

★ ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION 69 ★

YES ON 69: PREVENT THE LEGISLATURE FROM REDIRECTING TRANSPORTATION REVENUES AND ENSURE THEY CAN ONLY BE USED TO FUND TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENTS.

YES on 69 ensures existing transportation revenues we pay at the pump and when we register our vehicles can ONLY be used for road and transportation improvement projects. Proposition 69 constitutionally protects these funds by prohibiting the legislature from using these revenues for non-transportation purposes.

And YES on 69 won't raise taxes one cent.

YES ON 69 REQUIRES TRANSPORTATION FUNDS BE SPENT ON PRIORITIES LIKE FIXING LOCAL ROADS, HIGHWAYS, BRIDGES AND OTHER TRANSPORTATION PROJECTS.

Californians depend on a safe and reliable transportation network to support our quality of life and a strong economy. YES on 69 protects transportation taxes and fees we already pay for: • SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS to repair aging and deteriorating bridges, tunnels and overpasses, as well as highways, freeways and local streets and roads. • FILLING POTHoles and PAVING OVER CRACKED AND CRUMBLING ROADS. • RELIEVING TRAFFIC CONGESTION by adding new lanes and making repairs to remove bottlenecks that cause congestion. • UPGRADING LIGHT-RAIL AND COMMUTER RAIL, buses and other public transportation services to reduce traffic congestion and improve air quality. • IMPROVING PEDESTRIAN SAFETY by building and upgrading crosswalks and sidewalks.

YES ON 69 PROTECTS TRANSPORTATION FUNDS AND BENEFITS EVERY CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY.

Passing Proposition 69 protects revenues dedicated to every city, county and transportation agency in the state for repairing local roads and improving public transportation.

YES ON 69 PROTECTS EXISTING REVENUES AND DOES NOT INCREASE TAXES.

Proposition 69 protects existing taxes and fees we are already paying. It does not raise taxes.

YES ON 69 PROMOTES JOBS AND A STRONGER ECONOMY.

Ensuring transportation revenues are dedicated to transportation projects will support hundreds of thousands of good paying jobs and will boost our economy by improving the transportation network that gets employees to work and goods and services to the market.

YES ON 69 MEANS STRONG ACCOUNTABILITY TO PROTECT TAXPAYERS.

Proposition 69 ensures our transportation tax dollars can only be used to make road safety improvements, fill potholes, repair local streets, freeways and bridges, and to invest in public transit.

"Cracked, potholed roads in poor condition pose a major safety threat to California drivers," said Warren Stanley, commissioner, CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL. "We need Prop. 69 to protect revenues to fix the poor condition of our roads, to protect public safety and provide drivers with smoother, less congested roads and highways."

YES ON 69 IS SUPPORTED BY A BROAD COALITION.

YES on 69 is supported by a broad coalition representing business, labor, local governments, transportation advocates and taxpayers, including: • League of Women Voters of California • California Chamber of Commerce • California State Conference, NAACP • California Alliance for Jobs • California Business Roundtable • California State Association of Counties • League of California Cities • Southern California Partnership for Jobs • Transportation California • California Transit Association

VOTE YES ON PROP. 69 TO ENSURE OUR TRANSPORTATION REVENUES CAN ONLY BE SPENT ON TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS.

www.YesProp69.com

WARREN STANLEY, Commissioner
California Highway Patrol

HELEN HUTCHISON, President
League of Women Voters of California

ALLAN ZAREMBERG, President
California Chamber of Commerce

★ REBUTTAL TO ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION 69 ★

NO ON 69: BROKEN PROMISES HAVE LED TO A RUNDOWN, OUTDATED, AND CONGESTED TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM

Prior to the recent gas tax increases, Sacramento had plenty of your money through transportation-related fees and taxes to fix our crumbling roads, upgrade transportation infrastructure, and repair aging bridges. However, time and time again, the state spent YOUR money on everything BUT transportation. Now our roads are in complete decay, they promise that this time, they'll spend it as intended. While protecting your money is commendable, Californians are already unnecessarily taxed at the pump. If Sacramento were judicious in the handling of your money, California's transportation system would not be facing such crisis.

PROP. 69 PROTECTS TRANSPORTATION MONEY THAT WILL NOT FIX OUR ROADS

While the proponents argue protecting these dollars ensures traffic congestion relief, filling potholes, and

safety improvements, it's not quite the case. A portion of money protected by Proposition 69 is for transit, which is NOT fixing our roads; no new infrastructure, no updates to California's crumbling roads, and no traffic relief. Other dollars can go to projects like high speed rail, bike lanes, and protecting habitat.

