



CHILDREN AND YOUTH FUNDS IN CALIFORNIA: A SUMMARY of BALLOT MEASURES

| Community | Date | Type of Measure | Target Population | How Placed on Ballot | Outcome | Some Lessons Learned |
|---------------|-----------------------------|--|--|--|--|---|
| San Francisco | 11/91 11/2001 11/2014 | Charter Amendment Set-aside of Property tax | Ages 0 – 18 Last reauthorization: 0 – 24 All services | Signatures Board of Supervisors Board of Supervisors | Won by 55% Won by 73% Won by 74% | Take the initiative. Circumvent City Hall w. strong grassroots campaign. Do lots of homework. Build momentum and credibility with community over time. |
| Oakland | 11/1996 6/2009 | Charter Amendment Set-aside of General Fund | Children and Youth All services | Signatures City Council | Won by 75% Won by 71% | Take the initiative. Circumvent City Hall w. strong grassroots campaign. Set-aside much more popular with public than with elected officials. |
| San Francisco | 3/2004 | Charter Amendment Set-aside of General Fund | Preschool Support services in schools | Board of Supervisors | Won by 71% Reauthorized by 74% | Electorate primed to support kids. Popular elected official as champion builds support. Connection to education plays well w. public |

| | | | | | | |
|----------------------|------------------|--|-----------------------------|---|--|--|
| Napa County | 6/16 | General Sales Tax | Ages 0 – 18 All services | Board of Supervisors | Lost w. 45% | Jail measure combined w. kids measure tough sell, but public safety/kids possible. Strong grassroots leadership. Non-profits held back. Inadequate campaign funding. |
| Sacramento | 6/16 3/20 | Special Marijuana tax (business tax) 2.3% Set aside of General Fund | Ages 0 – 24 All services | City Council Voter Initiative | Lost w. 65.8% Lost with 45% | Public confused about marijuana – premature measure. Strong public support despite opposition from leading newspaper. 3/20 - Vigorous funded opposition from Mayor and firefighter’s union; difficult to overcome. Mayor’s commitment to 2022 measure. Millions in COVID19 \$’s went to youth development as result of campaign momentum. |
| Marin County | 11/16 | Special Sales tax | Ages 0 – 18 All services | Board of Supervisors | Lost w. 63% Needed 2/3 | Broad institutional support built strong campaign. Needed more grassroots outreach. Don’t be surprised by “taxpayer” opposition. |
| Solano County | 11/16 | General sales tax and Advisory Measure | Ages 0 – 18 All services | Board of Supervisors | Tax lost w. 45% Advisory won by 59% Both measures won in Vallejo | Two measures are confusing. Electorate will vote for advisory measure, thinks that is sufficient – but not tax. Knowledgeable, respected leader drove campaign. Lacked adequate campaign resources. |
| Richmond | 6/18 | Set-aside of General Fund, w. legislation requiring revenue | Ages 0 – 24 All services | Signatures Accompanying legislation put on by City Council | Won by 76% Won by 65% | Set-asides get political push-back but have strong public support. Lots of negotiations/compromises with politicians and labor necessary. Signature-gathering is tough. Youth engagement saved the day! |

| | | | | | | |
|---------------------------|--------------------|--|--|--|---|---|
| Alameda County | 6/18 3/20 | Special sales tax | Ages 0 – 5 childcare + some afterschool 3/20 measure included Children’s Hospital | Board of Supervisors Voter Initiative | Lost by 66.2% Needed 2/3 Received 64.4% (Final result pending court case on voter threshold needed) | Developed strong formula: Lots of preparation. Community foundation funding. Strong policy leadership. Elected official as champion. Strong parent and union leadership. 3/20 – Added benefit of partnership with hospital and health issues Benefit of signature drive |
| San Francisco | 6/18 | Special gross receipts tax on commercial rental receipts over \$1M | Ages 0 – 5 Childcare | Signatures | Won by 50.9% Will face legal challenge about voter threshold. | San Francisco is awesome. ☺ Children’s issues are part of electorate’s expectations. Children and youth providers are a political force honed over time. |
| Richmond | 11/18 | Real Estate Transfer Tax on properties over \$1M, increasing up to \$10M | All children and youth – up to age 24 | City Council | Won by 63.8% | Compromises with city officials and labor led to collective effort to support a tax to pay for the previously passed Richmond Fund for Children and Youth. Real Estate Transfer tax can be made progressive. |
| Oakland | 11/18 | Parcel Tax based on size of property, with multiple exceptions | Preschool Oakland Promise (high school and college scholarship) | Signatures | Received 61.8% Interpretation of results pending | Years of research documenting need. Leadership of Mayor, including fundraising by Mayor for campaign. Opposition by real estate industry. Controversy over priority needs in city. |
| San Joaquin County | 11/18 11/20 | Cannabis tax, with 50% going to children and youth services Similar measure | All children and youth 0 – 18 Same | Board of Supervisors Same | Lost by 63.5 Needed 2/3 Lost with 65% of the vote – needed 2/3 | Years of building coalition (San Joaquin Children’s Alliance). Board of Supervisors champion. Strong non-profit leadership. Public confusion/ambivalence re: marijuana Stronger campaign second time; increased public education materials. Conservative and unexpected wave in Stockton changed election dynamics. |

| | | | | | | |
|--|-------|--|---|-------------------------|---|---|
| Capitola | 11/18 | TOT 2% increase .35% for kids | Youth and Early Childhood | City Council | Won w. 75.3% | Inspired by City of Santa Cruz measures. Carve-out requires negotiation |
| Emeryville | 3/20 | Quarter cent sales tax | Public safety and child development ctr. | City Council | Won by 75% | Potential benefits of partnership with public safety and children's issues. Strong negotiations prior to the ballot. Strong City Council champion. |
| Campaigns that will increase funding for children and youth, but were not explicitly only for dedicated funding - below | | | | | | |
| Los Angeles | 11/20 | Set-aside for 10% of General Fund for new community investments. | Residents most impacted by racial injustice, strong emphasis on youth development | Board of Supervisors | Won by 57% - only needed majority vote – not a new tax | Strong longtime organizing for social justice provided opportunity after George Floyd killing to mount campaign for reallocation of local dollars. |
| Long Beach | 11/20 | Tax on oil | Youth Development and other city needs | City Council | Won by 57% - only needed majority – funding decisions will be made by City Council | Years of organizing by Khmer Girls in Action positioned group to play leadership role in campaign and get agreement from City Council for most of funding to go to youth development. |
| Contra Costa | 11/20 | Sales tax | TBD by Board of Supervisors – featured in needs assessment – local hospital, early care, and fire | Board of Supervisors | Won by 58% – only needed majority vote. General tax – allocations will be determined by Board of Supervisors | County positioned for first local revenue measure in years. Early care advocates at the table from the outset, ensured high profile of young children's needs in campaign. |
| Sonoma | 11/20 | Sales tax | Mental health – services for all ages and homelessness | Board of Supervisors | Won by 68% - needed 2/3 | Strong advocacy from early care advocates ensured that children's mental health were included in a county mental health measure. |