

Big Money Talks

California's
Billion Dollar
Club

The 15 Special
Interests that
Spent \$1 Billion to
Shape California
Government



California Fair Political Practices Commission • March 2010

Big Money Talks



a report by the
California Fair Political Practices Commission
March 2010

California Fair Political Practices Commission
428 J Street, Suite 620
Sacramento, CA 95814

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary	4
Introduction	7
The 15 That Spent \$1 Billion	10
1. California Teachers Association	11
2. California State Council of Service Employees	13
3. Pharmaceutical Research and Manufacturers of America	15
4. Morongo Band of Mission Indians	17
5. Pechanga Band of Luiseño Indians	18
6. Pacific Gas & Electric Company	20
7. Chevron Corporation	22
8. AT&T Inc.	24
9. Philip Morris USA Inc.	26
10. Agua Caliente Band of Cahuilla Indians	28
11. Southern California Edison	30
12. California Hospital Association	32
13. California Chamber of Commerce	34
14. Western States Petroleum Association	36
15. Aera Energy LLC	37
The Next 10	38
16. California Association of Realtors	39
17. California Correctional Peace Officers Association	41
18. California School Employees Association	43

TABLE OF CONTENTS

19. San Manuel Band of Mission Indians	45
20. Reynolds American Inc.	47
21. Pala Band of Mission Indians	48
22. United Auburn Indian Community	50
23. California Medical Association	52
24. Anthem Blue Cross	54
25. Consumer Attorneys of California	56
Methodology	58
Appendix 1 -- Committee ID Numbers	59
Appendix 2 -- Ballot Measures	62

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Special interests spend staggering amounts of money on candidates, ballot measures and lobbying to influence the outcome of governmental decisions in California.

The reality in politics is that money talks. Sometimes money shouts. If it didn't, special interests simply would not spend so much money trying to influence public policy and elections. They know that the more money they spend on behalf of a candidate or in support of or opposition to a ballot measure, the greater the chance of success. In California, special interests have very deep pockets.

This report, "Big Money Talks," examines California's Top 15 spending special interest groups over the last ten years. Their combined expenditures totaled more than \$1 billion.

Of the 15 identified groups, six are corporations, three are Indian tribes, two are labor unions and four are business associations.

This report leaves little doubt where the vortex of political power lies in this state. The numbers tell the story. And there is no end in sight to the spending binge by special interests.

California's Top 15 special interest groups often win by spending money to defeat ballot measures -- which has the effect of maintaining the status quo.

California's Top 15 special interest groups often win by spending money to defeat bal-

lot measures -- which has the effect of maintaining the status quo. Their willingness to spend vast sums of money gives them the ability not just to drown out others, but to exercise powerful political leverage. By spending huge amounts of money, they send an unmistakable message to political opponents and elected officials alike: *"We're ready, willing, and able to spend millions -- you don't want to fight us."* What is good for the people of California matters less than what hurts or helps the individual interests of these groups.

The following provides a breakdown of how these groups spent more than **\$1,000,000,000** between January 1, 2000 and December 31, 2009.

- * **Nearly \$660 million was expended for state and local ballot measures.** That averages to almost \$44 million for each of the 15 special interest groups. The ballot measures that generated the most expenditures among the 15 groups included proposals on gambling, tax increases and prescription drug rebates.
 - More than \$125 million was spent by Indian tribes on gaming ballot measures.
 - ✓ Propositions 94, 95, 96 and 97, which dramatically increased the number of slot machines at four Indian gaming casinos, appeared on the 2008 ballot.
 - ✓ Proposition 68, which sought to allow expansion of gambling at non-tribal establishments, such as race tracks and card rooms, appeared on the 2004 ballot.
 - ✓ Proposition 70, which sought 99-year tribal-state gambling compacts and no limits on the type or number of casino games, appeared on the 2004 ballot.
 - Nearly \$95 million was spent on dueling initiatives, which would have created drug discount programs.
 - ✓ Proposition 78 was backed by the pharmaceutical industry, while Proposition 79 was supported by union, health care and consumer groups. Those measures appeared on the 2005 special election ballot.
 - Proposition 86, which sought to increase the cigarette tax, appeared on the 2006 ballot.
 - Proposition 87, which sought to impose a tax on oil produced in California, appeared on the 2006 ballot.
- * **More than \$80 million was expended for state and local candidates.** The groups that spent the most on behalf of candidates include:

-
- California State Council of Service Employees -- \$18,786,136;
 - California Teachers Association -- \$16,716,386;
 - Pechanga Band of Luiseno Indians -- \$9,718,025;
 - California Chamber of Commerce -- \$7,130,666.

* ***More than \$30 million was contributed to various political committees of the Democratic and Republican parties.***

- \$17,739,656 was contributed to Democrats;
- \$13,037,111 was contributed to Republicans.

* ***More than \$250 million was spent for lobbying the California State Legislature and other state governmental agencies. The groups that spent the most to influence public officials include:***

- AT&T -- \$46,726,165;
- California Teachers Association -- \$38,516,307;
- Western States Petroleum Association -- \$35,214,325;
- California Chamber of Commerce -- \$26,796,460;
- California State Council of Service Employees -- \$25,607,849.

The conclusion is inescapable: A handful of special interests have a disproportionate amount of influence on California elections and public policy.

This report was researched and prepared by Susie Swatt, FPPC Communications Director. Special thanks goes to Ivy Sevilla, Lynda Cassady and Trish Mayer.

INTRODUCTION

Just 15 wealthy special interests have spent more than \$1 billion in the past 10 years to influence California voters and public officials. This powerful group includes labor unions, drug companies and Indian tribes. It also includes utility, oil, telecommunications and tobacco companies.

The conclusion is inescapable: A handful of special interests have a disproportionate amount of influence on California elections and public policy.

These interests have spent hundreds of millions of dollars for and against ballot measures. They often win by spending money to defeat measures, which has the effect of maintaining the status quo.

They have generously contributed directly to candidates and supported or opposed others through unlimited “independent expenditures.” While there are contribution limits for state candidates, there are no limits on what can be spent on “independent expenditures.” Thus, “independent expenditures” allow contributors to avoid contribution limits and spend whatever they want to support their favorite candidates.

They provide significant financial support to both major political parties and other campaign committees.

Roughly a quarter of their expenditures have been for lobbying various public officials.

This report, “Big Money Talks,” focuses on those California organizations and businesses that spent the most to influence public policy decisions and the outcome of elec-

tions.

Beginning in 2000, certain campaign reports (for candidates, committees, major donors and ballot measure committees) were required to be filed electronically with the Secretary of State's office. This information has been posted on the SOS website, allowing the public to access the information online. In addition, most lobbyist employers have to report online how much they spend to influence government decisions.

Any state committee that has raised or spent \$50,000 since January 1, 2000 must file electronically. Major donors must file electronically if they make expenditures of \$50,000 or more in a calendar year. Lobbying entities must file electronically once the total amount of any category of reportable payments, expenses, contributions, gifts or other items is \$5,000 or more in a calendar quarter.

*“ . . . the more money you have. . .
the louder you can speak.”*

*Chris Lehane, Political Strategist
Los Angeles Times, February 24, 2010*

This report looks at all the campaign and lobbying reports filed electronically with the SOS from January 1, 2000 to December 31, 2009 to determine the biggest spenders. This time period represents the first decade of electronic filing.

