pay a larger percent of their income towards all kinds of taxes, you know, be it sales tax. Assuming that there's more people that are around the poverty line than otherwise, I think they should be able to say, well, if we put out more taxes, we should be able to have a little bit more control of issuing bonds and that; because our belts are tight enough.</i>
294		<i>You think it's one thing. I think it's another thing. And we're like, oh, yeah, we're for it or, oh, we're against it. It's because we don't understand it. I don't understand it.</i>

295		<i>The process is flawed, but it's a process that allows the voters an opportunity to change law without having to go to their electeds and convince them. As an employee of local agencies, we pay lobbyists a lot of money to do that very thing. They are fairly ineffective, as well. It's very, very difficult to access legislators to change the law. So it's a flawed process that needs to be fixed, but it's really the only access – as I see it, the only access we have, as voters, to change a law.</i>
296		<i>It brings up the issue of who do you believe when you're</i>
297		<i>I'm just talking about just overall state government efficiency, I don't think, has really been enhanced by the initiative process, I guess, is what I'm saying.</i>
298		<i>In other words, I wouldn't say let's eliminate the initiative process and leave the state legislature as it is. You would have to somehow modify the state legislature, so that they would be more responsive to</i>

What's Next California
Supplementary Report: Transcripts

		<i>the voters, be less responsive to special interests and big money and – you'd have to do both. I don't think you could do one or the other.</i>
299		<i>I think it's an avenue for people to go around the legislature _____ feel is sometimes already dominated by a certain political class.</i>
300		<i>I think it provides for a _____ democracy. It's an interesting counterbalance to what we have right now</i>
301		<i>in concept, it's a good concept _____ theory. The problem is in practice _____ too complex _____.</i>
302		<i>you get a lot of people _____ political ideas that may not be constitutional, but they've got enough money to get it on the ballot anyway.</i>
303	A1	<i>I think this is really what's happening with most of the people here that – again, that don't have time. They just hear all this stuff and they're like oh, this guy kinda sounds like he knows what he's doing, so I'm gonna vote for him</i>
304		<i>it's before they bring it to us. It's like an equity process – a revision process</i>
305		<i>But it allows, for example, the Green party and the other groups that have a vested interest to be involved in the process, I'm assuming – that they could then find out what's going on and _____ get their word out earlier.</i>
306		<i>I don't think it would be effective. I think it would be, actually _____ to the process _____</i>
307		<i>it's not going into law at that moment _____ I don't think there's anything wrong with more discussion</i>
308	A2a	<i>if you can't vote on it, then the people who don't agree with it don't have a voice _____</i>
309	A2b	<i>There seem to be more cons with this one than the other ones, as far as making it more confusing. If I thought I knew, and then I _____ this other one, that could be more confusing. Then, the fact that there could be more corruption – friends that might get the legislature to _____ counter-initiative on there _____</i>
310		<i>I think the other thing, too, is just kind of thinking of the mentality of the campaign _____ you're being bombarded with that. So you're going to have _____. You're going to have _____ spending \$5 million a week on TV ads _____ by the state legislature _____</i>
311		<i>It's funny because this whole initiative was put into place, right, and the citizens have a voice against what the legislature is doing. Now, because it's gotten so far this way, it's the opposite. It's now giving the legislature a chance to have a voice against</i>
312	A2c	<i>It's been agreed on, and now you're changing it, over the next 30 days.</i>
313		<i>I think it's done too much by professionals. They pay people to get signatures and then they distort what's being, whatever was accomplished, stuff like that</i>

314		<i>I mean I think theoretically it's fine, but it's been overused. I mean I think that a lot of times there are issues on the ballot that are extremely complex and really technical. And I don't think that – I mean I'm reasonably well educated and intelligent, and I don't know what to vote. I mean I read this side of the argument. I read that side of the argument. A lot of times, there's not that much information in the newspapers about some of these things. I can't make an informed decision about this. I don't understand the implications, and I shouldn't be voting on this.</i>
315		<i>I'm, also, really disturbed that so many of the initiatives lock the legislature, or lock, you know, so much into our budget that the legislators don't have control over it. I mean so much of our budget is just mandated by the law and they don't have control and we have these huge budget crisis. And I don't think that necessarily the general public should be making those decisions. I'm more inclined to think that's why we have elected officials. They're supposed to be managing the budget.</i>
316		<i>Which is a good point, because all it is now is the number of signatures. Not about necessarily people being informed. But those that are out there getting the signatures, they get paid a certain amount per signature. And those that are hiring them are hiring them with that motive in mind and not necessarily informing the people as to what they are signing for.</i>
317		<i>have to admit, there's been a couple of times that I've signed it out of, you know, feeling sorry because someone's telling me this will get me \$2 a signature, and I really need this. You know, and maybe they're homeless or something. And so that becomes my motivation rather than being an informed citizen, you know. It would be nice to know if there was another way to get the information so you can make, like you said, an informed decision.</i>
318		<i>Obviously, the initiative system, you know, it may have worked 50 years ago; but it isn't serving us today. You know, a lot of the initiatives go to the ballot, you know, there's propositions. You know, maybe the voters vote on it and say yes, maybe they say no; and then somebody comes and takes it off the table after the voters, you know. That model is not working for us.</i>
319		<i>most of the initiative processes advertisements that I see, many of them are nonfactual. And there're no appropriate way to fact check without a lot of work. So you get a lot of emotionalism, xenophobia, people gut reacting because that's the process the way it's set up right now. If you have the money to perpetuate something that's not true, you can do that in effect with impunity.</i>
320	A4	<i>if a proposal initiative comes from the people who are interested, then how is it gonna be paid for? What is the financial affect for the state? How is it gonna work? I feel like the proposal that A-4, for my thoughts, it seems like a good idea to make sure that it can, actually, be</i>

What's Next California
Supplementary Report: Transcripts

		<i>feasible.</i>
321		<i>I think more accountability. You know, there could be good things like high-speed rail in the last election. I personally think it's great. I voted against it because I thought we don't have enough money to do this. You know, but it passed. And I don't know how they're gonna fund it. But, you know, more information about the real costs.</i>
322		<i>Because pay-go says we're gonna do this and that means that we're gonna cut this or increase this tax. The more of that that we have, the less able any legislative body will have to gather a budget; because the constraints on the budget are such that the discretionary items won't make any difference.</i>
323		<i>it would make a legislature pretty impotent if a number of initiatives tie up the money so there's not really much they can do. And then the citizens are gonna say they're doing nothing, but they wouldn't have much options – any options.</i>
324	A6	<i>To me that poses some limits on how easily we pass initiatives which lock the legislature into budgetary things that they can't deal with.</i>

235		<i>That is one of the problems with _____ language. The language is so complex. It has to be very simple _____.</i>
236		<i>The smartest thing you do is for the citizens to write an initiative that says that it has to be in plain language. It has to take in consideration what our Constitution says is legal. Yes, that's both state and federal constitution.</i>
237		<i>In other words, someone writes an initiative. In this state, once you write it and it's accepted, you cannot take it off the ballot. In other states, one of the things that I think would make sense is you write the initiative. If the legislature wants to, they can just make the initiative law, passing the laws the usual way. Then the voters don't have to bother with all that stuff.</i>
238		<i>One idea that they proposed – I don't remember if it was in the book I read in the thing they sent us, but you can have an initiative and then you can also put under the initiative, the legislature can look at that and they can put what they would have on the same topic, it was an alternative, and then you could have a third line which says, "If one of these wins, which would you rather see enacted?" So that you'd have three – you could, in other words, legislature could have an idea, and theirs might be a little more refined, better worded, more constitutional. The person who floated the initiative would have theirs.</i>
239		<i>Well, I think the fiscal responsibility should belong to – I think anything that has to do with money in this state should be taken care of in Sacramento. I don't think – that's what I think.</i>
240		<i>That's why it would be good to have to state how it would be paid for. Pay as you go. If you have initiatives, we would like more money for childcare, and we would like a 1 cent gasoline tax to pay for it. If you say, "We want, we want, we want," and the initiative never says how</i>

		<i>it's going to be paid for, then it leaves them in that terrible position.</i>
241		<i>Maybe there's another filter that the initiative goes through. Maybe that's what the initiative – maybe there's something before the initiative hits the state in Sacramento – maybe somewhere up the road it hits a filter to where we have people that sit there and can work the numbers out, see if it's doable.</i>
242		<i>what they'd like to be accomplished from all of us here together, is finding a way to take the money incentiveness out of our government legislators so that they are more apt to do the writing of the law rather than the micromanaging of where all the money goes, and how it's spent and what's done with it... And if we could come up with a way, all of us here together and all these other groups, on how to use the initiative process to the benefit of us people so that the state would be governed _____ and with less micromanaging of that money _____ because how far away is our state, and what would it look like when it fails?</i>
243		<i>They say, okay, this is a proposition on tax on cigarettes initiative. This is what the people say vote on. "It proposes additional 13 cent tax on each cigarette distributed. Indirectly increases tax on other tobacco products." Then they said, "Provides funding to qualified hospitals for emergency services, nursing education, health insurance to eligible children. Revenue also allocated to specified purposes for the tobacco use prevention program _____, research, prevention and treatment of various addictions.</i>
244		<i>One of the problems they're running into now in Sacramento is that so many of these things have been earmarked over the past 20 years just like this, that there's no place to turn to get the money needed for the general fund in a downturn like we're having now. All the money's locked in. They can't figure out how to do a budget. We've had so many initiatives where we said, "Don't tax us. Don't tax our property. Don't tax commercial property. Oh no, we don't want to pay any more income tax. We don't want to pay this. We don't want to pay that."</i>
245		<i>I don't like the idea of, they've earmarked, say, \$26 million. I like that as an example, but you know, if we're going to earmark it for a cause, let's take the money does come in, if it's 15 percent of that \$26 million or whatever. But that's what I voted for, and I'd like for my money to go to that cause</i>
246		<i>And the best way to do that is take the money out of their hands. And by the initiative process and having that third choice, it takes the money right away from them.</i>
247		<i>If the attorney general is writing the initiative, taking the control away from the people who originally got the signatures, the attorney general's writing the summary, but sometimes it's misleading and not understandable. They said, "Well then one of the propositions was well let's have a hearing and we'll discuss how the wording should be." And that would be after you already have the signatures, but</i>

What's Next California
Supplementary Report: Transcripts

		<i>before it goes onto the ballot. Well, here you can have some discussions after the people express their _____ want.</i>
248		<i>Why not even have another group that sits in between as a filter, that looks at the costs, maybe a board that can say, "Well, look, you know, and then these people are not voted on, maybe they would be specifically appointed, they could be appointed." That's a good idea they could be appointed. And what they'll do is they'll say, "You know, we're working on behalf of the public's interest. This is just our opinion, it doesn't look like we're going to be able to afford this.</i>
249		<i>We have, I want to have faith in our legislators, but _____ that's what – I'd like to just have faith in them and not – and some of our propositions have handcuffed us. Prop 13 _____. And the more I thought about this, I just want _____. We have recalls. I mean we've still got that check.</i>
250		<i>Even though our ballot box for elected officials is supposed to be our check, this gave us an extra check. And it has been used against us. It has been used against us by that huge amount of money that needs to be taken out of their hands and put into our hands. Even if that means we're going to have to say all the money that was put in by everybody goes to the one pot, and you divide it 58 ways for the 58 counties. And that's all the money you get, and you better dang well –</i>
251		<i>I feel like the third one will just give us a little bit of extra voice to be heard, and I think that people that _____ that way would be more apt to understand or try to understand.</i>
252		<i>So we need something to where the language can be more directed towards lay people, to where it's, you know, to where we're not, the language on the initiative isn't necessarily complicating the matter. You know? Because you know, special interests, you can fall on the attorney general's table as well.</i>
253		<i>So I mean if we could somehow make it simpler for everyone, then I mean there'd be more incentive _____. It's just very hard. I mean when I go there, I feel frustrated all the time.</i>
254		<i>One of the things about initiatives, maybe they should be time stamped. We've had some – first, we've got two different kinds of initiatives. We have some that are creating new revenue, where it's supposed to fund something. And then we have something that's restricting current revenue. So we might need to think of them – I think of them as different when I'm voting. But the ones creating new revenue – an example is Prop 10, is we said that in perpetuity we were going to fund these things.</i>
255		<i>I think that the first thing that we need to do is control the advertising. When we really understand something, we find out that most the ads you get are full of half-truths, lies, out and out lies.</i>
256		<i>What I'm saying is when somebody writes an initiative, it should go through _____ probably _____ something that some professors from the universities, some _____, they should sit down together and</i>

		<i>simplify the language, and that language should come back to the people who _____ the process. And if they agree, then it should become _____. And that way you can see if –</i>
257		<i>So I want anything that's going to strengthen the initiative process to give each of us a better voice without the complications of _____ corporations and special interests.</i>
258	A	<i>I dislike the fact that we can go to the trouble to make an initiative, put it to the voters, have them vote it in, and then have some federal judge decide, "Oh, we're not going to do that." That's a problem for me. There needs to be a place to override them.</i>
259	A1	<i>So on that, I think it would be interesting to have some type of constitutional litmus test prior to us going to the hassle of arguments voting, being let down by the system or the apparent let down by the system, where in that case, there was two-thirds of the state voted for it.</i>
260	A	<i>So it's kind of an interesting deal. I'm not going to say whether I'm for it or against it, but I find it interesting that you put all this effort, and two-thirds of the people voiced their opinion and were supposed to be represented by this thing called the vote. And then it comes down to one judge that says, "No, it's unconstitutional." It's like, "What are we doing?" Because this has happened where it's been one judge that overturns the will of the people, I think three times in the last ten years or so where it's kind of a funny feeling to me that, if two-thirds of the public vote for it, you know, we are the people of the state. It's weird that it's one person that makes that decision.</i>
261	A2	<i>Well one solution, I think, would be to have the legislature required to vote on the, required to present for a vote every, initially before it goes on the ballot or as it goes on the ballot. So it's like a – now they could abstain, but at least you would know what your representative in your legislature.</i>
262	B	<i>The initiative process is, yes, and that needs to be worked on too, the contributors. And you should know who the contributors are and what their agenda is. But I think part of the problem with having the legislature, depending on the legislature is they succumb to special interest and the lobbyists. And that is really a problem for our state. I think that's part of the reason we're in a lot of trouble, right?</i>
263	A	<i>The negative, the advertising on television. It's probably the biggest influence, the biggest pieces of information the voters get.</i>
264	A1	<i>And unfortunately, people are not informed. You know, they go out and vote based on who had the best television commercials that pushed me in the right direction. And no, the commercials don't actually lie. They just skew the facts enough. Because if they lied, they'd be in trouble.</i>
265	A	<i>Because I won't sign it. I say, "No. I want my</i>

What's Next California
Supplementary Report: Transcripts

		<i>legislator to create my laws.” That’s what I vote for them for.</i>
267	A7	<i>We want to know who’s supporting these things.</i>
268	A7	<i>Well, the other issue because I thought about this, it says in here that the voter pamphlets go out 40 days before an election. You know? And I want to include this proposition, but I don’t want people to know. And so what I’m going to do is I’m going to withhold my funding. You know, I’ve got half a million dollars to push against no on Prop 1. I’m going to let out \$50,000 of it so my name doesn’t appear in the Top 5, and then after the pamphlet is published, then I’m going to throw all my money into the situation. We’re going to just bombard the airwaves with no, no, no, no, no, and people won’t necessarily know, other than in the very small print they put at the bottom of the screen, that my company is involved with this.</i>
269	A7	<i>Well, the major contributions should be made before the pamphlet goes out. It should be in line with the pamphlet. Maybe that’s what we need to know, who’s funding what. Maybe at an X amount of money that can be, if you’re going to contribute this amount of money, then that has to be stated or something.</i>
270	A7	<i>I think if it’s a matter of not, those Top 5 contributors, they’re not being on the ballot versus being on the ballot just because there might be some hiding going on or whatever, I’d rather have the Top 5 on there, just you know, as a starting off point of who’s contributing</i>
271	A2	<i>Okay, why can’t the government do that then? Why can’t the people that are in charge, the politicians, maybe they have had a say in what goes on the ballots. We know someone who is accountable and is doing proper research.</i>
272	A7	<i>think that’s what we need is we need people who will really start following the money trail and exposing where this money is coming from.</i>
273	A7	<i>Yeah, but I think there’s probably a way to present it so that it’s very straightforward. Here’s the initiative. Here’s the group. Here’s the next group. And it could be kind of like a family tree of where all the money is coming from</i>
274	A 4/5	<i>I was just going to say, we’re spending a lot of time talking about the money spent to push these initiatives, but – and I mean it’s important to me to know who’s backing an initiative, but what’s more important to me is how much the initiative is going to cost us afterwards in taxes. That’s the proposal in here I like the best, the pay, the one that says if you’re going to submit an initiative that’s going to drive the budget up or cut taxes or whatever, where is this money coming from?</i>
275	A 4/5	<i>. A lot of unfunded mandates. And that just seems crazy to me, that I could get a grassroots thing together and go out and get everybody to vote for it, and suddenly add a \$50 million budget item to the budget that there’s no money for. During a time where the economy is taking – or you know, just anything. And to me,</i>

		<i>that's the money we ought to be watching. I mean, you know, as well as the who's trying to push whatever.</i>
276	A2	<i>Yeah, one thing that strikes me in a number of these proposals is it looks like an attempt by the legislature to get their fingers into the initiative process. And by doing that, they control and steer the initiative process. And that doesn't sit right with me.</i>
277	A2	<i>The initiative process is the ultimate check against the legislature, the legislative process. And so this proposal here specifically, why mingle the two?</i>
278	A	<i>The information does get out though. I mean I don't think there's a lack of information about initiatives once they get out. It's a matter of finding it. It's a matter of people being interested enough to search out that information.</i>
279	A2	<i>Well that's what I keep going back to. That's my entire problem with the initiative process. We are leaving the creation of the law up to a whole lot of people who decide to vote based on the best commercial that they saw last before they go and mark up that ballot. I think I choose my legislature. My legislature should make laws. I mean for heaven's sake, isn't that their duty statement?</i>
280	A	<i>In general, I don't understand – I mean I understand logically the concept of the initiative process. And I suppose in concept, it's a good idea. But in the way I see it on my ballot, the purpose of it is just to me, it's not effective.</i>
281	A2	<i>I'm wondering if there's a way that you can do the initiative process to, not necessarily open it for the public, but push it onto the legislator and force them to vote on it.</i>
282	A2a	<i>That's a good way because then you're not leaving it open to 37 million people to educate themselves and figure out what it's about. You have your group there that has a staff that can research it and understand what are the pros and cons, and they can come back to their district and plead their case. Here's the pros, here's the cons. What do you guys think? Probably have some type of feedback, focus group from their district. And then take that information back to Sacramento.</i>
283	A2a	<i>The problem with that is then the legislature can do away with that initiative. Like they're talking about Prop 13 right now. So if you've got a real liberal, a real tax-hungry legislature, and they've made the law, they can get rid of the law and you're right back where you started. That's the only problem. There needs to be checks and balances somewhere. A check on the judges, which the legislature is supposed to do. That's our problem is we haven't gotten the checks and balances that we should. But if they make the law, then they can get rid of the law.</i>
284	A2a	<i>But once it is law, then if the legislature made it law and once it is law, then they have the power to get rid of it. Where the initiative, the legislature can't change it the way the people have set</i>

What's Next California
Supplementary Report: Transcripts

		<i>it out.</i>
285	A2a	<i>So if it originates from the public, then they can't undo it per se.</i>
286	A	<i>What if we ran the initiative through a series of deliberative polls like we're doing now, just for that initiative, to have it in half a dozen places in the state. Use that as feedback to the group that's sponsoring it.</i>
287	A	<i>Yeah. I just, like some of these proposals, it's like opening the door to rewriting them. And I like that. I like having ones that I can look at and go, "Hey, that makes sense. That looks like it's supported well." I mean that's what I look for in an initiative. And some of these proposals, that's what they're trying to work on. I like a lot of these.</i>
288	A	<i>I think informed voters will do that. I think one solution would be so put all these on televised debates, like we do with presidential. I mean we have public broadcasting. That's one of the things public broadcasting will do, yeah, if ten people watch it, too bad. You know, there's stuff on public broadcasting not a lot of people watch. But if this is of public importance, it should be broadcast. How are you going to get the information out to everybody so that people know that on Monday, July 1, we're going to have a public debate on Proposition 2A, and you're going to get both sides there for everybody to hear it, and you can simul-cast it on the Web.</i>
289	A	<i>Yeah, could you get signatures, electronic signatures to get initiatives on the ballot. So I get a feeling the consensus around the table is you don't want an abundance of initiatives. So getting, making it easier for people to get them on the ballot, I don't know if that's necessarily the best way to do it. But I think there's an issue with the Internet here somehow.</i>
290		<i>I feel like the propositions are sorta copouts, right. They've become copouts for the legislature, not figuring out how to work together and do what's in the best interests of the constituents, and so they throw it over their wall. Somebody throws it over the wall to us, and then those kind of things happen as well. So we're not really experts, and we're voting on stuff that's really important to the state.</i>
291		<i>I guess this is just illustrating the problem of the democratic process. There's a disconnect between, okay, what does it really mean and the information that's being handed out there, so we make decisions that are not well informed.</i>
292	A	<i>Okay, also you tell me if I'm – nudge. This would be very basic and broad. How could we make this initiative process less confusing so all Californians, they have an opportunity to make an educated decision?</i>
293		<i>I think voters are required to attend a briefing before they can vote.</i>
294		<i>What if they had to get a license to vote?</i>

3. LEGISLATIVE REPRESENTATION

What's Next California

Supplementary Report: Transcripts

No.	Proposal	Quote
1	B1	<i>I don't like the idea (of B1). It would be too expensive and it would be too much _____. I like the idea of the unicameral, where you have twice as many representative, but just one House. And it wouldn't be more representatives.</i>
2		<i>I think the two are important in California, unless you're going to split the state, Northern California and Southern California, because the Senate is my area, theoretically, if they _____.</i>
3	B2	<i>was it B2, where they have proportional representation. And the example that was given was like you could have – like the Bay Area, you could have three Democrats, two Republicans, an Independent and a Green member part. That's kind of more representational to me. I think it's a little unwieldy at that size.</i>
4		<i>But the fact that it's not bipartisan would make me feel better just because I hate just black and white, or red and blue.</i>
5		<i>So I don't think creating more politicians would be the answer. The only good thing I could say that could come from that is that you take the power – like you said, instead of San Francisco having one representative, you take power and you split it out. And you make it more like, hey, you're not the only one with power in this area. There's seven, eight other guys who all have power.</i>
6		<i>Moneywise, it's much more expensive to run citywide. And so if you're talking about this particular proposal, for candidates to have to go appeal to people throughout the whole Bay Area, I'm not saying it's good or bad, I 'm just saying that's something that happens. It's much expensive to do that than to vote for – If you're just campaigning in San Francisco, because you're only a San Francisco representative, it's a smaller area. If you're campaigning Bay-wide, it's different.</i>
7	B1	<i>I really think that B1 that we should do that because it's so – it's unbelievable to think that one senator has 1 million constituents. There's no way I could ever, myself, I could never speak for a million people. I think that actually just needs to happen. California is bigger than most countries.</i>
8		<i>So the pro of having all of these different _____, would be to allow people to be embraced by our political system and that they mattered. I think that with the leadership we've seen just in my lifetime I fully expect anger to create gridlock from the people who get voted in. So it's a practicality problem I have.</i>
9	B1, B2	<i>I think to some extent – I think that B2 is unwieldy as it is in this proposal. I think that it's just way too unwieldy. But with B1 the district is smaller, but you have more representatives. They'd still be bigger than they are now, but there would be more representatives sort of thing, you know what I mean?</i>
10		<i>I'm assuming we're talking about proportional representation in terms of population, but my concern is proportional representation in terms</i>

		<i>of area. Because like you made this comment that California has different micro-climates. And I've always thought that the state of California has ignored my part of the state because there is a big population. And I don't think we're being represented because it's based on proportional population... I would like to see proportional representation based on population and area.</i>
11		<i>I think area needs to be considered and demographics in terms of ethnic background and regional typography.</i>
12	B1,B2	<i>B1, you have to live in the district to be – if they're going to increase the number of people in the Assembly, those people are tied geographically to an area. And so you have small little areas within the representation. They don't have to spend as much money because they only have to fundraise in that one area. That's the advantage of that. The advantage that she was talking about... B2, is that you have it regionally</i>
13		<i>What is the purpose of the state of California divided? It's the 8th largest economy in the world, and in my mind it's starting to go _____ of a super state. The business of government – a super state might be different than a traditional state. The concept was brought up hundreds of years ago. I think that's part of the struggle I'm having. In light of the current reality, what do we want for the state and how do we want to be represented?</i>
14		<i>how do you feel about a representative, how much time they spend in the district, and the length of time they are in office. How do you feel about that in terms of what your concerns are for them to address the districts end up being represented.</i>
15		<i>Campaign finance reform I think is the only way to get it done.</i>
16		<i>They (Legislature) should spend most of the time in your district because they represent the district – very little time out of the district.</i>
17		<i>Number 1, you need more time to represent _____. Those things need to be integrated together. If you say you want more local exposure and less corruption, I would say you need to, Number 1, have smaller districts so there's more visibility. You have more time in those districts and you remained full-time so you can keep an eye on the corruption issue. If you're a little closer – It's a little bit easier to see it if you're a little bit more in the community.</i>
18		<i>Absolute power corrupts, and absolute power corrupts absolutely. And so when they _____. Corruption is just something you can never completely get rid of. But I think that we've had full-time legislatures for so long and _____ corrupted, anyway. I think really that we should go to part-time maybe for ten years. And after ten years we need to change it up and go back to full-time.</i>
19		<i>So either cut – You're part-time, so you should be representing a much smaller group of people, which means more legislators, part-time. So that might be a solution. Link of some of these problems together _____.</i>

What's Next California
Supplementary Report: Transcripts

20		<i>I think that the mail-out ballots are a great idea. I think that the e-ballots, there's way too many flaws.</i>
21	B7	<i>I think they (Legislative Terms) should be longer because I think that they're running for election the whole time.</i>
22		<i>And so when you go to a performance-based type of thing, Number 1, it's incredibly subjective how you even measure this. I mean, everybody has had different managers that rated them differently, and you know it was a subjective type of thing on how well you – that relationship was at any one time. So you could lose funding for programs for autistic children because the person who's running it – it's too – they're not measuring it in objective units. How do you measure it in subjective units?</i>
23		<i>I mean, that sounds great and all, but the truth is there's not a bottomless pit of money and you have to look at how something is performing in order to _____.</i>
24		<i>I'm saying, what if we limited on what we chose what they performed on. I mean, not – not overall with every issue, but maybe certain things, like maybe their _____ or maybe their amount of time spent in the district. I'd like that to be performance-based. Not gonna be gone 90 percent of the time or not – never being able to get a hold of them, I'd love that to be evaluated.</i>
25		<i>He's (the mayor of San Diego) been there for so long, and it's not, he's not evolving with what the city needs. He's just there and just doing what he's known for so long and they're just so – the older generations I see that they're so resistant to change, and they're so resistant to new ideas and new ways of thinking. And they just do what they know. They're just like they're little robots in their chairs and they just do what they know. And they're not open to other ideas. And it's partially – I feel responsible, too, because I don't know what I should be proposing or what I could be doing to change it.</i>
26		<i>I would like the voters to have a say in how much they're get paid, I would like that they have to submit a report to the local district on what they are getting accomplished, their expenses and why we should justify paying them. Because I think it's out of control. I think the voters have no say in it whatsoever. I heard the legislators vote to determine their own salaries. And that's not the reality in public sector and it's not the reality in the corporate world...I think we should have a way where we can _____ him and veto him out of the office if we're not satisfied, if we get enough people.</i>
27		<i>I think the voters should have a say in what they make and their expenses. We should be voting on that. We should know – keep an _____ report on what they've accomplished, what they've spent every year.</i>
28	B1	<i>I wanna express shock at the number in table B1. I had no idea.</i>

29		<i>Don't you think that a lot of the politicians, I mean, look at what's going on right now. A lot of them have made it their career, instead of this is not the way our forefathers set out. Washington himself would not take another term because he said our constitution should not be set up so that we are doing this as a career. You should serve your term, serve your country, and then get out.</i>
30		<i>if they wanna keep him in, they're gonna keep voting for him. I understand the term limits, as far as only having two or three.</i>
31	B7	<i>And if you're only there for two years, then you get voted back in for another two years, four years is not really a long time in a state as complicated as California.</i>
32	B7	<i>I think what happens is they do their two terms, two-year terms, and then they go ahead and since they already passed the mustard, they already have their dragged through the mud. And _____ and then so he goes to the senate side, okay, and does his two terms there, which is another eight years. And then right after that he's termed out, then he gets a commission job. Somebody _____ program that he helped somebody else. So now he's collecting retirement for the legislative side, the senate side. He's making 200 grand for going to meetings on the Water District and stuff like that. Is that a career politician? Is that what we want, or do we want somebody with fresh ideas every two, four years? That's something that you gotta think about. Yeah, you're right about getting the job done.</i>
33	B7	<i>I'm really for more because it's hard to have one person speak for a large number, as opposed to having two and divide those people in half.</i>
34	B7	<i>But if you have more – look at what we have here. We're 2106, and then average big state is 1853. Now, understand when you have more, you're gonna be paying more salaries, more pension, more healthcare, more everything. Can we afford more?</i>
35	B7	<i>I think the big thing is that they're representatives. They represent people, and if we want people to represent us in a way that we feel like we have a connection them, that they really do represent us, that they're accessible, that they're available, that we can talk to them, then I think there's a case to be made for smaller districts.</i>
36	B7	<i>Yesterday they told us that the reason that they selected the amount of people – somebody was talking about statistics. If you have a large group of people like in California, it might take so many of those people, you're gonna get a _____. I mean, you can't do much. Nobody is gonna interview all of us, no matter how many elected officials we have. I live next door to Jerry Brown's brother. Have I ever seen him? No. So you see what I'm saying? We're not gonna get –</i>
37	B7	<i>Look at Obama. Two years into his campaign and he's off campaigning when we have all these other problems. I was</i>

What's Next California
Supplementary Report: Transcripts

		<i>horrified by that.</i>
38		<i>And I don't care if you're democrat, republican or whatever, they're gonna do it, and that's what they've always done. But if you limit the amount of terms you can run, so in other words, get in there, get your job done, and get out. Say you do two four-year terms, and you're not a lifetime politician, then maybe one, you're gonna get the stuff done you need to get done, and two, you're gonna not be so worried about, oh, my gosh, I need to be in this position in ten years from now, so I better not do this to tick these people off, and I better do this so these people will give me money in my campaign in ten years.</i>
39	B4	<i>I feel very uncomfortable with taking work part-time because I feel – and just my opinion, a lot of people are doing part-time work, and you made a small joke about Schwarzenegger, but nevertheless it's true. So when you give them that part-time, how much more part-time are they gonna be doing if you gave him that title already? Now, they're gonna be doing even less work. I want someone to –</i>
40		<i>I think they're trying to create a political career for themselves, and they would like to move up. And I don't think there's necessarily anything wrong with public service, if you have the right motives behind it, and if the system can support you in actually getting you to be able to accomplish what you'd like to accomplish.</i>
41	B4	<i>when I'm saying part-time is get them out of Sacramento. Let them be home. They could do their job on the Internet. They can do all kinds of stuff at home.</i>
42		<i>. I think there's a systemic problems and that's part of it, but the overriding principle, what we ought to be adhering to is less government is better.</i>
43		<i>I think as we've gotten older, we're getting very jaded because we're sick of it. As young people you go, you know what, we can still do this. As we get older we go, how much more can we take; how many more corrupt politicians can we deal with, and we're just frustrated with the whole situation.</i>
44	B7	<i>I would like smaller districts too, but that's increasing government staff.</i>
45	B7	<i>But, I mean, the cost of doubling the legislature is pennies compared to what our problems are. I mean, you can add millions of dollars to people's salaries. Our problems are billions. I think you could make a case that you don't need as big of a staff if you have a smaller district. So have the same number of staff serving twice as many senators and state assembly members, but they're serving a smaller district of people. They're more present. They're more accessible in their field offices, in their community. Serving a smaller group of people. I also think that whether we keep term limits or not, I think a two-year cycle is not long enough because then you're running</i>

		<i>for election another year.</i>
46	B4	<i>And you benefit two ways; one, you're spending more time at your district and you're actually involved with your area; two, you're reducing the cost of the travel. And that's a lot of money right there. I mean, they have to kinda keep up with technology in a sense. They can't use or have the same work ethics ten years ago. They have to –</i>
47	B8/9	<i>No, more often than that. And so B9, I would like B9 better if it included the audit independence concept somehow in there, and the same for B8, economic impact analysis. Well, like the big numbers we had in the initiatives, I would like to see an audit of that come from _____ or somebody's who's really competent to do that and is gonna present the numbers independently.</i>
48	B8 /9	<i>Why can't we have independents come in and do an audit? Why isn't _____ management practices? Why isn't it run more like a major corporation? I voted for Meg Whitman. I'm not a republican or a democrat, registered independent, but I voted for Meg Whitman because I felt like we needed somebody who runs a corporation to take over the running of California</i>
49	B8 /9	<i>Someone who has a business mindset because yeah, I'm a homemaker and I do a candle party business on the sided. In the meantime, if I ran my house the way California is, I'd go to jail. I'd go to jail.</i>
50	B9	<i>I think was wanna ask why not have that other entity be an independent audit.</i>
51	B10	<i>I think it should be done five years.</i>
52	B10	<i>And well, here's the other thing too. Some of these programs take a lot longer than one year to actually see if they're actually working or not.</i>
53	B10	<i>So having one every other year might not be the best thing, but if we're looking at the legislators themselves, we have to do it every two years because they'd be gone otherwise.</i>
54	B8/9	<i>So what would it look like, an audit – I mean, I'm intrigued by the idea of auditing actual legislators. What would you audit? Like how would you –</i>
55		<i>As far as federal government, I'm much more aware. I'm much more informed as what's happening at the federal level. Whereas, the state level – it doesn't – my representative doesn't seem to make much of an effort.</i>
56	B1	<i>But there's no chance you're gonna have a one-on-one with your state representative, where there's a half a million people</i>
57		<i>Returning to the topic, what do you consider effective representation, I think I agree with concerned with the needs of the citizens that he represents or she represents. I think we need to expect from them that they have a long-term _____ that they don't get</i>

What's Next California
Supplementary Report: Transcripts

		<i>into office, like they do now, with a two-year term, and the first item of business is how can I get re-elected? No. 2, how can I satisfy the lobbyists and special interests that got me here? No. 3, how can I not cross the party, so they will continue to fund me? He has to have spine and be willing to stand up for what he believes is right. He or she also has to have the ability to compromise and accept half a loaf. Those are conservative citizens, able to stand up to outside interests and a willingness to compromise.</i>
58		<i>Government should serve the people. The people don't serve the government.</i>
59		<i>Page 33 says, "Columbia University has found that nearly two thirds of the policies adopted by the California legislature match the policies most preferred by voters. The highest rates of similarity are _____. So it sounds like we're not aware that they're doing the job that we want them to do, in some ways.</i>
60	B4	<i>So we're for part-time legislation – legislature.</i>
61	B4	<i>If we're gonna increase the number, I think we need to make it part-time.</i>
62	B4	<i>The devil's advocate to part-time, though, is what do they do in their off time? They've got to work another job</i>
63	B4	<i>I was just going to say that for someone who is representing me in the state – in the largest – in one of the largest counties in the world, I think I would like them to be a professional and to devote their life to that. Because I agree that if someone is working part-time, then you are going to be biased to the job that you have and your free time, and it's going to be one of those pro-bono, extra things. I would rather someone devote their career</i>
64	B1	<i>question would be are we increasing the size to increase efficiency, or are we increasing the size to increase communication with the electorate?</i>
65	B1	<i>A weekly blog that the senator or representative sends out that people can respond to that everybody can read? Is that some way that our representatives can get to know the people that they're representing by going back and forth?</i>
66	B1	<i>I don't mean personally, for them. But how much, as a matter of taxes, are we going to paying the representatives? Are we willing to pay more</i>
67	B2	<i>I agree. The idea that – for the Bay Area, which is so huge and diverse, for them to have three democrats, two republicans, independent and green party, etc., that is much more representational than the geographic demographic thing</i>
68	B2	<i>The attempt of this is to try to stop two parties saying, "No, we want it this way; no, we want it this way," to stop this black and white sort of idea, where our team wins and your team's gonna lose, or our team's gonna win and your team's gonna lose. It brings in more people to the party, so either the republicans or the democrats have to align with the libertarians or with the green party,</i>

		<i>and they have to make some compromises _____ bring up bills, so that it's not just a win or lose situation between two parties. This brings more people to the table.</i>
69	B2	<i>I think so. I think so. If you're a member of the green party, there's a huge difference. You have one – maybe you have one representative in Sacramento; that's somebody</i>
70	B2	<i>It's not that Canada uses this, so they have gridlock and nothing gets done, either. Because obviously, things do get done in Europe and Canada with this system. It may get done differently. They may have more arguments, and yes _____</i>
71	B3	<i>It's less representation for greater efficiency.</i>
72	B4	<i>But anyway – so what I'm saying is if you care about something, you make time for it. So if a part-time person is caring about serving the government, they'll make time for it, just like any of us make time for hobbies and interests</i>
73	B4	<i>I don't want somebody part-time handling the decision that's gonna _____ affect my life during the long term. There's no such thing as halfway crooked. You're either all in or you're not.</i>

74	B1	<i>According to this chart, each of legislator represent more people than are in the entire state of Alaska. This doesn't make sense.</i>
75	B1	<i>How many of us have ever shaken hands in the last ten years with either of our elected representatives, either an assemblyperson, or state senator.</i>
76	B1	<i>I think that's one of the thoughts that this paper was designed to propose. Could we get a more efficient legislative system by taking the two Houses and making them one, and giving each elected representative a smaller constituent base to please? Some of those numbers are up there, like 900,000 each. Man, that's a lot of people.</i>
77	B5	<i>How do you all feel about term limits. Because I know I've come 180 degrees. I voted for term limits, and I think it's one of the worst things we ever did in this state. I may not have liked all of Willie Brown's positions, but if you made a deal with Willie, something that was for the good of the state, it stuck. Because he could ____ and he had enough expertise in the process that he knew how it worked. I mean, you hear this complaint about Sacramento all the time. It's like people up there don't have any institutional member and, you know, it's your two terms here in the assembly. How do you all feel? If you had to vote for term limits right now, today, how many people would vote for them?</i>
78	B7	<i>Well, they get term limited out of the Assembly, then they go to the Senate, then they get parked on something like the Salad Waste Board for a couple of years. I mean, that's what happens. It isn't as though there aren't professional politicians. The one thing</i>

What's Next California
Supplementary Report: Transcripts

		<i>that, from a very— I'm on a board of a non-profit and we're in a small town. And it takes a lot to get your legislative representative to know who you are and what your concerns are. And they do it and you know them and they're gone. So it's kind of nice to have somebody in there for the longer term. And I think it's a really good idea if they don't have to run every two years. Because every two years they're out there handing out their hands. You have to be influenced by who you get your money from.</i>
79	B7	<i>One of the reasons they have to do that is they have to communicate with 900,000 people in your district. You got to do it through media. Watch your election cycle. Six weeks before an election, all of a sudden, man, they're just – you can't escape them. Every spot on the radio, television, that's the way that the sale is made, as opposed to building up a relationship on a personal level over the course of ____.</i>
80	B3	<i>That's why I'm for the bicameral legislature. Because at least in theory the senate is supposed to be more of a temperance to the sway of the public opinion.</i>
81	B7	<i>One of the things that really bothers me – I don't know, maybe longer term limits is the idea, but I don't like the fact that they're constantly campaigning. It seems like you just got elected yesterday, why are campaigning today. I'd like to see a stop to that, or at least cut back some and actually due what we elected them to do.</i>
82	B1	<i>You gotta realize, California is a huge state. So if you keep the same number of representatives, that's just more people per legislator. You've got to at some point increase the size so the legislator would represent less people.</i>
83		<i>As cynical as I am about money having the power to enslave the masses, the last election was really an education for me both in the senatorial and the gubernatorial election, over finance candidate loss. That was the first time I was able to say, "Trust the people a little bit," because I'm a little cynical about trusting the people as well.</i>

84	B7	<i>I'd like to see legislators stay in longer, have less incentive to be looking at the short term, and you know, they'd be more professional.</i>
85	B1	<i>I'd like to see more legislators because California has expanded how many multiples of times since the 1800s when we started this system?</i>
86	B1	<i>Because obviously at 900,000, 937,000 people to be represented per senator is too high</i>
87	B1	<i>So that would be something that I would propose, and then maybe we could reshape that to something that other people can think about. What I'm saying is that where we want to go, to where we can see that a million people per senator is too much? And then do we want to set a level that's acceptable? And then as we meet that, then</i>

		<i>we have to introduce new senators or assembly members.</i>
88	B1	<i>but I'm saying once we lower the amount of people per representative, that's – we're going to end up with a different body.</i>
89		<i>Yeah, I think we need to lower the pensions and they're paying these guys too much for doing a crappy job, and they need to be rewarded on how they do. And they don't need – and I think we need more representatives, but they're being paid too much with their pensions. They're getting all these great incentives when they leave. But they're doing horrible jobs. It's like why do you need to – it's like we're the boss of them. We should reward them for doing good jobs and bringing the country where it needs to be. I don't go to work and expect my boss to give me a raise because I do a horrible job.</i>
90	B4	<i>I would be concerned about that just because you would have – but if you have, but then you get a division of loyalty and focus of attention because if you're a part-time legislator, what do you do with the rest of your _____? Probably you have a job or a business. So how much time are you going to be able to give to representing the people and your constituents when you've got these divided loyalties?</i>
91	B4	<i>For a state this size with the needs that we have, I think we need full-time legislators.</i>
92	B4	<i>My concern, rather than worry about how many people the legislator is representing or how many hours they're working, I'm concerned how much of their time is spent on re-election and campaigning and getting the money and the funds for that campaign. Because it can be – I mean if you're spending 90 percent of your time doing that, then it doesn't matter whether you have ten people or a million people. It doesn't matter whether you're full time or part time. I think that they're spending too much time worrying about re-election rather than doing their job.</i>
93		<i>I say fire them all.</i>
94	B7	<i>I think that looking at the term limits is definitely something that needs to be done. Because they're kind of hamstrung. If you think about it, even though we complain about the way they do their job and how much energy they put into being re-elected, they're kind of hamstrung when they're only getting two years to try to do the job. You know? It's reasonable to consider a three-year term. It's reasonable to set the bar higher for them as individuals representing the amount of people that they represent. It doesn't matter if they represent 900,000 or a million 2. It's still a lot of people.</i>
95	B7	<i>It made that for me, like Eric said, when they get elected, they have a goal set, that's just like any of us had a job and you get your performance once a year and you have to have a goal for your underperformance. So if they get elected, they should have to set at least five automatically, that they're going to achieve these goals and with two and four years, if they move it from two to four years. And then</i>

What's Next California
Supplementary Report: Transcripts

		<i>when they re-campaign, they can say, “Well, I did meet this one, but I didn’t meet this.”</i>
96	B1/B7	<i>So what it sounds like because I’m hearing two different things. I’m hearing that we need more representation, and I’m hearing that we need them to do a “good job.” I’m hearing that we don’t need more legislators. And it all sounds like it’s coming to accountability. So a better way to say doing a good job is accountability. And who are you accountable to if you’re representing a certain district? It would have to be the voters in that district.</i>
97		<i>I’d like to throw out the idea that there’s a difference between accountability and performance. And we tend to use the word accountability when we talk about legislators and the legislative process. But actually, that’s only, in my mind, that’s only half the process. Because accountability is really, you can say it’s almost an ethical kind of dimension. Do you show up? Do you act without self-interest? Act on behalf of your constituents? Do you try to be effective? Do you do all of these things that are ultimately kind of ethical?</i>
98		<i>I agree. When you get in there, like you say, _____ they have this _____ I’m going to do so much work. And their hands are so tied, they say, “Well, I probably will not get re-elected, so I’m just going to do the very minimum to make it look good.” And that’s when they start doing their bare minimum, we are affected.</i>
99		<i>I still think it comes back to the money. On Page 28, there’s a graph of how much was spent for campaign costs in California, all 50 states, it’s way up there. And I think that if you are being funded by a political action committee, you’re going to be accountable to that political action committee. You’re not going to be accountable to one single voter. So I think what really makes a big difference is who’s funding these campaigns.</i>
100		<i>Some of them are. I like to think the ones I’m involved with are. But I also see others that are put together by – when you see the propositions and you try to see who’s backing it, and they have a little crazy name like People For Justice and whatever. And you research all that, you find that that’s being funded by a huge corporation that has interests in that particular matter.</i>
101	B1	<i>I would like to pose a question. Can we reach a number or can we not have a number but envision a number where that’s the limit that a representative can have? Now I heard views against that because it’s going to cost more money to have more representation. But that’s how I pose this, is can we put a target number of constituents per representative? Because as we are leading the way with the numbers that we have here in California, now I don’t believe for a minute that that’s the cause of our demise. But will it improve our legislation?</i>
102	B1	<i>Right. Anyway, from where we’re at right now</i>

		<i>with almost a million people per senator, and nobody else in the nation is close to that, let's take a look at that and see if we can lower that number to better representation by adding more representation?</i>
103	B1	<i>You know, I very much believe that smaller is better and decentralization of government is better. But really, as I think about this, if we change our numbers, I don't have any confidence at all financially that things are going to be better in Sacramento if we double the numbers.</i>
104	B1	<i>It sounds like there's good – I mean there's obviously good and bad on both sides. The upside of having better representation or representing a smaller group of people is accountability. The downside is what it's going to look like in Sacramento. So where's the maybe center? Where's the good? Where's the good –</i>
105	B1	<i>Do the idea of more legislators, one thing that pops in my mind is that if there's more, they might have more diversity. Now they're so polarized as Republicans/Democrats, maybe if there were more of them, there would be some more in the middle and some more in the extremes, and it would break that gridlock because they weren't just two polarized entities.</i>
106	B8	<i>So we take that as a given. Then we're going to say, "Did this person excel in their job as a legislator?" Did they really perform? Did they perform better? Did they perform about average? Or did they perform below average?" And then just as you said a minute ago, all that we can ask them to do is to do the best performing, so to speak. Did they innovate? Did they have all these good qualities? And of course, then we see the results of their actual legislation in the votes that they cast, and how they cast those votes is influenced, just like you said, over time. You know, they may have cast a vote you didn't like about a fiscal matter, but it was during a time of fiscal crisis.</i>
107		<i>I don't know that that's better, but I do know that it may not be worse than some of what we see in Washington. And so can we, if we engineer or re-engineer how the legislature works, can it be done in a way that de-emphasizes a concentration of power, so to speak, in our traditional two-party system? And is that in our best interest.</i>
108	B6	<i>Yeah, would it be helpful or is it possible, you know? I don't know. I really don't know would it be best to have, you know, six political parties represented in California State legislature, especially if they're legislating 100,000 people per district instead of a million. You know, maybe it would be chaos, but it is an interesting question.</i>
109		<i>That's so true, and you know, a lot of the problems are because we've been irresponsible voters.</i>
110	B9	<i>Understanding what you said when you put it to my business, the way I would answer my performance, what I would say,</i>

What's Next California
Supplementary Report: Transcripts

		<i>"How many of my jobs failed," – not design – that's an artistic interpretation – "How many of my jobs failed in 10 years or 15 years?" There's my performance. So that is just like the social engineering. We can't say it while they're in office. When we look at something they voted on and five years down the road, it's had a positive or negative effect, then we can judge their performance.</i>
111		<i>And I understand the distinction. What I would say is I think as voters and as residents of a district, if we have a way of thinking about all three issues, recognizing that it's not perfect, that we would do a better job as voters of being able to put people in the legislature who will serve us, and we would be able to then have better opinions about collectively how the legislature performed in a given session or over a period of time. So it's really just trying to look for ways in which we can begin to hold up a set of, I'll say somewhat objective standards. We all know baseball players, for example –</i>
112	B9	<i>Are they spending tomorrow's money or are they living within? I do think we can assign not accountability, but performance to them while in office with something mentioned in this book called pay as you go. That's a criteria that we could assign for the in the now, not the five years down. How well do they perform based on pay as you go?</i>
113	B7	<i>I think it would give them time to really fight on issues that really matter, because it is a slow process</i>
114		<i>I think the two years is way too short.</i>
115		<i>I think if we lengthened the term of these positions, then we're more likely to see the fight played out.</i>
116		<i>So the less campaigning time they spend the better</i>
117		<i>If you can't get something done in two years, maybe you should not be in the game. ***Again, this is just to throw out a different perspective.***</i>
118		<i>I think the longer you're there, you're able to establish some credibility.</i>
119		<i>The longer you're there, the more likely that is to happen, the more likely you'll be productive and you'll get your bills passed.</i>
120		<i>And so what this would do, it would allow those relationships to remain entrenched.</i>
121	B8-10	<i>I love multi-year. I think it's a good idea. I think that it takes me so long to reach a budget.</i>
122		<i>What about the monies that are not reported? I mean, we have a budget for a certain amount. You know, something for a few years. If we can't do it in the time that we have and be accurate, who is to say that the actual numbers over a span of years are gonna be, you know, represented fully or truthfully</i>
123		<i>now you have these _____ economic factors that, you know, as soon as they change, your entire budget goes out the window.</i>
124	B1	<i>I start this off by saying the legislative representation we have now is completely backward and it's not working very well. The top proposal</i>

		<i>that actually I believe is a proposal, we definitely need more legislators.</i>
125		<i>If we cut down – you think about classrooms, smaller classroom sizes are good, right? It's easier to talk, communicate, get your point across to your teacher. Well, it's the same way with legislative representation.</i>
126	B3	<i>The way our system is set up is on checks and balances. We need the two groups. That's necessary.</i>
127		<i>Yeah, almost. So they give each other a check. You can't do one without the other. If you have one group, that's almost like a dictatorship in the legislature.</i>
128		<i>But if there's a majority in one and not the other – we're giving up a failsafe. The Assembly to the House and the House to the Assembly is a failsafe.</i>
129		<i>I personally think we probably at this point a unicameral House would be beneficial for California because they have such difficulty operating together, anyway</i>
130		<i>And if one's more Democratic, and one's more Republican, and the other one is more Democratic, nothing really gets done. You got about a 33 percent chance of your bill passing.</i>
131		<i>We go to unicameral, let's say. We do the unicameral and we do the proportional legislation, right. So now we have possible many, many hundred legislators in one House, in on Assembly. How is that going to affect the way things get done in that unicameral system.</i>
132	B7	<i>If all they're doing is campaigning all the time and it's all about trying to get enough money to run the next time, it seems like if we gave them twice as long they would have maybe more time to legislate.</i>
133		<i>I think if we had the longer term, and the more legislators, and we have the one House, we could pay – by cutting down on the one House, we can use their money to pay for the more legislators.</i>
134	B4	<i>But if you do the part-time and you send them back home more often, then they could pick up a second job in between doing assemblies and stuff like that.</i>
135		<i>Their salaries may be overblown, but it's a full-time job. I don't know about you, but if people are going to represent me, that's going to be their job. They're going to be representing me. They're not going to go home for six months and take a vacation</i>
136		<i>So we simply put in a thing where let's just pitch them all out periodically and get some fresh faces in here and hope that it's going to do better.</i>
137		<i>Do we want a legislature that spends most of their time campaigning and then get shoved out by term limits whether they do a good job or not?</i>
138		<i>If we lower the representative's pay, my common sense tells me that these people are actually going to want to do their job. Kind of like teachers. We don't pay them anything, but they teach because they love to teach.</i>
139		<i>For example, Texas, _____ legislature. In fact, I think they only meet</i>

What's Next California
Supplementary Report: Transcripts

		<i>every other year. _____. They're part-time, ____, pretty successful. I think there are some lessons to be learned, there. I'm pretty convinced that part-time legislature is the way to go.</i>
140	B9	<i>I want more information about that holds them accountable. I want to know where the money is going. Is the money being used wisely, even though it might not be benefiting me directly.</i>
141	B10	<i>We should know where this money that they want to spend is coming from.</i>
142	B2	<i>I had an American government teacher who said, if you think representative democracy is messy, go to Europe. Because they form coalitions and all kinds of – it's all crazy. And that's a lot of what this would introduce.</i>
143		<i>I would just like them to be honest</i>
144		<i>I'd like them to put the interest of the people above the special interest</i>
145		<i>So the only thing I'd say about my assemblyman and my state senator is it could be worse. They're not good, but they could be much worse, I think</i>
146		<i>I think the legislators and the assembly need people, need to discuss kinda on their constituents versus the special interest groups or whatever</i>
147		<i>So if there is a way the general public could figure out – I mean, figure out who is somebody that's really going to serve me and serve us, without their own interests, without being the people who are running, but we would be voting for.</i>
148		<i>Again, those people who really have a passion, I don't think they'd be able to run.</i>
149		<i>I think a consensus is that we think the state senate is redundant and not necessary.</i>
150	B1	<i>And possibly even larger than 120. Maybe 130 seats or something like that, just because there's so many people in California that need access to their – I mean, how many people even in this room, which is probably more people than most who even know the names of their senators. I mean, I knew one and I knew the other, but I hadn't had a view even before I came. I mean, how many people in this room even know the names of their assemblyman,</i>
151	B1	<i>After election time, once they win the seat, we don't hear anything of them</i>
152	B1	<i>Yeah, but the people, the politicians I tend to respect a lot more held to a single standard of what their position was, like it or not.</i>
153	B1	<i>I'd like to see lobbyists banned in Sacramento.</i>
154	B1	<i>why can't political contributions be taxed, which provides income to the state, plus also it dilutes the influence of companies giving money, at a fairly high rate, 25 percent.</i>
155	B5	<i>so I think combining the idea of longer terms with more term limits. For example, if you have four-year terms in the</i>

		<i>legislature with a four-year term limit, that would be sixteen years, which is more than enough.</i>
156	B4	<i>I am not against them getting a per diem, I'm just saying that the length of the process, it can't be that they're getting a per diem for nine months because that's ridiculous. If you're getting a per diem for nine months, then you should live there. That's enough for you to get an apartment because they're getting paid well enough</i>
157		<i>There's politicians out there that have been in office for many years who have war chests of millions of dollars, and if you it grandfathered in, that _____ a few years ago. The old money they stick in their pocket _____. This all started a few years ago where they have to give the money either back to the constituents or, I guess, charity.</i>
158		<i>Is it possible that politicians cannot run or cannot get jobs, or be on boards after their terms in office?</i>

159		<i>I'll start off. For the most part, in my opinion, I don't think our legislation represents us adequately enough, honestly enough, and transparently enough. And I think the whole system has gotten to the point that it's frozen most of the time, if not all of the time.</i>
160		<i>A better educated populace, you know. It's our fault if these things happen, if we all don't vote. I mean I bet you everybody here votes. Look at how many people don't. It's shocking by how low voter turnout is.</i>
161		<i>Oh, and I'm definitely for term limits. I mean Cesar Chavez was voted into office. He's passed a law that said that now he's dictator. I mean there's a good reason for term limits. You don't – you know, you don't want someone in office for life because now you have just one blinded view towards everything.</i>
162	B1	<i>In my local community, the people who run for local office – so our city council, you know, our mayor – things of that nature. They are truly representative of the people who live in my community. And they are just a citizen who happened to live there who thinks, you know what? I wanna have a voice in what's going on here. And I think my neighbors respect me enough to vote me into having a voice.</i>
163		<i>So my thing is that, you know, nobody wants to fund the elections, but maybe there's a way to cap it or, you know, so that everybody has a fair shot –</i>
164	B1	<i>I think it would be good if the districts were smaller. I think they might be more representative. I think it's worth a try anyway.</i>
165	B1	<i>But then you'd be putting more money out for wages.</i>
166	B1	<i>Take away the per diem.</i>
167		<i>Well, it doesn't seem like they get a whole lot done.</i>
168	B4	<i>Here's my argument for part-time legislature. If you're a boss and you go to work that day, you know, and you say, okay,</i>

What's Next California
Supplementary Report: Transcripts

		<i>this is a job. It takes four hours to do. You have four hours to do it. My employee is gonna take four hours to do it. If I say, okay, here's your job. You have all day to do it. My employee's gonna take all day to do it.</i>
169		<i>We have more people than Italy in California. It's very complicated. I mean I would love it if it could be part time. But, you know, I don't think we're quite giving them credit for everything they have to do. Unless we want a stronger federal government – they keep wanting to send issues back to the state for them to deal with so that it's more representative of us. Well, how do we do that? How do we send everything back to the state and make it like, you know, a part-time hobby to be a legislator. I don't understand that.</i>
170	B4	<i>Again, it goes back to accountability.</i>
171		<i>It's absolutely job performance. That's why the people who have the most money, maybe the most unsavory desirous of a corporation, get the jobs. You know, we get – we choose between people who raise the most money not people who are necessarily well qualified or even well intentioned. That's why I think we should pay for the – it should be publically funded elections.</i>
172		<i>Maybe I'm wrong, but I don't see politicians going in saying we need to cut this, this, this. No, it's we need to do this and do this and do this. And that's all they're talking about is more expenditure.</i>
173	B4	<i>They're the ones that put the constitutional amendments on that we voted for that ended up with the term limits, which ended up with the full-time legislature. We need to go back and look at it.</i>
174	B6	<i>I think that's a great idea.</i>
175	B6	<i>They're so expensive.</i>
176	B6	<i>It would be a cost thing, because it would be – you would have to hand-read the ballots because you would have a first choice and second choice.</i>
177	B6	<i>I think that really – I think that could really backfire in some ways. If there was somebody you really didn't want, that was the only third person on the ballot, I mean, it just seems like there's _____ that somehow you could, you know, the wrong person that neither wanted to get in.</i>
178	B7	<i>Oh, yeah. I like this.</i>
179	B9	<i>Government isn't set up to come in under budget, though. I don't know if you've ever worked with government offices or done anything like that. We work with a lot of cities. So the cities call us. It's 30 days until the end of their fiscal year and they said I have 60 grand I have to spend in the next 30 days; can you please come out and do X? Because if I don't spend it –</i>
180	B9	<i>Well, that's what I like about B-9. It's reviewing performance on programs. I think that's really a very good idea. And I</i>

		<i>think it – like I just said a few times, if something doesn't work, we need a process to get rid of it.</i>
181	B9/10	<i>Well, I still like B-8 and B-9. Accountability for money and accountability for –</i>
182		<i>Barbara Mathieson:</i>
159	B9/10	<i>Well, I think that we should stop funding things that don't work. And I think that we should put money into things that do work.</i>
160	B9/10	<i>I still want them to have more paperwork. And now they have to write to the people and a whole big page of what they've done. And you want to be able to read it. It sounds like that's what you want.</i>
161	B9/10	<i>No, what I would like is another – is some way of reviewing if programs work; and if they don't, I'd like for them to stop. And if they do, I'd like for them to have more funding.</i>
162	B9/10	<i>Now these programs should be reviewed, also, more than once every ten years.</i>
163	B9/10	<i>I would, also, like to hear, though, if a program is not successful, how is it eliminated? Wouldn't somebody be whistle blowing on their own job?</i>
164	B9/10	<i>We never really got to the heart of the matter, really. We've got this great program, this program, that program. We have tons of programs; but really what we need is right now is choices being made about, among the limited resources and possibilities, we need to get rid of these programs until the fundamental question here we are talking about was should we increase the size of the government in terms of the assembly. Do we have more representation or what do we need to do? I mean, we didn't really address any of those questions. We're just gonna end up with more programs.</i>

165	B1	<i>Well, it's interesting, because I frankly feel that, gosh, our representatives have an enormous amount of people that they have to represent. I mean, shouldn't this be broken down a little more and maybe have a few more people involved that can get to know their constituents, too. The tax money has to pay for that. They have to pay their salaries. That's a problem. No question about that. The last thing I want to do is raise taxes.</i>
166	B1	<i>We seem to be managing this discussion with 300 or 400 people here. That's probably the upside. But I certainly think we need more representatives, and I don't see an advantage to two houses.</i>
167	B1	<i>A way we can save money if we increased the number of representatives is to decrease their staff. Maybe have less constituents to deal with, they wouldn't need 17 people, or 6 people per legislator.</i>
168	B3	<i>Can somebody tell me what the purpose is of having another assembly? What's the advantage?</i>

What's Next California
Supplementary Report: Transcripts

169	B3	<i>My question is, what is the check and balance that the two houses provide for each other that good, common sense voting by either, whether it be a representative or a senator. I don't see where that really provides a check. You were talking about state's rights versus people. And the senators are voting, theoretically, for the state and the representatives for the people. I don't understand where the two balance in California.</i>
170	B1	<i>Nebraska is a pretty – I was there in '69 – but Nebraska is a pretty efficient state and they seem to get things done. I like the idea of smaller districts and being able to talk to your specific legislator. I've had an opportunity a couple of times to speak with my person from the Assembly, and even though I don't agree with her on a lot of things – Norma Torres – I'm at least able to have face-to-face contact with her. I think that's the most important thing that we have - people that are closer to us and we're able to speak with them. I would prefer actually having maybe a unicameral, but having more members, where you can – where they're in your community and you can actually speak with them and help them know what you want and have a dialogue with your representative. I think that's probably the most important thing for us as citizens.</i>
171	B1	<i>What I wonder is, is there a difference between – a real difference in what you can do between representing 450,000, as opposed to representing a little over 300,000. It's 150,000 different. You're still representing over 300,000 people. How can it make a real difference?</i>
172		<i>What if we didn't have Republicans and Democrats? Down the ballot, when you get down to like, I don't know, maybe below court recorder or something, it doesn't say Republican or Democrat; it's just the person. What if you had 120 people that weren't Democratic, Republicans, they were just independents or not affiliated.</i>
173	B2	<i>You look at those Proportional representation countries, and it isn't better than here. They have just as many problems, if not more. I don't see that as</i>
174	B1	<i>So do we want to – would we want to pay for that much more cost in order to have potentially representation that hears us?</i>
175	B7	<i>I agree. Because the representatives have two years. In two years, how much – like, by the time you get there, set your office up, do all that stuff, _____ just get into it. And then by the time you have six months of work and you're going to start recampaigning and try to get contributors to do your re-run, re-election. So it seems like two years isn't enough time</i>
176	B7	<i>I think if we were to change it, we could still limit it to being 14 years. I'd like to see it in one House, so that you wouldn't have the problem. But you could serve two, four-year terms, and one six-year term. Or if you're foolish, serve two, six-year terms and you'd</i>

		<i>be done. But limit it to a maximum of 14 years, so we don't have professional politicians that stay forever.</i>
177	B2	<i>I think my argument still is when you look at Europe where that's very common in all these countries, it doesn't appear to work better than our system at all. They spend a lot of time starting all over, reconvening, forming new coalitions. It doesn't appear in all the countries using it as if that's a model that –</i>
178	B2	<i>As a former Canadian, three party system, or multiple party system, as far as I can see, never worked up there. That's the reason Canada can never get anything done. British Columbia, I used to live up there, and all they would do is gang up on each other. There were three parties, and two of them would gang up against the other one, and nothing would happen. It's no better than what we've got. I really get off my high horse on that particular issue. Multiple parties don't work.</i>
179	B7	<i>Because if people aren't worrying about being re-elected in six month, maybe they'll compromise more and get the budget passed. But it's like, if I cave on this, I won't get elected and people will remember because the election is coming up. I don't know. Maybe a longer term will get people more likely to stay at the table and compromise and get something done.</i>
180	B3	<i>I'm leaning toward this idea of this proposal of a unicameral legislature.</i>
181		<i>The problem is, California is too big. You got North Dakota, South Dakota, North Carolina, South Carolina. The people in San Francisco are so different from us down in here in LA. Why don't they split it up and make North California and Southern California</i>
182	B5	<i>With 365 days in the year, and they only spend 110 days in the legislature, what are they doing the rest of the time?</i>
183		<i>I don't think there need to be. I don't feel like automatically representatives might – I do live in San Francisco where my views aren't as extreme as others, but so like when I vote – they're so like – it's not just San Francisco. They have San Francisco in other areas where your view or your representative may not necessarily be voting for what you would want, or whatever. They vote more special interest to get re-elected, as far as going back to the original question: Do we feel represented? I feel that they make more laws, more things for their own interests to stay in the game and be re-elected.</i>
184	B7	<i>They just want to save their jobs. That's what they're concerned about. Like all of us, we don't want to lose our jobs and that's what their main goal is.</i>
185		<i>Because I think that many of our legislators are very visible in the communities. They're doing all kinds of things. And I think asking everybody to report back isn't going to make those who are not doing what they are supposed to do do it. They'll just falsify the reports. I think we need to look at if people are visible, and they're</i>

What's Next California
Supplementary Report: Transcripts

		<i>representing us and they're supporting things and we're seeing them in the community supporting things, then we vote for them again. Even with employers. People can make up all kinds of stuff on their time cards. So asking for a report isn't going to do it.</i>
186		<i>One thing I really want to talk about is the unicameral legislation. It's really interesting to me. I think we should spend more time on that. Get rid of both houses, and you know, instead of having 40 senators and 80 assemblymen, have 120 representatives. I mean I see that as being able to get more done.</i>
187		<i>I was shocked when I read the material, that the numbers that are set right now were set in the 1800s. Our population has grown, you know, 10, 20 times. And so we don't know our representatives. And they don't know us. I mean and so by having, we're a big state. Having more representatives that are then, you know, you get smaller and you get to know them, they're going to come out, they're going to have to talk to you. Then you get more of your representative government, which is what we're supposed to. Right now we don't have – I don't think – yeah, it's called representative government, but you know ____.</i>
188		<i>The issue with the unicameral motion for me is that ____ responsibilities within both houses. So one like starts the budget. One approves the budget or one like approves judges and the other one doesn't touch that</i>
189		<i>Well you keep responsibilities separate so that, you know, there's – not one house can have – well I don't think that's the fault of that structural organization. I think how well that's working is represented – I mean how – what do you consider effective representation by our legislators? What do we expect from them? Well I mean I expect them to make budgets, make decisions on taxes, you know. Make laws for the state. But they're limited by such things as the initiative system that Stewart here was talking about. And I think the whole point of this is it would be less limited, having a unicameral legislation.</i>
190		<i>If you have more representatives so that every one, more representatives, more senators, then you have more people – the representation's a little bit closer and you still have those viewpoint, we'll go over, we'll do that. They have different functions and each function is kind of like you're not in your own clubhouse. You're not saying, "Let's just do whatever we want."</i>
191		<i>same about gerrymandering. I just feel that the impartial redistricting ____ redistribution of ____ it just really ____ minority groups. I'm personally Latino and I know that districts are shaped so that our voting power as a minority is consolidated in one area. That way our opinions are just kind of – they're – we're not able to fully, I guess, ____ our voice and allow it to be heard in the way that it should be expressed. ____ substantial part of the population in the state, and unfortunately because of the redistricting and other measures, it's really ____.</i>

