

Proceedings and Reports

1990 Pre-Primary

Election Convention

of the

California Labor Federation

AFL-CIO
COPE

San Francisco, April 19, 1990

COMMITTEE
ON
POLITICAL
EDUCATION

John F. Henning, Executive Secretary-Treasurer
417 Montgomery Street, Ste. 300, San Francisco 94104



**Officers of the
California Labor Federation, AFL-CIO**

JOHN F. HENNING
Executive Secretary-Treasurer

ALBIN J. GRUHN
President

VICE PRESIDENTS, GEOGRAPHICAL

District No. 1
Richard Robbins
District No. 2
William Waggoner
District No. 3
William R. Robertson
Kendall Orsatti
Jerry P. Cremins
Dallas Jones
Steven T. Nutter
John L. Smith
District No. 4
Armando Vergara
District No. 5
John Valenzuela
District No. 6
Don Hunsucker
District No. 7
Billy Joe Douglas

District No. 8
Val Connolly
District No. 9
David M. Reiser
District No. 10
Gunnar Lundeberg
Sherri Chiesa
Frank Souza
T.J. (Tom) Stapleton
District No. 11
Owen Marron
Jim Brown
District No. 12
Jack McNally
District No. 13
Loretta Mahoney
District No. 14
Wayne Harbolt

VICE PRESIDENTS AT LARGE

Edward C. Powell
Harry Ibsen
Anthony Ramos
Louie Bravo
Justin Ostro
Yolanda Solari

Steve Edney
Ophelia A. McFadden
Cass Alvin
Mary Bergan
Margaret Butz Shelleda
Michael Riley

Ted Hansen

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Proceedings of the 1990 Pre-Primary Convention	3-33
Endorsement Recommendations	8-33
Report of the Secretary-Treasurer	34-38
Roll of Delegates	39-43

PROCEEDINGS

of the

1990 Pre-General Election Convention

of the

California Labor Federation, AFL-CIO (COPE)

Thursday, April 19, 1990

Airport Hilton Hotel
San Francisco, California

Call to Order

The 1990 Pre-Primary Election Convention of the California Labor Federation, AFL-CIO, was called to order at 10:15 a.m. in the International Ballroom of the San Francisco Airport Hilton Hotel by President Albin J. Gruhn:

"Delegates, I do declare this 1990 Pre-Primary Election Convention of the California Labor Federation, AFL-CIO, in order to transact such business as may legally come before it.

"This is a private meeting. It is not open to the general public."

President Gruhn then led the delegates in the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag.

He next called on the Reverend Tim Dutcher-Walls, intern Pastor of Our Redeemer's Lutheran Church at South San Francisco who gave the invocation.

Reverend Dutcher-Walls gave the invocation and President Gruhn, now Chairman of the Convention, thanked him and welcomed the delegates and visitors.

Welcome to Delegates and Visitors Albin J. Gruhn President California Labor Federation, AFL-CIO

In welcoming the delegates and guests to this 1990 Pre-Primary Convention, I can tell you that organized labor rejoices at the progress the forces of democracy and freedom have recently made over the tyranny of dictatorships in many countries of the world. The 1990s offer great hope and opportunity for the continued expansion of the basic rights and freedom of association, freedom of speech, the right to vote in free elections. The kind of America that evolves in the 1990s will

play an important role in the progress that our sister and brother free trade unionists, the workers, make in these developing democracies.

California has a rendezvous with the future destiny of the United States of America as a leader in the cause of human dignity, justice and freedom. California is the most populous state of the Union with 45 congressional seats and is estimated on the basis of the 1990 federal census to increase its congressional seats by seven, making a total of fifty-two. It is a "must" that organized labor mobilize its full political strength and that of its families and friends in this 1990 election year. The forces of reaction, and particularly the enemies of organized labor, in our state and our country have targeted California as their priority political battleground in the 1990 elections. They will spend millions of dollars in this year's primary election to pass their anti-labor/anti-people ballot Propositions 118 and 119, the primary purpose of which is to give Republicans control of the redrawing of state and federal legislative districts in California after the 1990 census.

Spearheaded by President Bush, these enemies of organized labor and the ordinary people would eliminate the existing legislative authority to draw assembly and senate congressional districts by majority vote. These ruthless opponents of liberal government have as their objective the eventual redistricting out of office of as many Democrats as possible, including the capturing of most of the seven additional congressional seats by this Republican-oriented redistricting.

These anti-labor/anti-people ballot Propositions 118 and 119 must be soundly defeated at the June primary election. The future direction of our state and nation is at stake. California must once again help in turning our state and nation around from the disastrous years of the anti-labor/anti-

people Deukmejian, Reagan and Bush administrations that have attacked the fundamental basic rights of organized labor and weakened the fragile social and economic fabric of the humane safety net so essential to the less fortunate of our fellow citizens.

I know how I feel and I know that you feel the same way. I love this great country of ours, I love this great labor movement of ours, and I don't want to see it desecrated by these right-wing enemies.

You know, they call labor a "special interest". But this special interest has unselfishly given of its womanpower and manpower and its resources in the economic and political areas to help make a better life for all workers, union and non-union, for our youth, for the elderly, for the disabled and the minorities. We are fed up with these professional unionbusters and the anti-labor employers who have hired them to prey upon our unions, particularly the smaller ones, and have desecrated the basic purposes and objectives of the Wagner Act, the National Labor Relations Act—the law of this country that spells out the right of workers to more equal bargaining power with the corporations through the process of collective bargaining. And I know that all of us are fed up clear to here by their actions.

Unionbusters at Work

Yes, the unionbusters and those employer corporations who hire them give sanctimonious praise to the emerging free trade union movement in Eastern Europe, such as Solidarity, which has been the backbone of the democracy movement there. Yes, let me take the statements of these same hypocrites. They do everything they can to thwart and destroy our free trade union movement in the United States.

Brother and sister delegates, we have much political work to do between now and the June 5th primary. As I mentioned earlier, the Republican Party by choice is no friend of organized labor. It espouses its anti-labor policy of right-to-work. President Bush, a Republican, vetoed legislation that would have established a commission to study and make a report on the true facts related to the dispute between the Machinists and the anti-labor Eastern Airlines, headed by Frank Lorenzo.

He vetoed a long overdue increase in the federal minimum wage passed by Congress, thus forcing the enactment of a watered-down lesser increase. Poverty wages, part-time jobs (and these are forced part-time jobs), continue to be his and his party's menu for increasing the number of working poor people in this country.

Let us also make it clear to the Democrats that

they can't take labor's political action for granted. They need our support, as crucial election after crucial election has proven. Organized labor's political action arm must take the lead in coming campaigns and then see to it that our endorsed candidates be true liberals and not political hacks with no fundamental understanding or feeling for social and economic justice.

Unity Needed

A united labor movement in political action will strengthen our position in the political arena. A united labor movement can elect a Democratic governor in California this year. A united labor movement can help elect a majority of labor-endorsed candidates to the Assembly, the Senate and the Congress and other statewide offices. A united labor movement can help defeat Propositions 118 and 119 and win on our recommendations on Propositions on the June 5th ballot.

We can do it if we register every eligible member and their families. And don't tell me that it is not easy to register and don't let your members tell you about the issue that if they register, they may have to take the responsibility of being a juror. The jury system is one in which people are tried by their peers. Tell them that the Department of Motor Vehicle lists are now being used to call prospective jurors, as most of you know. Voting is one of the fundamental responsibilities and human rights of our country's citizens.

Let's make democracy work. We can do it if we educate our members and their families on the issues and the candidates. We can do it if we get the vote out on election day and to also urge our members to use the absentee ballot which has been very effective in recent elections. All it requires is a lot of dedication and hard work. The future of our state and our country deserves it.

Look to Labor

Before closing my remarks, I urge all of you to take the time to read the excellent report of our Executive Secretary, Jack Henning, that appears in your convention program. And when we complete our endorsements at this convention, let's always remember that in unity there is strength; united we stand, divided we fall. Let us be united as never before. The future progress of our labor movement, our state and our country and all freedom-loving people of the world depends on us.

Thank you very much. (Loud and sustained applause.)

At the conclusion of his welcoming address, Chairman Gruhn called on Secretary-Treasurer Jack Henning who introduced the next speaker, John Perkins, AFL-CIO national COPE Director.

Address
John Perkins
Director, National AFL-CIO
Committee on Political Education

Director Perkins addressed the delegates and received sustained applause.

Chairman Gruhn thanked Director Perkins for his words to the Convention and then called on Secretary-Treasurer Henning who introduced David Gregory, Region VI National AFL-CIO COPE director for his address.

Address
David Gregory
National AFL-CIO COPE,
Region 6

Director Gregory addressed the Convention and received a strong ovation from the assembled delegates.

Chairman Gruhn thanked Director Gregory for his address and next called on Executive Secretary-Treasurer Henning for his report to the Convention.

Before beginning his address, Secretary-Treasurer Henning introduced Sister Beryl Ash, a visiting trade unionist from Australia representing the Labour Council of New South Wales.

Address
John F. Henning
Executive Secretary-Treasurer
California Labor Federation, AFL-CIO

Mr. Chairman and delegates: I would like first to introduce a trade unionist from The Labor Council of New South Wales in Australia. Sister Beryl Ash is from Sydney, a great union city. (Whereupon, Sister Beryl Ash, member of The Labor Council of New South Wales, rose to acknowledge the introduction and applause.)

I noted the Reverend Tim Dutcher-Walls' opening reference to Harry Bridges, another native of Australia. Harry, a legend in American labor, died just a week and a half ago at the age of 89.

In 1934 the mayor of this city said that he "would drive Harry Bridges and all the other radicals of the waterfront out of the city for they were attempting not only to overthrow the government of San Francisco but were attempting to overthrow the government of the United States." That was the libelous language of Mayor Angelo Rossi at the time of the General Strike.

The General Strike came as the climax to the coastwise strike of the maritime unions: the longshoremen, the sailors, the marine firemen, the

marine cooks and stewards, the marine engineers, and all of the other maritime organizations. Bridges was chairman of the coastwise strike committee.

In the years that immediately followed the 1934 strike, the government of the United States four times sought to either deport or imprison Harry on the basis that he was a Communist, a subversive. Four times they failed.

The controlling reason for the efforts to deport or imprison him was that Harry Bridges preached down to his last day that the interests of the employer class would always be in conflict with the interests of the working class. Hence, unions.

To some that language is too strong. But without it, there is no labor movement.

Harry Bridges survived all of the assaults of the right-wing elements of the country, all of the assaults of the hysterical press and all of the assaults of the right-wing politicians.

And when he died, to show that in 1934 he was a man before his time, the present mayor of this city ordered the flags of San Francisco to be flown at half mast over all city facilities, including, I might note, the police stations.

The police had played a coercive role in the strike along with the National Guard which had been called into action by the governor of California.

One week and a half ago, Mayor Art Agnos offered to have Harry Bridges lie in state in the rotunda of the San Francisco City Hall. And this in the city that was the site of what was held to be the most revolutionary action the Pacific Coast has ever known in terms of labor rebellion. However, Harry before his death had indicated he wanted a simple funeral without public pomp or ceremony.

Times had changed. Harry Bridges' values and virtues had become an accepted part of community life in this city and, indeed, on this coast.

So, Sister Beryl Ash, you are in a city that has been honored and distinguished by the presence of the Australian-born Harry Bridges. (Loud and sustained applause.)

Bridges on AFL Executive Council

Let me add that he was a member of the Executive Council of the AFL's State Federation of Labor following the '34 strike. Later he became the founding president of the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union, now an affiliate of the AFL-CIO.

And now, to convention business. The Executive Council endorsement recommendations on candidates and ballot propositions are included in the report document issued to all delegates.

There is the critical importance of defeating Propositions 118 and 119. Should they pass, we

will have a compulsory right-to-work law in California if there's a Republican governor to sustain what a right-wing Legislature has ordained.

Even now, with a Democratic majority in both houses, we can only defeat anti-worker measures by close margins. If Propositions 118 and 119 pass, or if either of them passes, conservative Republicans will control the Legislature and the future of state labor laws.

The Republican Party in California is a monolithic anti-labor institution. It suffers from no moderate faction while at the same time there is a conservative wing in the Democratic Party. A dangerous circumstance.

It is essential that we elect progressives to power and authority in California, but it is also imperative to understand that you are fighting for your unions when you enter the struggle against 118 and 119. Progressive legislators are, of course, essential to our liberty, but there will be few progressives if 118 and 119 become law. Anything less than your militant political action against these measures will mean disaster. (Loud and sustained applause.)

Chairman Gruhn then called on Secretary-Treasurer Henning to announce the committee appointments for the Convention.

**Appointment of
Convention Committees
John F. Henning
Executive Secretary-Treasurer
California Labor Federation, AFL-CIO**

The Committees of the Convention as appointed by President Gruhn were announced by Secretary-Treasurer Henning.

**Committee on
Rules and Order of Business**

Steve Edney, Chairman, United Industrial Workers, Service, Transportation, Professional and Government Employees of America, Wilmington;

Donald Abrams, Bay Area Typographical No. 21, San Francisco;

Sherri Chiesa, Hotel and Restaurant Employees and Bartenders No. 2, San Francisco;

Paul Dempster, San Francisco Maritime Trades Port Council, San Francisco;

Margaret Dean, California State Employees Association No. 1000, SEIU, Sacramento;

Joseph S. Francis, San Diego-Imperial Counties, Central Labor Council, San Diego;

Robert L. Hanna, California State Council of Carpenters, Sacramento;

Dallas Jones, Los Angeles County Fire

Fighters No. 1014, Southgate;

Ben Leal, Freight Checkers, Clerical Employees, No. 856, San Francisco;

Owen Marron, Alameda County Central Labor Council, Oakland;

Gwen Newton, Office Employees No. 30, Los Angeles;

Don Payne, Northern California District Council of Laborers, Richmond;

Edward C. Powell, International Alliance of Theatrical Stage Employees No. 16, San Francisco;

James Quillin, California Conference of Machinists, Oakland;

William Robertson, Los Angeles County Federation of Labor, Los Angeles;

Paul M. Varacalli, United Public Employees No. 790, SEIU, Oakland.

Teamsters Welcomed Back

Secretary-Treasurer Henning noted that this was the first COPE Convention in which the Teamsters had participated since their reaffiliation with the Federation.

**Committee
Appointments Approved**

Secretary-Treasurer Henning's motion to approve the Rules and Order of Business Committee membership was seconded and carried.

He then announced the appointments to the Committee on Credentials:

Committee on Credentials

Loretta Mahoney, Chairperson, California State Council of Hotel Employees and Restaurant Employees, Santa Rosa;

Jack Baugh, Operating Engineers No. 3, San Francisco;

Frank Danniel, Napa-Solano Counties Central Labor Council, Vallejo;

Henry Disley, Marine Firemen's Union, San Francisco;

Billy Joe Douglas, Plasterers and Cement Masons No. 814, Stockton;

James B. Gordon, Jr., Communications Workers District Council No. 9, Sacramento;

Mickey Harrington, San Joaquin-Calaveras Counties Central Labor Council, Stockton;

Harry Jordan, Laborers No. 89, San Diego;

Kathleen Kinnick, Office and Professional Employees No. 3, San Francisco;

Ophelia McFadden, Los Angeles County Employees No. 434, Vernon;

John Moreno, Glass, Molders and Pottery Workers No. 8, Fremont;

Art Pulaski, San Mateo Central Labor Coun-

cil, San Mateo;

Bernie B. Tolentino, Automotive Machinists No. 1546, Oakland;

Mike Quevedo, Jr., Laborers No. 300, Los Angeles;

Herb Sisti, United Food and Commercial Workers No. 4, San Jose.

Committee Appointments Approved

Secretary-Treasurer Henning moved that the appointments to the Committee on Credentials be approved. His motion was seconded and carried.

Chairman Gruhn next called on Loretta Mahoney, chairperson of the Committee on Credentials for her report.

Report of Committee on Credentials Loretta Mahoney, Chairperson

Chairperson Mahoney read the additions to and deletions from the Preliminary Roll of Delegates. She noted there were 337 delegates in attendance.

Report Adopted

On Chairperson Mahoney's motion, duly seconded, the Credentials Committee report was approved.

She then read the committee members' names and moved that they be dismissed with thanks.

Her motion was seconded and carried.

Chairman Gruhn thanked the committee's members as well.

Report of Committee on Rules and Order of Business Steve Edney, Chairman

Chairman Gruhn next called on Steve Edney, chairman of the Committee on Rules and Order of Business, for a report.

Chairman Edney noted that "at all times during the deliberations a quorum was present." He then reported as follows:

1. *Robert's Rules of Order.* The Convention shall be governed by Robert's Rules of Order on all matters not provided for by the Constitution or specified in these rules.

2. *Rules—Adoption of Standing Rules.* The adoption of the standing rules shall require affirmative vote of a majority of the duly qualified delegates to the Convention, present and voting. When once adopted, such standing rules shall remain in effect, unless suspended or amended as

provided in these rules.

3. *Amendment of Standing Rules.* No standing rule of the Convention shall be amended except by an affirmative vote of a majority of the duly qualified delegates to the Convention, present and voting. No such amendment shall be considered until it shall have been referred to and reported by the Committee on Rules.

4. *Convening of the Convention.* The Convention shall convene at 10:00 a.m.

5. *Committee Reports.* Whenever there is a majority and minority report on any committee, both the majority and minority shall be entitled to report to the Convention. The discussion and vote of concurrence or non-concurrence shall be first on the minority report.

6. *Committee Quorum.* A majority of any committee shall constitute a quorum for transaction of its business.

