

**Data Appendix
Table of Contents**

1. Identification of Legislative Votes that Match Referenda	2
1.1 Sources of Legislative Bill/Referenda Matches	2
1.2 Proposition and Bill Attributes	5
2. Legislators and Legislative Floor Votes	6
2.1 List of Legislators by Session	6
2.2 Data on Legislative Floor Votes	7
3. Collapsing within District Voting and Demographics to the District Level	8
3.1 Geographic Data	8
3.2 District Voting Data based on Terciles	10
4. Validating the Data	11
4.1 Model Specification	11
4.2 Regression Results	12
Table 1. Matches between Propositions and Legislative Bills	13
Table 2. Summaries of Mandatory and Petition Referenda	17
Table 3. Summaries of Initiatives (Non-Mandatory) and Senate/Assembly Versions of Bills	21
Table 4. Relationship between Legislator Vote and Constituent Vote	25

1. Identification of Legislative Votes that Match Referenda

For propositions on statewide California election ballots between 1992 and 2008, we identify those that have the same or very similar content to specific bills voted on in the California State Legislature. Propositions can appear on general, primary, or in a few cases on special election ballots. We focus on propositions that appear on general and primary election ballots for all elections during the period except for the primary ballots in 2002 and 2004 where voting data is not yet available in electronic form. The list of statewide propositions and the descriptions of each proposition from this period can be found at

<http://lalaw.lib.ca.us/research/ballots/>

An itemized list of our matches along with information on each legislative bill and proposition is shown in Table 1.

1.1 Sources of Legislative Bill/Public Proposition Matches

In our analysis, we identified three specific circumstances in which the legislature voted on such bills.

First, the legislature regularly considers bills, (either legislative constitutional amendments, bond acts, or amendments to initiative statutes approved in a statewide election) that if passed by both houses of the state legislature and signed into law, are required to be approved by voters through a statewide ballot. We will refer to these throughout as mandatory matches. In a mandatory match the public proposition and the legislation are an exact match because the legislation is directly referenced in the public proposition and the vote is to approve the legislation or not. This set of propositions contributes 48 of our 77 total legislative bill/public proposition matches. Note that in two cases, a law passed by the legislature required multiple public votes. Specifically, Assembly Bill 16 passed in the 2001-02 session, authorized two separate bond acts for building school facilities, one in 2002 (prop 47) and a second in 2004 (prop 55). The 2002 general election is closer to the legislative vote so we match AB 16 to prop 47. In addition, Senate Constitutional Amendment 16 in the 2003-04 session addressed two topics: voting in primaries regardless of party registration, and the use of proceeds from the sale of surplus property, which were considered by the electorate in the 2004 general election as propositions 60 and 60A, respectively. We match SCA 16 with proposition 60 on primary voting because it appeared to us to be the salient issue. A summary of the purpose of each statute, constitutional amendment, or initiative amendment is provided in Table 2. See Section 8.5 of Article 4 of the California Constitution, as well as section 10 of Article 2 for details on legislative voting and public proposition on these types of statutes.

http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/.const/.article_4

http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/.const/.article_2

Second, voters can use the referendum process to “veto” a bill that has been passed by the legislature and signed into law by the governor by creating a petition and having this petition signed by registered voters totaling to at least 5% of the number of voters in the previous gubernatorial election. This is known as a petition referendum. As with mandatory matches, both a senate and assembly vote must exist for these propositions; these referenda directly reference the legislation and so represent an exact match between the legislation and the proposition. Unlike legislative bills that may address multiple topics or require multiple public votes, petition referenda are required by the constitution to address one particular statute. The referendum may in principle be designed to only repeal part of the legislation, but in practice all of the petition referenda in our sample address the repeal of an entire statute. Our sample contains eight matches arising from petition referenda. While a petition referendum is intended to repeal a legislatively passed statute, the referendum language is always such that a no vote overturns the statute. The second panel of Table 2 provides a summary describing each statute in our sample that was subject to a petition referendum. This process is described in section 9 of Article 2 of the California Constitution.

http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/.const/.article_2

The final set of propositions from which our sample is drawn are initiatives that propose a new statute or constitutional amendment. They are referred to as either Initiative Statutes or Initiative Constitutional Amendments. Initiatives are placed on the ballot by means of a petition signed by registered voters amounting to 8% (for a constitutional amendment) or 5% (for a statute) of the number of people who voted in the most recent election for governor. Proponents of an issue simultaneously work to both place a proposition on the ballot and to move a bill through the legislature or alternatively turn to one of these approaches when the other has failed. We have been able to identify 21 propositions or initiatives in which a similar bill proceeded to a floor vote in either the Assembly and/or the Senate. We began with the set of initiatives placed on statewide ballots during our sample period. We then conducted extensive web and archival searches on the topics addressed by these propositions in order to identify all bills that dealt with the same issues as the ballot initiatives. In order to determine whether the bills and propositions were exact matches, we examined the bill analyses at the following web site

<http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/bilinfo.html>

for all legislative sessions in our sample period except for 1991-92. Note that we used the senate and assembly floor vote analysis documents to summarize the bills post 1991-92. The assembly floor vote documents typically provided quite detailed summaries. Often the senate floor vote analysis documents were less detailed and we were required to supplement the summary using the actual Bill Text, available on the same website.

Data on the 1991-92 session is not available on-line, and we visited the state archives in Sacramento, CA in order to obtain the analyses and floor votes for that session. In addition, we

conducted on-line searches to identify the exact content of legislation that was matched to initiatives for the 1991-92 session. We identified an on-line description for each of the following bills

AB 702 <http://oig.hhs.gov/oas/reports/region9/99200116.pdf>

AB 2181 <http://leda.law.harvard.edu/leda/data/789/Sheu06.pdf>

AB 2001 <http://www.library.ca.gov/crb/07/07-013.pdf>

SB 308 <http://content.healthaffairs.org/cgi/reprint/13/2/123.pdf>

The public proposition process is described in section 8 of Article 2 of the California Constitution

