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Attachment One

January 26, 2022

To: CSAC Government Finance and Administration Policy Committee

From: Geoff Neill, CSAC Legislative Representative
Danielle Bradley, CSAC Legislative Analyst


Recommendation
CSAC staff recommends the committee forward a recommendation to the CSAC Executive Committee of opposition to “The Taxpayer Protection and Government Accountability Act”.

The Government Finance and Administration policy committee may recommend a position to the CSAC Executive Committee of support, oppose, neutral, or it may recommend CSAC take no position.

Summary
The Taxpayer Protection and Government Accountability Act would amend the California Constitution to restrict the ability of the state, counties, other local agencies, and the electorate to approve or collect taxes, fees, and other revenues.

It would require voter approval of all state taxes, would further restrict local fee authority by limiting it to the “minimum amount necessary” to provide government services, and would require voter approval for local measures such as franchise fees. Its provisions would make it easier to challenge local revenue measures by increasing the burden of proof on local agencies while disallowing an agency’s characterization of a measure from being considered in court.

The measure would prohibit county charter amendments that provide for any revenue whatsoever from being submitted to the electorate. It would also disallow local agencies from placing advisory measures on the same ballot as any general revenue measure and would raise the threshold for voter approval of local revenue measures proposed by initiative to two-thirds, although this measure itself would only require majority approval to be adopted.

The proposed constitutional initiative is sponsored by the California Business Roundtable, an association comprised of the largest corporations in California. The initiative discussed in this memo is designated by the Attorney General as “21-0042A1”
and has not yet received a title and summary. A previous version of the initiative that included even more onerous restrictions has since been withdrawn.

**Background**

Under current law, local revenue authority is limited by both statute and a number of voter-approved constitutional provisions, including those added by Proposition 13 (1978), Proposition 218 (1996), and Proposition 26 (2010). Due to these restrictions, counties have over time become more dependent on state and federal funding. These restrictions, combined with other factors, cause the taxes counties rely on for general revenues not to keep pace with population and economic growth. In most counties, tax revenues are still lower per capita and are a smaller share of the economy than they were before the Great Recession, in real dollars.

**Changes under Ballot Initiative**

The purpose of the ballot measure is to make it more difficult for counties, cities, schools, special districts, and the state to raise revenue by any means. It places new and increased restrictions on every manner of revenue measure and narrows exceptions to its most onerous requirements. Its provisions are so broad that while the proponents cite specific examples they are targeting for change, the measure would no doubt have many unintended consequences.

The effect will be to increase county costs, reduce tax and fee revenue for counties, subject *de rigueur* charges such as franchise fees to voter approval requirements, and open more government actions to legal challenges while simultaneously making those challenges more difficult to defend against. Further, as is the case with many ballot measures, it would write into the California Constitution contradictory and confusing language that cannot be changed or clarified without another future ballot measure that receives voter approval.

The fundamental provision of the proposed initiative would be to designate every levy, charge, or exaction of any kind imposed by the state or a local agency as either a tax or an “exempt charge.” Every revenue measure not defined as an exempt charge would be subject to voter approval requirements, some of which the initiative newly imposes or increases.

The list of exempt charges is based on the provisions of Proposition 26 (2010), with some changes. The list includes charges for the actual cost of a government service (such as utilities), charges for the regulatory costs of issuing licenses and performing related inspections and audits, charges for the lease or sale of government property, fines and penalties to punish violations of law, charges for tourism promotion, health care charges to increase Medi-Cal reimbursement rates, and, for local agencies, charges imposed as a condition of property development.

As proposed, every state and local revenue measure not defined as an exempt charge would need to be submitted to the voters for approval. Those measures would be required to include in both the title and summary and the ballot label the type and amount or rate of the tax, the duration of the tax, and the use of the revenue derived from the tax. In the case of local general taxes, the phrase “for general government use” would be required and it would be prohibited
to include an advisory measure on the same ballot to determine how the electorate would like to see those revenues used. By specifying that a duration must be provided, the proposed ballot measure appears to require taxes to be time limited.

Local voter initiatives that impose special taxes are currently subject to lower voting thresholds than those initiated by county and city governing boards. This measure would increase those thresholds from a majority vote to two-thirds.

This initiative would retroactively cancel other revenue measures passed by voters or approved between January 1, 2022, and the time this initiative goes into effect, if they do not comply with this measure’s provisions, even if they complied with all laws in effect at the time they passed. The proposed initiative would give those cancelled revenue measures twelve months to re-comply. However, local tax measures can only be put to voters at regular elections where governing board members can also be elected, unless the governing board unanimously calls a special election, and no regular elections would take place in the twelve months after the initiative would take effect.

The initiative reduces counties’ home rule authority by prohibiting certain types of amendments to county charters from even appearing before the voters. Whether they are proposed by the Board of Supervisors or by voters themselves, any charter amendment that provides for the imposition, extension, or increase of a tax, fee, charge, or exaction of any kind whatsoever would be prohibited.