192		<i>Which one of those legislators – that legislator who represents influential people is going to do a lot more for his constituents than somebody who doesn't know their constituents or doesn't go out into the community in certain neighborhoods. So there's a huge discrepancy there. I agree with Victor.</i>
193		<i>But the point he's making is a very powerful point because it's the device that has been used for a long time to minimize the impact of minorities. And that is to draw the districts so that they get one representative that's a minority instead of having the chance to have representatives from four or five districts. So if you concentrate them all in one place, they'll elect a Hispanic or an Asian or a black or whatever. But there's only going to be one.</i>
194		<i>one of my concerns is that it's not economically equal, economically, like he was saying. You know, there's – if you're representing Beverly Hills or you know, where are they drawing the line? So I completely agree with you, culturally yes, we see that and economically. And there's that – they can make that division, you know, between – and I just –</i>
195		<i>we're all in agreement that we want to increase the size of the legislature</i>
196		<i>How are we going to pay for it? We've got to pay them.</i>
197		<i>The structure of – the tax structure. There are any number of – well, I'm saying one can, you can identify efficiency and effectiveness. You can attach it to the number of legislators and say, "Okay, it would be more efficient and effective if we have more of them." Or you can say, "It's not efficient and effective for other reasons, and the number of them doesn't matter." So if you want to have more of them, you think it would make it more efficient and effective, then we should. We should be in support of that. If you think that there are other problems, then maybe changing the number doesn't really doesn't address the problem.</i>
198		<i>You tend to, in proportional representative systems, overseas anyway, how it's played out is you get more smaller parties represented. So you get Green Party, you get far right parties. You get people who could never muster a majority from any district because they're just too far out there or too specialized. These are people who end up being _____ to your congress or your parliament. If you think that's a good thing or not, hey _____.</i>
199		<i>But if you had a coalition where you had the Green Party and _____ and the Tea Party over here and all that, then you'd have to negotiate because the Democrat you don't have a majority and the Republican don't have a majority. So you have to have a coalition. So you have to talk to these other groups and say, "You support me, you know, and we agree to support this," sort of thing. So you actually become more inclusive.</i>
200		<i>The initiative process tried to say, okay, we're going to force your feet to the fire to make these adjustments to each other, make you work</i>

What's Next California
Supplementary Report: Transcripts

		<i>together. We tried to make them work together. You're still going to have that situation unless they do lose their _____. They still have to be able to work together. I mean they've got to realize they've got to pass the budget. But I mean this thing's in dire straits</i>
201		<i>The _____ threshold's not a 5 percent threshold. I mean with proportional representation, there has to be a threshold that you meet, and then you get a representative.</i>
202		<i>But I agree. You give these other people too much power. You give them way too much power.</i>
203		<i>There should be more people involved, not just two parties _____. You get – it would be interesting because it would cover a lot better more people, not just for the two sides that are just battling each other because they just don't like each other. That's pretty much what it's becoming. _____ and that's it. Because you're a Democrat, I don't care what you say. That's what it's become. It's become pretty much like a turf war. So by making it proportional, you've got somebody whose mind is actually still influencing the people because their party's still so much smaller.</i>
204	B4	<i>I am pretty much in favor of this (B4). I think these people need to spend more time in the real world, working real jobs like the rest of us so that they don't forget what it's like. I think that's enough said.</i>
205		<i>But more than that, people think, oh, just go to the end vote and come back. To be a legislator, there's so much – it's personalities, knowing the system. It's giving ahead, how this is the way things are here. To have somebody coming in, it's not like okay, stack those books and then you can leave. You need to have the experience. That's one of the reasons the trouble with _____, which is just as you're figuring out the system of how it works, they go, you're gone... If anything, there should be more people, there should be more days that they're there.</i>
206	B5	<i>I don't agree with it(B5) because I think that with the log jam that we have in congress, our assembly, we really need to get this stuff done. And as you have for pro teams in sports, send a scout out and have a representative that reflects what your interests are so that they can meet and greet the people and give the word in their ear and go directly back to their person and say, "This is what this group is saying." You can't have your legislator spread themselves too thin because they're not going to reach everywhere like Carolyn was saying.</i>
207		<i>Well I agree that they need to spend more time in _____ working.</i>
208		<i>I'd like to say that you have to pay them to be there, which is why I was so in favor of the part-time thing. But now I'm actually starting to be swung in the direction of maybe they should be working on this a little bit more because there really is a lot of work to do.</i>
209		<i>B6. Instead of picking – you don't vote for just the one person you want to win. You vote for your top three people or your top five people or something like that. I just have to say something _____. That shouldn't be a problem anymore. It's not 2004 anymore. We have a lot better</i>

		<i>technology, and as long as the people who are in charge of the technology are impartial, which is another problem, and probably a whole can of worms, and are using the best available equipment and the hardware and software are maintained properly, that really shouldn't be a problem.</i>
210		<i>It doesn't give the voters a sort of direct second choice. You have different candidates, then you have your, okay, these two guys need to run off, and you have to make like which of those two do you prefer? Versus the instant runoff where you're rank-ordering. The fourth con there, very strange things can happen, is never a phrase you want in your election. That there could be three or more candidates and the rank ordering can end up with a result that's actually extremely unpredictable because of how people will put someone down as being their second or third choice. It can also change how people vote tactically... So I guess I would sort of oppose on the grounds that you get to make your choice and it gets to be very clear. These two people are running against one another. We get to now choose between them.</i>
211		<i>I think the problem is it takes out the money because you're putting more people in the pot, so this guy can't spend all his money attacking the better guy. He'll have to spend, divide his money attacking four people</i>
212	B7	<i>I think that it (B7) would be fine because it gives people more time to build up their like knowledge of how everything works. As long as you still _____ returns.</i>
213		<i>Yeah. I think they should lengthen the terms because you do need that experience, you know, and you build experience. When you start out in the beginning, you're a novice and you learn. And I know with me, I've been in my job for many years, and I'm still learning. And every year, I learn more and every year I do a better job than I did before. So I think like having that time to get the experience behind me and to learn the job better, I do a better job.</i>
214		<i>I'd like to see this after we increase the number of legislators, make them more accountable to us. Then we have a better opportunity of getting the right people in there before we _____. Right now, I don't care if they're not that up to – because I don't really feel I'm being represented well anyway right now. I'd like to see it fixed before we start lengthening the term. But I do understand the complexity of our system, so _____.</i>
215	B8	<i>I am against B8 for all of the reasons stated. It is much too iffy and too unpredictable to predict the future.</i>
216		<i>I would say I was in support of B8 because I'm majoring in econ right now, and more work for me would be nice. But it would be – I do – but no, it would be very iffy and you'd probably have like an economic impact analysis that said, "This could happen if this happened, or conversely it would be awful if this happened as a result of this." And there'd just be too many permutations to occur for it to be effective.</i>

What's Next California
Supplementary Report: Transcripts

217		<i>What the legislative analyst does is a fiscal impact, which is different. It doesn't say, "How's this going to make businesses thrive or make businesses suffer?" Or so forth – that kind of thing. So the fiscal impact is this is what it will do to the budget. And the economic impact analysis would be this is what it's going to do to the economy. This is what's going to happen. This is what it's going to do to creating jobs or cutting jobs. And that is a different kind of an animal.</i>
218	B9	<i>I don't have a problem with B9.</i>
219		<i>I agree. I think there's a good argument for holding companies to the same – I mean for holding government to the same procedural standards and performance-based standards as companies, especially public ones, that private ones too, are held to. Because it kind of just intuitively made sense to me, but maybe I'm just naïve.</i>
220		<i>I agree with what she's saying, and I had kind of thought about this yesterday after discussing this topic with some other people, that you know, in businesses, you have your three to five-year business plan set, and sure, you might need to make some adjustments, depending on you know, what your projected, you know, revenue and all of that. But three to five years out, you kind of have a framework for what you're working on.</i>
221		<i>I'm happy with it. It reminds me a lot of what we've only recently been doing with our K through 12 education, and that _____. I think it would be great in other places _____ good for education, but we're _____.</i>
222	B10	<i>(B10) multi-year planning rather than one year at a time.</i>
223		<i>The budget has to fund the government activities for whatever period of time it's set up for. So if you set it up for one year, it's set up for one. If you set it up for two years, it's set up for two years, and if you're _____ services, you're going to get X amount of dollars in Year 1 and X amount of dollars _____.</i>
224		<i>It limits a little bit the impact of jolts and jumps in the economy because okay, we're doing the _____ revenue over two years as opposed to one year. It also, depending when you do the budget, what year it is, it takes, it could take it out of the election cycle. Because if the budget is on the off year, not everybody running on this budget right now, I'm not going to do that because a year from now when the election comes, everybody forgot what you did, and _____ you did.</i>
224		<i>I think it's easy to complain about the politicians. And I'm not saying there's anything wrong with it. I do it myself. But really we're the ones hiring those politicians, so at some point we have to question our apparent lack of ability to hire people, in a sense.</i>
225	B2	<i>...it's a mistake to kind of try to tie their hands to a certain course of action, beforehand. Because as you become a legislator, or a governor, or whatever, you do learn and your positions may evolve for credible reasons. You have to compromise.</i>
226	B4	<i>anybody who cares enough about their state and what's going on it</i>

		<i>doesn't – they don't have to get paid to do something.</i>
227	B4	<i>And just because you're elected for that job, you shouldn't be paid this much money. You were elected. We elected you. You ran for that office. You wanted that office. You got it. But you don't – where do you get the right – where do you have the right to make \$500,000 because you sit at a desk with a sign that says Joe Blow Top Notch.</i>
228	B4	<i>They still get money with workers' comp, workers' compensation. Schwarzenegger presented a midnight deal to the legislature, said this is what I want to do. I want to cut this, this, this and this. Midnight deal. They don't even read it. They approve it.</i>
229	B7	<i>I'm concerned about the proportional representation. I think that's up to me, although I do not like term limits at all, for the reasons that everybody has brought up really well</i>

229	B5/B7	<i>From a democratic point of view, you can say we do have terms limits; it's called elections. If people don't want to re-elect their representative as a member of the Assembly or the State Senate, we don't re-elect. If someone wants to re-elect the same person, that's the choice of the voters in that district.</i>
230	B2/B6	<i>I'd like to know a little bit more about proportional representation. I'm wondering if that means that the top three vote getters are elected. Do they have equal say in the legislature or do they have proportional say?</i>
231	B3	<i>the needs within that district would be so diverse that it would be very difficult to really get a grip on what people want. I mean, if you live in Northern California in a smaller town, it's so completely different than living down here where you have the dense population. So I see it as an issue of, again, feeling represented if you have this huge district with so much diversity</i>
232	B3	<i>To start there. Start there, see what happens when we get the community involved. Looking at those – like he was saying, you don't understand the wording. Bring people in that have the education that can understand. Bring the ones that really care.</i>
233		<i>I think our legislators work hard. I think we need to realize a massive state. We have the eighth largest economy in the world</i>
234		<i>These proposals are shameful, the ones you asked about down there.</i>
235	B2	<i>They all have to be almost exactly the same in population, but the organization, whether it's the state legislature, they gerrymandered it. They shaped them in certain ways to favor one political party.</i>
236		<i>This is so basic. This is the real constitutional issue. You're changing the whole structure.</i>
237	B 4, 5, 6	<i>B4, 5 and 6 would be like a slap in the face and that could be brought into that question.</i>
238		<i>A mandated constitutional revision</i>
239		<i>This would be sort of a maintenance procedure</i>

What's Next California
Supplementary Report: Transcripts

240	B6/B9	<i>There's a basic disconnect. When you give somebody responsibility, you have to give them an equal amount of authority and resources to carry that responsibility out. I think that's the problem we're having between funding and carrying out services. I was just thinking, you can't even fire an ineffective teacher because of the civil service law. Basic accountability even at that level we don't have, so how are we going to be accountable for the entire program?</i>
241		<i>The ones I'm most familiar with do. [elected officials do represent me well] I think that there are some people out there that are corrupt. But a lot of these guys _____ help to serve us and try and do what they can. So these are a couple of _____ I would vouch for a couple of people that I have dealt with.</i>
242		<i>I personally don't – I'm a conservative living in San Francisco.</i>
243		<i>_____ do a good job. I mean they listen to us. We have a lot of public forums in San Diego. Our people down there are constantly doing public stuff where you can come in and listen to them. They constantly are calling me, and I live way up in East County, and they're saying we're going to have this particular – come to this meeting, listen to this. And I would say a minimum of four to six times a year, they offer, the assembly persons for my district have _____. And I'll be honest with you. I was negligent. That's why I'm here is because this really woke me up, is that I have to be more aware, take advantage of these opportunities as they're trying to offer it to us.</i>
244		<i>The state legislators, I never hear from them.</i>
245	B1	<i>Page 27, Table B1, is an eye opener to me. Issues on the _____. California, residents per legislator in the lower house, half a million? What's wrong with this picture, folks? How can a legislator represent a half a million people effectively? And the residents in the upper house are a million almost. Compare that to the rest of the national average. Even New York has better representation than California.</i>
246	B3	<i>That's why I tend to think that the issue is more, almost like a federal/state divide. California is the seventh largest economy in the world. It is like a whole nation.</i>
247	B3	<i>It's more important to have representation than to have two different houses</i>
248	B3	<i>I think B3 is limiting us.</i>
249	B2	<i>I'm very conservative and I'm in a very liberal area. And so I like the fact that I have some representation because it's kind of all or nothing at this point. And I was even thinking about when we elect a candidate, we know their views or you have an idea of their views. And so when we vote them in, are we saying to them, "You can now go make decisions based on your views because we voted you in?" Or are they still supposed to be open-minded to all of the views in their district and constantly taking in feedback? And sometimes they need</i>

		<i>to vote against their own personal view because they know that that is what – I don't know how often that would happen, but I mean there are candidates where they had conservative views on some things and liberal on others. So I think this would just more fairly represent.</i>
250	B2	<i>It's the right direction, yeah.</i>
251	B2	<i>Yeah, they might go really well together. Then you'd have maybe – well, we're kind of wondering if you'd have more checks and balances. I mean this is almost where you have to be a political science PhD to study these different systems of government, to how it really pans out. We're just using, what do they say rational ignorance, is that the phrase? That's what I feel like –</i>

252	B6	<i>So _____ the top five is a good start. You know, it's a good start. I understand that, you know, they've got time limits and got what? Forty days prior to the election so people could throw their money in after that so the general public doesn't know really who's footing the bill for the initiative, but it's a good start. You know, maybe down the road we can make some other changes to that, but you've got to start somewhere.</i>
253	B7	<i>My opinion on A-6 is I am for A-6. Okay, so if you look at the breakdown of percentage of income that the populace pays, people on the lower end of things pay a larger percent of their income towards all kinds of taxes, you know, be it sales tax. Assuming that there's more people that are around the poverty line than otherwise, I think they should be able to say, well, if we put out more taxes, we should be able to have a little bit more control of issuing bonds and that; because our belts are tight enough.</i>
254	B9	<i>You think it's one thing. I think it's another thing. And we're like, oh, yeah, we're for it or, oh, we're against it. It's because we don't understand it. I don't understand it.</i>

255		<i>you'll get either an assemblyman or a senator that represents a very large area, and within that area, you've got very, very different demographics. So how can they adequately or effectively represent their constituents, when you've got constituencies that really conflict? For example, Lois Wong in Davis, represents Davis, which is the second-highest educated community in _____. Then, you've got West Sacramento next door, and then you've got Stockton, just across the delta, and they're two very, very blue collar, high crime – especially Stockton – totally opposite of what Davis is. So that representation _____ as a member of local government, I know it doesn't</i>
256	B1	<i>More is better.</i>
257		<i>I kinda think more isn't better because when you have a group of people – have you ever heard of that _____ and you're just adding on to what these people who are supposed to be in charge of other stuff</i>
258		<i>It's just gonna be a waste of time.</i>

What's Next California
Supplementary Report: Transcripts

259		<i>But we still can't, in many cases, get the majority to agree. So why would we double the numbers?</i>
260	B2	<i>, this is not a bad idea. It's a parliamentary approach to it, but you're going to have greater diversity. You're gonna have – not one extreme candidate and another extreme candidate and whoever has _____ wins.</i>
261		<i>you have one district, and you have two people you could go to _____ less polarized legislature.</i>
262		<i>Okay, another flaw with this – the guy – the fifth guy that got elected gets 8 percent of the vote. The No. 1 guy got 51 percent. They have the same votes in the legislature, correct?</i>
263	B3	<i>The intent behind the two is an increased check and balance,</i>
264		<i>My question is would a unicameral House function sufficiently well for a state as large and as _____ as this state is? It may be fine for Nebraska, but I'm sure they don't have the issues that we do in this state – just the sheer numbers of _____</i>
265	B5	<i>See, and it's not like they've never been to their districts before.</i>
266	B6	<i>I think we need to be careful about these kind of proposals that are intended to maybe save a little bit of money and streamline the election process. You want the person that gets the majority of the vote to represent</i>
267		<i>I think, also, this is really sort of an alternative to the at-large system, where _____ the top so many vote getters _____</i>
268	B7	<i>the fundamental problem in government now is that you have these people that become career politicians. They get entrenched with special interests groups. They get entrenched with special local government staff that enable them to continue getting _____ quid pro quo that goes on there. You scratch my back; I'll scratch yours. I think a lot of the solution – part of the solution to fixing _____ got to be term limits.</i>
269		<i>But my concern is the longer that you're in office, the longer – the more you become a career politician, the more entrenched you become with special interests –</i>
270		<i>At the same time, though, if you're – if you're never gonna run for re-election, what's to keep you from _____ all the money you can _____ you can, doing their job and _____ you're not gonna get re-elected anyway, so who cares?</i>
271	B8	<i>it could also be a first step. We have to start somewhere.</i>
272		<i>different permutations. So if you – let's say you cut ten different programs. So if you _____ Program 1, but not all the other _____. You have to analyze so many different configurations just to _____ suggesting that _____ very difficult undertaking for each _____</i>
273		<i>So this may actually not be doable.</i>
274	B9	<i>_____ I know that the performance-based standard _____ educational programs that we have in our schools have been completely ineffective</i>

		<i>in setting standards that are _____ for our school districts. Why would this be any different?</i>
275	B10	<i>If anything, we should become more frequent or at least have part of the process include some evaluation of the revenues to try and adjust expenditures to hopefully match _____ two-year budget I don't think makes sense</i>
276		<i>It seems to me like we need a long-term plan with short-term</i>
277	B7	<i>You mentioned short term. They're just focusing on that next election. I'm sure we'll get into current events shortly this weekend. But if they're only looking at making people as happy as possible right now, what does that do in the long term?</i>
278		<i>To me, if somebody's good and effective and doing a good job, why not keep 'em in? You know you have the option to vote people out who are not doing a good job.</i>
279		<i>But I think extending it to four to six years, then it would, also, maybe clue in people to vote more because it's not happening every two years. It's like, oh my goodness, it's six years, we've gotta really focus on who we're voting for, who we're electing who's going to last. As opposed to like it comes up so often that I feel like there's no collective memory on.</i>
280		<i>But by lengthening the terms, what about the guy that gets in there and doesn't do what he represented he would do?</i>
281	B4	<i>That's the exact opposite, which I think would be great since – in legislatures, that's the way _____. You, obviously, had to go back and live under the laws that you create.</i>
282		<i>I mean and the average person go and work part time at this complex job in Sacramento and still maintain some sort of other life. I mean, does it just favor the wealthy people who can afford to go work for a small salary?</i>
283		<i>Well, and also if it's part time, it would just give more strength to the bureaucracy; because if they're only there part time, our economy is a certain size.</i>
284		<i>I don't think it's a part-time job. I don't think it's – even if it's the idea that they return to their districts for the other part of the time. I don't want my legislator to be part time.</i>
285		<i>If we have shorter terms, we've got – if they had shorter terms it would be – it would break the ties to special interest, and it would increase tendency to vote on principle. But at the same time, it would be shorter one to weed out the good and the bad politicians, so to speak.</i>
286	B3	<i>The only difference is they've got different lengths of term. And part of that is if somebody only has two years, they're more responsive to the people than someone that has four. But that's not even enough to differentiate. I would see, just say make it all four. Make it all one group and be done with it.</i>
287		<i>Let's go back to this thing of just having one house or whatever you</i>

What's Next California
Supplementary Report: Transcripts

		<i>wanna call it. I think makes a lot of sense for California. And I don't see, as you said, the distinction after I started thinking about it. And there isn't really a good distinction.</i>
288		<i>It cuts the cost in half.</i>
289		<i>I think that with one house instead of two, you've got less debate, less competition. I love it with – you know, I wish there was a third party that came out. You just need more competition in the viewpoints. And they'd be forced to come out with better debates, better reasons for why they're voting for it. If we lose that, we only now have one body going up against the governor instead of two bodies.</i>
290	B2	<i>You've seven or eight different parties going on. And you only govern by pulling together some sort of</i>

291		<i>B1-I agree on – they want to shrink, it said they want to shrink the districts on this and increase the representation. I'm not in favor of that. I'm actually of – I'd be more in favor of not shrinking them, but rather to have larger districts with less representation.</i>
292		<i>And it requires larger, rather than smaller, districts. So that is – in other words, if you make smaller districts, you wed yourself to not using proportional representation. So I'm bringing it up here and showing them that so that you realize that if you're in favor of the smaller districts, you eliminate proportional representation as an option. Because when there's only one person representing all the people, the people who didn't want that person can't be represented.</i>
293		<i>We're way out of balance compared to the rest of the country. We're the worst. So the amount of people represented by our assembly members and our senators too is just atrocious. And it hasn't been changed for 100 years or something. And I have a wonderful young, Luis _____, he's my senate member, he's just awesome. And I think he can do an even better job if he is not representing so many people.</i>
294		<i>And by making these larger districts, so you have more representatives representing the district, the minority gets a say. If you're a Republican in Berkley right now, excuse me, but you're screwed. You're never going to have a representative. But with proportional representation in Berkley, you could, 10 percent of the people at Berkley re Republicans, and you had ten representatives, they would have one. It's much more democratic.</i>
295		<i>You can vote a bullet, which means you can put all your votes on one candidate, but you're actually going to get multiple representatives in this situation. That's the piece that's not in either one.</i>
296		<i>Before I agree with this I would want to know how our assembly members seem to have different rules and different percentages of how their votes count and all that. I would want to know what the proposal is and the responsibilities for that new structure.</i>
297		<i>So I want to know which way they're going to be going. Also we've implemented term limits a few years ago. We kind of went to a single</i>

		<i>house because what happens is people are in one house for two terms and then they switch over to the other house for two terms. So we have assemblymen who were senators and vice versa. They get confused about how to do it. So I'd be not against looking at this, but I would need much more information.</i>
298		<i>It seems the running of this, and you can't run a business part-time. You have to pay them well because it is a huge business. We're what? The seventh largest economy in the world?</i>
299		<i>I believe the initiative process should be used because it gives the people a bigger voice, and I believe the legislature should be proportional for the amount of people in their district and their representation, and that they shouldn't be part-time.</i>
300		<i>I'm not in favor of this because if we increase the number of representatives, definitely you will have a better chance to speak to them _____ one on one. So I don't want _____ into this, especially it's a very complex, diverse state. A lot of money is involved. A lot of the people have _____ issues. _____. I'm not in favor of this.</i>
301		<i>The thing on this, I think they should limit their campaigning in the districts. I don't _____ that, but instead of coming down to campaign, come down to meet constituents instead of spending their time getting their votes and going to the luncheons for your support _____. That's what I would add to this, that the campaign time be spent in the district.</i>
302		<i>I'd like to know how much, what they're doing with their time. And one of the problems now is their calendars, they don't ever release it to the public. It's all confidential. So you don't know if they're spending their time with their constituents or whether they're spending their time with special interests.</i>
303		<i>I would not want to cut the legislative time. But I do agree that there is a lot of good technology out there. They could Skype with each other. I mean I think there's a lot of good thinking that went in to the length of the legislature, their sessions. And I think – I don't really see anything that's broken _____ to fix it. You know?</i>
304		<i>So if we have a legislative calendar that shows when they're in Sacramento for the entire year, we can assume, or at least expect them in our area the rest of the time. So _____ for representation, you should be able to contact the person and say, "I want to speak to this person."</i>
305		<i>The way we do it now, if three people run for an office and one person wins, they might only have 40 percent of the votes. Sometimes in a primary election, it's real low voter turnout, so it's just like a few thousand people choosing. But when you can switch, and runoffs are very expensive. So instant runoff eliminates the need for a later runoff election. Essentially you're compressing it so that you do your runoff right at the polls.</i>
306		<i>You know, San Francisco spent as much as \$2 million on each election. And if they have to continue doing it each time, I mean and then to do it</i>

What's Next California
Supplementary Report: Transcripts

		<i>on the state level, think of how much money we would save as a state if we did it one time. I think it's something worth giving a try. But there is a chance, like you said, for absolute _____ or collusion as you said.</i>
307		<i>But yes, we need to do city by city. And _____ I completely understand your ideas about the security and integrity questions. If you look at the movie Black Box Voting and what happened during the Bush election, that movie, it shows how very corrupted the system was with _____. And I think it's a reasonable thing to say, "Well, is there a backup in writing? How can we track it?" It is possible to do it and it's not as easy. And the system has been corrupt and that's a perfectly good question, is how technically _____.</i>
308		<i>And the way to balance that question that Joan has is not to say big money, but to say how do you balance the money involved in the initiative process between what the citizens put in and everyone else puts in.</i>
309		<i>See, I'm in favor of term limits. I don't want _____ going every four years and politicians go there and they're working for _____ years and they're embedded into the system. And you don't see any system changing or anything happening. There is a gridlock. I want the limit so that our voters _____ or whatever the line is, they should get out and let the fresh blood come into it with fresh ideas. This is a very complex theory and I'm in favor of _____.</i>
310		<i>I think proportional representation, changing the structure for proportional representation so you have more of the people. You have more of the vote in the senate and the house, is the best question to have. Why can we not have more proportional representation? Because everything else can be done at the ballot box, this thing all talks about. Everything else can be done at the ballot box.</i>
311		<i>If you do not have a rainy day fund in any budget that has to do with the government, it doesn't matter if you have a 10-year, 20-year or 30-year budget. If you don't have a rainy day fund for when things go wrong, which they often do, what good does it do to even have a ten-day budget.</i>
312		<i>How can we remove party politics from legislative decision-making?</i>
313		<i>It's only proportional representation. If we could get up to 5 percent voter registration. People won't register _____. They think it's a waste. Because there is no proportional representation. If we had proportional representation, we could up to say a 5 percent threshold is reasonable. If we could get 5 percent of the people in California to register Green, we could get somebody elected and that would take away from the two-party system.</i>
314	B1	<i>I think that's part of the solution, is we have to get more legislative districts so people represent a fewer number.</i>
315	B4	<i>Yeah, that statement, I think, personally, I hadn't thought of that before. I'd thought about, yeah, I think a part-time legislature would</i>

		<i>be good.</i>
316	B4	<i>Part-time gives the lobbyists a lot more power.</i>
317	B5	<i>I mean I see politicians occasionally that come up and they'll come to this event or they'll come to that event. But I don't really see them – I don't know. It's like would they really be honest and really spend time getting to know the people and getting to know what they want, that type of thing? Or is it just going to be more of a social event for me, you know?</i>
318	B1	<i>And law enforcement and how it all relates to us. When you have a small number of people that you're representing, you get much more opportunity to interact</i>
319	B4	<i>Yeah, see that's the thing. I'm in an unincorporated place. I know who my state senator is, and I have no idea who else represents me. And I think the area that I'm in includes Palm Springs, and I know that's where my state senator spends most of the time. That's like 100 miles from my house. So I never see these people. Maybe if they worked part-time, I might see them. But still it's a huge area.</i>
320	B1	<i>Yeah, I know. That idea of making smaller areas, they showed the numbers on how many people these people represent. If that means that I could actually see my representatives every once in a while, I would be all for that. If I could get to know these people besides, oh, I recognize that name.</i>
321	B1	<i>Break California up into four states, and have a Confederation of California basically to replace the California State government. You would have the State of Jefferson which is up in northern California. The Bay Area, which would be an urban area _____ Sacramento. The other urban area up to Santa Barbara all the way down to San Diego, _____ California.</i>
322	B1	<i>And it would cost too much. The cost would go up.</i>
323	B1	<i>Yeah, 435 people in the House of Representatives. We're talking about 120 here, for a state that has 10 percent of the population of the country. So I don't know that necessarily adding more people necessarily creates more difficulty. I think it allows for closer representation, and I think going back to what _____ the issue with the gerrymandered districts, I like what you said about the staffing though. Because my state senator has offices in three different cities. You know? We'd be able to eliminate some.</i>
324	B general	<i>And the people are reporting more directly towards the smaller group and have that inkling of, I better do the right thing and I better represent them and I'd better not be bought off. Otherwise, it's going to show. I think that that might be a good thing. So spreading out that responsibility across the state, I think would be a good thing. Make the terms longer, seeing if we can come up with a two-year budget cycle where they don't have to meet year-round,</i>
325	B7	<i>My only concern with the two-year cycle – I like it – my only concern with it, and personally, I don't think it would be a</i>

What's Next California
Supplementary Report: Transcripts

		<i>deal killer, is the way the budget, or the revenues fluctuate in the state, something you've got to somehow level out. So we don't go from these years where we have profits, excess, to the next year we're real short money.</i>
326	B general	<i>they put the information on their website, and they're like, "Here. There you go. You want to see," – they should approach that, you know – I mean they're working for us. They should tell us what's going on. So like today, they all call because we are their voters. So I guess government has the power to email us or send us a kind of communication and telling us what they are doing. So that's a good idea.</i>
327	B1	<i>I'm not sure that more legislators is necessarily that much more representative. I mean I feel like I'm just not compelled that just because we had even 50 percent more state legislators, that people are necessarily better represented. I'm not sure that – you don't need to have a giant sample in order to have a representative sample. Going from 80 to 120, I'm just not sure. I mean rural underpopulated areas are still going to be more or less proportionally represented, so they don't have a difficult time getting their voices heard by the state. I don't know. Maybe it's my own personal ignorance on the issue, but it seems almost moot to me, you know, whether or not you're increasing the number of legislators, and the cost of the their salaries.</i>
328	B1	<i>I mean ultimately, the question what I see in a lot of this is, has California become so big that it's ungovernable? Because when we have one representative for 500,000 or a million people, is that so big that it's become ungovernable? And would it be better to consider breaking California into two states rather than having twice as many legislators, we have two states? How that process would be dealt with, that's somebody else's issue.</i>
329	B General	<i>So why do we have representative democracy? Either because we don't trust individuals – direct democracy – or because it's practical to have a representative that –</i>
330	B3, B5	<i>I want my legislators to provide leadership, to have the overall picture, and really pay attention to people on the margins and people who don't have a voice. I really want them to help lead this forward 'cause sometimes where I'm _____ California, and we really need people who are paying attention and moving forward so they're a couple steps ahead of the direction we should be going, to be a compassionate, caring, productive, effective state. That's what my hope is.</i>
331	B9	<i>Well, it's kinda like a good teacher, or anyone who is a leader, right, so if you think about it, your teachers are your parents. You don't necessarily agree with – you don't have the same opinions, the same point of view, but we put our trust in our teachers, or our boss, or</i>

		<i>whoever. We're there for one reason or another, and so I think our legislators, we elected them for a reason, well, to serve, but to lead us.</i>
332	B2	<i>We have accessibility, which we can't have unless you create a larger number of representatives, but then you have a practical problem. How do you house these people?</i>
333	B3	<i>This was modeled after the federal government, and the reason the federal government had two houses, the senate and the congress, is that the states wanted equal representation regardless of what their population was. Does that really reflect now, or necessary for California?</i>
334	B3	<i>I don't think so because according to this it looks like both are proportional. One, the senate just has larger districts with more people, but it's not like these counties are represented by senators. It's like they're still divided by population, so we have two houses that are population representatives. Do we need two separate houses?</i>
335	B4	<i>Vote for an organization and pay 'em zero.</i>
336	B1, B2 D General	<i>I just don't think you can sell Californians on increasing the size of representation and increasing the cost of government.</i>
337	B7	<i>I think that'd make a lot of sense in terms of getting them off the needing to constantly raise money for their campaigns, which is you look at the numbers for running for assembly and senate in California, the numbers are just off the scale. I mean we're – if you've read –</i>
338	C5, B10	<i>Having worked for the federal government for a long time, one thing I know about the annual budget is when you get near the end of the year, it's like, oh, we still have \$40,000 left in our budget, and spend it. 'Cause if you don't spend it, you'll lose it. If we could carry that over to the next year –</i>
339	B10	<i>Well, I think that budgeting on a two-year basis would probably work best, but I – and you can always adjust budgets. Usually there's a budget review at the middle of the period, so you can look at how things are going. I think it'd be a lot easier to budget on a two-year basis.</i>

4. STATE AND LOCAL REFORM

No.	Proposal	Quote
1	C3	<i>So C3 does look good because you can say, “We should do that. We should that.” But there’s no money for it.</i>
2		<i>So are any – it looks like we all agree that there’s – we should still maintain state, regional and local, but – what they’re doing. But we still want – the idea was for _____ state to local was to increase accountability for what’s going on, regardless of how much money that is that’s coming in, locally.</i>
3		<i>When state money is available for specific issues: gangs, education, etc., it can create a need at the local level in order to get that money. So local government, local – So local control over where, over what issues money is spent on is appealing, but how do you hold it accountable?</i>
4		<i>It sounds like you’re saying, so they (State) need checks and balances like what you see, even privately, to meet the goals. In the local levels you have your local place, when it’s foggy they send you home.</i>
5		<i>Well, I think state tends to have – we all think, oh, the state’s so bad and this and this and this, and retirement and the pensions are so high. But it’s really, to be honest, they’re not the higher level earners. And they do – they stretch a dollar. The state really does stretch dollars. And I think for local governments, I don’t think they stretch the dollars nearly as much.</i>
6		<i>I was hoping that local governments would be able to do, is not cut ten percent across the board. From the city, from fire, from police, from sidewalks, from _____. But the locals will decide that _____. This across the board is the start another fad. I mean, for fire you have to have a certain level of fire protection in your town, or else your insurance rates – right?</i>
7		<i>Police is Number 1. Fire is Number 2. Roads I would say is Number 3.</i>
8		<i>I see the fact that there’s no disclosure of anything. When you ask someone, they stonewall you. They hide everything. You ask them for information. No, they don’t have that – oh we don’t – no we don’t have that. We don’t know where it’s at. They don’t answer any questions. They’re very evasive. Like I asked to see – I want to see financial records. I want to see – I want to find out how I can get involved. They’re like, oh well, I don’t know. We don’t know.</i>
9		<i>It makes me not want to contribute to my society because I feel like I’m gonna be given the runaround every time I get involved with whatever task it is, whether it’s building schools or changing a light bulb. It’s just we would never do that. And so the point is is we’re – like this Proposal 5 says they should identify explicitly the results they seek to _____. Now, you said yourself, the people that run efficiently, they already do that.</i>
10		<i>Bureaucrats, they aren’t elected but they make a lot of rules, laws,</i>

What's Next California

Supplementary Report: Transcripts

		<i>ordinances, everything. And the only people that can stand up to them is the people. And if the people don't know that they do everything under the table. By the time you realize it's a law, it's already a law and then it's kind of hard to challenge once it's in there.</i>
11		<i>If you're going to put a lot of power back to – if you're going to give power back to the local level, you need standards</i>

12		<i>think corruption can happen at the local level, as well as up in Sacramento, and a perfect example is look at what happened to the city of Bell, with their city council. I mean, they were giving each other loans and not paying it back. I mean, just millions of dollars were given to each other. This is the council, and these are the people that are closest to us that we elect. So I think being able to have those checks and balances at the local level as well is something that we definitely need, and I think we do have it. It just took awhile for them to find it, in Bell, for an example, but I think it's tough to be able to find an independent source to be able to go in and make them accountable. Because right now, one of the legislations is have the legislators be accountable of themselves.</i>
13		<i>And I guess what my question would be is who's gonna regulate the regulators? I mean, who's really gonna be watching the money? Is it gonna be the local government watching their own backs, or is it gonna be the state watching out for the local government? I mean, I think that's something that we have to figure out, or at least put it out there to see, well, it really has to be an independent source and somebody that's not gonna be corrupted, and is that a judge or an official? I mean, that's what we need to find out.</i>
14	C1	<i>So I've had kinda both perspectives, and I actually, as I get older, I was talking to Ben earlier about this, I really am for if a community is wealthier, they probably worked really hard for it. Okay. They can spend their money how they want to, live how they want to. And the lower income made choices too along the line, you know what I mean.</i>
15	C1	<i>All communities will be required to set minimum standards. What I'm talking about is the con for that is it may not address – one down, may not address the current issue of wealthier areas of the state being better able to provide quality services in low income areas. I say yes, let them transfer, and I don't care whether it's even across the board. It doesn't make you better or less in a lot of ways whether you're wealthier or low income.</i>
16	C1	<i>And I would agree. In my head, I would much rather have the decisions on what streets get repaired or what happens here to the local government, but playing devil's advocate, I would say look at the Bell city situation.</i>
17	C4	<i>Yeah, right. It's an explosive proposal.</i>
18	C4	<i>I like the idea of we give the money to the local</i>

		<i>government to do what they will with the services, and if they're able to find a more efficient effective way to do it, then whatever money that's left over, they can use too. Like they don't have to send that back to the state.</i>
19		<i>Well, I think it allows citizens to be more empowered and see where their money goes. People talk about that before too. Like I support a tax when I know that that money's actually being spent on fixing the pothole that's on my street. If I can see the result of where that money goes, and I can feel confident about it, then I'm much more likely to support it. So I think having a few local level – and even if it is lower quality, but then you have local government officials who are right there accountable who you could run into in the supermarket.</i>
20		<i>And a lot of times you can read it in the local paper. I mean, I'm not talking L.A. Times or anything like that, and if you're in a small community, we have a small paper, and right off the bat, the first page I could see what's going on in my town. I could see what the politicians are doing.</i>
21		<i>You know what, there's too many people that take advantage. Even at county level, it's just too high up in government because they don't see what's going on with the social services or welfare, all this stuff 'cause a lot of people are taking advantage of it. They're making more money than I'm making I'm sure.</i>
22	C2	<i>so I was looking at the C2, and my concern would be that I think it would be good for the local level. They understand what their community is about and how to do that, but raising it might not all work in every locale.</i>
23	C2	<i>But now, what about smaller communities that don't have as much revenues generated – well, they basically get put on the backburner because they won't have as much, and as much coming in just because they don't have as many people to raise taxes on to pay for certain programs.</i>
24	C2	<i>Now, what happens when you have a community that doesn't have that? Say we go ahead and this goes into effect. The neighbor cities are gonna get more money just because they have a lot more people. So their community's gonna grow, whereas the smaller communities might not grow. They might die out because they don't have enough money in January to keep up with the flow. So would this be fair in community and wealth? I mean, there's communities that are dead now because they don't have the businesses there anymore. And it could be oil back in the days, small town, ended up being 150,000 people. Now, there's barely 10,000 going up in central California. If this was to happen, I think a lot of those cities would lose out or would almost die out because they wouldn't be getting the extra money coming in.</i>
25	C2	<i>Okay. That's one way to save it, but in other</i>

What's Next California
Supplementary Report: Transcripts

		<i>places, they're just not gonna happen. They're gonna die. I mean, like you said, at one time their major production was oil, okay, and they had boomtowns. Everybody was doing great, but then it ran out, okay. The town's gonna die.</i>
26	C1	<i>So do you think that the counties would be able to handle more responsibility? I mean, do you trust the state would give them</i>
27		<i>These proposals that we're looking at are asking for change in responsibility from the state to local government. So in my opinion, it sounds like a good idea, but then I'm just afraid that it's gonna be extremely convoluted, just confusing and that there's gonna be more responsibility put on the local government, and they're not gonna have any money to implement what they're supposed to. It's talking –</i>
28	C5	<i>See, I like that C5 was saying both state and local. It's not just saying just one, where it's actually combining both, you know, see what's going on.</i>
29	C1	<i>I think you get more oversight doing it at a local level than you can wondering about what the hell they're doing up in Sacramento and you got the governor screwing everybody that moves, pardon my French.</i>
30		<i>I have a concern that the state, they control the funds so they're distributing it, that they may attach too many restrictions of things to the funds and guarantee failure on the part of the local government.</i>
31		<i>And like I said on the questionnaire, I would like to see more control of, you know, by my local government, but reading the proposals, they're just too vague for me</i>
32	C5	<i>They can set up a mechanism of review. If certain levels of performance weren't achieved, then the city or government, local government would have to come up, along with an action plan they could present to the state or whatever agency they're under and _____. And then have a review sooner than the, you know, within a couple years if you corrected it.</i>
33		<i>I understand what you're saying. You're saying what makes our local government feel like they're smarter than the state government. The only thing I can think of because quite frankly some of the local people in my city, etc. are not that smart really. I mean, it's just that if you have a small city, you have less people to pull from. And I don't mean to say like it's mean, but if you have a small city –</i>
34		<i>Isn't all government local? The more access you have at the bottom, it would seem to me, you would have at least your voice heard.</i>
35	C2	<i>. This is all about accountability, but it says nothing down there about how they're gonna raise taxes or what formula it's gonna _____. It just says you have to be accountable for any money you have.</i>

36	C2	<i>How can a county raise its own taxes for itself, as well as the federal?</i>
37	C2	<i>It enhances accountability</i>
38	C2	<i>That's what C2 is all about is raising money for local authorities. We're saying maybe the local authorities need to grow; maybe they need to become bigger. Maybe they need money to grow, so they can extend their services 5, 10, 15 miles outside and save some other community money, and at the same time, make some money for them and cause their expenses, overall, to be less per unit of service delivered. Then, everybody benefits.</i>
39	C3	<i>. So the same thing would happen here. I can see _____ inequalities within the state, where certain cities could go ahead and take care of themselves very well, and other cities or counties might have problems meeting those standards and not necessarily because they're not capable, but because they're not generating enough tax revenue, or because they don't have, maybe, the people who wish to live in those cities and work there to help them run those services</i>
40		<i>It's a district that's been a corrupt district. Money has been just totally wasted. Administrators have stolen thousands of dollars and nothing's ever happened. Now, they're cutting teachers. They're cutting – they want to cut sports. They want to cut this and cut that and cut that.</i>
41	C4	<i>Then, reviewing the questions you guys had from before, then would be should communities be allowed to – should communities be allowed – can communities be assured that they will be allowed to use their surplus funding the way they want? That would be in regards to C4.</i>

42	C4	<i>You'd have to set the budget ahead of time to say we have this project; we calculate this amount of money; it's gonna cost us this. So you set the budget, and they have to give you that amount. It couldn't be just okay, we're hoping to do this, and then at every step, could we have some more? Could we have some more because _____</i>
43	C4	<i>I'm seeing a trend _____ privatization in my neighborhood, where the city used to come up in the local area, now you're seeing private people cutting the grass. You're seeing all this stuff because the money just isn't there to pay the salaries. What you see now is a big trend of privatization – so you're talking about city services that used to be, now it's privatized.</i>
44	C4	<i>You're taking something – you're taking a city service that was being done by people who were getting a city salary and city benefits, and now, you're giving it to a private contractor who has no standards for how they pay and compensate</i>
45	C4	<i>This has all come about with the economy – the foreclosures. A lot of these cities are _____ the people that are living there have moved on, so there isn't the tax revenue coming in _____ throughout the state. I don't care where you live, you're gonna have problems collecting the property</i>

What's Next California
Supplementary Report: Transcripts

		<i>taxes when they're in foreclosure. So this is putting a burden on what the state has to put out _____ down to the local level. It has to do with the economy.</i>
46	C4	<i>The problem I see with this is that some communities are more wealthy than others. If they – however they go about saving money, if they build their wealth and build their wealthy communities, rather than giving the money back to the state, the other communities are going to suffer.</i>
47	C4	<i>. I'm like Jan over there. I'm paying my taxes in Sacramento County. I really don't want – I don't care what goes on in L.A. County. Let them raise their own money. I want my money to stay –</i>
48	C4	<i>C4, I think, would work if we could – our question would be how can we assure that there is a set of secure and reliable standards by which we can measure local, county performance, in terms of these things _____ says the purpose of the system ensures that we all share a set core of services, as Americans.</i>
49	C4	<i>In terms of Proposal C4, how would returning the surplus and keeping it in the county prevent – okay, where I'm from, in Glendale, we have to pay extra for watering our sidewalk. We get fined if our sprinkler's _____ sidewalk. In Beverly Hills, they have a day where they hose down their driveways, like we're not all on the same water table. So how are you gonna prevent that kind of pattern of inequality from developing across communities when _____ richer communities tend to realize a greater surplus?</i>
50	C2	<i>Well, like you said, inside, right now the problem is the state points the finger at local, and local points the finger at state. So I think if you shift more power towards one side you can be held more accountable for the results, what they're doing with the money, programs.</i>
51		<i>But I'm thinking, for example, a truck crosses the line from California into Nevada, and all of a sudden in a really decentralized system, the truck's got to stop because it doesn't comply with the requirements of Nevada, and so it's not legal for it to deliver its goods there. Or in the case of – I think a lot about education. You could end up, if you really decentralized, you could really end up with huge gaps in the quality of education because rich districts put their money in their districts, and poor districts have less money to put in.</i>
52		<i>And if you try to make everything the same, you lose the character and the things that make some places valuable. And if they choose where they live, they're kind of voting on the issues that way and their values of the environment.</i>
53		<i>The problem that local governments have is the money goes uphill and then comes back down. I don't know why it sticks in Sacramento, but it doesn't come back down. So you want to</i>

		<i>think locally and act locally, but your means of action, which is money for a government.</i>
54	<i>DP process</i>	<i>That's what's so great about today. There's thoughts way in the back of our minds and all of a sudden we're enunciating them, and I'm listening to alternate points of view. I may not agree with all the alternate points of view, but I'm hearing them.</i>
55	<i>C2</i>	<i>I think this whole idea of, you know, I'll say decentralizing and allowing, if you will, allowing money to stop at the community level rather than going back up to Sacramento and back down, should ultimately be a reflection of the services that we want our communities to provide. And I personally believe that communities should be allowed to determine the services they want. And ultimately, the effect of some of the tax limitations that came about in Prop 13, in many respects, limit the ability of council of cities to exercise their independent discretion because they got an artificial set of pearls for limitations. And that is can they get the money back from Sacramento to use it the way they want?</i>
56		<i>Because we're talking about whether or not, I mean certain things, important things down in the local government and making it the responsibility of the local government. And in theory, it sounds really great because we're already like crazy and upside down about a distant government, Sacramento, telling us what to do. Certainly wealthier areas, compared to poorer areas, would be affected, the poorer area obviously being affected adversely. However, it doesn't have to be exactly like this. It could be amended or rewritten to include for the areas that need more help economically that the county and the state also still contribute to those areas.</i>

57	<i>C1</i>	<i>And I agree with you and that's all of these proposals that we're dealing with in C, really none of them address the idea that if you're going to push the services to local level, you need to push the revenue generating mechanism to the local level as well.</i>
58	<i>C1</i>	<i>See, the problem with that from my point of view is that they're pushing at the bottom level for the responsibility of this and that. But the stuff will still get filtered through the top or go back to them, so they're asking for more work out of the local, and yet it would seem to me the benefits will come to the state.</i>
59	<i>C4</i>	<i>When they set money aside, that's what worried me. They're setting money aside in, extra money if they do something.</i>
60	<i>C4</i>	<i>Okay, all right. But maybe that's okay. I mean if you do it on your own, if you can localize it and make it work, you don't need to pull state money anymore</i>
61	<i>C4</i>	<i>Right. If I'm a senator and I see some city or whatever you want to call it, an incorporated area that has a great amount of money because they had a tourist attraction or something, well, we don't need to fund them for our – whatever it is, whether it's people that have children that have</i>

What's Next California
Supplementary Report: Transcripts

		<i>disabilities or whether we have a lot of people that are homeless. We're not going to – you know, we want to pull that money out of the city that had a good tourist – and pull it by not even taking it, but not giving them something else because they have this abundance. So that's what I don't like about that.</i>
62	C3	<i>But that's the way it actually works right now. That's the way the whole property tax system works. The rich areas, Beverly Hills and Orange County, is sending more money to the state than they're getting back, and then the poorer counties that aren't sending that much money, are getting more money proportionally. And that's the whole concept of trying to make things equal in the state, you know? And so what you're saying is actually occurring right now and has been since Proposition 13.</i>
63	C2	<i>I'd like to ask a question though based on C2. Providing greater local authority over raising an out-eating tax revenue for local purposes in exchange for increased coordination of local service delivery and public reporting of progress and so forth. Isn't this exactly what went wrong with Bell? Nobody – seriously, here you've got a city government and they decided they had taxing authority to raise taxes, one of the poorest cities in the entire state. And they raised taxes on these very poor people so they could pay the mayor or city manager of Bell \$800,000 a year. Absolutely nobody thought about this. No one even questioned it.</i>
64	C1	<i>Sure. With smaller government, you have less oversight. You have less service. You just have less of everything.</i>
65	C1	<i>I think Santa Monica and West Hollywood have been very successful in being more locally oriented. But that's very rare, and it's a group of people that demographically are educated and don't have, are not blue collar and have time to deal with these things, and I would question whether that same thing is going to happen in areas like Watson or Compton where people are working harder to survive.</i>
66	C1	<i>Citrus Heights is it's been a kind of localized community where it built up a lot of its revenue. And it's actually the only area within the full Sacramento area that has a surplus of like \$20 million. And they, now because they have that surplus because they've kind of been localized, they can take a portion of that rainy day fund to put towards the Sayonara.</i>
67	C1	<i>And really you stop and try to, if you ever try to talk to those people, a lot of them are really stuck in their views about how to spend their money. No way, you know, I'm wealthy. I worked for my money. I want to keep my money. I want to do this.</i>
68		<i>And you talk about other areas of California that aren't as fortunate, and they're like, "Well, it's their tough luck." That's what I get a lot of. And with localized, with _____ power and local government and the richer community, I don't see how, when they raise the funds and then it goes back to the state level, correct, and it will come back down to them.</i>

		<i>What I'm trying to get at is I think if local government raises the money in wealthier areas, I think most of that money should go to other parts of California that aren't as fortunate. I don't know. I don't know how that really works out.</i>
69	C1	<i>I don't know if I like the idea of raising money in a rich community and then giving it to a different community.</i>
70	C1	<i>I have no idea how you choose those people. I just know that because we have a mistrust of so many different levels of government that it's an alternative and it's a thought, and I don't know what process we would use to choose those people. But I'm a damn sight happier with my neighbor being in the oversight committee than I am with somebody in Sacramento that I don't know.</i>
71	C5	<i>And the reason why I say a volunteer because there are citizens that are willing to do that in their community. It could be something that, the information could be disbursed to the community in a town hall meeting</i>
72	C5	<i>Okay, so you have this thing, manifesto. You have a manifesto about what you want to do. Then we work the whole year as a community, local government and the community together to get those things done in the order of importance that they need to be done. Then you get to the point where you have the annual report submitted to whoever it is that needs to see it. I guess it would be the state government. I'm not 100 percent sure. And then you've got to figure out who your oversight committee's going to be.</i>
73	C5	<i>I think it's worth, we can look maybe to business practices to give us some guidance, and I'm talking now about Proposal C5. Companies routinely, on an annual basis and sometimes even on a three and five-year basis, have a business plan, a long-range plan, and then maybe a year or two or three or five. But there's a difference between the business plan that a business has and its financial audit, okay? The business plan sets broad goals for the organization. And the financial audit comes in later or the management audit comes in later and says, "Well, is all the money in the right place? And are the systems of control and accountability all in the right place?"</i>
74	C5	<i>I'm feeling uncomfortable with localizing too much, and I really think that the state has to set some minimum guidelines, some minimum requirements because if you look around, there are places, for example the school system, if you let each little locality set a curriculum for their schools, I mean there are places in Texas that have changed science, I mean as far as evolution and as far as history. I mean they're rewriting history every day.</i>
75		<i>I think local level, because you know what you need in that area. To me, the cities should have more control.</i>
76		<i>I think the states should have a balance – I think, okay, so they should share power, if not equally, maybe like a 60-40; 60 being state, 40 being local.</i>

What's Next California

Supplementary Report: Transcripts

77		<i>I mean that's the flip side when you have a local government running ramped. It shouldn't have been a government to begin with. It should have been incorporated into the local surrounding cities.</i>
78	C3	<i>That's the problem with giving local governments more power, because they all going to do what's essential to them and then they're gonna blame other people for not taking care of the connecting issues.</i>
79	C1	<i>Handing all the power over to the city, I think is a recipe for disaster.</i>
80	C5	<i>Well, first of all, I would say the policy doesn't say anything.</i>

81	C	<i>I think these are great, but my problem is is that it kinda seems like we're trying to take like little spackles with the cement and trying to fix a dam that has a bunch of holes in it. I think maybe we need to think about throwing everything out and starting over again.</i>
82		<i>So the disparity becomes if you let Menlo Park decide what they want to do with their money, they're not going to give it to the poor. So do you continue that behavior? That's my question.</i>
83		<i>Nobody trusts the state.</i>
84	C1	<i>Another thing that I really worry about is that there would be such a divide among communities that we'll lose that sense of connectiveness of being Californians.</i>
85		<i>So I personally think what remains with the state needs to remain with the state, so that there is some general oversight.</i>
86	C4	<i>overall I think they kind of got the right ideas for once.</i>
87		<i>it looks like a really good to promote financial incentives, the better use of money</i>
88	C2	<i>Well, if local government decides to raise taxes, why does it have a caveat that says provided that they meet goals set by the state?</i>
89		<i>That's totally changing the social structure of our whole United States of America. Right now, the state has their policies and their set of processes that fall under that entity, the state. Whereas, what you're talking about, if you then change it to giving the local areas the right to tax and to set their own priorities and to oversee themselves and would have nothing over it, then you almost setting up ever local entity, or local municipality, or however local you want to, as each autonomous, of a country, practically. It would totally changing our whole overall system of government.</i>
90		<i>More fair for all the people in California, I think you need to maintain a lot more control with states. And they're in the business of kind of redistributing some of that.</i>
91		<i>So the state collects like sales tax and income tax, and they would collect the money and redistribute some of it to the poorer communities. If you have it all at the local level, the richer communities are not going to contribute any money to the poorer communities, any way you look at it.</i>

92		<i>So it sounds like we have two different questions that are up for debate. Are there any other suggestions for what we want to ask the experts? Okay, so we can either ask about a tax on political contributions or conflict of interest provisions after office. Do you want to do a vote?</i>
93		<i>that. I would really love to see these school districts consolidated to where you get rid of a lot of these high-priced administrators and get more money into the schools and the teachers. Eliminate these middle managers and these administrators</i>
94		<i>we just need to make sure all the kids in the State of California have an equal opportunity in getting a good education, and having the resources that they need.</i>
95		<i>We're not hiring the best because we're not paying them enough to hire the best teachers</i>
96		<i>To me, everybody's talking about cuts, cutting. All these schools are getting cut. Cut, cut, cut, cut. You can either fire teachers – which doesn't help the students – or you cut classes – that doesn't help the students – or you do something, you change the school year, which hurts the students. If you take it and consolidate all these school districts and get rid of them, these administrators, that doesn't hurt the students. That's what I do. If I could wave a magic wand, I would get rid of them.</i>
97		<i>In my opinion, just my opinion, teachers are an official like anyone else. If you have a store, which I have a business, and if I can bring Joe to the shop for \$2,000 and I find George can do it for 1,500, I will pick George.</i>
98		<i>Can you really put a dollar amount on a valuable education?</i>
99		<i>The one thing I find that some people bring up when it comes to teachers' pay is they wanna pay them based on results. Really, on an education, how can you go and – they call it, what, American, right? You've heard a lot of talk about that. How can you do that? You cannot go to a teacher and say we're going to give you merit pay because who's – it's so hard for her to do it.</i>
100		<i>Let me finish _____. I am in favor of giving teachers more money and schools, but I expect that they're going to be able to do the job and not be a teacher that is not doing the job, and it's not known that they're not doing their job.</i>
101		<i>Finland. The competition levels are fierce and the quality levels of the teachers are commensurate with much, much better.</i>
102		<i>One of the results of transferring county functions to the city is to make individual departments much more vulnerable and subject to local fluctuations. They don't have the reserves or money that comes from the state to keep things over during bad times. Everything works pretty well during the good times. The real problem of structure and what's best reveals itself when things get tight.</i>
103	C4	<i>Yeah, because our state is too diverse to say, okay, this is going to be the standard. What's good for Butte County up by Chico is the same thing</i>

What's Next California
Supplementary Report: Transcripts

		<i>that's good for L.A. County. I don't think you – you've got apples and oranges, so I don't think that you can just say, the standard could say what's good for Butte County is going to be what's good for L.A. County. That's why the counties need to decide, based on what their needs are, and tell the state. It's up to the state to say, well, that's acceptable or not acceptable.</i>
104		<i>I kinda wish criminal justice would become more regional, something between the county and the state.</i>
105		<i>The privatization of what were generally considered to be governmental functions has resulted in huge cost increases</i>
106	C2	<i>Now, all these proposals seem very amorphous. It's hard for me to really get a handle on something the same way you could with the issue of process because they're all kinda vague. We don't have any really criteria to provide.</i>
107	C2	<i>I thought that local authorities could raise taxes if they needed to.</i>
108	C3	<i>I'm thinking the Bay Area transportation should be redone. There should be one system. There shouldn't be BART, the Golden Gate Transit, Bay City Transit. We should be able to have one thing and it's definitely regionally distinct area, and that's maybe what this would apply to rather than having all these little transportation entities within a big broader regional area.</i>
109	C3	<i>So the combining of the districts is a political question, not a tax question. Right now, everybody fights for the same pie rather than having it go to the same institution</i>
110	C4	<i>So they're not going to give up. A regional agency or a local government isn't going to give up money to back into the state general fund.</i>
111	C4	<i>How do they measure the effectiveness? That's my biggest question about it is successful local management means that you're measuring something.</i>
112	C4	<i>That's the problem. We don't have efficient management because we have people burning up budgets so that they don't get their budget cut.</i>
113		<i>All I would have to say is that I think if they have money left over, if they can, they should put it back in the pot. That's tax money. Not to spend it, not to do anything else. If you have money left over, put it back in the bank where it belongs. Next year, you can take money back out and use it again.</i>
114	C4	<i>but the way I read Proposal C4, that you give those managers an incentive. They get some sort of reward for being a good manager and that excess doesn't go back to the state. The state doesn't come in and look at it and say, "Hey, you have \$10,000 left over. That means we're going to cut your budget \$10,000 for the next fiscal year."</i>
115	C4	<i>The government will decide, but if I was that government, since you're</i>

		<i>the steward and you were thrifty with your funds, you get to keep those funds and put to enhance your program or whatever. As long as it's for a good cause, not blow it on a party or just spending it on hours of work that doesn't even happen.</i>
--	--	---

116		<i>And it's all about management for one thing. I mean my town has a surplus;</i>
117	C1	<i>Well, wealthy neighborhoods happen to be geared to the wealthy and not so geared to the unwealthy. I'm not – I have no information about how – well, what neighborhoods do, you know, with their local government. It seems like the state should be sort of readily and more kinda there for the folks. I don't know that for a fact. That's just a thought. I don't really know. It would be nice – who knows?</i>
118		<i>So my taxes have doubled; but on purpose because we're, as a community, putting our tax money back into our own community. And you can do that. So it could be a combination why one is better than the other. We're a small community, and we get a lot of donations. Our – what do they call it? It's like a parent's club that – booster club, where the high school, middle school, and elementary school are all in the same location. Then we have one elementary school back, probably _____ valley.</i>
119	C2	<i>We'll use another example. What I'm trying to say is if you have a tax base which only affects, say, a quarter of the State of California, you're asking 100 percent of California to support that. If you had it as regional, you would have 100 percent in that area rather than pass it around.</i>
120		<i>I got robbed at gunpoint, and it made me totally see things differently. The guys that robbed us were terrified and dangerous because they were terrified; because they were real up-scale Beverly Hills bred stock with no sign in the front. I don't know how they even found the place. And it caused me to want to put – to make sure that poor neighborhoods had better education.</i>
121		<i>if I thought I could trust all the local governments. But they're as corrupt as anybody else.</i>
122	C1	<i>'cause the state spends X-amount of dollars on emergency room care. So now, okay, county here's your block of that emergency room care. Use it wisely. And they would. I think the county, with the exception of maybe L.A. because it's kinda catawampus right now, would do a very good job of taking care of their things. People know what their communities need. And communities are vastly different.</i>
123	C1	<i>I think what they're gonna do or they're thinking about it, whatever your town uses is gonna take money – right? They will give it to you point blank. Okay, here's your, let's say, 2 million bucks for the fiscal year, okay. And you – with this \$2 million will have your police and your fire. That's your money.</i>

What's Next California
Supplementary Report: Transcripts

124		<i>In England the presidential campaigns – the prime minister campaigns are _____ and all their advertising – or almost all of it is question-answer and debate on free television time. I mean, as opposed to two-year campaigns where they ask you for money every month and a-half and they bore us all so we're not even interested. I would like to see stuff like that, especially for state and local governments.</i>
125		<i>Well, it goes and it goes and it goes. Remember the thing that we were gonna get – the peace dividends after we defeated Communist Russia</i>
126	C4	<i>So local government has a budget. State government has a budget. So let's say with our healthcare, the local – let's say Orange County or L.A. County, their budget for healthcare for the hospitals, for whatever, is X. State government is Y. Why can't the state divide up Y so all the counties could get whatever their share of that pie is? And they say, okay, fine.</i>
127	C1	<i>Well, and I think the people who live in those communities, if they know that the local government has control of that, you know, right now people are at their house thinking, oh God, the state controls that. Oh God, the federal government controls that. There's nothing I can do about it. But if they know that if they walk down to the city council meeting and they'll sit in there and give their three minutes, you know, and somebody hears their say, then they have more of a play in what's going on with them.</i>
128		<i>But then with a lack of money, they would have to transcend their sense of my little community, my little Mafia, and gang up with other communities, again for _____ yeah, the city protection, the city – for fire, for police, roads. A certain number of services would have to be shared so that the cost would be reduced.</i>
129	C1	<i>Oh, I just had a question because we were talking about relocating some of the power down to the local government. But our state is in so much debt right now, how would that really change all the debt?</i>
130	C2	<i>Okay, and that's good and that's bad. And I'll tell you why. So you have L.A. County have the car dealerships, and I want to buy an Audi. And I live in L.A. County. But if I go just right outside the county line, because that Audi is so expensive, I can get that Audi for a couple of thousand dollars less because I pay less sales tax on it. I'm probably gonna do that, 'cause I wanna buy that same car. This is the one I want. So either I'm gonna buy it in the county I live in or if that tax base is high, I'm gonna go over there. So that's the disadvantage to that.</i>
131	C3	<i>So, actually, it's a layer between the state and what exists in either the counties or the cities. So the question, actually, are we creating an extra layer? The ideal would be that it is not an extra layer of government, but a layer of coordination. If we can make that coordination rather than government, I think it would be better.</i>

132	C3	<i>Another example I run down this morning, an example _____ helicopter. The reason is because the city of Pasadena has a fleet or about four or five helicopters. And they fly all over the area _____. They have _____, which contribute. They don't have to have a helicopter pad when they need the helicopters dispatched. So that's a way to save money. They can't afford helicopter, but they can afford having a ride in helicopter.</i>
133	C4	<i>If you moved it to a local government, that was more accountable to the people, you know, maybe they would save money. You know, I mean, maybe they would decide that they wanted to have a surplus in case there was a fire.</i>
134	C4	<i>That'll never happen.</i>
135	C5	<i>Well, the penalty should be if you mismanage something, you lose your job. That should be the penalty, because in the real world, that's what happens.</i>
136	C5	<i>Not in the public sector, but in the real world if you're given a budget of 100,000 and you spend 120, they're gonna fire you.</i>
137	C5	<i>Well, they were over-selling the situation. But here C-5, what I like about it is because they would be required to publish an annual report.</i>
138		<i>The reason I really see these coordinated entities, regional entities, as a future, in view precisely of the scarcity of funds. Let's share wealth and poverty. Let me put it this way. Let's share each other as much as we can.</i>
139		<i>Well, in some places already – I mean I know that like some people – some counties lease out their fire to the city next to them to do their police – you know, they hire the city next to them to, you know – they contract with another city.</i>
140		<i>If services are transferred to local government, how do we ensure they are distributed proportionately?</i>

141		<i>I think the question is we want a good education for all of our students, but when we're paying taxes, sending the tax dollars to Sacramento, and the Sacramento is basically dispersing the tax dollars back to us, back to our communities. When we start with one tax dollar and it goes to Sacramento and then it comes back to our schools, what do actually get back into the community?</i>
142	C1	<i>Another point that was raised is if we give local communities more authority, there's going to be different – more authority on their behalf to assign different curriculums in schools, or have different means of police enforcement. Do we want that kind of independence based on different communities or do we want uniformity at the state level with the state authority?</i>
143	C1	<i>I think right now, for example, you have some cities that are incorporated and they have their own police department. Some of them are small cities. I incorporate cities. I actually contract</i>