http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/.const/.article_2

Unlike mandatory and petition referenda, the text of the initiative may not exactly match the text of a legislative bill. Furthermore, since the legislature may not have passed the bill both houses may not have voted on the bill or the content of the bill may differ between the floor votes of the two houses. Our sample contains all initiatives where we observed an assembly and/or senate floor vote on a bill covering a substantively similar issue as the initiative. While our matching for initiatives is subjective, we tried to be quite conservative in matching bills. For example, Prop 210 and the senate version of AB 1184 in the 1997-98 session both increase the minimum wage, although by different amounts, while the final version of the assembly bill that reached a floor vote was about disability retirement and so we dropped the assembly vote. Similarly, Prop 215 decriminalized marijuana possession for patients and caregivers and SB 1364 in the 1993-94 session legalized marijuana for medical purposes, which media reports suggest imply the same de facto treatment of patients and caregivers under the law. On the other hand, AB 1529 in the 1995-96 session, which we did not match to Prop 215, differs substantially imposing requirements such as that prescriptions must be in writing and only covering four specific medical conditions. Also, AB 172 in the 2005-06 session has an initial vote in the assembly that establishes a voluntary preschool-for-all system that would only become operative if funding is subsequently provided under statewide initiative thereby matching Prop 82 closely, while the final assembly and senate floor votes, which were not used, mandated specific child development and family literacy services as conditions for receiving funding for prekindergarten programs. Some further examples of bills that we did not match to initiatives are AB 26 in the 1999-00 session or AB 2005 in the 2003-04 session providing for domestic partnership and domestic partnership benefits with Prop 22 that defines marriage as between a man and a woman, and AB 702 in the 1991-92 session eliminating certain benefits from the public pension system with Prop 162 that places the public pension system in the hands of pension boards. In both cases, the constituencies that opposed or favored the legislation were uniformly in favor or opposed to the proposition, respectively, but the specific intent of the proposition and legislation did not agree

and so these potential matches were excluded from our sample. For all initiatives, Table 3 contains a summary of the intent of the legislative bill when considered by each house, as well as a summary of the associated initiative.

Note that all statewide ballot measures can be approved by a simple majority of voters, see section 9 or Article 2. Also, see the California Secretary of State web page of ballot measures.

http://www.sos.ca.gov/elections/elections_j.htm

1.2 Proposition and Bill Attributes

Finally, our proposition data contain the proposition number, whether the vote occurred during a primary or general election, the date of the vote, whether the proposition passed, the type of proposition, the legislative bill number such as SB 1364 or AB 1529, the legislative session during which the bill was considered, and for initiatives (which are not automatic matches) whether the implications of a yes vote for the proposition are the same or the opposite of a legislative yes vote.

The proposition website

<http://lalaw.lib.ca.us/research/ballots/>

identifies proposition by election based on year and whether voted on in a primary or general election. To obtain the exact date of the vote on the proposition, we used the California Secretary of State's Statewide Election Results, available online at

http://www.sos.ca.gov/elections/elections_elections.htm

The website covers our entire sample period. In all cases except one, the date of the proposition vote is simply the date of the primary or general election for that year. The exception occurs in 2008 when California held two primaries. For that year we were able to match the propositions to the correct primary by using information contained in the "Official Declaration of the Vote Results on Statewide Ballot Measures," provided by the California Secretary of State. The document provides the proposition numbers in a given election and identifies that the votes on propositions 94, 95, 96, and 97 occurred on 2/5/2008, and the vote on proposition 99 occurred on 6/3/2008.

2. Legislators and Legislative Floor Votes

2.1 List of Legislators by Session

For each legislative session, we identify an initial set of legislators from the California Rosters between 1992 and 2008 published by the California Secretary of State. The roster provides the full name, district and party affiliation for each California state senator and assembly member during the current legislative session. The California state roster is available for recent years (currently back to 2003) at

<http://www.sos.ca.gov/admin/ca-roster/2009/>

We visited the state archives in Sacramento CA and manually recorded the information for earlier state rosters. This information provides a list of sitting legislators including information on their legislative body, district and political party, but does not provide a complete list of legislators because of resignations and special elections. This data was verified and supplemented using the California Political Almanac, which provides the name of all legislators who served during a particular session. The almanacs are biennial, and are available for all years except for 2001-06. For those years, we identify changes in legislative membership by examining the names of legislators listed in the floor votes in our sample. The key limitation of the almanacs is that they do not identify the period during which a legislator served. Only a total of 41 seats changed hands through special elections during our time period, between 1991 and 2010. In order to identify the exact dates of service for these legislators, we used information from the organization JoinCalifornia.com which is available at:

<http://www.joincalifornia.com>

JoinCalifornia.com provides an archive of election history for the state of California dating back to the mid-1800s. This database contains a detailed history of service for all past and currently elected officials in California allowing us to identify the actual dates of service for every member who came into office via special election. For legislators who entered through general elections, the date of service begins on the traditional day for California legislative sessions to begin, which is December 1, while for special elections we use the date on which the election was held. If the member who was being replaced died in office, the date of death is used as the end date of service. Similarly, if an individual left the Assembly or Senate in order to take a new elected office or was recalled via a California special election, the date of the special election was used as the end date of service for the first elected office. Other types of resignations, such as resignation to accept a political appointment or in response to a corruption scandal, are typically noted in the biography and additional web searches are used for each case to identify the date of resignation. The vast majority of these special elections arose because the current incumbent was elected to alternative office, typically either the state senate (from the Assembly) or the U.S. House of Representatives. However, two legislators died in office, three accepted appointments, and two resigned in response to legal difficulties.

For the 2001-02, 2003-04, and 2005-06 legislative sessions, we first examine which members were serving in the immediately preceding and following sessions. The legislative member's beginning or ending term of service during the session is known automatically if the member serves in the preceding and/or following session, respectively. For members who cannot be located in preceding or following sessions, we again rely on

<http://www.joincalifornia.com>

to identify special elections where members were replaced.

2.2 Legislative Floor Votes

Next, for every legislative bill matched to a proposition, we record the floor vote of every senator and/or assembly member as either yes (Y), no (N), or abstain, absent or not voting (A). If a seat is vacant at the time, the legislative name is listed as "Vacant" and the vote is listed as "A". The voting data are available by session and bill at

<http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/bilinfo.html>

This website contains the date of every floor vote relating to a particular bill, individual legislators' votes on each bill, and analysis of the motion or bill contents for each vote back to the 1994 legislative session. The votes for the 1992 legislative session were obtained in person at the state archives. Note that in 1992, the paper records only identify the legislators who vote "Y" or "N", and "A" must be identified as a residual category based on the legislators currently serving.

In the case of both mandatory and petition referenda, we used the final legislative floor vote for both the Senate and the Assembly because a bill must have passed both houses on a final floor vote in order to be the subject of a public proposition. For the third set of propositions or initiatives where we have manually identified a match between propositions and legislation, we review the analysis for each vote. If the broad content of the bill is fairly stable over time, we used the final floor vote. However, in a very small number of instances, the content and focus of the bill changed dramatically during the legislative process and we either reverted to an earlier floor vote that better matched the initiative content or dropped the vote of a particular legislative body when that body never conducted a floor vote on the initial content of the bill. Specifically, there were three instances where we did not use the final floor votes from both legislative bodies: 1. the only assembly floor vote for AB 1184 in the 1997-98 session differed from proposition 210 and so the assembly vote was dropped from our sample; 2. the final version of AB 172 for assembly and senate floor votes in the 2005-06 session did not match Prop 82, but the version of AB 172 for an earlier assembly vote on 6/02/2005 did match the proposition and so only that assembly vote is retained in our sample; and 3. the final version of AB 10 for assembly and senate floor votes in the 2007-08 session did not match Prop 3, but the version of AB 10 for an

earlier assembly vote on 8/27/2007 did match the proposition and so only that assembly vote is retained in our sample.