Providing full disclosure of contributions and expenditures gives the voting public useful information about ballot measures, candidates and their financial supporters. It allows voters to make informed decisions. One of the key responsibilities of the Commission is to ensure as much transparency as possible in political campaigns.

It is important to note that contribution limits for legislative candidates went into effect on January 1, 2001 and for statewide candidates on November 6, 2002. Political party committees can only accept \$32,400 per contributor per calendar year for direct state candidate support. However, both major parties have a state committee and 58 separate county committees. Each of these committees is legally entitled to accept the maximum of \$32,400 for direct state candidate support. Moreover, there are no limits on what may be contributed to a political party activity, such as “Get Out the Vote.” There are no contribution limits for ballot measure campaigns (except when state candidates are contributing to a ballot measure committee controlled by another state

candidate). There are no limits on what an entity can spend on lobbying.

This report includes:

- *Expenditures for state and local ballot measures (descriptions of all the ballot measures studied in this report are located in Appendix 2);*
- *Expenditures for state and local candidates (direct contributions and “independent expenditures”);*
- *Contributions to official political party entities, such as a state party or county party central committee;*
- *Contributions to other committees, which then make contributions to ballot measure committees and direct contributions or “independent expenditures” benefitting candidates.*
- *Amount of money spent on lobbying the California Legislature and other state agencies.*

A Public Policy Institute of California survey in August of 2008 asked 2,001 California adult residents, including 1,047 likely voters:

“Would you say the state government is pretty much run by a few big interests looking out for themselves, or that it is run for the benefit of all the people?”

The results:

67% a few big interests
24% benefit of all the people
9% don't know

The unrelenting flood of special interest dollars may help promote a sense of futility on the part of average citizens. Voters want their representatives to serve them, not whichever special interests can spend the most.

Every year, citizens see special interests pouring tens of millions of dollars into election campaigns and lobbying – dwarfing the ability of average voters to influence important public policy decisions. Little wonder the public feels impotent and overpowered by wealthy political insiders.

THE 15 THAT SPENT \$1 BILLION TO INFLUENCE CALIFORNIA VOTERS AND PUBLIC OFFICIALS

1. California Teachers Association	\$ 211,849,298
2. California State Council of Service Employees	\$ 107,467,272
3. Pharmaceutical Research and Manufacturers of America	\$ 104,912,997
4. Morongo Band of Mission Indians	\$ 83,600,438
5. Pechanga Band of Luiseno Indians	\$ 69,298,909
6. Pacific Gas & Electric Company	\$ 69,240,759
7. Chevron Corporation	\$ 66,257,132
8. AT&T Inc.	\$ 59,619,677
9. Philip Morris USA	\$ 50,756,360
10. Agua Caliente Band of Cahuilla Indians	\$ 49,078,448
11. Southern California Edison	\$ 43,412,031
12. California Hospital Association	\$ 43,281,456
13. California Chamber of Commerce	\$ 39,065,861
14. Western States Petroleum Association	\$ 35,214,325
15. Aera Energy LLC	\$ 34,671,163

GRAND TOTAL

\$1,067,726,126

#1 CALIFORNIA TEACHERS ASSOCIATION

TOTAL SPENDING: \$211,849,298

The California Teachers Association (CTA) is California's largest union representing public school teachers. It is the state affiliate of the National Education Association.

The chart below shows the amount of money spent by the California Teachers Association/Association for Better Citizenship, the California Teachers Association Issues PAC and the California committee of the National Education Association to influence California voters and public officials.

SPENDING BREAKDOWN

Ballot Measures	\$144,116,835
Candidates	\$16,716,386
Political Parties	\$6,613,834
Other Campaign Committees	\$5,885,936
TOTAL SPENT INFLUENCE VOTERS	\$173,332,991

TOTAL SPENT LOBBYING OFFICIALS	\$38,516,307
GRAND TOTAL SPENT	\$211,849,298

Highlights of California Teachers Association spending:

- * The biggest expenditure, \$26,366,491, was made to oppose Proposition 38 on the 2000 ballot. The measure sought to enact a school voucher system in California. It was defeated 29.4% to 70.6%.

-
- * **Spent more than \$50,000,000 to defeat three ballot measures on the 2005 special election statewide ballot.**
 - **Spent \$8,224,449 opposing Proposition 74, which sought to make changes in the probationary period for California school teachers. The proposal was defeated 44.8% to 55.2%.**
 - **Spent \$12,102,416 opposing Proposition 75, which sought to prohibit the use of public employee union dues for political contributions without individual employees' prior consent. The measure was defeated 46.5% to 53.5%.**
 - **Spent \$13,681,685 opposing Proposition 76, concerning state spending and minimum school funding requirements. The proposal was defeated 37.6% to 62.4%.**
 - **In addition to the millions spent directly to defeat Propositions 74, 75 and 76, CTA contributed another \$20,194,994 in 2005 to the Alliance for a Better California, which, in turn, used the money to help defeat these same propositions.**

 - * **Spent nearly \$12,000,000 supporting Propositions 1A and 1B on the 2009 special statewide election ballot.**
 - **Those measures dealt with changes in the budget process and extra money for local school districts and community colleges.**
 - **Proposition 1A was defeated 34.6% to 65.4% and Proposition 1B was defeated 38.1% to 61.9%.**

 - * **The largest contributions to a political party among the identified special interest groups were made by the California Teachers Association to the California Democratic Party -- totaling \$6,503,499.**

#2

CALIFORNIA STATE COUNCIL OF SERVICE EMPLOYEES TOTAL SPENDING: \$107,467,272

The California State Council of Service Employees has members throughout California. It is an affiliate of the Service Employees International Union.

The chart below shows the amount of money spent by the California State Council of Service Employees Political Committee, California State Council of Service Employees Issues Committee, California State Council of Service Employees Small Contributor Committee and Service Employees International Union Political Education and Action Fund to influence California voters and public officials.

SPENDING BREAKDOWN

Ballot Measures	\$50,292,790
Candidates	\$18,786,136
Political Parties	\$4,731,395
Other Campaign Committees	\$8,049,102
TOTAL SPENT INFLUENCE VOTERS	\$81,859,423
TOTAL SPENT LOBBYING OFFICIALS	\$25,607,849
GRAND TOTAL SPENT	\$107,467,272

Highlights of California State Council of Service Employees spending:

- * Ranked first among the identified interest groups in candidate support or opposition -- spending a total of \$18,786,136.

-
- * **Spent \$10,026,682 opposing Proposition 75 on the 2005 special election ballot. Proposition 75, which sought to prohibit the use of public employee union dues for political contributions without individual employees' prior consent, lost 46.5% to 53.5%.
 - **Spent \$6,202,205 in contributions to the Alliance for a Better California in 2005, which also opposed Proposition 75.****
 - * **Spent \$9,019,191 supporting Proposition 56 in 2004. That measure sought to lower the vote requirement for approval of the state budget to 55%. It was defeated 34.3% to 65.7%.**
 - * **Spent \$4,079,113 supporting Proposition 72 on the 2004 ballot. That measure dealt with health care coverage requirements for employers. It was defeated 49.2% to 50.8%.**
 - * **Spent \$2,535,000 on contributions to Opportunity PAC, which, in turn, made "independent expenditures" on behalf of candidates.**

#3

PHARMACEUTICAL RESEARCH AND MANUFACTURERS OF AMERICA TOTAL SPENDING: \$104,912,997

Pharmaceutical Research and Manufacturers of America (PhRMA) represents the leading research-based drug and biotechnology companies in the United States.

