

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

| Community     | Date                        | Type of<br>Measure                                   | Target<br>Population  | How Placed on<br>Ballot  | Outcome                                | Some Lessons Learned  |
|---------------|-----------------------------|--|---|--|--|---|
| San Francisco | 11/91<br>11/2001<br>11/2014 | Charter<br>Amendment<br>Set-aside of<br>Property tax | Ages 0 – 18<br>Last<br>reauthorization:<br>0 – 24<br>All services | Signatures<br>Board of<br>Supervisors<br>Board of<br>Supervisors | Won by 55%<br>Won by 73%<br>Won by 74% | Take the initiative.<br>Circumvent City Hall w. strong grassroots<br>campaign.<br>Do lots of homework.<br>Build momentum and credibility with<br>community over time. |
| Oakland       | 11/1996<br>6/2009           | Charter<br>Amendment<br>Set-aside of<br>General Fund | Children and<br>Youth<br>All services                             | Signatures<br>City Council                                       | Won by 75%<br>Won by 71%               | Take the initiative.<br>Circumvent City Hall w. strong grassroots<br>campaign.<br>Set-aside much more popular with public<br>than it is with elected officials.       |

| San Francisco | 3/2004 | Charter           | Preschool        | Board of         | Won by 71%      | Electorate primed to support kids.           |
|---------------|--------|-------------------|------------------|------------------|-----------------|--|
|               |        | Amendment         | Support services | Supervisors      | Reauthorized by | Popular elected official as champion         |
|               |        | Set-aside of      | in schools       |                  | 74%             | builds support.                              |
|               |        | General Fund      |                  |                  |                 | Connection to education plays well w.        |
|               |        |                   |                  |                  |                 | public                                       |
| Napa County   | 6/16   | General Sales     | Ages 0 – 18      | Board of         | Lost w. 45%     | Jail measure combined w. kids measure        |
|               |        | Тах               | All services     | Supervisors      |                 | tough sell, but public safety/kids possible. |
|               |        |                   |                  |                  |                 | Strong grassroots leadership. Non-profits    |
|               |        |                   |                  |                  |                 | held back. Inadequate campaign               |
|               |        |                   |                  |                  |                 | funding.                                     |
| Sacramento    | 6/16   | Special           | Ages 0 – 24      | City Council     | Lost w. 65.8%   | Public confused about marijuana –            |
|               |        | Marijuana tax     | All services     |                  |                 | premature measure.                           |
|               |        | (business tax)    |                  |                  |                 | Strong public support despite opposition     |
|               |        |                   |                  |                  |                 | from leading newspaper.                      |
|               | 3/20   | 2.5% Set aside    |                  | Voter Initiative | Lost with 45%   | 3/20 - Vigorous funded opposition from       |
|               |        | of General Fund   |                  |                  |                 | 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.                                    |
|               | 11/22  | General fund      | Ages 0 – 24      | City Council     | Won with 62%    | Negotiated compromise among all              |
|               |        | set-aside of 40%  | All Services     |                  | of vote         | parties – youth, Mayor, City Council,        |
|               |        | of cannabis tax   |                  |                  |                 | cannabis industry and unions.                |
|               |        | revenue           |                  |                  |                 | Key to ultimate success – strong City        |
|               |        |                   |                  |                  |                 | Council champion, Energized youth -          |
|               |        |                   |                  |                  |                 | leaders worked together.                     |
|               |        |                   |                  |                  |                 | NEVER GIVE UP!!                              |
| Marin County  | 11/16  | Special Sales tax | Ages 0 – 18      | Board of         | Lost w. 63%     | Broad institutional support built strong     |
|               |        |                   | All services     | Supervisors      |                 | campaign.                                    |
|               |        |                   |                  |                  | Needed 2/3      | Needed more grassroots outreach.             |
|               |        |                   |                  |                  |                 | Don't be surprised by "taxpayer"             |
|               |        |                   |                  |                  |                 | opposition.                                  |