What's Next California
Supplementary Report: Transcripts

		<i>with the sheriff's department for something like that and they pay for that for services. That seems to work well. Why can't we have a more competitive system? I mean, obviously, there's got to be standards for schools. But a more competitive system, rather than the government dole, because that's not working.</i>
144		<i>I used to work in the district, and there's layers and layers of the supervisors, managers, district this, this, this, this. And because a private school works better because there's just the principal and the teachers and the school. It's not like all this money goes through all these layers, and then by the time it gets to the school, then it's not that much left. If they can do that, that would be wonderful. But on the whole I think as America wants teaching for every children, it's a great idea. No child should be left behind, no matter what.</i>
145	C/D5	<i>My understanding is, particular since Prop 13 was put into place, is that a lot of the money that used to be collected at a local level for local use is no longer available. So state is the one who collects it from income tax, property tax. And they have taken it upon themselves to push that money back down to replace the money the locals lost. But in the process, I believe the issue is they've held on to a lot of the decision making. And I think the second paragraph on Page 47 in the beginning of this discussion really addresses the questions. If this decision-making has gone up to state level more and more, are we – is it as effective as making those decisions at a more local level, and should we do something to push it back down. In other words, do we get better government at the local level than we do relying on the state?</i>
146		<i>I was just thinking an example of the – there was some state funds last year I guess that Oakland got for their police department, and they could do anything they wanted with it. And they chose to go with this community policing, which apparently has been very, very successful. So they got this money and they could hire a bunch of police, extra additional bodies, and do something to make crime better. And they created this local policing that's really focusing teams of police in the worst neighborhoods. And apparently this community policing has been very, very successful.</i>
147		<i>So I mean, that's an example of, you apply for a grant, you get this money from the state and decide in your community, which is different than every other community, what's the best way to use this money. And for Oakland it was community policing, neighborhood policing. Maybe in other places it would be something different.</i>
148	C1/5	<i>C1, combined with C5, would increase the accountability, where the government needs to set standards and goals and show how their decisions are meeting those goals.</i>
149	C1/5	<i>Because if you look at the cons on C1, they are</i>

		<i>the things we talked about. And maybe C5 has the safeguards. If you look at the cons on C1, that's the worries.</i>
150	C5	<i>C5 says requires state and local governments to identify explicitly the results they seek to produce through their policy decisions and service delivery and publish annual reports about progress toward those goals. Where are the reports going?</i>
151	C2	<i>That would be really tough. Because if they never could get any of those approved they would never have the revenue to do anything.</i>
152	C1	<i>C2 would be good from my point of view if C1 continued, where the money was still being raised as it is going up to state being redistributed, with authority going down to the locals.</i>
153	C2	<i>But regarding C2, doesn't this give local people more control? If they're raising taxes, we have to say something on if we want to pay taxes for that, correct?</i>
154	C2	<i>They put the money where they – where most of the citizens said they wanted their money. But the point is, they can still do that, now.</i>
155	C2	<i>If you're going to take everything from state and put it down there at a local level, some very important services could end up not getting funded and people just say I don't want to pay for it.</i>
156	C2	<i>The town itself sets the standard that they want to live by. I can see the state coming in and setting standards for the school, but as far as the town goes, as far as fire safety, police safety, the residents of that town should set the standards that they want to live by.</i>
157	C2	<i>So maybe C1 plus C2 is better than C2 by itself.</i>
158	C4	<i>If there is a savings in the way that they allocate and spend the money from the state, and end up with a surplus at the end of the year, yes, they should be entitled to some sort of benefit from that, whether it's all of the funds, don't know. Whether its 50 percent, don't know. But if they can creatively save money in the process of managing their own city, yeah, absolutely give them a perk.</i>
159	C4/general	<i>They could also inspire the other local communities next to them about, try adding this program and see if it brings similar savings in your community. So again that "each one, teach one" idea.</i>
160	C4	<i>It would be nice if all the money they kept was earmarked for infrastructure. Some of the infrastructure improvements that are needed in all of our towns, it seems.</i>
161		<i>Now, the other half of the question that's proposed here is like, okay, now, we got a huge state, we got way too many people for each representative, so how do we – if we do this on a local level, more of the constituents are going to be more familiar and the local governments are more familiar with their constituents. Is this a way to spread the management out among – instead of just a few, but</i>

What's Next California
Supplementary Report: Transcripts

		<i>many. And then wouldn't that be managed better, right?</i>
162		<i>It's going both ways. How can we reconfigure the different layers of government so they're more efficient by moving some things upward toward the state, and some things down to a more local control.</i>
163		<i>I'll go from a school district perspective of equality of services generated. You get a definite disconnect with any _____ district you're in automatically. It's going to happen wherever you're out. And the sad part is sometimes it gets kind of ridiculous as to the extent of which you get certain classes somewhere, certain other classes not everywhere. I wouldn't dare suggest that everything should be completely standardized, but particularly the funding and general income bracket of a local area determines the quality of the school. And that's just – I have no idea how to fix that or anything. I'm just throwing that out there as an issue.</i>
164		<i>I think there is huge different propositions along the same lines. I'm all for it, having local government with more power. I guess the problem is how the state money is used when it gets to the local government. The, the oversight more.</i>
165		<i>So my feeling is if we gave more jurisdiction or gave them more power to use the money in the same amount we spent, it would, it just wouldn't work in that way.</i>
166		<i>So I think we should give more powers to the local governments to provide services and generate funds, and for more accountability if possible.</i>
167		<i>I think the way they (local government) manage some of the cities, little things like streetlights, parks, and I know the state is responsible for parks, but the cities, the local government _____ where there's _____. So more _____ so people move out of the cities and they _____. I'm not sure what's _____.</i>
168		<i>Well I think _____ by local government, particularly local government _____ and then they need to put more money into their police system, you know _____ and after-school programs and _____, you know. So if the state is even to send money to different local governments, why don't local governments _____? So how do you rationalize the same money to all the local governments? There'd be a local government in the lower crime area. It doesn't need that much money. And they probably generate more funds. So –</i>
169		<i>So if you're going to start shifting the funds, then who is going to be responsible? If the city gets all the funds, who's going to _____ the cities to ensure that the funds are being spent properly and they're providing _____ services. That's the question. There's got to be some oversight because it's too easy for – you know, we're going to get this money, and well we're going to spend it on law enforcement and we're not going to worry about schools. You know, that's _____ have to put</i>

		<i>some money over there ____.</i>
170		<i>I think one of the other propositions was letting local and state governments raise their own taxes, and that's an interesting ____.</i>
171		<i>I take like healthcare. We are a very depressed county. Our unemployment rate right now, I believe, stands at 19 percent. Any new business that's opening up right now is a second-hand store. Our tourist industry really collapsed significantly with the economic thing. And ____ I think we were one of the highest welfare counties in the state. So for us, I mean we don't even have parking meters. For us to increase revenue through parking meters, stuff like that, it just, it's not there. So I really think that our county does need help from the state because there's just, we don't have any way to really generate – we're trying to pull in industries and stuff to create jobs.</i>
172		<i>Oh, I think the local – I mean the stuff I just talked about, fire and you know, policing, that's definitely local.</i>
173		<i>Can I address one thing that you were just saying? I think that maybe these services that are offered to our local, in our local government, maybe in the past we have been too reliant on the state government or on the federal government. And now at this point, communities need to kind of shift their way of thinking and start thinking about how they can generate that income to provide those services.</i>
174		<i>I think what you need to do, and again, go back to Prop 13, is find a way that local communities who have.</i>
175		<i>So I mean it is – I'm not sure that any of the proposals in here really are going to give any clarity to what's going on. The one thing that is clear in the whole overlapping governmental issue is Proposition 13 knocked the legs out of the ability of people at a local level to finance their activities. School districts can't do it. Fire districts can't do it. On and on and on. Cities can't do it. So I'm not sure that any realignment can occur absent some major adjustment in Prop 13 because there's no source of money at the local level. There's no way to get money.</i>
176		<i>If they're going to give more power and authority to the local government, there's got to be much better oversight, much better oversight</i>
177		<i>Well you know, if the money flows more to the locality and they have authority to spend it more than they have now, how do we as a state in the whole make sure that that money is being spent in a way that people get equal access and get equal treatment? Because that's the struggle in passing – it's the struggle between the federal government and the states. I mean that's what the whole Mississippi thing was all about. I mean you know, they weren't letting the blacks go to the schools. And the federal government said, "You've got federal money. We're coming in and we're going to – you can't do that. We're going to make it be equal."... So there's this real problem. But the issue is how do you pass the money and the authority down and still maintain your standards.</i>
178		<i>how about becoming more of a pro-business-friendly state</i>

What's Next California
Supplementary Report: Transcripts

179		<i>So I think this proposal is partially devoted to trying to reduce that redundancy, that certain problems are in the city but affect the county, so increased coordination, I guess between _____ overall, might add some efficiency to our government _____.</i>
180		<i>I think that's why Pat was saying, there needs to be some more infrastructure for things that are built and move on, as opposed to programs to help you sustain. We need to fix the reservoir. We need to fix this. That's what it's for in your area, for water or whatever it is, as opposed to just ongoing –</i>
181		<i>Well, I think for me, anyway, a lot of these questions in the proposal are there, but they're leaving out a key component that, if the state allows local government, there needs to be checks and balances that we know that if we're saying if this came before us on a ballot, having this like this, I would have to say no unless I knew for sure that there's going to be something in place and make sure that you're just not throwing the money away. It's like okay, yeah, you solved this little problem here, but as Patrick said, sooner or later when it does get kind of bad, what are you going to do then? You know? Can we get it so it can be self-sufficient, or at least it won't require as much money in the future.</i>
182		<i>Oh, I said I don't want any other regional there between the state and the local government.</i>
183		<i>You're talking about a business consolidation. It's like five businesses consolidating under one management and you get rid of the excess. You could do that today without this thing because you have the revenues.</i>
184	C4	<i>C4- I mean I just see, you know, there's so much corruption and people just think they're – I don't know, people go up and they run for county or city government and they have all these really great things and ideas and they're going to do all this stuff. And somewhere along the line, the corruption comes in. You know? Like I say, it sounds well and good, but it – I just don't know that we can do the monitoring enough, you know, for them to monitor their performances and be transparent enough.</i>
185		<i>Well, I had – here's the problem that I had with the statement when I saw this on the arrival questionnaire. How – you can't write – you cannot have a law that requires people to be innovative. Innovation requires creativity. How do you – how unfair and ridiculous is it to require by law that people be creative?</i>
186		<i>Well, I think the idea is there's a threshold the government sets. If the county meets that threshold and saves money, they get to keep it. But they have to meet that threshold. But somebody has to come in and evaluate whether they meet the threshold. It can't be the county itself or the state or the city or whoever because they'll lie.</i>
187		<i>That should be determined by the local people. The local government should be determined by the local people, local citizenry, and if they don't approve of it, then you have to use the power of the vote them.</i>
188		<i>Well yeah. I think just going back to how much the states control</i>

		<i>funding for the local government.</i>
189		<i>You know, it depends with each thing. And _____ systems that we set up and stuff that you can monitor it locally. But the result is firm.</i>
190		<i>Well, _____. You know, it was just, you know, we're going to get this allocation to do this this year. That's all we're concerned about is to get through this year and wait 'til next year's allocation. There's no long-term plan of well, what's the goals in like say the food stamp program? I mean hopefully the goal would be that people wouldn't need them...But nobody's working towards that. They're just working to make sure that people who need them now get them. So there's no policy in the country to make sure everyone's adequately fed.</i>
191		<i>Not only that, if you _____ the schools, you've got the problem that the standard is wrong... You know, education's one thing. Transportation's another thing. So you can't lump them all together and say this is – and that's part of the problem. These rules wind up with lumping everything together, and we're not passing – well here, but it doesn't work for that, it works for this. And everything has to be – which is again why you break things down to a local level, where they're going, someone can say, "That doesn't work for us. We can do that, but we can't do this."</i>
192		<i>I think publishing anything is good because it puts accountability on the person that is publishing that, and then later on if they find out that it's lies, then that person is fired.</i>
193		<i>_____ standards and standards are set and how they're reported, then how those are evaluated and the sort of incentives that can be produced in there. So a lot of these things revolve around being able to meet minimum standards and the report of them, but there are no specifics in here. So if anyone had a question – a lot of our discussion has focused on that. So –</i>
194		<i>What's happening for the most part is when you give more control to local communities is that they _____ that we give them. In my community, I know that the city council that is in place has maintained their position for ten years. There has been no change. And so that really stagnates any progress in services and just community development. So yeah, basically the only way you're getting a city job is if you know someone that's already working in that, that's already part of that program.</i>
163	C1	<i>Well, how do they know who's really accountable? How do we as people know when someone's telling the truth and whose fault something is?</i>
164	C4	<i>And it would definitely lead to improvements and transparency. And you literally look at what do you do, or places of expertise, and create a shopping list. Go through the list.</i>
165	C1	<i>you have to massage people that you already know are going to be resistant.</i>
166	C4	<i>I don't think taxes should ever be punitive</i>
167	C4	<i>The elephant in the room as far as the state legislature –you could</i>

What's Next California

Supplementary Report: Transcripts

		<i>probably apply this to the United States Congress as well – is partisanship. I mean, that bottom-line is the problem. I mean, we don't have a state budget in this state, where other states do. Not because of the economy, not because of all the other issues, but because of partisanship, and that really is what is hurting California.</i>
168	C5	<i>the point is accountability is a big thing in this state we need to get to the point of where the money is going and may be possible to punish somehow the doers of this that are spending this money</i>
169	C5	<i>asically, what we're saying is we want it to be at the local level, but we want the local level to be thinned out and be more transparent.</i>
170	C1, C2, C5	<i>In the effort toward simplicity, transparency, can we eliminate districts and give their powers to city and counties?</i>
171	C2	<i>That's a day of reckoning. At one point, they're going to talk about how we've achieved their goals, and this is public. The people who are wondering whether they've done it or know they haven't show up.</i>
172	C1, C2	<i>Where the accountability lies is because when you receive state funds, the state is going to send the monies. If we say yes, send it to the local levels and the cities, and the counties.</i>
173		<i>But there's a lot to be said for creating the invitation, creating the opportunities. That's the essence of civic engagement. So if we have local, then we potentially have more civic engagement. But you can't assume just by shifting these to local that that's going to happen.</i>
174		<i>So just by changing things structurally doesn't mean that mean that people will make better choices necessarily. I think that maybe it really is a training issue.</i>
175	C1	<i>What about Proposal C1 with the caveat of what _____, which is how do we then provide for a balanced opportunity for those counties or those jurisdictions that aren't going to have the tax base to raise an equivalent amount of money? I mean what is fair? You know, LA County is going to be great. It's got Beverly Hills in it. You know? What are we going to do about Tulare County and their rights and have, again, a minimum standard of equal services?</i>
176		<i>But what I'm saying is when you transfer from the state to the local governments control and financing of services, there's the financing...I mean the feds give the state money and the state gives the local governments money, so it's a triple down _____. Somewhere along that line –</i>
177		<i>That's why schools have lost control of either the federal money going to the state and then it's getting assimilated in an unorganized, uncontrolled way that we see. And then the state takes it and they get that, and then they try to _____ to spread it out to the local areas.</i>
178		<i>So in theory the system worked. In theory, the power of the vote worked</i>
179		<i>I think the consensus is that we should be paying for education at the state level.</i>
180		<i>But it's not to say that all six areas have to be local or state. We could</i>

		<i>say that the jails are better managed, but that schools are better locally.</i>
181		<i>I think that that would be a good idea because bringing it to the local, that would create jobs and it would need more people to do these things.</i>
182		<i>giving the state power to tell the local people what they need, I think, is a problem. I mean that's the way I see it. If you can come to the state, like this is what we need for our local area –</i>
183		<i>Maybe if we manage it locally, is that we designate the fact that if these are going to remain open, then they have to be self-sufficient. And the people who use the parks and love the hiking and camping and that, then they pay for the use of that park to keep it open and keep it clean _____. That takes the responsibility away from the state because it's at the local level. The money stays in the community. It may create some jobs because now we're going to have to have people to take care of the park.</i>
184		<i>Well, the question was what would you do locally? And that just came to me. That's just one of the many things that we can do on a local level that's really management. Because the infrastructure's in place. Basically we just have to manage it locally through the county and our counties, saying, okay, this is going to be out state park management team, and we've got people that are experienced.</i>
185	C2	<i>You know, C2 is the one that I thought was interesting.</i>
186	C2	<i>I think in C2 you've got to listen to that word right there, raising.</i>
187	C2	<i>Well, the worry I have in C2 is the word incentive _____.</i>

188	C1	<i>So under C-1, it says we will transfer from the state to local government control and financing of services and take advantage of achieved results. So it doesn't say about what happens if they don't achieve the results. Is that – would that be like now where the cities like _____ who went belly-up? The state then takes over or what? What happens if they don't achieve the results that they're supposed to achieve? I don't know.</i>
189	C1	<i>Well, if all we're talking about is just transferring it from the state to the local level, I don't – I just don't see any downside to that at all. I really, really don't. Because each – and I noticed on one of the cons on here that, oh, that the approach _____ differences in levels of services provided to different communities across the state. That's not a bad thing. Every – California is so diverse. You have different communities, and they have different needs.</i>
190		<i>Wealthy communities already supplement. So it's not gonna be any different. We have schools in wealthy communities. They raise whatever money they need to keep their schools at top levels. So it's always gonna be the case.</i>
191		<i>Pay is a matter of public information – public record.</i>
192		<i>I think it would be difficult to have a second job – a part-time senator</i>
193		<i>You don't just want wealthy people in these positions</i>

What's Next California

Supplementary Report: Transcripts

194		<i>I expect, even if you are a legislator, you're gonna be working more than a 40-hour week. Hopefully, these guys are working more than a 40-hour week as full time because their job is important. Hopefully, they like their job. That's what people do when they like their job. They work more than 40 hours.</i>
195	C1	<i>So the concept here is that if the control – if the money is – goes directly to the county, as opposed to funneling through the state, is it gonna be less susceptible to state budget problems that we're now experiencing</i>
196		<i>It eventually rebounds, and our whole economy is built on good education, good jobs for people, and if some localities can't afford decent education or _____ it's gonna affect the whole state.</i>
197	C2	<i>I think it's a good idea for cities to have a little more flexibility, providing they're not – it depends on what taxes – what the authority is, and there should be some kind of</i>
198		<i>Again, I would worry about them raising revenues in a way that isn't sustainable</i>
199		<i>I guess my response to that is if the community wants to spend money on certain things, then the law should allow them to do it.</i>
200	C3	<i>I think, in general – I think there's a lot of issues that do have _____ regional impact and could benefit from more regional coordination. The only way to get that is by having sort of a regional funding source. It sounds, in general, like a good idea</i>
201		<i>The point is that – it just seems that you add a new layer – region – and then they have to – they start competing for resources, and they – so regional problems take precedence over county or city</i>
202		<i>It might be a little off the wall, but at this point in California's history, it seems to me that a regional authority for a large part of Southern California would be more effective _____ than five different counties.</i>
203		<i>To me, this is kind of a no-brainer. To me, you would want to do this. It's already _____ and it just – it's a hassle to do it. In Sacramento County, we've got – we do have transit, which provides transit. We also have surface transportation authority that collects money with light rail and _____, but it's a sales tax that has to be renewed every eight or ten years. Why make them do that? Why not just allow them to establish a permanent funding source for that regional</i>
204		<i>Can you – would this provide – should you provide, through a state amendment, a kind of an indefinite funding source so this cog can continue providing regional services, instead of having to go back every so many years and renew it, for example? I think that's the concept here. I think the answer is they should. Don't put up hurdles.</i>
205		<i>We have to decide where the local authority is appropriate.</i>
206		<i>I think that's one where you could – that could be a good carrot to a local government.</i>
207	C4	<i>I think the majority of Americans do support aggressive income tax, with the understanding that somebody who's very wealthy can afford to pay</i>

		<i>more than somebody who is making _____</i>
208		<i>I propose a flat tax. But let's talk about property tax. In my feeling, Prop 13 is unfair. I'm probably one of the people who've taken advantage of it. I bought my home in 1992. The people who live next to me bought theirs in 2006. They're paying more property tax than I am. Is that really fair?</i>
209		<i>We would hope they would have enough public pressure that they would set reasonable goals. If they set them too low, then the public's gonna react. If they set them too high, they can't achieve them. So it seems to me that this is a good check and balances</i>
210		<i>Actually, they are fairly effective. If you've got electives that are looking over your shoulder and questioning whether or not you can produce something better, there's pressure on you to try and perform better. So I think that there could be some benefits associated with this.</i>

211		<i>Maybe that's why we're the envy of the world. We already have that local control.</i>
212	C5	<i>I think C-5 is something that should be done at both the state and the local levels. You know, and saying that would be too much paperwork. Not really. As you're putting together a program, you ought to have some idea what you want it to do. You know, and writing that out doesn't sound to be terribly onerous, you know.</i>
213		<i>I'm just trying to think of how you would implement this. I mean there are like thousands of bills that are passed every year in the state. And we have all of these ongoing programs, and I think theoretically accountability is good. I work for a business _____ goals I need to meet. I just wonder how on such a large scale you would implement something like this at the state and locals.</i>
214	C1	<i>Overall this sounds good to me, except when they outline the specific services.</i>
215		<i>But I don't see how there's any other way they can evaluate that from one central office in the state to what, you know, your police department, your ambulance service, your whatever health and welfare, and things like that.</i>
216		<i>Cause I think you have triplicating, not just duplicating like we have now. They'd end up triplicating. They have to have state monitoring the progress, and why wouldn't they just monitor their own progress?</i>
217	C3	<i>C-3 says by designating a portion of the tax revenue generated by a growing economy. What happens when the economy is not growing?</i>
218		<i>It's stealing. It's stealing. You're asking people to redistribute</i>
219	C4	<i>C-4, direct any savings _____ successful local management. What about unsuccessful local management?</i>
220		<i>I think I like C-4, too, like the first comment list, like the whole list at the bottom. As soon as I read it, that's the first thing that came to my mind as well is that you're taking, you know, the additional assets, a group or an organization is able to create savings and then reallocate them to</i>

What's Next California
Supplementary Report: Transcripts

		<i>who wasn't able to.</i>
221		<i>And then what's gonna happen? The next year, the state's gonna see that and then they're gonna say, obviously, you didn't need it. So you're not gonna get more.</i>
222		<i>It seems like local governments should be rewarded if they are doing a good job and being accountable. I mean it seems like a good idea.</i>
223		<i>Yes, and it just makes people spend when they, you know, it would be better if they didn't.</i>
224		<i>Or they find ways to spend it wisely, quickly. That's how I pay for one of my jobs is the state gets money – the university gets money in a certain department there; and they have to spend it. So they have teacher workshops _____. So that's a good way. They have to find something very quickly that they can find a use, you know, so.</i>

225		<i>But I don't understand which this mean. For instance, in special education, at one time in our county, if kids needed to go to a special private school and the district demanded it, the state had to pay for each child's private school because the district demanded it. Then they changed the law and the district got a block grant, they got this much for special ed. The response of our district was to start their own school for kids who otherwise _____ private schools because they could no longer depend on the state to provide them money. Once that block grant was given, they had to work with _____.</i>
226		<i>Local government will be allowed to design and operate programs as long as they meet the goals set by the state. So basically the state is still funding the program.</i>
227		<i>And like my city, we now have a five-year, one cent increase. But it's just that all this money does go to Sacramento so there is money for them to send it back. And they can do it, and if they would send it back to the local community instead of going through bureaucracy, you may get more efficiency at a local level.</i>
228		<i>We have state prisons. We have county jails. We have city jails. As I understand it, there's now been a recent judicial decision that the prisons are unconstitutional in this state because of overcrowding. I don't know if it affects both men's and women's. I know it affects men's prisons. So I live in a community where the largest single employer is the prison. _____ but it's the truth. They're going to start busing those folks back. The prison officials get to decide partly, I believe, who gets to go back to the county jails... I would be personally really happy if we'd stop shipping people away so much because I think we might come up with more innovative programs to have those people be valuable members of our communities if we had to keep them closer by _____.</i>
229		<i>One thing, so I don't know if it was in here or in the book that I brought in, but it was the idea that if counties had the money transferred to them, then you can say counties have to rent the cells in state prisons if they're</i>

		<i>going to send somebody there. And that would make the counties much more hesitant to just send people up and give them to the state's responsibility.</i>
230		<i>I say if the money's going to be transferred back, it is much control _____ talk about sending people to jail as much as you can because we know our citizens. We know the problems they're having. There's not enough housing. There's not enough medical. There's not enough jobs. Get them back here. Get them retrained so they can do other jobs. Get 'em fixed up if there's something mentally wrong. Get the food on the table so the kids can eat. All those things, we know it ten times better in our home than we do when they're out of sight, out of mind.</i>
231		<i>Because if the local government sets up this program just like we were talking about, if we set up this program and all of a sudden the state gets _____ and there goes the money, then the local government's stuck. So I would say it's great to have local control and I think they _____ better if they have some sort of guarantee on the funds from state-mandated projects, that _____.</i>
232		<i>The local areas would be able to augment with their own monies through their own taxes and welfare areas would be able to have better services. That's probably every area that's being dealt with in this section.</i>
233		<i>There has to be some standardization.. But see, minimum standards. The fact that some counties are going to always be able to raise more money, create more revenue. They can provide all of these services much, much better..</i>
234		<i>I do know like for my generation, the younger 20s, a lot of us don't vote because we just feel like we don't have much say in it. So I feel like if you transfer a lot of the responsibilities to the local levels, a lot more people might, would probably go out and vote more because they feel they have a say. However, when you transfer so much of those responsibilities to the local level, like Marilyn was saying, it doesn't address the fact that Pasadena could raise more revenue. They could have better services. Whereas I _____ school and I went to a private school. So I can see what financing does... So I just – when it comes to education, I'm not sure if I agree with bringing it to the local level. But health services, I agree.</i>
235		<i>Oh yeah, maybe it doesn't make sense to blanket, give all control for everything locally _____ certain circumstances that do make sense to me, which they run _____. Education might be one.</i>
236		<i>I like to see more decisions at a state level. I think that's where they do business and I think that's where you should take care of the business. You start allowing local communities to make decisions and move money around, then they're doing this project over here and they're doing this over here. You know, I don't want my community making decisions. I really don't.</i>
237		<i>But I just think, my point is, I think the state is dodging the</i>

What's Next California
Supplementary Report: Transcripts

		<i>responsibility. If they can't afford this and they have a labor issue, then they need to take care of their labor issue. Because the county, they would be passing the labor issue onto the county or city.</i>
238		<i>I just think that things should be managed more at a state level, you know, where, you know, I wouldn't even mind seeing the state run everything. I wouldn't mind, but I wouldn't. I wouldn't. I wouldn't mind seeing the state run the majority or a greater percentage of construction projects or community work.</i>
239		<i>You know, we were talking this morning about how we didn't like the leadership that we were getting from the state. Now we're also saying some, it happens locally as well. So I mean it's systematic. As voters, you have to get the right people in and they have to be people with visions. They have to care about their communities. And it's – we're never going to have everything equal from city to city or state to state. There are going to be those inequities. But the only thing that we can do – the best thing we can do to balance it out is to get the right people in there to run it.. Whether it's a performance-based budget or whatever, you have to come up with some sort of standards to show how efficient you are in management. The program's in there..</i>
240		<i>I think some things are probably much better done at the state level and some things that are much better done at the local level. Marilyn's example of programs for single moms and that some places – I forget how you said it – but that some communities would do more research to that... While that is true, in my experience at the local level, those communities that have more resources, if they thought a bunch of single moms were moving in, would not allocate money for those programs. And that's my concern _____.</i>
241		<i>I think there has to be, there may have to be a transfer – if money goes to local areas, there may have to be a transfer between local areas for _____ health services something that comes to mind. People that live in cities tend to not want to deal with their trash, and they let them transport it out to smaller counties or rural counties. And with their trash goes health issues. So you're sending your diseases to another county. So you're either going to have to take some of your health money and send it along with your trash, or the state is somehow going to have to balance it out to make sure _____ paid for, which is not fair to the other counties who are not transporting their trash.</i>
242		<i>But I think that's the main thing some of us have been saying, that it's not the state should do everything or the local do everything, but it's got to be assigned appropriately, and the answer to what is appropriate is probably along the conversations _____.</i>
243		<i>Yeah, sorry that it has to go back to funding because I'm the local government, it's about funding. When the state gives you these mandates and takes your money, then you're stuck. So you may have the control, but you don't have the money. So again, I go back to the guarantees. There has to be guarantees on the funds. Gas tax is a</i>

		<i>perfect example. Most counties pay for roads and bear the gas taxes. The state allowed that, expecting to take gas tax away from _____ county. That would devastate the counties, all that money. It's millions of dollars.</i>
244		<i>Would it be possible to have a commission equivalent to the redistricting commission made up of the counties to discuss appropriate ways in which, as they said here, appropriate ways in which the duty to run each major program would be assigned to the proper level of government.</i>
245		<i>But whoever the commission is made up of, I think that the counties deserve and would have to have that type of ability to say we want this responsibility.</i>
246		<i>Well, you know, if you're looking through here, some of these are – it's a change to how much local control there is. But in the case of Proposal C3 on Page 58, it sounds like they want to create something brand new to deal with certain regional problems, and regional boundaries have not been designated at all. And they give two examples of regional problems: traffic and pollution. Which is kind of odd. I'd like to see more what they're thinking of for these regional things.</i>
247		<i>One of the best recommendations of the last constitutional revision commission that _____ ignored in 1996 effort, was to give citizens of California different _____ to remake local agencies, blah, blah, blah. Under the commission's proposal, counties _____ but not required to set up citizen commissions to rethink their local governments, shuffle and combine their missions, merge or eliminate them, _____. Out of these deliberations would come a new charter for voter approval and restoration of the _____. We just reinvented the 1996 _____.</i>
248		<i>I think a question I would have for the panel would be to ask them, you know, how would it be determined? Would it be a citizen group or some other mechanism that would decide which services are the most appropriate to be moved to the local level?</i>
249		<i>On the regional issue though, you know, it says one of the cons is allowing large _____ to dominate the policy. We haven't found that to be true. We are _____ like we have. I know because I sat on _____. Yeah, we don't feel like we're _____.</i>
250		<i>It's what _____ supposes, instead of sending people to jail, you get your money from the state for your crime prevention, and you put a lot of that money into basketball programs, single parent family, attendance, parole officers with smaller case loads, stuff like that. So there's less recidivism. So you save money on crime because you reallocate your funding. That would be one of the _____ of city. Then you could get to keep the savings is what they're saying.</i>
251	C4	<i>On the finishing up on the C4 proposal or the 3, there's got to be a mechanism in order to keep the participation fair so that cities don't want to double down _____ to keep that extra money and use it somewhere else. There's got to be a way or a mechanism because it says in order to do this, you'd have to amend the state constitution. So</i>

What's Next California
Supplementary Report: Transcripts

		<i>if you're going to amend the state constitution, you have to do it in such way, and there's got to be such a way to keep the cities from doing the old steal from Peter to pay Paul. _____ we'll do the least we have to so we have this big savings to use somewhere else.</i>
252		<i>You know, benchmarks and reviews of programs is extremely time-consuming, and you have to hire whole bunches of people. I know that from education. I've been involved in reviews at school districts. This is a concern here. Every year annual reports about _____ goals. Go back to Page 45. On Page 45, they're talking about the same thing. The governor and legislatures will establish goals and performance _____. It is recommended that it be every ten years. So how come all of a sudden we're in the section on local control and suddenly somebody thinks that we should be doing that every year?</i>
253		<i>I just have a problem when they were talking about the governor and the legislature establishing the goals. Why was it every ten years? And for the local level, it might be mandated by the state that the local government do it every year. I'm in favor of every year personally. I'm in favor of _____.</i>
254		<i>If I could just mention something. This would not be an initiative. Right now this performance-based budget is going to the legislature _____ has these proposals in it.</i>
255		<i>It's called the continuing accreditation review team, CART. Maybe that's the model they're thinking about here, so that you're always ready for the next time and you're ready for input and with the new legislature and you want to have new rules. Because they have got zero-based budgeting too. And maybe that's how we get the information to give them the feedback that they need, through this internal review process.</i>
256		<i>I think for our questions we have to do something at least that alludes to the fact that services will not be equitably allocated across the state. And it says it in here, so I don't know how to make a point about it. But there's a huge concern –</i>
257		<i>Your question isn't about local bond issues because those are just done by the local cities and counties. Your question is if you're giving more local control, how will the state meet the needs of the communities that can raise less money and need more money and the local control.</i>
258		<i>But I also think that the richer counties will _____ services. _____ so we're going to find some poor county that _____ pays less money. We're going to ship all of our mental health people somewhere else and we're going to contract out, put them on welfare. And we're going to stay within our money effectively. We'll have a few extra dollars _____ property taxes _____. They want us to have this. I foresee that now.</i>
259		<i>I just have a question about the balance of state funding in poorer and richer counties, however the two Marilyns vote that, I guess, about how to put it together. But I think that's the issue to be asking, how that gets resolved.</i>

260		<i>Will money be saved by the State of California with more local responsibility for revenue and programs if the state has to do financial oversight and program review in 58 counties? And how will the state mitigate the differences in allocations for the rich and the poorer?</i>
261		<i>I think this whole section is probably coming from a national outcry for more local control _____ thing. Honestly a lot of the people who are yelling that, in my experience, don't think about how that work and aren't necessarily volunteering to go down and help deal.</i>

262	C	<i>I think the closer you can get to local control, the better because local people are more responsive. You know, you don't look at them as being movies stars, like wow, there's my state senator. Or wow, there's, you know, the assembly speaker. It's, whoever it was on the end, said Duncan Hunter was my neighbor. You know? I mean he was a big guy in federal legislature.</i>
263	C	<i>Well, the people that make the decisions have to live with the results of the decision. The people living in Sacramento don't live with the results of their decisions that affect the people in Humboldt County.</i>
264	C	<i>Basically the purpose of federal government stepping in to education was trying to equalize standards for everybody all the way across the government, across the country, as opposed to individual states determining what the standards are. Now does that make sense to some extent? You know, should the kids in Mississippi be held to the same standards as the kids who live in San Francisco? I would say yeah. But once again, it's more of a local level with the federal government coming down and saying</i>
265	C4	<i>I think what I really got, when they create financial incentives, I think whenever you put money as the incentive for things, I have – it just really sets me back</i>
266	C	<i>I think it would be great if, at a local level, every aspect of the government is challenged, down to the servicing of fire engines, you know. The contracts. I mean not against servicing them, but are the guys that are performing these contracts, service stations, are they getting padded because they know it's a government contract? You know, those things can be defined and those can be out for bid, competitive bidding will drive that kind of savings. And it's kind of the mentality that we have to spend this to justify next year's budget, that makes it just spiral out of control.</i>
267	C2	<i>If we took the property taxes in our county and used them to support our educational system, we would have a better educational system and we'd have control over our own education.</i>
268	C	<i>It's just, you know, I'm just saying that the less populous areas probably benefit to some degree from the larger populous and higher density. You can't tell me that some –</i>
269	C	<i>I think, you know, one of the issues – and this</i>

What's Next California
Supplementary Report: Transcripts

		<i>dovetails with something else – the idea of block granting money to universities, schools, cities and counties, rather than targeting it with categorical funds. I mean we go back to looking at one of the things we don't like about propositions is they tie up 40 percent of the state budget's going to go to education. And do more block granting of monies. I don't know how possible that is to do that. Maybe why does the state feel like they've got to target?</i>
270	C2	<i>But what if the state, or let's use the city or the county says, "We need money for this, this and this. Here's the programs that we're going to have. We're going to do work on the fire. We're going to work on police and this." And maybe if they're allowed to say, "These are the programs we need to work on," then that money can be handed over, and those are the goals. You know what I mean? What if they submitted their own goals to the state and the state would approve the goals? And then it would give the local area that control over those funds instead of saying, "You get this amount for your police. You get this amount for your fire."</i>
271	C	<i>And then it was brought up well not all local governments are as honest as others, and that there was a big division between ones that – how could you trust your local government?</i>
272	C	<i>I think that just because I know that with most European education systems, the U.S. educational system, or at least the standards for it, are very much uneven. And I think we should all be up to par with them just because it makes more sense. Otherwise people are going to think, okay, well you're from America, so you must be dumb.</i>
273	C1	<i>Anyway, I like C1. I think it _____ give the money to the local level as much as possible, and require that they manage their results and that they meet minimum standards. Maybe those minimum standards are set by the state, and so you have some sort of parity throughout all the counties.</i>
274	C	<i>I think another new thing for the local government, in addition to being able to go up there and see them personally, is the minorities get hurt, you know. And then also like poor people that might not be taken seriously, if they went to, you know, a state meeting or something like that, are hurt because like in Santa Cruz, we have a lot of poor people that might not be taken seriously. But the city council knows that, and they know that looks don't justify everything that they're not – it doesn't determine their education or their points of view. So our city council will most likely hear those people out more and give them a platform to talk about something. And more people can join on and voice their opinions.</i>
275	C2	<i>. We should have the power to levy taxes, just more, greater local authority over raising and allocating taxes.</i>
276	C5	<i>We'll create measurable objectives of the data on results by which effectiveness of the programs can be assessed. I mean</i>

		<i>I'm just looking through here and saying if we have these proposals, we need to make sure that they are the outcomes that – there is a way to assess it, there is a way to make them responsible and accountable.</i>
277	C5	<i>, I'm saying to assess and make things measurable, you have to figure out what you're measuring it by and those type of things. I mean it's not as abstract as –</i>
278	C5	<i>Well they should have a thumb on the pulse of the city also and know what's going on in the city. Where do we need to take our city? I mean let's, like I said, if you want better roads, okay, we're going to spend \$1 million a month for the next 12 months on improving roads in Modesto. That's going to be our measure. Boom. Where is the money going to come from now? Have we met that at the end of the year? We had a mayor who came in basically saying that because the roads in Modesto were horrible. And at the end of his four years, he was able to say, "These are the roads I repaired. This is how much money we spent on it," and got re-elected.</i>
279	C	<i>I would trust in more local management if I felt they were more accountable for it. I just don't think that they are.</i>
280	C	<i>Is it possible to have an option whether the city or your town, if it seems like it's being manipulated by coercion or whatever, that maybe the town can say, "We'd like the state to govern our situation."</i>
281	C1	<i>But the solution, I don't think that it would be a solution to that, changing taxation. The local government's had responsibility for schools and they're taxing the property to pay for the schools. It wasn't happening apparently. So now the state is taking the money and giving it back to the local governments for the schools, and nobody's happy.</i>
282	C	<i>Well, for example, Apple Computers. They're based out of California, yet they built this huge thing in North Carolina strictly for taxes, this huge server farm they call it. They didn't build it where their headquarters is. They moved it to a state that was cheaper to put it.</i>

283	C2, C4	<i>The city of Half Moon Bay was facing bankruptcy for some errors in judgment they made and lost a lawsuit, \$18 million worth. As a result of that, they have this tremendous budget problem. One of the first things they did was they cancelled their city fire department, much to the chagrin of those people, and brought in Cal Fire and reduced – they just last week cancelled their police department and went with the local sheriff for the county.</i>
284	C5	<i>Everybody squandered all the money, which I think was one other – I don't know when – we're gonna address it eventually, but it is about a rainy-day fund, or maybe part has to do with stepping up a level, which is to guarantee that we don't squander money because we don't think ahead.</i>
285	C2	<i>My question is – had to do with the economic stability in the state and in</i>

What's Next California
Supplementary Report: Transcripts

		<i>the regions, and how do we ensure that we bring along the poorer parts of California with the wealthier part. I see this creating even a bigger divide between the poor and the rich, the poor – you know the have and the have-nots, whatever you wanna ____.</i>
286	C4	<i>What's possible without totally trampling all over people who would have no power if we did so? So that's where maybe standards can come into play.</i>
287	C3	<i>So by collecting some funds and elevating it up to the region, maybe the region can place its priorities and distribute the funds.</i>
288	C2	<i>Are there examples of this working or not working in diverse communities, or rich, or economic, or socio ____?</i>
289	C3	<i>Just set up a separate authority responsible for that particular function for, let's say roads. And you'd have another one for communication, another one for hospitals. It's not done on a broad spectrum. It's done on an individual item-by-item basis, whatever that item is, hospitals, or health, police. It's done on a vertical integration.</i>
290	C3, C5	<i>the accountability is to the people who are being held accountable by the communities, by those people who are electing them now.</i>

5. TAXATION

What's Next California

Supplementary Report: Transcripts

No.	Proposal	Quote
1		<i>And I think that deep feelings reflecting a sense of a loss of power is split between races, but a deep down fear for all of us, in terms of what's going to happen in a downturn.</i>
2		<i>I'm for lowering the tax rate, but spreading it out among services... Lower it 1 percent for everything. We add a little bit more to our revenue...</i>
3		<i>...what if parents put the kids through K through like 8th grade, or K through 6th grade, and then the government went and took from 9th grade and then put everybody through their AA.</i>
4		<i>I think that if you had a state where the units paid of the education, there would be a huge amount of people that wouldn't be educated, and that's the bottom line. We have the right to pay for a kid's education; we get a tax deduction for it...I think more money should go to education, than anything else.</i>
5		<i>The only thing I have to say maybe contrary to that is I think there is a lot of money already put into education, but we should use it better and more efficiently.</i>
6		<i>I'm just saying, what is happening to the money that's going into education? I'd like to see them audited and say, okay, where does the tax money go? How is it spent? Is it spent actually in the classroom? How much is spent in the classroom?</i>
7		<i>All that stuff was once provided for the schools, but now all of is coming out of the parents with no money or the teachers with no money. Because the superintendents and all the people on their school boards are where the majority of their money is going to.</i>
8		<i>You take all of that money, the millions that are in that fund, and fund the kindergartens in the whole state, and that frees up the money that you're paying for kindergarten and spread it out.</i>
9		<i>There's something, the Williams Act, and one of the things is everybody has got to have a textbook. The other is you're not supposed to pay for your own stuff...</i>
10		<i>I think a lot of this discussion is great because we're asking, well, why is our school system falling apart? But at the same time I see a lot of private tutors starting to open up their own businesses. So with every problem there's always a solution that springs up, and I think a lot of parents are starting to do the whole private tutoring thing. Because if you look at these kids, one kid isn't better than the other; it's just who spends more time... So I think that we criticize like our school system and it's underfunded. Yeah, maybe it's a little underfunded and all that stuff, but what I see is the lack of desire.</i>
11		<i>I've heard you say things like – with my nephew that made you so upset that an 8-year-old has to run around to pay for _____. And some of that is – I hesitate to say it because I don't necessarily believe this. Is that the teacher's unions and the other higher level staff where the</i>

		<i>money is going allow this to happen. Because, otherwise, it threatens their level.</i>
12		<i>Not enough people vote in these local elections.</i>
13		<i>It has a direct effect on your life and you know more about Obama than you know about this tax assessor.</i>
14		<i>There's not enough disclosure of what's going on and how our education funds are being spent, and it's very difficult and cumbersome to find the information. They'll tell you, oh, it's online, or blah, blah, blah.</i>
15		<i>Maybe we should have something to tie funding to schools to a little more transparency. To make it easier for everyone, not just the parents who don't have time. But if you tie the school funding to transparency where it goes, something like that.</i>
16		<i>But I want to know where the money is going. I want more specific examples of exactly what's going to be done with the money. I don't want to hear, oh, we just need more money.</i>
17		<i>Didn't we just talk about the general fund and siphoning off – putting things into the general fund, and new initiatives would come from the general fund, or they would be specified. _____ local, right? So that money for the schools would go more local. So you would be able to find out more locally where that money was going. _____. So the other thing he's saying is, extend the tax, but we're also going to take that money and give it all back to the local – give them local control. So your local school board would have it and they would be responsible for it. _____. The state tells us to spend the money this way. But if it goes to the local school board, you can go to the local school board and say, now you're in charge; how come you put the money there?</i>
18		<i>I'm thinking that our economy is really hurting, I think that we all know that. And increasing any taxes would only hurt our economy. So the way to solve it is to increase benefits and services, like for school. More efficiency and reducing waste.</i>
19		<i>One of the problems with the low income education system is everything is free and there's no value to that. They don't value it. Their parents don't value it. The students don't value it, and it's really hard to teach kids that don't value education. So I think giving them more and more free stuff is like it creates and entitlement attitude and they're going to stay there forever.</i>
20		<i>But first I want to talk about sales tax and minimum wage. Sales tax is a tax on the poor because the poor have to pay much more – a greater percentage of their income on services and on goods. And so their 7.25 percent is a whole lot more percentage of their whole income, than to other people. So you start spreading it out to services, I think that it's actually more _____ to have it on goods because the wealthy are going to buy the cars.</i>
21		<i>So I think that rather than saying goods should be and services not,</i>

What's Next California
Supplementary Report: Transcripts

		<i>look at the specific types. Like groceries, everybody needs groceries; exempt that. Everybody needs medical services. Have those be excluded, and then across goods and services, those things that aren't considered a necessity, tax that.</i>
22		<i>I don't think that we should raise taxes. I think that we need to prosecute the people who cheat on their taxes. I don't think taxes should be allowed to be written off in bankruptcy because I know people who do that.</i>
23		<i>All I'm saying is dollar devaluation is the only reason why taxes have been going up.</i>
24	<i>D4</i>	<i>My comment on D4 is, on principle I like the idea of something more progressive. It's the devil's in the detail. I would like it rather something like this saying currently like we have now where you phase out the deduction based on income...So I like some of the idea, but I would see it partially phased in and have it be more income related, than just a flat cut-off.</i>
25		<i>Well, there's too much waste, and not enough accountability. _____. No accountability for the money, and that's why I don't like raising taxes.</i>
26		<i>With attrition, what they do is they stack the deck in the budget and they'll say we need 15 people to do A, B, C, this year. And then the powers that be say, Oh, no, through attrition you're not going to get the 15 percent. Well, guess what, the only reason they asked for 15 people was because they knew that with attrition they wouldn't get them, and they could maintain their same level of funding.</i>
27		<i>So they say the percentage of revenue that we get from residential, even under Prop 13, is now – has grown. Whereas the percentage of revenue that you get from an office building has grown very slow. So Prop 5 would be just making business pay their fair share, not taxing them more.</i>
28		<i>You put people to work, they make money and they have to pay taxes on it. That is the best way to raise taxes. If you just say we're going to jump it up a percent, or whatever, you just discourage people, they have less money to spend, and since they have less money to spend, that's less sales tax.</i>
29		<i>I vote for the tax increases within my county because I know what it's going to get spent on. I really do. I know that they're trying to raise money for this bridge, or community college, different stuff. It's like I know what that money is going to be spent on. I vote for that. But when it comes to the state government, _____, I don't really know what my money is being spent on, and you hear about so much waste. So I hate when they just say we want more. Well, explain to me.</i>
30		<i>Why can't the state present to the electorate a five to ten-year plan, approximately one economic cycle, to help us better evaluate the balance between the spending cuts, tax increases and the size of a rainy day fund to smooth the budgeting process.</i>

31		<i>And I think the other point that Hugh was saying, that they should present a plan. Because if you present a plan, the voters will be more likely to vote for taxes if they see that the taxes are tied to a specific plan, just like Deborah was saying. So that's the only other part that I would add. He's saying he used that plan in order to fundraise.</i>
32		<i>I'd like to ask how we can get them to consider other sources of revenue besides taxes.</i>
33		<i>When people talk about the gridlock and removing the two-thirds majority, I cringe. Because basically what you're saying is we want a one-party rule, and it doesn't matter what party is in power. Just the principle of taking away the bargaining chip from the other party. When you butt heads, you force people to compromise. But if everything passed on a simple majority then you're just giving power to one party.</i>

34	<i>D1</i>	<i>So all they gotta do, is if they say, you know hat, this is how much money you got. You can only do it for the people who really need it, and then maybe they will weed out and take a better look at the recipients and make sure that the money is being used the way it's intended to be used.</i>
35	<i>D1</i>	<i>But when I look at this pay as you go, if you have an idea for a new program, or you wanna say I wanna implement this tax cut, you have to say, well, what's gonna change. What program are we gonna eliminate in order to have that tax cut, or what are we gonna do to make sure that we have enough to cover our expenses, which is what you would do with your own money, right, like you pay as you go.</i>
36	<i>D1</i>	<i>Well, it's a double negative. Yeah, it's sort of an odd way of phrasing it, but yeah, if you're gonna cut down in revenue, you have to figure out how that now gap in revenue is gonna be met by anything else or adjusting things.</i>
37		<i>The only way that the flat tax is gonna work is if you take all the loopholes from the fools that make billions and billions of dollars</i>
38	<i>D1</i>	<i>Well, let's just go back to Proposal B1. My opinion is that pay as you go, like I said, is kind of redundant. It's what they're supposed to be doing with these funds already, but they're not.</i>
39	<i>D1</i>	<i>But the cons say because California has a budget balance requirement, some of our fiscal discipline is already built in. Well, clearly that is not the case. It's not working.</i>
40	<i>D1/2</i>	<i>But what they have in here is that during good times, during the '80s, when things were much more flush, they should've put that money, instead of spending it or giving – I mean, I'm all for getting a nice little check. "Oh, we had extra money. Here's your tax cut 'cause someone wanted to get elected," but if they had put it in the bank, invested it safely, not some of these crazy things they did, then that money would've been there when fuel costs skyrocketed, or disasters happen, earthquakes, that type of things, yeah. It goes both</i>

What's Next California
Supplementary Report: Transcripts

		<i>ways. Yes, by all means pay as you go, but when good times are good, put that money away, just don't refund it. Have it there for that rainy day.</i>
41	D4	<i>If you're paying \$25,000 in interest, that's a pretty big</i>
42	D5	<i>– 1 percent. Oh, maybe one year you might be able to absorb it, but if you're going over a couple years, that hurts. Everything else is going up. If you're on medication, which usually happens when you get older, your medications – my dad fell into what they call the donut hole, when you reach a certain amount of – your deductible, expenditures. Right, it doesn't kick in, so in June, he hit the donut hole on medications. So between that and the end of the year, he was having to pay a substantial amount of his medicine that he takes for diabetes and heart and everything else. And that's six months that he is paying, his insurance, Medi-cal, until he reaches something like \$20,000 in medicine does the insurance kick back in. So he's in what they call the donut hole. Well, his Social Security didn't go up, but –</i>
43	D5	<i>I feel that they should be protected. They had the opportunity to work very hard and they should have that set fee on your property taxes. I think it should make that based on per case, per resident, per home. If you're already making this certain dollar amount _____ income, we're not gonna raise your property tax. It's already been paid off. That's how I would try to offer a solution for people like that.</i>
44	D5	<i>On my business, I get a lot of tax exempt for a lot of stuff.</i>
45	D5	<i>. Now, I'm not a business owner, but there are regulations that cost businesses because the amount of tax.</i>
46		<i>I think of raising taxes, to me like that stops the discussion. I think about can we create a system that's more equitable, that we're taxing the right things, and structuring it in a way that it encourages growth, encourages business, encourages people, creating jobs and opportunities, and it's fair to people.</i>
47	D5	<i>You gotta realize one thing, this is only gonna hurt for one year. If they increased – if they reassess _____ property values, it's only gonna hurt that first year because they haven't been assessed in years and years ago, because they've been in that company for a long time. That's why they wanna tax us because homeowners sell and buy a lot sooner, so every time they do that they assess the property and that's how they're gonna get the tax.</i>
48		<i>Sometimes the corporations, they find so many loopholes that they don't end up paying any tax.</i>
49		<i>I know just from our experience this year, the difference between the state and the federal is dramatic. Stuff that we could write off federally could not go statewide, and the one thing that just – I noticed was we donate back to the universities – two different universities that I was involved with through the athletic departments.</i>

50		<i>– I’m not gonna give you money. I don’t have the money to give anymore.</i>
51		<i>Well, and you look at – I know in _____ school district – a lot of school districts, in athletics, you’ve got to pay. Your kid wants to play, you have to pay, and you have to raise money.</i>
52		<i>That’s it; and that’s where all the entitlements – I call them entitlements – come into play. Because we got so used to all the wonderful things that we don’t have to pay for because it’s given to us that we’re spoiled, and they don’t want to give it up.</i>
53		<i>Right. Yeah. If there used to be revenue for all of those services in the school, why not now? Plus, they’re reducing the number of teachers drastically, increasing class sizes. If the money was there before, why isn’t it there now? What’s happened?</i>
54	<i>D1</i>	<i>I think what our issue today is how can we take away from the volatilities which is part of the pay as you go, and this applies to new programs. It doesn’t apply to the old programs. But as I read that proposal there, there’s nothing in there to say how long do you have to pay as you go? We can put all these programs in, and they’ll likely pay for them when the economy’s good. Are we gonna mandate that that amount of money stay with them when the economy goes in the tanks? That’s a pay as you go, but how do you define as you go under how long you’re gonna be going? It’s very complex to do that.</i>
55		<i>Corporations don’t pay taxes either. Bank of America does not pay taxes.</i>
56		<i>They’re all going to Texas or wherever there’s low taxes.</i>
57	<i>D1</i>	<i>I like the pay as you go, except I would like it more on a local level than a state level</i>
58	<i>D1</i>	<i>Well, we don’t know that, in the future, if something comes up that really is needed crucially, and suddenly we can’t pass it because we can’t pay for it, or we can’t figure out a way to pay for it. Now, the law prohibits that crucial thing that we might need from being passed because they took the easy way out saying well, we don’t know what this mess is, but we’ll live with it.</i>
59		<i>You just never want to make it easy for the state to raise taxes, ever. Because if you do, they will raise your taxes.</i>
60		<i>What will happen in a situation when the corporation is faced with an extra \$100 million in taxes? Who do you think is gonna pay for that? Every one of us will pay for that by higher costs for services. We’ll have less money to spend on anything else. The business may say, “I don’t want to fight this. I’m gonna go to Nevada.” Look at where all of our big chains are going. They’re going to Nevada, Texas, Arkansas, Missouri. The big things – we’re great for technology. We’re great for some of the leading-edge stuff. But the bread and butter of this economy _____ small business that are gonna be faced with doubling or tripling their taxes _____. They’re gonna leave.</i>

What's Next California
Supplementary Report: Transcripts

61	D2	<i>I kind of like the idea – yesterday, when I heard that the tax income for California spikes up and down, I thought to myself well, there's – I have plenty of friends who have their own businesses, and their income sometimes spikes just like that, too. There's good times and bad times, and they have to save for the bad times and enjoy the good times. Then, I was reading this – this Proposition D2 – that we had to target 10 percent of the state's budget for the rainy day fund, and then only use that extra income that comes in for one-time projects. It makes a lot of sense to me. It's just a single fix.</i>
62	D2	<i>One of the things that we've all been told by our financial advisors is you should keep three months' cash reserve on hand, in the event of an emergency. This 10 percent for three months would probably cover 25 days of state government. If you're talking about numbers, and you want to have something meaningful, 5 percent is being in the ocean; 10 percent might be reasonable, if you can convince people who think they're paying too much that they really haven't paid too much because the next time around, they're gonna lose something, when we're down and we have to tap that fund, rather than go through the gridlock that we're facing now in order to raise taxes to pay for services.</i>
63	D2	<i>I think if we had it, we would use it now. Our city has a rainy day fund. When our schools went into a big crisis, some – our teachers got paid. Some of our teachers got paid from the rainy day fund of our city.</i>
64	D2	<i>I think if California people understood what the rainy day fund would be used for – which, I imagine, would be generally for those things that benefit the whole state, like roads and bridges and house – I'm thinking of an earthquake _____ collapse and Oakland _____ those big, cataclysmic things that can happen in our state. They don't happen often, thank God, but if they understood, then they could be more supportive. So communication to the population about what this rainy day fund specifically would cover, and not just be a vague term of rainy day fund – that would help. My question, also, is does a rainy day fund need to have _____ that never gets touched, so there's always some _____ start over again.</i>
65	D3	<i>On this _____ increased incidents of Internet sales – some states, if you buy the product from a website that's based in their state, you're subjected to their state sales tax. You're not subjected to California state sales tax. Other corporations – other businesses you buy from, they pay the California tax. How much money is the state losing by not taxing Internet sales uniformly around the country, and is there a way that that can be implemented</i>
66	D3	<i>The smaller, local businesses lose out because you may go to those big websites knowing that you don't have to pay tax. Some do.</i>
67	D3	<i>I'm kind of for that because, actually, our</i>

		<i>economy, especially in California, is more of a service economy now. So most of our taxes should come from that. Now, there's gonna be a lot of deliberation as to which services _____ how, but services like what I was reading here – dry cleaning –</i>
68	D3	<i>Speculation is rampant in the financial sphere. Speculating on this, looking at the direction that the economy in California is taking, if we start putting services and leave the rate the same, services are gonna rise. The amount of services consumed in California's gonna go up, even if you lower the rate to keep it neutral now, two, three and five years out, we're gonna making a bundle more cash. So I think that that would be a way that you could do that because the amount of service in our state is not going to decline. It's gonna increase.</i>
69	D3	<i>About – well, back on cigarettes and alcohol. We could raise the taxes on that. It goes towards the healthcare fund.</i>
70	D3	<i>I have another question, but it's to the decision towards taxing services. Right now, sales tax disproportionately affects lower income. Will taxing services affect more the upper income or spread it evenly? Because I – it seemed wrong, but I would think that – the lower income people I don't think use dry cleaning as much or –</i>
71	D3	<i>No, but it is a service. But _____ what I'm saying is like _____ Coca Cola and all the other businesses we're driving out, we might start driving out the service industries if we tax too much.</i>
72	D4	<i>In some cases _____ boom that we just came out of, your mortgage interest might have been _____ \$25,000.00 for that first year. If you're making a \$4,000.00 a month mortgage payment, there's a good chance most of that is mortgage interest.</i>
73	D4	<i>If you've paid a couple million, why can't you have that whole write off? If you've worked and you've earned that right to buy that house, and you're paying all these taxes, why should you be limited on how much you can write off in mortgage interest?</i>
74	D4	<i>There is a renter's credit. Now, I think maybe you need to raise that, but I don't think you should have a limit. It doesn't matter what your mortgage interest is.</i>
75	D4	<i>I think this proposal kind of goes around to Proposition 13 by not necessarily increasing taxes on a home, but reducing the deduction you have on homes. So people who have more property or more expensive property, in a sense, would be paying more taxes.</i>
76	D5	<i>How often does business property values go up? I can see residential because as a little kid, I remember hearing about Proposition 13 and the reasons for it. It's like, "Well, if I buy a house, I take care of my house, and they take care of their house, and this becomes a desirable neighborhood and values go up." _____ why am I being taxed more for doing what's right? But businesses it's a little different. It's not like they move into a neighborhood and they're gonna</i>

What's Next California
Supplementary Report: Transcripts

		<i>take care of _____</i>
77	D5	<i>But if the owner has his building paid off, or if the owner's been – the owner of that building bought that building 30-40 years ago, then the owner's making money.</i>
78	D5	<i>I like how it says that it increases fairness between residential and non-residential property taxes.</i>
79	D5	<i>Is this much different than the owner of the building seeing an increase in his insurance rates because his property is now worth more? If he had a \$200,000.00 building _____ insured for \$200,000.00, it wouldn't cover squat. But if the building's worth \$600,000.00, he's probably paying four or five times as much insurance. Is this any different from that?</i>
80	D5	<i>If something did happen to his building, would he want it replaced or would he want his \$200,000.00? It's the same thing as a homeowner. If you're worried about replacement, you might as well insure it for what its value is.</i>
81	D5	<i>– it's easier to be running a business because the old businesses no longer have their reassessed property value because of the circumstance of when they came into ownership of the building. It might be more equitable.</i>
82	D5	<i>Just a point on – about the solar industry. If you check with some of these solar companies, their head offices are here in California – getting the rebates and all that. But do you know where they're building the solar panels?</i>
83	D5	<i>So the housing bubble was caused by greed and people not _____ responsibility of having a state in this situation. So the prices of houses can just go up and up and up because nobody really cared _____. But now, we're suffering the consequences because of all the foreclosures they're having. Some people have bought a home when the price was high, and now their property value's lower because of the change, and they're stuck. They can't afford to move out of their house.</i>
84	D5	<i>Do you know that, though? Maybe they aren't. Maybe commercial properties retain their value because they generate income for the owners. Whereas, a home doesn't really generate income for you.</i>
85	D5	<i>I guess a question would be can we – can we – if we were to do something like this – to adjust Proposition 13 – can we write in protections for people on fixed incomes?</i>
86	D6	<i>I don't agree with that. I think it – what it does is it gives the minority party veto power over the minority party.</i>
87	D6	<i>But if we extend term limits – _____ talking yesterday _____ have our representatives there longer, they could establish those connections that they were talking about and be able to work with each other. Then, if it was absolutely necessary and if it was better for California, then maybe once relationships have been set, that two thirds could be _____.</i>

88	D6	<i>That two thirds majority could be met because then, there'd be more people who might make connections, might be willing to cross party lines, might be able – people who have been serving longer who are there more for the purpose of building California than for cheering on the Democratic or Republican parties.</i>
89		<i>To me it doesn't matter how much they raise taxes, they still spend it wrong. And that needs to stop. When are people going to realize, yes, everyone needs to work harder, everyone needs to pay taxes, but they can't count on the government for everything. ____ So no matter what you do to raise taxes in the highest amount, our debt eventually will overtake _____. People need to be aware of that. Something needs to be done to cut spending, along with taxing. There's got to be a better balance.</i>
90	D2	<i>I think there needs to be a better balance and a better -- some program for saving that money. Like we said yesterday, a rainy day fund. I mean, if we have times of plenty, we should save for down times, and they don't do it.</i>
91	D3	<i>I don't think you should raise taxes, either. But I think it's more thinking about things we should be taxing that we're not in California. ____ that we're not taxing. Petroleum, parts for auto repair, things we're missing opportunities. Even marijuana. There are all these different things that are on the table that could be taxed.</i>
92		<i>But remember, we already pay the highest taxes in this state. So if you're going to add more taxes, you're going to say goodbye to more business, and more revenue. That's the bottom line. They will not stay here for that. People who have small businesses, a lot of them can't afford to do that.</i>
93	D3	<i>I have a problem with taxes on goods and services because it really impacts people who are poor. Everybody has to pay the same in 9.25 percent sales tax. And so if you're a guy who's making \$8 an hour, and you pay the 9.25, and you're a millionaire, you pay the same amount. And it hurts people who are struggling to have to pay that tax.</i>
94	D3	<i>Cigarettes are a little bit different because that's a choice, well, not after a while it's not such a choice. But that is a choice people make to purchase, cigarettes. But you don't make a choice to purchase bread. You don't make the choice to purchase milk for your kids.</i>
95	D3	<i>We quarrel about the exemptions. The one I hear that I thought was very interesting here was, let's do away with the exceptions but lower the sales tax rate. I don't have a whole lot of confidence that that sales tax rate will stay down at that level</i>
96	D3	<i>I think most of the – and this is on a national level – most of the people propose these national sales taxes now. They say there should be a rebate for like cost of living. So there is like a bare minimum so you're</i>

What's Next California
Supplementary Report: Transcripts

		<i>not taxing the poor as much as the rich</i>
97	D3	<i>Because, I mean, you got businesses at the rate they're taxing the businesses that business is not going to want to come or stay in California, which is true. But you got businesses that are making millions and people are making minimum wage, and spending most of their income on sales tax. How can that be fair? I know that sales tax is fair amongst everyone, it doesn't discriminate anyone, but it does. It's a catch-22,</i>
98	D3	<i>Because it does have at some levels unequal application in terms of – a dollar to you, is probably different than a dollar for me, a dollar for you.</i>
99		<i>If one of them raises the tax like that, you're going to find businesses moving out.</i>
100	D3	<i>The problem I have with that is the bureaucracy it creates for the business to collect, track, pay in, be subject to audit, all the things that are incurred when you have to levy a tax on your services. So that's a big expense for a company to have to keep track of some of these taxes.</i>
101		<i>And the thing is, it could be lower for everyone if we held our legislators accountable. I agree we need to take care of certain services, I totally agree with that. But right now it's gone so far afield, I think, taking care of everyone. We need to do some house cleaning and figure out who really needs the care, and who's living kind of on the state's back. And then we need to make it – and that needs to be a big discussion that the state has. What's most important? And cover those things. And then we need to incentivize businesses to come back here because everyone's cost of living goes – I mean, the value of their homes, everything goes up.</i>
102		<i>Even if they found some magic tax and you have a lot more revenue, who here would doubt that the legislature will spend that money – will find a way to spend that money.</i>
103		<i>I don't remember they brought up the topic when they budgeting, they don't do it annually; they sometimes do like three to five-year estimates. Maybe that's ne that should be an annual. It would be more representative of what the economy is doing right now, what's occurring right now.</i>
104	D2	<i>And remember when the dot com bubble, and the housing bubble was there, the money was there. They didn't have to spend all of that. But they came up with programs to spend it. And if they weren't allowed to come up with all of these new programs when we got a great income in our state, then it would be there when the income goes down. And that's the problem is they spend faster than they make it.</i>
105	D2	<i>Maybe you have some sort of balanced budget, but you're required to spend less than that. And whatever percentage of it, that difference would go into this rainy day fund.</i>
106	D2	<i>You don't put money into a savings account when</i>