We recorded the date of the floor vote in our database of legislators and legislative bills. We then manually verified the presence of each legislator recorded in the record of the floor vote against our data on the exact dates of service for each legislator. The match between voting records and dates of service is near perfect. We found only three instances when the seat was listed as vacant on the voting records, even though the legislator was still serving. All three of these were for Frank Hill for the 1993-94 session of the state senate. However, in that case, we were able to find documentation of an early departure from the legislature prior to the actual resignation date. See

http://articles.latimes.com/1994-07-19/local/me-17363_1_frank-hill

Therefore, we listed the seat as vacant during those particular votes because the legislator was officially not participating in the legislative process and would soon resign. The extraordinarily high rate of agreement between voting records and dates of service provide confidence in our data on the 1991-92 session where we had to rely solely on the dates of service to determine abstentions and absences because the paper voting records only provided the names of legislators voting yes or no.

The resulting voting data are comprised of a record for every currently serving legislator for each proposition that matches a bill for which a floor vote on one of our 77 matches took place. The resulting data set contains the legislative session, the name of the legislator, their legislative body, their district and their party affiliation.

3. Collapsing within District Voting and Demographics to the District Level

In order to conduct our statistical analysis of legislator voting behavior, we develop a third panel that describes the political, demographic, and socio-economic characteristics of the jurisdictions that individual state senators or assembly members represent during each session. This data come from three sources: 1) Geolytics data from the 1990 and 2000 Decennial Censuses and the five-year (05-09) moving averages from the American Community Survey (ACS) using 2000 Census geography, 2) the California Secretary of State Statewide Elections Results, and 3) the Statewide Database maintained by the Institute of Governmental Studies (IGS) at the University of California at Berkeley.

3.1 Geographic Data

The Geolytics census data and the ACS provide detailed demographic and socio-economic information including the number of eligible voters (approximated as number of citizens aged 18 and up) at the census tract level for 1990, 2000 and approximately 2007 using 2000 census tract

definitions. Precinct level data on registration and voting patterns are available at the Statewide Database for California Elections

<http://swdb.berkeley.edu/d00/index.html>

Between 1990 and 2000, the voting data are available at the census block or census tract level only. For all years except 1990, the voting data are based on 2000 census geography, and in 1990 we use census provided conversion files to estimate voting totals for 2000 census geography based on the totals for 1990 geography. Starting in 2002, the data are provided at the precinct level along with conversion files for mapping these precinct totals into 2000 census tract or block definitions. The voting data contain the total number of registered voters, total number voting in the election, the number voting for each candidate for national or state office, and as discussed earlier the number voting yes and no for each proposition on the ballot. A separate file at the same website contains registration totals by political party. These data allow us to create variables for share of eligible voters registered to vote, share of voters registered as Democrats or Republicans, share of votes cast in two party vote for the Democratic state senate candidate, Democratic state assembly candidate, Democratic gubernatorial candidate or Democratic presidential candidate, gubernatorial and presidential turnout based of two party votes relative to voting eligible population, turnout for each proposition relative to both number of eligible voters, number of votes yes and no for each proposition at both the census tract and district level. Finally, in order to minimize any measurement error in district level voting results for individual state legislatures, we use the California Secretary of State website on election results for statewide elections.

http://www.sos.ca.gov/elections/elections_elections.htm

We use the census tract as a basic definition for describing variation within districts. Commercially provided data from Geolytics contain detailed information on census tract from both the 1990 and 2000 Decennial Census long form. When census tracts cross either senate or assembly district boundaries, we create new tract definitions associated with a portion of the tract on either side. In terms of voting and registration counts, we apportion these totals to districts based on the share of total population from the tract in each district, which is available from the Statewide Database. An alternative is to determine which block groups from a tract are located in each district, which we have done for previous work, and assign the block group voting and registration totals to each district. However, voting and registration data at the block group level are imputed from precinct level totals, and our experience is that the block group level imputations are significantly noisier than the census tract imputations. Therefore, base our analysis entirely on the census tract registration and voting totals. Given this decision, we use census demographic data at the tract level as well for consistency.

For each legislative session between 91-92 and 99-00, we impute census tract composition based on a linear projection between the 1990 and 2000 compositions available from the decennial

censuses with the timing of the imputation based on the year of the elections for each legislative session, e.g. 1990 for 91-92 session, 1992 for 93-94 session, etc. For legislative sessions between 2001 and 2008, we use linear interpolations between the 2000 census and 2007 ACS again assigning values based on the year of the election. The decennial census and the ACS provide very accurate information on tract mean income.

Each census tract or census tract-district combination is assigned to a specific senate and assembly district for three different district definitions based on redistricting using the 1980, 1990 and 2000 decennial censuses. Elections held during the 2003-04 through 2007-08 legislative sessions (November of the preceding year) are based on redistricting from the 2000 census. Elections held during the 1993-94 through 2001-02 legislative sessions are based on the 1990 census, and finally elections held during the 1989-90 and 1991-92 legislative sessions are based on 1980. Senators voted into office for their four year terms in 1988 (odd districts) or 1998 (even districts) stand for re-election in new post-census districts in November of 1992 or 2002. However, senators voted into office in 1990 or 2000 will continue to serve through the next legislative session in principle representing the citizens from their old district who voted them into office until their term expires and they must stand for re-election in November 1994 or 2004. For the purposes of constructing our sample, we always assume that a politician represents the district in which he or she was elected. The alternative would have been to attempt to assign politicians to the post-redistricting districts. While a moderately straightforward exercise for legislators who continue to serve following redistricting, assigning legislators who faced term limits or chose not to run for office following redistricting is very difficult. District geography may change substantially from redistricting to redistricting, and there is little concordance between the district number that an incumbent runs in before and after redistricting. The reader should note that special elections in California are conducted using the district boundaries that were in place when the original representative was elected (most recent relevant general election).

3.2 District Voting Data based on Terciles

In order to sign propositions as either liberal or conservative, we estimate a model across all census tracts (2000 tract definitions) for each of our propositions regressing the share voting “yes” on two variables: share of registered voters who registered as Democrats and share registered Republicans. Our liberal index is simply the coefficient on share Democrat minus the coefficient on share Republican. This index is similar to and highly correlated (0.92) with an index based on the methodology that we used in Brunner, Ross and Washington (2011). The index is also highly correlated with similar indices based on legislator voting on the corresponding bills.