| Solano County | 11/16 | General sales     | Ages 0 – 18       | Board of           | Tax lost w. 45%   | Two measures are confusing.                  |
|---------------|-------|-------------------|-------------------|--------------------|-------------------|--|
|               |       | tax and Advisory  | All services      | Supervisors        | Advisory won by   | Electorate will vote for advisory            |
|               |       | Measure           |                   |                    | 59%               | measure, thinks that is sufficient – but     |
|               |       |                   |                   |                    | Both measures     | not tax – no money.                          |
|               |       |                   |                   |                    | won in Vallejo    | Knowledgeable, respected leader drove        |
|               |       |                   |                   |                    |                   | campaign.                                    |
|               |       |                   |                   |                    |                   | Lacked adequate campaign resources.          |
| Richmond      | 6/18  | Set-aside of      | Ages 0 – 24       | Signatures         | Won by 76%        | Set-asides get political push-back but       |
|               |       | General Fund,     | All services      |                    |                   | have strong public support.                  |
|               |       | w. legislation    |                   | Accompanying       | Won by 65%        | Lots of negotiations/compromises with        |
|               |       | requiring         |                   | legislation put on |                   | politicians and labor necessary.             |
|               |       | revenue           |                   | by City Council    |                   | Signature-gathering is tough.                |
|               |       |                   |                   |                    |                   | Youth engagement saved the day!              |
| Alameda       | 6/18  | Special sales tax | Ages 0 – 5        | Board of           | Lost by 66.2%     | Developed strong formula:                    |
| County        |       |                   | childcare + some  | Supervisors        | Needed 2/3        | Lots of preparation.                         |
|               |       |                   | afterschool       |                    |                   | Community foundation funding.                |
|               |       |                   | 3/20 measure      |                    |                   | Strong policy leadership.                    |
|               | 3/20  |                   | included          | Voter Initiative   | Received 64.4%    | Elected official as champion.                |
|               |       |                   | Children's        |                    | (Final result     | Strong parent and union leadership.          |
|               |       |                   | Hospital          |                    | pending court     | 3/20 – Added benefit of partnership with     |
|               |       |                   |                   |                    | case on voter     | hospital and health issues                   |
|               |       |                   |                   |                    | threshold         | Benefit of signature drive – only needed     |
|               |       |                   |                   |                    | needed)           | majority vote.                               |
| San Francisco | 6/18  | Special gross     | Ages 0 – 5        | Signatures         | Won by 50.9%      | San Francisco is awesome. 😳                  |
|               |       | receipts tax on   | Childcare         |                    | Will face legal   | Children's issues are part of electorate's   |
|               |       | commercial        |                   |                    | challenge about   | expectations.                                |
|               |       | rental receipts   |                   |                    | voter threshold.  | Children and youth providers are a           |
|               |       | over \$1M         |                   |                    |                   | political force honed over time.             |
| Richmond      | 11/18 | Real Estate       | All children and  | City Council       | Won by 63.8%      | Compromises with city officials and labor    |
|               |       | Transfer Tax on   | youth – up to age |                    |                   | led to collective effort to support a tax to |
|               |       | properties over   | 24                |                    |                   | pay for the previously passed Richmond       |
|               |       | \$1M, increasing  |                   |                    |                   | Fund for Children and Youth. Real Estate     |
|               |       | up to \$10M       |                   |                    |                   | Transfer tax can be made progressive.        |
| Oakland       | 11/18 | Parcel Tax based  | Preschool         | Signatures         | Received 61.8%    | Years of research documenting need.          |
|               |       | on size of        | Oakland Promise   |                    | Interpretation of | Leadership of Mayor, including               |
|               |       | property, with    |                   |                    | results pending   | fundraising by Mayor for campaign.           |
|               |       |                   |                   |                    |                   | Opposition by real estate industry.          |