7. *Passage of Committee Reports by Convention.* A majority of the delegates present and voting shall be required to act on a committee report. No motion shall be acted upon until an opportunity to speak has been given the delegate making the same, if he or she desires.

8. *Roll Call Vote.* At the request of one hundred and fifty (150) delegates present and voting, any motion shall be voted on by roll call per capita vote of the delegates. When a roll call has been ordered, no adjournment shall take place until the result has been announced.

9. *Precedence of Motions During Debate.* When a question is under debate or before the Convention, no motions shall be received but the following, which shall take precedence in the order named:

First: To adjourn.

Second: To recess to a time certain.

Third: For the previous question.

Fourth: To set as a special order of business.

Fifth: To postpone to a stated time.

Sixth: To postpone indefinitely.

Seventh: To refer to or re-refer to committee.

Eighth: To divide or amend.

Ninth: To lay on the table.

10. *Motions in writing.* Upon request of the Chair, a motion shall be reduced to writing and shall be read to the Convention by the Chair before the same is acted upon.

11. *Contents of Motions.* No motion, whether oral or written, shall be adopted until the same shall be seconded and distinctly stated to the Convention by the Chair.

12. *Motion to Reconsider.* A motion to reconsider shall not be entertained unless made by a delegate who voted with the prevailing side. Such motion shall require a two-thirds vote to carry.

13. *Motion to Table.* A motion to lay on the

table shall be put without debate.

14. Recognition and Decorum of Delegates.

(a) Delegates when arising to speak shall respectfully address the Chair and announce their full name and the identity of the organization which they represent.

(b) In the event two or more delegates arise to speak at the same time the Chair shall decide which delegate is entitled to the floor.

(c) No delegate shall interrupt any other delegate who is speaking, except for the purpose of raising a point of order or appealing a ruling of the Chair.

(d) Any delegate may appeal from a decision of the Chair, without waiting for recognition by the Chair, even though another delegate has the floor. No appeal is in order when another is pending, or when other business has been transacted by the Convention prior to the appeal being taken.

(e) Any delegate who is called to order while speaking shall, at the request of the Chair, be seated while the point of order is decided, after which, if in order, the delegate shall be permitted to proceed. The same shall apply while an appeal from the Chair is being decided.

(f) No delegate shall speak more than once on

the same subject until all who desire to speak shall have had an opportunity to do so; nor more than twice on the same subject without permission by a majority vote of those delegates present and voting; nor longer than five minutes at a time without permission by a majority vote of the delegates present and voting.

(g) Any delegate may rise to explain a matter personal to herself or himself and shall forthwith be recognized by the Chair, but shall not discuss a question in such explanation. Such matters of personal privilege yield only to a motion to recess or adjournment.

15. Voting Not To Be Interrupted. When once begun, voting shall not be interrupted. No delegate shall be allowed to change his or her vote, or to have his or her vote recorded after the vote is announced.

Report Adopted

On Chairman Edney's motion, duly seconded, the Committee's report was adopted.

Chairman Gruhn then called on Secretary-Treasurer Henning for the Executive Council's report and recommendations:

Report and Recommendations of the Executive Council

(Standing Committee on Political Education)

to the

PRE-PRIMARY ELECTION CONVENTION

of the

CALIFORNIA LABOR FEDERATION, AFL-CIO

San Francisco, April 19, 1990

The Executive Council of the California Labor Federation, AFL-CIO met in the San Francisco Airport Hilton Hotel, April 16-18, 1990 to consider candidates for election to the offices of Governor, Lieutenant Governor, Secretary of State, State Controller, State Treasurer, State Attorney General, Superintendent of Public Instruction, Insurance Commissioner, the State Board of Equalization, positions on the 17 statewide ballot propositions and local central body COPE recommendations for election to the United States House of Representatives, the State Senate and the State Assembly, in a statewide primary election on Tuesday, June 5, 1990.

Executive Council action was taken on Propositions 118 and 119 at the Council's meeting of March 6-7, 1990.

In the following instances a recommendation has been made by the Executive Council without consideration of the local central labor body COPE:

No recommendation was received for the office in a party by the local central labor body COPE with jurisdiction for the district.

No recommendation was received for the office in a party from one or more local central labor body COPEs that share jurisdiction of a district.

Failure of local central labor body COPEs that share jurisdiction of a district to agree on a recommendation for the office in a party.

Such Executive Council recommendations are preceded by an asterisk(*).

The following recommendations are accordingly submitted by the Executive Council for designated offices:

Governor

John Van de Kamp (D)

No Endorsement (R)

Secretary-Treasurer Henning moved adoption of the Executive Council's recommendation for Governor.

His motion was seconded.

Speaking in support of the Executive Council's recommendation were delegates Justin Ostro (Machinists and Aerospace Workers No. 727-A, Burbank), William Robertson (Los Angeles County Federation of Labor, Los Angeles), Ophelia McFadden (Los Angeles County Service Employees No. 434, Vernon), Tony Ramos (Vice President, California Labor Federation, AFL-CIO), William H. Sauerwald (Painters District Council No. 36, Los Angeles), John Smith (Laborers No. 1184, Riverside), Dean C. Tipps (California State Council of Service Employees, Sacramento), and Walter Johnson (San Francisco Labor Council, San Francisco).

Those speaking in opposition to the Executive Council's recommendation were delegates Michael Straeter (UFCW Retail Clerks No. 1442, Santa Monica), Joseph Grigsby (Carpenters No. 713, Hayward), Stanley Smith (San Francisco Building and Construction Trades Council, San Francisco), Ed Kelly (Pile Drivers No. 34, Oakland), Dianne Buckingham (San Bernardino-Riverside Counties Central Labor Council, Riverside), and Larry Martin (Transport Workers California State Conference, San Francisco).

Delegate Dolores Spears (Communications Workers No. 9505, Arcadia) moved the previous question. It was seconded and carried.

Secretary-Treasurer Henning spoke in support of the Executive Council's recommendation.

Roll Call Vote Requested

Delegate Michael Straeter (UFCW Retail Clerks No. 1442, Santa Monica) moved for a roll

call vote.

Chairman Gruhn explained that a motion is not required for a roll call vote under the rules adopted by the Convention.

A point of order was raised by Delegate Stanley Smith (San Francisco Building and Construction Trades Council, San Francisco).

Chairman Gruhn again explained that a motion was not required to call for a roll call vote, that if 150 delegates stood to support the request, then a roll call would be taken.

The Sergeants-at-Arms counted 65 delegates standing in support of a roll call vote, therefore, Chairman Gruhn declared, the roll call vote was denied.

Recommendation Adopted

The Executive Council's recommendation to endorse John Van de Kamp for the office of Governor was then adopted.

Lieutenant Governor

Leo T. McCarthy (D)

No Endorsement (R)

Secretary-Treasurer Henning's motion to adopt the Executive Council's recommendation for Lieutenant Governor was seconded and carried.

Secretary of State

March Fong Eu (D)

No Endorsement (R)

Secretary-Treasurer Henning's motion to adopt the Executive Council's recommendation for Secretary of State was seconded and carried.

State Controller

Gray Davis (D)
No Endorsement (R)

Secretary-Treasurer Henning's motion to adopt the Executive Council's recommendation for State Controller was seconded and carried.

State Treasurer

Kathleen Brown (D)
No Endorsement (R)

Secretary-Treasurer Henning's motion to adopt the Executive Council's recommendation for State Treasurer was seconded and carried.

State Attorney General

Ira Reiner (D)
No Endorsement (R)

Secretary-Treasurer Henning's motion to adopt the Executive Council's recommendation for State Attorney General was duly seconded.

Speaking in support of the Executive Council's recommendation were delegates James Quillin (California Conference of Machinists, Oakland), William Robertson (Los Angeles County Federation of Labor, Los Angeles), Dallas Jones (Los Angeles County Fire Fighters No. 1014, South Gate), Ophelia McFadden (Los Angeles County Service Employees No. 434, Vernon), Ronald Kennedy (Los Angeles Building and Construction Trades Council, Los Angeles), and Dean C. Tipps (California State Council of Service Employees, Sacramento).

Speaking in opposition to the Executive Council's recommendation were delegates Jack Baugh (Operating Engineers No. 3, San Francisco), Tom Dwyer (Service Employees No. 22, Sacramento), Stanley Smith (San Francisco Building and Construction Trades Council, San Francisco), Dianne Buckingham (San Bernardino-Riverside Counties Central Labor Council, Riverside), and Walter Johnson (San Francisco Labor Council, San Francisco).

The previous question was moved by delegate Yolanda Solari (California State Employees Association No. 1000, SEIU, Sacramento).

Secretary-Treasurer Henning spoke in support of the Executive Council's recommendation.

Recommendation Adopted

The motion to adopt the Executive Council's recommendation of Ira Reiner for the office of State Attorney General was then carried.

Superintendent of Public Instruction

Bill Honig

Secretary-Treasurer Henning commented that since the Executive Council had recommended the endorsement of Bill Honig for Superintendent of Public Instruction, information had been received that Honig had publicly supported legislation that would ban strikes by teachers if it became law.

Although obliged to move adoption of the Executive Council's recommendation, Secretary-Treasurer Henning asked the delegates to vote the motion down.

He then moved adoption of the Executive Council's recommendation. His motion was seconded.

Speaking in opposition to the Executive Council's recommendation were delegates James Gordon (Communications Workers No. 9412, Hayward), Mary Bergan (Peralta Federation of Teachers No. 1603, Oakland), Marv Katz (United Teachers of Los Angeles No. 1021, Los Angeles) and Larry Griffin (Hospital and Health Care Workers No. 250, San Francisco).

The previous question was moved by delegate William Robertson (Los Angeles County Federation of Labor, Los Angeles). His motion was seconded.

Recommendation Rejected

The motion to adopt the Executive Council's recommendation of Bill Honig for Superintendent of Public Instruction did not carry.

"No Endorsement" Adopted

On Secretary-Treasurer Henning's motion, duly seconded, "No Endorsement" for Superintendent of Public Instruction was adopted.

Insurance Commissioner

Bill Press (D)
No Endorsement (R)

Secretary-Treasurer Henning moved adoption of the Executive Council's recommendation. His motion was seconded.

Speaking in support of the Executive Council's recommendation were delegates James Quillin (California Conference of Machinists, Oakland), William Robertson (Los Angeles County Federation of Labor, Los Angeles), Raoul Teilhet (Vice President, California Labor Federation), William

H. Sauerwald (Painters District Council No. 36, Los Angeles), Majorie Caldwell (UFCW Butchers No. 115, South San Francisco), Sherri Chiesa (Hotel Employees and Restaurant Employees No. 2, San Francisco);

Steve Edney (United Industrial Workers—Cannery Division, Wilmington), Dallas Jones (Los Angeles County Fire Fighters No. 1014, South Gate), Justin Ostro (Machinists and Aerospace Workers No. 727-A, Burbank), Marv Katz (United Teachers of Los Angeles No. 1021, Los Angeles), Steve Nutter (Ladies Garment Workers No. 512, Los Angeles), and Jim Whisman (Operating Engineers No. 12, Pasadena).

Speaking in opposition to the Executive Council's recommendation were delegates Paul Varacalli (United Public Employees No. 790, Oakland), Margaret Dean (California State Employees Association No. 1000, SEIU, Sacramento), Michael Ryan (Communications Workers No. 9421, Sacramento), Dan Curtain (California State Council of Carpenters, Sacramento), Tom Dwyer (Service Employees No. 22, Sacramento) and Yolanda Solari (California State Employees Association No. 1000, SEIU, Sacramento).

The previous question was moved by delegate Ron Renish (Los Angeles County Federation of Labor Forum, Los Angeles). His motion was seconded and carried.

Division of House

Delegate Paul Varacalli (United Public Employees No. 790, Oakland) requested a division of the house on the vote to approve the Executive Council's recommendation.

Chairman Gruhn asked the Sergeants-at-Arms to count the delegates who were voting and a division of the house was completed.

Results

Chairman Gruhn announced the results: 209 yes votes and 91 no votes on the motion to approve the Executive Council's recommendation to endorse Bill Press for State Insurance Commissioner. The necessary two-thirds vote was cast, Chairman Gruhn noted, hence the Executive Council's recommendation was adopted.

Address

John Van de Kamp Democratic Candidate for Governor

Following the announcement of the vote on the Division of the House, Chairman Gruhn called on Secretary-Treasurer Henning to introduce the

COPE-endorsed democratic candidate for Governor, John Van deKamp.

Chairman Gruhn thanked Attorney General Van de Kamp for his address and then called on Secretary-Treasurer Henning to continue the report of the Standing Committee on Political Education.

Report and Recommendations of the Executive Council (Standing Committee on Political Education) And Endorsements by the Convention (Resumed)

State Board of Equalization

District

1. William M. Bennett (D) No Endorsement (R)

Secretary-Treasurer Henning's motion to adopt the Executive Council's recommendation was seconded.

Delegate Lewis Gibbons (Ship Clerks Association No. 34 ILWU, San Francisco) and Don Ziegunfuss (California State Employees Association No. 1000, SEIU, Sacramento) spoke in support of the Executive Council's recommendation.

The motion to adopt the Executive Council's recommendation was then carried.

District

2. Louis John Papan (D) No Endorsement (R)

The motion, duly seconded, to adopt the Executive Council's recommendation was carried.

District

3. Floyd L. Morrow (D) No Endorsement (R)

The motion to adopt the Executive Council's recommendation was seconded and carried.

District

4. Paul Carpenter (D) No Endorsement (R)

Secretary-Treasurer Henning's motion to adopt the Executive Council's recommendation was seconded and carried.

Endorsement Procedure Explained

Prior to asking Secretary-Treasurer Henning to read the recommendations of the Executive Council for Representatives in Congress, the State Senate and State Assembly, Chairman Gruhn explained the procedure to be used in making the endorsements.

As Secretary-Treasurer Henning reads the recommendations, he said, if any delegate objects to

a particular recommendation, that delegate should rise and ask for that seat to be set aside. That district, he explained, would be set aside and taken up individually after the other recommended endorsements were acted upon.

Secretary-Treasurer Henning then proceeded to announce the Executive Council's recommendations for the United States Representatives in Congress.

United States Representatives in Congress

District

- * 1. Douglas H. Bosco (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- * 2. Erwin E. (Bill) Rush (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- 3. Robert T. Matsui (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- 4. Vic Fazio (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- 5. Nancy Pelosi (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- 6. Barbara Boxer (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- 7. George Miller (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- 8. Ronald V. Dellums (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- 9. Fortney Pete Stark (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- 10. Don Edwards (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- 11. Tom Lantos (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- 12. Gary Bond (D)
Open (R)
- 13. Norman Y. Mineta (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- * 14. Patricia Malberg (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- * 15. Gary A. Condit (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- * 16. Leon E. Panetta (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- 17. Calvin Dooley (D)
No Endorsement (R)

District

- 18. Richard H. Lehman (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- * 19. Anita Perez Ferguson (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- * 20. Lita Reid (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- * 21. Richard D. Freiman (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- 22. David Bayer (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- 23. Anthony C. Beilenson (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- 24. Henry A. Waxman (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- 25. Edward R. Roybal (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- 26. Howard L. Berman (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- 27. Mel Levine (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- 28. Julian C. Dixon (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- 29. Maxine Waters (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- 30. Matthew G. Martinez (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- 31. Mervyn M. Dymally (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- 32. Glenn M. Anderson (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- 33. Open (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- 34. Esteban E. Torres (D)
No Endorsement (R)

District

- * 35. **Open (D)**
No Endorsement (R)
- 36. **George E. Brown, Jr. (D)**
No Endorsement (R)
- 37. **Ralph Waite (D)**
No Endorsement (R)
- 38. **Barbara Jackson (D)**
No Endorsement (R)
- 39. **Francis X. (Frank) Hoffman (D)**
No Endorsement (R)

None of the Congressional districts was set aside.

District

- 40. **Eugene C. Gratz (D)**
No Endorsement (R)
- 41. **Dan Kripke (D)**
No Endorsement (R)
- 42. **Open (D)**
No Endorsement (R)
- 43. **No Endorsement (R)**
- 44. **Jim Bates (D)**
No Endorsement (R)
- 45. **No Endorsement (R)**

Recommendations Adopted

Secretary-Treasurer Henning’s motion to adopt the Executive Council’s recommendations as a whole for United States Representatives in Congress was seconded and carried.

He then read the Executive Council’s recommendations for the State Senate:

State Senate

District

- 2. **Barry Keene (D)**
No Endorsement (R)
- * 4. **Mike Thompson (D)**
No Endorsement (R)
- 6. **Leroy F. Greene (D)**
No Endorsement (R)
- 8. **Jim Wachob (D)** (Dual)
Patrick C. Fitzgerald (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- 10. **Bill Lockyer (D)**
No Endorsement (R)
- 12. **Dan McCorquodale (D)**
No Endorsement (R)
- * 14. **Open (R)**
- 16. **Ray Gonzales (D)**
No Endorsement (R)
- 18. **Gary K. Hart (D)**
No Endorsement (R)
- 20. **Alan Robbins (D)**
No Endorsement (R)

District

- 22. **Herschel Rosenthal (D)**
No Endorsement (R)
- 24. **Art Torres (D)**
No Endorsement (R)
- 26. **Charles M. Calderon (D)**
No Endorsement (R)
- 28. **Diane E. Watson (D)**
- 30. **Ralph C. Dills (D)**
No Endorsement (R)
- * 32. **Evelyn Colon Beckett (D)** (Dual)
John J. Duran (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- 34. **Ruben S. Ayala (D)**
No Endorsement (R)
- 36. **Robert Presley (D)**
No Endorsement (R)
- * 38. **William A. (Bill) Craven (R)**
- 40. **Wadie P. Deddeh (D)**
No Endorsement (R)

State Senate District No. 18 was set aside by request.