One provision of the measure allows fines and penalties to be imposed by the judicial branch of government or imposed by a local administrative enforcement agency to punish violations of law, without voter approval. However, another section of the measure says that, notwithstanding any other provision of the Constitution, only the governing body of a local government acting by ordinance, or an elector exercising the initiative power, can impose any kind of charge without voter approval.

The measure specifically prohibits any tax or fee regulating or related to vehicle miles traveled imposed as a condition of property development or occupancy.

For most local fees, the measure would prohibit them from exceeding the “actual cost” and defines actual cost to “the minimum amount necessary,” opening up counties to litigation and judicial second-guessing about whether the county could have chosen a lower level of service or whether it could have achieved the result at a lower cost by other means.

The proposed measure would increase the burden of proof on local agencies to prove that a revenue measure is not subject to voter approval requirements—and that the amount of the charge is reasonable and does not exceed the “actual cost,” or “minimum amount necessary”—from a preponderance of evidence to clear and convincing evidence. Furthermore, the measure prohibits a court from considering how a local agency describes, or characterizes, a revenue
measure in making its determination, whereas the use of the funds would be required to be a factor in that determination.

To give an example of a normal county process that would be impacted by the proposed measure, consider a county’s sale of a parcel of land, which falls directly under one of the categories of exempt charge, the one defined in proposed subparagraph (3) of paragraph (j) of Article XIII C Section 1, “a reasonable charge for…the purchase…of local government property.” To impose an exempt charge under the terms of the initiative, the governing body must pass an ordinance specifying the amount of the exempt charge, in this case, the amount charged to purchase the property.

If anyone sued the county contesting whether the sale was an exempt charge or should instead have been treated as a tax, under the terms of the proposed initiative the court would be explicitly disallowed from factoring in the county’s description of the charge “as being paid in exchange for a[n]...asset.” Instead, the court would be required to consider as a factor “the use of revenue derived from the...charge.” So while board members might think the county could use the proceeds from the sale of property for general purposes, in order to show by clear and convincing evidence that the charge was not a tax, it would need to prove to the court both that the amount of the charge was reasonable and “that the amount charged does not exceed the actual cost of providing the...product to the payor,” with the “actual cost” defined as “the minimum amount necessary to reimburse the government for the cost of providing the...product to the payor...where the amount charged is not used by the government for any purpose other than reimbursing that cost.” So in selling, renting, or leasing property, a county would be limited to the county’s cost of providing the parcel to the buyer, instead of selling at market rate or to the person offering the highest amount.

At the state level, the measure would require all state taxes to receive voter approval, in addition to the current requirement for two-thirds approval of both houses of the Legislature. Any increase or imposition of any non-tax charge, however minor, would require approval of the Legislature if it results in any taxpayer paying a higher amount. This requirement would apply to everything from bar exam fees to State Fair ticket prices to any charge for a map, shirt, or deck of cards for sale at a state park. And due to the restrictions on the use of revenue from exempt charges, revenue from map, shirt, and playing card sales at state parks could not be used to support the maintenance of the park, but only to reimburse the minimum amount necessary to provide that map, sticker, or deck of cards to the purchaser.

Policy Considerations

Existing CSAC Policy

CSAC’s Policies and Procedures Manual instructs that staff recommendations on propositions be presented to policy committees based upon CSAC’s existing platform and principles and based upon direct impact to county government.

The California County Platform could not be clearer about counties’ opposition to the issues raised in this measure.
In its first chapter, the Platform lays out its three major planks based on the chief principle of local control, all of which speak against the proposed ballot measure:

1. to allow county government the fiscal resources that enable it to meet its obligations;
2. to permit county government the flexibility to provide services and facilities in a manner that resolves the day-to-day problems communities face; and
3. to grant county government the ability to tailor the levels of local revenues and services to citizens' satisfaction.

Chapter 9 of the Platform is dedicated to the topic of financing county services. It states that counties must have “the authority to collect revenues at a level sufficient to provide the degree of local services the community desires.”

Under the heading of “Financial Independence” it states that “counties should be granted enhanced local revenue-generating authority to respond to unique circumstances in each county to provide needed infrastructure and county services. Any revenue raising actions that require approval by the electorate should require a simple majority vote.” It continues: “Furthermore, counties should have the ability to adjust all fees, assessments, and charges to cover the full costs of the services they support.”

CSAC’s Policies and Procedures Manual states that in most circumstances, the Association will consider positions only on qualified ballot measures. However, it also provides for the CSAC Officers to direct a policy committee to review and make a recommendation on a proposed measure that has a direct impact on county governments, as is the case with this measure.

Staff Contact
Please contact Geoff Neill at gneill@counties.org or Danielle Bradley at dbradley@counties.org.