The chart below shows the amount of money spent by the PhRMA Initiative Fund, the PhRMA Independent Expenditure Committee and the PhRMA PAC to influence California voters and public officials.

SPENDING BREAKDOWN

Ballot Measures	\$99,379,368
Candidates	\$262,223
Political Parties	\$505,900
Other Campaign Committees	\$606,500
TOTAL SPENT INFLUENCE VOTERS	\$100,753,991

TOTAL SPENT LOBBYING OFFICIALS	\$4,159,006
GRAND TOTAL SPENT	\$104,912,997

Highlights of PhRMA spending:

- * Two dueling initiatives on the 2005 statewide special election ballot resulted in PhRMA spending \$95 million to support Proposition 78 and oppose Proposition 79.

-
- **Both ballot measures sought to establish a prescription drug discount program for low-income Californians.**
 - **Proposition 78 was backed by the pharmaceutical industry, while Proposition 79 was supported by union, health care and consumer groups.**
 - **PhRMA spent \$44,818,751 supporting Proposition 78, which lost 41.5% to 58.5% and \$50,752,042 to oppose Proposition 79, which lost 39.3% to 60.7%.**
- * **Spent \$3,202,575 supporting Proposition 75 on the 2005 statewide ballot.**
- **That measure, which sought to prohibit the use of public employee union dues for political contributions without individual employees' prior consent, lost 46.5% to 53.5%.**

#4 MORONGO BAND OF MISSION INDIANS

TOTAL SPENDING: \$83,600,438

The Morongo Indian Reservation is located near Banning, California. The tribe operates the Morongo Casino Resort & Spa, which is one of the largest tribal gaming facilities in the nation.

The chart below shows the amount of money spent by the Morongo Band of Mission Indians Native American Rights Fund to influence California voters and public officials.

SPENDING BREAKDOWN

Ballot Measures	\$62,755,818
Candidates	\$6,221,137
Political Parties	\$2,506,022
Other Campaign Committees	\$6,488,134
TOTAL SPENT INFLUENCE VOTERS	\$77,971,111
TOTAL SPENT LOBBYING OFFICIALS	\$5,629,327
GRAND TOTAL SPENT	\$83,600,438

Highlights of Morongo Band of Mission Indians spending:

- * Spent \$42,070,829 supporting Propositions 94, 95, 96 and 97 on the 2008 ballot. Those measures dramatically increased the number of slot machines at four Indian gaming casinos. They were approved by the voters 55.6% to 44.4%.
- * Spent \$5 million opposing Proposition 68 in 2004. That measure sought to expand gambling for horse racing tracks and card rooms. It was defeated 16.2% to 83.8%.
- * Gave \$1,159,912 to the Democratic Party and \$1,346,110 to the Republican Party.

#5

PECHANGA BAND OF LUISEÑO INDIANS TOTAL SPENDING: \$69,298,909

The Pechanga Band of Luiseño Indians is located in the Temecula valley where it operates the Pechanga Resort and Casino.

The chart below shows the amount of money spent by the Pechanga Band of Luiseño Indians to influence California voters and public officials.

SPENDING BREAKDOWN

Ballot Measures	\$53,402,188
Candidates	\$9,718,025
Political Parties	\$1,640,900
Other Campaign Committees	\$2,678,046
TOTAL SPENT INFLUENCE VOTERS	\$67,439,159

TOTAL SPENT LOBBYING OFFICIALS	\$1,859,750
GRAND TOTAL SPENT	\$69,298,909

Highlights of Pechanga Band of Luiseño Indians spending:

- * Spent nearly \$46 million supporting Propositions 94, 95, 96 and 97 on the 2008 ballot. Those measures dramatically increased the number of slot machines at four Indian gaming casinos. They were approved by the voters 55.6% to 44.4%.

-
- * Spent \$5,521,142 opposing Proposition 68 on the 2004 ballot. That measure sought to expand gambling at horse racing tracks and card rooms. It was defeated 16.2% to 83.8%.
 - * Spent nearly \$4 million in contributions to First Americans for a Better California Independent Expenditure Committee in 2003, which, in turn, made independent expenditures in support of Lt. Governor Cruz Bustamante’s gubernatorial candidacy in the 2003 special statewide recall election.
 - * Spent \$1,560,000 in contributions to the Native Americans and Peace Officers Committee, which, in turn, made “independent expenditures” on behalf of candidates and also made contributions to political parties and other committees.

#6

PACIFIC GAS & ELECTRIC COMPANY AND AFFILIATED ENTITIES TOTAL SPENDING: \$69,240,759

Pacific Gas & Electric Company, which is located in San Francisco, is one of the largest natural gas and electric utilities in the United States. It provides service to approximately 15 million people in northern and central California.

The chart below shows the amount of money spent by Pacific Gas & Electric Company to influence California voters and public officials.

SPENDING BREAKDOWN

Ballot Measures	\$46,472,034
Candidates	\$4,688,526
Political Parties	\$2,600,622
Other Campaign Committees	\$3,307,659
TOTAL SPENT INFLUENCE VOTERS	\$57,068,841

TOTAL SPENT LOBBYING OFFICIALS	\$12,171,918
GRAND TOTAL SPENT	\$69,240,759

Highlights of PG&E spending:

- * In 2008, roughly \$25 million was spent to oppose two ballot measures concerning renewable energy.
 - Nearly \$14 million was spent to defeat Proposition 7 on the statewide ballot, which lost 35.5% to 64.5%.

-
- **Another \$11 million was spent to defeat Proposition H in San Francisco, which lost 38.62% to 61.38%.**
 - * **In 2006, more than \$11 million was spent successfully opposing an effort by the Sacramento Municipal Utility District, which sought to annex PG&E customers in Yolo County.**
 - * **In 2009, PG&E spent \$3.5 million to qualify an initiative for the 2010 June ballot (Proposition 16). The proposal seeks to require local governments to obtain two-thirds approval before providing electricity to new customers or expanding such service to new territories if any public funds or bonds are involved.**
 - * **Gave \$1,324,250 to the Democratic Party and \$1,276,372 to the Republican Party.**

#7

CHEVRON CORPORATION AND ITS SUBSIDIARIES/AFFILIATES TOTAL SPENDING: \$66,257,132

Chevron Corporation is one of the world's largest integrated energy companies. It is headquartered in San Ramon, California and conducts business in more than 100 countries.

The chart below shows the money spent by Chevron Corporation attempting to influence California voters and public officials.

SPENDING BREAKDOWN

Ballot Measures	\$44,820,332
Candidates	\$3,212,611
Political Parties	\$2,989,400
Other Campaign Committees	\$2,973,326
TOTAL SPENT INFLUENCE VOTERS	\$53,995,669

TOTAL SPENT LOBBYING OFFICIALS	\$12,261,463
GRAND TOTAL SPENT	\$66,257,132

Highlights of Chevron spending:

- * Eighty-eight percent of all the money spent on ballot measures over the last ten years went to defeat Proposition 87 on the 2006 ballot. The proposal sought to impose a tax on oil producers in California.
 - Chevron spent \$39,400,000 opposing Proposition 87, which lost 45.4% to 54.6%.

