The Business Perspective:

Don’t Be Fooled
By Prop. 90

Before I moved to California, I heard a lot about our state’s ballot initiative process. Now that I have seen the Nov. 7 ballot, I know that all of the stories are true. Both good and bad ideas find their way to the ballot, and sometimes it is difficult to tell the difference.

From now until Election Day, I will be commenting each week on the propositions on the November ballot.

Proposition 90 is a poorly conceived measure that will cost taxpayers billions of dollars and reduce the ability of cities and counties to relieve traffic congestion, make sewer and water improvements, build affordable housing, provide flood protection or redevelop blighted areas. And it’s a constitutional amendment at that.

The measure is being touted as protecting home owners from eminent domain, but that tagline is just bait. This measure is so wide sweeping that when Oregon passed Measure 37, a similar law, it generated more than 2,000 lawsuits seeking $3.8 billion in payments from state and local taxpayers.

The new definitions in Proposition 90 would result in windfall payouts to a few property owners at the expense of common taxpayers. In many cases, the measure would make infrastructure improvements so prohibitively expensive that they simply won't be done.

Proposition 90 also contains a hidden provision that allows virtually anyone to sue, claiming a new law or regulation has caused them “economic harm” and impacted the value of their property.

Consider the story of James R. Miller that ran in the New York Times on July 25. Miller owns a doughnut hole of land inside Oregon’s Newberry National Volcanic Monument, a dormant volcano protected by open space and conservation laws. Under Measure 37, Miller has filed a suit demanding $203 million in compensation because he claims the zoning laws meant to protect the national monument have devalued his property and restricted his ability to build a pumice mine and power plant inside the monument.

The possible impact of Proposition 90 on California’s taxpayers is so enormous that the costs cannot be estimated. But we do know that it will rob our cities and counties of needed resources to improve our quality of life.

This measure has broad opposition, including the League of Women Voters of California; the California Labor Federation; AFL-CIO; California Police and Fire Chiefs Associations; California School Boards Association; National Wildlife Federation; League of California Cities, and the California Redevelopment Association. Any time a diverse group comes together to oppose an issue, you can be assured they have done the research that you might not have the time to do. Vote no on Proposition 90.

And that’s The Business Perspective.
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