Resources
1. Full text of Ballot Initiative
2. LAO Fiscal Analysis
Attachment Two

January 4, 2022

Anabel Renteria
Initiative Coordinator
Office of the Attorney General
State of California
PO Box 994255
Sacramento, CA 94244-25550

Re: Initiative 21-0042 – Amendment Number One

Dear Initiative Coordinator:

Pursuant to subdivision (b) of Section 9002 of the Elections Code, enclosed please find Amendment #1 to Initiative No. 21-0042 “The Taxpayer Protection and Government Accountability Act.” The amendments are reasonably germane to the theme, purpose or subject of the initiative measure as originally proposed.

I am the proponent of the measure and request that the Attorney General prepare a circulating title and summary of the measure as provided by law, using the amended language.

Thank you for your time and attention processing my request.

Sincerely,

Thomas W. Hiltachk
The Taxpayer Protection and Government Accountability Act

[Deleted codified text is denoted in strikethrough. Added codified text is denoted by italics and underline.]

Section 1. Title

This Act shall be known, and may be cited as, the Taxpayer Protection and Government Accountability Act.

Section 2. Findings and Declarations

(a) Californians are overtaxed. We pay the nation’s highest state income tax, sales tax, and gasoline tax. According to the U.S. Census Bureau, California’s combined state and local tax burden is the highest in the nation. Despite this, and despite two consecutive years of obscene revenue surpluses, state politicians in 2021 alone introduced legislation to raise more than $234 billion in new and higher taxes and fees.

(b) Taxes are only part of the reason for California’s rising cost-of-living crisis. Californians pay billions more in hidden “fees” passed through to consumers in the price they pay for products, services, food, fuel, utilities and housing. Since 2010, government revenue from state and local “fees” has more than doubled.

(c) California’s high cost of living not only contributes to the state’s skyrocketing rates of poverty and homelessness, they are the pushing working families and job-providing businesses out of the state. The most recent Census showed that California’s population dropped for the first time in history, costing us a seat in Congress. In the past four years, nearly 300 major corporations relocated to other states, not counting thousands more small businesses that were forced to move, sell or close.

(d) California voters have tried repeatedly, at great expense, to assert control over whether and how taxes and fees are raised. We have enacted a series of measures to make taxes more predictable, to limit what passes as a “fee,” to require voter approval, and to guarantee transparency and accountability. These measures include Proposition 13 (1978), Proposition 62 (1986), Proposition 218 (1996), and Proposition 26 (2010).

(e) Contrary to the voters’ intent, these measures that were designed to control taxes, spending and accountability, have been weakened and hamstrung by the Legislature, government lawyers, and the courts, making it necessary to pass yet another initiative to close loopholes and reverse hostile court decisions.

Section 3. Statement of Purpose

(a) In enacting this measure, the voters reassert their right to a voice and a vote on new and higher taxes by requiring any new or higher tax to be put before voters for approval. Voters also intend that all fees and other charges are passed or rejected by the voters themselves or a governing body elected by voters and not unelected and unaccountable bureaucrats.

(b) Furthermore, the purpose and intent of the voters in enacting this measure is to increase transparency and accountability over higher taxes and charges by requiring any tax measure placed on the ballot—
either at the state or local level—to clearly state the type and rate of any tax, how long it will be in effect, and the use of the revenue generated by the tax.

(c) Furthermore, the purpose and intent of the voters in enacting this measure is to clarify that any new or increased form of state government revenue, by any name or manner of extraction paid directly or indirectly by Californians, shall be authorized only by a vote of the Legislature and signature of the Governor to ensure that the purposes for such charges are broadly supported and transparently debated.

(d) Furthermore, the purpose and intent of the voters in enacting this measure is also to ensure that taxpayers have the right and ability to effectively balance new or increased taxes and other charges with the rapidly increasing costs Californians are already paying for housing, food, childcare, gasoline, energy, healthcare, education, and other basic costs of living, and to further protect the existing constitutional limit on property taxes and ensure that the revenue from such taxes remains local, without changing or superseding existing constitutional provisions contained in Section 1(c) of Article XIII A.

(e) In enacting this measure, the voters also additionally intend to reverse loopholes in the legislative two-thirds vote and voter approval requirements for government revenue increases created by the courts including, but not limited to, Cannabis Coalition v. City of Upland, Chamber of Commerce v. Air Resources Board, Schmeer v. Los Angeles County, Johnson v. County of Mendocino, Citizens Assn. of Sunset Beach v. Orange County Local Agency Formation Commission, and Wilde v. City of Dunsmuir.

Section 4. Section 3 of Article XIII A of the California Constitution is amended to read:

Sec. 3(a) Every levy, charge, or exaction of any kind imposed by state law is either a tax or an exempt charge.

(b) Any change in state statute law which results in any taxpayer paying a new or higher tax must be imposed by an act passed by not less than two-thirds of all members elected to each of the two houses of the Legislature, and submitted to the electorate and approved by a majority vote, except that no new ad valorem taxes on real property, or sales or transaction taxes on the sales of real property, may be imposed. Each Act shall include:

(A) A specific duration of time that the tax will be imposed and an estimate of the annual amount expected to be derived from the tax.