-
- * **Chevron spent \$2,180,332 in 2006 on qualifying an initiative, the Safe Products Initiative, by Californians for Sensible Lawsuit Reform Committee. The proposal sought to limit punitive damage awards. The initiative never qualified for the ballot.**

#8 AT&T INC. AND ITS AFFILIATES

TOTAL SPENDING: \$59,619,677

AT&T is a leader in the telecommunications industry.

The chart below shows the amount of money spent by AT&T (Formerly: Pacific Tele-
sis Group and Its Subsidiaries, Affiliates of SBC Communications, Inc.) to influence
California voters and public officials.

SPENDING BREAKDOWN

Ballot Measures	\$4,423,741
Candidates	\$3,381,758
Political Parties	\$2,543,200
Other Campaign Committees	\$2,544,813
TOTAL SPENT INFLUENCE VOTERS	\$12,893,512

TOTAL SPENT LOBBYING OFFICIALS	\$46,726,165
GRAND TOTAL SPENT	\$59,619,677

Highlights of AT&T spending:

- * AT&T ranked number one in lobbying expenditures -- a total of \$46,726,165.
 - Records from the Secretary of State's Office show that in the three-month period from April 1 - June 30, 2006, \$17,977,977 was spent on lobbying.

-
- **This was during the time when the State Legislature decided the fate of one of the biggest telecommunications proposals of the decade. AT&T favored the proposal, AB 2987, which opened the door for telephone companies to enter cable markets. It was signed into law by the Governor.**
 - * **Spent \$3,860,741 opposing Proposition 67 on the 2004 ballot, which sought to increase the telephone surcharge to provide additional funding for emergency medical services.**
 - **The measure was defeated 28.4% to 71.6%.**

#9

PHILIP MORRIS USA INC.
(THROUGH ITS PARENT COMPANY
ALTRIA CLIENT SERVICES, INC.)
TOTAL SPENDING: \$50,756,360

Philip Morris is the largest tobacco company in the United States.

The chart below shows the amount of money spent by Philip Morris to influence California voters and public officials.

SPENDING BREAKDOWN

Ballot Measures	\$37,024,122
Candidates	\$3,037,344
Political Parties	\$2,837,804
Other Campaign Committees	\$1,872,532
TOTAL SPENT INFLUENCE VOTERS	\$44,771,802
TOTAL SPENT LOBBYING OFFICIALS	\$5,984,558
GRAND TOTAL SPENT	\$50,756,360

Highlights of Philip Morris spending:

- * **Ninety-six percent of all the money Philip Morris spent on ballot measures in the last ten years went to oppose Proposition 86 on the 2006 ballot.**
 - **The proposal sought to impose an additional \$2.60 tax on each pack of cigarettes.**
 - **Philip Morris spent \$35,543,562 to defeat Proposition 86, which lost 48.3% to 51.7%.**

* **Spent \$2,777,804 on contributions to the California Republican Party, which was the largest amount the party received from any special interest group identified in this report.**

#10

AGUA CALIENTE BAND OF CAHUILLA INDIANS

TOTAL SPENDING: \$49,078,448

The Agua Caliente Band of Cahuilla Indians is based in Palm Springs. The tribe operates two hotels and casinos in the Palm Springs area.

The chart below shows the amount of money spent by the Agua Caliente Band of Cahuilla Indians to influence California voters and public officials.

SPENDING BREAKDOWN

Ballot Measures	\$37,160,908
Candidates	\$3,773,460
Political Parties	\$1,690,600
Other Campaign Committees	\$1,937,709
TOTAL SPENT INFLUENCE VOTERS	\$44,562,677

TOTAL SPENT LOBBYING OFFICIALS	\$4,515,771
GRAND TOTAL SPENT	\$49,078,448

Highlights of Agua Caliente spending:

- * Spent \$20,865,845 supporting Propositions 94, 95, 96 and 97 on the 2008 ballot. These measures, which dramatically increased the number of slot machines at four Indian gaming casinos, were approved 55.6% to 44.4%.

-
- * **Spent \$15,515,000 supporting Proposition 70 on the 2004 ballot. That proposal would have provided for 99-year tribal-state gambling compacts and no limits on the type or number of casino games. The measure lost 23.7% to 76.3%.**

#11

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON TOTAL SPENDING: \$43,412,031

Southern California Edison is an electric utility that provides service to more than 13 million people in southern California.

The chart below shows the amount of money spent by Southern California Edison to influence California voters and public officials.

SPENDING BREAKDOWN

Ballot Measures	\$19,821,745
Candidates	\$2,186,219
Political Parties	\$1,166,505
Other Campaign Committees	\$1,356,165
TOTAL SPENT INFLUENCE VOTERS	\$24,530,634

TOTAL SPENT LOBBYING OFFICIALS	\$18,881,397
GRAND TOTAL SPENT	\$43,412,031

Highlights of Southern California Edison spending:

- * Roughly 70% of the total amount spent on ballot measures in the last 10 years went to defeat Proposition 7 on the 2008 ballot.
 - The measure sought to require utilities to generate more power from renewable energy.

-
- **Spent \$13,720,250 opposing Proposition 7, which lost 35.5% to 64.5%.**
 - * **Southern California Edison has also been involved in a number of local ballot measures impacting utility service.**
 - **Spent \$2,407,242 in loans and monetary contributions supporting Measure N on the 2004 ballot. That measure sought to place restrictions on Moreno Valley’s municipal utility. It lost 49.57% to 50.43%.**

#12 CALIFORNIA HOSPITAL ASSOCIATION

TOTAL SPENDING: \$43,281,456

The California Hospital Association represents the interests of the operators of hospitals and health systems in the state.

The chart below shows the amount of money spent by the California Hospital Association PAC, sponsored by the California Association of Hospitals and Health Care Systems and the California Hospitals Committee on Issues, sponsored by the California Association of Hospitals and Health Care Systems to influence California voters and public officials.

SPENDING BREAKDOWN

Ballot Measures	\$21,865,456
Candidates	\$2,838,753
Political Parties	\$509,000
Other Campaign Committees	\$732,649
TOTAL SPENT INFLUENCE VOTERS	\$25,945,858
TOTAL SPENT LOBBYING OFFICIALS	\$17,335,598
GRAND TOTAL SPENT	\$43,281,456

Highlights of the California Hospital Association spending:

- * Spent \$17,001,721 supporting two initiatives -- one of which qualified for the ballot (Proposition 86 in 2006) -- to increase the tax on cigarettes.

-
- **The California Hospital Association was the biggest financial supporter of Proposition 86, which would have increased the tax on each pack of cigarettes by \$2.60.**
 - **The measure was defeated 48.3% to 51.7%.**
 - * **Spent \$541,735 supporting Proposition 63 on the 2004 ballot. The measure, which established a one percent tax on personal income above \$1 million to fund expanded health services for the mentally ill, was approved 53.8% to 46.2%.**
 - * **Spent \$2,464,600 supporting Proposition 67 on the 2004 ballot. The measure, which sought to increase the telephone surcharge to provide additional funding for emergency medical services, was defeated 28.4% to 71.6%.**

#13

CALIFORNIA CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

TOTAL SPENDING: \$39,065,861

The California Chamber of Commerce represents major California corporations. It works on the state and federal levels to influence government actions affecting all California business.

