

Appendix D

Summary of Propositions 12-13 and Proposition 117

On March 7, 2000, California voters approved a \$2.1 billion parks bond (Proposition 12) and a \$2 billion water bond (Proposition 13). The money provided by the bonds went to a variety of state, local, and nonprofit agencies to implement a broad range of resource protection and enhancement activities.

Major funding for the development and improvement of state parks and water projects has traditionally come from a variety of sources. These include the state's General Fund, special funds (including proceeds from environmental license plate sales, user and regulatory fees, and other sources), federal funds, as well as proceeds from general obligation bonds.

While bonds played an especially important role in parks and water facilities development in the 1970s and 1980s, they diminished as a funding source through the 1990s. There were no new parks bonds approved for these purposes between 1988 and 2000, and virtually all funds approved prior to 2000 had been depleted. Those funds were used to expand and improve the state parks system, increase public access to the coast and other public lands, and support the development of park facilities by regional and local entities.

Major Provisions of the Bond Measures

Proposition 12--The Parks Bond

Proposition 12, the Safe Neighborhood Parks, Clean Water, Clean Air, and Coastal Protection Bond Act of 2000, provided \$2.1 billion primarily for the development and improvement of state and local parks. The majority of this money (about \$1.3 billion) was directed to the state Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) for land acquisitions, park development and restoration, as well as grants to local governments and nonprofit organizations. The remaining \$750 million was allocated to about a dozen state departments for various land acquisition, preservation, and development purposes. Figure 1 shows the amount of funding allocated to each department by Proposition 12.

Figure 1
Proposition 12: Bond Funds by Department (In Millions)

Department	Purpose	Amount
Parks and Recreation	Grants to local governments.	\$824
Parks and Recreation	Acquisition, protection, development, and rehabilitation of parklands.	\$525

Department	Purpose	Amount
Wildlife Conservation Board	Acquisition, protection, and enhancement of wildlife habitat.	\$266
State Coastal Conservancy	Acquisition, protection, development, and rehabilitation of coastal watersheds and property.	\$220
California Tahoe Conservancy	Acquisition, protection, development, and rehabilitation of property in Tahoe region.	\$50
Secretary for Resources	River, watershed, and parkway projects.	\$46
Secretary for Resources	Miscellaneous specific local projects.	\$45
Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy	Acquisition, improvement, and restoration of park, wildlife, and natural areas.	\$35
Conservation	Grants to state, local, and nonprofit agencies for farmland protection.	\$25
San Joaquin River Conservancy	Acquisition, development, enhancement, and protection of land within conservancy's jurisdiction.	\$15
California Conservation Corps	Resource conservation and other capital projects.	\$15
Fish and Game	Development, enhancement, restoration, and preservation of habitat and wetlands.	\$12
Forestry and Fire Protection	Grants for purchase, planting, and maintenance of trees in urban areas.	\$10
Integrated Waste Management Board	Grants to local agencies for playground equipment.	\$7
Coachella Valley Mountains Conservancy	Acquisition, development, enhancement, and protection of land within conservancy's jurisdiction.	\$5
Total		\$2,100

Proposition 12 allocated bond proceeds for a variety of purposes. In many cases, the measure provides only general guidelines for the use of the funds (such as \$15 million to the San Joaquin River Conservancy for the acquisition, protection, and development of land consistent with its mission). In other cases, the measure provided more specific direction in the use of the bond money (such as \$250,000 to renovate a particular historical building).

About 57 percent (\$1.2 billion) of the bond funds was to be expended by about a dozen *state* departments to acquire and improve property. The other 43 percent (\$913 million) was to be provided as grants to local governments and nonprofit organizations. Of this amount, about 42 percent (\$388 million) was to be allocated to local governments on the basis of population. An additional 30 percent (\$272 million) was earmarked for recreational areas and cultural facilities in urban areas. The remaining 28 percent of the grant funding (\$253 million) was provided for a variety of purposes. These were primarily competitive grants, although a small portion are designated for specific projects and recipients.

Proposition 13--The Water Bond

Proposition 13, the Safe Drinking Water, Clean Water, Watershed Protection, and Flood Protection Act, provided \$2 billion in bond funds for various water-related purposes. Of this amount, about 70 percent was for loans and grants to local agencies and nonprofit associations, with the balance available for direct expenditure by a number of state agencies. These state agencies included the Departments of Water Resources (DWR) and Fish and Game, among others.

Figure 2 summarizes the allocation of Proposition 13 bond funds, by recipient of the funds and by purpose for which the funds were to be used. The broad purposes included improving the safety, quality, and reliability of water supplies, and improving flood protection.