(B) A specific and legally binding and enforceable limitation on how the revenue from the tax can be spent. If the revenue from the tax can be spent for unrestricted general revenue purposes, then a statement that the tax revenue can be spent for “unrestricted general revenue purposes” shall be included in a separate, stand-alone section. Any proposed change to the use of the revenue from the tax shall be adopted by a separate act that is passed by not less than two-thirds of all members elected to each of the two houses of the Legislature and submitted to the electorate and approved by a majority vote.

(2) The title and summary and ballot label or question required for a measure pursuant to the Elections Code shall, for each measure providing for the imposition of a tax, including a measure proposed by an elector pursuant to Article II, include:

(A) The type and amount or rate of the tax;

(B) The duration of the tax; and
(c) The use of the revenue derived from the tax.

(c) Any change in state law which results in any taxpayer paying a new or higher exempt charge must be imposed by an act passed by each of the two houses of the Legislature. Each act shall specify the type of exempt charge as provided in subdivision (e), and the amount or rate of the exempt charge to be imposed.

(d) As used in this section and in Section 9 of Article II, “tax” means every any levy, charge, or exaction of any kind imposed by the State state law that is not an exempt charge, except the following:

(e) As used in this section, “exempt charge” means only the following:

(1) A reasonable charge imposed for a specific government service or product provided directly to the payor that is not provided to those not charged, and which does not exceed the reasonable actual costs to the State of providing the service or product to the payor.

(2) A charge imposed for the reasonable regulatory costs to the State incident to issuing licenses and permits, performing investigations, inspections, and audits, enforcing agricultural marketing orders, and the administrative enforcement and adjudication thereof.

(3) A levy, charge, or exaction collected from local units of government, health care providers or health care service plans that is primarily used by the State of California for the purposes of increasing reimbursement rates or payments under the Medi-Cal program, and the revenues of which are primarily used to finance the non-federal portion of Medi-Cal medical assistance expenditures.

(4) A reasonable charge imposed for entrance to or use of state property, or the purchase, rental, or lease of state property, except charges governed by Section 15 of Article XI.

(5) A fine, or other monetary charge including any applicable interest for nonpayment thereof, imposed by the judicial branch of government or the State, as a result of a state administrative enforcement agency pursuant to adjudicatory due process, to punish a violation of law.

(6) A levy, charge, assessment, or exaction collected for the promotion of California tourism pursuant to Chapter 1 (commencing with Section 13995) of Part 4.7 of Division 3 of Title 2 of the Government Code.

(f) Any tax or exempt charge adopted after January 1, 2022 but prior to the effective date of this act, that was not adopted in compliance with the requirements of this section is void 12 months after the effective date of this act unless the tax or exempt charge is reenacted by the Legislature and signed into law by the Governor in compliance with the requirements of this section.

(g) The State bears the burden of proving by a preponderance of the clear and convincing evidence that a levy, charge, or other exaction is an exempt charge and not a tax. The State bears the burden of proving by clear and convincing evidence that the amount of the exempt charge is reasonable and that the amount charged does not exceed the actual cost of providing the service or product to the payor—that the amount is no more than necessary to cover the reasonable costs of the governmental activity—and
that the manner in which those costs are allocated to a payor bear a fair or reasonable relationship to the
payor's burdens on, or benefits received from, the governmental activity.

(2) The retention of revenue by, or the payment to, a non-governmental entity of a levy, charge, or exaction
of any kind imposed by state law, shall not be a factor in determining whether the levy, charge, or exaction
is a tax or exempt charge.

(3) The characterization of a levy, charge, or exaction of any kind as being voluntary, or paid in exchange
for a benefit, privilege, allowance, authorization, or asset, shall not be a factor in determining whether the
levy, charge, or exaction is a tax or an exempt charge.

(4) The use of revenue derived from the levy, charge or exaction shall be a factor in determining whether
the levy, charge, or exaction is a tax or exempt charge.

(h) As used in this section:

(1) “Actual cost” of providing a service or product means: (i) the minimum amount necessary to reimburse
the government for the cost of providing the service or product to the payor, and (ii) where the amount
charged is not used by the government for any purpose other than reimbursing that cost. In computing
“actual cost” the maximum amount that may be imposed is the actual cost less all other sources of revenue
including, but not limited to taxes, other exempt charges, grants, and state or federal funds received to
provide such service or product.

(2) “Extend” includes, but is not limited to, doing any of the following with respect to a tax or exempt
charge: lengthening its duration, delaying or eliminating its expiration, expanding its application to a new
territory or class of payor, or expanding the base to which its rate is applied.

(3) “Impose” means adopt, enact, reenact, create, establish, collect, increase or extend.