PROPOSITION 69 FAILS TO PROTECT OVER \$1 BILLION Proposition 69 fails to protect ALL transportation dollars. Sacramento will collect \$1 billion annually in vehicle weight fees, which will go unprotected and backfill the State's General Fund. Proposition 69 fails to fully protect transportation taxes from being diverted to programs that do nothing to fix our roads and highways. **VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION 69.**

ASSEMBLYMAN FRANK BIGELOW

5th Assembly District

SENATOR JOHN MOORLACH

37th Senate District

★ ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION 69 ★

How insulting can a ballot proposition be? Last year, a two-thirds majority of state legislators voted for a gas tax and vehicle fee increase for transportation improvements. And now they are asking you to tell them to only spend the money on that intended purpose? Do you see the lunacy of this request?

Is this measure supposed to make us feel better? Or is it an indictment that Sacramento can't help itself when it comes to spending your money? It's wasting billions of dollars for high speed rail, with massive cost overruns. And this proposition is supposed to prevent them from spending drift? Or is this an admission that, like an alcoholic, Sacramento is saying it won't siphon off some of your gas tax for other boondoggles, this time? And, once again, they really mean it. How sad can California's legislature get? Did you know that Caltrans wastes some \$500 million per year? Because it's overstaffed by nearly 3,300 architects and engineers and it is hiring more? That it only outsources ten percent of engineering work when most states outsource half? Did Sacramento streamline Caltrans before raising your gas taxes? No!

It embarrasses me, as a fiscal conservative, to have to ask you to tell Sacramento to spend a gas tax on highway repairs. It's disingenuous and duplicitous. How long will the voters of this state enable free-spending liberals to drive our Golden State into the ground? Accordingly, I'm voting "No" on this tripe called Proposition 69. You should too.

SENATOR JOHN M.W. MOORLACH
37th Senate District

PROPOSITION 69 FAILS TO PROTECT ALL TRANSPORTATION REVENUE.

All transportation related revenues must be protected from being diverted by the legislature for programs that don't fix our roads. Fact: most transportation revenues, including gasoline, diesel excise taxes and vehicle registration fees, are constitutionally protected from being used for purposes other than transportation. Unfortunately, PROPOSITION 69 FAILS TO PROTECT OVER \$1 BILLION ANNUALLY FROM VEHICLE WEIGHT FEES THAT HAVE BEEN SIDETRACKED SINCE 2011. ALL transportation taxes must be protected from being diverted and misused by politicians, otherwise these games will continue.

PROPOSITION 69 ALLOWS UNCHECKED SPENDING.

In addition to Proposition 13 (1978)—California's landmark initiative that limited local property taxes—voters passed Proposition 4 (1979), which limited the spending of government operations. Proposition 69 exempts the recently enacted transportation taxes and fees from the state spending limit. This effectively RAISES THE CAP ON GENERAL FUND SPENDING BY APPROXIMATELY \$2 BILLION ANNUALLY. By exempting these expenditures, state spending would be allowed to grow to levels that otherwise could not be reached.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION 69

I am opposed to the new gas taxes and vehicle registration fees. Too many Californians struggle to pay for housing, food and other necessities in this high-cost state. Californians don't need more taxes. I don't support Proposition 69 because state spending will continue to spiral out of control, and it fails to fully protect transportation taxes from being diverted to programs that do nothing to fix our roads and highways.

ASSEMBLYMAN FRANK BIGELOW
5th Assembly District

★ REBUTTAL TO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION 69 ★

Proposition 69 prevents the legislature from diverting transportation dollars for non-transportation purposes. So it's not surprising that the arguments against Prop. 69 are signed by . . . legislators.

But their arguments are not accurate.

Here are the facts.

FACT: When voters approve Proposition 69, recently enacted transportation revenues will be protected and required by our state constitution to go to transportation improvement projects.

FACT: Prop. 69 does not increase taxes. It protects the transportation taxes and fees we already pay.

FACT: Prop. 69 does not increase the state spending limit. It ensures that transportation revenues are completely dedicated to transportation improvements and not state debt.

Passing Prop. 69 will ensure our transportation dollars are spent on transportation improvement projects including:

- FIXING POTHoles and paving crumbling roads.
- MAKING SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS to bridges, overpasses, streets and highways.

- RELIEVING TRAFFIC CONGESTION by making repairs to improve traffic flow.
- INVESTING IN PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION like buses and commuter rail to help relieve traffic and improve air quality.

YES ON 69 MEANS STRONG ACCOUNTABILITY TO PROTECT TAXPAYERS.

Proposition 69 is supported by a broad coalition of public safety officials, business, local government, labor, environmentalists, seniors, taxpayers, Democrats, Republicans and independents.

Vote YES on Prop. 69 to prevent the legislature from diverting our transportation dollars and to guarantee that transportation funding is spent fixing our roads.

www.YesProp69.com

GARY PASSMORE, President
Congress of California Seniors

ROBERT C. LAPSLEY, President
California Business Roundtable

ALICE A. HUFFMAN, President
California State Conference NAACP