		<i>you have no money to live.</i>
107	D5	<i>I think when Prop 13 was originally introduced, it was a good idea, and then as time went on things needed to be adjusted.</i>
108	D5	<i>That part of it – when the housing bubble hit, my house went up so much in value that if the taxes went up to the true value of the house, I would have had to move out of the house.</i>
109	D5	<i>When my grandparents bought their home it was before Prop 13, and I think they bought it for about \$27,000 in San Mateo. And then it was ten years ago when they passed away and ____ sold, they sold it for close to half a million dollars. And it never changed hands in all that time. And so now the people living there, it got reassessed, but all that time they saved so much money by Prop 13 that they could have easily gotten kicked out of their home. It was good for them, but I don't know if it's fair.</i>
110	D4	<i>Yeah, I was going to say. The problem with it is, it's kind of a hands-off subject. It's a very passionate one. A lot of people would say, well, yeah, you're going to limit it to \$25,000 this year, but next year you're going to cut it down to \$12,000.</i>
111	D4	<i>The people in L.A. and San Francisco will feel the bite of this, than someone who lives in Inyo County.</i>
112	D4	<i>Because they think that it's going to address the people who are rich, but that's not necessarily the case depending on where you live.</i>
113		<i>Well, the fact of the matter is every tax there's a winner and there's a loser. Don't tax you, don't tax me, tax that guy behind the tree. That's the dilemma. As long as I don't have to pay tax, it's a hell of an idea.</i>
114		<i>It shouldn't matter if you've worked hard enough to get in the stature of life where you can buy a better home than I can buy, I don't think you have to pay more of the burden to put the roads down the street, or to pay for the fire service. I think it should be equal. And I think when you start enacting taxes like this that just target one group.</i>
115		<i>And maybe we need some distance in a new tax structure. Maybe we should ask the people who have incomes and properties of a higher value to take on a higher part of this burden. I mean, don't ask someone minimum wage to it.</i>
116		<i>It gets to be very hard when it comes to tax time for me. I've always had to pay, ever since I started paying taxes. Ever since I got a job, always had to pay at the end of the year. I really try to adjust and it always ends up more. I don't fall in some of those brackets. But I don't mind because I'm doing my part, and I hope that everybody else is doing their part.</i>
117		<i>. Expand the sales tax pay to include services as well as goods, reduce the sales tax, overall; keep the sales tax rate constant, and raise the state and local revenues.</i>

What's Next California
Supplementary Report: Transcripts

118	D4	<i>Well, limit the deduction because you want the – well, I would assume the reasoning in this they want the deduction to benefit the lower income people, but they want the taxes to hit more – It's progressive.</i>
119	D5	<i>I don't mind paying higher property taxes on commercial property, as long as those taxes enhance the value of my property by making schools better, my roads better, my lighting better, my fire department better, which is what property taxes are supposed to do.</i>
120	D6	<i>But the simple fact of the matter is because they need the two-thirds, the only reason Jerry Brown has any leverage with his own political party right now is because there's some Republican holdouts that are refusing to go along with the deals. And so Brown is saying to his own party, look, you gotta give me something to deal with to bring these – bring enough of these people to the other side of the table.</i>
121	D6	<i>My opinion, though, I think that threshold is just too high. Because the way things are now you can't get enough cooperation in both parties with a two-thirds rule to get the revenue that we need. So I think it's just too high right now, two-thirds.</i>
122	D6	<i>The goal is to get everybody to work together, ideally. And weren't they talking about yesterday where people didn't vote with their party; they went against them to get them out of House. They punish them in different ways. I really don't like that at all.</i>
123	D7	<i>I think that the higher though makes the group harder to come to some middle ground. I mean, if it's just majority, then all they're going to do is what they want to do, which is raise taxes and chase business out.</i>
124	D7	<i>But two-thirds is really difficult to get something passed. I mean, I worked on two different tax increase things on property taxes, one for schools and one for that we just actually passed for the fire department. And to get a two-thirds majority on those votes is a really difficult threshold to meet.</i>
125	D7	<i>That's what I'm saying. I know we're talking about taxes right now, but what I'm saying is the revenue is not going to change so much. What they need to change is actually get down to cutting spending. In Europe they're doing that now with austerity. The last time the British Prime Minister came over here, he flew in coach on British Airways. They actually did it. That'll never happen ____.</i>
126	D7	<i>That's actually not. Hang on. I think the reason for some higher percentage is that the higher you go, the more it's okay, acceptable, to force whatever the position, whether it's taxes or whatever, on an objecting minority. That principle is just basic in founding this country. The reason I could never support a 51 percent vote on revenue issues. I just think it's too oppressive. But I could say you could go from 66, to 60 percent.</i>

127	D7	<i>No. What's basic is, is that we take precautions not to oppress minorities. And by that I mean a voting minority. So I think the theory is, at some point, that's okay. If you get the 60 percent, or two-thirds percent, and you're the minority, then you just got to live with that because a significant, significant majority says we're going to go the other way. That's the system, we'll tolerate it. I think it's less tolerant if it's 50.5 versus 49.5.</i>
128		<i>And I agree. Don't forget, the dynamic has changed, the government, since then and now. You've added very powerful and rich lobbyists to the process that don't allow us citizens to get at this half percent, and feel comfortable about it because the decision is being driven by Procter & Gamble, in Cincinnati, and not –</i>
129		<i>I'll throw something out that's probably really unpopular. I'm pretty happy with the taxes that I pay, and I'm very happy with the schools that my kids go to. I'm very happy that I have roads – I've been here for 25 years. I used to drive around all of L.A. and the traffic was 100 times worse than it is today. We've come a long way in the last 20 years. I think it's okay.</i>
130		<i>I could see maybe taking two-thirds to 60 percent. I could never agree to go to 51 percent. That's just my personal view. You people have at that; we're not taking votes. It's designed to make it tough for a reason. Because the political class always wants to find the answer on the revenue enhancement side; they don't want to find the answer on the expenditure, production side, in my view. They'll do it if they have to, but that's now where their first inclination is.</i>
131		<i>It's the people making the money that historically have built the country, infrastructure, and you know, through revenue, through that evil word, taxes. And I'm not talking about taxing the people that are barely making their mortgage, taxing their property so bad that they can't make their mortgage. I'm talking about taxing the people that are supposed to be taxed, the people that aren't taxed, the people that aren't really people, the corporations.</i>

132	D3	<i>Even though it kind of piques me every time I pay sales tax, it really, honestly, it doesn't bother me, and I live from paycheck to paycheck like most people in this room.</i>
133	D3	<i>Well, you don't really notice. But if you added it all up, it would bother you. You'd be like, "Wow, that's what I paid in a year."</i>
134		<i>And even some of my wants. And I have a family and children and grandchildren and people that I am responsible for. And I used to live in the mentality of how am I going to pay the car payment? Or how am I going to pay this? Or how am I going to pay that? All of this stuff that we're talking about can be fixed. Not fixed, it can be made better. You know those people that were up, the experts that were up there talking and like rehashing and giving their opinion</i>

What's Next California
Supplementary Report: Transcripts

		<i>on all this stuff, it can be fixed so that it works better for us now. And in ten years, it may need to be fixed so it can work better for us then. You know what I mean?</i>
135	<i>Rational Ignorance</i>	<i>The language is very clear in these. I will say that. A lot clearer than I've ever read anywhere else. Because I do try to read the voter's pamphlet and I do read those stupid books that they send us with all that information. I really do, you guys. And I even, I'll even get online and use a dictionary for the things that I really don't understand. I want to know and I want to be informed. But it's so discouraging because there is a lot of double talk and a lot of – well, people are not going to really read this stuff. They don't really care. That's not true in this. I understand this.</i>
136		<i>I believe that big companies should pay more money in taxes, but I don't have a problem paying more taxes if it's going to help people.</i>
137	<i>D5a</i>	<i>Can I give an example? I was _____. And I was very, very against it, and I worked very hard against it, and I was very unhappy with it. And I saw the results of that with the decrease in music and art in the schools. I mean all the way down the line. We really got hurt from Proposition 13. But on the other hand, I wouldn't be able to afford my home if we hadn't had 13. So I'm really feeling very conflicted about it. Yeah, and at the time that it was there, I had no idea that property values would do what they did, you know, the house would triple or quadruple or whatever. I wouldn't have a home now if it wasn't for Proposition 13</i>
138	<i>D5a</i>	<i>Can I pose something? To me, I've always through Howard Jarvis and his people miswrote Prop 13 way back when in the '70s. It should have covered only residential property. However, today we've got big business and they're paying way too little. But we also have small businesses, businesses like on Main Street and in small towns and things like that, that may need a Prop 13. I don't know. I mean I haven't done much research. But definitely Coca Cola and GE and all those people, NBC, whatever, have gotten way too much value out of Prop 13. Where do we go from here might be a better question.</i>
139		<i>You know, it's interesting in California that we have so many people, everybody's tapped, we have so much revenue coming in. I don't think it's a matter of needing more taxes, it's a matter of needing to restructure where the money's going and how it's used because we have a lot of weight.</i>
140		<i>And the federal government because for example, and I'm not going to get into immigration, good, bad or indifferent, legal or illegal, but if "illegal immigrants" come in with the coyotes and they don't have any money, and then they have their kids, they go and they inundate the emergency rooms and don't pay for the services to the point that emergency rooms are closing lock, stock and</i>

		<i>barrel almost all over the place and all over the country. But California, great weather, they're coming here.</i>
141	D5b	<i>Also D5B at this point too, I don't think it's fair to say that we can be assured that the values are going to go up. So that doesn't necessarily look like a source of additional revenue because property values may not continue to go up in the short term.</i>
142		<i>I know we've lost a good portion of the film industry and other industries to Canada and other places. And I also think about what Paul says about creating jobs and services and jobs going elsewhere. Is there a way to make a tax system that's based on how many jobs you create, if a company were to move their headquarters here?</i>
143	D3	<i>So are we saying what the taxpayers are paying right now and what corporations are paying, are we saying that, _____ that they're giving to the government is substantial enough to run the State of California? And if we took corporations away – I know it's really hard to do – but with the money that we get right now, without corporations, could we sustain?</i>

144		<i>Now I believe that if we can restructure our system and we can get it down, then we would find that we, actually, have the funding and the money to do it. It's just making these people accountable for the money that they have control of – that we give them control of.</i>
145	D1	<i>My question was would this, also, allow the voters to see specifically what programs would be cut or what taxes would be increased when they're voting for it? Because they didn't think voters, like they were saying with one, a lot – it's not our job to figure out where the money comes from. I think we do have to be aware of what programs are going to be combined or cut, or what taxes will be increased</i>
146	D2	<i>You know, we're the eighth biggest economy in the world. We need one that's that large.</i>
147		<i>I mean, considering the fact that this sounds like a good idea, if it actually goes just like all the rest of these good ideas, they actually play out how they're suppose to play out; but, I mean, quite frankly, I just don't trust it. Let's be real. I just don't trust it. Unless they can show me some type of proof to say that this is actually what we're gonna do. This is all we're gonna do.</i>
148	D5a	<i>And when we start reassessing, we're gonna start seeing not more revenues, but a lot less. Because we're gonna realize that most of the commercial property out there is worthless.</i>
149		<i>Well, my opinion about D-5a is that it's good, because we're trying to revenue raise.</i>
150		<i>And this proposition hurts small businesses. And that's what we're losing in this country and this state. That's right around the mom and pop shop or the small business or the entrepreneur. This</i>

What's Next California
Supplementary Report: Transcripts

		<i>smashes the entrepreneur and the smaller businesses.</i>
151	D2	<i>You need to have something set aside for those times when – because the economy, I mean you need to look at this thing traditionally, historically over the last hundred years and it has gone up and down every ten years. It's just the way it is. If you know that it's done this historically over this long period of time, then you should be putting away money for those times when the economy goes down.</i>
152		<i>I just – I am in favor of increasing the rainy day fund, but I think it should be separated from ____ revenue spikes, because it seems like the major cons of this proposal are that you – how you measure revenue spikes and how do you determine when money should or shouldn't be spent, and so I think if you split them I would favor increasing the rainy day fund money with the other part.</i>
153	D3	<i>Let me just say, it's very hard to tax services, because there's no physical inventory. That's probably one reason they haven't tried to do it because people just report their straight cash</i>
154	D4	<i>The issue is, is it an equitable tax for her age, \$25,000, when she only generates so much trash from her own use. That's not an equitable tax. No one's talking about an equitable tax, which means if you use something then you should pay for something. No one's contemplating equitability. That's the most important thing, because you know why people are leaving California? Because there's not an equitable tax.</i>
155	D5a	<i>Inevitably when they create something like this, gazillion factions will say, well, I want a loophole and the farmers are going to do it, the small four units or less are going to do it, and all that sort of thing</i>
156		<i>I think the broad sense of this is pretty clear in the fact that when you do this, it affects – in a way it does effect residential because you are effecting apartment buildings, which are occupied by the poorest people who in turn are going to have their rents probably doubled if something like that went through, because the taxes – if the taxes went up significantly, that increase is going to be passed on.</i>
157		<i>Who's going to pay that tax when it goes up? That's going to get passed straight to the tenant, the poorest people, and your business people are the one that are going to end up paying for the taxes, not the corporation</i>
158	D5b	<i>reassessing it because they want to increase tax revenue is not smart, because they're going to cause the business to go out of business.</i>
159		<i>You're going to reassess them a higher value and then tax them more so they get out of business and they foreclose on it. You have</i>

		<i>to make it feasible for people to be in business.</i>
160		<i>Reassessment is bringing my property back down to a base level.</i>
161		<i>Because of that, because of those three houses within a three-block radius, they raised my property taxes, even though the value of my house has not increased.</i>
162	D5	<i>My question is, is there a need for more spending in a certain area in your community? That's my question. If there is, then the taxes should go up to have an equitable share.</i>
163	D6	<i>The assembly is elected by the people, and if two-thirds of the people in congress that were elected by the people agree to raise taxes, then that's great.</i>
164	D5	<i>In order to control this, reduce federal taxes and guess what, people will want to stay in their property. Otherwise 10 percent of the homes are empty right now in California and 25 percent are foreclosed on because of this one issue.</i>
165	D7	<i>Local government has more freedom to decide their own destination.</i>
166		<i>Rather than the minority taking control over what's going to happen, we get the majority to rule, so I think it's a good ____.</i>
167		<i>If you take – if one person pays 10 percent of his income and another person pays 5 percent of his income, that 5 percent is earning a lot more, that's called regressive, because he's paying – his percentage of income, his share, is used to support the state is a smaller percentage of his income. It's not fair.</i>
168	D1	<i>I think that for me it makes sense conceptually that if you're going to spend more money you need to be able to account for where revenues coming from</i>
169		<i>I would rather have it upfront than what they're doing now is basically saying, okay, we're over budget so let's cut education. Let's cut health and human services. This and that. I'd like to know upfront.</i>
170		<i>I feel a sense of risk in some of these proposals. I almost get sweaty palms.</i>
171		<i>We don't have a balanced budget now and the real risk that we face is that California laws are going to hit ____ status, in which case the state will be bankrupt and reform will be imposed on us externally that we won't like at all.</i>
172	D2	<i>There's no reason in the world why especially things are getting surplus or any of that stuff. If we have spikes in the income, it's always related to the economy and whatever you do to stabilize that income, that tax base, is going to also stabilize that income</i>
173		<i>When we tax that profit, they're going to raise their prices because they can.</i>
174		<i>There are too many companies that aren't being taxed.</i>

What's Next California
Supplementary Report: Transcripts

175		<i>When I'm paying 10 percent and someone in the top 1 percent making millions and millions of dollars is only paying 7.4. I don't find that fair.</i>
176		<i>I would be absolutely thrilled to pay more taxes, and I think there are others like me, but I think that we need to see where it's going.</i>
177		<i>Nobody wants new taxes, let's face it. We don't want more deeds, we don't want more permits; they're all taxes.</i>
178	D5a	<i>It seems like that's almost like a no-brainer, right? That we would want to change that so that commercial property actually, I don't think commercial property should even be a part of Prop 13.</i>
179		<i>I think it's just so difficult that I would just want to take out commercial.</i>
180		<i>So D5-A is a good idea. To reassess non-residential property more frequently.</i>
181		<i>If there were a lot of assessments that actually is going to decline in revenue because the values have decreased.</i>
182		<i>Do we want to do that to business where every year somebody can come in an arbitrarily come up with a figure that your commercial is now worth \$22 million, instead of \$20 million, and then pay taxes on that. Do we want to cause that burden to any property owner?</i>
183		<i>We'll lose a lot of businesses.</i>
184	D3	<i>But the thing that scares me the most is that we want to charge sales tax on services. They want to tax services. Do you know what you pay in service fees? Whenever somebody – somebody says, I'm going to charge you \$60 an hour to do your hair, you can add – they want to start taxing that service. Or if you go to the accountant and he charges you \$300 to do your taxes, they want to tax that service. So now everything you do is going to be taxed. Do you want to have a tax on service?</i>
185	D6	<i>I like it because I think it puts back to the legislation, who should be doing all this. It gives them more leverage to come to some type of compromise. Whereas, right now we're not – we're in gridlock. And I think we need this to get out of gridlock and to put them more to work.</i>
186		<i>I think given the state that we're in right now, that I agree that simple majority to pass new taxes.</i>

187	prop 13	<i>I would propose it's a split role where commercial property gets assessed every five years or something instead of never. Commercial property, technically, can never change hands even though the company that runs it can change or it's owned by a holding company that leases it out to the people who actually operate it, so it will never change hands. They enjoy all the benefits and it's the homeowners who have to shoulder the burden</i>
188	prop 13	<i>Why, after 30 years, are you asking that question? After 30 years _____ nobody bothered asking.</i>

189	prop 13	<i>Right, but what you have is like McDonnell Douglas owns a huge tract of land in the middle of L.A. that actually, I guess, is what happened. Because the same people basically own it, that multimillion, hundreds of millions of dollars piece of property is still being taxed at 1976 rates.</i>
190	prop 13	<i>Commercial properties should never have been in Prop. 13. That was a mistake.</i>
191	prop 13	<i>If you did that and you put it into an initiative, it would be too complicated for the Average Joe to figure out. You'd have somebody that was opposed to that saying they're going to raise your taxes. If you had it simple and you just said commercial property no longer –</i>
192	prop 13	<i>I get that, but they don't care about the real money. They care about the people that are getting kicked out in business after they get kicked out of office. Those are going to be corporations that own all this property. That's what these politicians care about. They don't listen about you and me. Just keeping their jobs and when they go back, like we said before, they get on a board of directors of some big company. They show up once year for 20 minutes and they get \$300,000 a year. They do that for four or five of their buddy companies and they're set for life.</i>
193	prop 13	<i>They say too that some businesses want to move out of California because it's more expensive to do business here than it is in some other states. The question would be would that cause more businesses to move out of the state if we did that?(RASINING TAXES ON PROPERTY)</i>
194		<i>So if they raise the taxes, where will all that extra money to go?</i>
195	C5	<i>Well, Proposal C5, I just don't know who will establish – it seems like another bureaucracy will be established.</i>
196	prop 13	<i>Well, that's – you kinda have that – what she said is they polled business owners on this deal. She said, according to her, that a lot of people that they had their commercial property adjusted to today's value that they might close up and move out of state. That's her words. So she said that if they promise that the money would be used locally, for infrastructure improvements, then that that would be acceptable to them and they wouldn't wanna close up shop.</i>
197		<i>Finding hundreds of millions of dollars in waste isn't going to help the \$6 billion deficit.</i>
198		<i>I think it's true idea was that homeowners are subsidizing commercial and industrial property taxes because they're so unfair.</i>
199		<i>Because a lot of their money comes from various industries affected by the increased property taxes</i>

What's Next California
Supplementary Report: Transcripts

200		<i>, because I don't see how we can keep trimming local government; can't any more. We need police officers. We need firemen. They trim and trim and trim. They're shorting out our parks and everything else. I came to the point I don't believe it's a lot of waste from local government, I really don't.</i>
201	<i>prop 13</i>	<i>It's not a loophole. That is Prop. 13.</i>
202		<i>There used to be a lot of money for education. There has to be a huge amount of education done in order to make sure understand what's happening.</i>
203	<i>lobbying</i>	<i>If I was the Irvine Company or Hewlett-Packard, I have millions of dollars to sit there and put a disinformation campaign out there, and make it sound as if these guys are going to throw everybody out in the street, even though their not.</i>
204		<i>Most of my daughters' friends and son's friends who were economically below a certain threshold got full scholarships to where they needed to go, so it wasn't a question of access to the education being cut off, but we experienced a 30 percent increase. That's tax increases to me.</i>
205		<i>A lot of it is because like Mark said, the stock market crashes and then the pension funds, and then you've got people there that promise to fix pension. There's that obligation, but if you gave them the money and said 401k, you're on your own, invest the way you want, they lose the money it's on them. Right now, the way the pension system is set up, if that fund goes bankrupt, then there's all those people that had promises made to them.</i>
206		<i>How is it illegal to have a pact that says you won't raise taxes for any reason? It just seems absurd.</i>
207		<i>They're unethical. Should they be illegal? You can't sign a pact saying you'll always do something before you take office? It sounds so stupid. It's, like, "Really?"</i>
208		<i>Well, if there was more transparency, then the public could see what was going on. I had no idea that that even existed. Maybe it wouldn't even take place.</i>
209	<i>prop 13</i>	<i>Say you could then wave that magic wand and correct Prop. 13, one of my questions is, is that sufficient?</i>
210		<i>You see even – if everybody looks at this chart, you'll see that it's not a progressive tax; it's a regressive tax. The less you make, the more you pay percentage-wise of your income in taxes.</i>
211		<i>In that the top 1 percent pays 3 percent less in taxes of their income than the bottom 20 percent.</i>
212		<i>We could go back to just the ballot box if our representatives aren't performing the job that we put them there to perform, even though it might be four years later or two years later, or whatnot. That's how we speak to them, by not voting for them again, or voting for them, I mean, in addition to the recalls.</i>

213	rational ignorance	<i>I think that we are not legislators ourselves and that's not our job. However, our jobs are our lives. We don't have the time or energy to spend that they do to become educated. That's their job. So it's our job as citizens to vote them in, but it's their job to make these decisions. I mean, I believe we should be active in our state, but we can't dedicate all our time and energy. A lot of people have family members to take care, plus jobs, plus kids. It's crazy to think that we would have the time to be that involved.</i>
214	D1	<i>My biggest concern with the pay-as-you-go, I think it's good to understand what the cost consequences are, but it's just that its outcome – it's always in isolation from the other priorities within the government. We're not sure what we're trading, what the tradeoffs are, what we have to give up in the event that this seems compelling, or what the alternative is going to be.</i>
215	D1	<i>Why can't new programs require new money as opposed to setting a situation where you're pitting programs against each other, borrowing from one to pay for the other? If new programs require new money, then that wouldn't happen.</i>
216	D1	<i>I do think this is at least a start to be able to say, okay, in order to be able to pass this and have this new proposal, the money has to come from someplace. We're at least telling you this is where we want to take it from, which I think is a good step, which is more than what we've got currently.</i>
217		<i>Let me ask you a simple question. Do you think your representative is going to listen to you or a lobbyist that's going to come in and give him \$50,000 for his campaign?</i>
218	D1	<i>I like the transparency and seeing how much something's going to cost, but I'm concerned about the third point that is made on the con side. When they are looking for funding sources, they can delve into budget areas that did not have this powerful support entity and say, "Okay, that's where we're going to take the money." So I guess the question is how do you give that particular element of response or how do they get to respond and protect the concerns that they have before their money gets taken away from them, if they don't have the kind of basic support that an entity coming wanting to fund something has?</i>
219	D1	<i>They would have to make it a palatable proposal, whereas right now, what they're doing – you know what they're doing right now, Irwin. If they come up with a new program that they want, they're not cutting somebody else's program, they're just going – that's the thing. I mean, what did Arnold do? He couldn't balance the budget, so he just borrowed.</i>
220	D2	<i>we have more problems than we have solutions, so let them just figure out the money then.</i>

What's Next California
Supplementary Report: Transcripts

221	D2	<i>I think a rainy day fund would be – it just depends on what the other measures are that take place to deal with these spikes</i>
222	D3	<i>I would argue that this is the most regressive, most harmful proposal of all the tax ones because services are just as regressive as sales taxes.</i>
223	D3	<i>I think Mark and Sheila made a really good point that I never even thought of. I was completely for this until you said that it's regressive and that people who make less are going to be paying a larger percentage of their income. I think a lot of people don't even think about that. It's sad, but if we're in a middle class bubble, we don't consider other people's situations as often as we should.</i>
224	D4	<i>What I saw when everything tanked is that a lot of people were living off of the equity of their homes. They were using the equity to fund a lifestyle that they really had not truly earned</i>
225	D4	<i>I'm not opposed to this. I'm not opposed to a cap, I'd just like to see the cap higher</i>
226	D4	<i>I agree also because if the cap is higher, it's not going to as likely affect middle class people who are willing to live in a 3,000 square foot house, which is plenty big for just about anybody. So people who choose to live in a 10,000 square foot house, they paid millions and millions of dollars for it, and they have huge mortgages, and a large part of that is in interest, and it's all tax deductible, so it's very unfair.</i>
227	D4	<i>This is my point. Some of these people, and I'm not – they're living paycheck-to-paycheck. They're not wealthy. Even if they sell their \$400,000 home, they're still not wealthy because they borrowed most of that money to buy it. So they're not wealthy, they're just trying to survive like everybody else</i>
228	D4	<i>They have to realize you have to pay above that tax because they chose to be wealthy. They live in a better house</i>
229	D4	<i>Everything has an impact. Like I was trying to say before, because of our low property taxes, because of our mortgage deduction, it motivates citizens to buy homes. So in California, a lot of people are motivated to buy homes because it's the financially smart thing to do, which drives up the price of homes.</i>

230		<i>The first question how high should our taxes be? I'll answer that. They should not be any higher than they are now.</i>
231		<i>The bottom line on taxes, the state is increasing the taxes, and businesses are either falling, folding, or moving out.</i>
232		<i>See, you have to look at all the different ways that they, if you're in the state, and say, well, what can we do to increase money? Well, you got to tax somebody</i>

233	D5	<i>They've lived their whole life – they're 86 years old. They don't wanna sell that property. They wanna live there until they die. You know.</i>
234	D5	<i>You can reassess anytime you upgrade your house or remodel. I kinda doubt that.</i>
235	D3	<i>I have a suggestion. How about like if you're a stock trader and you trade a lot every day or if you occasionally buy 100 shares or something, why not California charge – tax five cents on every 100 shares that somebody purchases?</i>
236		<i>There are some people here with a lot of money who are not paying their – you'd be shocked at how much taxes people are paying.</i>
237		<i>And they will pick up and they will leave this state. Some of them already have. And you're just gonna push the money out of California.</i>
238		<i>What I'm saying is people who feel like they need to pay more taxes, we should let them. If that's what people say we ought to do, then California should set up a system that you can donate more of your money to the state.</i>
239		<i>Puerto Rico offered ten years no tax. The companies went there like crazy. After ten years the government said, okay, fine. Now, we have to start charging you tax. Okay. Puerto Rico itself benefited out of those ten years, you know, salaries, people paying taxes –</i>
240		<i>No, we have to be taxed. I don't care if the taxes stay the way they are now. No more.</i>
241		<i>We spent money on every possible thing, retired benefits for state workers and everything else, and we just spent ourselves into a hole. It's not a tax problem, it's a spending problem. No matter what the state tries to tell us about needing to raise taxes, they just spent the money and they obligated it to go to certain things.</i>
242		<i>Why aren't the billionaires paying more?</i>
243	D1	<i>You're not gonna increase the revenue from the state. You've got to figure out, okay, if we're able to pay for this</i>
244	D1	<i>All right, so the pros are that during the good times, which is the dot-com rule, new programs and tax cuts were enacted that creates a budget deficit. In subsequent years joint revenues grow _____. So you increased your greater stability. And then – okay I gotta finish it. All right. California's new services and taxes by making sure that the legislatures and the governor pass policies that the state will be able to afford in the future. And then the current balanced budget requirement does not impose enough fiscal discipline because we have seen budget gimmicks in the past years that allow the state to spend more than income revenues cover. That's interesting.</i>
245	D1	<i>So what if you said in a proposal that the budget must be balanced to the average of the lowest three years of</i>

What's Next California
Supplementary Report: Transcripts

		<i>the last. And then everything above that is a surplus. And you could decide what to do with that money for special purposes.</i>
246	D1	<i>Average that out. And that would be your target for it. And then that way – because it's cyclical – everything is cyclical. So my company has been in business for – since 2001. Okay. So we look at all ten years. And we say, okay, what is our worst revenue year? And we do an equation by employees, you know. I mean, obviously, you're operating, you know, so you use this matrix. And you decide, okay, I am going to live within this; because this is the average per employee of my lowest year. Okay, and then make forecast budgets going forward. And that way, we can ride on years when it's better. We make a lot of money and we can do things like capital improvements, buy trucks, do things of that nature. That's how you run a business. You have to run government like a business.</i>
247		<i>We have a couple of two or three rules about solving problems like this. We'll be honest. We'll be fair. And we will be doing the right thing. You can come to a solution to these problems very easily. The problem is in the real world, you have all these different gimmicks, you have all these different scams, you have all these dishonest people going into the process.</i>
248	D2	<i>The emergencies on D-2, though, is important and might be helpful.</i>
249	D2	<i>So I mean I think D-2 – in a wonderful real world it would work;</i>
250	D2	<i>What they should do is the years when the state has a surplus instead of starting new programs, they should put that money into a rainy-day fund.</i>
251	D3	<i>So you want to be taxed when you go to the hairdresser, when you go to the doctor, when you go to the dentist, when you get your car repaired –</i>
252	D3	<i>. I pay income tax on that \$1,000 as a self-employed individual; but I don't pay sales tax. I don't charge them sales tax, because I'm a service now. What you don't realize is that I won't be paying that sales tax anyway.</i>
253	D3	<i>I almost think it might be more fair to charge on services so it wouldn't be such a burden on poor people. It wouldn't bother me a bit to pay a few dollars more to get my hair done, as I'm sure it is for somebody living on a subsistence wage, you know, to buy their groceries or their gasoline, you know.</i>
254	D3	<i>I would like to stop the tipping. I'd like to stop the tipping and pay the tax.</i>
255	D3	<i>That's the way the tax burden is. If you buy a cup of coffee, it is not taxed. If you buy a cup of coffee and a donut, it's taxed – it's a meal. If you buy a bottle of water, it's not taxed. If you buy a bottle of water and a bag of chips, it's taxed. That's how convoluted the sales tax law is in the State of California. That's the way it is.</i>

256	D3	<i>If I go and get a haircut, I will have to pay – I’m agreeing to pay whatever Bakersfield – 7.25 percent tax for my haircut. That’s what it’s saying _____ think that’s fair.</i>
257	D3	<i>And I don’t know if I think it’s a good or a bad thing, but I’m just gonna play devil’s advocate and I’m gonna give a really clear example to where this could have a bad consequence. Okay, so well say you buy a solar system from me. And that solar system costs \$30,000. \$10,000 of that solar system is materials. So I collect from you whatever your tax rate is in that – in your town. We’ll say seven and a quarter percent just to make it easy. Okay, so for that 10,000, I’m gonna charge you tax on top of the 40,000 for your solar system. Now if that’s enacted, now I’m gonna charge you tax on 40,000 for that solar system instead of 10,000. That’s just a consequence of that. So now your _____ runner, your engineering, all the labor for us to install that system, is all gonna be taxed; because that is a service that we provide for you.</i>
258	D3	<i>– maybe they should exclude medical and dental services from the tax because that would affect the elderly people also.</i>
259	D4	<i>Real high-end homes, if you pay a million dollars interest, you should be, you know, you should be willing maybe to pay a little bit more or cut your interest deduction, you know. Look at all the people who can never buy homes because some of us deduct \$75,000 a year in interest, which is about what we deduct on a home that we bought in 1985, you know. It hasn’t gone –</i>
260	D4	<i>So it’s already limited there. Someone who is buying a two or three million dollar house, okay, if they bought – get a loan for it, all they’re gonna do is not get a loan. They’re still gonna buy the house. Okay, so by limiting this, you’re discouraging people who can barely afford buying a nicer house that they really can’t afford and they’re doing it because they’re getting the interest right off. And then they end up losing the house. You’re discouraging them from doing that. And I think it would create a more stable real estate market.</i>
261	D4	<i>You know, where you need that deduction. What if your kids, you know, something happens seriously, you know, you’re gonna lose your house anyway? Medical bills or something. And that’s what the scary part is I think. Sometimes that mortgage interest deduction encourages people to go out and buy houses they really cannot –</i>
262	D5a	<i>Instead of saying nonresidential, it should say what the zoning is – light industrial, retail; and then –</i>
263	D5a	<i>And you, also, have a problem, too, because like in Bakersfield we have problems where whole areas were common rezoned. And you still have residential areas in commercial zones. And you have families suddenly getting zoned commercial. And I mean, how do</i>

What's Next California
Supplementary Report: Transcripts

		<i>you differentiate from that?</i>
264		<i>If we introduce a system of sales tax and tax the services and leave the current sales tax rate intact, what guarantee do we have that our legislatures won't continue to overspend?</i>
265	D5	<i>and that building hasn't changed hands. So in my community, even though my community has been around and we do have 20-year-old homes and older, most of my _____ so prop 13 – like my mall – the mall we have, beautiful new mall, is new. So they're paying the assessed value on that mall. My community is new. So – or my – you know, some of them are older. We have some older strip malls that have been there for 20 years, so maybe those people. So my community doesn't have a big impact. Now let's move to a community that's been around a lot longer. So let's move here.</i>
266	D6	<i>I'm against it.</i>
267	D6	<i>Do you know what the other states do? Does anybody know? Is this like a high majority compared to other states?</i>
268	D6	<i>How about splitting the difference between 66 and 55?</i>
269	D6	<i>I think a lot of people will never – in the legislature will never vote to raise taxes no matter what requirement there is to raise taxes, because it's not popular, obviously. I'm not sure it's a great way to get re-elected to raise taxes.</i>
270		<i>On page 63 there's a breakdown of the current budget where all the money is going – a breakdown of governor's current 2011. And the biggest money is spent in education and health and human services. So _____ you've got some of these little slices of the pie to cut from. The question is where are you gonna cut?</i>
271		<i>Unions are one of the biggest problems that we have that increase spending.</i>
272	D1	<i>How about what is the impact of cutting services? Before we just cut ten percent of all of them? You know, why not check the impact of raising taxes, cutting services, and making sure that what money we do raise or save is spent wisely and not add to the deficit.</i>
273		<i>Have we done everything possible to make sure that we don't have overlapping services or programs that are the exact same?</i>
274		<i>why are the proposals presented in the guidebook related to raising taxes and not –[cutting spending]</i>
275	D5	<i>Well, I voted for Proposition 13 because at the time I was living in a small town – I was living in Sausalito. And a lot of the older people there were – the values of people's homes started going up a lot. And a lot of older people living there couldn't afford to pay their taxes on their homes and</i>

		<i>they were having the move out their homes that they've been in their whole lives. So I thought it was a good thing. And now it's really not such a great thing, after all.</i>
276	D5	<i>It's still the same problem. The older people that had their homes, their property taxes but they can't afford their home, anymore. Proposition 13 protects the taxpayer because governments – their nature is, all they can do is tax and spend, tax and spend. They always have a deficit, they always want more money. So they're going to tax you and spend more. What we need is we need fiscal responsibility. You gotta live within your means, man.</i>

277		<i>Read my lips: No new taxes.</i>
278	D5	<i>If you listened yesterday to what some of the people said, one of the cons is that it taxes corporations and individuals unequally. It's at different rates. And that is a con. And that's not a benefit that most of us sitting at this table as citizens appreciate and enjoy the benefits of.</i>
279	D5a	<i>That's a point that needs to be talked about, is modification of Prop 13? I don't think anyone is – well, maybe some people – proposing to throw the whole baby out with the bath water. But the more rational approach is to make a modification of what was done in Prop 13. Protecting the residential, protecting the retirement personal property – I don't think anyone has a problem with that. The _____ as I understand it is that corporations got slipped into that protection and people did not realize what a change in the status and the economy that would make.</i>
280	D5a	<i>So now how does that affect the job market? If a corporation has to pay more taxes, and we don't know what that number is, but then where does a corporation have to cut to make up for their deficit?</i>
281	D5a	<i>I can agree with that. I can see that there needs to be some adjustment. Listen, there are a lot of adjustment that needs to be made. We're \$26 billion in debt and you can't even balance a budget. And they want more. My problem is, balance and give us a budget. If you can't balance the checkbook, I'm not going to give you more money.</i>
282		<i>One thing about that is right now they have less money than they have during the really good times when everything was going really well for California and the country and there was a ton of money. And everybody thought, oh, this is how its' going to be forever.</i>
283		<i>I think there are two problems, though. One problem is the economy and part of the problem with the economy is California taxes and regulates business too heavily.</i>

What's Next California
Supplementary Report: Transcripts

284	D5a	<i>That's a way of finding more source, but the problem – like these gentlemen are talking about. This is the real problem. We keep grinding on this Prop 13 thing, but like he said, businesses are taxed at such a high rate that they're leaving California. They leave California, no jobs, no revenue.</i>
285	D5a	<i>Can I say something. We're going to lose businesses from California even if we reduce all the taxes because it is expensive to live here and the hourly wage you have to pay someone in the state of California is much, much higher than the hourly rate in Texas. So if companies go from California to Texas, if we gave them a total tax break and said, you don't have to pay any taxes here, they'd still go. Because they can pay someone \$8 an hour there, that would be \$17 an hour here, times your whole workforce.</i>
286		<i>In order to fix taxes, we have to figure out where the money is going, first. Figure out where our money is being wasted at. If we don't know where the money is going, what are we going to keep paying taxes for?</i>
287		<i>And to your point about running off businesses, I mean, it's not politically correct, but these environmentalists are one of the things that's killing California. There are so many environmental regulations that nobody wants to _____ here. You try and build a house – our building permits up in Bethel Island are probably 60 percent more than they used to be and now you've got to report on the fish for the Fish and Wildlife. You've got some other report on the ground water. I mean, it's ridiculous. It just goes on and on and on.</i>
288	D5	<i>What aspect of a change of Prop 13 would be to allow commercial taxes to float at market value. I think we could put in a proposal that rates can only go up by a certain percentage a year so that a company is not facing their historically 2 percent tax rate, which they have had for 47 years, going up to 12 percent in one year. So that over the course of five or six years they could handle a 2 or 3 percent tax rate growth to bring them up to market value. So with a slow ramp-up on all commercial property in the course of five to six years, we could probably get to a point of close to leveling the Prop 13 inequity.</i>
289	D5	<i>You got to set a certain thing like maybe over a gross income of \$10 million or \$25 million and exclude the small business guys, that's fine. But you don't want to hit the small business people because they're going to close down. They are closing down. My restaurants are closing down, the juice bars. There's like nobody left in my town, all right? And if you keep jacking up the price, you're going to get all these people saying, okay, you, you're out of here. What do you make, \$50,000? Good. My tax went up \$50,000, I don't need you. And you're going to get</i>

		<i>rid of the employees and they're goes your income basis because he's not paying taxes.</i>
290	D5	<i>We're talking between the other business that just bought their place, next door, and can't compete because they're paying the higher taxes.</i>
291	D2/D3	<i>I think there's another way of doing that, though, that they talk about in the material. That is, when the economy is high pay extra taxes that aren't quickly spent right away. Try to _____. You could make a rainy day fund for that. And I think as far as equitable taxation goes, I think a fair tax is more equitable than any other tax. Do away with property tax, sales tax, income tax and have a fair tax. You only pay on what you consume. When you buy something, you pay –</i>
292	D3	<i>You're paying on what you consumer, on what you buy, but also there's part of the money would go to help the ones in the very low income that would be hurt more by a consumption tax, but you have a provision in there to do some kind of a rebate that would help them to exist in a better way. But everybody who buys things would pay the same rate on what they buy. Every time you buy something you pay. And nobody can get out of that. You can't get out of that.</i>
293	D3	<i>I do think like taxing services I think it's a good idea, and also taxing food. everything else is taxed. I don't see why there shouldn't be. I'm not sure if it should be as high as other taxes. But in my opinion, I think it'll create income and we can maybe use those incomes for – if you tax food, use that tax for health benefits, or MediCal, or Medicare, or whatever there's huge deficits.</i>
294	D3	<i>Taxing food will hit the lower-income strata much harder than it will the higher income strata.</i>
295	D3	<i>If we tax services – those are the big companies and corporations that are – okay, so, like if we people change our oil or whatever, well, they work for a big company and so I think the thing is is that we have got to do something about these big corporations that are not paying taxes. How are we going to change that? How are we going to make this multi – okay, so here are the four small businesses are going down, these employees have to work for, what, the big companies, they're not going to get pay anything. My husband worked for UPS; he got paid \$8.65 an hour. This huge company, right?</i>
296		<i>And so we have to figure out – we need the companies to pay taxes. We're not making it like this. We can't just keep saying, we need to pay for food, we need to pay for services, no. We need to make these big companies accountable. Find the loopholes. What's going on? We have a rich state. We have the rich, rich, rich, here. Where else are you going to go to find this?</i>

What's Next California
Supplementary Report: Transcripts

297	D3	<i>A lot of people go to Wal-Mart instead of buying at their local shop because they're going to save money, now, and it closes down all the stores. But some people don't make a personal – like, their personal – like pay more, you pay an extra \$.50 or \$.20, whatever for you products in a local shop. Or try and make sure you buy something that's made in California, or trying to make sure you read the label that say made in the USA, and buy that.</i>
298	D3	<i>Every time you buy something you pay a tax on it. If a corporation buys something, they pay a tax on it. If you buy something, you pay a tax on it. Everybody pays a tax. Nobody can get out of that.</i>
299	D3	<i>Illegal aliens are paying sales tax, they are paying income taxes, they are paying Social Security tax.</i>
300	D3/general	<i>There was study done, you can see it on the Internet, where they found it costs California about \$26 billion a year because of the illegal alien issue, whatever that is. I know illegal aliens. They go to the free clinic. My taxes pay for that. They get medical services. They get great medical services. It doesn't cost them a dime. They don't pay for insurance. I do know of illegal aliens who are on the dole, they get paid under the table, they do not pay income tax. I do know illegal aliens who do pay income tax under a false Social Security number. And there is a benefit to us because they pay Social Security that they'll never collect on. So there's a problem there.</i>
301		<i>Maybe we need to raise some taxes and look at how that affects businesses, and have some insurance that we're not going to push businesses _____ by raising some extra money that we need for our government. We are the government, by the way. It's not them. We elect people. Ultimately, if we become active in politics, we make the decisions about who the government is and what they do.</i>
302	D2	<i>Then when you look at Proposal D2, on Page 75, I feel like this is what happened last night. That's kind of why we're in trouble where we are – because of the revenue spikes. And now that the revenue has gone down and they're saying should there be a rainy day fund?</i>
303	D2	<i>Of course, the most that we've ever parted was 5 percent, and this suggests 10 percent. Given the volatility that we have, I think that's the minimum amount. Most people are told that they should have 10 percent of their income available for rainy days, and I don't see why the state should be any different.</i>
304	D2	<i>. I think the rainy day fund is a good idea, but we're \$26 billion in water, where will we get a rainy day fund from? Where is that going to come from.</i>
305	D2	<i>There's two issues. There's the short term</i>

		<i>issue and the long term issue. In the short term, we have a crisis, but we don't want the crisis to happen again. So we need a double plan. What's the short term plan? What's the long term plan? This looks like part of a long term plan, to me.</i>
306	D2	<i>It's unbelievable, in my mind, that we run the state so much more poorly than we do business. Business, you'd never just have a one-year budget. You'd have a one-year budget, a two-year budget. You'd do a five-year projection. You'd have long range strategies on how you're going to get your money in. And you would never suggest, Oh, well, why don't we do this? We don't have any money to do it, but let's do it.</i>
307	D1	<i>Yeah, but wait a minute. We can't reduce taxes because as soon as you put a number on how much tax you're going to reduce, you're eliminating growth.</i>
308	D2	<i>Well, for rainy day, yeah, it makes sense. But right now we're in a hole, so I don't see how we're ever going to have a rainy day.</i>
309	D2	<i>Well, we've had it in the past and we frittered our money away. Set up programs that we're still paying for. And that's the idea. Don't say, oh, we got lots of money. Let's set up a program and put it there forever, and then when the money goes away we don't have any way to pay for it.</i>
310	D2	<i>come to a proposal later, we need to start looking more than one year in advance so that we get a little bit of forward planning. And then that's where we can start putting a little bit of money away for the rainy day fund. Obviously, we can't take a full 10 percent now and drop it in because we're in such a hole. We need to get out of the hole first, to get back to level, and then we'll have the opportunity to start building.</i>
311	D1/2	<i>And we all just seem to day the pay-as-you-go idea and increasing the rainy day fund, and not spending the money when it peaks on ongoing programs just makes sense. Nobody seemed to have any strong negative attitude toward it. So maybe that's one thing.</i>
312	D2	<i>But as we begin to climb out of where we are right now, whatever, quote, unquote, windfall, or spike – the first spike is going to have to go toward restoring some of the very, very deep cuts in our social service safety net. A lot of people are really impacted by some of these massive cuts. Lots of the services that we need- health services, you know, a lot of things. So some of that has to be put back</i>
313	D2	<i>We have a safety net, or we have had a safety net for the most vulnerable Californians. And if none of us have every been the most vulnerable Californians, we're lucky. But it happens to people and we try to give people those basic medical services. I guess what I'm saying is, when the money goes up again, we need to restore those, first, and then build a rainy day</i>

What's Next California
Supplementary Report: Transcripts

		<i>fund.</i>
314	D5a	<i>I have a problem with it that it hurts the small businesses the most. And small businesses are a big part of the economy and one reason why the economy is in such bad shape right now</i>
315	D5a	<i>Mom and Pop shops need to be saved.</i>
316	D5a	<i>So let's go to Wal-Mart and say, we want you to pay your fair share of California taxes. Is that a fair thing to do?</i>
317	D5	<i>Or even like businesses value, like property value. If properties are worth \$5 million, then have that property be raised a certain percent. Like brackets. If your property is under \$100,000 then it only goes up a certain amount.</i>
318	D5a	<i>So maybe it starts by defining a level between small business and corporation – large corporation. And we apply proposal D5-A, first. Or the implementation of the proposal first goes on a corporation – large corporation. And that is in effect for “x” number of years. Then after that point, we start the reassessment process on companies below that, but limit their property tax increase to a small percentage per year, until they get up to current rate. So they have a graduated increase in property tax to bring them up to current market values.</i>
319	D5a	<i>We can say we like 5A, except _____ small businesses.</i>
320	D5a	<i>You want to encourage small businesses to start up, but this, in fact, inhibits new, small businesses from starting up. Does anyone have an argument against that being a reality?</i>
321	D5a	<i>That the current property taxing situation for businesses with regard to small businesses inhibits a new – a person who wants to start a new small business from starting up if they're going to buy property and pay – because of the taxes.</i>
322	D5a	<i>They haven't done it forever, and I think that it's created a tremendous inequity. We made a mistake; let's fix it.</i>

323		<i>One thing I would think is that people should have more say in the fees that are charged or levied. I went, I have a Jeep and a Toyota, and I went to get them registered this year. And the fees for them had gone up considerably, and it was like my cars are a little bit older, but they shouldn't be costing what a newer car was like a year ago. Fees if you have your car towed or fees if you – for whatever. I think we should have more say in what those fees are. You can't just say, “Well, we're going to just, you know, raise it by this amount or this percentage.”</i>
324		<i>think we should cut most of it out _____. The local government increases the fares, they should tell us _____.</i>
325		<i>One of my concerns about the _____ we have and the fact that they never tell you what tax, how we're paying for things. But what</i>

		<i>we're doing is they're not giving us the information as to what are the expenses that we're paying for. They give us a chart here, but how has that grown and what's caused the growth? I mean is it the policies of our legislature? I mean we're just talking, fine, here's your expenses. Now how are we going to pay for them? But there's no input as to what the, what generates these expenses. And so we can talk about axes, but in the back of mind it's going to be, I want to also, I'd like to control the expense side also.</i>
326		<i>I'd also like to see where the deficits are in budget _____ the amount spent versus the amount collected.</i>
327		<i>California gives more to the feds than they give back to us.</i>
328		<i>And I also feel it's right that a low income person gets a tax credit for \$2,000 that hasn't paid in any money. I mean that doesn't make sense either.</i>
329		<i>Low income tax credits has actually been a far more successful program than any welfare program because at least it requires that you get a job and at least it requires that you have to be working and starting to get some income. So eventually they'll get off of that. But with welfare, there's no portion of it that allows you to have that security.</i>
330		<i>California's going to want 10 or 12 percent for their flat tax. And then you have local tax. Pretty soon you're not saving any money on a flat tax. It sounds good, but _____.</i>
331		<i>And you need to think through how those things work and whether you support a more regressive tax or a more progressive tax. If you support a more regressive tax, then you're going to say, let's put a higher sales tax. Let's tax more items with sales tax. Versus doing it on income or doing a combination.</i>
332		<i>Forget about tax. Reduce regulations so that it's more accommodating to business, so that business will stay here and invest... You know, what are 20 percent of the regulations that really provide 80 percent of benefit? You need environmental regulation. You need safety. I'm not saying you blow it all up. But let's take a look at stuff that just discourages people.</i>
333		<i>Well in that case, I'm willing to say maybe regulations probably should have been relaxed a little bit, even though – although I value environmental regulations very highly. That land was already occupied by you, so you can't be doing much more damage than you've already done.</i>
334		<i>The basis of our tax revenue would be income, sales, property _____. And I think that we need to look at those issues. Those are the _____ of our tax revenue. You know? So I believe that we need to look at how do we want income taxes to be handled by the government, or what rate for sales tax, like _____. Sales tax is not on groceries. So low income areas are really not affected because groceries are the things they need to buy. They have a thing they</i>

What's Next California
Supplementary Report: Transcripts

		<i>are buying from _____ disposable income or _____ what they need to do...So they _____. I really think we should focus on income taxes, sales and property and Proposition 13. I think Proposition 13 is a big issue in California. Something needs to be done.</i>
335		<i>I was just going to say what do you tax that's not – that's a stable thing that you tax at all times, where it's not in fluctuation all the time, where's that revenue going to come from to make _____?</i>
336		<i>The question is how many people are willing to have their taxes increased in order to make sure they get what they need and we're providing, and that health _____.</i>
337		<i>I've got to rely on the young people that come through our education system to run my world. And if I live to be 100, I need them for a lot longer time. So when you say how many of you want your taxes raised, nobody does. How many of you want the kids educated better and more money spent on education and more money spent _____.</i>
338		<i>My first thought on any time when you're talking about raising taxes _____, my first thought is before you raise my taxes, I want you to look at where the waste is. I want you to fix whatever waste there is. Minor things to start with. And I'm sure there's bigger things they can look at. But minor things. I think as a worker, when I drive to work, I use my car. I drive to work, I pay for my gas. People in government, as far as I know, when they drive to work, they're using a government-sponsored car. They're getting their gas paid for. Their expenses are taken care of.</i>
339		<i>Anyway, you asked the question what were the things that came from Prop 13 that were good? Well, one of the things was it did shrink government. Because there wasn't as much revenue. It did shrink government. And include in that, when you're thinking about it, county hospital, schools, taking care of roads, other kinds of things that are very local. So those things did get squeezed back down. And there is probably some reason to argue that that is good. But it has – I mean the place where the biggest impact has been felt, make no doubt about it, is on personal real estate taxes on the positive side, and school system on the negative side.</i>
340		<i>As a student, Prop 13 has really affected tuition rates, especially considering that I'm from the UC system. They just raised tuition a third of what it was last year, and there's talk that they're going to raise it another 25 percent. I mean this, California is known for its university system, and now students are looking elsewhere. For example, I was thinking about just transferring to an East Coast school just because tuition over there is a lot less than what it is here. So that, for me, is a very issue.</i>
341		<i>Another problem, we do the budget now. Brown wants to put maintaining current tax levels on the ballot. _____ let the people choose. And you get the Republicans saying, "No. We're not even</i>

		<i>going to let people choose.” I mean to me, that’s insulting as a citizen. You know, _____ I want more representation. Well here’s a chance for people to get _____ they can vote up or down on taxes. But the Republicans won’t even let them have the vote. Talking about we’re trying to raise revenue in the state. It is absolutely impossible. But it’s like costs don’t go up every year, just the cost of living.</i>
342		<i>If we _____ Prop 13, what would happen is that the state would have the liberty on an annual basis to increase our property taxes. Now they are restricted to not increasing it by more than 1.25 percent _____. Also you would be able to, if you buy property, and _____ higher in price _____, then the supplemental taxes could be increased by more than 2 percent. Now it cannot be more than 2 percent. So if you buy a _____ property, you know, you cannot _____ more than 2 percent. What you are saying is that if you change property, the _____ property increase would be higher.</i>
343	<i>D1</i>	<i>I think the cons in D1, like particularly the second one, legislators should be able to set new priorities if the state _____ rise, I kind of figure if that happens, there will be ways that they can figure out - I mean there’s clever people up there that could work _____. There’s a reason for us to need something _____. We can be innovative with our structures, but – so I don’t really find that as a con of Proposal D1 because it will limit, like I guess it will limit the importance of that need before they have to start _____. Does that make sense?</i>
344		<i>I know it does need to be somehow tied in with the proposition system, where people putting initiatives in requiring spending. Because then _____ and then the legislature goes okay, we need to fund it because you require it. So that’s part of their – there’s got to be a way that nobody can require spending without saying where it’s coming from.</i>
345		<i>definitely agree with the idea of _____ long-term spending to save our rainy day fund because there’s no point in just putting the spending out. Bad times happen here and you get large deficits, so you’re going to be screwed.</i>
346		<i>I think that changing the sales tax, expanding the sales tax in any way is very dangerous because of its regressive nature. Certainly adding it to services will have an impact on a certain segment of the population more than another. I just think it’s an incredibly dangerous thing to be doing.</i>
347		<i>Earlier we brought up the point that one of the most important things we need to do is make our state more business friendly. This would do exactly the opposite because the businesses that exist, that there are so many small businesses that only provide services, that don’t manufacture anything. If they had to charge taxes, they would lose a lot of their clients, even if it was – whether it was business to</i>

What's Next California
Supplementary Report: Transcripts

		<i>business or business to individual consumer. They would lose a lot of their clients, and then they would go out of business and dig the hole deeper. Yes, I work for such a business.</i>
348		<i>Well, there's the con there, hurts small businesses most. How does this in particular impact small businesses more than large commercial property?</i>
349		<i>With or without the property taxes going up, we were _____ to lease a lot of properties _____ commercial _____. And that's across the border. So you're getting people now that are getting great deals. It doesn't matter _____ it's too much and people won't pay for it, then the owner's going to have to lower those prices to allow it to fit it. So with something like they're going to raise the rents, well if it's too much, nobody's going to lease it.</i>
350		<i>I think that's probably the most important part of it, is that it helps address this apathy about it. Because no matter who we elect right now, from our separate districts, it's not going to matter because there's no way you're going to get a two-thirds super majority of Democrats. And so it's going to be completely impossible for us to get anything done.</i>
323		<i>But I think that it's also, it's a double-edged sword, that this _____ is more than just education. Education is the cool thing everybody wants to be behind. But when they have other things, I want to know the transparency. Is there some special tax that they're to bring to _____ convention center that's run down, and really you should probably tear it down and start all over again. Or is this a special tax that's going to help something else? A hotel coming here that really isn't going to – it's not necessary.</i>
324		<i>We have always had a problem with the 50 percent plus one. That just almost seems a little too easy. It almost just seems a little too – you know, we could set a vote in here and 50 percent plus 1, so all of us plus him. All of us on this side of the room plus him. You know what I mean? I mean –</i>
325		<i>What's a fair tax, and everybody even – a fair tax was like 23 or 25 percent, just you know, as a flat tax. I mean it was like, again, a populace said if you're paying over that, then it's too much.</i>
326		<i>Do you want to identify though is the stock loophole, the ownership loophole? That loophole</i>
327		<i>But what happens to the judicial review and also the financial impact. I mean, I think they're throwing darts at a dartboard when it comes to how are we going to pay for this if it does pass.</i>
328	D5	<i>...let's take the sales tax down for everybody. That won't last. Just like a value-added tax hasn't lasted. In other words, once you buy into a low number of percent, don't think you own that forever</i>
329	D5	<i>I think Prop 13 is a horror. It's absurd. At one time in my life I made a lot of money. I have a great house. I am subsidized by an</i>

		<i>incredible amount every month because my property taxes are so low. I think it's incredibly unfair. You got an old couple, my wife and I live in this 4,000 square foot house, and I pay less property taxes than somebody that owns a small condo. It's just not right. We don't need the big house, but why would I give up this huge subsidy to move into a condo? I'm paying almost nothing for living in a mansion. It's wrong. It's just plain wrong. A young couple with four kids should live in my house. Not an old couple, like my wife and I.</i>
330	D5	<i>So can we somehow take care of the damage that Prop 13 can do in the long run, which is, young families won't move in to California because they can't afford the property taxes, they can't afford the real estate, so what does that do for the long term profile of the state.</i>
331	D2	<i>the poorest pay 20 percent of their household. That's 6.5 percent. Whereas, the richer they pay .9 percent. What's that about? That's just wrong.</i>
332	D5	<i>I don't know if it's a taxation problem; it's a spending problem. It's an allocation problem.</i>
333	D5	<i>That's always been a debatable subject because it's so subjective. When 13 was in the process at the beginning, and they were talking about school cuts, I raised the question – you got kids who are in school because of sports and arts, so who's going to decide what is an important subject and what is not? The messenger who was beaten up by throngs of parents, screaming, and doing nothing else, he said that's the problem. Who and how are they going to decide what's important. Because what's important to me is not necessarily important to some other person. Not every kid is going to be a rocket scientist. He'll be good at something else.</i>
334	D2	<i>They have to stop going to school because it's just higher and higher, you know? So my question was if they can't increase more taxes, what are they going to do? They're going to try to limit the amount of money by cutting back more programs that they have already done?</i>
335	D3	<i>How would taxing services affect the growth of state local economies if anybody – poor, rich, whoever – may stop buying or doing those services?</i>
336	D2	<i>By taxing the lower-income people, it's going to cause problems because they're going to run into situations where they can't pay for healthcare, they can't pay for services, and there is going to be a lot more criminal activity going on because they need to have some – they need to have things and they're not getting it</i>
337	D5	<i>it's totally and completely undemocratic, and that was the intent of the people that passed Prop. 13, 30 _____ years ago</i>
338	D2, D7	<i>Well, a few years ago, I told my son who wanted to go to college, I told him you see what kinda crime you can commit that will put you</i>

What's Next California
Supplementary Report: Transcripts

		<i>in jail for four years, and then we'll see which prison you wanna go to. San Quentin, U.C. Berkeley's right there</i>
339	D2, D7	<i>You're in prison, you can go to college and they pay for it. Then my father-in-law, who's in a convalescent hospital and it's costing him a lot of money – because they're expensive up in Santa Barbara, but back then, it was \$5,000 a month. I told my wife, she was alive at that point, I says, "We ought to have your father-in-law go break through a jewelry store. They'd put him in prison. We would know where he was at 24/7. He'd have healthcare, supervision. I wouldn't have to worry and I'd know where he was at."</i>
340	D2, D7	<i>last week that a guy in the Carolinas went to rob a bank \$1. He went into the bank and he said, "I wanna dollar," so they called the police and they arrested him. They said, "Why would you rob a bank for \$1?" He says, "So I can go to prison and get a examination and treatment because I'm very sick. I don't have insurance and nobody _____, so he says, "I'm going to prison in order to have full medical."</i>
341	D5	<i>See, I was _____ ignorant in that standpoint. When I voted for Prop. 13, I voted for my house. I didn't even read the whole thing. Of course, I was much younger, so I really didn't care, but then I'm finding out – well, I did find out before that it was commercial property that can't assessed at a different rate. I think they should. Like you say, maybe a couple, 2, 3 percent or whatever, but not like homes, they don't go crazy, 10 or 15 percent</i>
342	D5	<i>We have to take that into consideration. When we're looking at other states to make a decision on what California should do, and what looks good, what works for them would work really well for us because their tax rates are higher, so let's go with what they do. That's not going to benefit. It's just not a good guideline to go by to look at other states. We've got to look at the whole picture of what everything that is affected and involved.</i>
343	D5	<i>Going across, income levels, the lowest one up to the top 1 percent, and how much of each one of these areas of taxes these individual groups pay. It notices that the lowest 20 percent pays the highest portion of their income to sales and excise tax. They also pay the highest portion of their income for property tax. The blue is the income tax, and you notice that the income tax is higher way over here on the 1 percent of people who have the highest income. They pay a bigger percentage of their income as income tax than the lowest percentile.</i>
344	D3	<i>I buy on eBay because it's less money. I get free shipping. I get something from Hong Kong and have it in four days for a lot less money. I would have no problem whatsoever paying sales tax on that going back to the state. I don't do it to avoid sales tax, I do it to get the best buy</i>

345		<i>Schools don't need to be cut. The funding to schools does not need to be cut. We could look at what is the success rate as far as what's going on in schools and the monies that's being spent, as drastically compared to what's being spent on other things. There's other things that can be cut in our government, that can be cut. The expenses for the cell phones, the expenses for their laptops, the expenses for their cars, their expenses for eating out, their expenses for traveling out country.</i>
346	D5	<i>Get some initiatives in there that will control the revenue and the expenditures of the state in such a way that the legislature has to do it.</i>
347	D5	<i>A 2 percent annual cap on increases in assessments, and it's applying to both private property and commercial property. The next thing, the ban on real estate transfer taxes.</i>
348		<i>My husband contributed to the Social Security for 42 years and they tell me I can't even have that</i>
349	D5	<i>That all eventually comes back to the people. I think the people that are running our government need to learn how to do their job correctly and not take these extraordinary paychecks</i>
350	D2	<i>The top administrator in UCLA I saw they made \$800,000 and yet the students at UCLA are paying huge fees just to be able to attend.</i>
351	D2	<i>I'm very bothered that we're putting kids out of schools and the college who's got some financial aid and is trying to be a fulltime student, cannot take the entry class to the subject for which he is fully qualified. He's met all the requirements, he's ready to take the class, it is not be available. It may not be available next year, and there's so many other people exactly like him.</i>
352	D General/2	<i>That is terrible. I mean, we've got kids taking buses instead of going to the school that just closed half a mile away, so they've got to take a bus 15 miles each way. Eight-year-old kids, seven-year-old kids and this is we're balancing. Something went wrong. What is it? So what about this idea of a rainy day fund or something where there's more money around, so that we don't try and push _____ this kinda situation so quickly.</i>
353	D3	<i>But that's another regressive tax, so your lower income people are going to be hit far more by this service tax. They say it's going to be neutral, that they're going to keep the amount the same. That may be this year, but once you've got a tax enacted, it tends to go one way, and that's up</i>
354		<i>Legalize marijuana. We wouldn't need to _____.</i>
355		<i>Legalize prostitution as well.</i>
356	D3	<i>Regulation, regulation, remember what everybody was saying that the reason Wall Street went haywire is because the rules were there, but they were not enforced. Nobody cared.</i>
357		<i>Well, yeah. I mean, I think it does show that if you – the more people that play the game, the more accountability there is. The</i>

What's Next California
Supplementary Report: Transcripts

		<i>more people who pull themselves out of the process, the less accountability there is.</i>
--	--	--

358		<i>I mean I don't want to pay taxes and I don't think anybody really does want to pay taxes because you don't see where your money's going.</i>
359		<i>You're paying for this big behemoth here that's supposed to provide all the services, but it's the most inefficient thing in the world. And the more you put into it, the bigger it gets and the less money is actually going to the services that we're actually talking about.</i>
360		<i>I think that services should be taxed. I mean you have to like understand that we are in both a recession and a deficit. So like how many – everything has to be sort of carefully done. If you raise taxes right now, it might hurt businesses and _____ the economy. But by maybe doing it this way, taxing services, we might be able – and then taxing overall at a lower amount, we might be able to get everything that we need done.</i>
361		<i>We're all on kind of that point that – but I think I'm hearing that we're all saying we think there's a lot of waste and inefficiencies, and before we want to raise taxes and pour into the system, that we want to fix the system first.</i>
362		<i>But the farmers are not paying their fair share of payroll income tax. That would be a form of tax. It's a fair tax. It's a tax that should be paid, and it would also give us accountability for our workers in the field.</i>
363		<i>But I don't agree that we have to raise taxes. There are services that we can cut if we had the power to do it.</i>

364	<i>D1</i>	<i>I think proposal D-1 is a great idea.</i>
365	<i>D1</i>	<i>The problem is are we gonna be sort of in control of it or is it just gonna happen? Because the state can no longer pay its bills or borrow money, which actually doesn't help in the long run if you're borrowing more money. We all know that, you know, from our personal experience. So I guess I'm kind of okay with D-1 except for the bias of the language.</i>
366	<i>D1</i>	<i>the only option that could come out of this is, basically, the way it sounds to me is a blank check. Okay, we don't know what costs we're gonna incur. And as we get to it, we'll just write a check for funding however. Overrun again this year or if we can create a deficit. And we want the ability just to write another check or take another bond out or whatever we have to do. But to say, you know, just take it on as it comes up. No, I don't have that kind of faith in our legislature.</i>
367		<i>So pay the tax, I agree. Every time you get a tax owed, the government expands. Okay. Then there's no money and then got cut and they said, oh, I think we need to increase tax. They increase</i>