(4) “State law” includes, but is not limited to, any state statute, state regulation, state executive order,
state resolution, state ruling, state opinion letter, or other legal authority or interpretation adopted,
enacted, enforced, issued, or implemented by the legislative or executive branches of state government.
“State law” does not include actions taken by the Regents of the University of California, Trustees of the
California State University, or the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges.

Section 5. Section 1 of Article XIII C of the California Constitution is amended, to read:

Sec. 1. Definitions. As used in this article:

(a) “Actual cost” of providing a service or product means: (i) the minimum amount necessary to reimburse
the government for the cost of providing the service or product to the payor, and (ii) where the amount
charged is not used by the government for any purpose other than reimbursing that cost. In computing
“actual cost” the maximum amount that may be imposed is the actual cost less all other sources of revenue
including, but not limited to taxes, other exempt charges, grants, and state or federal funds received to
provide such service or product.

(b) “Extend” includes, but is not limited to, doing any of the following with respect to a tax, exempt charge,
or Article XIII D assessment, fee, or charge: lengthening its duration, delaying or eliminating its expiration,
expanding its application to a new territory or class of payor, or expanding the base to which its rate is
applied.
(c) "General tax" means any tax imposed for general governmental purposes.

(d) "Impose" means adopt, enact, reenact, create, establish, collect, increase, or extend.

(e) "Local government" means any county, city, city and county, including a charter city or county, any special district, or any other local or regional governmental entity, or an elector pursuant to Article II or the initiative power provided by a charter or statute.

(f) "Local law" includes, but is not limited to, any ordinance, resolution, regulation, ruling, opinion letter, or other legal authority or interpretation adopted, enacted, enforced, issued, or implemented by a local government.

(g) "Special district" means an agency of the State, formed pursuant to general law or a special act, for the local performance of governmental or proprietary functions with limited geographic boundaries including, but not limited to, school districts and redevelopment agencies.

(h) "Special tax" means any tax imposed for specific purposes, including a tax imposed for specific purposes, which is placed into a general fund.

(i) As used in this article, and in Section 9 of Article II, "tax" means every levy, charge, or exaction of any kind, imposed by a local government law that is not an exempt charge, except the following:

(j) As used in this section, "exempt charge" means only the following:

(1) A charge imposed for a specific benefit conferred or privilege granted directly to the payor that is not provided to those not charged, and which does not exceed the reasonable costs to the local government of conferring the benefit or granting the privilege.

(2) A reasonable charge imposed for a specific local government service or product provided directly to the payor that is not provided to those not charged, and which does not exceed the reasonable actual costs to the local government of providing the service or product.

(3) A charge imposed for the reasonable regulatory costs to a local government for issuing licenses and permits, performing investigations, inspections, and audits, enforcing agricultural marketing orders, and the administrative enforcement and adjudication thereof.

(4) A reasonable charge imposed for entrance to or use of local government property, or the purchase, rental, or lease of local government property.

(5) A fine, or penalty, or other monetary charge including any applicable interest for nonpayment thereof, imposed by the judicial branch of government or a local government administrative enforcement agency pursuant to adjudicatory due process, as a result of to punish a violation of law.

(6) A charge imposed as a condition of property development. No levy, charge, or exaction regulating or related to vehicle miles traveled may be imposed as a condition of property development or occupancy.

(7) An Assessments and property-related fees assessment, fee, or charge imposed in accordance with the provisions of subject to Article XIII D, or an assessment imposed upon a business in a tourism marketing district, a parking and business improvement area, or a property and business improvement district.
(7) A charge imposed for a specific health care service provided directly to the payor and that is not provided to those not charged, and which does not exceed the reasonable costs to the local government of providing the health care service. As used in this paragraph, a "health care service" means a service licensed or exempt from licensure by the state pursuant to Chapters 1, 1.3, or 2 of Division 2 of the Health and Safety Code.

The local government bears the burden of proving by a preponderance of the evidence that a levy, charge, or other exaction is not a tax, that the amount is no more than necessary to cover the reasonable costs of the governmental activity and that the manner in which those costs are allocated to the payor bear a fair or reasonable relationship to the payor's burdens on, or benefits received from, the governmental activity.

Section 6.

Section 2 of Article XIII C of the California Constitution is amended to read:

Sec. 2.

Local Government Tax Limitation. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Constitution:

(a) Every levy, charge, or exaction of any kind imposed by local law is either a tax or an exempt charge. All taxes imposed by any local government shall be deemed to be either general taxes or special taxes. Special purpose districts or agencies, including school districts, shall have no power to levy general taxes.

(b) No local law government, whether proposed by the governing body or by an elector, may impose, extend, or increase any general tax unless and until that tax is submitted to the electorate and approved by a majority vote. A general tax shall not be deemed to have been increased if it is imposed at a rate not higher than the maximum rate so approved. The election required by this subdivision shall be consolidated with a regularly scheduled general election for members of the governing body of the local government, except in cases of emergency declared by a unanimous vote of the governing body.