Within each district, we divide census tracts into terciles based on tract mean income. Specifically, the tracts are ordered based on income and then divided into equally sized terciles where tercile size is based on the population of eligible voters. Note that tracts on the boundary

between terciles are divided in order to assure that the terciles are equal in size with the tract weight being based on the fraction of eligible voters from the tract assigned to each tercile. We also develop terciles based on the share eligible voters registered Republican, share eligible voters registered Democrat, share voters voting Democratic for governor and president, the fraction of eligible voters who voted on this issue, share voting for highest office (governor or president) in the most recent general election, and share registered among eligible voters. We also divide tracts into income and party quintiles and deciles. Finally, we divide tracts into statewide income terciles and thereby characterize whether tracts are low or high mean income in terms of overall state income rather than within district. For the statewide terciles, we also create variables that contain the fraction of district population residing in the district census tracts that fall within each tercile, and those variables are used as additional controls in models that include the statewide terciles.

4. Validating the Data Against

We know from previous work that the views of the legislator and the constituency should be positively correlated. To verify the validity of both our vote coding (liberal/conservative) and our matching of voters to districts, we examine the relationship between a legislator's tendency to vote liberally on an issue and his or her constituents' desire for that legislator to vote liberally.

4.1 Model Specification

In order to examine the relationship between a legislator's tendency to vote liberally on an issue and his or her constituents' desire for that legislator to vote liberally, we aggregate our data to the district/issue level and run models of the form:

$$\text{Legislator_vote} = \beta_0 + \beta_1(\text{Constituency_vote}) + \varepsilon$$

where *Legislator_vote* is an indicator for whether the legislator voted liberally (or yes in the uncoded specification) and *Constituency_vote* is an indicator for whether the majority of voters in the district who voted on the corresponding ballot measure voted liberally (yes). We construct the *Constituency_vote* by aggregating tract level voting returns on an issue to the assembly (or senate) district as configured when the legislature voted on the measure. Note that because of redistricting this may differ from the configuration of the districts when voters voted on the initiative.

We classify observations in which legislators abstain as missing. Largely because of abstentions and to a small degree because of vacancies we lose about 10 percent of our target sample of 8680. (80 assembly members * 74 votes + 40 senators * 69 votes = 8680). There are 809 abstentions and 58 votes missing due to vacancies. While we find that Democrats are more likely to abstain the more conservative their constituents are on the issue and Republicans are more likely to abstain the more liberal their constituents are on the issue, we find that representatives of both parties are less likely to abstain when there is an above median difference of opinion between low and high income areas in their district. Thus we do not believe that abstentions are biasing our results.

Standard errors are clustered to allow for a lack of independence of the disturbance term within legislator/chamber. Note that clustering by legislator/chamber means that for legislators who serve in both the assembly and the senate in our time period, votes cast in the two chambers are in separate clusters.

4.2 Regression Results

The point estimate of 0.307 in the first column of Table 4 indicates that the likelihood that the legislator votes in favor of the legislation is 31 percentage points greater when the majority of the voting constituents favor a yes vote. The figure increases when we move from predicting yes votes to predicting more meaningful liberal votes. A majority of voting constituents in favor of a liberal vote is associated with a 53 percentage point increase in the likelihood that the legislator votes liberally on the issue. While the frequency with which the legislator votes in agreement with the constituents is the same whether we code bills as yes/no or liberal/conservative, the coefficient changes between specifications presented in Table 4 columns 1 and 2 because regression is sensitive to the distribution of those agreements [between 0,0 (in the first case no, no and the second case conservative, conservative) and 1,1 (in the first case yes, yes and the second case liberal, liberal)] and disagreements. When the constituents want a no (yes) vote the legislator votes no 42% (88%) of the time. However when the constituents want a conservative (liberal) vote the legislator votes yes 66% (87%) of the time. Thus, the constituents' liberal/conservative desires are more predictive of the legislator's vote than the constituents' yes/no desires.

Our coding system is most likely to misclassify those bills that are the least partisan, those for which Democratic and Republican registrants vote similarly. Thus it is comforting that our results are robust falling slightly to 0.48 after dropping more moderate bills, in particular the 13 bills for which $|\hat{\beta}_1 - \hat{\beta}_2| < 0.1$, as shown in column 3. One might also be concerned that legislative bills that we hand matched to ballot items are not as close a match in terms of bill content as the mandatory ones. We demonstrate in column 4 that these hand matches are not driving our Table 4 findings. In fact, our estimates increase somewhat for the mandatory match to 0.57. The coefficient for the hand matched sample is a statistically significant 0.370.

The fact that on 74 of 77 issues the public votes after the legislature raises the concern that constituents' votes are influenced by those of their legislators. Such influence would invalidate our use of the constituent vote as a measure of constituents' desires on the issue at the time of the legislative vote. If constituents' copying their representatives is driving our Table 5 results, then when we limit our focus to the matched pairs in which the public voted before the legislature we should see a smaller association between legislative and constituent voting. However, as shown in column 5 of Table 4, when we limit focus to this sample the coefficient on the constituent vote increases in magnitude, although not significantly. In the final four columns of the table we show that the relationship between constituent and legislator support holds across parties and chambers.