		<i>tax. The worst inefficiency. This is competing world. How can you compete with private sector? That means all managers have to have something in their mind for using the taxpayer's money.</i>
368		<i>Well, if you think about your own budget, how do you become efficient? Well, when you don't have a lot of money, you start figuring out ways to make things work. And if you start pulling back, you would be surprised as citizens if we start pulling back money, as opposed to giving it to the state as revenue the increased revenue for the state, if we start pulling it back, you'd be surprised how efficient you could make the government by giving them less money. The same is like with any corporation. When corporations downsize or when they do reduce things, they become more efficient. And a lot of times companies come up stronger because of that, because they implement programs that are more efficient. And then when they come out of a down period, they're a stronger company.</i>
369	D2	<i>the first half is, we're gonna tell the state if we can't take the spikes and start funding a new on-going program because the spike won't last, may not last. So we can't hire ten new cops just because you can afford them this year when you don't know the funding is coming next year. So that's what the first part of this is saying. You know, I don't think anybody is particularly opposed to that idea.</i>
370	D2	<i>It seems like D-2 is more about do you wanna hear local government or the state to have a ten percent rainy-day fund? And that goes back to where you wanna draw the line and where you're having the budget set. And I just – I think ten percent is a little excessive myself for rainy-day funds.</i>
371	D3	<i>I don't think we should tax services at all.</i>
372	D3	<i>I'm not against taxing services either. But I'm only against it if it's taxing things that are necessary needs. Because like the con No. 3 was exactly what I was thinking _____. It says food, prescription drugs, and many services are necessities and many people believe only discretionary spending should be taxed. And I believe that, too. I mean, okay, I only have to pay a little extra for, you know, up state if I go and get my hair cut at, you know, like a fancy salon or something. Or if I do whatever. But if I'm gonna go buy by groceries, I need to eat.</i>
373	D3	<i>They only want – the state will be making more money because there's more services. Because like you said, we're a service-based state rather than product based. But I think that we have two really _____. The government is going to have to raise revenue. But even if you lower the actual sales tax on products and attach it to services, there's more services being produced than product. They going to make money in government. You're going to lose – the consumer.</i>
374		<i>But we can't just put a stamp on it and say, no, I will not pay for</i>

What's Next California
Supplementary Report: Transcripts

		<i>services. Well, you got to pay something somewhere. We can't keep going down the road that we're going down now. The problem is only gonna get worse and worse and worse and worse. I don't see it being such a bad thing to start taxing more things.</i>
375		<i>I think the majority of Americans do support aggressive income tax, with the understanding that somebody who's very wealthy can afford to pay more than somebody who is making _____</i>
376		<i>I propose a flat tax. But let's talk about property tax. In my feeling, Prop 13 is unfair. I'm probably one of the people who've taken advantage of it. I bought my home in 1992. The people who live next to me bought theirs in 2006. They're paying more property tax than I am. Is that really fair?</i>
377	D2	<i>But I think we could say once you've achieved a certain level of – we reduce the deficit by X amount – whatever – at some point, rainy day funding would be very appropriate, but not where we're at at the moment. It doesn't seem responsible.</i>
378		<i>So I think the concept here is should the state be setting aside, every opportunity that they have, money that is a revenue spike – an unexpected spike – should they be setting that aside so that they have a reasonable reserve fund to address problems like we're having – reductions in revenues due to economic downturn?</i>
379		<i>I guess the other side of that argument is that if the state had a larger reserve fund, we could have dealt with this recession more effectively.</i>
380	D3	<i>the time and effort it's gonna take to even track this.</i>
381		<i>I think it's a great stimulation to the underground economy</i>
382		<i>If I could just end this by saying that I have a problem with – from a consistency standpoint. If you're going to have sales tax on goods, why not services, as well? Why do those businesses that provide services, as opposed to goods, somehow get a break?</i>
383	D4	<i>Yeah, 'cause they wouldn't be able to write off _____ now, there's almost an incentive to have this enormous home. That's not necessarily the direction we want, as Californians, even _____ the actual _____ per capita homeowners _____</i>
384		<i>But we _____ been encouraging mansion ownership. So that's what this actually is. So the current system encourages people to have bigger homes _____ so to me, it makes sense.</i>
385		<i>I guess the negative side of this _____ you can put a lot of downward pressure on the _____ that are currently – a lot of homes that are currently selling for \$750,000.00 will probably not be worth \$750,000.00 just because of that tax</i>
386		<i>And I think if the property tax had risen at a more normal rate then perhaps the dollar value wouldn't have skyrocketed to the extent that it did.</i>

387		<i>He said something, he said, you know, well if you tax the businesses, aren't they gonna leave? He said, you know, there are solutions to keep them here, you know. There's always gonna be created like here to keep 'em. It's a fear tactic, you know, to make us fearful that, oh, if we do this, if we do that, business is gonna leave. You're gonna lose your jobs. So just keep paying out of your pocket. I'm not convinced</i>
388		<i>We don't have a taxing problem. We have a spending problem.</i>
389		<i>And that's where the answer to the problem is. Start taxing the property. They're gonna pass it back to us anyway. But stop that as well. They wanna have a real fat profit. Having these people in the malls and all that, but they're not paying the property taxes on that. Even if you raise it, they're gonna just pass it back down. And legally, they get it done. If you know, if anybody owns any commercial properties out there, real estate property that they rent out to, they just pass the taxation down to the occupant.</i>
390	D3	<i>No, because sales tax is, as I think Michael said before, is very regressive. Okay, and if you added services, you're adding an additional regressive tax, okay. I'm not saying we should or shouldn't do it.</i>
391		<i>And taxing services could fall into that category of putting a bigger burden on those who are least able to afford it.</i>
392		<i>And I was thinking maybe for now, you know, before long we start taxing like luxury services like, you know, somebody who gets their pool cleaned. It's a luxury service. You know, something like that. Maybe that's where, you know, they should, you know, we could turn to some – the money could be used to put in, you know, some of these issues that we have as far as the debt we're in</i>
393	D2	<i>I wouldn't do that if you've got a one-time uptick, even if you didn't think it was a one-time uptick, you'd kinda of step back and say wait a minute. We just set that aside and see if this continues. But what we've done at the state is well, we'll get that revenue up hill and we'll dump it into commitments for long-range programs, and not things that create jobs, not infrastructure, but expense programs.</i>
394		<i>I think that putting away money for a rainy day is a thing that we, as people of this country, have gotten away from and that's a big mistake.</i>
395		<i>Because it's always gonna be cycles, and there's gonna be up times and down times. And there just always – to think we're always being in an up time is just kidding ourselves.</i>
396	D5a	<i>I think the nonresidential properties need to be reassessed. I really think that that's something and maybe put it to a question. I know real estate ownerships that are out there – commercial corporations that own things. They'll change hands and they'll take ownership over progression period of time and that lets you know there's not really any paperwork showing ownership change, because they do it</i>

What's Next California
Supplementary Report: Transcripts

		<i>gradually over the years. And this, you know, outside the escrow papers and they never get a tax hike and property tax hike.</i>
397		<i>Looking around the room, I may be the only person that owned real estate in California prior to Proposition 13. You did. There's two of us now. And I think I'd like to explain what anger caused Proposition 13. I bought a home in 1967. My taxes were under \$200 a year. By 1968, they were \$1,200 a year, which was more than a month's pay for me at that time. So it was starting to squeeze us big time. Coupled with that, somewhere in the early '70s, our state decided that they needed racial balance in our schools so our kids would learn more... And you know, there's an idea with the public that big corporations, well you just tax them and tax them and tax them. Well I worked 43 years for big corporations based in Southern California. And I watched 75 percent of our customer base from about 1980 to five years ago when I retired, move out of California. A combination of, I mean property taxes were just one small item. We have all the employee regulations and EPA regulations and on and on and on, and you just move not far away to Nevada. It all goes away. So again, it looks easy to tax the corporations more.</i>
398		<i>Yeah, they call it nonresidential property. The problem is if we wanted to pass a, if we wanted to do a proposal like this, if you wanted to be in favor of this, this is great in good economic times. But you know, I don't have a history of being a pro-business person, but when I read the cons on here and I realize that probably would be true. The tax burden on businesses, especially small businesses, in bad economic times, I don't know if this is the right time to do this.</i>
399		<i>But I don't see why there's nothing here that says businesses worth more than \$1 million. Because it seems to me the ones that I'd like to see taxed would be like Chevron in Richmond and Novarius in Emeryville and Pixar. They're not the small mom and pop businesses that could be heard, but I don't think they're so quick – Chevron's not going to be so quick to pick up everything and move out. And it's nothing to them. They could pay 10 times or 100 times what they pay now, and they wouldn't even notice that they put up that money.</i>
400		<i>And I think suggesting that raising the sales tax is an attack on people that don't even have a home. Because you know, I don't know how many people I talked to this weekend that are losing their homes, and they're 50, 60 years old and tears in their eyes that they could end up homeless. And they never thought about that as a possibility. I don't want to attack big business. On the other hand, a lot of my neighbors have built a business and at least one house, and for the people that are really out of it, sales tax hits them so much harder. They don't have anything.</i>
401		<i>The sad part is, is California refuses to look at other states to see how</i>

		<i>they're doing it and how they meet their obligations and how they, their state manages to pay for all the services that they pay for. California refuses to look at that.</i>
402		<i>Well if you're a forger, if you're basically creating _____ for yourself, the federal or the state government is going to catch on to it eventually. So if they are getting money, I'm sure they're being paid cash.</i>
403		<i>I've been really disappointed that the state is having to run businesses out of the state. It happened in the early to mid- '90s, taxed businesses out. They moved to Arizona, Nevada, back East.</i>
404		<i>That is one of the discussions, saying that these proposals are invalid. They're coming off a set of ideas that are not true. And just because they put a _____ to talk about them, doesn't mean they're really true. Doesn't mean that that is the real solution. So tax, tax, tax, tax, tax. Where's the spending cuts that go along with that so that they're – the things that they're supposed to be doing?</i>
405		<i>The spending cuts are in the wrong place. I live in Orange County and I think the Orange County Register, which is a libertarian newspaper, like _____. They have a reporter that is, her career is finding agencies that no one really knew existed, and finding out that their managers are making \$400,000 a year and their pension's going to be \$200,000. Those are the areas of waste that I think most of us want to see eliminated. There was just an article last week. I'm not even sure what this agency does. And it was like a duplication of other agencies. But he stated looking at his salaries of city managers, and we've all gone through that.</i>
406		<i>But I think on this proposition, whether it's a spending problem or a revenue problem, I think that this D1, I think that they discuss it as if there's something new, do you like the concept of pay as you go? I mean if you had a perfect budget right now and we didn't have a spending problem or a revenue problem, but we wanted to add a new service, would we support pay as you go? I think that's a discussion we can have about D1... I guess the problem I have with bonds, and you know a lot of the propositions that have been passed, they said when they sell the bonds, the payments come off the top of the budget. So all that stuff is paid for before they ever get down to dividing it to education or health and human services.</i>
407		<i>They have to start – I shouldn't say it this way, but they need to start running California as a business rather than thinking who's going to vote for them next time.</i>
408		<i>And it's happening. I had a business for 16, 17, 18 years, and I had to shut it down because no business. There was just no business. People couldn't afford to hire. And there's a lot of businesses like that. And so when you say, "Okay, let's _____ the drawing in of these funds to keep the spikes from going up," well, you're going to cause more spikage by the strain on the people who already, right</i>

What's Next California
Supplementary Report: Transcripts

		<i>now the whole country, I mean so is basically the world, you're going to put a strain on them rather than saying to yourself, "Okay, we need to do something like maybe a targeted area of revenue gain, but at the same time, let's bring down some of our expenses."</i>
409		<i>I think taxing groceries is the worst idea in the world because that directly impacts people's health choices and their livelihood and _____. I mean I can't think of any population, except maybe rich people, who I feel that that's not going to adversely affect.</i>
410		<i>So sugar is pretty much agreed it's unhealthy. It's making people unhealthy. They're gaining weight. They're developing back problems, knee problems, foot problems, dragging up healthcare costs, which then we have to pay for. _____ something that we ought not do, maybe that's a good thing to tax.</i>
411		<i>But we already had a _____. If you walked into a 7-11 and you buy a burrito and you take the burrito out and you don't _____ or you plan to eat it later, it's not taxable because it's a grocery. But if you go in and you decide you're going to eat that, you pay sales tax. So I mean it's possible to come up with a definition of convenience which is _____. But I'm not you could say necessarily sugar because we'd be overtaxing bread, you know. If something _____.</i>
412		<i>I think _____ is an interesting because I remember, I don't know if it was Jerry _____ who came up with the idea, some people had the idea that food stamps, people getting food stamps shouldn't be allowed to buy soda because soda is not a nutritious food. And people all over the state really objected to this, like we say _____ because it's like we're going to really micromanage everybody's health in the State of California, and it goes on and on to the extent of one group deciding what another group – I mean it's important that supermarkets be able to open in poor neighborhoods so people don't have to buy all their food at 7-11 and these little impossible stores.</i>
413		<i>Yeah, sin taxes are just – I think they're bad all around. I think the whole idea of taxing somebody for something that you feel is morally wrong or something that you feel that you can generally _____. You're targeting _____, they target a general population, somebody who smokes. They're targeting those people to tax them.</i>
414		<i>I'll read the summary. While our constitution currently requires that the overall state budget must be balanced, this would force the legislature and the governor to provide a funding source, either program cuts or tax increases, for the creation of new programs or a tax cut. So if we want to create something new, through an initiative or some other way, we would have to identify the source or create the source that is going to pay for what we want.</i>
415		<i>And you can't just have all tax increases because, like we've talked earlier, that will force the people who are in businesses or the people who are the earners, to have less money to do anything else with. So it becomes a lower source of income, which is what we have right</i>

		<i>now. So it needs – that’s the big problem with this particular proposal. It needs to be both those kind of things so that it would work.</i>
416		<i>But here’s one that says here that’s very interesting. It says and because some changes have the potential to be fiscally destabilizing over even longer terms, lawmakers would put an automatic ten-year sunset provision on any policy decisions subject to pay-go so future legislatures have to visit it in the light of changed circumstances. So it would be possible to do this pay-go thing, but have a sunset, like you were talking about some stuff yesterday doing, so that it wouldn’t permanently cripple the legislature if it later needed to find different ways to fund or defund something you couldn’t afford to.</i>
417		<i>I agree that it may have to include the taxes and however you said that, but it was _____ revenue stream. I think that made sense. And now I think it needs some wording that has to do with existing but unfunded programs. Do we go back and look at them as though they never existed and put them on the same table as new? Particularly in education _____.</i>
418		<i>I think that they should go ahead and tax some of the services that are very discretionary. And it will affect some businesses, however, but each one of these proposals affects somebody. And I think that with things like utilities, you could not tax up to a certain level because people need utilities. But after a certain level, maybe people who waste utilities, like they over-air condition their house or overheat their house – of course, that’s a judgment call. But I don’t want to see food taxed. I don’t want to see maybe insurance and utilities taxed very much. But I think services, some services.</i>
419		<i>You could exempt tax also. For instance, other states exempt taxes on groceries, medicine, property for resale, manufacturing equipment, items used to raise animals or grow food, and things like utilities and things like that. So that your expenses to live doesn’t change, but the expenses for, what do they call it?</i>
420		<i>But if it’s a carpet cleaning company like Stanley Steamer or we all remember the plumber, Jack _____, you know, he comes out to your – he comes out to you. I mean that’s a legitimate business. That’s not a private, you know, a small business, you know, like if I came out and did your plumbing for you. You know, of course I’m going to try that. _____ money, you know? But they actually don’t want to pay taxes on it. But if you’re hiring a corporation to come out and do work for you, well yeah, your tax, you’re going to pay extra tax, and then he’s going to pay extra tax. So it actually does, I think it works well to do that personally myself.</i>
421		<i>I think services are places where people will switch to cash, that have actually been paying taxes on their overall income. If there’s an added sales tax on it that they’ve got to pass on, they will start asking for cash and doing even more under the table. I hear that he already</i>

What's Next California
Supplementary Report: Transcripts

		<i>has that. But I have neighbors and people that run service stuff, housekeeping services, all kinds of things. Those people are paying some income tax. They're not paying all of it. Maybe that is part of it.</i>
422		<i>I would think you'd want to do it the opposite way. Like I don't pay as much as \$25,000 a year for my home for everything. So I think if you started at a high thing, you'd be only taxing people who can afford it. Like why wouldn't you exempt people up to \$100,000 or something?</i>
423		<i>That's going to hit a lot of middle class people.</i>
424		<i>But I think Carl brings a good point though, talking about his mortgage payment. There's a lot of people that are paying mortgage payments of \$4,500 or more, and I bet you a majority of it is interest.</i>
425		<i>You know, getting into taxing the rich or whatever that definition is. I don't think that's a bad solution. But instead of setting the threshold at 25, raise it up to whatever number. So ____ question regarding this, what would be a number to set this threshold at that would not affect these people? One of the other points I want to made about mortgages, people ____ 0 down, and their payments are \$3,500 a month. They really can't afford to be in the house anyways. But then they're relying on that interest deduction. So I guess we could formulate a question in that way. _____. Raising the \$25,000 to \$50,000.</i>
426		<i>Well, I think this is a bad idea. Because this is one of the very last tax deductions that we have. I mean over the years, we've gone from losing our interest on our loans, other loans and credit cards and whatnot. And this is the only thing we have. If you take that away from us, why don't we just hand over our checks to the state? And we'll let them dole out what we need.</i>
427		<i>I was ____ differently as opposed to a ____ your gross or your net, which would ____ income. So you could say, "I don't want to pay interest ____," but what percent of interest do you pay on your mortgage? I mean that's just the thing. I'm going to say somewhere between 15 and 20 percent of your mortgage, of your gross could be – your mortgage deduction could be no more than 15 or 20 percent of your grow income. And so all of a sudden, people are not going to be dicking with their income because they're going to want the higher percentage. I would support something like that.</i>
428		<i>There's also a suggestion under the cons. It says the pro was too broad in the last one. Phasing out deductions for interest on a second home ____ say that it's a business ____ landlord. Because I was afraid when I said I favor that, people who have enough money to have two homes right now, I'm okay with them getting taxed a little bit more. And though he's a landlord, it's a business, so it's not going to slap him. I feel better about that. And I agree with what you're saying as well, this increase is too big, I think.</i>

429		<i>Reassess nonresidential property value more frequently. The summary is this implements a split role taxation of property, keeping Prop 13's protection of residential property against reassessment, but removing protection for nonresidential property.</i>
430		<i>Now I personally, living in a small town, and having lived in a small town _____, would love to see this happen and have buildings that are more than 25 years old given a break here. Because what happens in my experience is we keep, it's more fun for corporations to come in and build some funky thing that gets abandoned, when we have downtown buildings that are vacant, when we have the old strip mall that's vacant, and now we've got a new one. That's what I'd love to see. You know, people that come in, they don't live there, they rent out to everybody, and they don't have any taxes come up because it doesn't change hands and they can afford to have it vacant.</i>
431		<i>I don't think it's _____. How does it work right now? Basically it's really going to put a hard oppressed _____ on the protections of Proposition 13 because it makes harder for people on fixed incomes who could face big financial strain when _____ drive up the property values, and reassessment and market value increases the hardship on families that experience falling income and on the elderly if they're not protected by a large enough increase in the amount of property exemption from the taxation.</i>
432		<i>I think this would really help the young people of California in their 20s and 30s who want to buy their first home because they're not going to be – without this, they would be buying a new home and they would be paying post Proposition 13 taxes on their new home. The could have a home that is equal to some person on a fixed income or any other person, that the home is equal, the valuation is the same, and they could be paying maybe, I don't know, maybe ten times the taxes. And so I think this would help get the housing market going a little bit. It would definitely help people in their 20s and 30s to buy their first home. So you're looking at the fixed income older people, and you're looking at the young people.</i>
433		<i>It discourages investments in home and business, and we need investments in home and business badly. It's a bad, bad, bad proposal.</i>
434		<i>Well, I'm going to go on record and say I'm in favor of this. I will pay my taxes. I am happy to do it. I want better parks. I want open spaces. I want ocean protection. I want good schools for my kids. I don't have a problem with this. And many of us don't, and we need to speak up because there are always going to be tax naysayers. Some of us will pay the taxes, and we will even take hikes in our taxes because we want it for the common good. I'm on record, that's me. I don't know if anyone joins me.</i>
435		<i>I don't mind paying taxes. I call it the weather tax _____. I pay for the nice weather in California. I'm happy to live in California and</i>

What's Next California
Supplementary Report: Transcripts

		<i>pay my taxes. But I just want them to be accountable. In my household, I make _____. My husband just _____ and we're having to make adjustments. I'm not going out to dinner. This is my vacation, coming here this weekend. So don't tell me I don't like to pay taxes. I do. I just want some accountability. We need to tighten up. When times are good here, we need to put some money aside _____. But I just don't want them grabbing and just spending, spending, spending.</i>
436		<i>If we allow them to do that, then they can increase the taxes. I _____ and we give them this power of 55 majority. And if they screw up big time, _____ but we can boot them out after two years, and the other party should be able to bring that next level back.</i>
437		<i>This isn't talking about necessarily about increasing taxes for everybody. It's talking about being able to increase taxes where appropriate. I talked to my Schwab agent, and he told me that the financial health of California actually is excellent. Financial health. I'm not talking about the economy. I don't know really what he meant. But he must mean that there are pockets of money out there that could be tapped for taxes. But if you can't even get the taxes passed, well then you're stymied. Then you do get the gridlock.. So this isn't saying we're going to tax the poor. This is saying we're going to be able to pass some tax things, and our legislatures need to be smart enough to do the taxes in the right place. We're talking about these propositions. I'm not in favor of any of these proposals that are going to tax the poor or make life any harder for the middle class family. But we've got to do something. And this allows things to happen. Things can start popping..</i>
438		<i>Lower the vote _____ special taxes to be the same as the vote required for the passage of general taxes.</i>
439		<i>So I guess the opposition to going from the super majority to 55 percent is that we'll get taxed to death. So what, I guess the question would be what guarantees can you give us that we're not going to be taxed to death? If we give you the free rein or freer rein –</i>
440		<i>I want to hear _____ explanation about how they're going to reduce gridlock and what the expectations are because I don't agree with them just going to this huge _____.</i>
441	<i>D general</i>	<i>Well I think also rich people because they have more disposable income, have the option to choose where it's spent. And they may not necessarily spend on areas that are taxed. Back in the '80s, when we passed the luxury tax in the state, it basically put industries out of business. Up in Stockton, drive by the Port of Stockton and all the yacht businesses have shut down because the rich people said, "Okay, if you're going to tax my boats, I'm not going to buy them." They just – or they buy it somewhere else.</i>
442	<i>D general</i>	<i>So there's a certain level of need that you have</i>

		<i>that you have to pay a tax on. You know, everybody needs to buy some sort of place to stay. Everybody needs sundries, clothing, you know, certain foods are taxed. And I know that's an issue for later on. And so a greater percent of poor people's money goes to those necessities that are taxed naturally. One of the issues I have is somewhere at this point in our society we've come to this idea that I see that guy over and he's got a big hunk of money, and some of it should be given to me.</i>
443	D5a	<i>I don't know how recent those are. The companies you just mentioned have been around for a few decades. But I've got a thing I pulled off here, you know, business relocation California, 120, over 120 businesses since January have left the state for other places for tax purposes, five times what has happened in previous years.</i>
444	D5a	<i>You have to also impact, the impact of what the California economy is right now. I mean you can't just say, oh because we're looking at what. But the fact is is that we've had a great low here. We're in crisis. If I had a business, I'm not going to pull it out because of taxes, I'm pulling out because of the economy here in California.</i>
445	D general	<i>You know, if we step back. You know, taxes are a problem. I agree that by increasing the taxes on the wealthy, that they can leave and take jobs away from the poor</i>
446	D general	<i>I wanted to comment on it – it's not necessarily people that want to pay taxes, but people are afraid and also don't have the money to pay it. But then they're not sure that the money they do pay in taxes is going to be used wisely. And if it's not, at least in terms of sales tax, if it's not covered by a consumer, then it's going to be covered by the business. So it's really a matter of passing the buck around and deciding which is more fair.</i>
447	D3	<i>. Because you're proposing that the consumer not pay a tax, then a company would, but it's not – it doesn't have to be an either or, I mean for consideration.</i>
448	D3	<i>It's not the consumer that decides this. It's the business that decides this because of how well the company is doing with the product or service that they offer. So if the cost is going to be too high to be sold to the consumer in the consumer's eyes, then their sales are not going to do very well. So if you eliminate that sales tax by taking it on themselves, then they'll be able to sell more of their good or service and they're going to make a profit. And so that's really where that's decided.</i>
449	D5	<i>I'm arguing. It's a conversation in my head, but no, but I'm wondering then where do we equalize, how do we try to equalize property taxes? Because obviously, the wealthy do own more in property than the poor. Would that be a possible avenue if they do after that Prop 13 thing? I mean I'm just throwing this out.</i>

What's Next California
Supplementary Report: Transcripts

		<i>How are we going to deal with this?</i>
450	D3	<i>It's going to hurt the poor more than anything</i>
451	D3	<i>One of the solutions that they're trying to get at in B3 here is lower the sales tax, and then you get your _____ out of the progressive taxes. And that accomplishes what you're talking about. Leaving the other taxes, if you left the other taxes exactly the way they are, and lowered the sales tax to 3 percent, you would then equalize what you want by people that would, the revenue would come mostly from income and property tax,</i>
452	D3	<i>What we're getting at here is a another initiative that's not brought into this, and that's disparity between top and bottom. It's growing more and more every year. The rich get richer, the poor stay poorer.</i>
453	D5a	<i>I don't have a problem with that, but then where's the compromise to businesses? Because businesses are going to be paying more. And to keep people employed, keep these – I mean to get back to the 3 ½, 4 percent unemployment rate, we can't do that if we don't encourage business.</i>
454	D4	<i>And darn it, you know, why should I – if I'm paying \$30,000 a year in interest, why shouldn't I be able to claim it all? I'm paying it.</i>
455	D4	<i>So when you lay a number like that, it's what's the rationale for that? And what's the method of adjusting it? Is it going to go up at the rate of inflation each year or down at the rate of inflation?</i>
456	D6	<i>The two-thirds relieves them of the responsibility. They don't have to make decisions. They can _____. And if we can't by – I'm not saying a simple majority, maybe 55 percent, but a reasonable way to assess taxes would more likely to hold the people responsible for making those decisions.</i>
457	D6	<i>I don't know if I'm the only one who feels this way. I'm sure maybe there are other people too. But I feel that for people to decide what taxes or how they should be, just what taxes should be might not be the best case because too many people are going to be thinking about their own personal interests. And then that brings your responsibility into it. But I also don't think that legislature is quite capable of handling it either. So really it's about which is the lesser of the evils?</i>
458	D6	<i>Well, we talked earlier about how the legislature uses their money to buy influence and ability to get re-elected. But that's one of the reasons I like the two-thirds majority. I think one of the problems with the two-thirds majority to raise taxes is if we had a simple majority now, it would probably be safe to say that the Democrats would raise taxes to fill the tax gap for the revenues we need. And in response to that, people in the State of California might vote them all out. We saw that at the national level</i>

		<i>in the House of Representatives.</i>
459	D7	<i>I don't have a problem with D7.</i>
460	D7	<i>But they don't want to use that money anymore because now they've given the local municipalities the ability to get 50 percent plus 1. So we're going to test the system. We're going to pull that money off these cities and we're going to see if they backfill by increasing taxes through special –</i>
461	D5a	<i>Proposal B5A, if we're going to reassess nonresidential property, value more frequently, which is business – I had to start writing it down – in the interest of compromise, which is what we have talked about here. If you reassess nonresidential property more often, what can be done on the flip side of that to reduce regulations on businesses? Since we are basically going to charge them more. Because if you don't, it will be inflationary. Businesses will just pass it on to consumers.</i>
462	D5a	<i>You know what? It could seem fair, but Suzie's Button Shop, whatever it's selling and has an overhead or a gross profit of maybe a couple thousand dollars, they get reassessed and now their property value goes up by \$600 or \$700, they're going to cut somebody</i>
463	D5a	<i>But you know what? Property owners do that anyway. They just had a big thing in downtown LA where all the shop owners on <i>Alvera</i> Street, they decided oh you guys aren't paying enough. And they reassessed all their rents, and they're driving all their rents up. Well they're not paying any more for the property. The business – people who own property already, the building we're in, they raise our rent every single time we go for a new lease. But so businesses who own property find ways to increase their income all the time. I don't have a problem with the fact that their assets that are appreciable should also be taxed.</i>
464	D5	<i>When I did some research to find out what really happened with the passing of Proposition 13, there were tens of millions of dollars put in by people who owned extraordinarily large amounts of commercial real estate who really didn't want their property taxes to ever go up, and that was – whereas, the private residential housing people do tend to change houses in California anywhere from five to ten years, to at the most, what, about 20 or 30 years if your kids grow up and you go out. Corporations don't.</i>
465	D5	<i>When you were talking about your business, I was thinking before I went to bed, I'd like to see Prop 13 split so the commercial properties get reassessed more often than residential.</i>
466	D General	<i>If I feel like I'm comfortable, and we're having deficits and we need to pay for programs that I want, I'm willing to pay a little more.</i>
467	D3	<i>instead of just taxing the way we are now, basically tax any time money changes hands? I lived in Hawaii for a while. That's how</i>

What's Next California
Supplementary Report: Transcripts

		<i>the tax system works there. You go to the doctor, and you pay the doc your whatever. You pay tax on that. You go see your CPA. You pay tax on that. You get your car fixed. You pay tax on that. But it's a lot lower. It's 4 percent.</i>
468	D3	<i>I dscapegoat each other, and they can't – nobody has to take responsibility for the choices they made in the legislature. In this state, if you're ____ over the last 30 years, we just have largely had a Democratic assembly and senate, but we've more often than not had a Republican governor. You can pass all the taxes you want in the legislature, but if you don't have a governor that will sign it, then it doesn't matter.on't like the fundamental idea that there's a body that's just taxing us all the time, that there's no limit. It almost seems like – though I like the idea – it seems like a simple process to tax everything continually – it doesn't seem like it's pushing us towards fiscal responsibility 'cause they can still adjust the tax rate accordingly, and now it's just a simple process for them to just modulate it up and down, and mechanisms build, and the money keeps flowing in. I guess what I'm tired of is the inefficiency, so that kinda goes back to is there a limit on taxation?</i>
469	D3	<i>Well, part of it is I find sometimes – when I didn't have a child – I didn't have a dependent – and I made a certain amount of income, I felt that I was taxed up the ass – to be honest with you – disproportionately to the regular Joe Shmoe because I was getting almost 40 percent taxed, and I didn't have a home at the time. So I bought a home, all those things, and started with my family business. That's where I found the tax relief. But not if you're a regular guy working for corporate America, making your salary, you're little piece of bread, every two weeks. You know what I mean? It was a lifestyle you chose. You're a single person. You get taxed higher. I feel that you're kinda being punished for that in some regards, and I'm kinda carrying an inequitable share of the burden.</i>
470	D5	<i>From what I've heard, Prop 13 was supposed to protect the homeowners, but we got tricked, so by reassessing the nonresidential properties more often, hopefully catching it when their properties have risen, maybe that would help the state more.</i>
471	D5	<i>From what I've heard, Prop 13 was supposed to protect the homeowners, but we got tricked, so by reassessing the nonresidential properties more often, hopefully catching it when their properties have risen, maybe that would help the state more.</i>
472	d1	<i>It's not necessarily the answer, but it's just an indication of – we're just blanket stating saying they're paying too much for the crap that we have now, and that's just as much of an assumption, or an opinion. It's not based on facts. We don't know that we're throwing money at nothing. We just might be throwing money at people's salaries, like Board of Transportation, or the school board</i>

		<i>supervisor.</i>
473	D6	<i>Well, I just think two-thirds is just too much to try to get people to vote for anything. We just have to support our schools. Our whole future depends on doing that, so I'd be in favor of the 55 percent requirement.</i>
474	B7, D6	<i>Right now, frankly, we have set up a system where everybody can scapegoat each other, and they can't – nobody has to take responsibility for the choices they made in the legislature. In this state, if you're ____ over the last 30 years, we just have largely had a Democratic assembly and senate, but we've more often than not had a Republican governor. You can pass all the taxes you want in the legislature, but if you don't have a governor that will sign it, then it doesn't matter. has to take responsibility for the choices they made in the legislature. In this state, if you're ____ over the last 30 years, we just have largely had a Democratic assembly and senate, but we've more often than not had a Republican governor. You can pass all the taxes you want in the legislature, but if you don't have a governor that will sign it, then it doesn't matter.</i>
475	D3	<i>For me, I like the idea of spreading out the taxes to more services and retail, but then lowering the rate. The reason I like it is 'cause on many levels it could end up generating some more in a way that feels not very painful, but by lowering the rate – our country is a very high consumption-based economy, and by lowering the rate, even though you're spreading out over more things, by lowering the rate, it's going to create a psychological effect that some of the certain things that you wanna buy are cheaper because you're at 4 percent instead of the 7.8 and 8 percent. It's a very real possibility for it to be that low.</i>
476	D3	<i>It's not equitable</i>
477	D3	<i>It's a regressive tax, absolutely</i>
478	D4	<i>But you know to that issue that is isn't necessary that every talented individual have a degree, that they need a profession, and we close so many trade schools in this state, it's really sad because you need trade people. You need mechanics. You need engineers. You need those people in those professions. It's a misnomer. So you have a BA in psychology. Whoop-de-doo! Good luck with getting a job.</i>
479	D5	<i>But you know what. Prop 13 was a good concept because if we had unlimited taxability by the legislature, what would they do? They'd spend it.</i>
480	General	<i>Say it in Spanish. It's all right.</i>
481	Response/D 5	<i>I speak English. Ah, well, in terms of real estate in Sacramento, I can give you an example of a house that back in 2005, when it was booming, it cost \$300,000. Then it went through foreclosure. Then it got bought out for \$130,000 in 2009. Then it went through foreclosure in – this year it went through foreclosure again, and then it got sold for \$51,000. So it lost value from \$300,000 all the</i>

What's Next California
Supplementary Report: Transcripts

		way down to \$51,000. If you think about it now, the property taxes –
482	D1	<i>The pay as you go doesn't always work or mean anything. It could be phony anywhere</i>
483		<i>We already have a balanced budget requirement in there. Not only that, in the summary of it, I don't like _____ it says this will force the legislator and the governor to provide a funding source, either program cuts or tax increases. That's leaving it in the government's hands of whether we get – cut programs, and leaving it in the government's hands whether we tax, not what it's been up 'til now.</i>
484		<i>It's giving them the approval to raise the taxes.</i>
485		<i>It'll force the government to provide a funding source, so that they're telling you where it's coming from, so that when you vote, you're not just voting that okay, we want this program. You're understanding that they're cutting 2 percent of education, in order to fund this program</i>
486	Taxes	<i>If our government's not running efficiently, why – my question would be why am I talking about raising taxes? Basically, what I'm doing then is saying here, give me taxes so I can do this thing more inefficiently for more money.</i>
487		<i>More transparency is very good.</i>
488	D2	<i>My only concern about _____ concerned about raising additional revenues through taxation is that if you go from 5 to 10 percent, I agree we definitely need a buffer fund to – for the hard times. But if you _____ increase your revenue streams, then you're looking at cutting your operating costs.</i>
489		<i>But if we put away our revenue when it spikes, we have them during times like this.</i>
490		<i>We can't just save all that money and not do anything with it. We have to spend it because if you don't spend all _____. We save money, but we have so much money left, we have to _____ programs.</i>
491		<i>It sounds nice, but personally, I don't trust the government. You give them 10 percent to save, they're gonna spend 20 percent.</i>
492		<i>I would say we have to allow our government to truly put away a rainy day fund, but have strict limits on what they can and can't do with it.</i>

Appendix 6: Responses by Party Affiliation

Key
T=Total
R=Republican
D=Democrat
I=Independent
O=Other

#	Question	(Before)					(After)				
		T	R	D	I	O	T	R	D	I	O
1	To begin with, all in all, on a 0 to 10 scale, where 0 is "extremely poorly", 10 is "extremely well," and 5 is exactly in the middle, how well or poorly would you say the system of democracy in California works these days?										
	Well	21%	12%	26%	25%	5.6%	38%	35%	42%	40%	19%
	Undecided	18%	24%	18%	8%	22%	15%	11%	15%	19%	19%
	Not well	61%	64%	55%	68%	72%	47%	55%	44%	42%	63%
2a	Creating a formal review process to allow an initiative's proponents to amend an initiative following public input										
	Desirable	60%	54%	63%	64%	50%	76%	72%	80%	74%	63%
	Undecided	19%	25%	18%	13%	20%	9%	11%	7%	10%	5%
	Undesirable	21%	21%	19%	23%	30%	16%	18%	13%	16%	32%
2b	Allowing the Legislature to remove an initiative from the ballot by enacting it into law										
	Desirable	37%	33%	42%	34%	35%	34%	31%	41%	25%	22%
	Undecided	14%	11%	16%	10%	25%	17%	16%	17%	20%	6%
	Undesirable	49%	56%	43%	56%	40%	49%	53%	42%	55%	72%
2c	Allowing a simple majority of the State Legislature to place a countermeasure to an already qualified initiative on the ballot next to that initiative										
	Desirable	32%	29%	38%	26%	26%	30%	25%	32%	33%	26%
	Undecided	17%	22%	17%	15%	0%	13%	19%	12%	4%	16%
	Undesirable	50%	50%	45%	58%	74%	58%	56%	56%	63%	58%
2d	Allowing the Legislature to amend an initiative that has already passed, subject to a public review and the agreement of the initiative's proponents										
	Desirable	43%	33%	51%	40%	42%	37%	30%	45%	28%	53%
	Undecided	13%	15%	14%	10%	11%	12%	14%	14%	7%	5%
	Undesirable	44%	51%	36%	51%	47%	51%	57%	41%	65%	42%
2e	Allowing the Legislature to amend an initiative that has already passed, subject to a two-thirds vote, even if an initiative's proponents do not agree with the amendment										
	Desirable	25%	16%	33%	20%	22%	18%	14%	22%	15%	11%
	Undecided	15%	16%	14%	16%	11%	9%	7%	11%	7%	16%
	Undesirable	61%	68%	53%	65%	67%	73%	79%	67%	78%	74%
2f	Allowing an initiative's proponents to withdraw it after it qualifies for the ballot										
	Desirable	47%	40%	54%	46%	37%	57%	59%	59%	50%	47%
	Undecided	21%	29%	17%	17%	26%	17%	19%	15%	20%	5%
	Undesirable	32%	32%	29%	38%	37%	26%	22%	25%	31%	47%
2g	Allowing an initiative's proponents to withdraw it after it qualifies for the ballot										
	Desirable	88%	87%	90%	91%	78%	84%	86%	83%	84%	82%
	Undecided	6%	9%	6%	3%	11%	7%	5%	9%	7%	0%
	Undesirable	5%	5%	5%	7%	11%	9%	9%	8%	10%	18%
2h	Requiring all ballot measures that require new expenditures to indicate how they will be paid for										
	Desirable	87%	84%	87%	88%	95%	91%	92%	92%	92%	67%
	Undecided	7%	9%	7%	7%	0%	5%	3%	5%	4%	17%
	Undesirable	6%	7%	6%	5%	5%	4%	5%	3%	4%	17%
2i	Requiring the ballot pamphlet to provide an analysis by the Legislative Analyst of how new initiative programs will likely be paid for										
	Desirable	67%	59%	74%	62%	65%	67%	59%	71%	70%	78%
	Undecided	20%	25%	19%	17%	24%	19%	17%	21%	22%	11%
	Undesirable	13%	16%	8%	21%	12%	13%	24%	9%	9%	11%
2j	Making the vote threshold needed to pass an initiative the same as any vote threshold that the initiative itself requires of the public in the future										
	Desirable	82%	77%	87%	78%	85%	91%	87%	94%	91%	89%
	Undecided	9%	14%	6%	11%	0%	4%	4%	5%	3%	0%
	Undesirable	8%	9%	6%	11%	15%	5%	9%	1%	7%	11%

Appendix 6: Responses by Party Affiliation

(#)	Question		T	R	D	I	O		T	R	D	I	O
2k	Increasing the number of Assembly districts from 80 to 120	Desirable	61%	54%	63%	62%	71%		62%	56%	68%	55%	78%
		Undecided	17%	13%	21%	17%	0%		17%	15%	18%	21%	0%
		Undesirable	23%	33%	16%	22%	29%		21%	30%	14%	25%	22%
2l	Expanding the size of districts and electing more than one legislative representative from each district	Desirable	48%	36%	52%	50%	71%		49%	36%	53%	51%	71%
		Undecided	19%	21%	19%	19%	6%		17%	21%	17%	14%	6%
		Undesirable	33%	43%	29%	31%	24%		34%	43%	30%	34%	24%
2m	Replacing the current State Senate and Assembly with a single house of 120 members	Desirable	32%	31%	34%	30%	31%		42%	36%	47%	42%	39%
		Undecided	25%	22%	25%	30%	25%		15%	17%	16%	8%	17%
		Undesirable	43%	47%	41%	40%	44%		43%	48%	37%	50%	44%
2n	Making the State Legislature part-time and paying legislators	Desirable	45%	59%	33%	52%	44%		26%	39%	18%	30%	18%
		Undecided	13%	13%	14%	15%	6%		9%	10%	10%	5%	12%
		Undesirable	42%	28%	54%	33%	50%		64%	51%	72%	64%	71%
2o	Reducing the length of the state legislative session and requiring legislators to spend more time in their districts	Desirable	57%	68%	49%	57%	65%		46%	60%	39%	45%	33%
		Undecided	19%	15%	22%	22%	12%		18%	17%	18%	21%	11%
		Undesirable	24%	17%	30%	22%	24%		36%	23%	43%	34%	56%
2p	Allowing voters to rank the candidates in order of preference, so that the winner can be decided without a second election	Desirable	61%	49%	67%	63%	68%		57%	43%	63%	62%	61%
		Undecided	13%	19%	10%	10%	11%		13%	22%	10%	8%	6%
		Undesirable	26%	32%	23%	27%	21%		30%	35%	27%	30%	33%
2q	Lengthening Assembly terms from 2 years to 4, and Senate terms from 4 years to 6	Desirable	46%	36%	58%	30%	56%		81%	77%	87%	74%	84%
		Undecided	14%	13%	16%	14%	0%		8%	10%	7%	10%	5%
		Undesirable	40%	51%	26%	56%	44%		11%	14%	6%	16%	11%
2r	Requiring economic impact analyses of major legislation before passage	Desirable	89%	86%	87%	92%	100%		90%	89%	91%	89%	83%
		Undecided	8%	11%	10%	3%	0%		5%	4%	6%	4%	6%
		Undesirable	3%	3%	3%	5%	0%		5%	7%	3%	7%	11%
2s	Establishing clear goals for each government program and assessing whether progress is being made toward these goals at least once every ten years	Desirable	86%	77%	89%	92%	85%		90%	91%	90%	89%	79%
		Undecided	8%	14%	7%	3%	5%		6%	4%	8%	1%	16%
		Undesirable	6%	9%	3%	5%	10%		5%	4%	3%	9%	5%
2t	Requiring the Governor and the Legislature to adopt two-year instead of one-year budgets	Desirable	57%	59%	59%	49%	59%		73%	71%	75%	66%	88%
		Undecided	25%	20%	28%	26%	29%		15%	15%	17%	11%	0%
		Undesirable	18%	21%	13%	25%	12%		13%	14%	8%	23%	12%
2u	Requiring the Governor and the Legislature to publish three and five year budget projections prior to the budget vote each year	Desirable	81%	81%	81%	80%	78%		83%	84%	80%	88%	89%
		Undecided	12%	10%	13%	11%	11%		9%	11%	11%	5%	0%
		Undesirable	8%	8%	6%	8%	11%		7%	5%	9%	7%	11%
2v	Transferring from the state to local governments control and financing of services provided at the local level <i>and</i> requiring minimum standards for delivering them	Desirable	66%	65%	65%	69%	74%		73%	74%	74%	73%	58%
		Undecided	16%	19%	17%	13%	5%		14%	15%	13%	14%	16%
		Undesirable	17%	15%	18%	18%	21%		13%	11%	13%	14%	26%
2w	Allowing local governments to raise taxes for local services in exchange for increased coordination of service delivery and public reporting of performance	Desirable	55%	42%	63%	52%	65%		63%	63%	69%	49%	53%
		Undecided	15%	15%	14%	18%	6%		16%	15%	14%	21%	16%
		Undesirable	30%	43%	23%	30%	29%		22%	22%	17%	30%	32%
2x	Creating a stable source of funds for regional priorities by dedicating a portion of tax revenue from economic growth to those priorities	Desirable	67%	56%	72%	68%	75%		67%	54%	75%	70%	61%
		Undecided	22%	28%	18%	23%	13%		21%	32%	17%	19%	11%
		Undesirable	12%	16%	10%	10%	13%		11%	14%	8%	11%	28%

Appendix 6: Responses by Party Affiliation

(#)	Question		T	R	D	I	O		T	R	D	I	O
2y	Direct any savings resulting from successful local management of state resources to those local governments, in exchange for monitoring their own performance and being accountable and innovative in their operations												
		Desirable	75%	73%	75%	77%	78%		76%	84%	72%	78%	67%
		Undecided	13%	15%	13%	12%	0%		12%	12%	15%	7%	6%
		Undesirable	12%	12%	12%	11%	22%		12%	4%	14%	15%	28%
2z	Requiring state and local governments to identify policy goals and publish their progress toward meeting them												
		Desirable	89%	86%	92%	86%	89%		92%	96%	90%	91%	89%
		Undecided	7%	7%	7%	7%	0%		5%	3%	6%	8%	0%
		Undesirable	4%	6%	2%	7%	11%		3%	1%	4%	1%	11%
2aa	Requiring legislation creating new programs that cost \$25 million or more to indicate how they will be paid for												
		Desirable	91%	92%	88%	95%	90%		90%	96%	87%	89%	83%
		Undecided	5%	3%	7%	5%	0%		5%	2%	9%	4%	0%
		Undesirable	4%	5%	5%	0%	10%		5%	3%	4%	7%	17%
2ab	Requiring legislation creating tax cuts that cost \$25 million or more to indicate how they will be paid for												
		Desirable	84%	75%	90%	82%	80%		84%	81%	90%	78%	72%
		Undecided	6%	8%	7%	3%	0%		8%	10%	6%	11%	0%
		Undesirable	10%	17%	3%	15%	20%		8%	9%	4%	11%	28%
2ac	Requiring legislation creating new programs or tax cuts that cost \$25 million or more to indicate how they will be paid for												
		Desirable	84%	76%	89%	84%	84%		88%	88%	90%	83%	78%
		Undecided	8%	14%	7%	4%	0%		7%	6%	6%	11%	0%
		Undesirable	8%	10%	4%	12%	16%		6%	5%	4%	7%	22%
2ad	Requiring that one-time revenue spikes only be spent on one-time projects, paying off debt, and filling the state rainy-day fund												
		Desirable	80%	77%	81%	82%	79%		84%	89%	83%	81%	84%
		Undecided	12%	13%	14%	6%	11%		7%	6%	7%	9%	0%
		Undesirable	8%	11%	5%	12%	11%		9%	4%	11%	9%	16%
2ae	Increasing the size of the State's rainy-day fund from 5% to 10% of the State budget												
		Desirable	66%	64%	67%	67%	60%		67%	75%	67%	55%	76%
		Undecided	21%	20%	20%	19%	33%		19%	14%	20%	26%	6%
		Undesirable	13%	16%	13%	13%	7%		14%	12%	14%	19%	18%
2af	Applying the sales tax to services as well as goods while reducing the sales tax rate												
		Desirable	38%	30%	44%	39%	35%		45%	38%	51%	41%	39%
		Undecided	17%	21%	17%	16%	12%		14%	15%	14%	17%	6%
		Undesirable	45%	50%	40%	46%	53%		41%	47%	35%	42%	56%
2ag	Applying the sales tax to services as well as goods while keeping the current sales tax rate												
		Desirable	23%	14%	32%	22%	12%		20%	12%	25%	16%	28%
		Undecided	16%	15%	17%	14%	6%		10%	10%	13%	7%	0%
		Undesirable	61%	71%	51%	64%	82%		70%	79%	62%	77%	72%
2ah	Limiting the current California state income tax deduction for home mortgage interest payments to \$25,000 per year												
		Desirable	43%	35%	52%	35%	47%		44%	29%	52%	49%	37%
		Undecided	21%	22%	20%	21%	20%		17%	19%	19%	10%	11%
		Undesirable	36%	43%	29%	44%	33%		40%	52%	29%	41%	53%
2ai	Reassessing non-residential property more frequently than now												
		Desirable	53%	30%	65%	58%	56%		72%	54%	86%	65%	67%
		Undecided	20%	23%	22%	12%	17%		13%	18%	9%	12%	17%
		Undesirable	27%	47%	13%	29%	28%		16%	28%	5%	23%	17%
2aj	Reassessing all property values more frequently while adjusting the current property tax exemption for inflation to about \$28,000 <i>and</i> allowing the exemption to rise with property values going forward												
		Desirable	35%	23%	44%	30%	46%		33%	22%	42%	32%	24%
		Undecided	25%	21%	29%	27%	8%		20%	16%	23%	15%	29%
		Undesirable	40%	56%	27%	43%	46%		47%	62%	36%	53%	47%
2ak	Allowing local electorates to raise the property tax rate above the current 1% rate cap												
		Desirable	28%	11%	43%	16%	42%		28%	16%	40%	21%	21%
		Undecided	11%	8%	14%	9%	16%		13%	8%	19%	4%	16%
		Undesirable	61%	81%	43%	76%	42%		59%	76%	41%	75%	63%

Appendix 6: Responses by Party Affiliation

(#)	Question	T	R	D	I	O	T	R	D	I	O
2a	Lowering local vote requirement to adopt taxes dedicated to specific purposes, to a simple majority so that it is the same as the vote requirement to adopt taxes for general purposes										
	Desirable	46%	27%	62%	38%	44%	42%	22%	59%	29%	50%
	Undecided	17%	19%	17%	13%	17%	16%	20%	14%	20%	6%
	Undesirable	38%	54%	22%	49%	39%	41%	58%	27%	51%	44%
2am	Decreasing the super-majority vote required in the Legislature to raise taxes (about 67%) to 55%										
	Desirable	32%	10%	49%	25%	30%	50%	21%	67%	49%	50%
	Undecided	9%	10%	9%	11%	5%	8%	8%	10%	3%	6%
	Undesirable	59%	80%	42%	64%	65%	43%	71%	23%	48%	44%
3	If the Legislature is allowed to amend an initiative that has already passed, by what sort of majority should it be able to do so?										
	A simple majority (50% plus 1)	13%	4%	19%	14%	6%	9%	7%	12%	6%	0%
	55%	18%	11%	25%	14%	24%	27%	23%	33%	21%	11%
	A two-thirds majority	69%	85%	57%	71%	71%	65%	70%	55%	73%	89%
4	Some people think that the Legislature should contain fewer Legislators, even if that means that each Legislator represents more people. Suppose these people are at one end of a 1-to-7 scale, at point 1. Other people think that each Legislator should represent fewer people, even if that means that the Legislature contains more Legislators. Suppose these people are at the other end of the scale, at point 7. People who are exactly in the middle are at point 4, and of course other people have opinions at other points between 1 and 7. Where would you place yourself on this scale, or wouldn't you have any opinion about that?										
	Fewer legislators	20%	27%	15%	21%	11%	10%	17%	6%	9%	5%
	Exactly in the middle	23%	22%	23%	25%	21%	20%	25%	17%	24%	11%
	More legislators	57%	51%	62%	54%	68%	70%	58%	78%	67%	84%
5	On a 0 to 10 scale, where 0 is "not at all", 10 is "as much as could reasonably be expected," and 5 is exactly in the middle, how much or little would you say the California State Legislature is able to get important things done?										
	Not at all	67%	75%	63%	66%	68%	69%	73%	65%	73%	78%
	Exactly in the middle	16%	13%	17%	18%	26%	10%	14%	9%	8%	11%
	As could be expected	17%	13%	21%	16%	5%	21%	13%	26%	19%	11%
6	On another 0 to 10 scale, where 0 is "not at all", 10 is "completely", and 5 is exactly in the middle, to what extent is the ability of the State Legislature to get things done affected by tensions between the political parties?										
	Not at all	27%	38%	19%	27%	37%	21%	25%	15%	26%	37%
	Exactly in the middle	8%	11%	6%	9%	5%	6%	10%	4%	5%	0%
	Completely	65%	52%	75%	64%	58%	73%	65%	81%	69%	63%
7	And, on another 0 to 10 scale, where 0 is completely at the local level, 10 is completely at the State level, and 5 is exactly in the middle, how much decision-making authority should there be at the local level versus the State level?										
	Local level	42%	47%	34%	49%	47%	43%	50%	39%	38%	61%
	Exactly in the middle	32%	30%	32%	34%	32%	29%	25%	29%	37%	22%
	State level	27%	23%	34%	18%	21%	27%	25%	31%	25%	17%
8	And, on the same scale, how much taxation power should there be at the local level versus State level?										
	Local level	34%	37%	30%	31%	53%	32%	37%	29%	29%	50%
	Exactly in the middle	40%	36%	42%	43%	24%	33%	36%	33%	32%	17%
	State level	27%	27%	27%	26%	24%	35%	27%	38%	39%	33%
9	On the same scale, where would you say the most important public policy decisions should be made?										
	Local level	25%	32%	16%	32%	39%	25%	31%	16%	32%	53%
	Exactly in the middle	30%	35%	26%	33%	33%	26%	32%	27%	16%	24%
	State level	44%	32%	58%	36%	28%	49%	37%	57%	53%	24%
10	On another 0 to 10 scale, where 0 is "completely by voters in referendums", 10 is "completely by the State Legislature", and 5 is exactly in the middle, how many of the State's major decisions should be made by voters in referendums versus by the State Legislature?										
	By voters in referendums	31%	36%	25%	35%	35%	29%	35%	21%	37%	33%
	Exactly in the middle	25%	31%	18%	28%	29%	26%	34%	24%	24%	17%
	By the State Legislature	45%	33%	57%	37%	35%	45%	31%	55%	39%	50%

Appendix 6: Responses by Party Affiliation

(#)	Question	T	R	D	I	O		T	R	D	I	O
11	Some people think that decisions made at the local level reflect the will of the local community more closely than decisions made at the state level. Suppose these people are at one end of a 1-to-7 scale, at point 1. Other people think that decisions made at the local level are more dominated by powerful special interests than decisions made at the state level. Suppose these people are at the other end of the scale, at point 7. People who are exactly in the middle are at point 4, and of course other people have opinions at other points between 1 and 7. Where would you place yourself on this scale, or wouldn't you have any opinion about that?											
	Reflect local community	47%	57%	40%	44%	61%		56%	65%	52%	53%	63%
	Exactly in the middle	25%	23%	27%	27%	22%		23%	23%	23%	26%	13%
	Dominated by special interests	28%	20%	34%	30%	17%		21%	13%	25%	22%	25%
13a	Replacing the current State Senate and Assembly with a single house would make it easier to pass important legislation											
	Agree strongly	17%	17%	16%	20%	24%		24%	20%	26%	23%	33%
	Agree somewhat	35%	35%	40%	26%	18%		39%	37%	39%	41%	44%
	Neither agree nor disagree	20%	15%	21%	23%	29%		15%	15%	15%	16%	11%
	Disagree somewhat	16%	17%	16%	13%	24%		13%	19%	13%	8%	0%
	Disagree strongly	12%	15%	8%	17%	6%		9%	9%	7%	12%	11%
13b	Replacing the current State Senate and Assembly with a single house would deprive the system of important checks and balances											
	Agree strongly	31%	36%	26%	36%	44%		29%	33%	27%	26%	32%
	Agree somewhat	26%	24%	30%	23%	19%		30%	28%	32%	27%	32%
	Neither agree nor disagree	20%	21%	20%	16%	25%		14%	17%	12%	18%	0%
	Disagree somewhat	13%	13%	15%	10%	6%		18%	16%	23%	11%	16%
	Disagree strongly	9%	6%	9%	14%	6%		10%	7%	7%	19%	21%
14a	Part-time legislators will tend to represent their districts more closely											
	Agree strongly	16%	26%	6%	23%	21%		10%	16%	4%	15%	11%
	Agree somewhat	27%	29%	24%	26%	37%		22%	28%	22%	14%	16%
	Neither agree nor disagree	18%	17%	19%	19%	16%		16%	18%	15%	18%	16%
	Disagree somewhat	20%	14%	27%	17%	5%		26%	19%	28%	31%	16%
	Disagree strongly	19%	13%	23%	16%	21%		27%	19%	31%	23%	42%
14b	Part-time legislators will be less likely to be career politicians.											
	Agree strongly	30%	42%	17%	41%	39%		25%	35%	21%	20%	28%
	Agree somewhat	41%	35%	48%	30%	50%		42%	39%	40%	49%	50%
	Neither agree nor disagree	12%	10%	14%	13%	6%		12%	11%	13%	11%	6%
	Disagree somewhat	10%	5%	13%	11%	6%		11%	6%	15%	11%	6%
	Disagree strongly	7%	8%	8%	6%	0%		10%	9%	11%	9%	11%
14c	Part-time legislators will tend to be more open to corruption.											
	Agree strongly	10%	10%	12%	6%	7%		11%	12%	13%	7%	6%
	Agree somewhat	17%	10%	21%	19%	13%		20%	16%	21%	26%	11%
	Neither agree nor disagree	34%	33%	32%	39%	33%		34%	27%	40%	29%	44%
	Disagree somewhat	22%	21%	25%	14%	27%		21%	27%	18%	19%	28%
	Disagree strongly	18%	26%	11%	22%	20%		13%	19%	8%	19%	11%
14d	Part-time legislators will tend to be less well informed about policy issues.											
	Agree strongly	15%	9%	19%	14%	12%		25%	15%	34%	23%	11%
	Agree somewhat	30%	25%	36%	26%	24%		29%	31%	24%	33%	39%
	Neither agree nor disagree	20%	21%	18%	22%	12%		20%	18%	20%	17%	39%
	Disagree somewhat	20%	23%	18%	18%	35%		16%	20%	16%	11%	6%
	Disagree strongly	15%	22%	9%	19%	18%		11%	16%	6%	16%	6%
15a	Increasing State Legislators' terms will make them less responsive to their districts.											
	Agree strongly	12%	17%	5%	17%	15%		4%	5%	3%	3%	5%
	Agree somewhat	29%	32%	25%	31%	35%		13%	17%	8%	17%	21%
	Neither agree nor disagree	21%	21%	20%	24%	15%		17%	17%	15%	20%	21%
	Disagree somewhat	26%	21%	33%	21%	15%		39%	35%	45%	32%	26%
	Disagree strongly	12%	8%	17%	7%	20%		27%	25%	29%	28%	26%
15b	Increasing State Legislators' terms will let them spend less time fundraising and campaigning and more time legislating.											
	Agree strongly	26%	19%	28%	26%	41%		43%	35%	49%	40%	47%
	Agree somewhat	42%	42%	43%	40%	41%		39%	45%	36%	37%	42%
	Neither agree nor disagree	13%	15%	12%	15%	0%		9%	9%	8%	15%	0%
	Disagree somewhat	11%	14%	11%	8%	12%		5%	8%	3%	5%	5%
	Disagree strongly	8%	10%	6%	10%	6%		4%	4%	4%	3%	5%

Appendix 6: Responses by Party Affiliation

#	Question		T	R	D	I	O		T	R	D	I	O
16a	Arnold Schwarzenegger												
		Extremely dissatisfied	76%	65%	81%	77%	83%		75%	61%	83%	78%	74%
		Exactly in the middle	12%	17%	11%	8%	11%		14%	24%	9%	8%	21%
		Extremely satisfied	12%	18%	7%	15%	6%		11%	15%	8%	14%	5%
16b	Jerry Brown												
		Extremely dissatisfied	30%	55%	11%	43%	22%		25%	47%	8%	34%	38%
		Exactly in the middle	20%	27%	17%	16%	28%		21%	31%	16%	18%	13%
		Extremely satisfied	49%	18%	73%	40%	50%		54%	22%	76%	48%	50%
16c	California State Senate												
		Extremely dissatisfied	69%	82%	60%	73%	67%		68%	78%	62%	71%	61%
		Exactly in the middle	19%	15%	22%	16%	13%		14%	16%	21%	14%	22%
		Extremely satisfied	12%	3%	18%	11%	20%		13%	6%	17%	14%	17%
16d	California State Assembly												
		Extremely dissatisfied	68%	78%	60%	73%	60%		71%	74%	70%	68%	67%
		Exactly in the middle	19%	18%	22%	15%	13%		16%	17%	15%	15%	17%
		Extremely satisfied	13%	4%	17%	12%	27%		13%	8%	14%	17%	17%
16e	California State Legislature												
		Extremely dissatisfied	72%	81%	63%	74%	76%		70%	77%	70%	61%	74%
		Exactly in the middle	18%	18%	21%	14%	12%		18%	15%	18%	23%	11%
		Extremely satisfied	10%	1%	16%	12%	12%		12%	8%	13%	16%	16%
16f	California's initiative/referendum process												
		Extremely dissatisfied	50%	44%	56%	48%	50%		37%	25%	49%	26%	42%
		Exactly in the middle	22%	22%	21%	23%	21%		19%	23%	17%	20%	0%
		Extremely satisfied	28%	34%	23%	30%	29%		44%	52%	33%	54%	58%
16g	California's State government												
		Extremely dissatisfied	72%	83%	64%	72%	74%		64%	75%	55%	71%	63%
		Exactly in the middle	15%	9%	21%	10%	16%		19%	18%	23%	11%	16%
		Extremely satisfied	13%	8%	14%	17%	11%		17%	7%	22%	19%	21%
16h	Your city/town and county's government												
		Extremely dissatisfied	37%	34%	35%	40%	61%		28%	31%	24%	29%	42%
		Exactly in the middle	20%	20%	23%	14%	17%		20%	20%	21%	17%	11%
		Extremely satisfied	43%	46%	43%	46%	22%		52%	49%	54%	53%	47%
16i	California's local governments generally												
		Extremely dissatisfied	39%	38%	34%	45%	67%		30%	30%	27%	35%	50%
		Exactly in the middle	29%	33%	33%	19%	13%		32%	34%	31%	32%	25%
		Extremely satisfied	32%	29%	33%	36%	20%		38%	36%	42%	32%	25%
18	Some people think that local communities should be able to decide their own taxes and services, even if that means big differences between communities. Suppose these people are at one end of a 1-to-7 scale, at point 1. Other people think that taxes and services should be the same throughout the state, even if that means less local control. Suppose these people are at the other end of the scale, at point 7. People who are exactly in the middle are at point 4. Where would you place yourself on this scale, or wouldn't you have any opinion about that?												
		Local communities decide	39%	50%	30%	41%	40%		42%	52%	37%	37%	53%
		Exactly in the middle	21%	27%	20%	14%	20%		20%	25%	17%	21%	21%
		Same throughout the state	41%	24%	50%	45%	40%		38%	24%	46%	42%	26%
19	Some people think that government should provide certain benefits and services, even if that means higher taxes. Suppose these people are at one end of a 1-to-7 scale, at point 1. Other people think that government should lower taxes, even if that means reduced benefits and services. Suppose these people are at the other end of the scale, at point 7. People who are exactly in the middle are at point 4. Where would you place yourself on this scale, or wouldn't you have any opinion about that?												
		Provide benefits and services, even if that means higher taxes	46%	16%	67%	40%	47%		57%	27%	78%	48%	56%
		Exactly in the middle	18%	20%	15%	20%	16%		15%	23%	11%	17%	6%
		Lower taxes, even if that means reducing benefits and services	37%	64%	18%	40%	37%		28%	50%	11%	35%	39%

Appendix 6: Responses by Party Affiliation

(#) Question		T	R	D	I	O		T	R	D	I	O
20	Some people think that majorities should always have their way no matter how big the minorities are or how strongly they feel. Suppose these people are at one end of a 1-to-7 scale, at point 1. Other people think that minorities should have their way when they are large enough or feel strongly enough. Suppose these people are at the other end of the scale, at point 7. People who are exactly in the middle are at point 4. Where would you place yourself on this scale, or wouldn't you have any opinion about that?											
		Majorities always have their way	34%	39%	34%	28%	37%	37%	35%	37%	40%	28%
		Exactly in the middle	33%	33%	31%	39%	26%	33%	37%	31%	30%	33%
		Minorities have their way	33%	28%	35%	33%	37%	31%	28%	32%	30%	39%
21	Some people think that the best society is one in which nobody can tell anybody else what to do, even if there is a cost to others. Suppose these people are at one end of a 1-to-7 scale, at point 1. Other people think that the best society is one in which the community can decide together what people can and cannot do, even if some people object. Suppose these people are at the other end of the scale, at point 7. People who are exactly in the middle are at point 4. Where would you place yourself on this scale, or wouldn't you have any opinion about that?											
		Nobody can tell anybody else what to do	18%	22%	11%	24%	30%	20%	25%	11%	29%	37%
		Exactly in the middle	19%	20%	17%	19%	25%	22%	24%	21%	24%	26%
		Community can decide	64%	58%	72%	57%	45%	58%	51%	68%	47%	37%
22	Some people think that the best government is one in which everyone gets to vote directly on making the laws. Suppose these people are at one end of a 1-to-7 scale, at point 1. Other people think that the best government is one in which everyone gets to vote for representatives who then vote on making the laws. Suppose these people are at the other end of the scale, at point 7. People who are exactly in the middle are at point 4. Where would you place yourself on this scale, or wouldn't you have any opinion about that?											
		Everyone votes on laws	34%	36%	28%	39%	60%	34%	39%	30%	38%	26%
		Exactly in the middle	20%	17%	24%	18%	10%	16%	20%	14%	16%	26%
		Representatives vote on laws	46%	47%	48%	43%	30%	50%	41%	57%	46%	47%

Appendix 7: Responses by Ethnicity

T=Total
W=White
B=Black
H=Hispanic
A/PI = Asian/ Pacific Islander
NA = Native American
O = Other