The chart below shows the amount of money spent by the California Chamber of Commerce to influence California voters and public officials.

SPENDING BREAKDOWN

Ballot Measures	\$4,510,756
Candidates	\$7,130,666
Political Parties	\$441,585
Other Campaign Committees	\$186,394
TOTAL SPENT INFLUENCE VOTERS	\$12,269,401

TOTAL SPENT LOBBYING OFFICIALS	\$26,796,460
GRAND TOTAL SPENT	\$39,065,861

Highlights of the California Chamber of Commerce spending:

- * Of the \$7,130,666 spent on behalf of candidates, \$5,832,213 went to independent expenditures for state legislative candidates.

-
- **By making independent expenditures, special interests do not have to adhere to any contribution limits and thus are able to spend unlimited amounts of money on their favorite candidates, provided there is no coordination with the campaign.**
 - * **Spent \$1,342,000 to support Proposition 77 on the 2005 special election ballot.**
 - **That measure, which sought to take the redistricting process out of the hands of the Legislature, lost 40.2% to 59.8%.**

#14 WESTERN STATES PETROLEUM ASSOCIATION

TOTAL SPENDING: \$35,214,325

Western States Petroleum Association (WSPA) represents companies involved in petroleum exploration, production refining, transportation and marketing in the six western states of Arizona, California, Hawaii, Nevada, Oregon and Washington.

The chart below shows the amount of money spent by Western States Petroleum Association to influence officials. While WSPA did not directly participate in elections, just two of its members, Chevron Corporation and Aera Energy, spent in excess of \$87 million on campaigns.

SPENDING BREAKDOWN

Ballot Measures	\$0
Candidates	\$0
Political Parties	\$0
Other Campaign Committees	\$0
TOTAL SPENT INFLUENCE VOTERS	\$0

TOTAL SPENT LOBBYING OFFICIALS	\$35,214,325
GRAND TOTAL SPENT	\$35,214,325

Highlights of Western States Petroleum spending:

- * Spent \$35,214,325 on lobbying state officials.

#15

AERA ENERGY LLC

TOTAL SPENDING: \$34,671,163

Aera Energy is located in Bakersfield and is one of California's largest oil and gas producers.

The chart below shows the amount of money spent by Aera Energy LLC to influence California voters and public officials.

SPENDING BREAKDOWN

Ballot Measures	\$33,107,269
Candidates	\$25,000
Political Parties	\$0
Other Campaign Committees	\$10,000
TOTAL SPENT INFLUENCE VOTERS	\$33,142,269

TOTAL SPENT LOBBYING OFFICIALS	\$1,528,894
GRAND TOTAL SPENT	\$34,671,163

Highlights of Aera Energy spending:

- * Over 99% of the money spent on ballot measures in the past ten years went to defeat Proposition 87 on the 2006 ballot.
 - The measure sought to impose a tax on oil producers in California.
 - Spent \$32,824,243 opposing Proposition 87, which lost 45.4% to 54.6%.

THE NEXT 10

The committees identified in this section round out the Top 25 California special interests that spent the most to influence public policy decisions and the outcome of elections in the last decade.

The combined spending of the Top 25 committees from January 1, 2000 to December 31, 2009 totaled \$1,338,725,492. Of that amount, nearly \$775,000,000 was spent supporting or opposing ballot measures and more than \$330,000,000 was spent lobbying public officials.



#16 CALIFORNIA ASSOCIATION OF REALTORS

TOTAL SPENDING: \$33,329,943

The California Association of Realtors is a statewide trade association representing real estate agents.

The chart below shows the amount of money spent by the California Real Estate Independent Expenditure Committee, the California Real Estate PAC and the California Association of Realtors Issues Mobilization PAC to influence California voters and public officials.

SPENDING BREAKDOWN

Ballot Measures	\$5,552,012
Candidates	\$9,823,538
Political Parties	\$3,414,699
Other Campaign Committees	\$4,687,300
TOTAL SPENT INFLUENCE VOTERS	\$23,477,549

TOTAL SPENT LOBBYING OFFICIALS	\$9,852,394
GRAND TOTAL SPENT	\$33,329,943

Highlights of spending by the Realtors:

- * One of the top spenders among the identified interest groups on candidate support and opposition -- \$9,823,538.

-
- * **Spent \$1,485,000 in contributions to the California Alliance for Progress and Education, which, in turn, primarily made “independent expenditures” on behalf of candidates for state office.**
 - * **Spent \$712,713 in support of Proposition 98 on the 2008 ballot. That proposal sought to limit government from taking private property.**
 - **The measure was defeated 38.4% to 61.6%.**
 - * **Spent \$471,250 to defeat Measure A in Santa Clara County in 2006. That proposal sought to protect 400,000 acres of rural county lands from development.**
 - **The measure was defeated 49.26% to 50.74%.**
 - * **Gave \$1,399,700 to the Democratic Party and \$2,014,999 to the Republican Party.**

#17 CALIFORNIA CORRECTIONAL PEACE OFFICERS ASSOCIATION (CCPOA)

TOTAL SPENDING: \$32,452,083

The California Correctional Peace Officers Association represents the prison guards and state parole agents.

The chart below shows the amount of money spent by the California Correctional Peace Officers Association, CCPOA Independent Expenditure Committee, CCPOA Issues Committee, CCPOA Local PAC, CCPOA PAC, and CCPOA Truth In American Government Fund to influence California voters and elected officials.

SPENDING BREAKDOWN

Ballot Measures	\$9,771,032
Candidates	\$9,832,048
Political Parties	\$3,204,535
Other Campaign Committees	\$6,088,626
TOTAL SPENT INFLUENCE VOTERS	\$28,896,241

TOTAL SPENT LOBBYING OFFICIALS	\$3,555,842
GRAND TOTAL SPENT	\$32,452,083

Highlights of CCPOA spending:

- * The largest spending was on behalf of candidates.
- * Ranked third among the identified special interest groups in making contributions to other committees.

-
- **Spent nearly \$3.5 million in contributions to the Alliance for a Better California in 2005, which, in turn, used the money to oppose Propositions 74, 75, 76 and 78, while supporting Propositions 77, 79 and 80 on the 2005 special statewide election.**
 - **Spent \$2,000,000 in contributions to the Alliance for California Renewal Committee, which, in turn, contributed money in opposition to Proposition 93 on the 2008 ballot. That measure sought to modify term limits for legislators.**
 - **Spent \$1,140,000 in contributions to the Native Americans and Peace Officers committee, which, in turn, made “independent expenditures” on behalf of candidates and made contributions to political parties and other committees.**
 - * **Spent \$1,825,000 to oppose Proposition 5 on the 2008 ballot. That measure sought to limit court authority to incarcerate offenders who commit certain drug crimes. It lost 40.5% to 59.5%.**
 - * **Spent \$854,866 to oppose Proposition 66 on the 2004 ballot. That measure sought to enact some limitations on the Three Strikes Law. It lost 47.3% to 52.7%.**
 - * **Gave \$1,766,310 to the Democratic Party and \$1,438,225 to the Republican Party.**

#18 CALIFORNIA SCHOOL EMPLOYEES ASSOCIATION

TOTAL SPENDING: \$31,861,749

The California School Employees Association represents school support staff, known as classified school employees, in California public schools and community colleges.