Executive Council’s recommendations for the State Senate was seconded and carried.

Recommendations Adopted

With the exception of District No. 18, Secretary-Treasurer Henning’s motion to adopt the

District No. 18

Secretary-Treasurer Henning moved adoption of the Executive Council’s recommendation for

State Senate District No. 18.

His motion was seconded.

Delegate LeRoy Villa (Electrical Workers No. 413, Santa Barbara) spoke in opposition to the Executive Council's recommendation.

Delegate Mary Bergan (Peralta Federation of Teachers No. 1603, Oakland) and Secretary-Treasurer Henning spoke in support of the Executive Council's recommendation.

Recommendation Adopted

The motion to adopt the Executive Council's recommendation for the 18th State Senate District was carried.

Secretary-Treasurer Henning then continued to read the Executive Council's recommendations for the State Assembly.

State Assembly

District

- * 1. Arlie E. Caudle (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- 2. Dan Hauser (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- * 3. Lon S. Hatamiya (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- 4. Thomas M. Hannigan (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- 5. Joe Buonaiuto (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- 6. Lloyd G. Connelly (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- 7. Norman S. Waters (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- * 8. Bev Hansen (R)
- 9. Vivien Bronshvag (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- 10. Phillip Isenberg (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- 11. Bob Campbell (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- 12. Tom Bates (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- 13. Barbara Lee (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- 14. Johan Klehs (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- 15. Wendell H. Williams (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- 16. John L. Burton (D)
- 17. Willie L. Brown, Jr. (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- 18. Delaine Eastin (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- 19. Jackie Speier (D)

District

- 20. Ted Lempert (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- 21. Byron D. Sher (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- 22. Bob Levy (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- 23. John Vasconcellos (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- 24. Dominic L. (Dom) Cortese (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- * 25. Rusty Areias (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- 26. Patrick Johnston (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- 27. Sal Cannella (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- * 28. Sam Farr (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- * 29. Open (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- * 30. Jim Costa (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- 31. Bruce Bronzan (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- * 32. Bernie McGoldrick (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- * 33. No Endorsement (R)
- * 34. No Endorsement (R)
- * 35. Open (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- 36. Ginny Connell (D)
Kevin G. Staker (R)
- * 37. Open (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- 38. Irene F. Allert (D)
No Endorsement (R)

District

- 39. **Richard Katz (D)**
No Endorsement (R)
- 40. **Tom Bane (D)**
No Endorsement (R)
- 41. **Jeanette Mann (D)**
No Endorsement (R)
- 42. **Open (D)**
No Endorsement (R)
- 43. **Terry B. Friedman (D)**
No Endorsement (R)
- 44. **Tom Hayden (D)**
No Endorsement (R)
- 45. **Burt Margolin (D)**
No Endorsement (R)
- 46. **Mike Roos (D)**
No Endorsement (R)
- 47. **Teresa P. Hughes (D)**
- 48. **Robert C. Farrell (D)**
No Endorsement (R)
- 49. **Gwen Moore (D)**
No Endorsement (R)
- 50. **Curtis R. Tucker, Jr. (D)**
No Endorsement (R)
- 51. **Marilyn J. Landau (D)**
No Endorsement (R)
- 52. **Gary L. Neely (D)**
No Endorsement (R)
- 53. **Richard E. (Dick) Floyd (D)**
No Endorsement (R)
- 54. **Willard H. Murray, Jr. (D)**
No Endorsement (R)
- 55. **Richard Polanco (D)**
- 56. **Lucille Roybal-Allard (D)**
- 57. **Dave Elder (D)**
No Endorsement (R)
- 58. **Open (D)**
No Endorsement (R)
- 59. **Open (D)**
No Endorsement (R)
- 60. **Sally Tanner (D)**
No Endorsement (R)

Recommendations Adopted

Secretary-Treasurer Henning's motion to approve the Executive Council's recommenda-

District

- 61. **No Endorsement (D)**
No Endorsement (R)
- 62. **Open (D)**
No Endorsement (R)
- 63. **Bob Epple (D)**
No Endorsement (R)
- 64. **Kevin Grant Gardner (D)**
No Endorsement (R)
- 65. **Bob Erwin (D)**
No Endorsement (R)
- 66. **Jerry Eaves (D)**
No Endorsement (R)
- 67. **Fred Smoller (D)**
No Endorsement (R)
- 68. **Steve Clute (D)**
No Endorsement (R)
- 69. **Jim Toledano (D)**
No Endorsement (R)
- 70. **Howard Adler (D)**
Phyllis Badham (R)
- * 71. **Richard T. Polis (D)** (Dual)
Peter Mathews (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- 72. **Tom Umberg (D)** (Open)
Jerry Yudelson (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- 73. **Ray Strait (D)**
No Endorsement (R)
- 74. **Gerald (Jerry) Franklin (D)**
No Endorsement (R)
- 75. **Deirdre (Dede) Alpert (D)**
No Endorsement (R)
- 76. **Stephen B. (Steve) Thorne (D)**
No Endorsement (R)
- 77. **No Endorsement (D)**
No Endorsement (R)
- 78. **Mike Gotch (D)**
No Endorsement (R)
- 79. **Pete Chacon (D)**
No Endorsement (R)
- 80. **Open (D)**
No Endorsement (R)

tions for the State Assembly as a whole was seconded and carried.

He next announced the Executive Council's recommendations for the 17 ballot propositions.

BALLOT PROPOSITIONS

PROPOSITION NO. 107

Housing and Homeless Bond Act of 1990

Recommendation: Vote YES

Official Summary: This act provides for a bond issue of one hundred fifty million dollars (\$150,000,000) to provide funds for a housing program that includes: (1) emergency shelters and transitional housing for homeless families and individuals, (2) new rental housing for families and individuals including rental housing which meets the special needs of the elderly, disabled, and farmworkers, (3) rehabilitation and preservation of older homes and rental housing, and (4) home purchase assistance for first-time homebuyers.

Bond Act (SB 1693)—Digest of Analysis by Legislative Analyst: This measure authorizes the state to sell \$150 million in general obligation bonds to provide funds for four housing programs administered by the state. General obligation bonds are backed by the state, meaning that the state is obligated to pay the principal and interest costs on these bonds. General Fund revenues would be used to pay these costs. These revenues come primarily from the state corporate and personal income taxes and the state sales tax.

The \$150 million in bond proceeds would be used to assist low-income persons by providing assistance for the development or rehabilitation of affordable rental housing and temporary housing for the homeless, and by providing financial assistance to first-time home buyers. The state would use specific definitions of "low-income" and "affordable" to administer the program.

The \$150 million in bond proceeds would be divided among four existing programs as follows:

Rental Housing Construction Program (\$100 million). The state would use \$100 million to provide affordable rental housing for low-income households. Under this program, the state makes low-interest "deferred-payment" loans to public and private developers to develop and finance affordable rental housing. Borrowers generally do not pay principal and interest for the first 30 years, but fully repay the loan by the 40th year. In return for the low-interest loans, the state requires borrowers to rent at least 30 percent of the units to low-income households at affordable rents.

Home Purchase Assistance Program (\$25 million). The state would use \$25 million to help low-income persons buy their first home. Under this program, the state provides low-interest 30-year *second mortgages* to low-income persons. These second mortgages make homes more affordable because they reduce the amount households must borrow and repay for *first mortgages*. Borrowers delay repayment of the principal and interest on the second mortgage until the end of the 30-year loan period, or until they sell or refinance their home. This program supplements the low-interest first mortgages provided under two state programs that assist California veterans and low- and moderate-income households in buying homes.

California Housing Rehabilitation Program (\$15 million). The state would make \$15 million in loans for the purchase and rehabilitation of residential hotels. These hotels typically rent rooms to low-income individuals on a month-to-month basis. Under this program, the state lends money at low interest rates for periods of at least 20 to 30 years. During this time, hotel owners may not raise rents on units rehabilitated or purchased with program loans above levels affordable to the low-income tenants. Borrowers generally pay interest on an annual basis, but postpone payment of principal until the end of the loan period.

Emergency Shelter Program (\$10 million). The state would make \$10 million in grants to non-profit agencies and local governments to purchase and repair emergency shelters for the homeless.

Fiscal Effect:

Direct Cost of Paying Off the Bonds. The state would receive loan repayments under the three loan programs discussed above. These repayments, however, would be used for additional loans, not for repayment of the general obligation bonds. As a result, the state's General Fund would be responsible for the bond principal and interest payments, which typically would be paid off over a period of about 20 years.

Generally, the interest on bonds issued by the state is exempt from both federal and state income taxes. However, most of the programs covered by this measure are not eligible for the federal (but they are eligible for the state) income tax exemption on the interest income. As a result, the average interest rate on these bonds will be higher than on other state bonds. If the authorized bonds

are sold at an average interest rate of about 9 percent, the cost would be about \$295 million to pay off both the principal (\$150 million) and interest (\$145 million). The average payment would be about \$15 million each year.

Recommendation Adopted

Secretary-Treasurer Henning's motion to adopt the Executive Council's recommendation for Proposition No. 107 was seconded and carried.

PROPOSITION NO. 108

Passenger Rail and Clean Air Bond Act of 1990

Recommendation: Vote YES

Official Summary: This act provides for a bond issue of one billion dollars (\$1,000,000,000) to provide funds for acquisition of rights-of-way, capital expenditures, and acquisitions of rolling stock for intercity rail, commuter rail, and rail transit programs. Appropriates money from state General Fund to pay off bonds.

Summary of Legislative Analyst's estimate of net state and local government fiscal impact: If all authorized bonds are sold at 7.5 percent and paid over the typical 20 year period, the General Fund will incur about \$1.8 billion to pay off bond principal (\$1 billion) and interest (\$790 million). The estimated annual cost of bond principal and interest is \$90 million.

Bond Act (AB 973)—Digest of Analysis by Legislative Analyst: This measure authorizes the state to sell \$1 billion in general obligation bonds to provide funds for rail capital outlay. This authorization, however, would only take effect if voters approve Proposition 111, *The Traffic Congestion Relief and Spending Limitation Act of 1990*, also to be decided at this election. General obligation bonds are backed by the state, meaning that the state is obligated to pay the principal and interest costs on these bonds. General Fund revenues would be used to pay these costs. These revenues come primarily from the state corporate and personal income taxes and the state sales tax.

Upon appropriation by the Legislature, the bond money would be available for rail capital outlay. These projects must be located on routes and corridors specified in the measure, or in future statutes enacted by the Legislature.

The measure requires that at least 15 percent of the total bond funds be spent for intercity rail purposes. These funds must be allocated among projects in eligible intercity rail corridors based on the relative populations served by each corridor.

Fiscal Effect:

The fiscal effect of this measure would depend on whether voters approve Proposition 111, *The Traffic Congestion Relief and Spending Limitation Act of 1990*.

If Proposition 111 is approved by voters at this election, the passage of this measure would result in the following fiscal effect:

- *Direct Costs of Paying Off the Bonds.* For these types of bonds, the state typically makes principal and interest payments from the state's General Fund over a period of about 20 years. If all of the bonds authorized by this measure are sold at an interest rate of 7.5 percent, the cost would be about \$1.8 billion to pay off both the principal (\$1 billion) and interest (\$790 million). The average payment for principal and interest would be about \$90 million per year.

If Proposition 111 is *not* approved, this measure would not take effect and, consequently, it would have no fiscal effect.

Recommendation Adopted

On Secretary-Treasurer Henning's motion, duly seconded, the Executive Council's recommendation for Proposition No. 108 was adopted.

PROPOSITION NO. 109

Governor's Review of Legislation. Legislative Deadlines

Recommendation: Vote NO

Official Summary: Extends Governor's time to review bills in Governor's possession after adjournment in first year of legislative session, except reapportionment measures, from 12 up to an additional 29 days. Statutes subject to referendum petitions filed prior to January 1 take effect January 1 or 91 days from enactment, whichever is later. Extends, to next working day, 12-day period for Governor to consider bills if 12th day falls on Saturday, Sunday or holiday.

Changes legislative deadline for consideration of bills introduced in first year of legislative session to January 31 of sec-

ond year. **Summary of Legislative Analyst's estimate of net state and local government fiscal impact:** No direct state or local fiscal impact.

Legislative Constitutional Amendment (ACA 54)—Digest of Analysis by Legislative Analyst: This measure would give the Governor up to an additional 29 days to act on a bill passed by the Legislature, at the end of the first year of the legislative session. Thus, the Governor would have the same period of time to act on a bill at the end of both the first and second years.

It also contains a technical change, which under certain circumstances, changes the date when a bill takes effect.

Fiscal Effect:

This measure would have no direct state or local fiscal effect.

Recommendation Adopted

The motion to adopt the Executive Council's recommendation for Proposition No. 109 was seconded and carried.

PROPOSITION NO. 110

Property Tax Exemption for Severely Disabled Persons

Recommendation: Vote YES

Official Summary: Measure would permit Legislature to allow severely disabled homeowners to transfer base year values of former primary residences to replacement dwellings, purchased or newly constructed on or after the effective date of this measure. This measure would also exclude from the definition of "newly constructed" the construction, installation, or modification of any portion or structural component of a single or multiple family dwelling eligible for the homeowner's exemption if such construction, installation or modification is for the purpose of making the dwelling more accessible to severely disabled persons.

Summary of Legislative Analyst's estimate of net state and local government fiscal impact: Measure would have no direct state or local fiscal effect because it merely authorizes the Legislature to implement its provisions. If implemented by the Legislature, reductions in annual property tax collections from the reappraisal of replacement homes beginning in 1990-91, would result in property

tax revenue loss of probably \$1 million to \$2 million per year. However, exclusions of structural improvements for use by disabled persons from reappraisal would not reduce revenues by a significant amount.

Cities, counties and special districts would bear approximately two-thirds of the revenue loss, with the remainder affecting school districts and community college districts. However, existing law requires the state to replace lost education revenues if they caused the amount of funding per student to fall below existing levels, as adjusted for inflation.

Legislative Constitutional Amendment (SCA 37)—Digest of Analysis by Legislative Analyst: This constitutional amendment would authorize the Legislature to:

- Allow severely disabled homeowners, regardless of their age, to transfer the assessed value of their existing home to a replacement home in the same way now provided for homeowners over the age of 55; and
- Exclude from reappraisal building improvements that make an owner-occupied home more usable by severely disabled persons.

These provisions would apply only to replacement homes bought or improvements made on and after June 5, 1990.

Fiscal Effect:

This measure would have no direct state or local fiscal effect, because it merely authorizes the Legislature to implement its provisions.

If implemented by the Legislature, the measure would reduce annual property tax collections from the reappraisal of replacement homes, beginning in 1990-91. The property tax revenue loss would be \$1 to \$2 million per year. However, improvements to make homes more usable by the disabled usually do not add substantial market value, so that excluding these improvements from reappraisal would not reduce revenues by a significant amount.

Cities, counties, and special districts would bear approximately two-thirds of the revenue loss. The remainder of the loss would affect school districts and community college districts. Under existing constitutional requirements, the state would have to replace these lost education revenues if they caused the amount of funding per student to fall below existing levels, as adjusted for inflation.

Recommendation Adopted

Secretary-Treasurer Henning's motion to adopt the Executive Council's recommendation for Proposition No. 110 was seconded and carried.

PROPOSITION NO. 111

The Traffic Congestion Relief and Spending Limitation Act of 1990

Recommendation: Vote YES

Official Summary: This measure would enact a statewide traffic congestion relief program and update the spending limit on state and local government to better reflect the needs of a growing California population. It would provide new revenues to be used to reduce traffic congestion by building state highways, local streets and roads, and public mass transit facilities.

This measure would enact a 55% increase in truck weight fees and a five cent per gallon increase in the fuel tax on August 1, 1990, and an additional one cent on January 1 of each of the next four years. This measure updates the state appropriations limit to allow for new funding for congestion relief, mass transit, health care, services for the elderly, and other priority state programs while still providing an overall limit on state and local spending.

This measure would continue to provide that public education and community colleges receive at least 40% of the state general fund budget, and would provide that revenues in excess of the state appropriations limit are allocated equally between education and taxpayers.

Legislative Constitutional Amendment (SCA 1)—Digest of Analysis by Legislative Analyst: This measure makes changes in how the appropriations limit operates and in how the minimum funding guarantee for public schools and community colleges is determined. Passage of this measure also would cause several changes in laws relating to transportation funding to take effect. These changes are described below.

Changes in the Appropriations Limit Formula. The state and local appropriations limits are based on the amount of tax dollars appropriated in 1978–79, adjusted for subsequent changes in the cost-of-living and population. The current cost-of-living adjustment is made using the lower of the change in (1) the United States Consumer Price Index (USCPI), or (2) California per capita personal income. The current population adjustment is based on the changes in each jurisdiction's population, except for schools, where the adjust-

ment is the change in the number of students based on average daily attendance (ADA).

This measure changes to cost-of-living and population factors for both the state and local appropriations limits as described below:

- New cost-of-living factor.
 - For the *state* and for *schools*, it is the change in California per capita personal income.
 - For *local* governments, each local government annually may choose either:
 - The change in California per capita personal income, or
 - The percentage change in the jurisdiction's assessed valuation which is attributable to nonresidential new construction.
- New population factor.
 - For the *state*, it is based on both the change in attendance at public schools and community colleges and in statewide population.
 - For *local* governments, the Legislature may establish an alternative population factor.