#	Question	(Before)							(After)						
		T	W	B	H	A/PI	NA	O	T	W	B	H	A/PI	NA	O
1	To begin with, all in all, on a 0 to 10 scale, where 0 is "extremely poorly", 10 is "extremely well," and 5 is exactly in the middle, how well or poorly would you say the system of democracy in California works these days?														
	Well	21%	18%	39%	23%	22%	25%	20%	38%	36%	40%	35%	65%	50%	44%
	Undecided	18%	12%	35%	30%	44%	25%	30%	15%	13%	32%	20%	6%	0%	11%
	Not well	61%	70%	26%	47%	33%	50%	50%	47%	51%	28%	45%	29%	50%	44%
2a	Creating a formal review process to allow an initiative's proponents to amend an initiative following public input														
	Desirable	60%	60%	52%	56%	81%	75%	56%	76%	73%	82%	80%	90%	25%	80%
	Undecided	19%	17%	32%	26%	14%	25%	11%	9%	8%	7%	7%	10%	75%	0%
	Undesirable	21%	23%	16%	19%	5%	0%	33%	16%	18%	11%	13%	0%	0%	20%
2b	Allowing the Legislature to remove an initiative from the ballot by enacting it into law														
	Desirable	37%	39%	29%	24%	52%	50%	44%	34%	35%	36%	31%	33%	50%	40%
	Undecided	14%	14%	4%	17%	19%	0%	11%	17%	14%	14%	19%	38%	0%	20%
	Undesirable	49%	47%	67%	59%	29%	50%	44%	49%	51%	50%	50%	29%	50%	40%
2c	Allowing a simple majority of the State Legislature to place a countermeasure to an already qualified initiative on the ballot next to that initiative														
	Desirable	32%	31%	37%	30%	40%	20%	44%	30%	30%	29%	27%	33%	25%	33%
	Undecided	17%	16%	4%	26%	30%	0%	22%	13%	12%	11%	13%	24%	0%	22%
	Undesirable	50%	53%	59%	44%	30%	80%	33%	58%	58%	61%	60%	43%	75%	44%
2d	Allowing the Legislature to amend an initiative that has already passed, subject to a public review and the agreement of the initiative's proponents														
	Desirable	43%	43%	31%	42%	67%	0%	50%	37%	36%	32%	41%	57%	0%	30%
	Undecided	13%	11%	23%	25%	5%	0%	10%	12%	9%	29%	17%	14%	25%	10%
	Undesirable	44%	46%	46%	34%	29%	100%	40%	51%	54%	39%	43%	29%	75%	60%
2e	Allowing the Legislature to amend an initiative that has already passed, subject to a two-thirds vote, even if an initiative's proponents do not agree with the amendment														
	Desirable	25%	25%	18%	15%	50%	40%	30%	18%	15%	11%	24%	29%	0%	30%
	Undecided	15%	12%	14%	27%	25%	20%	10%	9%	8%	26%	7%	14%	0%	0%
	Undesirable	61%	64%	68%	58%	25%	40%	60%	73%	77%	63%	69%	57%	100%	70%
2f	Allowing an initiative's proponents to withdraw it after it qualifies for the ballot														
	Desirable	47%	52%	40%	28%	38%	50%	56%	57%	60%	35%	54%	62%	75%	33%
	Undecided	21%	19%	16%	33%	33%	0%	0%	17%	15%	23%	28%	5%	0%	22%
	Undesirable	32%	29%	44%	39%	29%	50%	44%	26%	25%	42%	19%	33%	25%	44%

Appendix 7: Responses by Ethnicity

(#)	Question		T	W	B	H	A/PI	NA	O		T	W	B	H	A/PI	NA	O
2g	Allowing an initiative's proponents to withdraw it after it qualifies for the ballot																
		Desirable	88%	90%	84%	80%	95%	100%	89%		84%	83%	81%	83%	100%	75%	89%
		Undecided	6%	5%	16%	11%	5%	0%	11%		7%	7%	15%	6%	0%	0%	0%
		Undesirable	5%	6%	0%	9%	0%	0%	0%		9%	9%	4%	11%	0%	25%	11%
2h	Requiring all ballot measures that require new expenditures to indicate how they will be paid for																
		Desirable	87%	90%	78%	76%	86%	80%	88%		91%	92%	92%	95%	81%	75%	80%
		Undecided	7%	5%	11%	13%	14%	20%	0%		5%	4%	8%	4%	19%	0%	0%
		Undesirable	6%	5%	11%	11%	0%	0%	13%		4%	5%	0%	2%	0%	25%	20%
2i	Requiring the ballot pamphlet to provide an analysis by the Legislative Analyst of how new initiative programs will likely be paid for																
		Desirable	67%	67%	60%	69%	65%	100%	57%		67%	66%	64%	72%	75%	50%	80%
		Undecided	20%	17%	32%	24%	29%	0%	43%		19%	20%	20%	16%	25%	25%	10%
		Undesirable	13%	15%	8%	8%	6%	0%	0%		13%	14%	16%	12%	0%	25%	10%
2j	Making the vote threshold needed to pass an initiative the same as any vote threshold that the initiative itself requires of the public in the future																
		Desirable	82%	86%	68%	75%	90%	80%	50%		91%	92%	89%	91%	95%	75%	78%
		Undecided	9%	6%	24%	15%	5%	20%	13%		4%	3%	7%	6%	5%	25%	22%
		Undesirable	8%	8%	8%	9%	5%	0%	38%		5%	6%	4%	4%	0%	0%	0%
2k	Increasing the number of Assembly districts from 80 to 120																
		Desirable	61%	64%	42%	55%	55%	33%	70%		62%	65%	41%	61%	57%	50%	60%
		Undecided	17%	14%	33%	20%	25%	0%	20%		17%	14%	37%	20%	19%	25%	20%
		Undesirable	23%	22%	25%	25%	20%	67%	10%		21%	21%	22%	20%	24%	25%	20%
2l	Expanding the size of districts and electing more than one legislative representative from each district																
		Desirable	48%	47%	43%	53%	53%	0%	44%		49%	44%	41%	64%	67%	50%	70%
		Undecided	19%	17%	26%	22%	32%	0%	22%		17%	17%	15%	17%	24%	0%	10%
		Undesirable	33%	36%	30%	25%	16%	100%	33%		34%	39%	44%	19%	10%	50%	20%
2m	Replacing the current State Senate and Assembly with a single house of 120 members																
		Desirable	32%	32%	36%	33%	33%	20%	11%		42%	40%	32%	54%	57%	50%	33%
		Undecided	25%	23%	20%	45%	22%	0%	22%		15%	16%	21%	5%	14%	0%	11%
		Undesirable	43%	46%	44%	22%	44%	80%	67%		43%	44%	46%	41%	29%	50%	56%
2n	Making the State Legislature part-time and paying legislators																
		Desirable	45%	44%	23%	47%	61%	33%	60%		26%	27%	18%	26%	24%	0%	44%
		Undecided	13%	11%	38%	17%	0%	33%	0%		9%	8%	11%	17%	14%	0%	11%
		Undesirable	42%	44%	38%	36%	39%	33%	40%		64%	66%	71%	57%	62%	100%	44%
2o	Reducing the length of the state legislative session and requiring legislators to spend more time in their districts																
		Desirable	57%	53%	64%	61%	75%	33%	50%		46%	43%	39%	64%	48%	25%	50%
		Undecided	19%	18%	18%	24%	15%	67%	20%		18%	19%	29%	14%	19%	25%	0%
		Undesirable	24%	28%	18%	15%	10%	0%	30%		36%	39%	32%	21%	33%	50%	50%

Appendix 7: Responses by Ethnicity

(#)	Question		T	W	B	H	A/PI	NA	O		T	W	B	H	A/PI	NA	O
2p	Allowing voters to rank the candidates in order of preference, so that the winner can be decided without a second election																
		Desirable	61%	62%	69%	55%	71%	40%	50%		57%	55%	57%	67%	71%	0%	50%
		Undecided	13%	10%	8%	28%	10%	40%	20%		13%	11%	18%	13%	24%	25%	10%
		Undesirable	26%	29%	23%	17%	19%	20%	30%		30%	34%	25%	20%	5%	75%	40%
2q	Lengthening Assembly terms from 2 years to 4, and Senate terms from 4 years to 6																
		Desirable	46%	46%	40%	45%	44%	20%	67%		81%	84%	79%	63%	90%	75%	89%
		Undecided	14%	13%	16%	20%	22%	0%	0%		8%	7%	14%	13%	0%	25%	0%
		Undesirable	40%	41%	44%	35%	33%	80%	33%		11%	8%	7%	25%	10%	0%	11%
2r	Requiring economic impact analyses of major legislation before passage																
		Desirable	89%	90%	85%	78%	90%	100%	90%		90%	89%	89%	89%	95%	100%	100%
		Undecided	8%	6%	11%	20%	5%	0%	10%		5%	5%	7%	7%	5%	0%	0%
		Undesirable	3%	3%	4%	2%	5%	0%	0%		5%	6%	4%	4%	0%	0%	0%
2s	Establishing clear goals for each government program and assessing whether progress is being made toward these goals at least once every ten years																
		Desirable	86%	87%	81%	76%	95%	100%	80%		90%	90%	89%	85%	100%	100%	80%
		Undecided	8%	7%	11%	16%	0%	0%	10%		6%	5%	11%	7%	0%	0%	10%
		Undesirable	6%	5%	7%	7%	5%	0%	10%		5%	5%	0%	7%	0%	0%	10%
2t	Requiring the Governor and the Legislature to adopt two-year instead of one-year budgets																
		Desirable	57%	60%	54%	44%	50%	75%	56%		73%	75%	64%	62%	90%	50%	60%
		Undecided	25%	24%	27%	33%	22%	25%	22%		15%	13%	29%	15%	10%	25%	20%
		Undesirable	18%	16%	19%	23%	28%	0%	22%		13%	12%	7%	24%	0%	25%	20%
2u	Requiring the Governor and the Legislature to publish three and five year budget projections prior to the budget vote each year																
		Desirable	81%	83%	77%	72%	75%	100%	80%		83%	85%	68%	80%	90%	75%	70%
		Undecided	12%	10%	15%	20%	15%	0%	0%		9%	9%	21%	5%	10%	25%	10%
		Undesirable	8%	7%	8%	8%	10%	0%	20%		7%	6%	11%	15%	0%	0%	20%
2v	Transferring from the state to local governments control and financing of services provided at the local level <i>and</i> requiring minimum standards for delivering them																
		Desirable	66%	69%	54%	59%	76%	25%	78%		73%	74%	57%	74%	70%	75%	80%
		Undecided	16%	14%	18%	28%	14%	25%	11%		14%	13%	21%	13%	20%	25%	10%
		Undesirable	17%	18%	29%	13%	10%	50%	11%		13%	13%	21%	13%	10%	0%	10%
2w	Allowing local governments to raise taxes for local services in exchange for increased coordination of service delivery and public reporting of performance																
		Desirable	55%	58%	41%	47%	52%	20%	78%		63%	64%	46%	65%	55%	25%	90%
		Undecided	15%	14%	26%	17%	10%	20%	11%		16%	15%	29%	13%	10%	50%	0%
		Undesirable	30%	28%	33%	36%	38%	60%	11%		22%	21%	25%	22%	35%	25%	10%
2x	Creating a stable source of funds for regional priorities by dedicating a portion of tax revenue from economic growth to those priorities																
		Desirable	67%	71%	54%	52%	75%	25%	71%		67%	69%	52%	69%	75%	50%	38%
		Undecided	22%	20%	31%	30%	10%	50%	14%		21%	20%	40%	15%	15%	25%	50%
		Undesirable	12%	10%	15%	18%	15%	25%	14%		11%	11%	8%	15%	10%	25%	13%

Appendix 7: Responses by Ethnicity

(#)	Question	T	W	B	H	A/PI	NA	O		T	W	B	H	A/PI	NA	O
2y	Direct any savings resulting from successful local management of state resources to those local governments, in exchange for monitoring their own performance and being accountable and innovative in their operations															
	Desirable	75%	79%	54%	63%	86%	33%	89%		76%	80%	44%	71%	84%	50%	60%
	Undecided	13%	11%	18%	21%	5%	33%	0%		12%	9%	30%	13%	16%	50%	10%
	Undesirable	12%	9%	29%	15%	10%	33%	11%		12%	11%	26%	15%	0%	0%	30%
2z	Requiring state and local governments to identify policy goals and publish their progress toward meeting them															
	Desirable	89%	90%	93%	81%	95%	80%	89%		92%	92%	93%	95%	90%	100%	89%
	Undecided	7%	5%	7%	15%	0%	0%	11%		5%	5%	4%	5%	5%	0%	11%
	Undesirable	4%	5%	0%	4%	5%	20%	0%		3%	3%	4%	0%	5%	0%	0%
2aa	Requiring legislation creating new programs that cost \$25 million or more to indicate how they will be paid for															
	Desirable	91%	93%	81%	80%	95%	100%	80%		90%	90%	85%	87%	100%	100%	90%
	Undecided	5%	4%	7%	13%	5%	0%	0%		5%	4%	15%	9%	0%	0%	0%
	Undesirable	4%	3%	11%	7%	0%	0%	20%		5%	6%	0%	4%	0%	0%	10%
2ab	Requiring legislation creating tax cuts that cost \$25 million or more to indicate how they will be paid for															
	Desirable	84%	84%	81%	75%	90%	100%	89%		84%	82%	89%	84%	100%	100%	90%
	Undecided	6%	5%	15%	14%	0%	0%	0%		8%	7%	11%	13%	0%	0%	0%
	Undesirable	10%	11%	4%	11%	10%	0%	11%		8%	10%	0%	4%	0%	0%	10%
2ac	Requiring legislation creating new programs or tax cuts that cost \$25 million or more to indicate how they will be paid for															
	Desirable	84%	86%	74%	79%	86%	100%	89%		88%	86%	85%	89%	100%	100%	100%
	Undecided	8%	7%	15%	14%	0%	0%	0%		7%	7%	15%	7%	0%	0%	0%
	Undesirable	8%	7%	11%	7%	14%	0%	11%		6%	7%	0%	4%	0%	0%	0%
2ad	Requiring that one-time revenue spikes only be spent on one-time projects, paying off debt, and filling the state rainy-day fund															
	Desirable	80%	82%	80%	69%	85%	100%	50%		84%	86%	74%	82%	86%	100%	60%
	Undecided	12%	9%	12%	24%	10%	0%	38%		7%	6%	15%	9%	10%	0%	0%
	Undesirable	8%	9%	8%	8%	5%	0%	13%		9%	8%	11%	9%	5%	0%	40%
2ae	Increasing the size of the State's rainy-day fund from 5% to 10% of the State budget															
	Desirable	66%	68%	67%	49%	80%	80%	44%		67%	68%	52%	68%	67%	100%	70%
	Undecided	21%	20%	19%	32%	10%	20%	22%		19%	20%	30%	13%	5%	0%	10%
	Undesirable	13%	12%	15%	19%	10%	0%	33%		14%	12%	19%	20%	29%	0%	20%
2af	Applying the sales tax to services as well as goods while reducing the sales tax rate															
	Desirable	38%	37%	41%	32%	48%	40%	50%		45%	44%	33%	40%	71%	50%	60%
	Undecided	17%	15%	15%	32%	24%	20%	0%		14%	14%	11%	20%	14%	0%	0%
	Undesirable	45%	48%	44%	36%	29%	40%	50%		41%	41%	56%	40%	14%	50%	40%

Appendix 7: Responses by Ethnicity

(#)	Question		T	W	B	H	A/PI	NA	O		T	W	B	H	A/PI	NA	O
2ag	Applying the sales tax to services as well as goods while keeping the current sales tax rate																
		Desirable	23%	22%	26%	26%	33%	40%	13%		20%	18%	19%	25%	33%	0%	22%
		Undecided	16%	13%	26%	25%	14%	0%	25%		10%	10%	15%	11%	5%	0%	11%
		Undesirable	61%	66%	48%	49%	52%	60%	63%		70%	72%	65%	64%	62%	100%	67%
2ah	Limiting the current California state income tax deduction for home mortgage interest payments to \$25,000 per year																
		Desirable	43%	42%	40%	42%	47%	25%	67%		44%	48%	35%	31%	33%	0%	56%
		Undecided	21%	19%	15%	38%	16%	25%	17%		17%	15%	26%	26%	10%	25%	11%
		Undesirable	36%	39%	45%	20%	37%	50%	17%		40%	37%	39%	43%	57%	75%	33%
2ai	Reassessing non-residential property more frequently than now																
		Desirable	53%	51%	46%	57%	60%	25%	78%		72%	71%	89%	73%	65%	25%	80%
		Undecided	20%	19%	21%	31%	15%	0%	11%		13%	13%	7%	17%	5%	25%	10%
		Undesirable	27%	30%	33%	12%	25%	75%	11%		16%	17%	4%	10%	30%	50%	10%
2aj	Reassessing all property values more frequently while adjusting the current property tax exemption for inflation to about \$28,000 <i>and</i> allowing the exemption to rise with property values going forward																
		Desirable	35%	33%	33%	28%	61%	0%	56%		33%	31%	31%	34%	50%	25%	50%
		Undecided	25%	24%	33%	39%	11%	25%	0%		20%	19%	31%	22%	15%	0%	13%
		Undesirable	40%	43%	33%	33%	28%	75%	44%		47%	50%	38%	44%	35%	75%	38%
2ak	Allowing local electorates to raise the property tax rate above the current 1% rate cap																
		Desirable	28%	30%	21%	20%	29%	0%	22%		28%	29%	19%	30%	24%	0%	50%
		Undecided	11%	8%	25%	18%	10%	25%	11%		13%	12%	30%	6%	24%	0%	10%
		Undesirable	61%	61%	54%	63%	62%	75%	67%		59%	59%	52%	65%	52%	100%	40%
2al	Lowering local vote requirement to adopt taxes dedicated to specific purposes, to a simple majority so that it is the same as the vote requirement to adopt taxes for general purposes																
		Desirable	46%	49%	44%	37%	42%	0%	44%		42%	42%	44%	43%	38%	0%	50%
		Undecided	17%	13%	20%	35%	11%	0%	22%		16%	13%	26%	27%	24%	0%	20%
		Undesirable	38%	38%	36%	29%	47%	100%	33%		41%	45%	30%	29%	38%	100%	30%
2am	Decreasing the super-majority vote required in the Legislature to raise taxes (about 67%) to 55%																
		Desirable	32%	33%	23%	27%	35%	0%	44%		50%	50%	54%	55%	38%	0%	50%
		Undecided	9%	8%	15%	16%	0%	0%	22%		8%	6%	15%	8%	19%	0%	20%
		Undesirable	59%	59%	62%	56%	65%	100%	33%		43%	45%	31%	38%	43%	100%	30%
3	If the Legislature is allowed to amend an initiative that has already passed, by what sort of majority should it be able to do so?																
		A simple majority (50% plus 1)	13%	11%	17%	15%	14%	40%	0%		9%	7%	13%	8%	21%	0%	22%
		55%	18%	18%	9%	23%	24%	0%	11%		26%	24%	39%	35%	26%	0%	44%
		A two-thirds majority	69%	70%	74%	62%	62%	60%	89%		65%	69%	48%	58%	53%	100%	33%

Appendix 7: Responses by Ethnicity

(#)	Question		T	W	B	H	A/PI	NA	O		T	W	B	H	A/PI	NA	O
4	Some people think that the Legislature should contain fewer Legislators, even if that means that each Legislator represents more people. Suppose these people are at one end of a 1-to-7 scale, at point 1. Other people think that each Legislator should represent fewer people, even if that means that the Legislature contains more Legislators. Suppose these people are at the other end of the scale, at point 7. People who are exactly in the middle are at point 4, and of course other people have opinions at other points between 1 and 7. Where would you place yourself on this scale, or wouldn't you have any opinion about that?																
		Fewer legislators	20%	19%	32%	15%	21%	25%	20%		10%	10%	12%	6%	14%	25%	10%
		Exactly in the middle	23%	20%	20%	32%	32%	75%	30%		20%	19%	24%	25%	29%	25%	0%
		More legislators	57%	61%	48%	53%	47%	0%	50%		70%	72%	64%	70%	57%	50%	90%
5	On a 0 to 10 scale, where 0 is "not at all", 10 is "as much as could reasonably be expected," and 5 is exactly in the middle, how much or little would you say the California State Legislature is able to get important things done?																
		Not at all	67%	75%	50%	44%	43%	100%	56%		69%	74%	61%	57%	62%	75%	60%
		Exactly in the middle	16%	11%	29%	26%	38%	0%	22%		10%	9%	18%	13%	5%	0%	20%
		As could be expected	17%	13%	21%	30%	19%	0%	22%		21%	17%	21%	30%	33%	25%	20%
6	On another 0 to 10 scale, where 0 is "not at all", 10 is "completely", and 5 is exactly in the middle, to what extent is the ability of the State Legislature to get things done affected by tensions between the political parties?																
		Not at all	27%	26%	26%	27%	38%	50%	30%		21%	18%	32%	24%	35%	50%	20%
		Exactly in the middle	8%	5%	22%	13%	19%	0%	0%		6%	5%	4%	9%	10%	0%	0%
		Completely	65%	69%	52%	60%	43%	50%	70%		73%	77%	64%	67%	55%	50%	80%
7	And, on another 0 to 10 scale, where 0 is completely at the local level, 10 is completely at the State level, and 5 is exactly in the middle, how much decision-making authority should there be at the local level versus the State level?																
		At the local level	42%	44%	38%	42%	24%	50%	40%		43%	44%	32%	44%	38%	50%	50%
		Exactly in the middle	32%	31%	27%	29%	48%	25%	40%		29%	32%	36%	22%	24%	25%	10%
		At the State level	27%	25%	35%	29%	29%	25%	20%		27%	24%	32%	35%	38%	25%	40%
8	And, on the same scale, how much taxation power should there be at the local level versus State level?																
		At the local level	34%	33%	20%	43%	30%	0%	30%		32%	32%	29%	35%	29%	25%	60%
		Exactly in the middle	40%	39%	44%	34%	40%	50%	70%		33%	34%	46%	33%	14%	50%	10%
		At the State level	27%	27%	36%	23%	30%	50%	0%		35%	34%	25%	33%	57%	25%	30%
9	On the same scale, where would you say the most important public policy decisions should be made?																
		At the local level	25%	28%	12%	19%	25%	0%	30%		25%	25%	15%	29%	29%	0%	30%
		Exactly in the middle	30%	29%	46%	36%	20%	20%	30%		26%	25%	41%	29%	19%	50%	10%
		At the State level	44%	43%	42%	45%	55%	80%	40%		49%	50%	44%	42%	52%	50%	60%

Appendix 7: Responses by Ethnicity

(#)	Question	T	W	B	H	A/PI	NA	O		T	W	B	H	A/PI	NA	O
10	On another 0 to 10 scale, where 0 is “completely by voters in referendums”, 10 is “completely by the State Legislature”, and 5 is exactly in the middle, how many of the State’s major decisions should be made by voters in referendums versus by the State Legislature?															
	By voters in referendums	31%	31%	25%	31%	26%	25%	40%		29%	28%	19%	25%	33%	75%	50%
	Exactly in the middle	25%	22%	33%	35%	37%	25%	10%		26%	24%	31%	38%	33%	25%	20%
	By the State Legislature	45%	47%	42%	35%	37%	50%	50%		45%	48%	50%	37%	33%	0%	30%
11	Some people think that decisions made at the local level reflect the will of the local community more closely than decisions made at the state level. Suppose these people are at one end of a 1-to-7 scale, at point 1. Other people think that decisions made at the local level are more dominated by powerful special interests than decisions made at the state level. Suppose these people are at the other end of the scale, at point 7. People who are exactly in the middle are at point 4, and of course other people have opinions at other points between 1 and 7. Where would you place yourself on this scale, or wouldn’t you have any opinion about that?															
	Reflect local community	47%	51%	42%	36%	40%	25%	50%		56%	57%	39%	55%	63%	33%	78%
	Exactly in the middle	25%	23%	19%	34%	30%	50%	30%		23%	21%	32%	30%	21%	67%	22%
	Dominated by special interests	28%	26%	38%	30%	30%	25%	20%		21%	22%	29%	15%	16%	0%	0%
13a	Replacing the current State Senate and Assembly with a single house would make it easier to pass important legislation															
	Agree strongly	35%	37%	26%	35%	21%	0%	30%		39%	43%	19%	33%	28%	0%	50%
	Agree somewhat	17%	18%	11%	14%	16%	40%	10%		24%	24%	12%	20%	44%	50%	10%
	Neither agree nor disagree	20%	17%	22%	29%	32%	40%	20%		15%	14%	27%	19%	0%	25%	30%
	Disagree somewhat	12%	11%	19%	4%	32%	0%	10%		9%	8%	15%	9%	17%	25%	0%
	Disagree strongly	16%	16%	22%	18%	0%	20%	30%		13%	11%	27%	19%	11%	0%	10%
13b	Replacing the current State Senate and Assembly with a single house would deprive the system of important checks and balances															
	Agree strongly	26%	29%	22%	13%	33%	0%	44%		30%	31%	27%	25%	44%	25%	10%
	Agree somewhat	31%	34%	30%	17%	28%	40%	44%		29%	31%	23%	19%	25%	25%	30%
	Neither agree nor disagree	20%	14%	30%	46%	11%	60%	11%		14%	10%	15%	31%	13%	0%	30%
	Disagree somewhat	9%	9%	0%	10%	22%	0%	0%		10%	10%	8%	8%	6%	50%	10%
	Disagree strongly	13%	14%	17%	13%	6%	0%	0%		18%	18%	27%	17%	13%	0%	20%
14a	Part-time legislators will tend to represent their districts more closely															
	Agree strongly	27%	25%	11%	43%	20%	20%	30%		22%	21%	19%	26%	15%	25%	30%
	Agree somewhat	16%	18%	19%	10%	25%	0%	0%		10%	10%	4%	9%	20%	0%	0%
	Neither agree nor disagree	18%	16%	22%	20%	20%	40%	40%		16%	19%	0%	11%	15%	0%	20%
	Disagree somewhat	19%	19%	30%	14%	15%	40%	20%		27%	25%	33%	30%	20%	50%	40%
	Disagree strongly	20%	23%	19%	14%	20%	0%	10%		26%	25%	44%	24%	30%	25%	10%

Appendix 7: Responses by Ethnicity

(#)	Question	T	W	B	H	A/PI	NA	O		T	W	B	H	A/PI	NA	O
14b	Part-time legislators will be less likely to be career politicians.															
	Agree strongly	41%	41%	35%	38%	47%	60%	44%		42%	44%	41%	35%	35%	25%	50%
	Agree somewhat	30%	33%	23%	19%	32%	0%	33%		25%	27%	15%	18%	35%	25%	20%
	Neither agree nor disagree	12%	10%	23%	25%	5%	0%	0%		12%	9%	19%	18%	10%	25%	20%
	Disagree somewhat	7%	7%	8%	8%	0%	20%	22%		10%	8%	11%	16%	10%	25%	10%
	Disagree strongly	10%	9%	12%	10%	16%	20%	0%		11%	11%	15%	13%	10%	0%	0%
14c	Part-time legislators will tend to be more open to corruption.															
	Agree strongly	17%	17%	19%	14%	21%	20%	11%		20%	19%	27%	23%	30%	25%	0%
	Agree somewhat	10%	9%	12%	8%	5%	60%	22%		11%	10%	15%	11%	15%	50%	20%
	Neither agree nor disagree	34%	32%	35%	44%	37%	0%	33%		34%	34%	38%	36%	25%	0%	60%
	Disagree somewhat	18%	22%	8%	8%	16%	0%	11%		13%	14%	4%	13%	15%	25%	10%
	Disagree strongly	22%	20%	27%	26%	21%	20%	22%		21%	24%	15%	17%	15%	0%	10%
14d	Part-time legislators will tend to be less well informed about policy issues.															
	Agree strongly	30%	33%	35%	18%	30%	25%	22%		29%	31%	33%	20%	30%	25%	20%
	Agree somewhat	15%	17%	12%	10%	5%	50%	0%		25%	22%	33%	33%	35%	25%	30%
	Neither agree nor disagree	20%	14%	31%	42%	25%	0%	33%		20%	19%	15%	24%	15%	50%	30%
	Disagree somewhat	15%	16%	12%	16%	10%	0%	11%		11%	12%	4%	7%	10%	0%	10%
	Disagree strongly	20%	20%	12%	14%	30%	25%	33%		16%	16%	15%	16%	10%	0%	10%
15a	Increasing State Legislators' terms will make them less responsive to their districts.															
	Agree strongly	29%	30%	23%	27%	35%	40%	11%		13%	14%	11%	9%	14%	25%	0%
	Agree somewhat	12%	12%	12%	12%	15%	20%	0%		4%	3%	7%	7%	5%	25%	0%
	Neither agree nor disagree	21%	19%	23%	27%	30%	20%	22%		17%	16%	19%	16%	29%	25%	10%
	Disagree somewhat	12%	13%	12%	6%	15%	0%	22%		27%	28%	15%	33%	19%	0%	40%
	Disagree strongly	26%	27%	31%	27%	5%	20%	44%		39%	39%	48%	35%	33%	25%	50%
15b	Increasing State Legislators' terms will let them spend less time fundraising and campaigning and more time legislating.															
	Agree strongly	42%	45%	28%	31%	53%	40%	33%		39%	43%	33%	21%	62%	25%	20%
	Agree somewhat	26%	28%	20%	18%	16%	0%	56%		43%	45%	30%	43%	29%	50%	60%
	Neither agree nor disagree	13%	11%	20%	22%	5%	0%	0%		9%	6%	26%	19%	10%	25%	0%
	Disagree somewhat	8%	8%	12%	10%	0%	20%	0%		4%	3%	7%	6%	0%	0%	10%
	Disagree strongly	11%	7%	20%	20%	26%	40%	11%		5%	4%	4%	11%	0%	0%	10%
16a	Arnold Schwarzenegger															
	Extremely dissatisfied	76%	77%	89%	65%	74%	40%	100%		75%	76%	96%	64%	71%	25%	89%
	Exactly in the middle	12%	12%	7%	18%	16%	20%	0%		14%	13%	0%	18%	19%	50%	11%
	Extremely satisfied	12%	11%	4%	16%	11%	40%	0%		11%	10%	4%	18%	10%	25%	0%
16b	Jerry Brown															
	Extremely dissatisfied	30%	35%	7%	31%	21%	0%	0%		25%	31%	0%	21%	15%	0%	10%
	Exactly in the middle	20%	16%	36%	25%	26%	33%	63%		21%	14%	32%	38%	35%	75%	30%
	Extremely satisfied	49%	50%	57%	44%	53%	67%	38%		54%	55%	68%	42%	50%	25%	60%

Appendix 7: Responses by Ethnicity

(#)	Question		T	W	B	H	A/PI	NA	O		T	W	B	H	A/PI	NA	O
16c	California State Senate	Extremely dissatisfied	69%	76%	54%	59%	45%	75%	33%		68%	76%	48%	51%	47%	100%	56%
		Exactly in the middle	19%	14%	33%	25%	25%	25%	67%		18%	14%	37%	26%	21%	0%	33%
		Extremely satisfied	12%	10%	13%	16%	30%	0%	0%		13%	10%	15%	23%	32%	0%	11%
16d	California State Assembly	Extremely dissatisfied	68%	75%	52%	56%	53%	75%	38%		71%	76%	52%	60%	65%	100%	56%
		Exactly in the middle	19%	15%	28%	25%	26%	25%	50%		16%	13%	33%	21%	15%	0%	44%
		Extremely satisfied	13%	10%	20%	19%	21%	0%	13%		13%	12%	15%	19%	20%	0%	0%
16e	California State Legislature	Extremely dissatisfied	72%	80%	48%	54%	47%	75%	63%		70%	75%	56%	62%	50%	100%	60%
		Exactly in the middle	18%	13%	32%	27%	32%	25%	38%		18%	13%	37%	24%	35%	0%	30%
		Extremely satisfied	10%	7%	20%	19%	21%	0%	0%		12%	12%	7%	14%	15%	0%	10%
16f	California's initiative/referendum process	Extremely dissatisfied	50%	53%	50%	43%	28%	50%	60%		37%	37%	38%	38%	35%	50%	50%
		Exactly in the middle	22%	19%	33%	24%	44%	0%	30%		19%	16%	27%	29%	20%	0%	10%
		Extremely satisfied	28%	28%	17%	33%	28%	50%	10%		44%	47%	35%	33%	45%	50%	40%
16g	California's State government	Extremely dissatisfied	72%	77%	50%	63%	53%	80%	70%		64%	67%	52%	62%	52%	75%	50%
		Exactly in the middle	15%	12%	38%	22%	21%	0%	10%		19%	17%	33%	17%	24%	25%	30%
		Extremely satisfied	13%	11%	12%	16%	26%	20%	20%		17%	16%	15%	21%	24%	0%	20%
16h	Your city/town and county's government	Extremely dissatisfied	37%	38%	37%	27%	53%	20%	33%		28%	28%	30%	25%	38%	25%	30%
		Exactly in the middle	20%	18%	22%	29%	0%	60%	22%		20%	19%	26%	26%	14%	50%	0%
		Extremely satisfied	43%	43%	41%	44%	47%	20%	44%		52%	53%	44%	49%	48%	25%	70%
16i	California's local governments generally	Extremely dissatisfied	39%	42%	30%	28%	50%	50%	33%		30%	28%	38%	33%	45%	0%	40%
		Exactly in the middle	29%	29%	35%	34%	11%	50%	22%		32%	35%	29%	29%	20%	25%	10%
		Extremely satisfied	32%	30%	35%	38%	39%	0%	44%		38%	37%	33%	38%	35%	75%	50%
18	Some people think that local communities should be able to decide their own taxes and services, even if that means big differences between communities. Suppose these people are at one end of a 1-to-7 scale, at point 1. Other people think that taxes and services should be the same throughout the state, even if that means less local control. Suppose these people are at the other end of the scale, at point 7. People who are exactly in the middle are at point 4. Where would you place yourself on this scale, or wouldn't you have any opinion about that?																
		Local communities decide	39%	40%	23%	43%	42%	25%	30%		42%	44%	29%	43%	43%	50%	33%
		Exactly in the middle	21%	20%	15%	24%	21%	50%	20%		20%	19%	29%	24%	19%	25%	33%
		Same throughout the state	41%	40%	62%	33%	37%	25%	50%		38%	38%	43%	33%	38%	25%	33%

Appendix 7: Responses by Ethnicity

(#)	Question	T	W	B	H	A/PI	NA	O		T	W	B	H	A/PI	NA	O
19	Some people think that government should provide certain benefits and services, even if that means higher taxes. Suppose these people are at one end of a 1-to-7 scale, at point 1. Other people think that government should lower taxes, even if that means reduced benefits and services. Suppose these people are at the other end of the scale, at point 7. People who are exactly in the middle are at point 4. Where would you place yourself on this scale, or wouldn't you have any opinion about that?															
	Provide certain benefits and services, even if that means higher taxes	46%	48%	46%	35%	35%	40%	60%		57%	58%	50%	50%	50%	50%	80%
	Exactly in the middle	18%	16%	27%	22%	20%	40%	10%		15%	15%	14%	22%	10%	0%	10%
	Lower taxes, even if that means reducing benefits and services	37%	37%	27%	44%	45%	20%	30%		28%	27%	36%	28%	40%	50%	10%
20	Some people think that majorities should always have their way no matter how big the minorities are or how strongly they feel. Suppose these people are at one end of a 1-to-7 scale, at point 1. Other people think that minorities should have their way when they are large enough or feel strongly enough. Suppose these people are at the other end of the scale, at point 7. People who are exactly in the middle are at point 4. Where would you place yourself on this scale, or wouldn't you have any opinion about that?															
	Majorities always have their way	34%	35%	37%	35%	11%	50%	33%		37%	41%	36%	29%	15%	25%	20%
	Exactly in the middle	33%	36%	19%	28%	37%	25%	22%		33%	30%	46%	27%	45%	75%	50%
	Minorities have their way when they are big enough or feel strongly enough	33%	29%	44%	37%	53%	25%	44%		31%	30%	18%	44%	40%	0%	30%
21	Some people think that the best society is one in which nobody can tell anybody else what to do, even if there is a cost to others. Suppose these people are at one end of a 1-to-7 scale, at point 1. Other people think that the best society is one in which the community can decide together what people can and cannot do, even if some people object. Suppose these people are at the other end of the scale, at point 7. People who are exactly in the middle are at point 4. Where would you place yourself on this scale, or wouldn't you have any opinion about that?															
	Nobody can tell anybody else what to do	18%	21%	8%	8%	15%	50%	0%		20%	24%	7%	9%	14%	50%	20%
	Exactly in the middle	19%	17%	23%	27%	10%	25%	30%		22%	24%	21%	18%	24%	25%	20%
	Community can decide	64%	62%	69%	65%	75%	25%	70%		58%	53%	71%	73%	62%	25%	60%

Appendix 7: Responses by Ethnicity

(#)	Question	T	W	B	H	A/PI	NA	O		T	W	B	H	A/PI	NA	O
22	Some people think that the best government is one in which everyone gets to vote directly on making the laws. Suppose these people are at one end of a 1-to-7 scale, at point 1. Other people think that the best government is one in which everyone gets to vote for representatives who then vote on making the laws. Suppose these people are at the other end of the scale, at point 7. People who are exactly in the middle are at point 4. Where would you place yourself on this scale, or wouldn't you have any opinion about that?															
	Everyone votes on laws	34%	31%	39%	43%	35%	50%	50%		34%	31%	37%	44%	25%	67%	50%
	Exactly in the middle	20%	18%	36%	22%	15%	0%	20%		16%	17%	15%	15%	25%	33%	0%
	Representatives vote on laws	46%	51%	25%	35%	50%	50%	30%		50%	52%	48%	41%	50%	0%	50%

Appendix 8: Responses by Region

T=Total
 LA = LA County
 OC = Orange County
 IE = Inland Empire
 SD = San Diego County
 CC = Central Coast
 CF = Central/ Fresno
 GS = Greater Sacramento
 BA = Bay Area
 N = North

#	Question	(Before)										(After)									
		T	LA	OC	IE	SD	CC	CF	GS	BA	N	T	LA	OC	IE	SD	CC	CF	GS	BA	N
1	To begin with, all in all, on a 0 to 10 scale, where 0 is "extremely poorly", 10 is "extremely well," and 5 is exactly in the middle, how well or poorly would you say the system of democracy in California works these days?																				
	Well	21%	20%	23%	31%	18%	22%	10%	33%	15%	8%	38%	37%	42%	39%	45%	33%	43%	38%	33%	42%
	Undecided	18%	17%	14%	19%	24%	15%	14%	13%	23%	17%	15%	15%	14%	21%	9%	15%	14%	21%	12%	8%
	Not well	61%	63%	63%	50%	58%	63%	76%	53%	62%	75%	47%	47%	44%	39%	45%	52%	43%	41%	55%	50%
2a	Creating a formal review process to allow an initiative's proponents to amend an initiative following public input																				
	Desirable	60%	53%	43%	58%	62%	74%	52%	56%	74%	71%	76%	67%	78%	72%	80%	96%	70%	67%	80%	100%
	Undecided	19%	18%	40%	8%	23%	15%	22%	15%	15%	21%	9%	9%	10%	10%	10%	0%	9%	11%	9%	0%
	Undesirable	21%	28%	17%	33%	15%	11%	26%	29%	12%	7%	16%	24%	13%	18%	10%	4%	22%	22%	11%	0%
2b	Allowing the Legislature to remove an initiative from the ballot by enacting it into law																				
	Desirable	37%	38%	33%	16%	44%	41%	30%	42%	47%	31%	34%	32%	30%	36%	49%	32%	30%	29%	39%	21%
	Undecided	14%	13%	14%	16%	11%	7%	17%	16%	14%	23%	17%	18%	23%	23%	13%	18%	0%	14%	15%	21%
	Undesirable	49%	50%	53%	68%	44%	52%	52%	42%	39%	46%	49%	50%	48%	41%	38%	50%	70%	57%	47%	57%
2c	Allowing a simple majority of the State Legislature to place a countermeasure to an already qualified initiative on the ballot next to that initiative																				
	Desirable	32%	37%	45%	27%	33%	28%	23%	42%	26%	8%	30%	31%	36%	37%	27%	25%	18%	28%	28%	36%
	Undecided	17%	17%	24%	22%	15%	16%	27%	12%	14%	8%	13%	18%	13%	13%	17%	11%	5%	8%	11%	0%
	Undesirable	50%	46%	32%	51%	51%	56%	50%	45%	59%	85%	58%	51%	51%	50%	56%	64%	77%	64%	62%	64%
2d	Allowing the Legislature to amend an initiative that has already passed, subject to a public review and the agreement of the initiative's proponents																				
	Desirable	43%	37%	33%	38%	53%	46%	39%	59%	48%	36%	37%	31%	43%	41%	54%	39%	17%	42%	35%	43%
	Undecided	13%	16%	21%	14%	13%	12%	30%	3%	6%	7%	12%	17%	10%	5%	17%	4%	13%	11%	9%	21%
	Undesirable	44%	47%	46%	49%	34%	42%	30%	38%	46%	57%	51%	52%	48%	54%	29%	57%	70%	47%	56%	36%
2e	Allowing the Legislature to amend an initiative that has already passed, subject to a two-thirds vote, even if an initiative's proponents do not agree with the amendment																				
	Desirable	25%	21%	18%	23%	33%	27%	35%	22%	28%	21%	18%	16%	20%	28%	22%	15%	22%	17%	11%	14%
	Undecided	15%	12%	18%	17%	18%	12%	13%	13%	18%	7%	9%	9%	13%	5%	12%	8%	9%	8%	7%	21%
	Undesirable	61%	66%	65%	60%	50%	62%	52%	66%	54%	71%	73%	75%	68%	67%	66%	77%	70%	75%	82%	64%
2f	Allowing an initiative's proponents to withdraw it after it qualifies for the ballot																				
	Desirable	47%	42%	44%	43%	42%	52%	39%	50%	58%	64%	57%	54%	65%	41%	59%	71%	61%	49%	61%	57%
	Undecided	21%	23%	23%	19%	25%	19%	26%	25%	15%	14%	17%	18%	10%	23%	12%	7%	22%	26%	15%	21%
	Undesirable	32%	35%	33%	38%	33%	30%	35%	25%	27%	21%	26%	28%	25%	36%	29%	21%	17%	26%	24%	21%

Appendix 8: Responses by Region

(#)	Question	T	LA	OC	IE	SD	CC	CF	GS	BA	N		T	LA	OC	IE	SD	CC	CF	GS	BA	N
2g	Allowing an initiative's proponents to withdraw it after it qualifies for the ballot																					
	Desirable	88%	91%	88%	89%	89%	89%	76%	88%	88%	93%		84%	88%	85%	84%	76%	89%	95%	81%	79%	92%
	Undecided	6%	7%	8%	5%	5%	4%	10%	3%	7%	7%		7%	3%	8%	0%	12%	0%	0%	14%	15%	0%
	Undesirable	5%	2%	5%	5%	5%	7%	14%	9%	6%	0%		9%	9%	8%	16%	12%	11%	5%	6%	6%	8%
2h	Requiring all ballot measures that require new expenditures to indicate how they will be paid for																					
	Desirable	87%	91%	82%	92%	84%	93%	68%	81%	89%	86%		91%	92%	95%	85%	95%	89%	83%	89%	92%	100%
	Undecided	7%	3%	13%	5%	8%	4%	9%	14%	6%	14%		5%	5%	3%	5%	2%	4%	9%	0%	8%	0%
	Undesirable	6%	6%	5%	3%	8%	4%	23%	6%	6%	0%		4%	3%	3%	10%	2%	7%	9%	11%	0%	0%
2i	Requiring the ballot pamphlet to provide an analysis by the Legislative Analyst of how new initiative programs will likely be paid for																					
	Desirable	67%	67%	63%	74%	71%	68%	50%	61%	70%	69%		67%	65%	78%	66%	51%	79%	55%	61%	78%	69%
	Undecided	20%	19%	23%	20%	23%	20%	28%	23%	16%	23%		19%	24%	11%	18%	33%	14%	23%	21%	12%	8%
	Undesirable	13%	14%	13%	6%	6%	12%	22%	16%	14%	8%		13%	11%	11%	16%	15%	7%	23%	18%	10%	23%
2j	Making the vote threshold needed to pass an initiative the same as any vote threshold that the initiative itself requires of the public in the future																					
	Desirable	82%	80%	82%	92%	84%	93%	48%	86%	83%	93%		91%	86%	93%	92%	90%	96%	95%	89%	93%	100%
	Undecided	9%	8%	15%	5%	11%	4%	29%	6%	6%	7%		4%	7%	3%	3%	5%	0%	0%	6%	4%	0%
	Undesirable	8%	12%	3%	3%	5%	4%	24%	9%	11%	0%		5%	7%	5%	5%	5%	4%	5%	6%	3%	0%
2k	Increasing the number of Assembly districts from 80 to 120																					
	Desirable	61%	63%	56%	56%	60%	54%	71%	53%	62%	83%		62%	64%	62%	62%	64%	63%	67%	53%	62%	64%
	Undecided	17%	17%	19%	22%	17%	15%	5%	15%	17%	17%		17%	13%	13%	15%	21%	19%	10%	17%	21%	29%
	Undesirable	23%	20%	25%	22%	23%	31%	24%	32%	21%	0%		21%	22%	26%	23%	15%	19%	24%	31%	18%	7%
2l	Expanding the size of districts and electing more than one legislative representative from each district																					
	Desirable	48%	54%	46%	46%	49%	40%	19%	42%	56%	45%		49%	54%	44%	47%	55%	50%	41%	31%	50%	57%
	Undecided	19%	19%	23%	20%	11%	24%	29%	13%	17%	27%		17%	13%	17%	24%	18%	15%	18%	19%	20%	7%
	Undesirable	33%	27%	31%	34%	40%	36%	52%	45%	27%	27%		34%	34%	39%	29%	26%	35%	41%	50%	30%	36%
2m	Replacing the current State Senate and Assembly with a single house of 120 members																					
	Desirable	32%	33%	49%	26%	28%	24%	22%	41%	29%	31%		42%	39%	53%	34%	44%	54%	29%	50%	43%	36%
	Undecided	25%	26%	26%	29%	28%	12%	35%	21%	23%	31%		15%	15%	15%	11%	21%	0%	17%	14%	14%	36%
	Undesirable	43%	41%	26%	46%	44%	64%	43%	38%	48%	38%		43%	47%	33%	55%	36%	46%	54%	36%	42%	29%
2n	Making the State Legislature part-time and paying legislators																					
	Desirable	45%	42%	64%	62%	44%	46%	33%	42%	31%	50%		26%	20%	48%	33%	20%	32%	38%	33%	13%	36%
	Undecided	13%	13%	14%	8%	14%	4%	19%	15%	16%	25%		9%	12%	10%	5%	10%	7%	13%	8%	8%	7%
	Undesirable	42%	45%	22%	30%	42%	50%	48%	42%	53%	25%		64%	68%	43%	62%	71%	61%	50%	58%	79%	57%
2o	Reducing the length of the state legislative session and requiring legislators to spend more time in their districts																					
	Desirable	57%	56%	79%	72%	53%	52%	55%	62%	38%	50%		46%	41%	62%	63%	49%	46%	58%	44%	30%	50%
	Undecided	19%	19%	11%	17%	26%	19%	27%	9%	25%	21%		18%	18%	8%	21%	24%	18%	8%	17%	22%	21%
	Undesirable	24%	24%	11%	11%	21%	30%	18%	29%	37%	29%		36%	41%	31%	16%	27%	36%	33%	39%	47%	29%

Appendix 8: Responses by Region

(#)	Question	T	LA	OC	IE	SD	CC	CF	GS	BA	N		T	LA	OC	IE	SD	CC	CF	GS	BA	N
2p	Allowing voters to rank the candidates in order of preference, so that the winner can be decided without a second election																					
	Desirable	61%	62%	69%	61%	43%	65%	36%	54%	69%	92%		57%	57%	63%	50%	55%	54%	39%	47%	69%	69%
	Undecided	13%	14%	15%	19%	14%	4%	23%	9%	11%	0%		13%	13%	20%	14%	3%	21%	13%	14%	9%	15%
	Undesirable	26%	24%	15%	19%	43%	31%	41%	37%	20%	8%		30%	31%	18%	36%	42%	25%	48%	39%	22%	15%
2q	Lengthening Assembly terms from 2 years to 4, and Senate terms from 4 years to 6																					
	Desirable	46%	48%	43%	21%	45%	50%	29%	55%	57%	50%		81%	75%	75%	72%	87%	89%	78%	92%	86%	93%
	Undecided	14%	14%	11%	16%	13%	15%	10%	6%	20%	14%		8%	8%	8%	21%	8%	4%	9%	3%	8%	0%
	Undesirable	40%	38%	46%	63%	42%	35%	62%	39%	23%	36%		11%	17%	18%	8%	5%	7%	13%	6%	7%	7%
2r	Requiring economic impact analyses of major legislation before passage																					
	Desirable	89%	87%	93%	84%	82%	96%	77%	97%	89%	100%		90%	83%	93%	97%	83%	96%	86%	94%	93%	93%
	Undecided	8%	11%	8%	11%	10%	0%	14%	0%	10%	0%		5%	10%	8%	0%	5%	0%	0%	3%	4%	7%
	Undesirable	3%	2%	0%	5%	8%	4%	9%	3%	1%	0%		5%	7%	0%	3%	13%	4%	14%	3%	3%	0%
2s	Establishing clear goals for each government program and assessing whether progress is being made toward these goals at least once every ten years																					
	Desirable	86%	81%	78%	92%	88%	93%	65%	91%	92%	100%		90%	89%	93%	97%	93%	89%	79%	80%	89%	100%
	Undecided	8%	13%	13%	5%	13%	0%	13%	3%	6%	0%		6%	5%	3%	3%	7%	7%	13%	14%	4%	0%
	Undesirable	6%	6%	10%	3%	0%	7%	22%	6%	3%	0%		5%	6%	5%	0%	0%	4%	8%	6%	7%	0%
2t	Requiring the Governor and the Legislature to adopt two-year instead of one-year budgets																					
	Desirable	57%	53%	71%	40%	46%	63%	43%	67%	60%	85%		73%	64%	70%	68%	78%	89%	54%	75%	80%	92%
	Undecided	25%	30%	13%	34%	29%	26%	19%	15%	30%	8%		15%	20%	18%	13%	15%	7%	13%	14%	14%	0%
	Undesirable	18%	17%	16%	26%	26%	11%	38%	18%	10%	8%		13%	16%	13%	18%	8%	4%	33%	11%	7%	8%
2u	Requiring the Governor and the Legislature to publish three and five year budget projections prior to the budget vote each year																					
	Desirable	81%	78%	83%	81%	84%	89%	61%	82%	82%	93%		83%	80%	90%	79%	80%	86%	71%	83%	89%	86%
	Undecided	12%	14%	10%	11%	11%	4%	17%	12%	12%	7%		9%	11%	8%	10%	15%	7%	13%	11%	5%	7%
	Undesirable	8%	8%	8%	8%	5%	7%	22%	6%	6%	0%		7%	10%	3%	10%	5%	7%	17%	6%	5%	7%
2v	Transferring from the state to local governments control and financing of services provided at the local level <i>and</i> requiring minimum standards for delivering them																					
	Desirable	66%	64%	66%	83%	61%	74%	57%	64%	64%	71%		73%	72%	73%	79%	70%	81%	63%	67%	77%	71%
	Undecided	16%	19%	13%	11%	25%	7%	9%	17%	18%	14%		14%	12%	13%	10%	25%	4%	13%	17%	15%	14%
	Undesirable	17%	17%	21%	6%	14%	19%	35%	19%	18%	14%		13%	16%	15%	10%	5%	15%	25%	17%	8%	14%
2w	Allowing local governments to raise taxes for local services in exchange for increased coordination of service delivery and public reporting of performance																					
	Desirable	55%	57%	55%	41%	46%	52%	43%	56%	65%	69%		63%	63%	67%	56%	56%	77%	42%	64%	68%	71%
	Undecided	15%	13%	11%	32%	24%	8%	10%	12%	13%	8%		16%	14%	8%	21%	28%	8%	21%	17%	14%	14%
	Undesirable	30%	31%	34%	27%	30%	40%	48%	32%	22%	23%		22%	24%	26%	23%	15%	15%	38%	19%	19%	14%
2x	Creating a stable source of funds for regional priorities by dedicating a portion of tax revenue from economic growth to those priorities																					
	Desirable	67%	66%	55%	72%	67%	72%	43%	63%	77%	75%		67%	65%	62%	82%	59%	69%	62%	71%	67%	83%
	Undecided	22%	27%	30%	13%	19%	12%	29%	16%	18%	25%		21%	22%	30%	11%	33%	12%	14%	20%	22%	17%
	Undesirable	12%	7%	15%	16%	14%	16%	29%	22%	5%	0%		11%	13%	8%	8%	8%	19%	24%	9%	11%	0%

Appendix 8: Responses by Region

(#)	Question	T	LA	OC	IE	SD	CC	CF	GS	BA	N		T	LA	OC	IE	SD	CC	CF	GS	BA	N
2y	Direct any savings resulting from successful local management of state resources to those local governments, in exchange for monitoring their own performance and being accountable and innovative in their operations																					
	Desirable	75%	68%	78%	86%	66%	85%	83%	62%	78%	93%		76%	73%	80%	82%	70%	93%	75%	69%	74%	86%
	Undecided	13%	18%	8%	3%	24%	8%	4%	18%	12%	0%		12%	12%	10%	13%	10%	0%	17%	22%	11%	14%
	Undesirable	12%	13%	14%	11%	11%	8%	13%	21%	10%	7%		12%	16%	10%	5%	20%	7%	8%	8%	15%	0%
2z	Requiring state and local governments to identify policy goals and publish their progress toward meeting them																					
	Desirable	89%	85%	90%	91%	85%	96%	95%	86%	90%	100%		92%	93%	98%	95%	88%	86%	91%	89%	92%	100%
	Undecided	7%	11%	3%	9%	5%	4%	5%	6%	6%	0%		5%	4%	0%	5%	10%	7%	4%	6%	7%	0%
	Undesirable	4%	4%	8%	0%	10%	0%	0%	9%	4%	0%		3%	3%	3%	0%	2%	7%	4%	6%	1%	0%
2aa	Requiring legislation creating new programs that cost \$25 million or more to indicate how they will be paid for																					
	Desirable	91%	91%	90%	87%	89%	93%	91%	82%	95%	100%		90%	90%	95%	92%	83%	93%	87%	89%	89%	93%
	Undecided	5%	7%	3%	8%	9%	0%	4%	9%	3%	0%		5%	4%	5%	3%	10%	0%	4%	6%	8%	7%
	Undesirable	4%	2%	8%	5%	3%	7%	4%	9%	3%	0%		5%	6%	0%	5%	8%	7%	9%	6%	3%	0%
2ab	Requiring legislation creating tax cuts that cost \$25 million or more to indicate how they will be paid for																					
	Desirable	84%	86%	71%	87%	81%	100%	73%	74%	86%	100%		84%	85%	86%	90%	70%	96%	74%	88%	84%	93%
	Undecided	6%	6%	11%	5%	8%	0%	9%	12%	4%	0%		8%	7%	8%	5%	18%	0%	9%	3%	9%	7%
	Undesirable	10%	8%	18%	8%	11%	0%	18%	15%	10%	0%		8%	8%	5%	5%	13%	4%	17%	9%	7%	0%
2ac	Requiring legislation creating new programs or tax cuts that cost \$25 million or more to indicate how they will be paid for																					
	Desirable	84%	85%	72%	89%	76%	96%	68%	79%	92%	100%		88%	86%	90%	92%	83%	96%	77%	89%	88%	93%
	Undecided	8%	7%	13%	8%	16%	0%	18%	6%	4%	0%		7%	7%	8%	5%	8%	0%	14%	3%	8%	7%
	Undesirable	8%	8%	15%	3%	8%	4%	14%	15%	4%	0%		6%	7%	3%	3%	10%	4%	9%	9%	4%	0%
2ad	Requiring that one-time revenue spikes only be spent on one-time projects, paying off debt, and filling the state rainy-day fund																					
	Desirable	80%	79%	76%	86%	81%	92%	81%	64%	79%	100%		84%	85%	93%	97%	83%	93%	83%	64%	77%	100%
	Undecided	12%	10%	18%	5%	9%	8%	10%	24%	13%	0%		7%	6%	5%	3%	10%	0%	4%	14%	9%	0%
	Undesirable	8%	11%	5%	8%	9%	0%	10%	12%	7%	0%		9%	9%	3%	0%	8%	7%	13%	22%	13%	0%
2ae	Increasing the size of the State's rainy-day fund from 5% to 10% of the State budget																					
	Desirable	66%	60%	74%	69%	71%	64%	48%	59%	73%	71%		67%	73%	74%	63%	68%	59%	58%	64%	62%	79%
	Undecided	21%	23%	21%	19%	20%	20%	22%	25%	16%	21%		19%	17%	15%	21%	16%	15%	17%	22%	23%	14%
	Undesirable	13%	16%	5%	11%	9%	16%	30%	16%	11%	7%		14%	10%	10%	16%	16%	26%	25%	14%	15%	7%
2af	Applying the sales tax to services as well as goods while reducing the sales tax rate																					
	Desirable	38%	35%	44%	27%	43%	32%	32%	52%	42%	23%		45%	39%	43%	41%	43%	39%	43%	44%	61%	36%
	Undecided	17%	14%	21%	11%	19%	12%	23%	15%	25%	15%		14%	20%	25%	15%	13%	11%	4%	8%	9%	14%
	Undesirable	45%	51%	36%	62%	38%	56%	45%	33%	33%	62%		41%	40%	33%	44%	45%	50%	52%	47%	29%	50%
2ag	Applying the sales tax to services as well as goods while keeping the current sales tax rate																					
	Desirable	23%	21%	28%	16%	17%	28%	24%	30%	27%	21%		20%	19%	10%	29%	15%	25%	23%	19%	22%	7%
	Undecided	16%	17%	13%	14%	17%	4%	19%	15%	23%	0%		10%	10%	18%	5%	8%	11%	5%	17%	11%	0%
	Undesirable	61%	62%	60%	70%	67%	68%	57%	55%	50%	79%		70%	70%	72%	66%	78%	64%	73%	64%	68%	93%

Appendix 8: Responses by Region

(#)	Question	T	LA	OC	IE	SD	CC	CF	GS	BA	N		T	LA	OC	IE	SD	CC	CF	GS	BA	N
2ah	Limiting the current California state income tax deduction for home mortgage interest payments to \$25,000 per year																					
	Desirable	43%	42%	39%	33%	41%	44%	50%	44%	44%	62%		44%	40%	41%	47%	46%	36%	48%	44%	49%	46%
	Undecided	21%	18%	26%	23%	28%	24%	33%	18%	15%	8%		17%	17%	18%	12%	18%	21%	22%	19%	10%	23%
	Undesirable	36%	40%	34%	43%	31%	32%	17%	38%	41%	31%		40%	42%	41%	41%	36%	43%	30%	36%	41%	31%
2ai	Reassessing non-residential property more frequently than now																					
	Desirable	53%	53%	34%	58%	39%	74%	36%	41%	67%	75%		72%	72%	73%	67%	65%	82%	46%	75%	80%	77%
	Undecided	20%	20%	37%	12%	33%	13%	18%	21%	11%	17%		13%	13%	10%	15%	23%	7%	13%	8%	9%	23%
	Undesirable	27%	26%	29%	30%	28%	13%	45%	38%	21%	8%		16%	15%	18%	18%	13%	11%	42%	17%	11%	0%
2aj	Reassessing all property values more frequently while adjusting the current property tax exemption for inflation to about \$28,000 <i>and</i> allowing the exemption to rise with property values going forward																					
	Desirable	35%	37%	38%	50%	22%	30%	14%	37%	33%	50%		33%	33%	26%	31%	31%	56%	19%	26%	42%	21%
	Undecided	25%	30%	9%	22%	31%	20%	24%	20%	27%	42%		20%	19%	21%	17%	20%	12%	14%	24%	23%	21%
	Undesirable	40%	33%	53%	28%	47%	50%	62%	43%	39%	8%		47%	48%	54%	51%	49%	32%	67%	50%	35%	57%
2ak	Allowing local electorates to raise the property tax rate above the current 1% rate cap																					
	Desirable	28%	32%	26%	20%	25%	28%	17%	34%	30%	29%		28%	23%	21%	21%	30%	36%	17%	33%	42%	29%
	Undecided	11%	12%	13%	11%	6%	4%	9%	11%	16%	7%		13%	19%	13%	10%	15%	7%	8%	8%	13%	7%
	Undesirable	61%	56%	62%	69%	69%	68%	74%	54%	54%	64%		59%	59%	66%	69%	55%	57%	75%	58%	46%	64%
2al	Lowering local vote requirement to adopt taxes dedicated to specific purposes, to a simple majority so that it is the same as the vote requirement to adopt taxes for general purposes																					
	Desirable	46%	40%	37%	36%	35%	58%	48%	59%	61%	36%		42%	45%	35%	31%	44%	50%	30%	46%	48%	38%
	Undecided	17%	24%	17%	22%	21%	12%	17%	3%	5%	36%		16%	19%	15%	21%	22%	7%	13%	20%	12%	15%
	Undesirable	38%	37%	46%	42%	44%	31%	35%	38%	34%	29%		41%	36%	50%	49%	34%	43%	57%	34%	40%	46%
2am	Decreasing the super-majority vote required in the Legislature to raise taxes (about 67%) to 55%																					
	Desirable	32%	34%	21%	21%	22%	37%	26%	35%	44%	43%		50%	52%	33%	42%	51%	57%	25%	50%	60%	71%
	Undecided	9%	8%	11%	11%	14%	11%	9%	6%	9%	14%		8%	7%	10%	11%	12%	7%	4%	3%	8%	0%
	Undesirable	59%	59%	68%	68%	65%	52%	65%	59%	47%	43%		43%	41%	58%	47%	37%	36%	71%	47%	32%	29%
3	If the Legislature is allowed to amend an initiative that has already passed, by what sort of majority should it be able to do so?																					
	A simple majority (50% plus 1)	69%	63%	70%	72%	75%	71%	88%	60%	67%	85%		65%	64%	79%	66%	51%	48%	76%	64%	69%	54%
	55%	18%	20%	16%	11%	19%	21%	6%	27%	20%	15%		27%	29%	13%	24%	35%	30%	24%	27%	24%	46%
	A two-thirds majority	13%	17%	14%	17%	6%	8%	6%	13%	13%	0%		9%	8%	8%	11%	14%	22%	0%	9%	7%	0%

Appendix 8: Responses by Region

(#)	Question	T	LA	OC	IE	SD	CC	CF	GS	BA	N	T	LA	OC	IE	SD	CC	CF	GS	BA	N
4	Some people think that the Legislature should contain fewer Legislators, even if that means that each Legislator represents more people. Suppose these people are at one end of a 1-to-7 scale, at point 1. Other people think that each Legislator should represent fewer people, even if that means that the Legislature contains more Legislators. Suppose these people are at the other end of the scale, at point 7. People who are exactly in the middle are at point 4, and of course other people have opinions at other points between 1 and 7. Where would you place yourself on this scale, or wouldn't you have any opinion about that?																				
	Fewer legislators	20%	21%	29%	26%	14%	19%	23%	26%	11%	7%	10%	9%	10%	11%	12%	7%	17%	8%	7%	7%
	Exactly in the middle	23%	27%	18%	26%	22%	19%	27%	26%	21%	14%	20%	23%	25%	17%	17%	15%	26%	22%	18%	14%
	More legislators	57%	52%	53%	47%	65%	63%	50%	49%	68%	79%	70%	68%	65%	72%	71%	78%	57%	69%	76%	79%
5	On a 0 to 10 scale, where 0 is "not at all", 10 is "as much as could reasonably be expected," and 5 is exactly in the middle, how much or little would you say the California State Legislature is able to get important things done?																				
	Not at all	67%	58%	70%	68%	69%	70%	65%	77%	70%	77%	69%	66%	68%	61%	71%	68%	79%	67%	75%	79%
	Exactly in the middle	16%	24%	13%	11%	3%	19%	17%	9%	20%	15%	10%	11%	13%	16%	5%	21%	13%	6%	5%	7%
	As could be expected	17%	18%	18%	21%	28%	11%	17%	14%	10%	8%	21%	22%	20%	24%	24%	11%	8%	28%	20%	14%
6	On another 0 to 10 scale, where 0 is "not at all", 10 is "completely", and 5 is exactly in the middle, to what extent is the ability of the State Legislature to get things done affected by tensions between the political parties?																				
	Not at all	27%	21%	30%	31%	33%	30%	43%	36%	16%	36%	21%	16%	28%	19%	20%	25%	33%	19%	16%	57%
	Exactly in the middle	8%	12%	8%	8%	5%	7%	13%	3%	7%	0%	6%	4%	8%	3%	7%	11%	13%	6%	4%	0%
	Completely	65%	67%	63%	61%	62%	63%	43%	61%	77%	64%	73%	80%	65%	78%	73%	64%	54%	75%	80%	43%
7	And, on another 0 to 10 scale, where 0 is completely at the local level, 10 is completely at the State level, and 5 is exactly in the middle, how much decision-making authority should there be at the local level versus the State level?																				
	Local level	42%	42%	45%	45%	43%	37%	43%	42%	36%	50%	43%	42%	51%	47%	37%	52%	48%	39%	41%	36%
	Exactly in the middle	32%	27%	30%	34%	30%	26%	39%	36%	37%	29%	29%	29%	31%	26%	20%	26%	39%	36%	31%	29%
	State level	27%	31%	25%	21%	27%	37%	17%	22%	27%	21%	27%	29%	18%	26%	44%	22%	13%	25%	28%	36%
8	And, on the same scale, how much taxation power should there be at the local level versus State level?																				
	Local level	34%	29%	45%	28%	27%	54%	36%	39%	26%	43%	32%	31%	28%	31%	31%	31%	48%	37%	32%	29%
	Exactly in the middle	40%	42%	30%	50%	38%	23%	45%	42%	42%	36%	33%	31%	41%	38%	38%	42%	26%	31%	29%	7%
	State level	27%	29%	25%	22%	35%	23%	18%	18%	32%	21%	35%	37%	31%	31%	31%	27%	26%	31%	39%	64%
9	On the same scale, where would you say the most important public policy decisions should be made?																				
	Local level	25%	22%	28%	32%	23%	44%	27%	29%	17%	21%	25%	26%	23%	33%	20%	30%	35%	25%	20%	14%
	Exactly in the middle	30%	30%	33%	32%	28%	19%	41%	41%	22%	50%	26%	24%	25%	28%	30%	22%	22%	39%	25%	21%
	State level	44%	48%	40%	35%	49%	37%	32%	29%	61%	29%	49%	50%	53%	38%	50%	48%	43%	36%	55%	64%