The chart below shows the amount of money spent by Political Action for Classified Employees of the California School Employees Association (PACE of CSEA) and PACE of California School Employees Association -- Issues to influence California voters and public officials.

SPENDING BREAKDOWN

Ballot Measures	\$6,599,108
Candidates	\$7,177,324
Political Parties	\$2,345,931
Other Campaign Committees	\$900,098
TOTAL SPENT INFLUENCE VOTERS	\$17,022,461

TOTAL SPENT LOBBYING OFFICIALS	\$14,839,288
GRAND TOTAL SPENT	\$31,861,749

Highlights of California School Employees Association spending:

- * Spent \$1,781,225 to oppose Proposition 38 on the 2000 ballot, which sought to enact a school voucher system in California. The measure was defeated 29.4% to 70.6%.

-
- * **Spent \$1,220,000 to oppose Proposition 75 on the 2005 special election ballot. That measure, which sought to prohibit the use of public employee union dues for political contributions without individual employees' prior consent, was defeated 46.5% to 53.5%.**
 - **In addition to the money spent directly to defeat Proposition 75, \$1,398,808 was contributed to the Alliance for a Better California in 2005, which, in turn, used the money to help defeat the same proposition.**

#19

SAN MANUEL BAND OF MISSION INDIANS

TOTAL SPENDING: \$29,747,811

The San Manuel Band of Serrano Mission Indians is located near the city of Highland, California. The tribe operates the San Manuel Indian Bingo and Casino.

The chart below shows the amount of money spent by the San Manuel Band of Mission Indians to influence California voters and public officials.

SPENDING BREAKDOWN

Ballot Measures	\$20,147,261
Candidates	\$3,032,030
Political Parties	\$2,251,890
Other Campaign Committees	\$3,218,715
TOTAL SPENT INFLUENCE VOTERS	\$28,649,896

TOTAL SPENT LOBBYING OFFICIALS	\$1,097,915
GRAND TOTAL SPENT	\$29,747,811

Highlights of San Manuel Band of Mission Indians spending:

- * Almost all the money spent on ballot measures in the past ten years went to support two Indian gaming proposals.
 - \$11 million was spent supporting Proposition 70 on the 2004 ballot. The proposal would have provided for 99-year tribal-state gambling compacts and no limits on the type or number of casino games. The proposal was defeated 23.7% to 76.3%.

-
- * **\$8,611,261 was spent to support Proposition 1A on the 2000 ballot. That proposal authorized the Governor to negotiate compacts for the operation of slot machines and other games on Indian land. The proposal was approved 64.5% to 35.5%.**

#20 REYNOLDS AMERICAN INC.

TOTAL SPENDING: \$29,213,942

Reynolds American Inc. is the parent company of R.J. Reynolds Tobacco Company, American Snuff Company, LLC, Santa Fe Natural Tobacco Company, Inc. and Nicovum AB.

The chart below shows the amount of money spent by Reynolds American to influence California voters and public officials.

SPENDING BREAKDOWN

Ballot Measures	\$25,872,148
Candidates	\$595,602
Political Parties	\$167,500
Other Campaign Committees	\$20,140
TOTAL SPENT INFLUENCE VOTERS	\$26,655,390
TOTAL SPENT LOBBYING OFFICIALS	\$2,558,552
GRAND TOTAL SPENT	\$29,213,942

Highlights of Reynolds American spending:

- * Almost 99% of all the money Reynolds spent in the last ten years on ballot measures went to defeat Proposition 86 on the ballot in 2006.
 - Proposition 86 sought to impose an additional \$2.60 tax on each pack of cigarettes.
 - Reynolds spent \$25,496,898 to defeat Proposition 86, which lost 48.3% to 51.7%.

#21

PALA BAND OF MISSION INDIANS

TOTAL SPENDING: \$24,021,356

The Pala Band of Mission Indians is located in northern San Diego County. The tribe operates the Pala Casino Resort and Spa.

The chart below shows the amount of money spent by the Pala Band of Mission Indians to influence California voters and public officials.

SPENDING BREAKDOWN

Ballot Measures	\$22,174,726
Candidates	\$341,795
Political Parties	\$162,900
Other Campaign Committees	\$1,073,200
TOTAL SPENT INFLUENCE VOTERS	\$23,752,621

TOTAL SPENT LOBBYING OFFICIALS	\$268,735
GRAND TOTAL SPENT	\$24,021,356

Highlights of Pala Band of Mission Indians spending:

- * A little over 92% of all the money spent by the Palas on ballot measures in the last ten years went to oppose five proposals involving gambling issues.
 - Spent \$12,982,836 opposing Propositions 94, 95, 96 and 97 on the 2008 ballot. These measures, which dramatically increased the number of slot machines at four Indian gaming casinos, were approved 55.6% to 44.4%.

-
- **More than \$8 million was spent to defeat Proposition 68 in 2004. That proposal sought to expand gambling at non-tribal establishments, such as race tracks and card rooms. Proposition 68 lost 16.2% to 83.8%.**

#22 UNITED AUBURN INDIAN COMMUNITY TOTAL SPENDING: \$24,019,877

The United Auburn Indian Community operates the Thunder Valley Casino in Lincoln.

The chart below shows the amount of money spent by the United Auburn Indian Community to influence California voters and public officials.

SPENDING BREAKDOWN

Ballot Measures	\$21,888,175
Candidates	\$501,874
Political Parties	\$280,600
Other Campaign Committees	\$1,143,300
TOTAL SPENT INFLUENCE VOTERS	\$23,813,949

TOTAL SPENT LOBBYING OFFICIALS	\$205,928
GRAND TOTAL SPENT	\$24,019,877

Highlights of United Auburn spending:

- * Almost all of the money spent on behalf of ballot measures in the past ten years concerned gaming.
 - Spent \$13,006,836 opposing Propositions 94, 95, 96 and 97 on the 2008 ballot. These measures, which dramatically increased the number of slot machines at four Indian gaming casinos, were approved 55.6% to 44.4%.

-
- **Spent more than \$8 million to defeat Proposition 68 in 2004. That proposal sought to expand gambling at non-tribal establishments, such as race tracks and card rooms. Proposition 68 lost 16.2% to 83.8%.**

#23 CALIFORNIA MEDICAL ASSOCIATION

TOTAL SPENDING: \$23,064,218

The California Medical Association is an organization of medical doctors with members in all modes of practice and specialties serving patients in California.

The chart below shows the amount of money spent by the California Medical Association Major Donor Committee, California Medical Association -- Physicians' Issues Committee, California Medical Association Independent Expenditure Committee, California Medical Association Political Action Committee and California Medical Association Small Contributor Committee to influence California voters and public officials.