Changes in the K-14 Education Funding Guarantee. Under existing law, two formulas are used to determine the minimum funding guarantee for public schools and community colleges. One (known as the "percentage-of-revenues" formula) guarantees these schools and colleges collectively the same percentage (about 41 percent) of state General Fund tax revenues as they received in 1986–87. The other (known as the "maintenance-of-effort" formula) guarantees these schools and colleges collectively their prior-year funding level adjusted for increases in enrollment and changes in cost-of-living. Whichever formula produces the *larger* amount determines the level of state funding for these schools and colleges.

This measure changes the cost-of-living factor used in the maintenance-of-effort formula. Specifically, it requires that the change in California per capita personal income be used instead of the lower of the USCPI or California per capita personal income.

This measure also allows the state to reduce the minimum funding guarantee in low revenue-growth years. However, it also requires that the funding base be restored in future years so that education eventually receives the same annual amount that it would have received if no reduction had occurred.

Changes in the Calculation of Excess Revenues. Under existing law, the calculation of

whether the state has revenues in excess of its limit is made on an annual basis. This measure provides that revenues which exceed the limit in one year may be carried over to a succeeding year. Only that portion of the carried-over revenue which cannot be appropriated within the following year's limit would be considered excess revenue.

Changes in the Allocation of Excess Revenues.

Under existing law, the first portion of any revenues in excess of the state's appropriations limit must go to public schools and community colleges. The maximum amount of excess revenues which can go to schools is an amount equal to 4 percent of the minimum funding guarantee, or about \$600 million in the current year. Excess revenues above this level must be returned to the taxpayers. Any excess revenues received by schools become part of the funding guarantee which must be maintained in future years.

This measure changes the allocation of excess state revenues. It provides that one-half of all excess revenues must go to public schools and community colleges, and the other one-half must be returned to taxpayers. Any excess revenues going to schools are not added into the base when computing the minimum funding guarantee in future years.

Changes in Excluded Appropriations. This measure excludes several new categories of appropriations from the state's appropriations limit. Existing law provides several exclusions from the state's limit, including one for debt service on voter-approved bonds, another for certain payments to local governments, and one for the costs of federal and court mandates. This measure also excludes appropriations for (1) costs of natural disasters, (2) appropriations financed by increases in transportation-related taxes, and (3) qualified capital outlay expenditures (as defined by the Legislature).

Other Programs Affected by Passage of This Measure

There are several changes in law which would take effect only if this measure is approved by the voters. These changes would:

- *Increase gas taxes.* The current 9 cents-per-gallon state excise tax on motor vehicle fuels would increase by 5 cents-per-gallon on August 1, 1990. It would increase an additional 1 cent-per-gallon each January 1 during the period 1991 through 1994.
- *Increase truck weight fees.* Commercial vehicle weight fees would increase by 40 percent on August 1, 1990 and by an additional 10 percent on January 1, 1995.

- *Provide partial authorization for transportation bond issues.* The Passenger Rail and Clean Air Bond Act of 1990 (Proposition 108) would only become operative if this measure is also approved by the voters. Proposition 108 would authorize the state to issue \$1 billion in general obligation bonds to fund capital improvements on intercity, commuter and urban rail transit systems.
- *Authorize the transfer of \$4 million from the Highway Users Tax Account to the State Parks and Recreation Fund for road repair in the state park system.*

Fiscal Effect:

The fiscal effects of this measure will, to a large extent, depend on future economic conditions in the state. The estimates discussed below reflect the economic conditions assumed in the *1990-91 Governor's Budget*, which was released on January 10, 1990.

Transportation Funding Changes. Approval of this measure would increase revenues for transportation purposes by \$925 million in 1990-91, \$1.1 billion in 1991-92 and increasing amounts until 1994-95 as a result of increased state gas taxes and truck weight fees. These revenue increases would be exempt from state and local appropriations limits.

Changes in the Appropriations Limit Formula. As a result of the proposed changes in the limit adjustment factors, we estimate that this measure would increase the state's appropriations limit by more than \$800 million in 1990-91 and unknown amounts annually thereafter. The ability of the state to appropriate additional funds as a result of the increased state limit is dependent on the level of revenues received by the state. In 1990-91 the increase would have no effect on existing spending levels, outside of the transportation program area, because state revenues are expected to be less than the existing limit.

This measure also will increase local government appropriations limits by an unknown, but probably significant amount.

Education Funding Changes. The impact of this measure on education funding will depend on how it affects the amount of the minimum funding guarantee and the amount of excess revenues. Generally speaking, this measure will tend to increase the minimum funding guarantee, because it increases the maintenance-of-effort formula amount, and thus makes it more likely that this formula will determine the amount of the guarantee. At the same time, the changes made by this measure in the appropriations limit adjustment factors will tend to decrease the likelihood that public schools and community colleges

would receive excess revenues.

Using the revenue and economic assumptions contained in the *1990–91 Governor’s Budget*, we estimate that this measure would have no impact on General Fund costs for public schools and community colleges in 1990–91. This is because the minimum funding guarantee under both current law and under this measure is projected to be determined by the percentage of revenues formula (as opposed to the maintenance-of-effort formula), and revenues are expected to be below the state’s appropriations limit. The net fiscal effect of this measure with respect to public schools and community colleges in subsequent years is unknown.

Bond Measure Costs. As noted earlier, Proposition 108 would only take effect if this measure is also approved. As a result, passage of this measure—in combination with passage of Proposition 108—would authorize the state to issue \$1 billion in general obligation bonds, which would be paid off from the state’s General Fund, over a period of about 20 years. If all of the bonds were sold at an interest rate of 7.5 percent, the cost would be about \$1.8 billion to pay off both the principal (\$1 billion) and interest (\$790 million). The average payment for principal and interest would be about \$90 million per year.

Recommendation Adopted

On Secretary-Treasurer Henning’s motion, duly seconded, the Executive Council’s recommendation for Proposition No. 111 was adopted.

PROPOSITION NO. 112

State Officials, Ethics, Salaries, Open Meetings

Recommendation: Vote YES

Official Summary: Prohibits legislators, statewide elected officers from accepting honoraria, or accepting compensation for representing another before a state board or agency. Directs Legislature to enact laws applicable to legislators, statewide elected officers, implementing honoraria and compensation prohibitions, limiting acceptance of gifts, strengthening conflict laws, prohibiting receipt of income from lobbying firms, and prohibiting lobbying for compensation within 12 months after leaving office.

Repeals current provisions setting salaries, benefits of legislators, elected statewide officials; establishes seven-member Commission, appointed by Governor, to

annually establish salaries, benefits. Mandates open meetings of Legislature, with specified exceptions.

Summary of Legislative Analyst’s estimate of net state and local government fiscal impact: Unknown costs to state General Fund, depending on levels of salaries, benefits established by Citizens Compensation Commission. Relatively minor costs to state for support of Commission and enforcing provisions of this measure.

Legislative Constitutional Amendment (SCA 32)—Digest of Analysis by Legislative Analyst: This constitutional amendment prohibits Members of the Legislature and other elected state officers from receiving any honoraria. It also imposes restrictions on gifts, lobbying activity, and the sources of income of these officers. In addition, it creates a Citizens Compensation Commission, which shall have the exclusive power to set the salaries and all fringe benefits, except retirement, for these elected state officers.

The state officers that are affected by this measure include all Members of the Legislature, the Governor, Lieutenant Governor, Attorney General, Controller, Insurance Commissioner, Secretary of State, Superintendent of Public Instruction, Treasurer, and the members of the Board of Equalization.

The specific provisions of this measure are:

Prohibition on Honoraria and Restrictions on Gifts

- Prohibits Members of the Legislature and other elected state officers from accepting honoraria.
- Requires the Legislature to enact laws that ban or strictly limit the acceptance of gifts by elected state officers if the acceptance of the gifts might create a conflict of interest.

Restrictions on Lobbying

- Restricts Members of the Legislature and other elected state officers from accepting compensation for appearing before a *state* board or agency.
- Permits Members of the Legislature and other elected state officers to accept compensation for appearing on behalf of another person before any *local* board or agency. However, Members or state officers who accept this compensation may not participate, for the following 12 months, in any action or decision that uniquely affects a financial interest of that person.
- Prohibits Members from receiving any compensation from a lobbyist, or from any person who

has been under a contract with the Legislature during the previous 12 months. Also prohibits elected state officers from receiving any compensation from a lobbyist, or from any person who has been under contract during the previous 12 months with their state agency.

- Requires the Legislature to enact laws to prohibit a Member from lobbying, for compensation, before the Legislature for 12 months after the Member leaves office. This provision would affect Members whose terms begin on or after December 3, 1990.
- Requires the Legislature to enact laws to prohibit state officers, or heads of state agencies who are appointed by the Governor, from lobbying for compensation before the executive branch of government for 12 months after leaving office. This provision would affect state officers and heads of agencies who are holding office on or after January 7, 1991.

Compensation

- Creates the California Citizens Compensation Commission with the exclusive authority to set the annual salaries, and the medical, dental, insurance, and other similar benefits of Members of the Legislature and the following elected state officers: the Governor, Lieutenant Governor, Attorney General, Controller, Insurance Commissioner, Secretary of State, Superintendent of Public Instruction, Treasurer, and the members of the Board of Equalization.
 - The Governor must appoint the seven members of the commission within 30 days after the June election.
 - The commission membership must include three public members: one member who has experience in employee compensation; one member who is a representative of a non-profit public interest organization; and one member who is a representative of the general population. The commission membership must also include two members with experience in the business community and two members who are representatives of labor organizations. No current or former officer or employee of the state is eligible for appointment to the commission.
 - The Commission would have until December 3, 1990 to set the salaries and benefits which would be effective for one year beginning on that date.
 - In the following years, the Commission could adjust annually the salaries and benefits for elected state officers.

Other Legislative Rule Changes

- Limits the ability of the Legislature to close

sessions of the Legislature or its committees to the public.

- Requires the President pro Tempore of the Senate, the Speaker of the Assembly, and the minority leader of each house to report to the Senate or Assembly at the beginning of each session on the goals and objectives of each house during the session. At the end of the session, these individuals would have to report to each house on the progress made toward meeting the goals and objectives.

Fiscal Effect:

This measure would result in unknown costs to the state General Fund. The amount of these costs would depend on the levels of salaries and benefits established by the Citizens Compensation Commission.

The cost to the state of supporting the commission and enforcing the provisions of the measure would probably be relatively minor.

Recommendation Adopted

The motion to adopt the Executive Council's recommendation for Proposition No. 112 was seconded and carried.

PROPOSITION NO. 113

Practice of Chiropractic

Recommendation: Vote YES

Official Summary: Amends the Chiropractic Act to require annual renewal of chiropractic licenses during a licensee's month of birth rather than on January 1 of each year. Increases penalties for unlawful practice of chiropractic and violation of the Chiropractic Act. Minimum fine is increased from \$50 to \$100. Maximum fine is increased from \$250 to \$750. Possible imprisonment increased from a minimum of 30 days and maximum of 90 days to a maximum of six months without specification of a minimum.

Summary of Legislative Analyst's estimate of net state and local government fiscal impact: State Board of Chiropractic Examiners Fund would incur minor one-time costs in 1990-91 to modify automated license renewal system. Increased fines for violation of Chiropractic Act would result in additional revenues to state and local governments.

Legislative Initiative Amendment (SB 2751)—Digest of Analysis by Legislative

Analyst: This measure:

- Changes the license renewal date from January 1 of each year to the last day of the licensee's birth month. The measure requires the Board of Chiropractic Examiners to establish regulations on July 1, 1991 to make this change in the renewal process.
- Increases the fines and penalties for violations of the Chiropractic Law. The minimum fine would be raised from \$50 to \$100 and the maximum fine from \$200 to \$750. The measure also raises the maximum jail term from 90 days to six months.

Fiscal Effect:

This measure would result in minor one-time costs in 1990–91 to the State Board of Chiropractic Examiners Fund to modify the board's automated renewal system in order to change the license renewal dates.

By raising the fines for violations of the Chiropractic Law, the measure would result in additional revenues to state and local governments.

Recommendation Adopted

Secretary-Treasurer Henning's motion to adopt the Executive Council's recommendation for Proposition No. 113 was seconded and carried.

PROPOSITION NO. 114

*Murder of a Peace Officer.
Criminal Penalties.
Special Circumstance.
Peace Officer Definition.*

Recommendation: Vote NO

Official Summary: The Briggs Death Penalty Initiative Act defined "peace officer" for cases where a defendant is found guilty of first degree murder and the victim was a peace officer. No changes have been made to this section since its enactment. The Legislature has reclassified peace officers by grouping them into different categories and has made other changes since 1979.

This statute conforms to the definition found in the Initiative Act to the new classifications, thereby increasing the numbers and types of peace officers covered by the act.

Summary of Legislative Analyst's estimate of net state and local government fiscal impact: Increases the number of peace officers for which the special cir-

cumstance for first degree murder applies. To the extent longer prison terms result, there will be unknown increases in state costs.

Legislative Initiative Amendment (SB 353)—Digest of Analysis by Legislative Analyst:

By reference, this measure would incorporate the legislative changes in the definition of a peace officer into the provisions of the 1978 Death Penalty Initiative. As a result, this measure expands the number and types of peace officers the murder of whom would be a special circumstance under the 1978 Death Penalty Initiative.

Fiscal Effect:

This measure increases the number of crimes for which the special circumstances for first-degree murder may apply. To the extent these changes result in longer prison terms, there will be unknown increases in state costs.

Recommendation Adopted

On Secretary-Treasurer Henning's motion, duly seconded, the Executive Council's recommendation for Proposition No. 114 was adopted.

PROPOSITION NO. 115

Criminal Law

Recommendation: Vote NO

Official Summary: Amends state Constitution regarding criminal and juvenile cases: affords accused no greater constitutional rights than federal Constitution affords; prohibits post-indictment preliminary hearings; establishes People's right to due process and speedy, public trials; provides reciprocal discovery; allows hearsay in preliminary hearings.

Makes statutory changes, including: expands first degree murder definition; increases penalty for specified murders; expands special circumstance murders subject to capital punishment; increases penalty for minors convicted of first degree murder to life imprisonment without parole; permits probable cause finding based on hearsay; requires court to conduct jury examination.

Summary of Legislative Analyst's estimate of net state and local government fiscal impact: The net fiscal effect of this measure is unknown.

The measure makes several significant

changes to the criminal justice system. How the measure will be implemented and interpreted is unknown. There may be only a minor fiscal impact on state and local governments, or there may be a major fiscal impact.

Initiative Constitutional Amendment and Statute—Digest of Analysis by Legislative Analyst: The proposal makes numerous significant and complex changes in criminal law and in the judicial procedures that must be followed in criminal cases. The more important changes are summarized below.

Rights of Defendants in Criminal Cases. The measure provides that the California Constitution shall not be construed by the courts to afford greater rights to criminal defendants, including minors, than those afforded by the Constitution of the United States. These rights include the right to equal protection of the laws, to due process, to the assistance of counsel, to be personally present with counsel, to a speedy and public trial, to compel the attendance of witnesses, to confront the witnesses against him or her, to be free from unreasonable searches and seizures, to privacy, to not be compelled to be a witness against himself or herself, to not be placed twice in jeopardy for the same offense, and to not suffer the imposition of cruel or unusual punishment.

First Degree Murder and Special Circumstances
This measure:

- Expands the definition of first degree murder to include murder committed during the commission or attempted commission of additional serious crimes.
- Expands the list of “special circumstances” to include a variety of serious crimes, such as the killing of a witness to prevent his or her testimony in certain juvenile proceedings.
- Prohibits the dismissal of a special circumstance finding by a judge.
- Allows minors who are 16 or 17 years of age at the time of the crime and convicted of first degree murder with special circumstances to be punished by life imprisonment *without* the possibility of parole.

Crime of Torture. This measure creates a new crime of torture which would be punished by life imprisonment with the possibility of parole.

Preliminary Hearings. This measure prohibits a preliminary hearing when a felony is pros-

ecuted by grand jury indictment.

Speedy Trial

Generally, this measure:

- Provides the people of California with the right to due process of law and to a speedy and public trial.
- Requires the court to assign felony cases only to defense attorneys who will be ready to proceed within specified time limits.
- Requires felony trials to be set within 60 days of the defendant’s arraignment except upon a showing of good cause.
- Establishes a court review procedure for felony cases when preliminary hearings or trials are scheduled beyond the time specified by law or postponed “without good cause.” Petitions for a court review would have priority over all other cases in the court.

Disclosure of Information

This measure:

- Changes the rule under which prosecutors and defense attorneys must reveal information to each other in their prospective criminal cases.
- Repeals the requirement that a copy of the arrest report be delivered to the defendant at the initial court appearance, or within two days of the appearance.

Hearsay Evidence. This measure allows the use of hearsay evidence at preliminary hearings if these out-of-court statements are introduced through the testimony of certain trained and experienced law enforcement officers.

Examination of Prospective Jurors. This measure makes major changes in the way juries are selected for criminal trials. Specifically, the measure:

- Repeals a requirement which generally permits reasonable examination of prospective jurors by counsel for the people and for the defendant for purposes of making peremptory challenges and challenges for cause.
- Requires the court to conduct the examination of prospective jurors, but allows further examination by the parties or the court itself upon a showing of good cause.
- Requires that the examination of prospective jurors be conducted only in aid of the exercise of challenges for cause.

Joining Criminal Cases

This measure:

- Prohibits the constitution from being construed by the courts to prohibit the joining of criminal cases as prescribed by statute.