Appendix 8: Responses by Region

(#)	Question	T	LA	OC	IE	SD	CC	CF	GS	BA	N	T	LA	OC	IE	SD	CC	CF	GS	BA	N
10	On another 0 to 10 scale, where 0 is “completely by voters in referendums”, 10 is “completely by the State Legislature”, and 5 is exactly in the middle, how many of the State’s major decisions should be made by voters in referendums versus by the State Legislature?																				
	By voters in referendums	31%	29%	38%	38%	33%	38%	39%	30%	18%	29%	29%	29%	35%	44%	29%	32%	39%	22%	18%	14%
	Exactly in the middle	25%	22%	24%	24%	25%	23%	39%	18%	24%	43%	26%	26%	30%	33%	26%	21%	22%	25%	25%	29%
	By the State Legislature	45%	49%	38%	38%	42%	38%	22%	52%	58%	29%	45%	45%	35%	23%	45%	46%	39%	53%	57%	57%
11	Some people think that decisions made at the local level reflect the will of the local community more closely than decisions made at the state level. Suppose these people are at one end of a 1-to-7 scale, at point 1. Other people think that decisions made at the local level are more dominated by powerful special interests than decisions made at the state level. Suppose these people are at the other end of the scale, at point 7. People who are exactly in the middle are at point 4, and of course other people have opinions at other points between 1 and 7. Where would you place yourself on this scale, or wouldn’t you have any opinion about that?																				
	Reflect local community	47%	46%	38%	57%	47%	44%	35%	33%	57%	64%	56%	49%	56%	59%	59%	46%	61%	58%	65%	43%
	Exactly in the middle	25%	32%	30%	20%	18%	24%	26%	30%	18%	21%	23%	29%	22%	27%	26%	18%	13%	11%	21%	36%
	Dominated by special interests	28%	22%	32%	23%	35%	32%	39%	36%	25%	14%	21%	22%	22%	14%	15%	36%	26%	31%	13%	21%
13a	Replacing the current State Senate and Assembly with a single house would make it easier to pass important legislation																				
	Agree strongly	17%	14%	18%	14%	18%	23%	29%	18%	19%	7%	24%	21%	24%	11%	15%	35%	33%	36%	25%	29%
	Agree somewhat	35%	34%	39%	28%	33%	8%	33%	45%	41%	43%	39%	44%	34%	41%	54%	23%	24%	31%	39%	50%
	Neither agree nor disagree	20%	24%	21%	17%	15%	15%	14%	27%	17%	29%	15%	13%	21%	14%	23%	15%	14%	8%	15%	14%
	Disagree somewhat	16%	16%	11%	28%	21%	31%	10%	3%	14%	14%	13%	12%	18%	22%	3%	12%	10%	19%	15%	7%
	Disagree strongly	12%	13%	11%	14%	12%	23%	14%	6%	9%	7%	9%	11%	3%	14%	5%	15%	19%	6%	7%	0%
13b	Replacing the current State Senate and Assembly with a single house would deprive the system of important checks and balances																				
	Agree strongly	31%	29%	19%	43%	43%	33%	27%	27%	31%	36%	29%	27%	27%	35%	23%	25%	29%	20%	38%	21%
	Agree somewhat	26%	27%	14%	34%	23%	30%	36%	21%	30%	21%	30%	32%	30%	27%	38%	39%	48%	17%	22%	21%
	Neither agree nor disagree	20%	25%	32%	14%	14%	19%	23%	27%	13%	7%	14%	13%	16%	16%	10%	0%	5%	17%	18%	21%
	Disagree somewhat	13%	15%	14%	6%	20%	4%	0%	6%	18%	29%	18%	19%	14%	16%	21%	21%	5%	29%	15%	29%
	Disagree strongly	9%	4%	22%	3%	0%	15%	14%	18%	8%	7%	10%	9%	14%	5%	8%	14%	14%	17%	7%	7%
14a	Part-time legislators will tend to represent their districts more closely																				
	Agree strongly	16%	17%	21%	16%	8%	15%	26%	20%	12%	14%	10%	8%	13%	15%	10%	7%	22%	6%	3%	29%
	Agree somewhat	27%	24%	45%	38%	32%	15%	17%	23%	20%	29%	22%	19%	41%	31%	17%	29%	9%	25%	16%	14%
	Neither agree nor disagree	18%	16%	18%	11%	19%	11%	9%	20%	26%	29%	16%	20%	21%	10%	22%	7%	22%	19%	9%	14%
	Disagree somewhat	20%	24%	8%	24%	19%	26%	13%	17%	23%	21%	26%	26%	8%	31%	29%	18%	13%	22%	37%	36%
	Disagree strongly	19%	18%	8%	11%	22%	33%	35%	20%	19%	7%	27%	28%	18%	13%	22%	39%	35%	28%	35%	7%

Appendix 8: Responses by Region

(#)	Question	T	LA	OC	IE	SD	CC	CF	GS	BA	N		T	LA	OC	IE	SD	CC	CF	GS	BA	N
14b	Part-time legislators will be less likely to be career politicians.																					
	Agree strongly	30%	28%	35%	36%	33%	42%	41%	28%	20%	21%		25%	19%	28%	26%	28%	37%	33%	14%	27%	43%
	Agree somewhat	41%	40%	43%	39%	38%	38%	27%	31%	48%	71%		42%	46%	48%	49%	30%	44%	38%	47%	34%	36%
	Neither agree nor disagree	12%	11%	13%	11%	18%	0%	9%	19%	14%	0%		12%	15%	13%	15%	15%	0%	8%	6%	12%	14%
	Disagree somewhat	10%	12%	5%	14%	5%	12%	14%	8%	9%	7%		11%	10%	5%	10%	13%	4%	13%	19%	15%	7%
	Disagree strongly	7%	9%	5%	0%	5%	8%	9%	14%	9%	0%		10%	10%	8%	0%	15%	15%	8%	14%	12%	0%
14c	Part-time legislators will tend to be more open to corruption.																					
	Agree strongly	10%	12%	13%	3%	3%	15%	25%	8%	9%	0%		11%	13%	10%	13%	5%	11%	17%	20%	8%	0%
	Agree somewhat	17%	18%	10%	18%	22%	12%	10%	8%	23%	29%		20%	17%	10%	24%	24%	19%	35%	14%	26%	15%
	Neither agree nor disagree	34%	31%	23%	36%	41%	38%	35%	39%	37%	21%		34%	42%	25%	26%	37%	33%	30%	23%	40%	31%
	Disagree somewhat	22%	24%	36%	21%	19%	19%	0%	25%	15%	36%		21%	14%	30%	26%	22%	22%	4%	31%	18%	46%
	Disagree strongly	18%	16%	18%	21%	16%	15%	30%	19%	15%	14%		13%	16%	25%	11%	12%	15%	13%	11%	8%	8%
14d	Part-time legislators will tend to be less well informed about policy issues.																					
	Agree strongly	15%	20%	18%	8%	10%	26%	9%	17%	12%	0%		25%	26%	18%	16%	37%	36%	26%	17%	27%	14%
	Agree somewhat	30%	30%	13%	31%	36%	22%	27%	31%	42%	36%		29%	27%	21%	32%	22%	21%	26%	31%	38%	43%
	Neither agree nor disagree	20%	19%	38%	22%	21%	11%	18%	14%	15%	14%		20%	26%	21%	22%	12%	18%	13%	25%	16%	14%
	Disagree somewhat	20%	22%	15%	22%	26%	19%	18%	22%	15%	29%		16%	12%	21%	19%	17%	14%	9%	25%	12%	21%
	Disagree strongly	15%	9%	18%	17%	8%	22%	27%	17%	16%	21%		11%	9%	21%	11%	12%	11%	26%	3%	7%	7%
15a	Increasing State Legislators' terms will make them less responsive to their districts.																					
	Agree strongly	12%	13%	16%	17%	13%	4%	26%	8%	6%	0%		4%	5%	5%	5%	0%	7%	8%	0%	3%	0%
	Agree somewhat	29%	29%	32%	56%	23%	35%	17%	19%	21%	36%		13%	10%	13%	21%	17%	14%	8%	19%	9%	14%
	Neither agree nor disagree	21%	17%	26%	14%	26%	27%	17%	25%	21%	21%		17%	14%	26%	26%	24%	14%	4%	14%	13%	21%
	Disagree somewhat	26%	29%	24%	8%	23%	15%	17%	31%	38%	36%		39%	39%	36%	39%	37%	32%	42%	36%	45%	29%
	Disagree strongly	12%	11%	3%	6%	15%	19%	22%	17%	14%	7%		27%	31%	21%	8%	22%	32%	38%	31%	30%	36%
15b	Increasing State Legislators' terms will let them spend less time fundraising and campaigning and more time legislating.																					
	Agree strongly	26%	25%	28%	11%	23%	31%	27%	31%	30%	29%		43%	44%	38%	24%	38%	50%	58%	36%	51%	50%
	Agree somewhat	42%	45%	38%	38%	38%	35%	41%	31%	55%	36%		39%	39%	38%	51%	45%	29%	33%	47%	33%	36%
	Neither agree nor disagree	13%	14%	13%	27%	13%	0%	9%	17%	6%	29%		9%	7%	13%	19%	8%	7%	4%	14%	7%	7%
	Disagree somewhat	11%	9%	10%	16%	18%	19%	14%	14%	6%	0%		5%	5%	8%	5%	3%	7%	0%	3%	8%	0%
	Disagree strongly	8%	7%	10%	8%	10%	15%	9%	8%	4%	7%		4%	5%	3%	0%	8%	7%	4%	0%	1%	7%
16a	Arnold Schwarzenegger																					
	Extremely dissatisfied	76%	78%	63%	71%	77%	73%	77%	78%	83%	69%		75%	77%	63%	79%	75%	73%	67%	81%	82%	64%
	Exactly in the middle	12%	13%	20%	16%	13%	8%	9%	14%	9%	8%		14%	15%	23%	8%	10%	8%	21%	17%	8%	21%
	Extremely satisfied	12%	9%	18%	13%	10%	19%	14%	8%	9%	23%		11%	8%	15%	13%	15%	19%	13%	3%	10%	14%
16b	Jerry Brown																					
	Extremely dissatisfied	30%	27%	42%	41%	33%	37%	57%	17%	18%	29%		25%	21%	33%	37%	25%	25%	48%	19%	17%	23%
	Exactly in the middle	20%	21%	34%	26%	11%	11%	29%	14%	15%	36%		21%	24%	31%	17%	23%	25%	22%	17%	11%	15%
	Extremely satisfied	49%	52%	24%	32%	56%	52%	14%	69%	68%	36%		54%	55%	36%	46%	53%	50%	30%	64%	71%	62%
16c	California State Senate																					
	Extremely dissatisfied	69%	65%	72%	82%	58%	69%	85%	73%	65%	75%		68%	61%	72%	69%	59%	62%	70%	69%	80%	85%
	Exactly in the middle	19%	23%	18%	12%	27%	15%	15%	9%	21%	8%		18%	23%	10%	8%	33%	23%	17%	17%	13%	15%
	Extremely satisfied	12%	11%	10%	6%	15%	15%	0%	18%	14%	17%		13%	16%	18%	22%	8%	15%	13%	14%	7%	0%

Appendix 8: Responses by Region

(#)	Question		T	LA	OC	IE	SD	CC	CF	GS	BA	N		T	LA	OC	IE	SD	CC	CF	GS	BA	N
16d	California State Assembly	Extremely dissatisfied	68%	65%	67%	75%	62%	70%	67%	79%	65%	77%		71%	68%	69%	61%	64%	67%	65%	77%	84%	77%
		Exactly in the middle	19%	24%	18%	14%	24%	11%	24%	9%	25%	8%		16%	17%	8%	18%	31%	15%	17%	14%	12%	15%
		Extremely satisfied	13%	12%	15%	11%	14%	19%	10%	12%	10%	15%		13%	16%	23%	21%	5%	19%	17%	9%	4%	8%
16e	California State Legislature	Extremely dissatisfied	72%	67%	67%	79%	59%	74%	76%	82%	74%	77%		70%	67%	68%	63%	72%	58%	73%	69%	85%	69%
		Exactly in the middle	18%	24%	13%	12%	30%	11%	19%	9%	20%	15%		18%	19%	10%	16%	23%	27%	14%	17%	14%	31%
		Extremely satisfied	10%	9%	21%	9%	11%	15%	5%	9%	7%	8%		12%	14%	23%	21%	5%	15%	14%	14%	1%	0%
16f	California's initiative/referendum process	Extremely dissatisfied	50%	58%	38%	43%	39%	54%	50%	56%	56%	38%		37%	46%	26%	38%	24%	30%	42%	33%	42%	43%
		Exactly in the middle	22%	20%	23%	35%	24%	23%	20%	9%	16%	46%		19%	13%	26%	26%	20%	22%	17%	14%	21%	14%
		Extremely satisfied	28%	21%	40%	22%	37%	23%	30%	34%	28%	15%		44%	42%	49%	36%	56%	48%	42%	53%	37%	43%
16g	California's State government	Extremely dissatisfied	72%	71%	70%	81%	64%	63%	77%	63%	76%	85%		64%	63%	59%	72%	73%	64%	58%	58%	64%	71%
		Exactly in the middle	15%	12%	20%	14%	18%	22%	14%	14%	15%	15%		19%	18%	21%	13%	10%	18%	25%	19%	23%	21%
		Extremely satisfied	13%	16%	10%	5%	18%	15%	9%	23%	9%	0%		17%	19%	21%	15%	17%	18%	17%	22%	12%	7%
16h	Your city/town and county's government	Extremely dissatisfied	37%	34%	28%	43%	58%	33%	30%	36%	33%	43%		28%	34%	11%	31%	46%	11%	29%	22%	26%	36%
		Exactly in the middle	20%	23%	18%	19%	16%	19%	22%	14%	25%	7%		20%	19%	26%	13%	20%	25%	13%	25%	21%	7%
		Extremely satisfied	43%	43%	54%	38%	26%	48%	48%	50%	42%	50%		52%	47%	63%	56%	34%	64%	58%	53%	53%	57%
16i	California's local governments generally	Extremely dissatisfied	39%	39%	24%	47%	47%	26%	45%	43%	44%	29%		30%	33%	16%	30%	36%	20%	30%	37%	31%	36%
		Exactly in the middle	29%	33%	38%	28%	29%	37%	25%	17%	24%	29%		32%	33%	37%	30%	42%	40%	39%	20%	28%	14%
		Extremely satisfied	32%	28%	38%	25%	24%	37%	30%	40%	33%	43%		38%	35%	47%	39%	22%	40%	30%	43%	41%	50%
18	Some people think that local communities should be able to decide their own taxes and services, even if that means big differences between communities. Suppose these people are at one end of a 1-to-7 scale, at point 1. Other people think that taxes and services should be the same throughout the state, even if that means less local control. Suppose these people are at the other end of the scale, at point 7. People who are exactly in the middle are at point 4. Where would you place yourself on this scale, or wouldn't you have any opinion about that?																						
		Local communities decide	39%	39%	46%	40%	32%	44%	29%	42%	35%	43%		42%	40%	48%	46%	39%	46%	29%	56%	40%	29%
		Exactly in the middle	21%	18%	21%	17%	26%	16%	33%	19%	19%	36%		20%	20%	18%	16%	27%	23%	29%	14%	17%	36%
		Same throughout the state	41%	43%	33%	43%	42%	40%	38%	39%	46%	21%		38%	40%	35%	38%	34%	31%	42%	31%	43%	36%

Appendix 8: Responses by Region

(#)	Question	T	LA	OC	IE	SD	CC	CF	GS	BA	N	T	LA	OC	IE	SD	CC	CF	GS	BA	N
19	Some people think that government should provide certain benefits and services, even if that means higher taxes. Suppose these people are at one end of a 1-to-7 scale, at point 1. Other people think that government should lower taxes, even if that means reduced benefits and services. Suppose these people are at the other end of the scale, at point 7. People who are exactly in the middle are at point 4. Where would you place yourself on this scale, or wouldn't you have any opinion about that?																				
	Provide certain benefits and services, even if that means higher taxes	46%	45%	31%	36%	50%	44%	32%	44%	61%	50%	57%	58%	33%	58%	56%	57%	35%	53%	75%	57%
	Exactly in the middle	18%	16%	13%	19%	23%	15%	18%	17%	18%	21%	15%	19%	15%	5%	20%	25%	22%	14%	8%	21%
	Lower taxes, even if that means reducing benefits and services	37%	38%	56%	44%	28%	41%	50%	39%	21%	29%	28%	23%	53%	37%	24%	18%	43%	33%	17%	21%
20	Some people think that majorities should always have their way no matter how big the minorities are or how strongly they feel. Suppose these people are at one end of a 1-to-7 scale, at point 1. Other people think that minorities should have their way when they are large enough or feel strongly enough. Suppose these people are at the other end of the scale, at point 7. People who are exactly in the middle are at point 4. Where would you place yourself on this scale, or wouldn't you have any opinion about that?																				
	Majorities have their way	34%	35%	38%	38%	31%	26%	38%	29%	34%	43%	37%	34%	42%	30%	28%	36%	23%	44%	43%	54%
	Exactly in the middle	33%	34%	27%	41%	31%	41%	38%	32%	26%	43%	33%	24%	26%	35%	38%	50%	59%	32%	30%	23%
	Minorities have their way when they are big enough or feel strongly enough	33%	31%	35%	22%	39%	33%	24%	38%	40%	14%	31%	42%	32%	35%	35%	14%	18%	24%	27%	23%
21	Some people think that the best society is one in which nobody can tell anybody else what to do, even if there is a cost to others. Suppose these people are at one end of a 1-to-7 scale, at point 1. Other people think that the best society is one in which the community can decide together what people can and cannot do, even if some people object. Suppose these people are at the other end of the scale, at point 7. People who are exactly in the middle are at point 4. Where would you place yourself on this scale, or wouldn't you have any opinion about that?																				
	Nobody can tell anybody else what to do	18%	16%	28%	19%	18%	8%	27%	9%	21%	7%	20%	19%	28%	28%	13%	18%	22%	25%	16%	14%
	Exactly in the middle	19%	21%	13%	25%	13%	8%	27%	29%	16%	14%	22%	23%	23%	26%	20%	7%	43%	28%	17%	29%
	Community can decide	64%	63%	60%	56%	68%	85%	45%	63%	63%	79%	58%	58%	49%	46%	68%	75%	35%	47%	67%	57%

Appendix 8: Responses by Region

(#)	Question	T	LA	OC	IE	SD	CC	CF	GS	BA	N		T	LA	OC	IE	SD	CC	CF	GS	BA	N	
22	Some people think that the best government is one in which everyone gets to vote directly on making the laws. Suppose these people are at one end of a 1-to-7 scale, at point 1. Other people think that the best government is one in which everyone gets to vote for representatives who then vote on making the laws. Suppose these people are at the other end of the scale, at point 7. People who are exactly in the middle are at point 4. Where would you place yourself on this scale, or wouldn't you have any opinion about that?																						
		Everyone votes on laws	34%	36%	40%	47%	26%	33%	52%	34%	22%	21%		34%	39%	35%	46%	29%	25%	54%	35%	20%	29%
		Exactly in the middle	20%	20%	23%	36%	18%	11%	9%	26%	19%	0%		16%	10%	13%	24%	22%	14%	17%	21%	21%	7%
		Representatives vote on laws	46%	44%	38%	17%	56%	56%	39%	40%	59%	79%		50%	51%	53%	30%	49%	61%	29%	44%	59%	64%

Appendix 9: Responses by Age

T=Total
 1 = 18 to 24
 2 = 25 to 34
 3 = 35 to 44
 4 = 45 to 54
 5 = 55 to 64
 6 = 65 or Older

#	Question	(Before)							(After)							
		T	1	2	3	4	5	6	T	1	2	3	4	5	6	
1	To begin with, all in all, on a 0 to 10 scale, where 0 is "extremely poorly", 10 is "extremely well," and 5 is exactly in the middle, how well or poorly would you say the system of democracy in California works these days?															
	Well	21%	23%	29%	20%	20%	19%	17%		38%	15%	43%	49%	30%	42%	43%
	Undecided	18%	37%	17%	16%	12%	18%	17%		15%	24%	11%	12%	15%	14%	15%
	Not well	61%	40%	55%	64%	68%	63%	65%		47%	61%	46%	39%	54%	44%	43%
2a	Creating a formal review process to allow an initiative’s proponents to amend an initiative following public input															
	Desirable	60%	72%	58%	59%	62%	57%	57%		76%	74%	76%	68%	75%	82%	77%
	Undecided	19%	13%	18%	20%	19%	17%	24%		9%	6%	8%	11%	10%	5%	11%
	Undesirable	21%	16%	24%	20%	19%	26%	19%		16%	21%	16%	21%	15%	14%	12%
2b	Allowing the Legislature to remove an initiative from the ballot by enacting it into law															
	Desirable	37%	31%	26%	41%	33%	43%	43%		34%	31%	36%	31%	38%	27%	41%
	Undecided	14%	13%	17%	12%	18%	13%	9%		17%	23%	2%	15%	15%	19%	23%
	Undesirable	49%	56%	57%	47%	49%	44%	49%		49%	46%	62%	54%	47%	53%	36%
2c	Allowing a simple majority of the State Legislature to place a countermeasure to an already qualified initiative on the ballot next to that initiative															
	Desirable	32%	41%	42%	27%	25%	34%	33%		30%	24%	27%	27%	32%	28%	35%
	Undecided	17%	25%	18%	24%	17%	13%	14%		13%	15%	21%	10%	10%	10%	15%
	Undesirable	50%	34%	40%	49%	58%	54%	53%		58%	61%	52%	63%	57%	61%	51%
2d	Allowing the Legislature to amend an initiative that has already passed, subject to a public review and the agreement of the initiative’s proponents															
	Desirable	43%	44%	52%	41%	42%	42%	40%		37%	33%	45%	39%	38%	42%	28%
	Undecided	13%	19%	13%	11%	12%	8%	20%		12%	24%	6%	10%	15%	8%	15%
	Undesirable	44%	38%	35%	48%	46%	50%	40%		51%	42%	49%	52%	48%	51%	57%
2e	Allowing the Legislature to amend an initiative that has already passed, subject to a two-thirds vote, even if an initiative’s proponents do not agree with the amendment															
	Desirable	25%	32%	30%	31%	16%	20%	29%		18%	15%	20%	20%	17%	17%	16%
	Undecided	15%	16%	15%	19%	13%	15%	13%		9%	6%	6%	5%	10%	10%	14%
	Undesirable	61%	52%	55%	51%	71%	65%	58%		73%	79%	73%	75%	73%	72%	70%
2f	Allowing an initiative’s proponents to withdraw it after it qualifies for the ballot															
	Desirable	47%	34%	42%	34%	52%	57%	49%		57%	38%	47%	46%	68%	67%	55%
	Undecided	21%	19%	24%	28%	22%	15%	20%		17%	34%	15%	23%	13%	10%	18%
	Undesirable	32%	47%	33%	38%	26%	28%	30%		26%	28%	38%	31%	19%	23%	27%
2g	Allowing an initiative’s proponents to withdraw it after it qualifies for the ballot															
	Desirable	88%	86%	87%	88%	91%	89%	88%		84%	82%	91%	79%	84%	83%	88%
	Undecided	6%	9%	4%	8%	6%	5%	7%		7%	6%	4%	11%	8%	6%	6%
	Undesirable	5%	6%	9%	3%	4%	6%	5%		9%	12%	4%	10%	8%	12%	7%

Appendix 9: Responses by Age

(#)	Question	T	1	2	3	4	5	6		T	1	2	3	4	5	6
2h	Requiring all ballot measures that require new expenditures to indicate how they will be paid for															
	Desirable	87%	91%	87%	89%	82%	85%	90%		91%	94%	90%	85%	88%	95%	94%
	Undecided	7%	3%	2%	8%	13%	7%	4%		5%	6%	4%	8%	7%	1%	3%
	Undesirable	6%	6%	11%	3%	6%	7%	6%		4%	0%	6%	7%	6%	3%	3%
2i	Requiring the ballot pamphlet to provide an analysis by the Legislative Analyst of how new initiative programs will likely be paid for															
	Desirable	67%	71%	62%	59%	72%	74%	61%		67%	77%	67%	59%	62%	72%	72%
	Undecided	20%	21%	22%	23%	18%	15%	26%		19%	20%	21%	28%	23%	13%	14%
	Undesirable	13%	7%	16%	18%	10%	11%	13%		13%	3%	12%	14%	15%	15%	14%
2j	Making the vote threshold needed to pass an initiative the same as any vote threshold that the initiative itself requires of the public in the future															
	Desirable	82%	79%	85%	81%	72%	87%	92%		91%	85%	94%	92%	87%	94%	93%
	Undecided	9%	6%	2%	11%	21%	5%	3%		4%	12%	2%	2%	4%	2%	5%
	Undesirable	8%	15%	13%	8%	7%	8%	5%		5%	3%	4%	7%	9%	3%	1%
2k	Increasing the number of Assembly districts from 80 to 120															
	Desirable	61%	72%	73%	57%	54%	57%	63%		62%	63%	72%	64%	59%	55%	65%
	Undecided	17%	19%	11%	18%	17%	17%	17%		17%	17%	11%	17%	16%	18%	18%
	Undesirable	23%	9%	16%	25%	29%	26%	20%		21%	20%	17%	19%	24%	26%	17%
2l	Expanding the size of districts and electing more than one legislative representative from each district															
	Desirable	48%	63%	57%	43%	38%	49%	48%		49%	59%	60%	58%	38%	43%	49%
	Undecided	19%	17%	18%	30%	25%	9%	16%		17%	15%	16%	23%	15%	18%	16%
	Undesirable	33%	20%	25%	27%	38%	42%	35%		34%	26%	23%	19%	48%	39%	35%
2m	Replacing the current State Senate and Assembly with a single house of 120 members															
	Desirable	32%	19%	40%	28%	35%	31%	35%		42%	52%	44%	50%	47%	31%	40%
	Undecided	25%	31%	20%	32%	27%	23%	20%		15%	9%	8%	13%	15%	18%	18%
	Undesirable	43%	50%	40%	40%	38%	46%	45%		43%	39%	48%	37%	38%	51%	42%
2n	Making the State Legislature part-time and paying legislators															
	Desirable	45%	35%	48%	42%	47%	47%	44%		26%	26%	32%	21%	33%	23%	24%
	Undecided	13%	3%	14%	24%	10%	13%	14%		9%	11%	11%	10%	3%	10%	13%
	Undesirable	42%	61%	39%	34%	43%	41%	42%		64%	63%	57%	69%	64%	67%	63%
2o	Reducing the length of the state legislative session and requiring legislators to spend more time in their districts															
	Desirable	57%	64%	58%	61%	58%	54%	50%		46%	57%	47%	51%	41%	45%	43%
	Undecided	19%	21%	24%	20%	20%	15%	18%		18%	14%	12%	13%	23%	18%	23%
	Undesirable	24%	15%	18%	19%	22%	31%	32%		36%	29%	41%	36%	36%	36%	35%
2p	Allowing voters to rank the candidates in order of preference,so that the winner can be decided without a second election															
	Desirable	61%	56%	68%	63%	64%	54%	61%		57%	65%	62%	62%	51%	59%	52%
	Undecided	13%	21%	11%	12%	12%	14%	12%		13%	12%	11%	5%	19%	13%	14%
	Undesirable	26%	24%	21%	25%	24%	32%	27%		30%	24%	28%	33%	30%	28%	34%
2q	Lengthening Assembly terms from 2 years to 4, and Senate terms from 4 years to 6															
	Desirable	46%	55%	52%	36%	34%	52%	54%		81%	71%	81%	79%	80%	88%	82%
	Undecided	14%	9%	13%	21%	14%	10%	14%		8%	3%	9%	7%	10%	8%	9%
	Undesirable	40%	36%	35%	43%	52%	38%	32%		11%	26%	11%	15%	10%	5%	8%

Appendix 9: Responses by Age

(#)	Question	T	1	2	3	4	5	6		T	1	2	3	4	5	6
2r	Requiring economic impact analyses of major legislation before passage															
	Desirable	89%	85%	83%	92%	90%	94%	85%		90%	88%	94%	84%	91%	92%	89%
	Undecided	8%	15%	10%	3%	8%	5%	11%		5%	9%	4%	5%	4%	5%	5%
	Undesirable	3%	0%	6%	5%	2%	1%	4%		5%	3%	2%	11%	4%	3%	5%
2s	Establishing clear goals for each government program and assessing whether progress is being made toward these goals at least once every ten years															
	Desirable	86%	83%	87%	81%	85%	91%	86%		90%	89%	90%	79%	90%	97%	91%
	Undecided	8%	9%	6%	10%	13%	5%	7%		6%	3%	4%	11%	7%	3%	5%
	Undesirable	6%	9%	6%	10%	2%	4%	7%		5%	9%	6%	10%	3%	0%	4%
2t	Requiring the Governor and the Legislature to adopt two-year instead of one-year budgets															
	Desirable	57%	47%	42%	52%	63%	58%	67%		73%	52%	75%	72%	70%	77%	79%
	Undecided	25%	31%	42%	29%	18%	26%	17%		15%	21%	13%	15%	15%	13%	15%
	Undesirable	18%	22%	16%	20%	19%	16%	16%		13%	27%	13%	13%	16%	10%	5%
2u	Requiring the Governor and the Legislature to publish three and five year budget projections prior to the budget vote each year															
	Desirable	81%	72%	80%	77%	86%	76%	87%		83%	62%	88%	89%	80%	84%	88%
	Undecided	12%	13%	11%	12%	10%	15%	10%		9%	12%	6%	5%	14%	10%	8%
	Undesirable	8%	16%	9%	11%	5%	9%	3%		7%	26%	6%	7%	6%	6%	4%
2v	Transferring from the state to local governments control and financing of services provided at the local level <i>and</i> requiring minimum standards for delivering them															
	Desirable	66%	68%	65%	70%	65%	64%	68%		73%	78%	79%	67%	74%	74%	69%
	Undecided	16%	13%	19%	18%	19%	15%	12%		14%	16%	13%	13%	16%	6%	21%
	Undesirable	17%	19%	16%	12%	16%	21%	20%		13%	6%	8%	20%	10%	21%	9%
2w	Allowing local governments to raise taxes for local services in exchange for increased coordination of service delivery and public reporting of performance															
	Desirable	55%	48%	64%	45%	53%	57%	59%		63%	63%	67%	59%	59%	60%	70%
	Undecided	15%	24%	13%	18%	13%	13%	13%		16%	19%	9%	11%	20%	15%	16%
	Undesirable	30%	27%	22%	37%	34%	30%	28%		22%	19%	24%	30%	20%	24%	14%
2x	Creating a stable source of funds for regional priorities by dedicating a portion of tax revenue from economic growth to those priorities															
	Desirable	67%	53%	64%	71%	65%	66%	72%		67%	61%	83%	78%	61%	62%	67%
	Undecided	22%	33%	23%	14%	20%	22%	23%		21%	13%	12%	7%	31%	24%	27%
	Undesirable	12%	13%	13%	14%	15%	12%	5%		11%	26%	5%	16%	8%	14%	5%
2y	Direct any savings resulting from successful local management of state resources to those local governments, in exchange for monitoring their own performance and being accountable and innovative in their operations															
	Desirable	75%	74%	70%	75%	77%	75%	77%		76%	77%	76%	67%	76%	75%	84%
	Undecided	13%	16%	15%	12%	13%	9%	14%		12%	10%	11%	15%	13%	11%	10%
	Undesirable	12%	10%	15%	14%	10%	16%	9%		12%	13%	13%	18%	10%	14%	7%
2z	Requiring state and local governments to identify policy goals and publish their progress toward meeting them															
	Desirable	89%	76%	87%	88%	88%	91%	94%		92%	91%	91%	89%	95%	92%	92%
	Undecided	7%	21%	7%	3%	5%	6%	6%		5%	9%	6%	3%	2%	6%	7%
	Undesirable	4%	3%	7%	8%	7%	2%	0%		3%	0%	2%	8%	2%	2%	1%

Appendix 9: Responses by Age

(#)	Question	T	1	2	3	4	5	6		T	1	2	3	4	5	6
2aa	Requiring legislation creating new programs that cost \$25 million or more to indicate how they will be paid for															
	Desirable	91%	81%	88%	92%	93%	95%	89%		90%	82%	90%	89%	91%	92%	91%
	Undecided	5%	11%	8%	2%	6%	3%	6%		5%	12%	2%	5%	8%	3%	4%
	Undesirable	4%	8%	4%	6%	1%	3%	6%		5%	6%	8%	7%	1%	5%	5%
2ab	Requiring legislation creating tax cuts that cost \$25 million or more to indicate how they will be paid for															
	Desirable	84%	86%	85%	82%	86%	79%	85%		84%	82%	86%	87%	79%	85%	89%
	Undecided	6%	9%	2%	8%	7%	8%	4%		8%	15%	0%	2%	15%	8%	6%
	Undesirable	10%	6%	13%	10%	7%	14%	10%		8%	3%	14%	11%	6%	7%	6%
2ac	Requiring legislation creating new programs or tax cuts that cost \$25 million or more to indicate how they will be paid for															
	Desirable	84%	89%	89%	77%	86%	81%	86%		88%	85%	91%	85%	86%	89%	89%
	Undecided	8%	8%	2%	8%	8%	12%	7%		7%	9%	0%	5%	11%	6%	7%
	Undesirable	8%	3%	9%	15%	6%	8%	7%		6%	6%	9%	10%	2%	6%	4%
2ad	Requiring that one-time revenue spikes only be spent on one-time projects, paying off debt, and filling the state rainy-day fund															
	Desirable	80%	73%	63%	81%	79%	84%	89%		84%	79%	85%	82%	81%	90%	85%
	Undecided	12%	13%	23%	14%	10%	10%	6%		7%	6%	4%	5%	9%	5%	9%
	Undesirable	8%	13%	14%	5%	11%	5%	5%		9%	15%	10%	13%	9%	6%	5%
2ae	Increasing the size of the State's rainy-day fund from 5% to 10% of the State budget															
	Desirable	66%	48%	51%	71%	69%	65%	75%		67%	60%	69%	59%	71%	74%	63%
	Undecided	21%	24%	22%	16%	17%	27%	19%		19%	20%	0%	27%	21%	13%	26%
	Undesirable	13%	27%	27%	13%	14%	8%	6%		14%	20%	31%	14%	8%	12%	11%
2af	Applying the sales tax to services as well as goods while reducing the sales tax rate															
	Desirable	38%	45%	45%	29%	40%	38%	33%		45%	60%	40%	40%	54%	41%	39%
	Undecided	17%	21%	20%	22%	14%	14%	18%		14%	11%	22%	12%	11%	17%	14%
	Undesirable	45%	33%	34%	49%	45%	48%	48%		41%	29%	38%	48%	34%	42%	47%
2ag	Applying the sales tax to services as well as goods while keeping the current sales tax rate															
	Desirable	23%	26%	28%	19%	29%	25%	15%		20%	32%	15%	20%	20%	18%	18%
	Undecided	16%	15%	21%	15%	15%	12%	17%		10%	6%	15%	7%	10%	10%	12%
	Undesirable	61%	59%	51%	66%	56%	63%	68%		70%	62%	71%	73%	70%	71%	70%
2ah	Limiting the current California state income tax deduction for home mortgage interest payments to \$25,000 per year															
	Desirable	43%	37%	49%	38%	42%	44%	45%		44%	31%	43%	45%	36%	47%	54%
	Undecided	21%	47%	24%	24%	10%	16%	28%		17%	31%	20%	16%	13%	16%	15%
	Undesirable	36%	16%	27%	38%	48%	40%	28%		40%	38%	38%	40%	51%	37%	31%
2ai	Reassessing non-residential property more frequently than now															
	Desirable	53%	60%	59%	46%	44%	53%	62%		72%	73%	69%	70%	68%	72%	78%
	Undecided	20%	28%	17%	31%	16%	17%	21%		13%	18%	10%	13%	10%	11%	16%
	Undesirable	27%	12%	24%	23%	40%	31%	17%		16%	9%	20%	16%	22%	17%	5%
2aj	Reassessing all property values more frequently while adjusting the current property tax exemption for inflation to about \$28,000 <i>and</i> allowing the exemption to rise with property values going forward															
	Desirable	35%	42%	47%	35%	24%	33%	40%		33%	42%	35%	40%	25%	30%	37%
	Undecided	25%	33%	24%	35%	22%	21%	25%		20%	19%	15%	19%	20%	21%	21%
	Undesirable	40%	25%	29%	31%	54%	47%	35%		47%	38%	50%	41%	55%	49%	43%

Appendix 9: Responses by Age

(#)	Question	T	1	2	3	4	5	6		T	1	2	3	4	5	6
2ak	Allowing local electorates to raise the property tax rate above the current 1% rate cap															
	Desirable	28%	29%	31%	26%	26%	28%	30%		28%	44%	31%	29%	21%	26%	31%
	Undecided	11%	14%	15%	16%	9%	10%	7%		13%	15%	16%	11%	9%	16%	13%
	Undesirable	61%	57%	54%	59%	66%	62%	63%		59%	41%	53%	60%	70%	58%	57%
2al	Lowering local vote requirement to adopt taxes dedicated to specific purposes, to a simple majority so that it is the same as the vote requirement to adopt taxes for general purposes															
	Desirable	46%	47%	46%	45%	46%	46%	46%		42%	42%	51%	35%	38%	44%	47%
	Undecided	17%	19%	13%	22%	16%	15%	15%		16%	24%	7%	23%	14%	15%	19%
	Undesirable	38%	34%	41%	33%	38%	39%	38%		41%	33%	42%	42%	49%	42%	34%
2am	Decreasing the super-majority vote required in the Legislature to raise taxes (about 67%) to 55%															
	Desirable	32%	29%	32%	30%	27%	36%	36%		50%	59%	48%	52%	38%	51%	56%
	Undecided	9%	9%	13%	12%	12%	4%	9%		8%	19%	6%	10%	5%	8%	5%
	Undesirable	59%	62%	55%	58%	60%	60%	55%		43%	22%	46%	38%	57%	41%	38%
3	If the Legislature is allowed to amend an initiative that has already passed, by what sort of majority should it be able to do so?															
	A simple majority (50% plus 1)	13%	18%	17%	11%	12%	10%	12%		9%	3%	12%	14%	6%	6%	11%
	55%	18%	21%	17%	16%	16%	25%	14%		27%	41%	16%	27%	29%	26%	25%
	A two-thirds majority	69%	62%	66%	73%	72%	65%	74%		65%	56%	71%	59%	65%	68%	65%
4	Some people think that the Legislature should contain fewer Legislators, even if that means that each Legislator represents more people. Suppose these people are at one end of a 1-to-7 scale, at point 1. Other people think that each Legislator should represent fewer people, even if that means that the Legislature contains more Legislators. Suppose these people are at the other end of the scale, at point 7. People who are exactly in the middle are at point 4, and of course other people have opinions at other points between 1 and 7. Where would you place yourself on this scale, or wouldn't you have any opinion about that?															
	Fewer legislators	20%	14%	17%	24%	22%	19%	18%		10%	6%	8%	7%	14%	11%	7%
	Exactly in the middle	23%	19%	28%	24%	25%	22%	19%		20%	15%	10%	18%	24%	23%	22%
	More legislators	57%	67%	54%	52%	53%	58%	63%		70%	79%	82%	75%	62%	66%	71%
5	On a 0 to 10 scale, where 0 is "not at all", 10 is "as much as could reasonably be expected," and 5 is exactly in the middle, how much or little would you say the California State Legislature is able to get important things done?															
	Not at all	67%	52%	59%	67%	70%	73%	70%		69%	62%	64%	72%	77%	69%	66%
	Exactly in the middle	16%	30%	17%	16%	13%	16%	13%		10%	18%	8%	10%	6%	11%	12%
	As could be expected	17%	18%	24%	16%	17%	11%	17%		21%	21%	28%	18%	17%	20%	22%
6	On another 0 to 10 scale, where 0 is "not at all", 10 is "completely", and 5 is exactly in the middle, to what extent is the ability of the State Legislature to get things done affected by tensions between the political parties?															
	Not at all	27%	39%	20%	24%	34%	21%	28%		21%	26%	18%	25%	30%	16%	15%
	Exactly in the middle	8%	6%	4%	10%	12%	6%	8%		6%	6%	2%	7%	8%	1%	9%
	Completely	65%	55%	76%	66%	55%	73%	64%		73%	68%	80%	69%	63%	83%	76%

Appendix 9: Responses by Age

(#)	Question	T	1	2	3	4	5	6		T	1	2	3	4	5	6
7	And, on another 0 to 10 scale, where 0 is completely at the local level, 10 is completely at the State level, and 5 is exactly in the middle, how much decision-making authority should there be at the local level versus the State level?															
	Local level	42%	51%	40%	41%	39%	47%	36%		43%	62%	44%	51%	44%	45%	24%
	Exactly in the middle	32%	31%	27%	34%	31%	20%	46%		29%	21%	28%	31%	30%	23%	39%
	State level	27%	17%	33%	25%	30%	33%	17%		27%	18%	28%	18%	26%	32%	36%
8	And, on the same scale, how much taxation power should there be at the local level versus State level?															
	Local level	34%	37%	37%	30%	39%	31%	28%		32%	42%	33%	37%	31%	30%	29%
	Exactly in the middle	40%	37%	37%	42%	31%	44%	48%		33%	30%	29%	31%	33%	32%	40%
	State level	27%	26%	26%	28%	30%	26%	24%		35%	27%	39%	32%	36%	39%	32%
9	On the same scale, where would you say the most important public policy decisions should be made?															
	Local level	25%	31%	30%	22%	29%	22%	21%		25%	29%	40%	37%	25%	17%	12%
	Exactly in the middle	30%	14%	22%	38%	36%	24%	38%		26%	23%	18%	18%	29%	30%	34%
	State level	44%	56%	48%	40%	35%	54%	41%		49%	49%	42%	45%	46%	53%	54%
10	On another 0 to 10 scale, where 0 is “completely by voters in referendums”, 10 is “completely by the State Legislature”, and 5 is exactly in the middle, how many of the State’s major decisions should be made by voters in referendums versus by the State Legislature?															
	By voters in referendums	31%	33%	33%	36%	30%	26%	30%		29%	39%	35%	20%	37%	25%	23%
	Exactly in the middle	25%	33%	30%	20%	28%	21%	21%		26%	30%	27%	34%	18%	26%	28%
	By the State Legislature	45%	33%	38%	44%	42%	53%	49%		45%	30%	39%	46%	45%	49%	49%
11	Some people think that decisions made at the local level reflect the will of the local community more closely than decisions made at the state level. Suppose these people are at one end of a 1-to-7 scale, at point 1. Other people think that decisions made at the local level are more dominated by powerful special interests than decisions made at the state level. Suppose these people are at the other end of the scale, at point 7. People who are exactly in the middle are at point 4, and of course other people have opinions at other points between 1 and 7. Where would you place yourself on this scale, or wouldn’t you have any opinion about that?															
	Reflect local community	47%	59%	41%	43%	49%	51%	40%		56%	61%	60%	57%	55%	55%	53%
	Exactly in the middle	25%	19%	29%	21%	27%	25%	28%		23%	19%	21%	17%	28%	22%	28%
	Dominated by special interests	28%	22%	29%	36%	23%	25%	31%		21%	19%	19%	27%	17%	23%	19%
13a	Replacing the current State Senate and Assembly with a single house would make it easier to pass important legislation															
	Agree strongly	17%	18%	19%	15%	21%	13%	19%		24%	29%	35%	28%	28%	19%	14%
	Agree somewhat	35%	38%	36%	35%	28%	48%	24%		39%	41%	37%	31%	36%	44%	42%
	Neither agree nor disagree	20%	26%	21%	22%	22%	14%	19%		15%	18%	9%	14%	16%	13%	21%
	Disagree somewhat	16%	6%	12%	20%	18%	14%	21%		13%	6%	13%	21%	11%	13%	15%
	Disagree strongly	12%	12%	12%	8%	12%	10%	16%		9%	6%	7%	7%	10%	12%	8%
13b	Replacing the current State Senate and Assembly with a single house would deprive the system of important checks and balances															
	Agree strongly	31%	32%	28%	29%	32%	32%	34%		29%	45%	22%	17%	29%	31%	31%
	Agree somewhat	26%	23%	28%	32%	20%	26%	30%		30%	15%	36%	36%	29%	33%	24%
	Neither agree nor disagree	20%	35%	19%	22%	24%	14%	14%		14%	21%	9%	19%	12%	8%	18%
	Disagree somewhat	13%	6%	21%	8%	11%	18%	11%		18%	9%	24%	19%	16%	23%	15%
	Disagree strongly	9%	3%	5%	8%	13%	9%	10%		10%	9%	9%	10%	14%	5%	13%

Appendix 9: Responses by Age

(#)	Question	T	1	2	3	4	5	6		T	1	2	3	4	5	6
14a	Part-time legislators will tend to represent their districts more closely															
	Agree strongly	16%	6%	9%	18%	14%	21%	20%		10%	12%	11%	15%	11%	5%	8%
	Agree somewhat	27%	44%	33%	25%	22%	26%	22%		22%	21%	30%	24%	16%	25%	19%
	Neither agree nor disagree	18%	12%	26%	17%	18%	16%	19%		16%	12%	13%	13%	11%	18%	26%
	Disagree somewhat	20%	26%	24%	22%	19%	15%	22%		26%	29%	17%	31%	31%	20%	26%
	Disagree strongly	19%	12%	9%	18%	27%	21%	17%		27%	26%	30%	18%	30%	32%	22%
14b	Part-time legislators will be less likely to be career politicians.															
	Agree strongly	30%	21%	28%	20%	33%	41%	27%		25%	15%	41%	13%	30%	30%	19%
	Agree somewhat	41%	39%	43%	44%	31%	39%	51%		42%	52%	37%	45%	37%	42%	42%
	Neither agree nor disagree	12%	24%	15%	10%	14%	9%	7%		12%	12%	10%	16%	8%	8%	19%
	Disagree somewhat	10%	12%	9%	17%	12%	4%	7%		11%	15%	6%	13%	10%	11%	12%
	Disagree strongly	7%	3%	4%	8%	10%	8%	7%		10%	6%	6%	13%	15%	9%	7%
14c	Part-time legislators will tend to be more open to corruption.															
	Agree strongly	10%	16%	14%	10%	12%	5%	6%		11%	9%	15%	18%	13%	9%	4%
	Agree somewhat	17%	23%	14%	17%	17%	14%	19%		20%	19%	13%	23%	23%	20%	20%
	Neither agree nor disagree	34%	42%	40%	34%	27%	36%	31%		34%	56%	43%	24%	25%	31%	41%
	Disagree somewhat	22%	13%	26%	22%	17%	29%	20%		21%	9%	17%	19%	21%	26%	24%
	Disagree strongly	18%	6%	7%	16%	27%	16%	23%		13%	6%	11%	16%	18%	13%	10%
14d	Part-time legislators will tend to be less well informed about policy issues.															
	Agree strongly	15%	10%	11%	17%	17%	16%	14%		25%	38%	17%	27%	23%	30%	19%
	Agree somewhat	30%	32%	31%	38%	21%	26%	38%		29%	21%	34%	19%	34%	28%	32%
	Neither agree nor disagree	20%	29%	20%	15%	29%	15%	13%		20%	21%	19%	18%	20%	19%	22%
	Disagree somewhat	20%	23%	27%	15%	18%	25%	16%		16%	15%	13%	21%	16%	16%	12%
	Disagree strongly	15%	6%	11%	15%	15%	18%	19%		11%	6%	17%	15%	7%	7%	15%
15a	Increasing State Legislators' terms will make them less responsive to their districts.															
	Agree strongly	12%	3%	12%	12%	13%	13%	13%		4%	9%	0%	2%	8%	3%	1%
	Agree somewhat	29%	36%	26%	38%	28%	28%	21%		13%	9%	16%	15%	11%	16%	11%
	Neither agree nor disagree	21%	33%	16%	22%	19%	19%	23%		17%	18%	14%	23%	15%	10%	24%
	Disagree somewhat	26%	24%	35%	18%	26%	26%	30%		39%	41%	47%	32%	42%	38%	35%
	Disagree strongly	12%	3%	12%	10%	14%	15%	14%		27%	24%	22%	29%	24%	32%	29%
15b	Increasing State Legislators' terms will let them spend less time fundraising and campaigning and more time legislating.															
	Agree strongly	26%	33%	30%	23%	18%	26%	31%		43%	63%	43%	40%	32%	48%	44%
	Agree somewhat	42%	36%	40%	43%	40%	46%	43%		39%	22%	35%	39%	51%	40%	35%
	Neither agree nor disagree	13%	15%	14%	11%	17%	9%	13%		9%	6%	10%	13%	8%	6%	12%
	Disagree somewhat	11%	12%	12%	13%	14%	10%	7%		5%	9%	6%	8%	2%	3%	5%
	Disagree strongly	8%	3%	5%	10%	11%	9%	7%		4%	0%	6%	0%	7%	2%	4%
16a	Arnold Schwarzenegger															
	Extremely dissatisfied	76%	74%	80%	89%	71%	70%	74%		75%	67%	77%	83%	73%	73%	77%
	Exactly in the middle	12%	15%	7%	5%	14%	15%	17%		14%	17%	13%	10%	16%	14%	14%
	Extremely satisfied	12%	12%	13%	7%	15%	15%	9%		11%	17%	11%	7%	11%	14%	9%

Appendix 9: Responses by Age

(#)	Question		T	1	2	3	4	5	6		T	1	2	3	4	5	6
16b	Jerry Brown	Extremely dissatisfied	30%	30%	33%	25%	34%	30%	31%		25%	18%	26%	19%	30%	28%	24%
		Exactly in the middle	20%	23%	23%	26%	21%	15%	18%		21%	32%	26%	26%	22%	11%	19%
		Extremely satisfied	49%	47%	44%	49%	45%	56%	51%		54%	50%	49%	55%	48%	61%	57%
16c	California State Senate	Extremely dissatisfied	69%	56%	56%	63%	80%	74%	70%		68%	52%	64%	67%	74%	72%	68%
		Exactly in the middle	19%	30%	22%	23%	16%	12%	19%		18%	26%	14%	23%	13%	16%	23%
		Extremely satisfied	12%	15%	22%	14%	5%	14%	11%		13%	22%	21%	10%	13%	12%	10%
16d	California State Assembly	Extremely dissatisfied	68%	62%	54%	60%	76%	71%	73%		71%	59%	70%	68%	72%	76%	70%
		Exactly in the middle	19%	23%	26%	26%	17%	14%	18%		16%	30%	14%	22%	12%	13%	17%
		Extremely satisfied	13%	15%	21%	14%	7%	15%	9%		13%	11%	16%	10%	16%	11%	13%
16e	California State Legislature	Extremely dissatisfied	72%	58%	62%	67%	78%	77%	72%		70%	61%	73%	70%	70%	75%	67%
		Exactly in the middle	18%	27%	21%	19%	14%	15%	21%		18%	25%	15%	20%	15%	15%	21%
		Extremely satisfied	10%	15%	18%	14%	7%	8%	7%		12%	14%	12%	10%	15%	10%	11%
16f	California's initiative/referendum process	Extremely dissatisfied	50%	46%	43%	53%	51%	48%	57%		37%	42%	40%	39%	36%	32%	42%
		Exactly in the middle	22%	25%	33%	25%	21%	16%	19%		19%	16%	18%	21%	15%	23%	18%
		Extremely satisfied	28%	29%	25%	22%	28%	37%	24%		44%	42%	42%	40%	49%	45%	41%
16g	California's State government	Extremely dissatisfied	72%	65%	66%	73%	77%	75%	67%		64%	61%	67%	66%	74%	64%	52%
		Exactly in the middle	15%	19%	18%	17%	10%	15%	17%		19%	21%	13%	16%	13%	22%	26%
		Extremely satisfied	13%	16%	16%	10%	13%	10%	16%		17%	18%	21%	18%	14%	13%	22%
16h	Your city/town and county's government	Extremely dissatisfied	37%	31%	36%	45%	34%	40%	32%		28%	33%	26%	35%	22%	29%	27%
		Exactly in the middle	20%	17%	25%	20%	17%	18%	23%		20%	21%	15%	23%	24%	19%	15%
		Extremely satisfied	43%	52%	39%	35%	49%	41%	45%		52%	45%	59%	42%	55%	52%	58%
16i	California's local governments generally	Extremely dissatisfied	39%	37%	40%	48%	40%	40%	29%		30%	39%	35%	41%	28%	30%	16%
		Exactly in the middle	29%	26%	25%	22%	26%	37%	35%		32%	23%	23%	26%	41%	34%	34%
		Extremely satisfied	32%	37%	35%	29%	34%	23%	37%		38%	39%	42%	33%	31%	36%	49%
18	Some people think that local communities should be able to decide their own taxes and services, even if that means big differences between communities. Suppose these people are at one end of a 1-to-7 scale, at point 1. Other people think that taxes and services should be the same throughout the state, even if that means less local control. Suppose these people are at the other end of the scale, at point 7. People who are exactly in the middle are at point 4. Where would you place yourself on this scale, or wouldn't you have any opinion about that?																
		Local communities decide	39%	44%	47%	43%	42%	38%	24%		42%	48%	40%	51%	47%	38%	32%
		Exactly in the middle	21%	25%	13%	20%	20%	16%	30%		20%	32%	20%	11%	16%	20%	28%
		Same throughout the state	41%	31%	40%	37%	38%	46%	46%		38%	19%	40%	38%	37%	42%	39%

Appendix 9: Responses by Age

(#)	Question	T	1	2	3	4	5	6		T	1	2	3	4	5	6
19	Some people think that government should provide certain benefits and services, even if that means higher taxes. Suppose these people are at one end of a 1-to-7 scale, at point 1. Other people think that government should lower taxes, even if that means reduced benefits and services. Suppose these people are at the other end of the scale, at point 7. People who are exactly in the middle are at point 4. Where would you place yourself on this scale, or wouldn't you have any opinion about that?															
	Provide certain benefits and services, even if that means higher taxes	46%	44%	57%	44%	42%	44%	45%		57%	73%	71%	55%	45%	53%	59%
	Exactly in the middle	18%	15%	15%	16%	17%	16%	23%		15%	18%	8%	18%	14%	16%	19%
	Lower taxes, even if that means reducing benefits and services	37%	41%	28%	39%	41%	40%	32%		28%	9%	20%	27%	41%	31%	23%
20	Some people think that majorities should always have their way no matter how big the minorities are or how strongly they feel. Suppose these people are at one end of a 1-to-7 scale, at point 1. Other people think that minorities should have their way when they are large enough or feel strongly enough. Suppose these people are at the other end of the scale, at point 7. People who are exactly in the middle are at point 4. Where would you place yourself on this scale, or wouldn't you have any opinion about that?															
	Majorities always have their way	34%	39%	42%	29%	35%	41%	23%		37%	38%	27%	38%	28%	42%	45%
	Exactly in the middle	33%	21%	14%	37%	31%	29%	54%		33%	25%	29%	31%	41%	36%	26%
	Minorities have their way when they are big enough or feel strongly enough	33%	39%	44%	34%	34%	30%	23%		31%	38%	44%	31%	31%	22%	29%
21	Some people think that the best society is one in which nobody can tell anybody else what to do, even if there is a cost to others. Suppose these people are at one end of a 1-to-7 scale, at point 1. Other people think that the best society is one in which the community can decide together what people can and cannot do, even if some people object. Suppose these people are at the other end of the scale, at point 7. People who are exactly in the middle are at point 4. Where would you place yourself on this scale, or wouldn't you have any opinion about that?															
	Nobody can tell anybody else what to do	18%	9%	22%	23%	18%	21%	10%		20%	18%	20%	26%	21%	22%	12%
	Exactly in the middle	19%	27%	9%	20%	19%	17%	22%		22%	35%	24%	18%	22%	18%	24%
	Community can decide	64%	64%	70%	57%	63%	62%	68%		58%	47%	56%	56%	56%	60%	64%
22	Some people think that the best government is one in which everyone gets to vote directly on making the laws. Suppose these people are at one end of a 1-to-7 scale, at point 1. Other people think that the best government is one in which everyone gets to vote for representatives who then vote on making the laws. Suppose these people are at the other end of the scale, at point 7. People who are exactly in the middle are at point 4. Where would you place yourself on this scale, or wouldn't you have any opinion about that?															
	Everyone votes on laws	34%	52%	48%	39%	36%	23%	24%		34%	45%	45%	34%	40%	24%	25%
	Exactly in the middle	20%	18%	13%	23%	17%	24%	21%		16%	18%	22%	11%	15%	20%	13%
	Representatives vote on laws	46%	30%	39%	39%	47%	54%	55%		50%	36%	33%	54%	45%	56%	61%

Appendix 11: Responses by Income

T=Total

<\$25k = Less than \$25,000

<\$50k = \$25,000 to \$49,999

<\$75k = \$50,000 to \$74,999

<\$100k = \$75,000 to \$99,999

<\$125k = \$100,000 to \$124,999

<\$150k = \$125,000 to \$149,999

>\$150k = \$150,000 or More

#	Question	(Before)								(After)							
		T	<\$25k	<\$50k	<\$75k	<\$100k	<\$125k	<\$150k	>\$150k	T	<\$25k	<\$50k	<\$75k	<\$100k	<\$125k	<\$150k	>\$150k
1	To begin with, all in all, on a 0 to 10 scale, where 0 is "extremely poorly", 10 is "extremely well," and 5 is exactly in the middle, how well or poorly would you say the system of democracy in California works these days?																
	Well	21%	18%	27%	28%	19%	14%	29%	21%	38%	38%	30%	41%	47%	35%	29%	54%
	Undecided	18%	22%	20%	16%	13%	21%	6%	21%	15%	10%	23%	14%	11%	14%	21%	11%
	Not well	61%	60%	54%	56%	67%	64%	65%	59%	47%	53%	47%	46%	42%	51%	50%	35%
2a	Creating a formal review process to allow an initiative's proponents to amend an initiative following public input																
	Desirable	60%	55%	62%	57%	61%	65%	53%	64%	76%	66%	78%	75%	80%	77%	82%	80%
	Undecided	19%	23%	17%	26%	20%	22%	20%	6%	9%	15%	7%	7%	10%	9%	0%	5%
	Undesirable	21%	23%	21%	17%	19%	13%	27%	31%	16%	19%	15%	18%	10%	15%	18%	15%
2b	Allowing the Legislature to remove an initiative from the ballot by enacting it into law																
	Desirable	37%	30%	31%	42%	40%	38%	44%	41%	34%	24%	39%	38%	37%	43%	29%	28%
	Undecided	14%	13%	8%	17%	12%	24%	0%	8%	17%	24%	15%	20%	8%	13%	18%	23%
	Undesirable	49%	57%	61%	41%	48%	38%	56%	51%	49%	52%	46%	42%	55%	45%	53%	50%
2c	Allowing a simple majority of the State Legislature to place a countermeasure to an already qualified initiative on the ballot next to that initiative																
	Desirable	32%	36%	35%	33%	30%	30%	38%	35%	30%	25%	30%	35%	26%	32%	24%	30%
	Undecided	17%	20%	12%	18%	11%	26%	6%	11%	13%	16%	19%	11%	10%	21%	6%	10%
	Undesirable	50%	43%	53%	49%	59%	43%	56%	54%	58%	59%	52%	55%	64%	47%	71%	60%
2d	Allowing the Legislature to amend an initiative that has already passed, subject to a public review and the agreement of the initiative's proponents																
	Desirable	43%	47%	41%	42%	36%	46%	59%	43%	37%	35%	33%	39%	38%	34%	35%	49%
	Undecided	13%	18%	16%	17%	16%	9%	0%	5%	12%	11%	17%	14%	15%	11%	6%	7%
	Undesirable	44%	36%	43%	40%	47%	46%	41%	51%	51%	54%	50%	48%	48%	55%	59%	44%
2e	Allowing the Legislature to amend an initiative that has already passed, subject to a two-thirds vote, even if an initiative's proponents do not agree with the amendment																
	Desirable	25%	22%	23%	22%	25%	32%	29%	21%	18%	20%	19%	15%	10%	24%	35%	22%
	Undecided	15%	17%	12%	17%	18%	15%	6%	21%	9%	7%	15%	13%	13%	7%	0%	2%
	Undesirable	61%	61%	65%	61%	57%	53%	65%	58%	73%	74%	67%	72%	77%	69%	65%	76%

Appendix 11: Responses by Income

(#)	Question	T	<\$25k	<\$50k	<\$75k	<\$100k	<\$125k	<\$150k	>\$150k	T	<\$25k	<\$50k	<\$75k	<\$100k	<\$125k	<\$150k	>\$150k
2f	Allowing an initiative's proponents to withdraw it after it qualifies for the ballot																
	Desirable	47%	32%	46%	52%	46%	56%	53%	51%	57%	47%	49%	59%	65%	56%	59%	68%
	Undecided	21%	30%	20%	19%	20%	22%	18%	19%	17%	22%	25%	14%	15%	11%	24%	12%
	Undesirable	32%	38%	34%	30%	33%	22%	29%	30%	26%	31%	25%	27%	20%	33%	18%	20%
2g	Allowing an initiative's proponents to withdraw it after it qualifies for the ballot																
	Desirable	88%	89%	88%	87%	88%	94%	94%	84%	84%	87%	75%	87%	77%	91%	94%	85%
	Undecided	6%	7%	8%	9%	5%	4%	6%	3%	7%	7%	11%	5%	13%	2%	6%	5%
	Undesirable	5%	4%	4%	4%	7%	2%	0%	13%	9%	7%	13%	8%	10%	7%	0%	10%
2h	Requiring all ballot measures that require new expenditures to indicate how they will be paid for																
	Desirable	87%	89%	81%	87%	89%	91%	94%	76%	91%	98%	84%	94%	92%	91%	94%	88%
	Undecided	7%	4%	9%	6%	7%	2%	0%	16%	5%	0%	11%	3%	3%	7%	0%	2%
	Undesirable	6%	7%	9%	6%	4%	6%	6%	8%	4%	2%	5%	3%	5%	2%	6%	10%
2i	Requiring the ballot pamphlet to provide an analysis by the Legislative Analyst of how new initiative programs will likely be paid for																
	Desirable	67%	72%	52%	62%	68%	77%	79%	74%	67%	67%	58%	69%	67%	76%	67%	68%
	Undecided	20%	16%	35%	22%	21%	18%	14%	9%	19%	21%	24%	24%	16%	17%	0%	15%
	Undesirable	13%	12%	13%	16%	11%	5%	7%	17%	13%	12%	18%	8%	17%	7%	33%	17%
2j	Making the vote threshold needed to pass an initiative the same as any vote threshold that the initiative itself requires of the public in the future																
	Desirable	82%	73%	76%	84%	82%	89%	88%	87%	91%	87%	89%	91%	93%	93%	88%	93%
	Undecided	9%	9%	14%	11%	7%	6%	6%	8%	4%	7%	9%	3%	3%	4%	0%	0%
	Undesirable	8%	18%	10%	5%	11%	4%	6%	5%	5%	7%	2%	5%	3%	2%	12%	7%
2k	Increasing the number of Assembly districts from 80 to 120																
	Desirable	61%	67%	63%	53%	63%	65%	69%	64%	62%	52%	52%	62%	70%	71%	56%	68%
	Undecided	17%	14%	20%	17%	13%	12%	13%	19%	17%	20%	30%	15%	17%	11%	13%	13%
	Undesirable	23%	19%	17%	30%	23%	23%	19%	17%	21%	27%	19%	23%	13%	18%	31%	20%
2l	Expanding the size of districts and electing more than one legislative representative from each district																
	Desirable	48%	66%	41%	52%	38%	48%	43%	36%	49%	62%	47%	51%	46%	52%	20%	40%
	Undecided	19%	11%	22%	20%	21%	26%	21%	14%	17%	10%	16%	18%	16%	22%	7%	18%
	Undesirable	33%	23%	37%	27%	40%	26%	36%	50%	34%	29%	37%	30%	39%	26%	73%	43%
2m	Replacing the current State Senate and Assembly with a single house of 120 members																
	Desirable	32%	42%	21%	28%	46%	33%	43%	28%	42%	50%	44%	41%	41%	51%	35%	39%
	Undecided	25%	26%	28%	34%	19%	25%	7%	17%	15%	9%	13%	16%	20%	17%	6%	10%
	Undesirable	43%	33%	51%	38%	35%	43%	50%	56%	43%	41%	43%	43%	39%	32%	59%	51%
2n	Making the State Legislature part-time and paying legislators																
	Desirable	45%	62%	47%	43%	50%	26%	64%	35%	26%	43%	35%	28%	23%	13%	35%	20%
	Undecided	13%	11%	16%	14%	11%	22%	7%	14%	9%	9%	16%	7%	5%	7%	12%	10%
	Undesirable	42%	27%	38%	43%	39%	52%	29%	51%	64%	48%	49%	64%	72%	80%	53%	71%