SPENDING BREAKDOWN

Ballot Measures	\$752,807
Candidates	\$6,999,852
Political Parties	\$760,000
Other Campaign Committees	\$572,075
TOTAL SPENT INFLUENCE VOTERS	\$9,084,734

TOTAL SPENT LOBBYING OFFICIALS	\$13,979,484
GRAND TOTAL SPENT	\$23,064,218

Highlights of California Medical Association spending:

- * **More than 75% of the money spent in the last decade to influence voters was used to benefit candidates, either directly or through “independent expenditures.”**
 - **In the 2008 legislative elections, CMA gave money to seven candidate-specific “independent expenditure” committees.**
 - **This new trend has the effect of letting candidates know in advance of an election that additional monetary support is on its way.**
- * **Spent \$666,807 supporting Proposition 67 on the 2004 ballot. That measure, which sought to increase the telephone surcharge to provide additional funding for emergency medical services, was defeated 28.4% to 71.6%.**

#24 ANTHEM BLUE CROSS

(A SUBSIDIARY OF WELLPOINT, INC.)
TOTAL SPENDING: \$21,993,466

Anthem Blue Cross is a for-profit health insurance company which has 8.3 million subscribers in California.

The chart below shows the amount of money spent by Anthem Blue Cross to influence California voters and public officials.

SPENDING BREAKDOWN

Ballot Measures	\$551,500
Candidates	\$2,039,930
Political Parties	\$1,270,700
Other Campaign Committees	\$2,816,770
TOTAL SPENT INFLUENCE VOTERS	\$6,678,900

TOTAL SPENT LOBBYING OFFICIALS	\$15,314,566
GRAND TOTAL SPENT	\$21,993,466

Highlights of Anthem Blue Cross spending:

- * Spent \$2,000,000 in 2007 as the sole sponsor of the Coalition for Responsible Health Care Reform Committee. The money was used for an advertising campaign advocating the company's views on health care reform.
- * The largest expenditure on behalf of a ballot measure was \$235,000 in support of Proposition 64 on the 2004 ballot.

-
- **That measure, which allows individual or class action unfair business lawsuits only if a plaintiff can prove an actual loss, was approved by the voters 59% to 41%.**

#25 CONSUMER ATTORNEYS OF CALIFORNIA

TOTAL SPENDING: \$21,294,921

The Consumer Attorneys of California, formerly the California Trial Lawyers Association, is an organization consisting of 3,000 trial attorneys.

The chart below shows the amount of money spent by the Consumer Attorneys Issues Political Action Committee, Consumer Attorneys Independent Campaign Committee, Consumer Attorneys Political Action Committee, Consumer Attorneys Campaign Committee (Small Contributor Committee) and Consumer Attorneys Action Fund to influence California voters and public officials.

SPENDING BREAKDOWN

Ballot Measures	\$1,114,663
Candidates	\$5,398,591
Political Parties	\$132,079
Other Campaign Committees	\$2,186,423
TOTAL SPENT INFLUENCE VOTERS	\$8,831,756
TOTAL SPENT LOBBYING OFFICIALS	\$12,463,165
GRAND TOTAL SPENT	\$21,294,921

Highlights of Consumer Attorneys of California spending:

- * **Spent \$5,330,041 on behalf of candidates, including \$2,241,376 contributed to California Alliance, a Coalition of Consumer Attorneys, Conservationists and Nurses, which, in turn, made “independent expenditures” supporting and opposing candidates.**
- * **Spent \$763,700 opposing Proposition 64 on the 2004 ballot.**
 - **That measure, which allows individual or class action unfair business lawsuits only if a plaintiff can prove an actual loss, was passed by the voters 59% to 41%.**

METHODOLOGY

Information in this report was obtained from the Secretary of State’s website using the “contributions made” section for each of the 25 identified groups in this report.

This report focused on special interest group spending, not spending by individual donors.

Descriptions for each of the special interest groups identified were obtained from information on their websites.

Descriptions of the ballot measures were obtained from the Secretary of State’s ballot pamphlets.

APPENDIX 1

COMMITTEES/MAJOR DONORS

ID NUMBERS

- #1 California Teachers Association/Association for Better Citizenship (ID #741941)
 - California Teachers Association Issues PAC (ID #880873)
 - National Education Association (ID #981293)

 - #2 California State Council of Service Employees
 - California State Council of Service Employees Issues Committee (ID #960895)
 - California State Council of Service Employees Political Committee (ID #1258324)
 - California State Council of Service Employees Small Contributor Committee (ID #831628)
 - Service Employees International Union Political Education and Action Fund (ID #782200)

 - #3 Pharmaceutical Research and Manufacturers of America
 - Pharmaceutical Research and Manufacturers of America CA Initiative Fund (ID #1274444)
 - Pharmaceutical Research and Manufacturers of America PAC (ID #1282378)
 - Pharmaceutical Research and Manufacturers of America IE Committee (ID #1266887)

 - #4 Morongo Band of Mission Indians
 - Morongo Band of Mission Indians Native American Rights Fund (ID #494203)

 - #5 Pechanga Band of Luiseño Indians
 - Pechanga Band of Luiseño Indians (ID #498071)

 - #6 Pacific Gas & Electric Company
 - Pacific Gas & Electric Company (ID #478163)

 - #7 Chevron Corporation
 - Chevron Corporation (ID #478104)

 - #8 AT&T Inc.
 - AT&T Inc. (ID #478036)

 - #9 Philip Morris USA Inc.
 - Philip Morris USA Inc. (ID #1221911)

 - #10 Agua Caliente Band of Cahuilla Indians
-

-
- Agua Caliente Band of Cahuilla Indians (ID #496128)**
- #11 California Hospital Association**
California Hospital Association PAC (ID #790773)
California Hospitals Committee on Issues (ID #880212)
- #12 Southern California Edison**
Southern California Edison (ID #478008)
- #13 California Chamber of Commerce**
California Business PAC (ID #761010)
California Chamber of Commerce Political Action Committee (ID #950352)
JOBSPAC, A Bi-Partisan Coalition of California Employers (ID #911819)
ChamberPAC Independent Expenditure Committee (ID #1285295)
ChamberPAC Small Contributor Committee (ID #1275328)
- #14 Aera Energy LLC**
Aera Energy LLC (ID #1224762)
- #15 Western States Petroleum Association**
No Political Action Committee
- #16 California Association of Realtors**
California Real Estate Independent Expenditure Committee (ID #963026)
California Real Estate PAC (ID #890106)
California Association of Realtors Issues Mobilization PAC (ID #782560)
- #17 California Correctional Peace Officers Association (CCPOA)**
California Correctional Peace Officers Association (ID #1314847)
CCPOA Independent Expenditure Committee (ID #902202)
CCPOA Issues Committee (ID #910475)
CCPOA Local Political Action Committee (ID #960532)
CCPOA Political Action Committee (ID #830349)
CCPOA Truth in American Government Fund (ID #1302403)
- #18 California School Employees Association**
PACE of California School Employees Association (ID #761128)
PACE of California School Employees Association -- Issues (ID #902738)
- #19 San Manuel Band of Mission Indians**
San Manuel Band of Mission Indians (ID #496051)
- #20 Reynolds American Inc.**
Reynolds American Inc. (ID #478390)
- #21 Pala Band of Mission Indians**
-

Pala Band of Mission Indians (ID #1242839)

**#22 United Auburn Indian Community of the Auburn Rancheria
United Auburn Indian Community of the Auburn Rancheria (ID #1246083)**

**#23 California Medical Association
California Medical Association (ID# 479136)
California Medical Association -- Physicians' Issues Committee (ID #870983)
California Medical Association Independent Expenditure Committee (ID #1231459)
California Medical Association Political Action Committee (ID #742617)
California Medical Association Small Contributor Committee (ID #1231460)**