- Prohibits the severing of jointly charged cases due to the unavailability of or unpreparedness of one or more defendants, except as specified.

Fiscal Effect:

The net fiscal effect of this measure is unknown. The measure makes several significant changes to the criminal justice system. How the measure will be implemented and interpreted is unknown. There may be only a minor fiscal impact on state and local governments, or there may be a major fiscal impact.

Recommendation Adopted

The motion to adopt the Executive Council's recommendation for Proposition No. 115 was seconded and carried.

PROPOSITION NO. 116

Rail Transportation. Bond Act

Recommendation: Vote YES

Official Summary: Authorizes general obligation bond issue of \$1,990,000,000 to provide funds principally for passenger and commuter rail systems, with limited funds available for public mass transit guideways, paratransit vehicles, bicycle and ferry facilities, and railroad technology museum.

Allocates certain amounts to specified state and local entities through a grant program administered by the California Transportation Commission. Program will require some matching funds from local entities. Appropriates money from state General Fund to pay off bonds.

Summary of Legislative Analyst's estimate of net state and local government fiscal impact: If all authorized bonds are sold at 7.5 percent interest and paid over the typical 20 year period, the General Fund will incur about \$3.6 billion in costs to pay off bond principal (\$2 billion) and interest (\$1.6 billion). The estimated annual cost of bond principal and interest is \$180 million.

Initiative Statute--Digest of Analysis by Legislative Analyst: This measure authorizes the state to sell \$1.99 billion in general obligation bonds to provide funds mostly for rail capital outlay. General obligation bonds are backed by

the state, meaning that the state is obligated to pay the principal and interest costs on these bonds. General Fund revenues would be used to pay these costs. These revenues come primarily from the state corporate and personal income taxes and the state sales tax.

The bond money would be allocated by the CTC to state and local agencies according to a grant process set up by the measure. The measure identifies the eligible projects and their funding levels for the entire amount of the bond measure. Caltrans would receive about 20 percent of the bond funds. The other 80 percent would be given to specific local government agencies. The bond money would be expended as follows:

\$1,033 million for commuter and intercity rail projects:

- \$202 million for the Los Angeles-San Diego rail corridor.
- \$173 million for Caltrain on the San Francisco Peninsula.
- \$140 million for the Los Angeles-Fresno-San Francisco Bay Area rail corridor and extension of the corridor to Sacramento.
- \$98 million for the San Bernardino-Los Angeles rail corridor.
- \$85 million to implement intercity rail service from Placer County to Santa Clara County.
- \$81 million for the Los Angeles-Santa Barbara rail corridor.
- \$79 million for the San Bernardino-Riverside-Orange County rail corridor.
- \$75 million for specified projects and engineering studies to provide commuter and intercity rail service.
- \$100 million for the acquisition of rail cars and locomotives.

\$728 million for urban rail transit and local rail projects

- \$229 million for projects in Los Angeles County (including at least \$80 million for the Metro Rail).
- \$132 million for specified urban rail projects in the City of Irvine and the City of South Lake Tahoe.
- \$108 million for BART (including an extension to San Mateo County) and other projects in Alameda and Contra Costa Counties.
- \$100 million for projects in the Sacramento Regional Transit District.
- \$77 million for projects in San Diego County.
- \$47 million for projects in Santa Clara County.
- \$35 million for projects in San Francisco.

\$229 million for other projects:

- \$80 million for grade separations on the

downtown Los Angeles—San Pedro and Long Beach Harbor rail freight line.

- \$73 million for rail station improvements, rail rights-of-way acquisition, other rail improvements, and purchase of paratransit vehicles in specified nonurban counties.
- \$30 million for water-borne ferry systems.
- \$20 million to improve bicycle commuter facilities.
- \$16 million for specified studies, administrative costs of the CTC and Caltrans, and construction of the California State Museum of Railroad Technology.
- \$10 million for rail projects in Humboldt and Mendocino Counties.

Fiscal Effect:

Direct Costs of Paying Off the Bonds. For these types of bonds, the state typically makes principal and interest payments from the state's General Fund over a period of about 20 years. If all of the bonds authorized by this measure are sold at an interest rate of 7.5 percent, the cost would be about \$3.6 billion to pay off both the principal (\$2 billion) and interest (\$1.6 billion). The average payment for principal and interest would be about \$180 million per year.

Recommendation Adopted

Secretary-Treasurer Henning's motion to adopt the Executive Council's recommendation for Proposition No. 116 was seconded and carried.

PROPOSITION NO. 117

Wildlife Protection

Recommendation: Vote YES

Official Summary: Establishes Habitat Conservation Fund. Transfers \$30 million to Fund annually from existing environmental funds and General Fund. Monies from Fund appropriated to Wildlife Conservation Board; Coastal, Tahoe, Santa Monica Mountains Conservancies; state and local parks programs. Funds to be used principally for acquisition of deer and mountain lion habitat; rare and endangered species habitat. Remaining funding for wetlands; riparian and aquatic habitat; open space; other environmental purposes.

Prohibits taking of mountain lions unless for protection of life, livestock or other property. Permit for taking required, but prohibits use of poison, leg-

hold or metal-jawed traps and snares.

Summary of Legislative Analyst's estimate of net state and local government fiscal impact: For 1990–91, approximately \$18 million from Unallocated Account in Cigarette and Tobacco Products Surtax Fund and \$12 million from General Fund will be transferred to the Habitat Conservation Fund, unless Legislature makes transfers from other funds. In subsequent years, General Fund transfers may increase if sales of cigarettes and tobacco products decline. Estimated annual costs of managing acquired properties could exceed \$1 million, supported by sources other than Habitat Conservation Fund.

Initiative Statute—Digest of Analysis by Legislative Analyst: This measure creates the Habitat Conservation Fund (HCF) and guarantees it \$30 million a year for the next 30 years. This funding would be obtained by transferring monies from various existing environmental funds and from the state's General Fund. These monies would be used to acquire, enhance, or restore specified types of lands for wildlife or open space.

On an annual basis this measure provides funding to the following agencies:

- \$10 million (for five years) to the Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy.
- \$4.5 million to the DPR. Of this amount, \$1.5 million would be for projects located in the Santa Lucia Mountain Range in Monterey County, \$1 million would be for additions to the state park system, and \$2 million would be for matching grants to local agencies.
- \$4 million to the State Coastal Conservancy.
- \$0.5 million to the California Tahoe Conservancy.
- The balance of the money in the HCF would go to the WCB. For the first five years (1990–1991 through 1994–1995), this balance would be \$11 million a year. Thereafter, the balance would be \$21 million a year because the allocation to the Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy would have expired.

This measure requires that these funds be used for the acquisition of lands for the protection of deer and mountain lions, rare and endangered animals and plant life, wetlands, and for park purposes. The measure requires that, to the extent possible, half of the funds be spent in northern California and half of the funds be spent in southern California.

In addition, this measure designates mountain lions as a specially protected mammal, and prohibits their taking, injury, possession, or sale. However, under limited circumstances the mea-

sure allows the killing of mountain lions if the lion (1) is perceived to be an imminent threat to public health or safety or (2) damages livestock or other property.

Fiscal Effect:

The \$30 million in annual HCF funding would come from the following sources:

1. 10 percent of the funds in the Proposition 99 "unallocated account."

2. The remainder from the state's General Fund, less any amounts the Legislature may transfer from other existing environmental funds.

We estimate that for 1990-91 these amounts would be \$18 million from the unallocated account and \$12 million from the General Fund, unless other transfers are made.

In subsequent years, the share of funds from the General Fund (or other environmental funds) may be higher because there will be less revenues in the unallocated account as the sale of cigarettes and tobacco products decline.

Ongoing costs to manage these properties would not come from the HCF, but would be supported by other state funds. These costs could exceed \$1 million annually.

Recommendation Adopted

On Secretary-Treasurer Henning's motion, duly seconded, the Executive Council's recommendation for Proposition No. 117 was seconded and carried.

PROPOSITION NO. 118

Legislature. Reapportionment. Ethics.

Recommendation: Vote NO

Official Summary: Amends state constitutional provisions governing redistricting procedures and criteria for Senate, Assembly and Congressional offices. Redistricting plan requires two-thirds vote of each house, approval by voters. Reschedules elections for all senatorial offices to second, sixth, tenth years following national census.

Amends constitution to create Joint Legislative Ethics Committee, directs Legislature establish ethical standards. Amends and adds statutes to: prohibit participation in legislation when legislator has personal interest; require legislators report gifts, honoraria of \$50 or more; prohibit receipt of gifts from sources employing lobbyists; prohibit

lobbying by former legislators for one year.

Summary of Legislative Analyst's estimate of net state and local government fiscal impact: Limit on redistricting expenditures to one-half of costs of last redistricting (adjusted for cost of living changes) could reduce state costs by several millions of dollars each decade. However, requirement of electorate vote and possible court reapportionment could increase state costs, offsetting part of all of savings. Costs of legislative ethics provisions are probably minor.

Initiative Constitutional Amendment and Statute—Digest of Analysis by Legislative Analyst:

This measure makes changes:

- In the reapportionment process,
- The timing for the election of state Senators, and
- In the laws regarding ethical standards for Members of the Legislature.

Reapportionment Process

This measure makes the following changes:

Changes to the Reapportionment Process. This measure:

- Requires the Legislature to establish new boundary lines for Senate, Assembly, and Congressional districts in separate statutes—one for the Senate and the Assembly, and one for the U.S. House of Representatives.
- Requires the enactment of these statutes by a two-thirds vote, rather than a majority vote, of each house by July 15, 1991, and every 10 years thereafter.
- Requires the Secretary of State to submit each statute to the electorate as a referendum measure at the next scheduled statewide election following the enactment of the reapportionment statutes.
- Prohibits the Legislature from expending public monies for data and/or a computer system for redistricting purposes, unless the data or system is accessible to every Member of the Legislature.

Objectives and Standards Governing Reapportionment Statutes. This measure requires each statute which establishes boundary lines for Senate, Assembly, or Congressional district boundaries to:

- Provide fair representation to all people of the state.
- Provide that each Senate district shall be composed of two adjacent Assembly districts.

- Provide that Senate and Assembly districts shall not vary in population by more than one percent. Congressional districts shall be as nearly equal in population as practicable.
- Provide that districts shall respect certain county boundaries, be composed of contiguous and compact territories, and shall minimize the division of cities.
- Provide that districts shall not be drawn for the purpose of favoring any political party or any incumbent.

If a redistricting statute does not comply with the measure's specifications, or if it is rejected by the electors through the referendum process, the measure authorizes any voter to commence judicial proceedings to establish boundaries that comply with this measure. The measure authorizes the court to designate interim and/or decade-long district boundaries, and invite members of the public to submit proposed redistricting plans.

Senate Elections. This measure makes the following two changes in the election of Senators:

- All Senate seats, rather than half, shall be filled at the same election.
- All Senate terms beginning in the year of the decennial census will be for two years, rather than four years.

Legislative Ethics

This measure makes various changes in the law regarding the conduct of Members and former Members, including restrictions on honoraria, gifts, income, and lobbying.

Joint Legislative Ethics Committee. This measure:

- Establishes a new Joint Legislative Ethics Committee (JLEC) to establish, monitor, publicize, and enforce ethical standards for Members of the Legislature and to monitor and report to the public on the reapportionment process. The committee will be comprised of four Members from each house of the Legislature, equally divided between the two political parties.
- Requires the JLEC to develop ethics standards for current and departing Members, conduct ethics seminars, receive conflict of interest statements, and maintain a list of former Members.
- Requires the JLEC to submit an annual report to the Legislature on the ethical standards established by the JLEC, and on the ethics complaints received, action taken, and advisory opinions issued by the JLEC. The measure also requires the JLEC to make its advisory opinions available to the public.

Restrictions on Gifts and Honoraria. This measure:

- Prohibits Members from accepting gifts and honoraria from anyone who employs a lobbyist or from anyone who works for an organization that employs a lobbyist.
- Requires Members to report to the JLEC on the receipt of certain gifts and honoraria, and certain payments and reimbursements. The measure requires the JLEC to make these reports available to the public.

Restrictions on Lobbying. This measure prohibits former Members from receiving pay for representing other persons before the Legislature or state agencies for one year after they leave the Legislature.

Fiscal Effect:

The measure provides that the amount of public expenditures by the Legislature for redistricting shall be no greater than one-half of the amount that the Legislature spent in developing and adopting the redistricting plans that were based on the 1980 census, adjusted for changes in the cost-of-living. This provision could reduce state costs by several millions of dollars each decade. However, the provision requiring the electorate to vote on the reapportionment measures and the possible subsequent reapportionment by the courts could increase state costs, thereby offsetting part or all of the above savings.

The costs of this measure associated with the conduct of Members and former members of the Legislature are probably minor.

Recommendation Adopted

The motion to adopt the Executive Council's recommendation for Proposition No. 118 was seconded and carried.

PROPOSITION NO. 119

Reapportionment by Commission

Recommendation: Vote NO

Official Summary: Amends state Constitution. Requires 12-person Commission, appointed by retired appellate justices, adjust boundaries of California Senatorial, Assembly, Congressional, and Board of Equalization districts. Commissioners appointed from nominees of non-partisan, non-profit state organizations.

Requires Commission review plans submitted by registered voters and adopt

plan or amended plan which complies with standards. Each district's population may vary no more than 1% from average district population. Senatorial districts formed from two adjacent Assembly districts, Board of Equalization districts from 10 adjacent Senate districts. Elections held for all Senate and Assembly seats in 1992.

Summary of Legislative Analyst's estimate of net state and local government fiscal impact: Requires Legislature to transfer \$3.5 million to the Independent Citizens Redistricting Fund in 1990-91 for expenses of commission. Transfers thereafter, every 10 years, adjusted for changes in the Consumer Price Index, resulting in the reduction of reapportionment costs by several millions of dollars each decade. If Supreme Court undertakes redistricting, state costs would increase thereby offsetting part or all of above savings.

Initiative Constitutional Amendment and Statute—Digest of Analysis by Legislative Analyst: This measure amends the California Constitution to create the Independent Citizens Redistricting Commission for the purpose of reapportioning Assembly and Senate, Congressional, and Board of Equalization districts. It also changes the elections cycle for state Senators.

The Redistricting Commission. An Independent Citizens Redistricting Commission would be established following each decennial census. The commission would consist of 12 members. A panel of 3 retired justices from the California Courts of Appeal would appoint the members and alternates from a list of registered California voters nominated by nonprofit, nonpartisan organizations. At least 5 members of the commission must come from each of the two largest political parties. The remaining two members must not be members of these parties.

Members of the first reapportionment commission would be appointed on May 31, 1991. Immediately following their appointment, members are subject to disqualification by representatives of any political party which received 10 percent or more of the total vote for governor in the preceding election. Each party may disqualify two members of the commission in this manner. Disqualified members would be replaced by the justices from among the alternates.

The commission is required to adopt one plan for Assembly, Senate and Board of Equalization districts, and another plan for Congressional districts. If the commission is not able to adopt redistricting plans that meet the requirements of

this measure, it would be disbanded and a new commission would be selected following the same procedure used to select the original commission. If the second commission is also unable to adopt plans, then the commission would be disbanded and the California Supreme Court would be required to adopt the reapportionment plans.

The Redistricting Process. The redistricting process begins with the publication of an information manual by the Secretary of State. This manual includes information about the standards which a redistricting plan must meet, copies of census maps, statistical data, instructions for the submission of redistricting plans to the commission, and other data requested by the justices. Any registered voter may then submit a single redistricting plan to the commission within the sixty-day period for submission of plans. The plans must then be made available for public inspection for a forty-five day period. During this period, the commission is required to accept and review written comments, and to solicit and accept public comments at three public hearings prior to adopting final reapportionment plans.

Within 30 days after the close of the public inspection period, the commission is required to adopt the reapportionment plans which best satisfy the requirements of this measure. A majority vote of at least seven commissioners is required to adopt the plans, with at least two votes coming from commission members belonging to each of the two major political parties. If no plan satisfies the standards, the commission must pick at least three but not more than five of the submitted plans. These plans must be returned to their authors for resubmittal, along with the transcript indicating how the plans failed to meet the standards. The commission must then select the best of the resubmitted plans, or amend them as necessary to achieve compliance with the standards.

The reapportionment plans are subject to the referendum, if sufficient signatures are gathered to place the measure on the statewide ballot. In the event that the voters reject an adopted reapportionment plan, the justices must appoint a new commission to adopt a new plan within 45 days of the rejection. However, if the rejected plan was used for the immediately preceding primary election, it must continue to be used in the subsequent general election.

The California Supreme Court would have exclusive state court jurisdiction to review legal challenges to plans adopted by the commission. The court is required to adopt new plans within 60 days if neither the original commission nor the replacement commission adopt plans within the

designated time, or if a replacement commission's adopted plans are found by the court to violate federal laws. The court must adopt plans that are in accordance with the objectives and standards of this measure.

Objectives and Standards Governing Reapportionment Plans. The measure requires that the commission's reapportionment plans promote certain objectives and conform with certain standards. These objectives and standards require that:

- Assembly and Congressional districts not vary in population by more than one percent.
- Fair and effective representation be provided for all residents of the state.
- Minority populations must not be dispersed or concentrated in a manner that has an adverse effect on their political influence.
- Each Senate district be composed of 2 adjacent Assembly districts and each Board of Equalization district be composed of 10 adjacent Senate districts.
- District lines must respect certain county boundaries, be composed of contiguous and compact territories, and must minimize the division of cities.
- To the extent practicable and consistent with the achievement of the other standards, the proportion of registered voters of each major political party in a district must be within two percent of the statewide proportion of that party's voters.

