



Orange County
Taxpayers Association

30205 Hillside Terrace, San Juan Capistrano CA 92675-1542
phone (949) 240-6226 • fax (949) 240-0304 • www.octax.org

To: OCTax Directors and Members
From: Reed Royalty, President
Date: February 6, 2008
Subject: How Did OCTax Do in the Election?

The good news: on the most important three of the state ballot measures, Orange County voters agreed with OCTax! Statewide voters also agreed with OCTax.

The bad news: voters disagreed with OCTax on the Indian gaming agreements.

The sort of good news: at least the Indian gaming agreements, unfair as they are, will bring a trickle (a fraction of one percent of the budget) of additional revenue to the state.

<u>State Propositions</u>	<u>OCTax</u>	<u>Orange County Voters</u>	<u>Statewide Voters</u>
91: Transportation Funds	No	No	No

Proposition 91 might have created a legal challenge to Proposition 1A’s restrictions against legislators’ diverting motor vehicle fuel sales and use taxes to “social programs.”

92: Community Colleges	No	No	No
------------------------	----	----	----

Proposition 92 would have locked in spending without a source of revenue, made spending irreversible, and given community college “insiders” power to spend without limits.

93: Legislative term limits	No	No	No
-----------------------------	----	----	----

Proposition 93 would have given incumbents a few more years of pomp under the Capitol dome. The special beneficiaries of Proposition 92, Senate President Pro Tem Perata and Assembly Speaker Nunez, argued that they “need more time to solve the state’s problems.” Huh? Those guys are the cause of our \$14.5 billion deficit, not the solvers of it.

94-97: Indian gaming	No	Yes	Yes
----------------------	----	-----	-----

Propositions 94-97 now perpetuate and exacerbate an unfair Indian monopoly on Casino gaming, which (since voters approved Proposition 5 in 1998) is a socially-acceptable enterprise that should be open to all entrepreneurs regardless of race.