



2004 General Election Initiative and Referendum (I & R) Priorities

State	I & R Number/Title	Description	ATR Position
Arizona	Proposition 200	Proposition 200 would require all Arizonians seeking public benefits to prove they are legal citizens. Proponents of the measure state that it is intended to combat voter fraud and cut social services for undocumented immigrants.	AGAINST: In addition to privacy concerns, the impact of the initiative will be to increase the cost of state government requiring future tax hikes. A state government analysis found that \$20 million per year is needed to cover the basic costs of verifying the immigration papers of individuals seeking public benefits. The potential costs to taxpayers include almost \$11 million for the Department of Environmental Quality to verify citizenship at car emission stations and another \$8 million for the Department of Public Safety to conduct background checks for traffic accident investigations and arrests.
California	Proposition 63	Prop 63 will create a surcharge on state personal income taxes for taxpayers with annual taxable incomes of more than \$1 million to finance an expansion of county mental health programs.	AGAINST: Jeff Griffin, executive Director of The Citizens commission on Human rights of Los Angeles, following a thorough study of the measure stated, "This initiative is so cleverly written that it obfuscates the truth about what it actually is...For example, it may seem that it is a tax on the rich only. Actually it is going to set in motion probable taxes for all of us in the next two years, and this in a time when balancing the budget without tax increases is on the minds of everyone." This is a volatile tax driven by economic cycles and will most certainly increase the tax burden of the middle class.
California	Proposition 67	The measure will increase the telephone tax 400% with less than 1% of the revenue directed towards the 911	AGAINST: According to the analysis of "The 911 Emergency and Trauma Care Act", Legislative Analyst's Office Report, only .75% of the increased phone tax would actually be used for the 911 system. In comparison, 3.75%

		<p>system. Without provisions to dedicate the 60% that private hospitals receive to rescuing emergency rooms, the for-profit hospitals will not be required to improve emergency care.</p>	<p>would go to the Firefighter's Union, 5% would go to Community Clinics, and the remaining 90.5% would be added to the coffers of hospitals and doctors.</p>
<p>California</p>	<p>Proposition 72 or "The Health Insurance Act"</p>	<p>The measure will uphold a California law requiring employers to provide health insurance to workers or pay into a state fund that would provide it. Employers would be forced to pay an estimated \$5.7 billion in new taxes.</p>	<p>AGAINST: In a June 2004 economic study, the "[Health Insurance Act] is a very costly multi-billion dollar program for California businesses and employees. Overall, considering uninsured coverage, low-income worker coverage, and presumed tax savings, [health insurance act] bottom-line cost when fully implemented in 2007 will be \$7 billion. Businesses will pay the lion's share: \$5.3 billion. Employees will pay an additional \$1.7 billion."</p>
<p>Colorado</p>	<p>Referendum A</p>	<p>The measure will reform the state personnel system by updating the procedures for hiring and disciplining state employees, by allowing greater opportunity to contract out state services to the private sector, and equip future CO governors with the necessary authority to appoint more personal staff once they take office.</p>	<p>SUPPORT: The Colorado civil service system was created in 1918 when only 1,000 employees worked in state government. Today, over 31,000 people work in Colorado state government in a system far too antiquated for a 21st Century workforce. Referendum A will allow taxpayer dollars to be spent on the most qualified individuals, providing the most efficient personnel system possible. And all contracts will maintain full disclosure requirements, keeping a system free from political favors and back door antics.</p>
<p>Florida</p>	<p>Amendment 5</p>	<p>This amendment will determine whether the state will increase the minimum wage from \$5.15 to \$6.15</p>	<p>AGAINST: According to a study conducted by Dr. David Macpherson of Florida State University, a large fraction of workers affected by higher minimum wages are 24 or younger and are less</p>

		per hour. This proposed increase would present a minimum wage almost 20 percent in excess of what is required under federal law.	likely to be supporting a family than the typical Florida worker. Macpherson's study concludes that "an important effect of the minimum wage increase is that some workers will lose their jobs because it will no longer be profitable for firms to employ them."
Maine	Question 1: 1% Property Tax Cap Referendum	The initiative would cap property taxes at \$10 per \$1,000 of assessed value, based on values in 1996-97, and limit assessment increase to 2 percent yearly while ownership of property remains in the family.	SUPPORT: The elected officials of Maine on both the state and local level have failed to address the unmitigated tax burden faced by the citizens of the state. According to the non-partisan Tax Foundation, Maine's property taxes are the highest in the country as a percentage of personal income. Forty-six states have some kind of cap on spending, assessments or tax rates, according to the National Council of State Legislators. The only states who do not have limits are Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont and Hawaii.
Nevada	Ballot Question #6	Ballot Question #6 on Nevada's November ballot will determine whether the state will increase the minimum wage from \$5.15 to \$6.15 per hour. This proposed increase would present a minimum wage almost 20 percent in excess of what is required under federal law.	AGAINST: Thomas McCurdy and Frank McIntyre of Stanford University ascertained in a 2000 study that "...three in four of the poorest workers lose from shouldering the costs of higher prices resulting from the wage increase. When these benefits and costs are considered, the minimum wage is ineffective as an anti-poverty policy."
Oklahoma	State Question 713	The measure will increase the current 23-cent cigarette tax by a net of 55 cents per pack.	AGAINST: Excise tax increases are regressive in nature impacting the lower-income citizens of the state. An increase in the tobacco tax draws money out of state and local private economies, forcing reductions in the retail sector's workforce. Most importantly, governments on the state and local level will be forced to raise the sales tax on staple items such as

			food and clothing in order to make up for lost revenue. One tax increase will inevitably lead to another in the future.
Washington	I-884	Initiative 884 or I-884 will increase the state sales tax by 15 percent, raising the rate from 6.5 percent to 7.5 percent. In a number of cities, the total sales tax rate could become as high as 10 percent when combined with local sales taxes.	AGAINST: An economic model was developed by the Beacon Hill Institute at Suffolk University in conjunction with the Washington Policy Center which showed that approximately 10,000 would be lost in the state. In addition, the retail sector would face huge decline and disposable income would be decreased by an average of \$115 per resident. Furthermore, Washington residents with the lowest incomes will be forced to pay an additional 0.8% of their income in taxes.