Table 1: Matches between Propositions and Legislative Bills

Election	Prop	Proposition Name or Description	Type	Session	Leg. Bill
1992 G	155	1992 School Facilities Bond Act.	Bond Act	1991-92	SB 34*
1992 G	157	Toll Roads and Highways.	Legislative Constitutional Amendment	1991-92	SCA 27*
1992 G	158	Office of California Analyst.	Legislative Constitutional Amendment	1991-92	SCA 33*
1992 G	159	Office of the Auditor General.	Legislative Constitutional Amendment	1991-92	SCA 34*
1992 G	160	Property Tax Exemption.	Legislative Constitutional Amendment	1991-92	ACA 40*
1992 G	163	Ends Taxation of Certain Food Products.	Initiative Constitutional Amendment#	1991-92	AB 2181*
1992 G	166	Basic Health Care Coverage.	Initiative statute#	1991-92	AB 2001
1994 G	183	Recall Elections. State Officers.	Legislative Constitutional Amendment	1993-94	SCA 38*
1994 G	184	Increased Sentences. Repeat Offenders (Three Strikes)	Initiative statute#	1993-94	AB 971*
1994 G	186	Health Services. Taxes.	Initiative Constitutional Amendment	1991-92	SB 308
1994 G	188	Smoking and Tobacco. Local Preemption. Statewide Reg.	Initiative statute#	1993-94	AB 996
1994 G	189	Bail Exception. Felony Sexual Assault.	Legislative Constitutional Amendment	1993-94	ACA 37*
1994 G	190	Commission on Judicial Performance.	Legislative Constitutional Amendment	1993-94	ACA 46*
1994 G	191	Abolish Justice Courts	Legislative Constitutional Amendment	1993-94	SCA 7*
1996 G	204	Safe, clean, reliable water supply act	Bond Act	1995-96	SB 900*
1996 G	205	Youthful & adult offender local facilities bond act of 1996	Bond Act	1995-96	AB 3116*
1996 G	206	Veterans' bond act of 1996	Bond Act	1995-96	SB 852*
1996 G	210	Living wage act of 1996. Minimum wage increase	Initiative statute#	1997-98	AB 1184
1996 G	213	Limitation recovery: felons, uninsured motorists, drunk drivers	Initiative statute#	1995-96	AB 432
1996 G	215	Compassionate Use Act of 1996. Medical use of marijuana	Initiative statute#	1993-94	SB 1364
1996 G	217	Local control & fiscal responsibility Act.	Initiative statute#	1997-98	AB 83
1998 G	1	Property taxes: Contaminated property	Legislative Constitutional Amendment	1997-98	ACA 22*
1998 G	2	Transportation Funding	Legislative Constitutional Amendment	1997-98	ACA 30*
1998 G	3	Partisan presidential primary elections	Legislative Initiative Amendment	1997-98	SB 1505
1998 G	9	Electric utilities. Assessments. Bonds	Initiative statute#	1995-96	AB 1890*
1998 G	11	Local sales and use taxes - revenue sharing	Legislative Constitutional Amendment	1997-98	ACA 10*
1998 G	1A	Class size Reduction Kindergarten-University	Bond Act	1997-98	SB 50*
1998 P	219	Ballot measures Application.	Legislative Constitutional Amendment	1995-96	SCA 18*
1998 P	220	Courts. Superior & municipal court consolidation	Legislative Constitutional Amendment	1995-96	SCA 4*
1998 P	221	Subordinate judicial officers. Discipline	Legislative Constitutional Amendment	1995-96	SCA 19*

1998 P	222	Murder. Peace officer victim. Sentence credits	Legislative Initiative Amendment	1997-98	AB 446
1998 P	227	English language in public schools	Initiative statute#	1997-98	SB 6*
2000 G	32	Veterans' Bond Act of 2000	Bond Act	1999-00	AB 2305*
2000 G	33	Legislature. Participation in Public Employees' Retirement.	Legislative Constitutional Amendment	1999-00	ACA 12*
2000 G	34	Campaign Contributions and Spending. Limits. Disclosure.	Legislative Initiative Amendment	1999-00	SB 1223
2000 P	12	Parks, Clean Water, Clean Air and Coastal Protection 2000	Bond Act	1999-00	AB 18*
2000 P	13	Drinking Water, Water, Watershed and Flood Protection	Bond Act	1999-00	AB 1584*
2000 P	14	California Reading, Literacy Improvement and Library	Bond Act	1999-00	SB 3*
2000 P	15	The Hertzberg-Polanco Crime Laboratories	Bond Act	1999-00	AB 1391*
2000 P	16	Veterans Homes Bond Act of 2000.	Bond Act	1999-00	SB 630*
2000 P	17	Lotteries. Charitable Raffles.	Legislative Constitutional Amendment	1999-00	SCA 4*
2000 P	18	Murder: Special Circumstances.	Legislative Initiative Amendment	1997-98	SB 1878
2000 P	19	Murder. BART and CSU Peace Officers	Legislative Initiative Amendment	1997-98	SB 1690
2000 P	20	California State Lottery. Allocation Instructional Materials	Legislative Initiative Amendment	1997-98	AB 1453
2000 P	26	School Facilities. Local Majority Vote. Bonds, Taxes	Initiative Constitutional Amendment	1997-98	ACA 5*
2000 P	29	1998 Indian Gaming Compacts.*	Petition Referendum	1997-98	SB 287
2000 P	30	Insurance Claims Practices. Civil Remedies.*	Petition Referendum	1999-00	SB 1237
2000 P	31	Insurance Claims Practices. Civil Remedy Amendments.*	Petition Referendum	1999-00	AB 1309
2000 P	1A	Gambling on Tribal Lands.	Legislative Constitutional Amendment	1999-00	SCA 11*
2002 G	46	Housing and Emergency Shelter Trust Fund Act of 2002	Bond Act	2001-02	SB 1227*
2002 G	47	Kindergarten-University Public Education Facilities f 2002	Bond Act	2001-02	AB 16*
2002 G	48	Court Consolidation	Legislative Constitutional Amendment	2001-02	ACA 15*
2004 G	59	Public Records, Open Meetings	Legislative Constitutional Amendment	2003-04	SCA 1
2004 G	60	Election Rights of Political Parties	Legislative Constitutional Amendment	2003-04	SCA 18
2004 G	71	Stem Cell Research. Funding. Bonds	Initiative Const. Amend. and Statute#	2001-02	SB 253
2004 G	72	Health Care Coverage Requirements*	Petition Referendum	2003-04	SB 2
2004 G	1A	Protection of Local Government Revenues	Legislative Constitutional Amendment	2003-04	SCA 4
2006 G	83	The Sexual Predator, Jessica's Law.	Initiative Statute#	2005-06	SB 1128
2006 G	87	The Clean Alternative Energy Act.	Initiative Statute#	2007-08	AB 118
2006 G	1A	Transportation Funding Protection	Legislative Constitutional Amendment	2005-06	SCA 7
2006 G	1B	Highway Safety, Traffic, Air Quality, Port Security 2006	Bond Act	2005-06	SB 1266
2006 G	1C	Housing and Emergency Shelter Trust Fund Act of 2006	Bond Act	2005-06	SB 1689