(c) Any general tax imposed, extended, or increased, without voter approval, by any local government on or after January 1, 1995, and prior to the effective date of this article, shall continue to be imposed only if approved by a majority vote of the voters voting in an election on the issue of the imposition, which election shall be held within two years of the effective date of this article and in compliance with subdivision (b).

(d) No local law government, whether proposed by the governing body or by an elector, may impose, extend, or increase any special tax unless and until that tax is submitted to the electorate and approved by a two-thirds vote. A special tax shall not be deemed to have been increased if it is imposed at a rate not higher than the maximum rate so approved.

(d) The title and summary and ballot label or question required for a measure pursuant to the Elections Code shall, for each measure providing for the imposition of a tax, include:

(1) The type and amount or rate of the tax;

(2) the duration of the tax; and

(3) The use of the revenue derived from the tax. If the proposed tax is a general tax, the phrase "for general government use" shall be required, and no advisory measure may appear on the same ballot that would indicate that the revenue from the general tax will, could, or should be used for a specific purpose.

(e) Only the governing body of a local government, other than an elector pursuant to Article II or the initiative power provided by a charter or statute, shall have the authority to impose any exempt charge. The governing body shall impose an exempt charge by an ordinance specifying the type of exempt charge
as provided in Section 1(j) and the amount or rate of the exempt charge to be imposed, and passed by the
governing body. This subdivision shall not apply to charges specified in paragraph (7) of subdivision (i) of
Section 1.

(f) No amendment to a Charter which provides for the imposition, extension, or increase of a tax or exempt
charge shall be submitted to or approved by the electors, nor shall any such amendment to a Charter
hereafter submitted to or approved by the electors become effective for any purpose.

(g) Any tax or exempt charge adopted after January 1, 2022, but prior to the effective date of this act, that
was not adopted in compliance with the requirements of this section is void 12 months after the effective
date of this act unless the tax or exempt charge is reenacted in compliance with the requirements of this
section.

(h)(1) The local government bears the burden of proving by clear and convincing evidence that a levy,
charge or exaction is an exempt charge and not a tax. The local government bears the burden of proving
by clear and convincing evidence that the amount of the exempt charge is reasonable and that the amount
charged does not exceed the actual cost of providing the service or product to the payor.

(2) The retention of revenue by, or the payment to, a non-governmental entity of a levy, charge, or exaction
of any kind imposed by a local law, shall not be a factor in determining whether the levy, charge, or
exaction is a tax or exempt charge.

(3) The characterization of a levy, charge, or exaction of any kind imposed by a local law as being paid in
exchange for a benefit, privilege, allowance, authorization, or asset, shall not be factors in determining
whether the levy, charge, or exaction is a tax or an exempt charge.

(4) The use of revenue derived from the levy, charge or exaction shall be a factor in determining whether
the levy, charge, or exaction is a tax or exempt charge.

Section 7. Section 3 of Article XIII D of the California Constitution is amended, to read:

Sec. 3. Property Taxes, Assessments, Fees and Charges Limited

(a) No tax, assessment, fee, or charge, or surcharge, including a surcharge based on the value of property,
shall be assessed by any agency upon any parcel of property or upon any person as an incident of property
ownership except:

(1) The ad valorem property tax imposed pursuant to described in Section 1(a) of Article XIII and Section
1(a) of Article XIII A, and described and enacted pursuant to the voter approval requirement in Section 1(b)
of Article XIII A.

(2) Any special non-ad valorem tax receiving a two-thirds vote of qualified electors pursuant to Section 4
of Article XIII A, or after receiving a two-thirds vote of those authorized to vote in a community facilities
district by the Legislature pursuant to statute as it existed on December 31, 2021.

(3) Assessments as provided by this article.

(4) Fees or charges for property related services as provided by this article.
(b) For purposes of this article, fees for the provision of electrical or gas service shall not be deemed charges or fees imposed as an incident of property ownership.

Section 8. Sections 1 and 14 of Article XIII are amended to read:

Sec. 1 Unless otherwise provided by this Constitution or the laws of the United States:

(a) All property is taxable and shall be assessed at the same percentage of fair market value. When a value standard other than fair market value is prescribed by this Constitution or by statute authorized by this Constitution, the same percentage shall be applied to determine the assessed value. The value to which the percentage is applied, whether it be the fair market value or not, shall be known for property tax purposes as the full value.

(b) All property so assessed shall be taxed in proportion to its full value.

(c) All proceeds from the taxation of property shall be apportioned according to law to the districts within the counties.

Sec. 14. All property taxed by state or local government shall be assessed in the county, city, and district in which it is situated. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, such state or local property taxes shall be apportioned according to law to the districts within the counties.