|                                |       | multiple<br>exceptions   | (high school and<br>college<br>scholarship)                         |                         |  | Controversy over priority needs in city.  |
|--------------------------------|-------|--|---|-------------------------|--|---|
| San Joaquin<br>County          | 11/18 | Cannabis tax,<br>with 50% going<br>to children and<br>youth services           | All children and<br>youth<br>0 — 18                                 | Board of<br>Supervisors | Lost by 63.5<br>Needed 2/3                   | Years of building coalition (San Joaquin<br>Children's Alliance). Board of Supervisors<br>champion. Strong non-profit leadership.<br>Public confusion/ambivalence re:<br>marijuana  |
|                                | 11/20 | Similar measure  | Same  | Same                    | Lost with 65% of<br>the vote –<br>needed 2/3 | Stronger campaign second time;<br>increased public education materials.<br>Conservative and unexpected wave in<br>Stockton changed election dynamics.   |
| Capitola                       | 11/18 | TOT 2% increase<br>.35% for kids   | Youth and Early<br>Childhood  | City Council            | Won w. 75.3%                                 | Inspired by City of Santa Cruz measures.<br>Carve-out requires negotiation  |
| Emeryville                     | 3/20  | Quarter cent<br>sales tax  | Public safety and<br>child<br>development ctr.                      | City Council            | Won by 75%                                   | Potential benefits of partnership with<br>public safety and children's issues.<br>Strong negotiations prior to the ballot.<br>Strong City Council champion.   |
| City of Santa<br>Cruz          | 11/21 | 20% set-aside of cannabis tax  | Early care and youth services                                       | City Council            | Won by 82.7%                                 | Two popular ideas – a cannabis tax and a<br>set-aside; no new taxes; strong, cost-<br>effective social media, ads, mailings.<br>Started with legislation successfully<br>implemented – became ballot measure.   |
| Monterey<br>County             | 11/22 | \$49 parcel tax  | Affordable Child<br>Care  | Voter initiative        | Yes vote<br>41%                              | Over 300 endorsements of key<br>organizations and leaders, including<br>business, health, early care, anti-tax<br>leaders, grassroots organizers, labor,<br>elected officials, unanimous Board of<br>Supervisors. Hurt by inflation and low<br>voter turnout. |
| City of South<br>San Francisco | 11/22 | Parcel tax on<br>commercial<br>office properties<br>over 25,000<br>square feet | Universal<br>preschool<br>Living wages for<br>child care<br>workers | Voter Initiative        | Yes Vote<br>47%                              | Groundbreaking proposal; Progressive<br>tax structure. Grassroots campaign<br>overcome by half a million dollars<br>opposition campaign from biotech<br>industry.   |

| Los Angeles  | 11/20 | Set-aside for  | Residents most    | Board of     | Won by 57% -      | Strong longtime organizing for social     |
|--------------|-------|----------------|-------------------|--------------|-------------------|---|
| -            |       | 10% of General | impacted by       | Supervisors  | only needed       | justice provided opportunity after        |
|              |       | Fund for new   | racial injustice, |              | majority vote –   | George Floyd killing to mount campaign    |
|              |       | community      | strong emphasis   |              | not a new tax     | for reallocation of local dollars.        |
|              |       | investments.   | on youth          |              |                   |   |
|              |       |                | development       |              |                   |   |
| Long Beach   | 11/20 | Tax on oil     | Youth             | City Council | Won by 57% -      | Years of organizing by Khmer Girls in     |
|              |       |                | Development and   |              | only needed       | Action positioned group to play           |
|              |       |                | other city needs  |              | majority –        | leadership role in campaign and get       |
|              |       |                |                   |              | funding           | agreement from City Council for most of   |
|              |       |                |                   |              | decisions will be | funding to go to youth development.       |
|              |       |                |                   |              | made by City      |   |
|              |       |                |                   |              | Council           |   |
| Contra Costa | 11/20 | Sales tax      | TBD by Board of   | Board of     | Won by 58% –      | County positioned for first local revenue |
|              |       |                | Supervisors –     | Supervisors  | only needed       | measure in years. Early care advocates    |
|              |       |                | featured in needs |              | majority vote.    | at the table from the outset, ensured     |
|              |       |                | assessment –      |              | General tax –     | high profile of young children's needs in |
|              |       |                | local hospital,   |              | allocations will  | campaign.                                 |
|              |       |                | early care, and   |              | be determined     |   |
|              |       |                | fire              |              | by Board of       |   |
|              |       |                |                   |              | Supervisors       |   |
| Sonoma       | 11/20 | Sales tax      | Mental health –   | Board of     | Won by 68% -      | Strong advocacy from early care           |
|              |       |                | services for all  | Supervisors  | needed 2/3        | advocates ensured that children's         |
|              |       |                | ages and          |              |                   | mental health were included in a county   |
|              |       |                | homelessness      |              |                   | mental health measure.                    |