2006 G	1D	Kindergarten-University Public Education Facilities 2006	Bond Act	2005-06	AB 127
2006 G	1E	Disaster Preparedness and Flood Prevention 2006	Bond Act	2005-06	AB 140
2006 P	81	Reading, Literacy, and Library Construction and 2006.	Bond Act	2003-04	SB 1161
2006 P	82	Preschool Education Income Tax Over \$400,000.	Initiative Const. Amend. and Statute#	2005-06	AB 172
2008 G	3	Children's Hospital Bond Act. Grant Program	Initiative Statute#	2007-08	AB 10
2008 G	7	Renewable Energy Generation	Initiative Statute#	2007-08	SB 411
2008 G	8	Eliminates Right of Same-Sex Couples to Marry	Initiative Constitutional Amendment	2007-08	AB 43
2008 G	11	Redistricting.	Initiative Constitutional Amendment	2005-06	SCA 3
2008 G	12	Veterans' Bond Act of 2008	Bond Act	2007-08	SB 1572
2008 G	1A	Safe, Reliable High-Speed Passenger Train Bond Act	Bond Act	2007-08	AB 3034
2008 P	94	Amendment to Indian Gaming Compact: Pechanga*	Petition Referendum	2007-08	SB 903
2008 P	95	Amendment to Indian Gaming Compact: Morongo*	Petition Referendum	2007-08	SB 174
2008 P	96	Amendment to Indian Gaming Compact: Sycuan*	Petition Referendum	2007-08	SB 175
2008 P	97	Amendment to Indian Gaming Compact: Agua Caliente*	Petition Referendum	2007-08	SB 957
2008 P	99	Eminent Domain. Limits for Owner-Occupied Residence	Initiative Constitutional Amendment	2007-08	ACA 8

Notes. A ‘#’ next to the proposition type designates that proposition type as citizen sponsored so that the text of the initiative may not exactly match the text of the legislative bill. All other propositions refer to specific bills and so the implications of the referenda and the legislation are identical. An ‘*’ next to the legislative bill identifies bills that require a two-thirds vote of the legislative membership, typically because the bill was an urgency status requiring immediate implementation or a bond act. Individual links are not available for 1992 and 1994 propositions, but the summary of all propositions in those years can be found at <http://lalaw.lib.ca.us/research/ballots/1990/1992.aspx> and <http://lalaw.lib.ca.us/research/ballots/1990/1994.aspx>, respectively.

Table 2: Summaries of Mandatory and Petition Referenda

Mandatory Referenda		
Prop	Leg. Bill	Legislation Summary
155	SB 34	Authorizes a statewide general obligation (GO) bond election in the amount of nine hundred million dollars (\$900,000,000) for the construction and renovation of public education facilities.
157	SCA 27	Amends the State Constitution to ban toll collection on state toll roads and highways leased to private entities after tolls have been collected for thirty-five years or on expiration of the lease.
158	SCA 33	Amends the State Constitution to establish the Office of California Analyst, replacing the Legislative Analyst's Office.
159	SCA 34	Establishes the Office of the Auditor General in the State Constitution.
160	ACA 40	Amends the State Constitution to expand the property tax exemption to include the homes of unmarried surviving spouses of persons who died while on active military duty from a service-related injury or disease.
183	SCA 38	Amends the State Constitution to allow a recall election to be conducted within 180 days (rather than 60 to 80 days) of the date of certification of sufficient signatures.
189	ACA 37	Amends the State Constitution to permit the denial of bail to persons accused of committing felony sexual assault, adding this crime to others excepted from right to bail.
190	ACA 46	Amends the State Constitution to transfer the authority to remove or discipline judges from the California Supreme Court to the Commission on Judicial Performance.
191	SCA 7	Amends the State Constitution to eliminate justice courts by elevating them to municipal courts; all justice court judges would become full-time municipal court judges.
204	SB 900	Authorizes a statewide general obligation (GO) bond election in the amount of nine hundred ninety-five million dollars (\$995,000,000) for water supply / conservation, local flood control / prevention, and fish / wildlife protection.
205	AB 3116	Authorizes a statewide general obligation (GO) bond election in the amount of seven hundred million (\$700,000,000) for the construction and renovation of juvenile and adult correctional facilities.
206	SB 852	Authorizes a statewide general obligation (GO) bond election in the amount of four hundred million dollars (\$400,000,000) for the Cal-Vet program, which provides farm and home aid for California veterans.
1	ACA 22	Permits property owners to transfer their current assessed value to a replacement property within their county if the original property was environmentally contaminated.
2	ACA 30	Permits loans from transportation funds to the state General Fund only if the loan is repaid in the same budget year.

3	SB 1505	Limits candidate selection in primary elections to registered party members (i.e., closed partisan primaries).
11	ACA 10	Authorizes local governments to voluntarily enter into sales tax revenue-sharing agreements with a two-thirds vote of each affected jurisdiction's governing body.
1A	SB 50	Authorizes a statewide general obligation (GO) bond election in the amount of nine billion two hundred million dollars (\$9,200,000,000) for the construction of K-12 schools and higher education facilities in order to relieve overcrowding and reduce class size.
219	SCA 18	Requires that ballot measures apply in the same way in all parts of the jurisdiction affected by the measures, regardless of how any individual part of that jurisdiction voted.
220	SCA 4	Permits superior and municipal courts to consolidate their operations into one unified superior court upon a majority vote of each municipal and superior court judges.
221	SCA 19	Grants the Commission on Judicial Performance discretionary authority regarding the oversight and discipline of subordinate judicial officers.
222	AB 446	Sets a prison sentence of 25 years to life for the second degree murder of a peace officer and life without parole if the murder is committed intentionally.
32	AB 2305	Authorizes a statewide general obligation (GO) bond election in the amount of five hundred million dollars (\$500,000,000) for farm and home aid for California veterans.
33	ACA 12	Amends the State Constitution to permit legislators to obtain retirement benefits via participation in the state Public Employees' Retirement System (PERS).
34	SB 1223	Establishes new contribution and voluntary spending limits for state elective offices; individual campaign contributions per election: state legislature (\$3,000), statewide elective office (\$5,000), and governor (\$20,000).
12	AB 18	Authorizes a statewide general obligation (GO) bond election in the amount of two billion one hundred million dollars (\$2,100,000,000) for environmental protection, wildlife conservation, and improvements to state and local parks.
13	AB 1584	Authorizes a statewide general obligation (GO) bond election in the amount of one billion nine hundred seventy million dollars (\$1,970,000,000) to finance a safe drinking water, water quality, flood protection, and water reliability program.
14	SB 3	Authorizes a statewide general obligation (GO) bond election in the amount of three hundred fifty million dollars (\$350,000,000) for the construction and renovation of public library facilities.
15	AB 1391	Authorizes a statewide general obligation (GO) bond election in the amount of two hundred twenty million dollars (\$220,000,000) to construct new local forensic laboratories and remodel existing ones.
16	SB 630	Authorizes a statewide general obligation (GO) bond election in the amount of fifty million dollars (\$50,000,000) to fund the design and construction of veterans' homes and complete a comprehensive renovation of the Veterans' Home at Yountville.
17	SCA 4	Amends the State Constitution to allow private nonprofit organizations to conduct raffles if at least 90% of the gross receipts go directly to charitable purposes.