Support for the Commission. Each member would receive: (1) \$100 for each day of commission business, and (2) reimbursement for reasonable expenses incurred. The commission is authorized to employ staff as needed.

Election of Senators. The measure also requires elections to be held for *all* Senate seats in 1992, and every 10 years thereafter. Following the 1992 election, all even-numbered seats will have one two-year term, followed by two four-year terms. Following the 2002 election, the odd-numbered Senate seats will have one two-year term and two four-year terms. The terms for odd- and even-numbered seats would continue to rotate in this fashion following every census.

Fiscal Effect:

The measure requires the Legislature to transfer \$3.5 million from legislative funds to the Independent Citizens Redistricting Fund in 1990–91 for expenses of the commission. No other public monies may be appropriated or expended for redistricting. The Legislature must make transfers to the fund every 10 years thereaf-

ter, adjusted for changes in the Consumer Price Index, and reduced to account for any previously unexpended funds. As a result of this limit, reapportionment costs in the state could be reduced by several millions of dollars each decade. However, if the task of adopting a reapportionment plan fell to the Supreme Court, state costs would increase, thereby offsetting part or all of the above savings.

Recommendation Adopted

Secretary-Treasurer Henning's motion to adopt the Executive Council's recommendation for Proposition No. 119 was seconded and carried.

PROPOSITION NO. 120

New Prison Construction Bond Act of 1990

Recommendation: Vote YES

Official Summary: This act provides for a bond issue of four hundred fifty million dollars (\$450,000,000) to provide funds to relieve overcrowding in the state's prisons and the Youth Authority facilities through new construction.

Bond Act (SB 842)—Digest of Analysis by Legislative Analyst: This measure authorizes the state to sell \$450 million of general obligation bonds. The money would be deposited in the 1990 Prison Construction Bond Fund, created by this measure. General obligation bonds are backed by the state, meaning that the state is obligated to pay principal and interest costs on these bonds. General Fund revenues would be used to pay these costs. These revenues come primarily from the state and corporate personal income taxes and the state sales tax.

The proceeds in the 1990 Prison Construction Bond Fund would be used by buy land and construct, remodel, and maintain youth and adult correctional facilities, as determined by the Governor and the Legislature. From this fund, about \$194 million has already been designated for a 2,200-bed adult prison in North Imperial County. In addition, the Governor's 1990–91 Budget proposes (contingent on approval of this bond measure by the voters) to spend about \$92 million for maintenance and alteration of existing youth and adult correctional facilities and for administrative costs associated with the youth and adult correctional facilities construction program.

This measure also requires the Department of Corrections and the Department of the Youth

Authority to annually submit five-year plans to the Legislature on or before January 10 and include in each plan a program of proposed expenditures from the 1990 Prison Construction Fund.

Fiscal Effect:

Direct Cost of Paying Off the Bonds. For these types of bonds, the state typically would make principal and interest payments from the state's General Fund over a period of about 20 years. If all of the bonds authorized by this measure are sold at an interest rate of 7.5 percent, the cost would be about \$805 million to pay off the principal (\$450 million) and interest (\$355 million). The average payment would be about \$40 million per year.

Recommendation Adopted

On Secretary-Treasurer Henning's motion, duly seconded, the Executive Council's recommendation for Proposition No. 120 was seconded and carried.

PROPOSITION NO. 121

Higher Education Facilities Bond Act of June 1990

Recommendation: Vote YES

Official Summary: This act provides for a bond issue of four hundred fifty million dollars (\$450,000,000) to provide funds for the construction or improvement of facilities of California's public higher education institutions, which include the University of California's nine campuses, the California State University's 20 campuses, the 71 districts of the California Community Colleges, the Hastings College of the Law, the California Maritime Academy, and off-campus facilities of the California State University approved by the Trustees of the California State University on or before July 1, 1990.

The use of funds authorized under this act includes, but is not necessarily limited to, the construction or improvement of classrooms, laboratories, and libraries, and the implementation of earthquake and other health or safety improvements.

Bond Act (SB 147)—Digest of Analysis by Legislative Analyst: This measure authorizes the state to sell \$450 million in general obligation

bonds for California's public higher education system. General obligation bonds are backed by the state, meaning that the state is obligated to pay the principal and interest costs on these bonds. General Fund revenues would be used to pay these costs. These revenues come primarily from the state corporate and personal income taxes and the state sales tax.

The bond money would be used to purchase building sites and equipment related to new buildings, construct new buildings, and alter existing buildings. The state also would be authorized to use General Fund money for short-term loans to community colleges for the purchase of instructional equipment.

The Governor and the Legislature would decide how to spend the bond money. The state's budget proposed by the Governor for the 1990-91 fiscal year would spend about \$386 million from this bond measure (if approved by the voters) for projects at various campuses. This spending proposal includes \$130 million for the University of California, \$130 million for the California State University, and about \$126 million for the California Community Colleges. Of these amounts, about \$344 million would be used to construct or alter buildings and provide related development (such as utilities). In addition, almost \$19 million would be used to remove asbestos from buildings and \$23 million would be used to purchase instructional equipment for the community colleges.

Fiscal Effect:

Direct Costs of Paying Off the Bonds. For these types of bonds, the state typically makes principal and interest payments from the state's General Fund over a period of about 20 years. If all of the bonds authorized by this measure are sold at an interest rate of 7.5 percent, the cost would be about \$805 million to pay off both the principal (\$450 million) and interest (about \$355 million). The average payment for principal and interest would be about \$40 million per year.

Paying Off Loans to Community Colleges. This measure requires that any General Fund money loaned to community colleges be repaid from future state's tidelands oil revenues or from money received from the sale of these bonds.

Recommendation Adopted

The motion to adopt the Executive Council's recommendation for Proposition No. 121 was seconded and carried.

PROPOSITION NO. 122

Earthquake Safety and Public Buildings Rehabilitation Bond Act of 1990

Recommendation: Vote YES

Official Summary: This act provides for a bond issue of three hundred million dollars (\$300,000,000) to provide funds for the reconstruction, seismic retrofitting, repair, replacement, and relocation of state and local government buildings which are unsafe primarily due to earthquake-related dangers.

Bond Act (SB 1250)—Digest of Analysis by Legislative Analyst: This measure authorizes the state to sell \$300 million in general obligation bonds. General obligation bonds are backed by the state, meaning that the state is obligated to pay the principal and interest costs on these bonds. General Fund revenues would be used to pay these costs. These revenues come primarily from the state corporate and personal income taxes and the state sales tax.

The bond money from this measure would be deposited in the Earthquake Safety and Public Buildings Rehabilitation Fund of 1990 which would be created by this measure. The money would be available for state and local government purposes. The Governor and the Legislature would decide which state and local projects would be funded with the bond money based upon recommendations by the State Architect.

State Purposes

This measure authorizes \$250 million for state purposes which could be spent for the following purposes:

- Repair, reconstruction, replacement or relocation of state-owned buildings which would be unsafe during earthquakes. The money could also be used for state-owned buildings that have other problems such as fire safety deficiencies, the presence of asbestos or other toxics, or inadequate access for handicapped individuals. The money *cannot* be used for bridges, highways, or university buildings. (Money available under Proposition 121 on this ballot could be used to make these improvements to university buildings.)
- Investigation of state-owned buildings (excluding bridges, highways, and university buildings) to determine earthquake safety problems, fire safety problems, asbestos and

other toxic material hazards, and handicap accessibility problems.

Local Government Purposes

This measure authorizes \$50 million to provide grants to local governments to cover up to 75 percent of the costs for earthquake safety related repairs, structural strengthening, reconstruction, replacement or relocation of certain local government-owned buildings. Buildings eligible for these funds are those that provide essential public services as defined in existing law (such as police stations, fire stations and emergency operations centers). In addition, county hospitals, courthouses and city halls that need to resist earthquakes and remain operational after a major earthquake would be eligible for these funds.

State Seismic Safety Commission

Of the total amount available for state and local government purposes, up to \$3 million would be available, upon appropriation by the Legislature, for the State Seismic Safety Commission to research methods and technologies to make earthquake safety improvements to state and local government buildings. The commission could also use these funds to help develop building standards and administrative regulations to reconstruction buildings for earthquake safety purposes.

Fiscal Effect:

Direct Costs of Paying Off the Bonds. For these types of bonds, the state typically makes principal and interest payments from the state's General fund over a period of about 20 years. If all of the authorized bonds were sold at an interest rate of 7.5 percent, the cost would be about \$535 million to pay off both the principal (\$300 million) and interest (about \$235 million). The average payment for principal and interest would be about \$27 million per year.

Recommendation Adopted

Secretary-Treasurer Henning's motion to adopt the Executive Council's recommendation for Proposition No. 122 was seconded and carried.

PROPOSITION NO. 123

1990 School Facilities Bond Act

Recommendation: Vote YES

Official Summary: This act provides for a bond issue of eight hundred million dollars (\$800,000,000), to provide capital

outlay for construction or improvement of public schools.

Bond Act (SB 173)—Digest of Analysis by Legislative Analyst: This measure authorizes the state to sell \$800 million in general obligation bonds to pay for (1) the construction, reconstruction, or modernization of elementary and secondary school buildings under the State School Building Lease-Purchase Program and (2) other school facility projects. General obligation bonds are backed by the state, meaning that the state is obligated to pay the principal and interest costs on these bonds. General Fund revenues would be used to pay these costs. These revenues come primarily from the state corporate and personal income taxes and the state sales tax.

The money raised from the bond sales would be distributed to school districts by the State Allocation Board. The board is a seven-member body composed of four members of the Legislature, two directors of state departments, and the Superintendent of Public Instruction. This measure requires the board to use the bond proceeds as follows:

- At least \$500 million would be used for the construction of *new* school buildings.
- No more than \$260 million could be used for (1) the reconstruction or modernization of *existing* school buildings, (2) school construction projects in small school districts that may not otherwise receive funding under the state building program because of their small size, (3) abatement of hazardous asbestos in school buildings, (4) purchase of portable classrooms, and/or (5) funding of child care facilities.
- No more than \$40 million could be used to purchase and install air conditioning equipment and insulation materials in certain “year-round” schools.

Fiscal Effect:

Direct Cost of Paying Off the Bonds. For these types of bonds, the state typically would make principal and interest payments from the state's General Fund over a period of about 20 years. If all of the bonds authorized by this measure are sold at an interest rate of 7.5 percent, the cost would be about \$1.4 billion to pay off both the principal (\$800 million) and interest (about \$630 million). The average payment for principal and interest would be about \$70 million per year.

Recommendation Adopted

The motion to adopt the Executive Council's recommendation for Proposition No. 123 was seconded and carried.

Recommendations Adopted as a Whole

Secretary-Treasurer Henning made the motion: “Mr. Chairman, I move adoption of the ballot proposition recommendations as a whole.”

His motion was seconded and carried.

Sergeants-at-Arms Thanked

Secretary-Treasurer Henning thanked the Sergeants-at-Arms for their work during the Convention and read their names;

W.J. Billingsly, Chief Sergeant-at-Arms, Laborers No. 73, Stockton

Clarence Hin, Sailors Union of the Pacific, San Francisco

Lorna Johnson, Office and Professional Employees No. 3, San Francisco

Jack Gribbon, Hotel and Restaurant Employees and Bartenders No. 2, San Francisco

John J. Moylan, Plasterers No. 66, Daly City

Luis Hernandez, Hotel and Restaurant Employees and Bartenders No. 2, San Francisco, and

Joe Sharpe, United Food and Commercial Workers No. 648, Retail Clerks, San Francisco

Tribute to Harry Bridges

Secretary-Treasurer Henning spoke to the assembled delegates: “Brothers and sisters, I thank you for your participation and your attendance. I take the liberty at this time before Chairman Gruhn adjourns the meeting to ask that we stand in one moment of silence in tribute to Harry Bridges.”

(Here followed standing tribute in silent memory of Harry R. Bridges, deceased President-emeritus of the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union.)

Adjournment

The motion to adjourn was seconded and carried, whereupon, at 2:25 p.m. the California Labor Federation, AFL-CIO Pre-Primary COPE Convention was concluded.

REPORT OF SECRETARY-TREASURER John F. Henning

To the 1990 Pre-Primary COPE Convention of the California Labor Federation, AFL-CIO:

As we convene for the 1990 Pre-Primary COPE convention, a worldwide upsurge of democratic movements provides inspiration, while at home the Reagan-Bush oligarchy enters its second decade of governance of, by, and for the profit of the wealthiest few.

The collapse of the commissars in Eastern Europe and the generalissimos of South America, the freeing of Nelson Mandela in South Africa, even the massacres of workers and students in Tiananmen Square, reaffirm the truth that popular resistance to tyranny ultimately prevails.

Unfortunately, the Bush Administration is wedded to the idea of advancing primitive capitalism in the liberated nations. His cronies in the Chamber of Commerce go so far as to declare that venture capital, not U.S. foreign aid, is the solution to Poland's economic woes.

On the domestic front, the Administration continues to faithfully reward its corporate sponsors. With a foreign trade deficit exceeding \$150 billion a year, the United States has become the world's leading debtor nation. American corporations continue their race to move production facilities overseas, leaving behind massive unemployment of industrial workers and devastation of the social fabric of urban communities.

A decade of Reagan-Bush economics has pushed the cost of home ownership beyond the reach of most Americans. The glorification of greed has yielded a harvest of indictments and convictions of Wall Street profiteers and high government officials.

The continuing shift from an industrial economy to a service economy has produced more low paying jobs without the benefits and protection afforded by unions. Violations of protective labor legislation regulating industrial homework, minimum wage, occupational safety, and child labor, among others, are rampant. Tens of millions of Americans, including five million Californians, are without health insurance. Millions of Americans are homeless, undercounted by the census and ignored by the govern-

ment bureaucracy.

In California, the Deukmejian administration continues its equivocation towards labor legislation. In 1989, the Governor vetoed 32 Federation-sponsored bills. He signed 32 bills that labor supported.

Last year, we delivered a major breakthrough in workers' compensation benefits paid to injured workers. After a year of negotiations involving labor, business, insurers, and ultimately the Legislature and the Governor, a compromise bill was fashioned that will improve workers' compensation benefits by \$1.5 billion over the next three years. Bills raising unemployment insurance benefits and state disability insurance benefits to workers by about \$4 billion over the next three years were also enacted.

Cal-OSHA, restored through victory for Proposition 97, the Federation-sponsored ballot initiative in the November 1988 general election, resumed operation by the autumn of 1989. Our vigilance will be necessary to assure that the revived Cal-OSHA vigorously enforces the state's job safety and health laws.

The latest threat to labor posed by the Deukmejian administration is the prison labor initiative in circulation for the November ballot. The measure would pit tens of thousands of state prison and jail inmates working at minimum wage and no benefits, without unions and supervised by armed guards, against free California workers in the private sector. The Federation fought and dashed the Administration's hopes of placing the measure on the ballot through legislative acquiescence. We will fight the current prison labor initiative should it qualify for the ballot.

We shall succeed if the labor movement mobilizes for voter registration and gets out the vote in 1990. The stakes are enormous.

We must meet the challenge of defeating Propositions 118 and 119 in June. These reactionary reapportionment measures would crush the liberal majorities in the state legislature and turn the California congressional delegation into a kennel for corporate lap dogs.

We must elect the COPE-endorsed candi-

date for Governor, or face the prospect of four more years of vetoes.

And we must hold and expand our progressive majorities in the State Senate, Assembly and in Congress.

If all of us roll up our sleeves, victory will be ours.

A LOOK AT THE 1988 ELECTIONS

The Primary

The California Labor Federation led an energetic effort to register, educate, and motivate trade unionists to vote for labor-endorsed candidates. The Federation prepared special endorsement pamphlets in fifteen regional variations and distributed them to the central labor councils. Voter registration drives were mounted in targeted districts where close election contests between labor allies and foes were anticipated.

Financial assistance was provided to the A. Philip Randolph Institute and Labor Council for Latin American Advancement chapters to run registration campaigns in black and latino communities.

Federation-sponsored workshops in Los Angeles and San Francisco drew together unionists to launch our signature collection effort to qualify the Cal-OSHA initiative for the ballot. Central labor councils coordinated signature drives throughout the state.

On April 25th, 703,316 signatures were submitted to election officials. This was nearly double the number required to place the measure on the November ballot.

Labor-endorsed candidates won primary elections in 115 races. Only 10 endorsed lost primary elections, for a 92% victory rate. Primary wins included Democratic Party standard bearer Leo McCarthy for United States Senate.

In the State Senate 17 of 18 COPE-endorsed candidates won nomination, as did 61 COPE-endorsed Assembly candidates. Six were defeated.

Thirty-six Congressional candidates won primaries with COPE backing. Only 3 were defeated.

Five statewide ballot propositions with COPE backing won voter approval, as did two measures that labor opposed. Two COPE-opposed ballot measures were defe-

ated, as were two measures that labor supported, for a total win-loss record of 7 to 4 on ballot propositions.

The General

COPE focused its efforts in the general election on the twin tasks of winning passage of Proposition 97, the Federation's Cal-OSHA restoration proposition, and delivering the vote for Michael Dukakis, the AFL-CIO-endorsed Democratic nominee for President, and Leo McCarthy for U.S. Senate.

COPE workshops were held in San Francisco and Los Angeles to implement a program of targeting and delivering the labor vote through a direct mail and phone bank operation coordinated by the central labor councils.