**#24 Anthem Blue Cross
Anthem Blue Cross (ID #496480)**

**#25 Consumer Attorneys of California
Consumer Attorneys Independent Campaign Committee (ID #962871)
Consumer Attorneys Campaign Committee (ID #1231884)
Consumer Attorneys Political Action Committee (ID #760231)
Consumer Attorneys Issues Political Action Committee (ID #842149)
Consumer Attorneys Action Fund (ID #1294927)**

APPENDIX 2

BALLOT MEASURE INFORMATION

2000 Ballot

- * **Proposition 1A modified the state Constitution’s prohibition against casinos and lotteries. It also authorized the Governor to negotiate compacts, with legislative ratification, for the operation of slot machines, lottery games and other card games by federally recognized Indian tribes on Indian lands in California.**
 - **The measure was approved 64.5% to 35.5%.**
- * **Proposition 38 sought to enact a school voucher system in California with annual state payments of at least \$4,000 per pupil for private and religious schools. It further sought to restrict state and local authority to require private schools to meet standards, including school academic requirements.**
 - **The measure was defeated 29.4% to 70.6%.**

2004 Ballot

- * **Proposition 56 sought to lower the vote requirement for budget-related and tax/appropriation bills from 66 2/3% of the vote to 55%.**
 - **The measure was defeated 34.3% to 65.7%.**
- * **Proposition 63 established a one percent tax on personal income above \$1 million to fund expanded health services for the mentally ill.**
 - **The measure was approved 53.8% to 46.2%.**
- * **Proposition 64 provided that except for the Attorney General and local public prosecutors, no person can bring a lawsuit for unfair competition unless the person has suffered injury and lost money or property.**
 - **The measure was approved 59% to 41%.**
- * **Proposition 66 sought to limit the “Three Strikes” law to violent and/or serious felonies.**

-
- The measure was defeated 47.3% to 52.7%.
 - * **Proposition 67 sought to increase the telephone surcharge and allocate other funds for emergency room physicians, hospital emergency rooms, community clinics, emergency personnel training/equipment and 911 telephone system.**
 - The measure was defeated 28.4% to 71.6%.
 - * **Proposition 68 sought to allow expansion of gambling at non-tribal establishments such as race tracks and card rooms.**
 - The measure was defeated 16.2% to 83.8%.
 - * **Proposition 70 would have required the Governor to execute, upon a tribe's request, a renewable 99-year gaming compact. Tribes would have had to contribute a percentage of net gaming income to a state fund and would have been granted exclusive tribal gaming rights with no limits on the number of machines, facilities or types of games on Indian land.**
 - The measure lost 23.7% to 76.3%.
 - * **Proposition 72 appeared on the ballot as a referendum vote on legislation signed into law by the Governor. The voters cast ballots rejecting legislation requiring health care coverage for employees working for large and medium sized employers.**
 - The legislation was rejected 49.2% to 50.8%.

2005 Ballot

- * **Proposition 74 sought to increase the probationary period for public school teachers from two to five years and further would have allowed school boards to dismiss a teacher who received two consecutive unsatisfactory performance evaluations.**
 - The measure was defeated 44.8% to 55.2%.
- * **Proposition 75 sought to prohibit public employee union dues for political contributions without individual employees' prior consent.**
 - The measure was defeated 46.5% to 53.5%.
- * **Proposition 76 sought to place limits on state spending, to change minimum school funding requirements and to grant the Governor new power to reduce state spending.**
 - The measure was defeated 37.6% to 62.4%.

-
- * **Proposition 77 sought to change the process for the redrawing the lines for California’s Senate, Assembly, Congressional and Board of Equalization districts.**
 - **The measure was defeated 40.2% to 59.8%.**
 - * **Proposition 78 sought to establish a discount prescription drug program for certain low- and moderate-income Californians.**
 - **The measure was defeated 41.5% to 58.5%.**
 - * **Proposition 79 sought to provide drug discounts to Californians with qualifying incomes. In addition, the proposal would have prohibited Medi-Cal contracts with manufacturers not providing Medicaid best price.**
 - **The measure was defeated 39.3% to 60.7%.**
 - * **Proposition 80 sought to subject electric service providers to regulation by the California Public Utilities Commission. The measure also would have restricted electricity customers’ ability to switch from private utilities to other providers.**
 - **The measure was defeated 34.4% to 65.6%.**

2006 Ballot

- * **Proposition 86 sought to impose an additional \$2.60 tax on each pack of cigarettes. The money would have been used to provide funding for qualified hospitals for emergency services, nursing education and health insurance for eligible children.**
 - **The measure was defeated 48.3% to 51.7%.**
- * **Proposition 87 sought to establish a \$4 billion program with a goal to reduce petroleum consumption by 25%, with research and production incentives for alternative energy, alternative energy vehicles, energy efficient technologies, and for education and training. This program was to be funded by a tax of 1.5% to 6% (depending on oil price per barrel) on producers of oil extracted in California.**
 - **The measure was defeated 45.4% to 54.6%.**
- * **Measure A in Santa Clara County sought to limit development on ranches and hillsides covering 400,000 acres.**
 - **The measure was defeated 49.26% to 50.74%.**

2008 Ballot

- * **Propositions 94 - 97 appeared on the ballot as referenda vote on legislation approved by the Legislature. The proposals dramatically increased the number of slot machines at four Indian casinos -- Pechanga Band of Mission Indians, the Morongo Band of Mission Indians, the Sycuan Band of the Kumeyaay Nation and the Agua Caliente Band of Cahuilla Indians.**
 - **The measures were approved by the voters 55.6% to 44.4%.**
- * **Proposition 98 sought to bar state and local governments from taking or damaging private property for private uses and to prohibit rent control and similar measures.**
 - **The proposal was defeated 38.4% to 61.6%.**
- * **Proposition 5 sought to limit court authority to incarcerate offenders who commit certain drug crimes, break drug treatment rules or violate parole and also would have allocated \$460,000,000 to improve drug treatment programs.**
 - **The measure was defeated 40.5% to 59.5%.**
- * **Proposition 7 sought to require government-owned utilities to generate 20% of their electricity from renewable energy by 2010, a standard currently applicable to private electrical corporations. The requirement for all utilities would have been raised to 40% in 2020 and 50% by 2025.**
 - **The measure was defeated 35.5% to 64.5%.**
- * **Proposition H on the San Francisco ballot sought to mandate that the city switch to 100 percent clean, renewable and sustainable electricity by 2040 and to authorize the city of San Francisco to purchase PG&E facilities.**
 - **The measure was defeated 32.62% to 61.38%.**

2009 Ballot

- * **Proposition 1A sought to require above-average state revenues to be deposited into its “rainy day” fund for use during economic downturns and other purposes.**
 - **The measure was defeated 34.6% to 65.4%.**
- * **Proposition 1B would have required supplemental payments to local school districts and community colleges to address recent budget cuts.**
 - **The measure was defeated 38.1% to 61.9%.**

2010 Ballot

- * **Proposition 16 seeks to require local governments to obtain the approval of two-thirds of the voters before providing electricity to new customers or expanding such service to new territories if any public funds or bonds are involved. The measure also requires the vote to be in the jurisdiction of the local government and any new territory to be served.**
 - **This is an initiative proposal that will appear on the June 2010 statewide ballot.**