18	SB 1878	Sets a prison sentence of death or life without parole (rather than 25 years to life) for first degree murderers who killed a victim "by means of lying in wait" or if arson / kidnapping was involved.
19	SB 1690	Expands the scope of peace officer categories to include Bay Area Rapid Transit, California State University, and University of California peace officers such that certain provisions regarding peace officers becomes applicable to these individuals.
20	AB 1453	Provides that 50% of any increase in California State Lottery revenues above the amount allocated in fiscal year 1997-1998 must be spend on instructional materials for K-14 public schools.
1A	SCA 11	Amends the State Constitution to permit certain Class III games (e.g., lotteries, slot machines, and banked card games) on Indian tribal lands; authorizes the governor to enter into gambling compacts with Indian tribes.
46	SB 1227	Authorizes a statewide general obligation (GO) bond election in the amount of two billion one hundred million dollars (\$2,100,000,000) for twenty-one housing programs such as emergency shelters and low-income housing for seniors, amongst others.
47	AB 16	Authorizes two statewide general obligation (GO) bond elections, one in 2002 and one in 2004, in the amounts of \$13,050,000,000 and \$12,300,000,000, respectively, for the construction and renovation of public education facilities (K-12 and higher education).
48	ACA 15	Amends the State Constitution to eliminate language pertaining to municipal courts, which are obsolete due to the consolidation of superior and municipal courts into unified superior courts.
59	SCA 1	Amends the State Constitution to provide public access to government information.
60	SCA 18	Permits voters to vote for partisan candidates in primary elections regardless of how they are registered and provides that candidates who received the highest vote among its party's candidates would be placed on the ballot; requires that proceeds from the sale of surplus state property be used to repay bonds issued under the Economic Recovery Bond Act.
1A	SCA 4	Amends the State Constitution protect the property tax revenues of local governments i.e., restricts state authority over local government revenue.
1A	SCA 7	Amends the State Constitution to limit the use of gasoline sales tax revenues for non-transportation purposes when the state experiences fiscal difficulties.
1B	SB 1266	Authorizes a statewide general obligation (GO) bond election in the amount of nineteen billion nine hundred twenty-five million dollars (\$19,925,000,000) for transportation improvement projects.
1C	SB 1689	Authorizes a statewide general obligation (GO) bond election in the amount of two billion eight hundred fifty million dollars (\$2,850,000,000) for a variety of housing and development programs.
1D	AB 127	Authorizes a statewide general obligation (GO) bond election in the amount of ten billion four hundred sixteen million dollars (\$10,416,000,000) for the renovation and upgrade of public education facilities (K-12 and higher education).
1E	AB 140	Authorizes a statewide general obligation (GO) bond election in the amount of four billion ninety million dollars (\$4,090,000,000) for disaster preparedness and flood prevention projects.
81	SB 1161	Authorizes a statewide general obligation (GO) bond election in the amount of six hundred million dollars (\$600,000,000) for the construction and renovation of public library facilities.

12	SB 1572	Authorizes a statewide general obligation (GO) bond election in the amount of nine hundred million dollars (\$900,000,000) for the Cal-Vet program, which provides farm and home aid for California veterans.
1A	AB 3034	Authorizes a statewide general obligation (GO) bond election in the amount of nine billion nine hundred fifty million dollars (\$9,950,000,000) for the construction of a high-speed intercity passenger train system in California.
Petition Referenda		
29	SB 287	Ratifies eleven tribal-state gaming compacts which permit certain types of gambling on Indian tribal lands; Class III games such as lotteries, slot machines, and horse race wagering are prohibited.
30	SB 1237	Permits third-party claimants the right to sue an insurance company for unfair claim practices in certain liability cases; creates a binding arbitration system for settling the cases.
31	AB 1309	Limits the rights of third-party claimants to sue an insurance company for unfair claim practices.
72	SB 2	Requires that certain employers provide health insurance to their employees, either through a fee to a state-based system or by arranging directly with insurance providers.
94	SB 903	Amends the gaming compact between the Luiseño Indians and the state government to allow the tribe to operate more slot machines in return for paying the state a higher percentage of proceeds.
95	SB 174	Amends the gaming compact between the Mission Indians and the state government to allow the tribe to operate more slot machines in return for paying the state a higher percentage of proceeds.
96	SB 175	Amends the gaming compact between the Kumeyaay Indians and the state government to allow the tribe to operate more slot machines in return for paying the state a higher percentage of proceeds.
97	SB 957	Amends the gaming compact between the Cahuila Indians and the state government to allow the tribe to operate more slot machines in return for paying the state a higher percentage of proceeds.

Table 3: Summaries of Initiatives (Non-Mandatory) and Senate/Assembly Versions of Bills

Prop	Leg. Bill	Initiative Summary	Assembly Summary	Senate Summary
163*	AB 2181	Amends the State Constitution to prohibit the imposition of sales and use taxes on certain food products (e.g., candy, snack food, and bottled water).	Imposes an 8.25% sales and use tax on certain food products that had previously been exempt from such taxes (e.g., candy, snack food, and bottled water).	Imposes an 8.25% sales and use tax on certain food products that had previously been exempt from such taxes (e.g., candy, snack food, and bottled water).
166	AB 2001	Requires employers to provide health care coverage for most employees and their dependents.	Requires employers to provide health care coverage for most employees and their dependents.	N/A
184	AB 971	Increases prison sentences for convicted felons who have prior convictions for violent or serious offenses: one prior conviction results in twice the normal sentence; two priors result in an indeterminate life sentence.	Increases prison sentences for convicted felons who have prior convictions for violent or serious offenses: one prior conviction results in twice the normal sentence; two priors result in an indeterminate life sentence.	Increases prison sentences for convicted felons who have prior convictions for violent or serious offenses: one prior conviction results in twice the normal sentence; two priors result in an indeterminate life sentence.
186	SB 308	Establishes a "single payer" health care system in which the State of California would administer and finance health care coverage; replaces most private and public health care programs.	Institutes comprehensive government health insurance; benefits would include—but not be limited to—hospitalization coverage, prescription drugs, and elderly care, amongst others.	Institutes comprehensive government health insurance; benefits would include—but not be limited to—hospitalization coverage, prescription drugs, and elderly care, amongst others.
188	AB 996	Establishes statewide regulations governing the sale, use, and possession of tobacco products, replacing existing local and state tobacco laws; precludes local regulation in this area in the future.	Establishes statewide regulations governing the sale, use, and possession of tobacco products but does not replace more restrictive local prohibitions already in place as of April, 1993; precludes local regulation in this area in the future.	N/A
210	AB 1184	Increases the state hourly minimum wage \$5.00 per hour on March 1, 1997, and then to \$5.75 per hour on March 1,	N/A	Increases the state hourly minimum wage to \$6.50 per hour on March 1, 1999.