To build the broadest possible base for Proposition 97, the Federation created the Coalition to Restore Safety at Work, which was the official committee sponsoring the ballot measure. John Henning served as Coalition chairman. The Coalition embraced the health, consumer, environmental and law enforcement communities, as well as organized labor. Coalition members and supporters included the Sierra Club, League of Women Voters, American Lung Association, American Cancer Society, League of Conservation Voters, California Medical Association, California Trial Lawyers Association, and a host of public officials, including the Democratic state-wide elected officials, most Democrats in the state legislature and the California Congressional delegation. Los Angeles District Attorney Ira Reiner toured the state extolling Cal-OSHA from a law enforcement perspective.

In addition to a grass roots campaign by labor union volunteers, the campaign recognized the need to utilize advertising to reach the millions of voters in the state. The coalition raised over \$1.6 million and bought television airtime in the major population centers to run commercials presenting an upbeat message in support of Proposition 97. The lion's share of financial contributions came from local and international unions' treasuries.

The Federation mailed nearly one million general election endorsement pamphlets to union members registered to vote. The pam-

phlets, in fifteen regional variations, focused on Proposition 97, Dukakis and McCarthy, and listed endorsed candidates for congressional, state legislative, and local election.

Proposition 97 prevailed by a vote of 4,776,182 to 4,116,102, or 54% to 46%. Never before in California history had voters overturned a gubernatorial veto of an existing state program. Never before since the 1958 right-to-work struggle had organized labor faced as dire a political threat. As in 1958, labor put together a sweeping coalition of support to meet its enemies head on and smash them.

Despite a vigorous precinct-based get out the vote operation run in concert with central labor councils, Michael Dukakis was unable to overcome Bush's inflammatory conservative appeals. Bush carried the state by 51% to 47.5%.

With the advantages of incumbency and a massive financial war chest, Pete Wilson won re-election to the U.S. Senate.

COPE prevailed on 24 of 27 statewide ballot propositions. These included victory for Proposition 103, an insurance price roll-back and reform measure, and defeat for insurance industry-sponsored propositions 101, 104 and 106 despite a \$90 million media blitz by the industry.

Twenty-seven of 42 Congressional candidates running with COPE's endorsement won, a 64 percent victory rate.

Thirteen of eighteen COPE-endorsed candidates won election to the State Senate, a 72 percent victory rate.

In the State Assembly, 42 COPE-endorsed candidates won election, while 26 lost, a 62 percent victory rate. Democrats with labor backing unseated three incumbent Republican Assemblymen. In the 20th District, Democrat Ted Lempert captured a seat held by the Republican Party for over 100 years.

The dedication and hard work of local union and local central body officials throughout the state was vital to the political efforts of organized labor.

The energy and enthusiasm of thousands of labor volunteers in voter registration, education, and get-out-the-vote efforts were indispensable for the success of our electoral program. Labor's efforts were greatly augmented by the supportive services of the A. Philip Randolph Institute, the Labor Council for Latin American Advancement and the Federation of Retired Union Members.

COPE-endorsed candidates elected to Congress in November 1988 were:

District

1. Douglas Bosco (D)
3. Robert T. Matsui (D)
4. Vic Fazio (D)
5. Nancy Pelosi (D)
6. Barbara Boxer (D)
7. George Miller (D)
8. Ronald V. Dellums (D)
9. Fortney (Pete) Stark (D)
10. Don Edwards (D)
11. Tom Lantos (D)
13. Norm Mineta (D)
15. Tony Coelho (D)
16. Leon Panetta (D)
18. Richard Lehman (D)
23. Anthony Beilenson (D)
24. Henry Waxman (D)
25. Edward Roybal (D)
26. Howard Berman (D)
27. Mel Levine (D)
28. Julian Dixon (D)
29. Augustus F. Hawkins (D)
30. Matthew Martinez (D)
31. Mervyn Dymally (D)
32. Glenn Anderson (D)
34. Esteban Torres (D)
36. George E. Brown, Jr. (D)
44. Jim Bates (D)

COPE-endorsed candidates winning State Senate seats in November, 1988, listed by district, were:

District

3. Milton Marks (D)
5. John Garamendi (D)
7. Dan Boatwright (D)
9. Nicholas Petris (D)
13. Alfred E. Alquist (D)
15. Rose Ann Vuich (D)
17. Henry J. Mello (D)
23. David Roberti (D)
27. Bill Greene (D)
29. Robert G. Beverly (R)
33. Cecil Green (D)
35. John Seymour (R)
37. Marian Bergeson (R)

Assembly candidates winning in November 1988 with COPE's backing, included:

District

2. Dan Hauser (D)
4. Thomas M. Hannigan (D)

District

6. Lloyd G. Connelly (D)
7. Norman S. Waters (D)
10. Phillip Isenberg (D)
11. Robert J. (Bob) Campbell (D)
12. Tom Bates (D)
13. Elihu M. Harris (D)
14. Johan Klehs (D)
16. John L. Burton (D)
17. Willie L. Brown, Jr. (D)
18. Delaine Eastin (D)
19. Jackie Speier (D)
20. Ted Lempert (D)
21. Byron D. Sher (D)
23. John Vasconcellos (D)
24. Dominic L. (Dom) Cortese (D)
26. Patrick Johnston (D)
28. Sam Farr (D)
30. Jim Costa (D)
31. Bruce Bronzan (D)
35. Jack O'Connell (D)
39. Richard Katz (D)
40. Tom Bane (D)
43. Terry B. Friedman (D)
44. Tom Hayden (D)
45. Burt Margolin (D)
46. Mike Roos (D)
47. Teresa P. Hughes (D)
48. Maxine Waters (D)
49. Gwen Moore (D)
50. Curtis R. Tucker (D)
53. Richard E. (Dick) Floyd (D)
54. Willard H. Murray, Jr. (D)
55. Richard Polanco (D)
56. Lucille Roybal-Allard (D)
57. Dave Elder (D)
60. Sally Tanner (D)
63. Bob Epple (D)
68. Steve Clute (D)
78. Lucy Killea (D)
79. Peter R. Chacon (D)

Special Elections

Several special elections were held since November 1988 to fill legislative vacancies.

In February, 1989, Curtis Tucker, Jr. (D) was elected with COPE's backing to the 50th Assembly District seat previously held by his father, Curtis Tucker, who passed away.

The vacancy in the 76th Assembly District created by the death of Bill Bradley (R), was filled in August 1989 by the election of Tricia Hunter (R).

Two Senate seats were filled on April 10,

1990. COPE-endorsed Democrat Charles Calderon sailed to victory in the vacant 26th Senate District. In the heavily Republican 31st Senate District, Frank Hill (R) won election.

Organized labor mounted vigorous efforts using new campaign techniques to win a series of special elections in San Diego County and the San Joaquin Valley in the fall and winter of 1989.

In September 1989, COPE-endorsed candidate Gary Condit (D) won election in the 15th Congressional District seat vacated by Tony Coelho. The central labor councils in Stanislaus-Tuolumne, Merced-Mariposa, and Fresno-Madera counties mounted strenuous phone bank and direct mail contact programs to identify the sympathies of union members, persuade the undecided to support our candidate, and to turn out mass volumes of pro-Condit labor votes. Implementing a program designed and supported by national AFL-CIO and State Federation COPE staff, the labor council volunteers solicited mail ballots to boost labor voter turnout. A post-election computer analysis underscored the extent of our program's success. In the special election, 34 percent of all registered voters actually voted. Among AFL-CIO members, 70 percent voted, more than twice the rate of the general electorate. Close to one-half of the union voters cast their ballots by mail.

Gary Condit's election to Congress set the stage for a fierce battle to fill his 27th Assembly District seat. Our Federation assigned COPE staff to work closely with the Stanislaus-Tuolumne and Merced-Mariposa labor councils.

Refining the voter identification, persuasion, and turn out program with targeting data developed during the Condit campaign, COPE-endorsed Democrat Sal Cannella won a hotly contested primary election against better financed opponents. A rank and file member of the Machinists Union for 29 years who lost his job in a tool and die shop to scabs during a strike last year, Sal Cannella ran as a labor candidate. In January, 1990, he won the run-off, thanks to the COPE program.

A vacancy in the 39th Senate District created by the resignation of Larry Stirling (R) was filled by COPE-endorsed Lucy

Killea (D), who won a stunning upset victory in the overwhelmingly Republican district. The San Diego-Imperial Counties Central Labor Council waged an intensive program to augment the labor turnout through mail balloting. The vote by mail campaign provided the margin of victory for Killea.

Killea's elevation to the Senate opened her 78th Assembly District seat. Labor-endorsed Democrat Mike Gotch prevailed over Democratic party rivals in the April 10,

1990, election, and faces a runoff election on June 5.

Labor's victories in these special elections show that new campaign techniques can be successfully wedded to our traditional and proper reliance on grassroots volunteers to dramatically boost the voting participation of union members and their families. Utilizing new technology, not as a substitute for, but to increase the efficiency of our established COPE membership contact program will result in further victories in 1990.

Roll of Delegates

This comprises the completed roll of delegates to the 1990 Pre-Primary Election Convention of the California Labor Federation, AFL-CIO.

Carpenters and Joiners of America, United Brotherhood of

Pile Drivers No. 34 (726)
Ed Kelly, 726
Lathers No. 68 (470)
William Ward, 235
J.M. Witt, 235
Millmen & Ind. Carpenters
No. 262 (485)
Tom P. White, 243
Gordon F. Franco, Sr., 242
Carpenters No. 309 (1,039)
William G. Luddy, 1,039
Carpenters No. 586 (876)
L.D. Landson, 876
Carpenters No. 713 (7,155)
Joseph M. Grigsby, 3,578
Paul J. Makela, 3,577
Cabinet Markers and Millmen
No. 721 (968)
Daniel M. Curtin, 968
Carpenters No. 1506 (967)
Robert Milewsky, 967
Carpenters No. 2361 (928)
Randy J. Thornhill, 928

Communications Workers of America

Bay Area Typographical
No. 21 (797)
Donald Abrams, 266
Leon Olson, 266
Morris Goldman, 265
Communications Workers
No. 9400 (2,226)
Ronald A. Cawdrey, 1,113
Robert Shamas, 1,113
Communications Workers
No. 9408 (1,048)
Harry Ibsen, 1,048
Communications Workers
No. 9410 (2,442)
Cathy Gnagie, 2,442
Communications Workers
No. 9411 (378)
Bernie Chiaravalle, 378
Communications Workers
No. 9412 (1,463)
James B. Gordon, Jr., 1,463
Communications Workers
No. 9415 (2,346)
Herb White, 2,346
Communications Workers
No. 9421 (1,841)
Michael C. Flanagan, 369
Michael Ryan, 368
Shaunda Davis, 368
Tom Ramirez, 368
Nancy Emery, 368
Communications Workers
No. 9423 (2,480)
Sue Anne Feller, 1,240
Nancy A. Biagini, 1,240

Communications Workers
No. 9426 (222)
Kenneth L. Crosswell, 222
Communications Workers
No. 9502 (621)
Jim Wood, 621
Communications Workers
No. 9505 (1,800)
Dolores Spears, 1,800
Communications Workers
No. 9510 (1,083)
John Pope, 1,083
Communications Workers
No. 9574 (205)
James Woods, 205
Communications Workers
No. 9576 (735)
Frank Hernandez, 735
Communications Workers
No. 9586 (2,595)
Katie Farias, 2,595
Communications Workers
No. 9588 (104)
Dianne Buckingham, 104

Electrical Workers, Int'l. Brotherhood of

Electrical Workers No. 18 (3,474)
Steve Cook, 1,737
Al Lasko, 1,737
Electrical Workers No. 47 (508)
Helga Lotito, 254
Scott Hanlon, 254
Electrical Workers No. 180 (135)
Dan Pinckard, 135
Electrical Workers No. 340 (367)
Roy Ridley, 367
Electrical Workers No. 413 (345)
LeRoy Villa, 345
Electrical Workers No. 465 (955)
Richard Robbins, 955
Electrical Workers No. 569 (632)
Joe Heisler, 632
Electrical Workers No. 595 (1,348)
Carol Pelz, 450
Jon Lockwood, 449
Blake Albin, 449
Electrical Workers No. 1245 (16,711)
Jack McNally, 3,343
James E. McCauley, 3,342
Michael J. Davis, 3,342
Howard Stiefer, 3,342
Eric Wolfe, 3,342

Electronic, Electrical, Salaried, Machine and Furniture Workers, AFL-CIO International Union of
Furniture Workers No. 262 (793)
John F. Angelo, 793

Engineers, Int'l. Union of Operating

Operating Engineers No. 3 (10,917)
Jack Baugh, 10,917

Operating Engineers No. 12 (10,000)
Fred Young, 1,429
Chester Wasco, 1,429
Bob Waggoner, 1,429
Gary West, 1,429
Jim Whisman, 1,428
David Lanham, 1,428
Eugene Lyon, 1,428

Operating Engineers No. 501 (1,500)
Joseph Wetzler, 500
James McLaughlin, 500
Donald Mear, 500

Fire Fighters, Int'l. Association of

Los Angeles City Fire Fighters
No. 112 (2,385)
Andrew P. Fox, 2,385
San Francisco Fire Fighters
No. 798 (1,242)
James T. Ferguson, 314
Timothy F. O'Brien, 314
James M. Ahern, 314
L.A. County Fire Fighters
No. 1014 (2,515)
Dallas Jones, 2,515

Food and Commercial Workers, Int'l. Union, United

U.F.C.W. Butchers No. 115 (3,771)
Ralph Huber, 629
Robert Angeli, 629
Richard Quon, 629
Marjorie Caldwell, 628
Leslie Rainey, 628
Frank Cambou, 628
United Food & Commercial Wkrs.
No. 135 (1,089)
Thomas J. Vandeveld, Jr., 273
David A. Didier, 272
Skip Moore, 272
Thomas Vandeveld, III, 272
U.F.C.W. Retail Store Employees
No. 373 (180)
Stanley Lathen, 180
United Food and Commercial
Workers No. 428 (8,628)
David M. Reiser, 1,079
E. Dennis Hughes, 1,079
Louis Menacho, 1,079
Ronald J. Lind, 1,079
Homer Rivera, 1,078
Herb Sisti, 1,078
Steve Stamm, 1,078
Sandra Hudnall, 1,078
U.F.C.W. Meat Cutters
No. 439 (3,199)
William Lathrop, 1,600
Thomas Sloan, 1,599
U.F.C.W. Butchers No. 532 (839)
William Senn, 420
David H. Raynes, 419
U.F.C.W. Retail Clerks
No. 648 (2,937)
Joseph P. Sharpe, 1,469
James O'Meara, 1,468

United Food & Commercial Workers
No. 770 (5,908)
Gerald McTeague, 1,970
Rod Diamond, 1,969
Joe Gilligan, 1,969

U.F.C.W. Retail Clerks
No. 775 (2,909)
Lennis A. Ellis, 582
Robert A. Brisbee, 582
James R. Gustafson, 582
John C. Arnolfo, 582
Kurt R. Rothenbuescher, 581

U.F.C.W. Retail Clerks
No. 870 (3,669)
Stephen H. Rodriguez, 1,835
Kenneth D. Beasley, 1,834

United Food & Commercial Wkrs.
No. 1036 (1,655)
Marvin Armas, 828
Chris Ivey, 827

United Food and Commercial
Workers No. 1179 (4,975)
James T. Day, 2,488
Philip J. Carney, 2,487

U.F.C.W. Retail Clerks
No. 1288 (2,526)
Gregory Don Hunsucker, 1,263
Dave Wilson, 1,263

U.F.C.W. Retail Clerks
No. 1442 (5,181)
Michael Straeter, 2,591
Dolores Press, 2,590

**Garment Workers Union, Int'l.
Ladies**

Ladies Garment Workers
No. 512 (620)
Steven Nutter, 620

**Glass, Molders, Pottery, Plastics
and Allied Workers Int'l. Union**

Glass, Molders & Pottery Workers
No. 2 (92)
Norm Heald, 92

Glass, Molders & Pottery Workers
No. 34 (359)
Julio Mathis, 180
Richard Brantley, 179

Glass, Molders & Pottery
No. 82 (115)
John Moreno, 115

Glass, Molders & Pottery Workers
No. 137 (774)
Floretta Sokolowski, 258
Reginald Davis, 258
Michael Gulivich, 258

Glass, Molders & Pottery Workers
No. 141 (230)
Flora M. Williams, 115
Sharon L. Adcock, 115

Glass, Molders, Pottery Workers
No. 164-B (311)
Anthony Bodero, 311

Glass, Molders & Pottery Workers
No. 374 (54)
Pierre S. Thomas, 54

**Graphics Communications Int'l.
Union**

Graphics Communications
No. 338-M (4,496)
Ray Munoz, 4,496

**Hotel Employees & Restaurant
Employees Int'l. Union**

Hotel Empls. & Restaurant Empls.
No. 2 (8,684)
Sherri Chiesa, 1,448
Rafael Espinoza, 1,448
James A. McCormick, 1,448
Jack Gribbon, 1,447
Debbi Anderson, 1,447
Luis Rodriguez, 1,447