Section 9. General Provisions

A. This Act shall be liberally construed in order to effectuate its purposes.

B. (1) In the event that this initiative measure and another initiative measure or measures relating to state or local requirements for the imposition, adoption, creation, or establishment of taxes, charges, and other revenue measures shall appear on the same statewide election ballot, the other initiative measure or measures shall be deemed to be in conflict with this measure. In the event that this initiative measure receives a greater number of affirmative votes, the provisions of this measure shall prevail in their entirety, and the provisions of the other initiative measure or measures shall be null and void.

(2) In furtherance of this provision, the voters hereby declare that this measure conflicts with the provisions of the “Housing Affordability and Tax Cut Act of 2022” and “The Tax Cut and Housing Affordability Act,” both of which would impose a new state property tax (called a “surcharge”) on certain real property, and where the revenue derived from the tax is provided to the State, rather than retained in the county in which the property is situated and for the use of the county and cities and districts within the county, in direct violation of the provisions of this initiative.

(3) If this initiative measure is approved by the voters, but superseded in whole or in part by any other conflicting initiative measure approved by the voters at the same election, and such conflicting initiative is later held invalid, this measure shall be self-executing and given full force and effect.

C. The provisions of this Act are severable. If any portion, section, subdivision, paragraph, clause, sentence, phrase, word, or application of this Act is for any reason held to be invalid by a decision of any court of competent jurisdiction, that decision shall not affect the validity of the remaining portions of this Act. The People of the State of California hereby declare that they would have adopted this Act and each and every portion, section, subdivision, paragraph, clause, sentence, phrase, word, and application not
declared invalid or unconstitutional without regard to whether any portion of this Act or application thereof would be subsequently declared invalid.

D. If this Act is approved by the voters of the State of California and thereafter subjected to a legal challenge alleging a violation of state or federal law, and both the Governor and Attorney General refuse to defend this Act, then the following actions shall be taken:

(1) Notwithstanding anything to the contrary contained in Chapter 6 of Part 2 of Division 3 of Title 2 of the Government Code or any other law, the Attorney General shall appoint independent counsel to faithfully and vigorously defend this Act on behalf of the State of California.

(2) Before appointing or thereafter substituting independent counsel, the Attorney General shall exercise due diligence in determining the qualifications of independent counsel and shall obtain written affirmation from independent counsel that independent counsel will faithfully and vigorously defend this Act. The written affirmation shall be made publicly available upon request.

(3) A continuous appropriation is hereby made from the General Fund to the Controller, without regard to fiscal years, in an amount necessary to cover the costs of retaining independent counsel to faithfully and vigorously defend this Act on behalf of the State of California.

(4) Nothing in this section shall prohibit the proponents of this Act, or a bona fide taxpayers association, from intervening to defend this Act.
January 19, 2022

Hon. Rob Bonta
Attorney General
1300 I Street, 17th Floor
Sacramento, California 95814

Attention: Ms. Anabel Renteria
Initiative Coordinator

Dear Attorney General Bonta:

Pursuant to Elections Code Section 9005, we have reviewed the proposed constitutional Taxpayer Protection and Government Accountability Act initiative (A.G. File No. 21-0042, Amendment #1).

Background

State Government

Taxes and Fees. This year’s state budget spends over $255 billion in state funds. Over 90 percent of the state budget is funded with revenues from taxes. These include, for example, sales taxes paid on goods and income taxes paid on wages and other sources of income. Much of the rest of the state budget is funded by fees and other charges. Examples include: (1) charges relating to regulatory activities; (2) charges for specific government services or products, like fees charged to drivers to improve roads; (3) charges for entering state property, such as a state park; and (4) judicial fines, penalties, and other charges. The State Constitution requires the state to set fees at a reasonable level, generally reflecting the costs of the services or benefits provided. The state uses revenue from taxes and fees to fund a variety of programs and services, including education, health care, transportation, and housing and homelessness services.

Current Requirements to Approve Taxes and Fees. Under the State Constitution, state tax increases require approval by two-thirds of each house of the Legislature or a majority vote of the statewide electorate. The Legislature can reduce taxes with a majority vote of each house, provided the change does not result in an increase in taxes paid by any single taxpayer. In many cases, the Legislature has enacted statutes that delegate its authority to adjust fees and other
Local Government

Taxes and Fees. The largest local government tax is the property tax, which raises roughly $75 billion annually. Other local taxes include sales taxes, utility taxes, and hotel taxes. In addition to these taxes, local governments levy a variety of fees and other charges. Examples include parking meter fees, building permit fees, regulatory fees, and judicial fines and penalties. In order to be considered a fee, the charge cannot exceed the reasonable costs to the local government of providing the associated product or service. Local governments use revenues from taxes and fees to fund a variety of services, like fire and police, public works, and parks.

Current Requirements to Approve Taxes and Fees. State law requires increases in local taxes to receive approval of the local governing body—for example, a city council or county board of supervisors—as well as approval of voters in that local jurisdiction. Most proposed taxes require a two-thirds vote of the local governing board before being presented to the voters. Special taxes (those used for a specific purpose) require a two-thirds vote of the electorate while other types of taxes require a majority vote of the electorate. The majority-vote general taxes can be used for any purpose. Recent case law suggests that citizen initiative special taxes may be approved by majority vote, rather than a two-thirds vote. Currently, local governing bodies have the ability to delegate their authority to adjust fees and other charges to administrative entities, like city departments. In these cases, these charges can be increased or changed by the department within certain limits.