		1998.		
213	AB 432	Prohibits a person convicted of a felony from suing to recover any losses suffered in commission of the crime.	Prohibits a person convicted of a felony from suing to recover any losses suffered in commission of the crime.	N/A
215	SB 1364	Exempts patients and caregivers from criminal laws which prohibit marijuana possession / cultivation if the marijuana use is recommended by a physician to treat a medical condition.	Classifies marijuana as a Schedule II drug (i.e., a highly regulated drug with a medical purpose).	Classifies marijuana as a Schedule II drug (i.e., a highly regulated drug with a medical purpose).
217	AB 83	Retroactively reinstates and raises top marginal tax rates from 9.3% to 10% and 11%; allocates the money from this tax increase to schools and local governments.	Raises top marginal tax rates from 9.3% to 10 and 11%. The law also creates a refundable California Earned Income Tax Credit and creates a non-refundable income tax credit for annual community college fees for qualifying students.	N/A
9*	AB 1890	Prohibits private utility companies from charging customers (1) for the cost of nuclear power plants, and (2) the extra fees for repaying bonds sold to finance an existing 10% rate reduction. Also requires an additional rate reduction of 10%.	Requires private utility companies to make a 10% reduction in electricity rates for customers over a 4-year period but permits these companies to charge customers (1) for the cost of nuclear power plants, and (2) the extra fees for repaying bonds sold to finance the 10% rate reduction.	Requires private utility companies to make a 10% reduction in electricity rates for customers over a 4-year period but permits these companies to charge customers (1) for the cost of nuclear power plants, and (2) the extra fees for repaying bonds sold to finance the 10% rate reduction.
227*	SB 6	Requires all public school instruction be conducted in English and removes most bilingual classes.	Establishes a program in the school system to aid in developing English language skills; designates students either "English proficient pupils" or "English learners."	Establishes a program in the school system to aid in developing English language skills; designates students either "English proficient pupils" or "English learners."
26	ACA 5	Permits school facilities bond measures to be approved by a simple majority vote; allows property taxes to exceed the current 1% limit in order to repay the bonds.	Permits school facilities bond measures to be approved by a simple majority vote; allows property taxes to exceed the current 1% limit in order to repay the bonds.	N/A

71	SB 253	Establishes a constitutional right to conduct stem cell research and authorizes the issuance of \$3 billion in state general obligation bonds to fund this research.	Permits the use of human embryonic stem cells for research purposes.	Permits the use of human embryonic stem cells for research purposes.
83	SB 1128	Increases penalties for violent sex offenders and provides a system for the electronic monitoring of sex offenders released from prison.	Increases penalties for violent sex offenders and sets record-keeping requirements with respect to the registration of sex offenders.	Increases penalties for violent sex offenders and sets record-keeping requirements with respect to the registration of sex offenders.
87	AB 118	Imposes a tax on oil production for a \$4 billion program to develop and promote alternative energy technologies.	Establishes the Enhanced Fleet Modernization Program and the Air Quality Improvement Program; provides funding for alternative and renewable fuels programs.	Establishes the Enhanced Fleet Modernization Program and the Air Quality Improvement Program; provides funding for alternative and renewable fuels programs.
82	AB 172	Establishes a voluntary preschool program for all four-year old children to be funded by a 1.7% tax on individual incomes above \$400,000 (\$800,000 for couples).	Establishes a voluntary preschool-for-all system that would only become operative if funding is subsequently provided under statewide initiative.#	N/A
3	AB 10	Provides a bond issue of nine hundred eighty million dollars (\$980,000,000) for the construction and renovation of children's hospitals.	Provides a bond issue of nine hundred eighty million dollars (\$980,000,000) for the construction and renovation of children's hospitals.#	N/A
7	SB 411	Requires private and public utilities to generate 20% of their power from renewable energy by 2010, 40% by 2020, and 50% by 2025.	N/A	Requires retail sellers of electricity to generate 20% of their power from renewable energy by 2010 and 33% by 2020.
8*	AB 43	Amends the State Constitution to eliminate the right of same-sex couples to marry; only marriage between a man and a woman is valid or recognized in	Provides that marriage is a personal relation arising out of a civil contract between two persons; eliminates the "different-gender" requirement in the	Provides that marriage is a personal relation arising out of a civil contract between two persons; eliminates the "different-gender" requirement in the

		California.	state's definition of marriage.	state's definition of marriage.
11	SCA 3	Amends the State Constitution to shift authority for establishing state legislature and Board of Equalization district boundaries from elected state representatives to a 14-member citizens' commission.	N/A	Amends the State Constitution to shift authority for establishing U.S. Congress, state legislature, and Board of Equalization district boundaries from elected state representatives to an 11-member citizens' commission.
99	ACA 8	Prohibits government takings of single-family homes for the purpose of transferring them to private parties.	Prohibits government takings of single-family homes for the purpose of transferring them to private parties.	NA

Notes. An ‘*’ next to the proposition identifies bills where the effect of the legislation is the opposite of the effect of the proposition. A ‘#’ identified legislative bills where an initial floor vote was used instead of the final floor vote.

Table 4: Relationship between Legislator Vote and Constituent Vote

Outcome:	Vote Yes	Vote Liberal	Vote Liberal	Vote Liberal	Vote Liberal	Vote Liberal	Vote Liberal	Vote Liberal	Vote Liberal
Majority of District Voters Voting Yes	0.307*** (0.016)								
Majority of District Voters Voting Liberal		0.530*** (0.012)	0.483*** (0.014)	0.565*** (0.016)	0.581*** (0.053)	0.463*** (0.015)	0.511*** (0.017)	0.559*** (0.015)	0.554*** (0.021)
N	7813	7813	6405	5994	232	4589	3172	4798	2312
Sample:	Full Sample	Full Sample	More partisan bills	Mandatory Matches	Citizens vote before the legislators	Democratic Legislators	Republican Legislators	Assembly Bills Voted on by Both Chambers	Senate Bills Voted on by Both Chambers

Notes. Each column shows the coefficient from a regression of a binary on how the legislator votes on a binary variable for whether a majority of district voters cast their ballots for yes (the liberal side) on the associated ballot proposition. The first column contains estimates based on a yes/no coding of the legislative and popular vote and the second column contains estimates using the liberal/conservative coding of these pairs. The third column is estimated on the subsample of votes for which we have the most confidence in our liberal/conservative coding. The fourth column is estimated on the subsample in which the match between bill and proposition is exact because the ballot proposition was based on a specific piece of legislation. The fifth column includes only the vote pairs in which the ballot proposition vote occurred before the legislative vote. The last four columns examine subsamples based on legislator’s party and chamber. Robust standard errors clustered by legislator/chamber in parentheses. Finally, *** denotes significance at the one percent level.