Hotel and Restaurant Employees
No. 11 (4,286)
Miguel Contreras, 4,286

Hotel & Restaurant Employees
No. 18 (540)
Loretta Mahoney, 540

Hotel & Restaurant No. 28 (591)
Lincoln Smith, 296
Daniel Cassidy, 295

Hotel & Restaurant Employees
No. 30 (2,450)
Jef L. Eatchel, 2,450

Hotel & Restaurant Employees
No. 49 (706)
Joseph McLaughlin, 706

Hotel Employees and Restaurant
Employees No. 340 (4,622)
Val Connolly, 4,622

**Iron Workers, Int'l. Association of
Bridge, Structural and
Ornamental**

Shopmen's Local No. 790 (1,432)
Arnold P. Zuniga, 1,432

**Laborers' Int'l. Union of North
America**

Laborers No. 73 (743)
W.J. Billingsly, 743

Laborers No. 89 (3,937)
Harry Jordan, 3,937

Hod Carriers & Laborers
No. 139 (963)
Albin J. Gruhn, 963

Construction & General Laborers
No. 261 (1,250)
Dan Flores, 313
Bob McDonnell, 313
Mario De La Torre, 312
Tom Harrison, 312

Laborers No. 270 (3,093)
Glade Faulkner, 3,093

Laborers No. 291 (397)
Orville R. Koenning, 397

Laborers No. 300 (4,962)
Mike Quevedo, Jr., 552
Carlos R. Cerna, 552
Joe V. Martinez, 552
Spencer Stacy, 551
Herbert Barton, 551
Librado Chavez, 551
Sergio Rascon, 551
Willie Robinson, 551
Allen Rush, 551

Const. & General Laborers
No. 304 (1,850)
Jose A. Moreno, 370
Julian C. Vega, 370
Max Munoz, 370
William Eddings, 370
Richard L. Smith, 370

Granite Workers No. 345 (273)
Gary Jones, 273

Laborers No. 371 (314)
Jerry Payne, 314

Const. & Gen. Laborers
No. 389 (600)
Joseph L. Bates, 600

Laborers No. 507 (1,324)
Patrick Knight, 331
Robert La Farga, 331
Dan Garcia, 331
Eddie Contreras, 331

Laborers No. 585 (1,384)
Leo Valenzuela, 692
John Valenzuela, 692

Laborers No. 591 (215)
Albert J. Casarez, 215

Shipyard & Marine Laborers
No. 886 (467)
Mike Hanrahan, 234
Don Hightower, 233

Hod Carriers No. 1082 (780)
Isidro H. Rocha, 780

Laborers No. 1184 (1,805)
John L. Smith, 1,805

**Longshoremen's Association
AFL-CIO, Int'l.**

Masters, Mates & Pilots (900)
Al W. Groh, 450
Doug Best, 450

**Longshoremen's and
Warehousemen's Union, Int'l.**

Inlandboatmen-Marine Division,
ILWU (36)
Marina Secchitano, 18
Molly Hassler, 18

Warehouse Union ILWU No. 6 (316)
Jim Ryder, 158
Leon Harris, 158

Ship Clerks Assoc., ILWU
No. 34 (90)
Lewis Gibbons, 45
Donald Watson, 45

**Machinists and Aerospace
Workers, Int'l. Association of**

Machinists No. 284 (692)
Gregory L. Dalton, 692

Machinists No. 311 (2,198)
Amador Chavez, 2,198

Automotive Machinists
No. 428 (172)
James H. Beno, 172

Machinists & Aerospace Workers
No. 727-A (242)
James Quillin, 121
Justin Ostro, 121

Air Transport Lodge No. 1058 (311)
Kenneth D. Boone, 311

Machinists Lodge No. 1111 (892)
John Zumbrun, 892

- Auto Machinists No. 1305 (1,272)
J.B. Martin, 636
Frank Souza, 636
- Peninsula Auto Mechanics
No. 1414 (1,015)
Leland Stafford, 508
Glenn D. Gandolfo, 507
- Machinists No. 1484 (102)
Matt McKinnon, 102
- Auto Machinists No. 1546 (3,570)
Michael J. Day, 893
Nicholas E. Antone, 893
Robert V. Miller, 892
Bernie B. Tolentino, 892
- Air Transport Employees
No. 1781 (7,410)
Tom Ryan, 3,705
Robert Anderson, 3,705
- Maintenance of Way Employes,
Brotherhood of**
- Maintenance of Way Empls., Br. of
No. 1002 (119)
David Dalzell, 119
- Maintenance of Way Empls., Br. of
No. 1196 (116)
Robert S. Douglas, 116
- Marine Engineers Beneficial
Association, National**
- Marine Engineers Association,
Pacific Coast Dist. (1,128)
Edward Mackin, 1,128
- Musicians of the U.S. and Canada,
American Federation of**
- Musicians No. 6 (1,004)
Nick J. Bardes, 502
Earl Watkins, 502
- San Jose Federation of Musicians
No. 153 (45)
Sam Cohen, 23
Sandy Sandstrom, 22
- Office and Professional Employees
Int'l. Union**
- Office & Professional Employees
No. 3 (1,463)
John F. Henning, 366
Lorna G. Johnson, 366
Kathleen Kinnick, 366
Marylouise Lovett, 365
- Office Employees No. 30 (3,989)
Gwen Newton, 3,989
- Painters and Allied Trades of
the U.S. and Canada,
Int'l Brotherhood of**
- Painters No. 15 (211)
Rayna Lehman, 211
- Painters No. 83 (100)
Gable Miggins, 50
Peter Tiernan, 50
- Painters No. 507 (750)
Art Castillo, 750
- Sign and Display No. 510 (609)
Michael E. Hardeman, 305
Robert L. Owen, 304
- Painters No. 741 (217)
Paul Shanks, 217
- Painters & Decorators No. 913 (110)
Arthur Demarchis, 110
- Plasterers' and Cement Masons'
Int'l. Association of the U.S. and
Canada, Operative**
- Plasterers No. 66 (335)
John J. Moylan, 168
Michael Moylan, 167
- Plasterers & Cement Masons
No. 355 (130)
Don Merrill, 130
- Cement Masons No. 814 (81)
Billy Joe Douglas, 81
- Plumbing and Pipe Fitting
Industry of the U.S. and Canada,
United Assn. of Journeymen and
Apprentices of the**
- Plumbers & Fitters No. 38 (2,335)
Larry Mazzola, 1,168
Bill Fazande, 1,167
- Plumbers & Fitters No. 447 (240)
William C. Rhoten, 240
- Roofers, Waterproofers and Allied
Workers, United Union of**
- Roofers No. 40 (355)
Mervil Kessinger, 178
Larry Hamilton, 177
- Seafarers Int'l. Union of
North America**
- Marine Firemen's Union (1,200)
Henry Disley, 300
B.C. Shoup, 300
Joel E. McCrum, 300
Robert Iwata, 300
- Sailors Union of the Pacific (2,250)
Gunnar Lundeberg, 375
Duane Hewitt, 375
Kaj Kristensen, 375
Knud Andersen, 375
Clarence Hin, 375
Lou Webb, 375
- Seafarers—Atlantic & Gulf (1,331)
George McCartney, 333
Roy Buck Mercer, 333
Nick Celona, 333
Vincent Coss, 332
- United Industrial Workers—Cannery
Division (5,989)
Steve Edney, 1,498
Delbert Zwolle, 1,497
Robert Vodden, 1,497
Wadenia Arendain, 1,497
- Service Employees Int'l. Union,
AFL-CIO**
- Service Employees No. 22 (235)
Stephanie Batey, 118
Tom Dwyer, 117
- Window Cleaners No. 44 (140)
John Thurston, 140
- Building Service Employees
No. 87 (3,200)
Richard Leung, 3,200
- Theatrical Janitors No. 121 (42)
Roscoe W. Nanninga, 42
- Hospital & Health Care Workers
No. 250 (9,173)
Sal Rosselli, 1,020
Pamela Martinez, 1,020
Lois Herron, 1,019
Larry Griffin, 1,019
Ed Brown, 1,019
Shirley Clyde, 1,019
Howard Wallace, 1,019
Joan Emslie, 1,019
Susan Kizziee, 1,019
- L.A. County Employees
No. 434 (3,716)
Ophelia McFadden, 3,716
- Social Services No. 535 (2,957)
Jerry Fillingim, 2,957
- Service Employees No. 616 (391)
Owen Marron, 196
Cliff Tillman, 195
- L.A. County Service Employees
No. 660 (2,256)
Henry Walton, 2,256
- Service Employees No. 715 (4,060)
Kristina M. Sermersheim, 4,060
- United Public Employees
No. 790 (14,669)
Steve Neuberger, 2,934
Margaret Butz Shelleda, 2,934
Pat Arca, 2,934
Marshall Walker III, 2,934
Paul Varacalli, 2,933
- Calif. State Empls. Assn.
No. 1000 (6,481)
Margaret Dean, 811
Yolanda Solari, 810
George Smith, 810
Don Ziegenfuss, 810
Perry Kenny, 810
Steve Smith, 810
Brian Young, 810
Gwen Hooker, 810
- Stage Employes and Moving
Picture Machine Operators of the
U.S. and Canada,
Int'l. Alliance of Theatrical**
- Theatrical Stage Employees
No. 16 (487)
Edward C. Powell, 487
- I.A.T.S.E. No. 33 (1,152)
George Hekkers, 576
Theodore Zachary, Jr., 576
- Theatre Stage Operators
No. 409 (62)
John A. Woodworth, 62
- M.P. Photographers No. 659 (368)
Edward C. Powell, 368
- Lab Film/Video Technicians
No. 683 (941)
Donald P. Haggerty, 471
Bill R. Elliott, 470
- Theatrical Wardrobe No. 768 (91)
Dorothy T. Priest, 91
- Theatrical Wardrobe No. 784 (75)
Andrea Cooper, 38
Alfred Lorente, Jr., 37
- Script Supervisors No. 871 (171)
John L. Coffey, 171

- State, County and Municipal Employees, American Federation of**
A.F.S.C.M.E. No. 800 (173)
Max Mont, 173
- Teachers, American Federation of**
San Francisco Federation of Teachers
No. 61 (1,469)
Carolyn Doggett, 1,469
- United Teachers of L.A.
No. 1021 (5,404)
Marv Katz, 2,702
Jerry Solender, 2,702
- Peralta Federation of Teachers
No. 1603 (394)
Mary Bergan, 394
- UC-AFT Librarians No. 1795 (33)
Laurel Burley, 33
- Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen and Helpers of America, Int'l. Brotherhood of**
Sales & Delivery Drivers No. 14 (38)
James E. Wilkerson, Sr., 38
- Teamsters, Auto Truck Drivers
No. 70 (270)
Chuck Mack, 270
- Teamsters Automotive Empls.
No. 78 (145)
Stephen J. Mack, 145
- Freight, Construction, Gen. Drivers
No. 287 (202)
Mary Ruth Gross, 202
- Sanitary Truck Drivers No. 350 (79)
Robert Morales, 79
- Teamsters No. 490 (175)
Casey Sawyer, 175
- Teamsters, Chauffeurs & Warehousemen No. 542 (173)
Richard Aceves, 87
Robert Harris, 86
- Cannery Workers, Food Processors and Drivers No. 748 (178)
Tom Fontana, 178
- Freight Checkers, Cler. Empls.
No. 856 (1,591)
Ben Leal, 1,591
- Cannery Workers & Warehousemen
No. 857 (54)
Jerry L. Laird, 54
- Newspaper, Periodical Drivers
No. 921 (221)
Ben Papapietro, Jr., 221
- Misc. Warehousemen, Drivers
No. 986 (2,113)
Bernard J. Celaya, 1,057
Lazaro Uranga, 1,056
- Transit Union, Amalgamated**
Amalgamated Transit
No. 192 (1,724)
Ely Hill, 345
William M. McCombe, 345
Edgar S. Jackson, 345
Nicholas Norton, 345
Donald E. Bonds, 344
- Amalgamated Transit No. 256 (426)
Art Carter, 213
Roy Williams, 213
- Amalgamated Transit No. 1574 (352)
Edward R. Legenza, 176
Rodney Hart, 176
- Transport Workers Union of America**
S.E.A.M. Transport Workers
No. 200 (154)
Frank Taylor, 77
Fred Peterson II, 77
- Transport Workers
No. 250-A (1,549)
Bobbie L. Brown, 775
Ray J. Antonio, 774
- Air Transport Workers
No. 502 (1,274)
Paul Hunt, 1,274
- Transport Workers No. 505 (400)
Thomas Smoot, 200
Julius Lucas, 200
- Building and Construction Trades Councils**
Alameda Co. Bldg. & Const. Trades Council (2)
James L. Brown, 1
- Bay Cities Metal Trades Council (2)
Richard E. Harden, 1
- Los Angeles Bldg. & Const. Trades Council (2)
Ronald T. Kennedy, 1
- Napa & Solano Counties Building & Construction Trades Council (2)
James F. Smith, Jr., 1
- San Francisco Bldg. & Const. Trades Council (2)
Stanley M. Smith, 1
- Santa Clara Bldg. & Const. Trades Council (2)
John E. Neece, 1
William A. Nack, 1
- California State Councils**
Bldg. & Const. Trades State Council (2)
Jerry P. Cremins, 1
Tim Cremins, 1
- Carpenters, California State Council of (2)
Robert L. Hanna, 1
Daniel M. Curtin, 1
- Electrical Workers, California State Assn. of (2)
Franz E. Glen, 1
- Hotel Employees & Restaurant Employees, Calif. State Council of (2)
M.R. Callahan, 1
Loretta Mahoney, 1
- Letter Carriers, Calif. State Assn. of (2)
Gene Lorenzo, 1
Alex Mallonee, 1
- Machnists, Calif. Conference of (2)
James Quillin, 1
- Operating Engineers, California State Conference (2)
Ron Wood, 1
- Service Employees, Calif. State Council of (2)
Dean C. Tipps, 1
Woodrow Fleming, 1
- Theatrical Federation, Calif. State (2)
Edward C. Powell, 1
- Transport Workers, Calif. State Conf. of (2)
Lawrence B. Martin, 1
- Central Labor Councils**
Alameda County Central Labor Council (2)
Owen A. Marron, 1
Michael K. Henneberry, 1
- Contra Costa County Central Labor Council (2)
Steven A. Roberti, 1
- Five Counties Central Labor Council (2)
Walter L. Hurlburt, 1
- Fresno & Madera Counties Central Labor Council (2)
Faytie R. Shilling, 1
- Los Angeles County Federation of Labor (2)
William Robertson, 1
James Wood, 1
- Marin County Central Labor Council (2)
Bernard V. Chiaravalle, 1
James E. Findley, 1
- Merced and Mariposa Counties Central Labor Council (2)
Jerry Martin, 1
Richard Becker, 1
- Napa & Solano Counties Central Labor Council (2)
Frank Daniel, 1
John T. Miller, 1
- Orange County Central Labor Council (2)
Bob Wilberg, 1
- Sacramento Central Labor Council (2)
Wayne Harbolt, 1
- San Bernardino/Riverside Central Labor Council (2)
Dianne Buckingham, 1
Jack Stowers, 1
- San Francisco Labor Council (2)
Walter L. Johnson, 1
- San Diego/Imperial Central Labor Council (2)
Joseph S. Francis, 1
Matthew McKinnon, 1
- San Joaquin/Calaveras Central Labor Council (2)
Mickey Harrington, 1
- San Mateo County Central Labor Council (2)
Art Pulaski, 1
Robert D. Anderson, 1
- Santa Clara/San Benito Counties Central Labor Council (2)
Richard F. Sawyer, 1
Steve Preminger, 1

Sonoma, Mendocino & Lake
Counties Central Labor
Council (2)
Don C. Whitaker, 1
Steven Ruchalski, 1
Stanislaus/Tuolumne Central Labor
Council (2)
Jim Bieber, 1
Ed Bach, 1
Tulare & Kings Counties Central
Labor Council (2)
Kirk Vogt, 1

Councils

Calif. Professional Fire Fighters (2)
Dan Terry, 1
Brian Hatch, 1
S.F. Maritime Trades Port
Council (2)
Paul Dempster, 1
Brandon Tynan, 1
District Councils
Carpenters, San Diego Dist.
Council (2)
Jeffrey Cole, 1
Communications Workers Dist.
Council No. 9 (2)
Harry Ibsen, 1
James B. Gordon, Jr., 1
Laborers, No. Calif. Dist.
Council (2)
Don R. Payne, 1

Laborers, So. Calif. Dist.
Council (2)
Louie Bravo, 1
John Valenzuela, 1
Painters District Council. No. 36 (2)
William H. Sauerwald, 1
Public Empls., Calif. Region District
Council (2)
Mason M. Warren, 1
Charles J. Reiter, 1
Teamsters Joint Council No. 7 (1)
Chuck Mack, 1
Joint Council of Teamsters No. 42 (1)
Michael J. Riley, 1

Forums

Alameda County Central Labor
Council (1)
Bob Martin, 1
Contra Costa County Central Labor
Council (1)
William Harris, 1
Los Angeles County Federation of
Labor (1)
Ron Renish, 1
San Diego-Imperial Counties Central
Labor Council (1)
Arthur Edelman, 1
San Mateo Central Labor Council (1)
William H. Tupper, 1

Santa Clara County Central Labor
Council (2)
George Soares, 1

Retiree Organizations

Electrical Workers No. 180 Retirees'
Club (1)
Ken Breckenridge, 1
Electrical Workers No. 1245
Retirees' Club (1)
Tom Riley, 1
Food and Commercial Workers
No. 428 Retirees' Club (1)
James P. McLoughlin, 1
Food and Commercial Workers
No. 775 Retirees' Club (1)
Arthur Kaufman, 1
Food and Commercial Workers
No. 1100 Retirees' Club (1)
Patrick L. Kelley, 1
Office Employees No. 3 Active
Retirees' Club (1)
Reeva Olson, 1
Office and Professional Employees
No. 29 Retirees Club (1)
Edith Withington, 1
Teamsters Stockton-Modesto
Retirees (1)
Wendel J. Kiser, 1