Figure 2
Proposition 13: Allocation and Use of Bond Funds (In Millions)

State Agencies - Direct Expenditures	Subtotals
Department of Water Resources	\$ 406.9
• "CALFED" projects in Bay-Delta.	\$ 250.0
• Flood control projects and local technical assistance.	\$ 152.4 ^a
• Floodplain mapping.	\$ 2.5
• Develop Delta Science Center.	\$ 2.0
Conservancies and Departments	\$ 95.0
• River parkway acquisition and riparian habitat restoration.	\$ 95.0
Department of Fish and Game	\$ 45.0
• Protection and acquisition of coastal salmon habitat.	\$ 25.0 ^b
• Fish and wildlife habitat mitigation for flood projects on Yuba/Feather Rivers.	\$ 20.0
University of California, CSU-Fresno	\$ 6.0
• Establish Watershed Science Laboratory and San Joaquin Valley Water Institute.	\$ 6.0
Department of Conservation	\$ 2.5
• Agriculture and open space mapping.	\$ 2.5
Department of Health Services	\$ 2.0
• Technical assistance to "disadvantaged" public water systems.	\$ 2.0
Total for Direct Expenditures	\$ 557.4
Grants and Loans to Local Agencies and Nonprofit Associations	Subtotals
Allocated by State Water Resources Control Board	\$ 695.0
• Protection of Santa Ana Watershed.	\$ 235.0
• "Nonpoint source" pollution control.	\$ 190.0
• Water pollution prevention, water recycling, and other water quality projects.	\$ 165.0
• Develop and implement local watershed management plans.	\$ 90.0
• Protection of Lake Elsinore and San Jacinto Watersheds.	\$ 15.0

Grants and Loans to Local Agencies and Nonprofit Associations	Subtotals
Allocated by Department of Water Resources	\$ 649.6
• Groundwater storage.	\$ 200.0 ^c
• Water quality and supply projects in areas receiving delta water.	\$ 180.0
• Water conservation projects.	\$ 155.0
• Local flood protection projects.	\$ 114.6
Allocated by Department of Health Services	\$ 68.0
• Public water system capital improvements to meet safe drinking water standards.	\$ 68.0
Total for Grants and Loans	\$ 1,412.6

^a Of this amount, up to \$64 million may be used for grants to local public agencies and nonprofits for flood control projects.

^b Funds may also be used for grants to public agencies and nonprofits.

^c Grantee may be a private entity provided there is also local agency participation in the project.

Proposition 13 provided funds for a number of existing programs, such as the programs for wastewater treatment construction and safe drinking water. In addition, the bond measure also established several major new programs. For example, the bond measure established major new grant programs (totaling over \$560 million) under the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) for nonpoint source pollution control, watershed management plan development and implementation, wastewater recycling, and the protection of targeted watersheds (the Santa Ana River, Lake Elsinore, and San Jacinto Watersheds).

In addition, Proposition 13 provided targeted funding to particular local flood control projects and established a number of new programs under DWR. These new programs included programs for groundwater storage, to fund CALFED projects, and to increase the reliability of water supplies to local agencies served by Delta water. See Figure 3.

Figure 3
Parks and Water Bonds 2000-01 Appropriations by Department (In Millions)

Department	Proposition 12 (Parks Bond)	Proposition 13 (Water Bond)
California Conservation Corps	\$3.0	--
California Tahoe Conservancy	\$6.5	--
Coachella Valley Mountains Conservancy	\$4.9	--
Coastal Conservancy	\$60.5	\$21.5
Conservation	\$0.5	\$0.5
Fish and Game	\$1.5	\$7.7
Forestry and Fire Protection	\$1.4	--
Health Services	--	\$35.0
Integrated Waste Management	\$2.8	--
Parks and Recreation	\$274.9	\$1.5
Resources	\$41.6	\$25.0
Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy	\$17.5	\$5.0

Department	Proposition 12 (Parks Bond)	Proposition 13 (Water Bond)
Water Resources	--	\$383.2
Water Resources Control Board	--	\$260.2
Wildlife Conservation Board	\$231.1	\$14.0
Totals	\$646.2	\$753.6

Proposition 117, ***The Habitat Conservation Fund***. (aka the Mountain Lion Initiative) https://lao.ca.gov/analysis_2008/resources/res_anl08009.aspx

The California Wildlife Protection Act of 1990 (Proposition 117), was enacted by the voters in 1990. Among other provisions, Proposition 117 required an annual transfer of \$30 million of specified state funds to HCF until 2020. Proposition 117 allocated HCF funds to various agencies—including \$21 million to WCB—for specific programmatic goals (listed below) divided between Northern and Southern California:

- Acquisition of habitat—including oak woodlands, for the protection of deer and mountain lions;
- Acquisition of habitat—to protect rare, endangered, threatened, or fully protected species;
- Acquisition of habitat—to further implement the Habitat Conservation Program (protection of unique species or natural communities of species);
- Acquisition, enhancement, or restoration of wetlands;
- Acquisition, enhancement, or restoration of aquatic habitat for salmon and trout;
- Acquisition, restoration, or enhancement of riparian habitat.

Under Proposition 117, funds to be transferred to HCF came from the General Fund unless other, eligible funds are transferred. Eligible fund sources for HCF include the Cigarette and Tobacco Products Surtax Fund (Proposition 99), the Environmental License Plate Fund, the Wildlife Restoration Fund, and any bond funds authorized after 1990, for which the allowed uses match the purposes of Proposition 117. In previous years, Proposition 50 bond funds were used to fulfill Proposition 117's requirements, reducing the General Fund transfer amount. Under the Governor's budget proposal, \$8 million came from Proposition 99 funds, \$20.8 million came from the General Fund, and \$1 million came from Proposition 50.