Proposal

This measure amends the State Constitution to change the rules for how the state and local governments can impose taxes, fees, and other charges.

State and Local Government Taxes

Expands Definition of Tax. The measure amends the State Constitution to expand the definition of taxes to include some charges that state and local governments currently treat as fees and other charges. For example, certain charges imposed for a benefit or privilege granted to a payer but not granted to those not charged would no longer be considered fees. As a result, the measure could increase the number of revenue proposals subject to the higher state and local vote requirements for taxes discussed below.

Requires Voter Approval for State Taxes. The measure increases the vote requirements for increasing state taxes. Specifically, the measure requires that legislatively proposed tax increases receive approval by two-thirds of each house and a majority vote of the statewide electorate. Voters would still be able to increase taxes by majority vote of the electorate without legislative action, however. Any state tax approved between January 1, 2022 and the effective date of this measure would be nullified unless it fulfills the requirements of the measure.

Requirements for Approving Local Taxes. Whether sought by the local governing body or the electorate, the measure establishes the same approval requirements for increasing local
special taxes. Any local tax approved between January 1, 2022 and the effective date of this measure would be nullified unless it fulfills the requirements of the measure.

**Allowable Uses and Duration of State and Local Tax Revenues Must Be Specified.** The measure requires state and local tax measures to identify the type and amount (or rate) of the tax and the duration of the tax. State and local government general tax measures must state that the revenue can be used for general purposes.

**State and Local Government Fees**

*Requires the Legislature and Local Government Bodies to Impose State and Local Fees.* Fees would have to be imposed by a majority vote of both houses of the Legislature or local governing bodies. The measure would restrict the ability of state and local governments to delegate fee changes to administrative entities. The extent of these restrictions would depend on future court decisions. Any fee approved between January 1, 2022 and the effective date of this measure would be nullified unless it fulfills the requirements of the measure.

*Some New State and Local Fees Could Not Exceed Actual Costs.* For some categories of fees, if the Legislature or a local governing body wished to impose a new fee or make changes to an existing fee, the measure generally would require that the charge be both reasonable and reflect the actual costs to the state or local government of providing the service. The measure also specifies that actual cost should not exceed “the minimum amount necessary.” In many cases, existing fees already reflect the government’s actual costs. In other cases, some fees would have to more closely approximate the payer’s actual costs in order to remain fees. If a fee payer challenged the charge, the state or local government would need to provide clear and convincing evidence that the fee meets this threshold. State and local governments also would bear the burden of providing clear and convincing evidence that the levy is a fee—which is not subject to a vote by the electorate—and not a tax under the new definition.

**Fiscal Effects**

*Lower State Tax and Fee Revenue.* By expanding the definition of a tax, increasing the vote requirements for approving taxes, and restricting administrative changes to fees, the measure makes it harder for the Legislature to increase nearly all types of state revenues. The extent to which revenues would be lower under the measure would depend on various factors, most notably future decisions made by the Legislature and voters. For example, requirements for legislative approval of fee increases currently set administratively could result in lower fee revenues, depending on future votes of the Legislature. That lower revenue could be particularly notable for some state programs largely funded by fees. Due to the uncertainty of these factors, we cannot estimate the amount of reduced state revenue, but it could be substantial.

*Lower Local Government Tax and Fee Revenue.* Compared to the state, local governments generally face greater restrictions to raising revenue. By expanding the definition of taxes and restricting administrative changes to fees, the measure would make it somewhat harder for local governments to raise revenue. Consequently, future local tax and fee revenue could be lower than they would be otherwise. The extent to which revenues would be lower is unknown, but
fees could be more impacted. The actual impact on local government revenue would depend on various factors, including future decisions by the courts, local governing bodies, and voters.

**Possible Increased State and Local Administrative Costs to Change Some Fee Levels.** In some cases, state and local departments would need to develop methods for setting fees to reflect actual costs if the Legislature or local governing bodies wanted to change those fees in the future. Estimating actual costs by program and fee source could involve some added workload for those state and local departments, which likely would be supported by fee revenue. The extent of these administrative costs would depend on (1) whether the state and local governments determine a fee increase is needed in order to maintain their current level of programs and services funded through fee revenue and (2) future court decisions.

**Summary of Fiscal Effects.** We estimate that this measure would have the following major fiscal effects:

- Lower annual state and local revenues, potentially substantially lower, depending on future actions of the Legislature, local governing bodies, voters, and the courts.

Sincerely,

_____________________________
for Gabriel Petek
Legislative Analyst

_____________________________
for Keely Martin Bosler
Director of Finance