Appendix 11: Responses by Income

(#)	Question	T	<\$25k	<\$50k	<\$75k	<\$100k	<\$125k	<\$150k	>\$150k	T	<\$25k	<\$50k	<\$75k	<\$100k	<\$125k	<\$150k	>\$150k
2o	Reducing the length of the state legislative session and requiring legislators to spend more time in their districts																
	Desirable	57%	67%	60%	59%	51%	41%	67%	47%	46%	64%	65%	40%	43%	43%	38%	37%
	Undecided	19%	20%	18%	16%	20%	35%	20%	14%	18%	11%	5%	24%	18%	19%	13%	24%
	Undesirable	24%	13%	22%	24%	29%	24%	13%	39%	36%	26%	29%	35%	39%	38%	50%	39%
2p	Allowing voters to rank the candidates in order of preference, so that the winner can be decided without a second election																
	Desirable	61%	66%	54%	67%	65%	61%	53%	49%	57%	56%	54%	59%	59%	61%	59%	51%
	Undecided	13%	18%	16%	9%	4%	20%	18%	16%	13%	13%	16%	15%	8%	16%	6%	11%
	Undesirable	26%	16%	30%	24%	32%	20%	29%	35%	30%	31%	30%	26%	33%	23%	35%	38%
2q	Lengthening Assembly terms from 2 years to 4, and Senate terms from 4 years to 6																
	Desirable	46%	31%	40%	47%	53%	42%	53%	50%	81%	58%	84%	88%	85%	81%	71%	90%
	Undecided	14%	16%	6%	15%	13%	28%	0%	18%	8%	18%	9%	7%	3%	9%	18%	2%
	Undesirable	40%	53%	54%	37%	35%	30%	47%	32%	11%	24%	7%	4%	12%	11%	12%	7%
2r	Requiring economic impact analyses of major legislation before passage																
	Desirable	89%	85%	80%	86%	98%	87%	94%	92%	90%	78%	89%	91%	95%	94%	94%	90%
	Undecided	8%	11%	14%	9%	0%	13%	0%	8%	5%	7%	9%	3%	2%	6%	0%	2%
	Undesirable	3%	4%	6%	5%	2%	0%	6%	0%	5%	16%	2%	5%	3%	0%	6%	7%
2s	Establishing clear goals for each government program and assessing whether progress is being made toward these goals at least once every ten years																
	Desirable	86%	74%	80%	91%	89%	85%	100%	84%	90%	87%	89%	90%	89%	91%	94%	95%
	Undecided	8%	13%	10%	7%	4%	11%	0%	11%	6%	2%	7%	7%	8%	4%	0%	0%
	Undesirable	6%	13%	10%	1%	7%	4%	0%	5%	5%	11%	4%	2%	3%	4%	6%	5%
2t	Requiring the Governor and the Legislature to adopt two-year instead of one-year budgets																
	Desirable	57%	41%	47%	57%	72%	59%	44%	62%	73%	58%	63%	77%	75%	83%	71%	80%
	Undecided	25%	29%	24%	29%	21%	30%	31%	16%	15%	16%	17%	16%	18%	13%	12%	8%
	Undesirable	18%	29%	29%	13%	7%	11%	25%	22%	13%	26%	20%	7%	7%	4%	18%	13%
2u	Requiring the Governor and the Legislature to publish three and five year budget projections prior to the budget vote each year																
	Desirable	81%	65%	83%	81%	89%	85%	94%	72%	83%	69%	77%	84%	85%	96%	81%	88%
	Undecided	12%	16%	9%	12%	9%	11%	6%	22%	9%	11%	13%	11%	8%	4%	6%	10%
	Undesirable	8%	19%	9%	8%	2%	4%	0%	6%	7%	20%	9%	5%	7%	0%	13%	3%
2v	Transferring from the state to local governments control and financing of services provided at the local level <i>and</i> requiring minimum standards for delivering them																
	Desirable	83%	65%	58%	74%	72%	69%	76%	53%	73%	73%	59%	77%	75%	87%	65%	68%
	Undecided	9%	17%	16%	19%	15%	25%	3%	33%	14%	4%	19%	12%	17%	11%	18%	15%
	Undesirable	7%	19%	26%	7%	13%	6%	22%	13%	13%	22%	22%	12%	8%	2%	18%	17%
2w	Allowing local governments to raise taxes for local services in exchange for increased coordination of service delivery and public reporting of performance																
	Desirable	55%	58%	37%	53%	60%	62%	59%	65%	63%	50%	58%	64%	71%	73%	81%	63%
	Undecided	15%	12%	12%	17%	16%	22%	6%	5%	16%	15%	17%	20%	10%	14%	13%	12%
	Undesirable	30%	30%	51%	29%	24%	16%	35%	30%	22%	35%	25%	16%	19%	14%	6%	24%

Appendix 11: Responses by Income

(#)	Question	T	<\$25k	<\$50k	<\$75k	<\$100k	<\$125k	<\$150k	>\$150k	T	<\$25k	<\$50k	<\$75k	<\$100k	<\$125k	<\$150k	>\$150k
2x	Creating a stable source of funds for regional priorities by dedicating a portion of tax revenue from economic growth to those priorities																
	Desirable	63%	54%	69%	69%	70%	79%	63%	79%	67%	73%	53%	72%	64%	84%	56%	62%
	Undecided	16%	25%	20%	22%	26%	7%	23%	21%	21%	7%	41%	25%	21%	11%	6%	24%
	Undesirable	22%	21%	11%	10%	5%	14%	14%	0%	11%	20%	6%	3%	16%	4%	38%	14%
2y	Direct any savings resulting from successful local management of state resources to those local governments, in exchange for monitoring their own performance and being accountable and innovative in their operations																
	Desirable	75%	73%	67%	75%	79%	84%	82%	72%	76%	71%	70%	76%	74%	89%	88%	76%
	Undecided	13%	9%	15%	13%	14%	9%	12%	17%	12%	7%	13%	13%	15%	7%	12%	10%
	Undesirable	12%	18%	19%	12%	7%	7%	6%	11%	12%	21%	17%	11%	11%	5%	0%	15%
2z	Requiring state and local governments to identify policy goals and publish their progress toward meeting them																
	Desirable	89%	89%	78%	90%	91%	96%	100%	84%	92%	84%	93%	95%	92%	96%	94%	93%
	Undecided	7%	9%	12%	8%	3%	4%	0%	8%	5%	11%	7%	2%	3%	4%	0%	5%
	Undesirable	4%	2%	10%	2%	5%	0%	0%	8%	3%	4%	0%	3%	5%	0%	6%	2%
2aa	Requiring legislation creating new programs that cost \$25 million or more to indicate how they will be paid for																
	Desirable	91%	85%	84%	91%	96%	96%	94%	84%	90%	85%	85%	94%	88%	98%	94%	93%
	Undecided	5%	2%	8%	8%	2%	4%	0%	8%	5%	4%	7%	3%	8%	2%	0%	2%
	Undesirable	4%	13%	8%	1%	2%	0%	6%	8%	5%	11%	7%	3%	3%	0%	6%	5%
2ab	Requiring legislation creating tax cuts that cost \$25 million or more to indicate how they will be paid for																
	Desirable	84%	83%	76%	85%	82%	89%	94%	84%	84%	83%	85%	88%	81%	89%	81%	88%
	Undecided	6%	2%	10%	8%	4%	6%	6%	5%	8%	2%	9%	5%	8%	7%	6%	8%
	Undesirable	10%	15%	14%	8%	14%	4%	0%	11%	8%	15%	6%	6%	10%	4%	13%	5%
2ac	Requiring legislation creating new programs or tax cuts that cost \$25 million or more to indicate how they will be paid for																
	Desirable	84%	85%	74%	86%	82%	89%	94%	84%	88%	87%	87%	89%	85%	96%	81%	90%
	Undecided	8%	2%	16%	6%	7%	7%	6%	8%	7%	7%	6%	6%	7%	4%	6%	5%
	Undesirable	8%	13%	10%	7%	11%	4%	0%	8%	6%	7%	7%	4%	8%	0%	13%	5%
2ad	Requiring that one-time revenue spikes only be spent on one-time projects, paying off debt, and filling the state rainy-day fund																
	Desirable	80%	77%	80%	78%	82%	86%	88%	70%	84%	87%	77%	85%	84%	96%	88%	85%
	Undecided	12%	7%	11%	12%	16%	7%	12%	16%	7%	2%	15%	7%	7%	4%	0%	3%
	Undesirable	8%	16%	9%	10%	2%	7%	0%	14%	9%	11%	8%	7%	10%	0%	12%	13%
2ae	Increasing the size of the State's rainy-day fund from 5% to 10% of the State budget																
	Desirable	66%	60%	57%	60%	79%	76%	69%	67%	67%	69%	66%	69%	62%	70%	76%	74%
	Undecided	21%	21%	20%	29%	14%	20%	13%	17%	19%	18%	15%	22%	22%	16%	12%	8%
	Undesirable	13%	19%	23%	11%	7%	4%	19%	17%	14%	13%	19%	10%	17%	14%	12%	18%

Appendix 11: Responses by Income

(#)	Question	T	<\$25k	<\$50k	<\$75k	<\$100k	<\$125k	<\$150k	>\$150k	T	<\$25k	<\$50k	<\$75k	<\$100k	<\$125k	<\$150k	>\$150k
2af	Applying the sales tax to services as well as goods while reducing the sales tax rate																
	Desirable	38%	30%	43%	30%	33%	41%	50%	56%	45%	31%	44%	43%	50%	51%	53%	56%
	Undecided	17%	14%	14%	25%	21%	14%	6%	11%	14%	21%	9%	15%	12%	16%	29%	12%
	Undesirable	45%	56%	43%	45%	46%	45%	44%	33%	41%	48%	46%	42%	38%	33%	18%	32%
2ag	Applying the sales tax to services as well as goods while keeping the current sales tax rate																
	Desirable	23%	14%	26%	24%	20%	27%	13%	39%	20%	22%	24%	19%	19%	13%	24%	23%
	Undecided	16%	19%	18%	15%	14%	14%	13%	11%	10%	18%	4%	16%	5%	9%	6%	10%
	Undesirable	61%	67%	56%	60%	66%	59%	75%	50%	70%	60%	72%	65%	76%	78%	71%	68%
2ah	Limiting the current California state income tax deduction for home mortgage interest payments to \$25,000 per year																
	Desirable	20%	48%	49%	47%	49%	27%	29%	33%	44%	48%	58%	45%	28%	51%	50%	41%
	Undecided	10%	19%	24%	16%	19%	27%	6%	33%	17%	18%	16%	23%	15%	18%	0%	10%
	Undesirable	70%	33%	27%	37%	33%	47%	65%	33%	40%	35%	27%	32%	57%	31%	50%	49%
2ai	Reassessing non-residential property more frequently than now																
	Desirable	53%	60%	38%	56%	40%	59%	71%	57%	72%	68%	72%	78%	71%	70%	65%	73%
	Undecided	20%	18%	27%	18%	33%	20%	0%	9%	13%	11%	17%	7%	14%	17%	24%	10%
	Undesirable	27%	23%	36%	27%	27%	20%	29%	34%	16%	21%	11%	15%	15%	13%	12%	17%
2aj	Reassessing all property values more frequently while adjusting the current property tax exemption for inflation to about \$28,000 and allowing the exemption to rise with property values going forward																
	Desirable	35%	45%	29%	35%	23%	35%	25%	44%	33%	31%	36%	35%	25%	40%	31%	41%
	Undecided	25%	26%	22%	24%	26%	35%	8%	24%	20%	23%	19%	21%	22%	21%	0%	5%
	Undesirable	40%	29%	49%	41%	51%	29%	67%	32%	47%	46%	45%	44%	53%	40%	69%	54%
2ak	Allowing local electorates to raise the property tax rate above the current 1% rate cap																
	Desirable	28%	21%	26%	32%	23%	32%	13%	31%	28%	26%	27%	31%	29%	31%	19%	29%
	Undecided	11%	12%	6%	13%	7%	20%	7%	9%	13%	15%	8%	15%	10%	16%	0%	20%
	Undesirable	61%	67%	68%	56%	70%	48%	80%	60%	59%	59%	65%	54%	61%	53%	81%	51%
2al	Lowering local vote requirement to adopt taxes dedicated to specific purposes, to a simple majority so that it is the same as the vote requirement to adopt taxes for general purposes																
	Desirable	46%	47%	39%	52%	41%	51%	38%	47%	42%	34%	38%	49%	41%	42%	44%	46%
	Undecided	17%	14%	20%	18%	17%	19%	6%	11%	16%	23%	21%	13%	20%	9%	13%	12%
	Undesirable	38%	40%	41%	31%	43%	30%	56%	42%	41%	43%	40%	38%	39%	49%	44%	41%
2am	Decreasing the super-majority vote required in the Legislature to raise taxes (about 67%) to 55%																
	Desirable	32%	32%	25%	32%	26%	43%	13%	39%	50%	51%	43%	55%	50%	52%	53%	55%
	Undecided	9%	6%	6%	12%	13%	11%	6%	8%	8%	7%	15%	7%	3%	7%	6%	3%
	Undesirable	59%	62%	69%	57%	60%	45%	81%	53%	43%	42%	42%	38%	47%	41%	41%	43%
q3	If the Legislature is allowed to amend an initiative that has already passed, by what sort of majority should it be able to do so?																
	A simple majority (50% plus 1)	13%	19%	12%	11%	4%	12%	13%	28%	9%	2%	12%	10%	9%	13%	13%	6%
	55%	18%	21%	12%	24%	8%	24%	13%	16%	27%	29%	29%	32%	26%	17%	20%	23%
	A two-thirds majority	69%	60%	77%	66%	88%	63%	75%	56%	64%	69%	59%	58%	65%	70%	67%	71%

Appendix 11: Responses by Income

(#)	Question	T	<\$25k	<\$50k	<\$75k	<\$100k	<\$125k	<\$150k	>\$150k	T	<\$25k	<\$50k	<\$75k	<\$100k	<\$125k	<\$150k	>\$150k
q4	Some people think that the Legislature should contain fewer Legislators, even if that means that each Legislator represents more people. Suppose these people are at one end of a 1-to-7 scale, at point 1. Other people think that each Legislator should represent fewer people, even if that means that the Legislature contains more Legislators. Suppose these people are at the other end of the scale, at point 7. People who are exactly in the middle are at point 4, and of course other people have opinions at other points between 1 and 7. Where would you place yourself on this scale, or wouldn't you have any opinion about that?																
	Fewer legislators	20%	31%	12%	22%	15%	11%	31%	16%	10%	20%	9%	10%	3%	7%	6%	12%
	Exactly in the middle	23%	22%	39%	20%	27%	16%	19%	22%	20%	18%	22%	20%	20%	18%	31%	15%
	More legislators	57%	47%	49%	57%	58%	73%	50%	62%	70%	62%	69%	70%	77%	76%	63%	73%
q5	On a 0 to 10 scale, where 0 is "not at all", 10 is "as much as could reasonably be expected," and 5 is exactly in the middle, how much or little would you say the California State Legislature is able to get important things done?																
	Not at all	67%	67%	57%	65%	71%	65%	76%	76%	69%	73%	73%	60%	75%	70%	59%	78%
	Exactly in the middle	16%	20%	16%	15%	12%	21%	12%	16%	10%	11%	13%	14%	2%	9%	18%	10%
	As could be expected	17%	13%	27%	20%	17%	15%	12%	8%	21%	16%	15%	26%	23%	21%	24%	12%
q6	On another 0 to 10 scale, where 0 is "not at all", 10 is "completely", and 5 is exactly in the middle, to what extent is the ability of the State Legislature to get things done affected by tensions between the political parties?																
	Not at all	27%	42%	29%	29%	25%	25%	18%	21%	21%	24%	31%	22%	16%	13%	29%	15%
	Exactly in the middle	8%	6%	12%	11%	7%	6%	12%	0%	6%	4%	11%	6%	10%	2%	0%	0%
	Completely	65%	52%	59%	60%	68%	69%	71%	79%	73%	71%	57%	72%	74%	85%	71%	85%
q7	And, on another 0 to 10 scale, where 0 is completely at the local level, 10 is completely at the State level, and 5 is exactly in the middle, how much decision-making authority should there be at the local level versus the State level?																
	Local level	42%	52%	38%	37%	39%	38%	53%	53%	43%	38%	38%	42%	51%	47%	35%	48%
	Exactly in the middle	32%	26%	33%	34%	40%	32%	24%	24%	29%	33%	33%	34%	17%	30%	41%	25%
	State level	27%	22%	29%	29%	21%	30%	24%	24%	27%	29%	29%	24%	32%	23%	24%	28%
q8	And, on the same scale, how much taxation power should there be at the local level versus State level?																
	Local level	34%	33%	24%	37%	36%	34%	24%	39%	32%	38%	28%	35%	42%	19%	29%	30%
	Exactly in the middle	40%	43%	51%	34%	44%	39%	41%	39%	33%	27%	33%	36%	30%	45%	35%	25%
	State level	27%	24%	24%	29%	20%	27%	35%	21%	35%	36%	39%	30%	28%	36%	35%	45%
q9	On the same scale, where would you say the most important public policy decisions should be made?																
	Local level	25%	40%	25%	24%	30%	17%	29%	24%	25%	25%	31%	27%	28%	28%	25%	15%
	Exactly in the middle	30%	23%	37%	33%	32%	17%	29%	32%	26%	25%	24%	22%	30%	23%	13%	32%
	State level	44%	37%	37%	43%	38%	66%	41%	45%	49%	50%	44%	51%	42%	49%	63%	54%

Appendix 11: Responses by Income

(#)	Question	T	<\$25k	<\$50k	<\$75k	<\$100k	<\$125k	<\$150k	>\$150k	T	<\$25k	<\$50k	<\$75k	<\$100k	<\$125k	<\$150k	>\$150k
q10	On another 0 to 10 scale, where 0 is “completely by voters in referendums”, 10 is “completely by the State Legislature”, and 5 is exactly in the middle, how many of the State’s major decisions should be made by voters in referendums versus by the State Legislature?																
	By voters in referendums	31%	48%	35%	31%	26%	27%	19%	16%	29%	38%	33%	32%	24%	18%	24%	20%
	Exactly in the middle	25%	24%	27%	28%	25%	22%	31%	19%	26%	32%	24%	26%	31%	22%	35%	17%
	By the State Legislature	45%	29%	39%	41%	49%	51%	50%	65%	45%	30%	43%	42%	45%	60%	41%	63%
q11	Some people think that decisions made at the local level reflect the will of the local community more closely than decisions made at the state level. Suppose these people are at one end of a 1-to-7 scale, at point 1. Other people think that decisions made at the local level are more dominated by powerful special interests than decisions made at the state level. Suppose these people are at the other end of the scale, at point 7. People who are exactly in the middle are at point 4, and of course other people have opinions at other points between 1 and 7. Where would you place yourself on this scale, or wouldn’t you have any opinion about that?																
	Reflect local community	47%	43%	44%	53%	52%	50%	40%	39%	56%	50%	43%	60%	62%	56%	56%	63%
	Exactly in the middle	25%	25%	32%	25%	21%	24%	47%	14%	23%	18%	31%	22%	20%	29%	38%	10%
	Dominated by special interests	28%	32%	24%	22%	27%	26%	13%	47%	21%	33%	25%	18%	18%	16%	6%	27%
13a	Replacing the current State Senate and Assembly with a single house would make it easier to pass important legislation																
	Agree strongly	17%	19%	22%	13%	19%	20%	38%	11%	24%	27%	25%	27%	17%	33%	18%	23%
	Agree somewhat	35%	36%	33%	33%	44%	31%	19%	36%	39%	36%	39%	29%	51%	37%	47%	45%
	Neither agree nor disagree	20%	24%	22%	22%	11%	18%	13%	33%	15%	18%	10%	16%	19%	9%	12%	15%
	Disagree somewhat	16%	14%	16%	18%	17%	18%	13%	11%	13%	9%	18%	17%	10%	15%	18%	10%
	Disagree strongly	12%	7%	7%	14%	9%	13%	19%	8%	9%	11%	8%	12%	3%	7%	6%	8%
13b	Replacing the current State Senate and Assembly with a single house would deprive the system of important checks and balances																
	Agree strongly	31%	24%	35%	27%	31%	35%	31%	39%	29%	14%	26%	31%	33%	22%	24%	39%
	Agree somewhat	26%	32%	21%	28%	35%	13%	25%	31%	30%	27%	26%	35%	28%	37%	35%	27%
	Neither agree nor disagree	20%	21%	23%	23%	13%	24%	6%	17%	14%	16%	14%	14%	16%	4%	6%	12%
	Disagree somewhat	13%	13%	8%	13%	16%	22%	19%	6%	18%	20%	24%	11%	16%	28%	29%	15%
	Disagree strongly	9%	11%	13%	9%	5%	7%	19%	8%	10%	23%	10%	9%	7%	9%	6%	7%
14a	Part-time legislators will tend to represent their districts more closely																
	Agree strongly	16%	27%	23%	12%	18%	9%	18%	14%	10%	27%	15%	5%	7%	9%	12%	2%
	Agree somewhat	27%	43%	28%	21%	25%	25%	18%	24%	22%	22%	24%	21%	26%	17%	18%	20%
	Neither agree nor disagree	18%	9%	13%	20%	25%	18%	24%	11%	16%	13%	13%	15%	18%	20%	24%	17%
	Disagree somewhat	20%	11%	21%	27%	11%	32%	29%	19%	26%	16%	22%	32%	23%	30%	18%	22%
	Disagree strongly	19%	9%	15%	21%	21%	16%	12%	32%	27%	22%	26%	27%	26%	24%	29%	39%

Appendix 11: Responses by Income

(#)	Question	T	<\$25k	<\$50k	<\$75k	<\$100k	<\$125k	<\$150k	>\$150k	T	<\$25k	<\$50k	<\$75k	<\$100k	<\$125k	<\$150k	>\$150k
14b	Part-time legislators will be less likely to be career politicians.																
	Agree strongly	30%	30%	27%	33%	35%	28%	41%	27%	25%	24%	35%	19%	26%	36%	24%	18%
	Agree somewhat	41%	36%	50%	34%	41%	52%	35%	30%	42%	41%	31%	48%	39%	43%	53%	43%
	Neither agree nor disagree	12%	16%	13%	15%	4%	4%	12%	19%	12%	11%	20%	10%	8%	13%	0%	10%
	Disagree somewhat	10%	11%	4%	12%	7%	13%	12%	8%	11%	17%	7%	13%	10%	4%	12%	18%
	Disagree strongly	7%	7%	6%	7%	13%	2%	0%	16%	10%	7%	7%	11%	16%	4%	12%	13%
14c	Part-time legislators will tend to be more open to corruption.																
	Agree strongly	10%	8%	6%	8%	11%	11%	12%	14%	11%	12%	10%	12%	8%	13%	18%	12%
	Agree somewhat	17%	10%	24%	20%	17%	7%	24%	14%	20%	16%	12%	22%	28%	15%	18%	24%
	Neither agree nor disagree	34%	33%	34%	35%	25%	39%	24%	46%	34%	37%	45%	33%	23%	32%	35%	39%
	Disagree somewhat	22%	30%	20%	19%	30%	23%	29%	11%	21%	16%	27%	21%	26%	19%	18%	12%
	Disagree strongly	18%	20%	16%	19%	17%	20%	12%	14%	13%	19%	6%	12%	15%	21%	12%	12%
14d	Part-time legislators will tend to be less well informed about policy issues.																
	Agree strongly	15%	10%	15%	13%	15%	18%	12%	27%	25%	20%	23%	29%	26%	21%	35%	23%
	Agree somewhat	30%	29%	19%	35%	37%	33%	41%	16%	29%	26%	23%	27%	34%	36%	6%	45%
	Neither agree nor disagree	20%	24%	23%	18%	22%	13%	6%	16%	20%	22%	23%	17%	15%	26%	29%	5%
	Disagree somewhat	20%	24%	27%	15%	17%	16%	29%	30%	16%	9%	21%	14%	20%	9%	12%	28%
	Disagree strongly	15%	14%	15%	18%	9%	20%	12%	11%	11%	24%	11%	13%	5%	9%	18%	0%
15a	Increasing State Legislators' terms will make them less responsive to their districts.																
	Agree strongly	12%	9%	18%	10%	11%	11%	13%	16%	4%	4%	4%	4%	0%	4%	6%	7%
	Agree somewhat	29%	33%	37%	33%	26%	24%	25%	14%	13%	11%	17%	15%	16%	11%	6%	7%
	Neither agree nor disagree	21%	26%	16%	18%	19%	29%	6%	22%	17%	27%	17%	6%	11%	30%	35%	17%
	Disagree somewhat	26%	22%	22%	22%	30%	27%	50%	32%	39%	36%	33%	41%	44%	38%	24%	44%
	Disagree strongly	12%	11%	8%	17%	15%	9%	6%	16%	27%	22%	30%	34%	28%	17%	29%	24%
15b	Increasing State Legislators' terms will let them spend less time fundraising and campaigning and more time legislating.																
	Agree strongly	26%	24%	27%	28%	27%	24%	6%	27%	43%	43%	47%	49%	39%	38%	29%	34%
	Agree somewhat	42%	48%	22%	38%	45%	48%	63%	43%	39%	36%	32%	38%	44%	40%	47%	49%
	Neither agree nor disagree	13%	9%	27%	14%	13%	7%	0%	11%	9%	9%	11%	3%	11%	13%	12%	5%
	Disagree somewhat	11%	15%	12%	11%	5%	17%	19%	11%	5%	9%	4%	5%	3%	6%	0%	7%
	Disagree strongly	8%	4%	12%	10%	9%	4%	13%	8%	4%	2%	6%	4%	2%	2%	12%	5%
16a	Arnold Schwarzenegger																
	Extremely dissatisfied	76%	71%	74%	80%	70%	74%	71%	78%	75%	75%	80%	85%	65%	67%	71%	70%
	Exactly in the middle	12%	20%	18%	13%	9%	11%	6%	8%	14%	18%	17%	10%	17%	22%	6%	8%
	Extremely satisfied	12%	9%	8%	8%	21%	15%	24%	14%	11%	7%	4%	5%	18%	11%	24%	23%
16b	Jerry Brown																
	Extremely dissatisfied	30%	38%	26%	30%	32%	29%	25%	31%	25%	35%	18%	28%	23%	24%	25%	25%
	Exactly in the middle	20%	26%	30%	17%	25%	16%	19%	11%	21%	28%	29%	14%	26%	22%	19%	13%
	Extremely satisfied	49%	36%	44%	53%	43%	56%	56%	57%	54%	38%	53%	58%	51%	53%	56%	63%

Appendix 11: Responses by Income

(#)	Question		T	<\$25k	<\$50k	<\$75k	<\$100k	<\$125k	<\$150k	>\$150k		T	<\$25k	<\$50k	<\$75k	<\$100k	<\$125k	<\$150k	>\$150k
16c	California State Senate	Extremely dissatisfied	69%	66%	65%	64%	76%	64%	67%	85%		68%	73%	55%	60%	75%	81%	67%	77%
		Exactly in the middle	19%	26%	17%	21%	16%	25%	17%	3%		18%	17%	27%	27%	13%	9%	17%	5%
		Extremely satisfied	12%	8%	17%	15%	7%	11%	17%	12%		13%	10%	18%	14%	12%	11%	17%	18%
16d	California State Assembly	Extremely dissatisfied	68%	63%	65%	65%	71%	66%	79%	74%		71%	76%	65%	58%	80%	78%	86%	77%
		Exactly in the middle	19%	27%	21%	21%	20%	20%	7%	9%		16%	20%	22%	23%	12%	11%	0%	3%
		Extremely satisfied	13%	10%	15%	14%	9%	14%	14%	17%		13%	5%	14%	19%	8%	11%	14%	21%
16e	California State Legislature	Extremely dissatisfied	72%	73%	65%	67%	71%	74%	67%	79%		70%	76%	60%	63%	79%	80%	69%	74%
		Exactly in the middle	18%	23%	22%	23%	20%	17%	13%	6%		18%	12%	29%	22%	15%	13%	13%	8%
		Extremely satisfied	10%	5%	12%	10%	9%	10%	20%	15%		12%	12%	12%	15%	7%	7%	19%	18%
16f	California's initiative/referendum process	Extremely dissatisfied	50%	41%	61%	45%	46%	57%	44%	58%		37%	41%	33%	27%	37%	43%	44%	55%
		Exactly in the middle	22%	29%	16%	25%	22%	24%	19%	11%		19%	20%	24%	20%	14%	19%	13%	10%
		Extremely satisfied	28%	29%	22%	30%	31%	20%	38%	31%		44%	39%	43%	53%	49%	38%	44%	35%
16g	California's State government	Extremely dissatisfied	72%	76%	71%	64%	82%	70%	69%	74%		64%	76%	46%	59%	72%	62%	65%	68%
		Exactly in the middle	15%	10%	14%	24%	5%	19%	19%	8%		19%	16%	35%	21%	16%	19%	12%	7%
		Extremely satisfied	13%	15%	16%	12%	13%	11%	13%	18%		17%	9%	19%	20%	11%	19%	24%	24%
16h	Your city/town and county's government	Extremely dissatisfied	37%	38%	49%	33%	39%	27%	20%	32%		28%	39%	35%	22%	21%	19%	31%	29%
		Exactly in the middle	20%	26%	18%	20%	11%	27%	20%	24%		20%	20%	15%	19%	20%	32%	0%	12%
		Extremely satisfied	43%	36%	33%	48%	50%	46%	60%	45%		52%	41%	50%	59%	59%	49%	69%	59%
16i	California's local governments generally	Extremely dissatisfied	39%	46%	51%	33%	39%	27%	21%	34%		30%	49%	33%	26%	27%	23%	33%	29%
		Exactly in the middle	29%	31%	24%	35%	24%	40%	29%	29%		32%	27%	23%	35%	32%	50%	13%	21%
		Extremely satisfied	32%	23%	24%	32%	37%	33%	50%	37%		38%	24%	44%	39%	41%	27%	53%	50%
18	Some people think that local communities should be able to decide their own taxes and services, even if that means big differences between communities. Suppose these people are at one end of a 1-to-7 scale, at point 1. Other people think that taxes and services should be the same throughout the state, even if that means less local control. Suppose these people are at the other end of the scale, at point 7. People who are exactly in the middle are at point 4. Where would you place yourself on this scale, or wouldn't you have any opinion about that?																		
		Local communities decide	39%	39%	28%	30%	56%	39%	59%	37%		42%	36%	35%	43%	52%	46%	47%	37%
		Exactly in the middle	21%	22%	24%	24%	15%	20%	12%	13%		20%	27%	25%	17%	16%	17%	24%	15%
		Same throughout the state	41%	39%	48%	46%	29%	41%	29%	50%		38%	38%	40%	40%	31%	37%	29%	49%

Appendix 11: Responses by Income

(#)	Question	T	<\$25k	<\$50k	<\$75k	<\$100k	<\$125k	<\$150k	>\$150k	T	<\$25k	<\$50k	<\$75k	<\$100k	<\$125k	<\$150k	>\$150k
19	Some people think that government should provide certain benefits and services, even if that means higher taxes. Suppose these people are at one end of a 1-to-7 scale, at point 1. Other people think that government should lower taxes, even if that means reduced benefits and services. Suppose these people are at the other end of the scale, at point 7. People who are exactly in the middle are at point 4. Where would you place yourself on this scale, or wouldn't you have any opinion about that?																
	Provide certain benefits and services, even if that means higher taxes	46%	31%	42%	51%	40%	51%	47%	45%	57%	61%	52%	59%	55%	62%	47%	61%
	Exactly in the middle	18%	19%	22%	16%	14%	23%	24%	16%	15%	9%	22%	13%	10%	15%	41%	12%
	Lower taxes, even if that means reducing benefits and services	37%	50%	36%	33%	46%	26%	29%	39%	28%	30%	26%	28%	35%	23%	12%	27%
20	Some people think that majorities should always have their way no matter how big the minorities are or how strongly they feel. Suppose these people are at one end of a 1-to-7 scale, at point 1. Other people think that minorities should have their way when they are large enough or feel strongly enough. Suppose these people are at the other end of the scale, at point 7. People who are exactly in the middle are at point 4. Where would you place yourself on this scale, or wouldn't you have any opinion about that?																
	Majorities always have their way	34%	36%	35%	30%	30%	35%	47%	43%	37%	40%	29%	30%	38%	38%	31%	48%
	Exactly in the middle	33%	33%	27%	33%	30%	39%	35%	37%	33%	28%	41%	43%	30%	31%	25%	30%
	Minorities have their way when they are big enough or feel strongly enough	33%	31%	38%	37%	40%	26%	18%	20%	31%	33%	29%	27%	32%	31%	44%	23%
21	Some people think that the best society is one in which nobody can tell anybody else what to do, even if there is a cost to others. Suppose these people are at one end of a 1-to-7 scale, at point 1. Other people think that the best society is one in which the community can decide together what people can and cannot do, even if some people object. Suppose these people are at the other end of the scale, at point 7. People who are exactly in the middle are at point 4. Where would you place yourself on this scale, or wouldn't you have any opinion about that?																
	Nobody can tell anybody else what to do	18%	15%	10%	15%	23%	22%	6%	24%	20%	20%	13%	18%	21%	15%	24%	24%
	Exactly in the middle	19%	30%	25%	17%	13%	9%	25%	18%	22%	30%	29%	28%	16%	13%	18%	12%
	Community can decide	64%	54%	65%	67%	64%	69%	69%	58%	58%	50%	58%	54%	62%	72%	59%	63%

Appendix 11: Responses by Income

(#)	Question	T	<\$25k	<\$50k	<\$75k	<\$100k	<\$125k	<\$150k	>\$150k	T	<\$25k	<\$50k	<\$75k	<\$100k	<\$125k	<\$150k	>\$150k
22	Some people think that the best government is one in which everyone gets to vote directly on making the laws. Suppose these people are at one end of a 1-to-7 scale, at point 1. Other people think that the best government is one in which everyone gets to vote for representatives who then vote on making the laws. Suppose these people are at the other end of the scale, at point 7. People who are exactly in the middle are at point 4. Where would you place yourself on this scale, or wouldn't you have any opinion about that?																
	Everyone votes on laws	34%	67%	40%	29%	29%	26%	18%	16%	34%	56%	31%	33%	36%	26%	24%	15%
	Exactly in the middle	20%	20%	16%	29%	21%	9%	24%	19%	16%	11%	19%	20%	16%	11%	24%	18%
	Representatives vote on laws	46%	13%	44%	42%	50%	66%	59%	65%	50%	33%	50%	47%	48%	64%	53%	68%

Responses by Education Level

2n	Making the State Legislature part-time and paying legislators	Desirable	32%	0%	15%	35%	31%	22%	37%	0%	42%	0%	30%	41%	45%	26%	49%	0%
		Exactly in the middle	25%	100%	45%	28%	22%	30%	19%	0%	15%	100%	17%	16%	12%	22%	12%	0%
		Undesirable	43%	0%	40%	37%	47%	48%	44%	100%	43%	0%	52%	42%	43%	52%	39%	100%
2o	Reducing the length of the state legislative session and requiring legislators to spend more time in their districts	Desirable	45%	50%	52%	47%	41%	47%	45%	0%	26%	100%	48%	27%	27%	19%	21%	0%
		Exactly in the middle	13%	50%	19%	17%	9%	16%	13%	0%	9%	0%	13%	10%	7%	23%	8%	0%
		Undesirable	42%	0%	29%	36%	50%	37%	41%	100%	64%	0%	39%	63%	66%	58%	71%	100%
2p	Allowing voters to rank the candidates in order of preference, so that the winner can be decided without a second election	Desirable	57%	100%	64%	67%	51%	45%	53%	100%	46%	100%	57%	52%	43%	42%	40%	100%
		Exactly in the middle	19%	0%	23%	13%	23%	23%	20%	0%	18%	0%	22%	16%	21%	15%	17%	0%
		Undesirable	24%	0%	14%	20%	26%	32%	27%	0%	36%	0%	22%	32%	35%	42%	43%	0%
2q	Lengthening Assembly terms from 2 years to 4, and Senate terms from 4 years to 6	Desirable	61%	0%	48%	61%	58%	62%	68%	100%	57%	100%	48%	48%	55%	50%	70%	100%
		Exactly in the middle	13%	50%	22%	13%	14%	5%	11%	0%	13%	0%	14%	22%	11%	12%	7%	0%
		Undesirable	26%	50%	30%	26%	28%	33%	21%	0%	30%	0%	38%	30%	33%	38%	23%	0%
2r	Requiring economic impact analyses of major legislation before passage	Desirable	46%	0%	41%	36%	46%	52%	56%	100%	81%	50%	61%	76%	83%	89%	87%	100%
		Exactly in the middle	14%	0%	14%	14%	14%	17%	14%	0%	8%	50%	17%	12%	6%	0%	6%	0%
		Undesirable	40%	100%	45%	50%	41%	30%	30%	0%	11%	0%	22%	12%	11%	11%	6%	0%
2s	Establishing clear goals for each government program and assessing whether progress is being made toward these goals at least once every ten years	Desirable	89%	100%	75%	88%	86%	91%	94%	100%	90%	100%	73%	88%	91%	88%	93%	100%
		Exactly in the middle	8%	0%	25%	9%	8%	9%	5%	0%	5%	0%	18%	5%	4%	8%	4%	0%
		Undesirable	3%	0%	0%	3%	6%	0%	1%	0%	5%	0%	9%	7%	5%	4%	3%	0%
2t	Requiring the Governor and the Legislature to adopt two-year instead of one-year budgets	Desirable	86%	100%	77%	80%	87%	83%	91%	100%	90%	100%	78%	86%	90%	93%	94%	100%
		Exactly in the middle	8%	0%	9%	14%	7%	13%	4%	0%	6%	0%	9%	7%	7%	7%	2%	0%
		Undesirable	6%	0%	14%	6%	6%	4%	5%	0%	5%	0%	13%	7%	2%	0%	4%	0%
2u	Requiring the Governor and the Legislature to publish three and five year budget projections prior to the budget vote each year	Desirable	57%	0%	29%	55%	53%	71%	66%	100%	75%	50%	45%	72%	74%	80%	75%	100%
		Exactly in the middle	25%	0%	33%	30%	24%	19%	23%	0%	15%	50%	14%	14%	16%	0%	17%	0%
		Undesirable	18%	100%	38%	15%	23%	10%	11%	0%	13%	0%	41%	13%	11%	20%	8%	0%
2v	Transferring from the state to local governments control and financing of services provided at the local level and requiring minimum standards for delivering them	Desirable	81%	100%	50%	81%	78%	87%	87%	100%	83%	100%	50%	83%	88%	88%	82%	100%
		Exactly in the middle	12%	0%	25%	13%	11%	9%	10%	0%	9%	0%	23%	12%	7%	8%	8%	0%
		Undesirable	8%	0%	25%	6%	11%	4%	3%	0%	7%	0%	27%	5%	5%	4%	9%	0%
2w	Allowing local governments to raise taxes for local services in exchange for increased coordination of service delivery and public reporting of performance	Desirable	66%	50%	52%	60%	65%	82%	74%	0%	73%	50%	64%	68%	76%	70%	76%	100%
		Exactly in the middle	16%	50%	33%	16%	20%	9%	9%	0%	14%	0%	18%	13%	13%	19%	14%	0%
		Undesirable	17%	0%	14%	24%	15%	9%	16%	100%	13%	50%	18%	19%	11%	11%	10%	0%
2x	Creating a stable source of funds for regional priorities by dedicating a portion of tax revenue from economic growth to those priorities	Desirable	55%	0%	36%	46%	58%	65%	62%	0%	63%	50%	50%	58%	68%	63%	64%	0%
		Exactly in the middle	15%	0%	27%	13%	17%	4%	14%	100%	16%	0%	14%	23%	11%	15%	16%	0%
		Undesirable	30%	100%	36%	40%	26%	30%	24%	0%	22%	50%	36%	19%	21%	22%	20%	100%
2y	Direct any savings resulting from successful local management of state resources to those local governments, in exchange for monitoring their own performance and being accountable and innovative in their operations	Desirable	67%	0%	42%	67%	71%	71%	66%	0%	67%	100%	52%	61%	74%	74%	67%	100%
		Exactly in the middle	22%	50%	32%	20%	20%	24%	22%	100%	21%	0%	24%	30%	16%	17%	22%	0%
		Undesirable	12%	50%	26%	13%	9%	5%	12%	0%	11%	0%	24%	10%	11%	9%	12%	0%
2z	Requiring state and local governments to identify policy goals and publish their progress toward meeting them	Desirable	75%	50%	75%	69%	75%	86%	79%	100%	76%	100%	59%	72%	79%	70%	80%	100%
		Exactly in the middle	13%	50%	10%	15%	10%	0%	16%	0%	12%	0%	18%	13%	11%	15%	10%	0%
		Undesirable	12%	0%	15%	15%	15%	14%	6%	0%	12%	0%	23%	14%	11%	15%	9%	0%
2aa	Requiring legislation creating new programs that cost \$25 million or more to indicate how they will be paid for	Desirable	89%	50%	76%	89%	88%	100%	91%	0%	92%	100%	73%	90%	98%	92%	91%	100%
		Exactly in the middle	7%	50%	19%	8%	5%	0%	6%	0%	5%	0%	18%	6%	2%	0%	7%	0%
		Undesirable	4%	0%	5%	3%	7%	0%	3%	100%	3%	0%	9%	4%	0%	8%	3%	0%
		Desirable	91%	100%	70%	91%	93%	91%	91%	100%	90%	50%	76%	87%	95%	85%	91%	100%
		Exactly in the middle	5%	0%	17%	4%	3%	4%	7%	0%	5%	50%	19%	5%	2%	11%	5%	0%
		Undesirable	4%	0%	13%	5%	4%	4%	2%	0%	5%	0%	5%	8%	3%	4%	5%	0%

Responses by Education Level

2ab	Requiring legislation creating tax cuts that cost \$25 million or more to indicate how they will be paid for	Desirable	84%	50%	61%	85%	86%	91%	83%	100%	84%	50%	85%	84%	85%	85%	100%
		Exactly in the middle	6%	50%	22%	5%	5%	4%	5%	0%	8%	50%	10%	10%	6%	8%	0%
		Undesirable	10%	0%	17%	10%	9%	4%	12%	0%	8%	0%	5%	6%	9%	8%	0%
2ac	Requiring legislation creating new programs or tax cuts that cost \$25 million or more to indicate how they will be paid for	Desirable	84%	0%	68%	86%	84%	96%	85%	100%	88%	50%	90%	87%	89%	89%	100%
		Exactly in the middle	8%	100%	18%	6%	7%	4%	8%	0%	7%	50%	5%	7%	5%	7%	0%
		Undesirable	8%	0%	14%	8%	9%	0%	7%	0%	6%	0%	5%	6%	5%	4%	0%
2ad	Requiring that one-time revenue spikes only be spent on one-time projects, paying off debt, and filling the state rainy-day fund	Desirable	0%	0%	81%	76%	82%	82%	83%	N/A	84%	100%	85%	84%	85%	92%	0%
		Exactly in the middle	0%	100%	10%	16%	11%	9%	8%	N/A	7%	0%	0%	11%	5%	4%	0%
		Undesirable	0%	0%	10%	8%	8%	9%	9%	N/A	9%	0%	15%	5%	11%	4%	100%
2ae	Increasing the size of the State's rainy-day fund from 5% to 10% of the State budget	Desirable	66%	0%	60%	64%	69%	55%	70%	0%	67%	100%	52%	69%	69%	60%	100%
		Exactly in the middle	21%	50%	20%	24%	18%	32%	19%	0%	19%	0%	29%	16%	18%	24%	0%
		Undesirable	13%	50%	20%	13%	13%	14%	11%	100%	14%	0%	19%	15%	13%	16%	0%
2af	Applying the sales tax to services as well as goods while reducing the sales tax rate	Desirable	38%	0%	48%	34%	35%	35%	44%	100%	45%	50%	48%	40%	47%	26%	100%
		Exactly in the middle	17%	100%	13%	19%	23%	13%	10%	0%	14%	0%	10%	14%	12%	19%	0%
		Undesirable	45%	0%	39%	47%	42%	52%	47%	0%	41%	50%	43%	47%	41%	56%	0%
2ag	Applying the sales tax to services as well as goods while keeping the current sales tax rate	Desirable	23%	0%	13%	16%	26%	21%	31%	0%	20%	50%	15%	15%	23%	15%	0%
		Exactly in the middle	16%	100%	30%	12%	18%	13%	11%	0%	10%	0%	10%	10%	7%	15%	0%
		Undesirable	61%	0%	57%	71%	55%	67%	58%	100%	70%	50%	75%	75%	70%	70%	100%
2ah	Limiting the current California state income tax deduction for home mortgage interest payments to \$25,000 per year	Desirable	43%	50%	35%	41%	48%	27%	43%	100%	44%	50%	42%	38%	47%	29%	0%
		Exactly in the middle	21%	50%	29%	28%	17%	18%	16%	0%	17%	0%	21%	23%	12%	21%	0%
		Undesirable	36%	0%	35%	31%	35%	55%	41%	0%	40%	50%	37%	39%	41%	50%	100%
2ai	Reassessing non-residential property more frequently than now	Desirable	53%	0%	68%	45%	48%	64%	61%	0%	72%	50%	68%	64%	74%	81%	0%
		Exactly in the middle	20%	100%	21%	26%	19%	14%	16%	100%	13%	0%	23%	21%	6%	11%	0%
		Undesirable	27%	0%	11%	29%	33%	23%	23%	0%	16%	50%	9%	15%	20%	7%	100%
2aj	Reassessing all property values more frequently while adjusting the current property tax exemption for inflation to about \$28,000 and allowing the exemption to rise with property values going forward	Desirable	35%	0%	35%	30%	36%	26%	42%	0%	33%	50%	21%	32%	36%	26%	0%
		Exactly in the middle	25%	0%	41%	29%	22%	26%	22%	0%	20%	0%	47%	24%	12%	19%	0%
		Undesirable	40%	100%	24%	40%	42%	47%	37%	100%	47%	50%	32%	45%	52%	56%	100%
2ak	Allowing local electorates to raise the property tax rate above the current 1% rate cap	Desirable	28%	0%	20%	15%	28%	36%	41%	0%	28%	0%	18%	15%	33%	30%	0%
		Exactly in the middle	11%	0%	10%	13%	11%	5%	11%	0%	13%	0%	23%	16%	11%	7%	0%
		Undesirable	61%	100%	70%	72%	61%	59%	48%	100%	59%	100%	59%	69%	56%	63%	0%
2al	Lowering local vote requirement to adopt taxes dedicated to specific purposes, to a simple majority so that it is the same as the vote requirement to adopt taxes for general purposes	Desirable	46%	0%	25%	32%	52%	61%	54%	100%	42%	0%	18%	39%	39%	54%	0%
		Exactly in the middle	17%	50%	25%	21%	15%	13%	12%	0%	16%	50%	41%	18%	17%	12%	0%
		Undesirable	38%	50%	50%	47%	33%	26%	34%	0%	41%	50%	41%	43%	44%	35%	100%
2am	Decreasing the super-majority vote required in the Legislature to raise taxes (about 67%) to 55%	Desirable	32%	50%	19%	23%	28%	43%	45%	100%	50%	0%	50%	42%	46%	58%	0%
		Exactly in the middle	9%	0%	10%	6%	10%	22%	9%	0%	8%	50%	20%	8%	7%	8%	0%
		Undesirable	59%	50%	71%	71%	61%	35%	47%	0%	43%	50%	30%	49%	47%	35%	0%
3	If the Legislature is allowed to amend an initiative that has already passed, by what sort of majority should it be able to do so?	A simple majority (50% plus 1)	13%	100%	10%	12%	10%	20%	14%	100%	9%	50%	10%	8%	7%	23%	0%
		55%	18%	0%	25%	13%	18%	20%	23%	0%	27%	0%	24%	22%	29%	31%	100%
		A two-thirds majority	69%	0%	65%	75%	72%	60%	63%	0%	65%	50%	67%	70%	63%	46%	0%
4	Some people think that the Legislature should contain fewer Legislators, even if that means that each Legislator represents more people. Suppose these people are at one end of a 1-to-7 scale, at point 1. Other people think that each Legislator should represent fewer people, even if that means that the Legislature contains more Legislators. Suppose these people are at the other end of the scale, at point 7. People who are exactly in the middle are at point 4, and of course other people have opinions at other points between 1 and 7. Where would you place yourself on this scale, or wouldn't you have any opinion about that?	Fewer legislators, each representing more people	20%	0%	22%	21%	17%	13%	23%	0%	10%	0%	18%	10%	11%	4%	0%
		Exactly in the middle	23%	100%	39%	28%	23%	25%	14%	0%	20%	50%	36%	22%	18%	22%	0%

Responses by Education Level

More legislators, each representing fewer people	57%	0%	39%	52%	60%	63%	64%	100%	70%	50%	45%	67%	71%	74%	76%	100%
On a 0 to 10 scale, where 0 is "not at all", 10 is "as much as could reasonably be expected," and 5 is exactly in the middle, how much or little would you say the California State Legislature is able to get important things done?																
Not at all	67%	50%	50%	61%	69%	73%	74%	100%	69%	50%	57%	67%	71%	69%	73%	0%
Exactly in the middle	16%	0%	27%	21%	14%	14%	13%	0%	10%	50%	17%	9%	10%	12%	9%	0%
As much as could reasonably be expected	17%	50%	23%	19%	17%	14%	13%	0%	21%	0%	26%	24%	19%	19%	18%	100%
On another 0 to 10 scale, where 0 is "not at all", 10 is "completely", and 5 is exactly in the middle, to what extent is the ability of the State Legislature to get things done affected by tensions between the political parties?																
Not at all	27%	0%	24%	39%	28%	25%	16%	0%	21%	0%	13%	31%	18%	26%	18%	0%
Exactly in the middle	8%	50%	14%	12%	7%	8%	4%	0%	6%	50%	4%	5%	8%	7%	2%	0%
Completely	65%	50%	62%	49%	65%	67%	81%	100%	73%	50%	83%	64%	74%	67%	81%	100%
And, on another 0 to 10 scale, where 0 is completely at the local level, 10 is completely at the State level, and 5 is exactly in the middle, how much decision-making authority should there be at the local level versus the State level?																
Completely at the local level	42%	50%	33%	39%	45%	58%	38%	100%	43%	0%	35%	39%	48%	52%	42%	0%
Exactly in the middle	32%	50%	33%	29%	31%	25%	37%	0%	29%	50%	30%	31%	29%	19%	29%	100%
Completely at the State level	27%	0%	33%	32%	25%	17%	26%	0%	27%	50%	35%	30%	23%	30%	28%	0%
And, on the same scale, how much taxation power should there be at the local level versus State level?																
Completely at the local level	34%	0%	10%	39%	36%	39%	30%	0%	32%	0%	43%	35%	31%	38%	29%	100%
Exactly in the middle	40%	100%	60%	36%	37%	43%	42%	0%	33%	50%	35%	37%	32%	15%	34%	0%
Completely at the State level	27%	0%	30%	26%	27%	17%	29%	100%	35%	50%	22%	29%	37%	46%	37%	0%
On the same scale, where would you say the most important public policy decisions should be made?																
Completely at the local level	25%	0%	9%	29%	29%	26%	21%	0%	25%	50%	26%	30%	25%	23%	19%	0%
Exactly in the middle	30%	50%	30%	30%	30%	35%	30%	0%	26%	50%	30%	30%	20%	19%	31%	0%
Completely at the State level	44%	50%	61%	41%	41%	39%	49%	100%	49%	0%	43%	39%	54%	58%	50%	100%
On another 0 to 10 scale, where 0 is "completely by voters in referendums", 10 is "completely by the State Legislature", and 5 is exactly in the middle, how many of the State's major decisions should be made by voters in referendums versus by the State Legislature?																
Completely by voters in referendums	31%	0%	29%	40%	29%	14%	27%	100%	29%	0%	27%	36%	33%	12%	21%	100%
Exactly in the middle	25%	100%	19%	26%	31%	32%	15%	0%	26%	50%	32%	33%	22%	27%	25%	0%
Completely by the State Legislature	45%	0%	52%	34%	40%	55%	58%	0%	45%	50%	41%	32%	45%	62%	54%	0%

Responses by Gender

	Key						
	T=Total (N=412)						
	M=Male (N=179)						
	F=Female (N=222)						
		(Before)			(After)		
(#)	Question	T	M	F	T	M	F
1	To begin with, all in all, on a 0 to 10 scale, where 0 is "extremely poorly", 10 is "extremely well," and 5 is exactly in the middle, how well or poorly would you say the system of democracy in California works these days?						
	Well	21%	23%	18%	38%	43%	32%
	Exactly in the middle	18%	18%	18%	15%	14%	15%
	Not well	61%	59%	65%	47%	43%	53%
2a	Creating a formal review process to allow an initiative's proponents to amend an initiative following public input						
	Desirable	60%	58%	62%	76%	73%	79%
	Exactly in the middle	19%	22%	16%	9%	10%	7%
	Undesirable	21%	21%	22%	16%	17%	14%
2b	Allowing the Legislature to remove an initiative from the ballot by enacting it into law						
	Desirable	37%	36%	39%	34%	35%	34%
	Exactly in the middle	14%	12%	16%	17%	17%	16%
	Undesirable	49%	52%	46%	49%	48%	51%
2c	Allowing a simple majority of the State Legislature to place a countermeasure to an already qualified initiative on the ballot next to that initiative						
	Desirable	32%	30%	35%	30%	30%	30%
	Exactly in the middle	17%	16%	19%	13%	13%	13%
	Undesirable	50%	54%	46%	58%	57%	58%
2d	Allowing the Legislature to amend an initiative that has already passed, subject to a public review and the agreement of the initiative's proponents						
	Desirable	43%	40%	47%	37%	36%	39%
	Exactly in the middle	13%	12%	14%	12%	13%	11%
	Undesirable	44%	48%	39%	51%	51%	50%
2e	Allowing the Legislature to amend an initiative that has already passed, subject to a two-thirds vote, even if an initiative's proponents do not agree with the amendment						
	Desirable	25%	28%	20%	18%	21%	14%
	Exactly in the middle	15%	18%	11%	9%	10%	9%
	Undesirable	61%	54%	69%	73%	70%	78%
2f	Allowing an initiative's proponents to withdraw it after it qualifies for the ballot						
	Desirable	47%	48%	46%	57%	56%	58%
	Exactly in the middle	21%	21%	22%	17%	19%	14%
	Undesirable	32%	32%	32%	26%	25%	28%
2g	Allowing an initiative's proponents to withdraw it after it qualifies for the ballot						
	Desirable	88%	90%	86%	84%	82%	86%
	Exactly in the middle	6%	5%	8%	7%	7%	7%
	Undesirable	5%	5%	6%	9%	11%	7%
2h	Requiring all ballot measures that require new expenditures to indicate how they will be paid for						
	Desirable	87%	91%	81%	91%	92%	90%
	Exactly in the middle	7%	4%	11%	5%	4%	6%
	Undesirable	6%	5%	8%	4%	4%	5%
2i	Requiring the ballot pamphlet to provide an analysis by the Legislative Analyst of how new initiative programs will likely be paid for						
	Desirable	67%	66%	69%	67%	74%	59%
	Exactly in the middle	20%	19%	22%	19%	15%	25%
	Undesirable	12%	15%	9%	13%	11%	16%
2j	Making the vote threshold needed to pass an initiative the same as any vote threshold that the initiative itself requires of the public in the future						
	Desirable	83%	83%	82%	91%	90%	92%
	Exactly in the middle	9%	9%	10%	4%	4%	4%
	Undesirable	9%	8%	9%	5%	6%	3%
2k	Increasing the number of Assembly districts from 80 to 120						
	Desirable	61%	61%	60%	62%	61%	63%
	Exactly in the middle	17%	13%	22%	17%	16%	17%
	Undesirable	23%	26%	18%	21%	22%	20%
2l	Expanding the size of districts and electing more than one legislative representative from each district						
	Desirable	48%	45%	51%	49%	53%	43%
	Exactly in the middle	19%	19%	20%	17%	15%	19%
	Undesirable	33%	36%	29%	34%	32%	38%
2m	Replacing the current State Senate and Assembly with a single house of 120 members						
	Desirable	32%	35%	28%	42%	43%	42%
	Exactly in the middle	25%	23%	28%	15%	11%	19%
	Undesirable	43%	43%	44%	43%	46%	39%
2n	Making the State Legislature part-time and paying legislators						
	Desirable	45%	49%	39%	26%	32%	20%
	Exactly in the middle	13%	11%	16%	9%	7%	12%

Responses by Gender

	Undesirable	42%	39%	45%	64%	61%	68%
2o	Reducing the length of the state legislative session and requiring legislators to spend more time in their districts						
	Desirable	57%	56%	57%	46%	48%	43%
	Exactly in the middle	19%	20%	19%	18%	18%	19%
	Undesirable	24%	24%	24%	36%	34%	38%
2p	Allowing voters to rank the candidates in order of preference, so that the winner can be decided without a second election						
	Desirable	61%	63%	59%	57%	58%	56%
	Exactly in the middle	13%	10%	17%	13%	9%	17%
	Undesirable	26%	28%	24%	30%	33%	27%
2q	Lengthening Assembly terms from 2 years to 4, and Senate terms from 4 years to 6						
	Desirable	46%	40%	53%	81%	79%	84%
	Exactly in the middle	14%	14%	14%	8%	10%	6%
	Undesirable	40%	46%	33%	11%	11%	10%
2r	Requiring economic impact analyses of major legislation before passage						
	Desirable	89%	90%	86%	90%	90%	90%
	Exactly in the middle	8%	7%	10%	5%	5%	6%
	Undesirable	3%	3%	4%	5%	6%	5%
2s	Establishing clear goals for each government program and assessing whether progress is being made toward these goals at least once every ten years						
	Desirable	86%	86%	86%	90%	89%	90%
	Exactly in the middle	8%	7%	10%	6%	6%	6%
	Undesirable	6%	7%	4%	5%	5%	4%
2t	Requiring the Governor and the Legislature to adopt two-year instead of one-year budgets						
	Desirable	57%	57%	57%	73%	69%	77%
	Exactly in the middle	25%	22%	30%	15%	17%	11%
	Undesirable	18%	21%	14%	13%	14%	11%
2u	Requiring the Governor and the Legislature to publish three and five year budget projections prior to the budget vote each year						
	Desirable	81%	81%	80%	83%	84%	82%
	Exactly in the middle	12%	10%	14%	9%	9%	10%
	Undesirable	8%	9%	6%	7%	7%	8%
2v	Transferring from the state to local governments control and financing of services provided at the local level and requiring minimum standards for delivering them						
	Desirable	67%	70%	62%	73%	76%	69%
	Exactly in the middle	16%	16%	17%	14%	13%	15%
	Undesirable	18%	14%	22%	13%	11%	17%
2w	Allowing local governments to raise taxes for local services in exchange for increased coordination of service delivery and public reporting of performance						
	Desirable	55%	56%	53%	63%	64%	62%
	Exactly in the middle	15%	15%	15%	16%	13%	19%
	Undesirable	31%	30%	31%	22%	24%	19%
2x	Creating a stable source of funds for regional priorities by dedicating a portion of tax revenue from economic growth to those priorities						
	Desirable	67%	66%	67%	67%	66%	69%
	Exactly in the middle	22%	22%	2%	21%	19%	25%
	Undesirable	12%	12%	12%	11%	15%	6%
2y	Direct any savings resulting from successful local management of state resources to those local governments, in exchange for monitoring their own performance and being accountable and innovative in their operations						
	Desirable	75%	76%	74%	76%	77%	74%
	Exactly in the middle	13%	11%	15%	12%	8%	17%
	Undesirable	12%	13%	11%	12%	15%	9%
2z	Requiring state and local governments to identify policy goals and publish their progress toward meeting them						
	Desirable	89%	86%	92%	92%	91%	93%
	Exactly in the middle	7%	8%	5%	5%	5%	5%
	Undesirable	5%	6%	2%	8%	9%	7%
2aa	Requiring legislation creating new programs that cost \$25 million or more to indicate how they will be paid for						
	Desirable	91%	92%	89%	90%	91%	89%
	Exactly in the middle	5%	4%	7%	5%	4%	7%
	Undesirable	4%	5%	4%	5%	6%	4%
2ab	Requiring legislation creating tax cuts that cost \$25 million or more to indicate how they will be paid for						
	Desirable	84%	81%	87%	84%	82%	88%
	Exactly in the middle	6%	5%	8%	8%	7%	8%
	Undesirable	10%	14%	5%	8%	11%	4%
2ac	Requiring legislation creating new programs or tax cuts that cost \$25 million or more to indicate how they will be paid for						
	Desirable	84%	81%	88%	88%	87%	89%
	Exactly in the middle	8%	9%	7%	7%	6%	8%
	Undesirable	8%	10%	5%	6%	8%	3%
2ad	Requiring that one-time revenue spikes only be spent on one-time projects, paying off debt, and filling the state rainy-day fund						
	Desirable	80%	81%	76%	84%	86%	82%

Responses by Gender

	Exactly in the middle	12%	9%	16%	7%	5%	9%
	Undesirable	8%	11%	5%	9%	9%	9%
2ae	Increasing the size of the State's rainy-day fund from 5% to 10% of the State budget						
	Desirable	66%	68%	63%	67%	74%	59%
	Exactly in the middle	21%	19%	23%	19%	13%	25%
	Undesirable	13%	13%	14%	14%	13%	16%
2af	Applying the sales tax to services as well as goods while reducing the sales tax rate						
	Desirable	38%	41%	34%	45%	49%	39%
	Exactly in the middle	17%	17%	18%	14%	15%	14%
	Undesirable	45%	42%	48%	41%	36%	46%
2ag	Applying the sales tax to services as well as goods while keeping the current sales tax rate						
	Desirable	24%	25%	22%	20%	23%	15%
	Exactly in the middle	16%	12%	21%	10%	8%	13%
	Undesirable	61%	63%	58%	70%	68%	72%
2ah	Limiting the current California state income tax deduction for home mortgage interest payments to \$25,000 per year						
	Desirable	43%	45%	40%	44%	42%	46%
	Exactly in the middle	21%	17%	26%	17%	16%	18%
	Undesirable	36%	38%	34%	40%	42%	36%
2ai	Reassessing non-residential property more frequently than now						
	Desirable	53%	53%	52%	72%	69%	75%
	Exactly in the middle	20%	17%	25%	13%	13%	13%
	Undesirable	27%	30%	23%	16%	18%	12%
2aj	Reassessing all property values more frequently while adjusting the current property tax exemption for inflation to about \$28,000 and allowing the exemption to rise with property values going forward						
	Desirable	3480%	38%	30%	33%	39%	26%
	Exactly in the middle	25%	21%	30%	20%	18%	21%
	Undesirable	40%	40%	40%	47%	43%	53%
2ak	Allowing local electorates to raise the property tax rate above the current 1% rate cap						
	Desirable	28%	27%	29%	28%	34%	22%
	Exactly in the middle	11%	12%	10%	13%	11%	16%
	Undesirable	61%	62%	60%	59%	56%	63%
2al	Lowering local vote requirement to adopt taxes dedicated to specific purposes, to a simple majority so that it is the same as the vote requirement to adopt taxes for general purposes						
	Desirable	47%	43%	49%	42%	43%	42%
	Exactly in the middle	17%	16%	17%	16%	14%	20%
	Undesirable	38%	41%	34%	41%	44%	38%
2am	Decreasing the super-majority vote required in the Legislature to raise taxes (about 67%) to 55%						
	Desirable	32%	33%	31%	43%	47%	37%
	Exactly in the middle	10%	8%	11%	8%	7%	9%
	Undesirable	60%	59%	58%	50%	46%	54%
3	If the Legislature is allowed to amend an initiative that has already passed, by what sort of majority should it be able to do so?						
	A simple majority (50% plus 1)	13%	14%	11%	8%	7%	10%
	55%	18%	14%	23%	26%	22%	32%
	A two-thirds majority	68%	70%	66%	63%	69%	56%
4	Some people think that the Legislature should contain fewer Legislators, even if that means that each Legislator represents more people. Suppose these people are at one end of a 1-to-7 scale, at point 1. Other people think that each Legislator should represent fewer people, even if that means that the Legislature contains more Legislators. Suppose these people are at the other end of the scale, at point 7. People who are exactly in the middle are at point 4, and of course other people have opinions at other points between 1 and 7. Where would you place yourself on this scale, or wouldn't you have any opinion about that?						
	Fewer legislators, each representing more people	20%	21%	18%	10%	9%	10%
	Exactly in the middle	23%	21%	25%	20%	21%	20%
	More legislators, each representing fewer people	57%	58%	57%	70%	70%	71%
5	On a 0 to 10 scale, where 0 is "not at all", 10 is "as much as could reasonably be expected," and 5 is exactly in the middle, how much or little would you say the California State Legislature is able to get important things done?						
	Not at all	67%	65%	70%	69%	67%	72%
	Exactly in the middle	16%	15%	18%	10%	11%	9%
	As much as could reasonably be expected	17%	20%	13%	21%	21%	19%
6	On another 0 to 10 scale, where 0 is "not at all", 10 is "completely", and 5 is exactly in the middle, to what extent is the ability of the State Legislature to get things done affected by tensions between the political parties?						
	Not at all	27%	25%	29%	21%	19%	25%
	Exactly in the middle	8%	10%	7%	6%	6%	5%
	Completely	65%	65%	65%	73%	75%	70%
7	And, on another 0 to 10 scale, where 0 is completely at the local level, 10 is completely at the State level, and 5 is exactly in the middle, how much decision-making authority should there be at the local level versus the State level?						
	Completely at the local level	41%	46%	36%	43%	47%	39%
	Exactly in the middle	32%	28%	36%	29%	26%	34%

Responses by Gender

	Completely at the State level	27%	26%	27%	27%	28%	27%
8	And, on the same scale, how much taxation power should there be at the local level versus State level?						
	Completely at the local level	34%	39%	27%	32%	31%	34%
	Exactly in the middle	40%	34%	47%	33%	30%	37%
	Completely at the State level	27%	28%	25%	35%	39%	29%
9	On the same scale, where would you say the most important public policy decisions should be made?						
	Completely at the local level	25%	27%	23%	25%	27%	22%
	Exactly in the middle	30%	26%	36%	26%	23%	31%
	Completely at the State level	45%	47%	41%	49%	50%	47%
10	On another 0 to 10 scale, where 0 is "completely by voters in referendums", 10 is "completely by the State Legislature", and 5 is exactly in the middle, how many of the State's major decisions should be made by voters in referendums versus by the State Legislature?						
	Completely by voters in referendums	31%	32%	29%	29%	27%	31%
	Exactly in the middle	25%	22%	29%	26%	25%	28%
	Completely by the State Legislature	45%	47%	42%	45%	48%	41%