

OFFICE OF
THE CITY ATTORNEY
CITY OF SAN DIEGO

Michael J. Aguirre
CITY ATTORNEY

1200 THIRD AVENUE, SUITE 1620
SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA 92101-4178
TELEPHONE (619) 236-6220
FAX (619) 236-7215

November 2, 2007

**REPORT TO THE COMMITTEE ON RULES, FINANCE
AND INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS**

**CITY BALLOT MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTERS ARE SUBJECT TO THE
SEPARATE VOTE (SINGLE SUBJECT) RULE**

INTRODUCTION

The San Diego City Council Rules, Open Government, and Intergovernmental Relations Committee is scheduled to consider the final report of the 2007 San Diego Charter Review Committee, issued on October 4, 2007 [CRC Report]. The report proposes that the City Council submit a series of amendments to the voters during 2008. CRC Report at 8-9. The report broadly separates the changes into three major groups: interim strong mayor and legislative tightening; financial reform and the Kroll report; and duties of elected officials. This Office anticipates the Committee and the Council may request advice on whether these measures may be combined in a single ballot measure. This Report discusses the requirement that each measure submitted to voters address only a single subject so that each subject may be voted on separately.

DISCUSSION

I. The Separate Vote and Single Subject Rules.

The separate vote rule is expressed in the last sentence of Article XVIII, section 1 of the California constitution, which provides: "Each amendment [to the state constitution] shall be so prepared and submitted that it can be voted on separately." Although this provision has existed in one form or another in the state constitution since 1879,¹ it was only in 2006 that the California Supreme Court interpreted its scope and construction. In *Californians for an Open Primary v. McPherson*, 38 Cal. 4th 735 (2006) [*McPherson*], the court decided the separate vote rule limited the authority of the state legislature to package disparate proposed constitutional amendments in a single measure, and that it should be construed consistently with single subject rule, a kindred provision governing voter-originated constitutional initiatives under Article II, section 8(d) of the constitution. *Id.* at 738.

¹ The 1879 version provided: "Should more than one amendment be submitted at the same election, they shall be so prepared and distinguished, by numbers or otherwise, that each can be voted on separately." *Id.* at 747.

Both the separate vote rule and the single subject rule serve the same purpose—to bar submission of measures that “might cause voter confusion or might constitute ‘logrolling’- that is, the practice of combining two or more unrelated provisions in one measure, thereby forcing a single take-it-or-leave-it vote on matters that properly should be voted upon separately.” *Id.* at 749 (citations omitted) and 765-766. The goal in classic logrolling is to bundle a provision attractive to the voters with one that is less attractive, “simply to increase the likelihood that the proponent’s desired proposal will be adopted.” *Senate of the State of Cal. v. Jones*, 21 Cal. 4th 1142, 1151 (1999).

II. Charter Measures Submitted by the City Council to the Voters Are Subject to the Separate Vote (Single Subject) Rule.

Courts have not yet determined that the separate vote rule of the California Constitution is a matter of statewide concern, applicable to the submission of charter amendments to city voters by their legislative bodies. In San Diego’s case, the wait for such decision is unnecessary because the Charter requires the City Council to comply with the separate vote rule in submitting charter amendments to the voters.

Charter section 223 was adopted with the 1931 City Charter. It provides the Charter “be amended in accordance with the provisions of Section Eight, Article Eleven, of the Constitution of the State of California, or any amendment thereof or provision substituted therefor in the State Constitution.” The 1931 version of Article XI, section 8 of the California Constitution, incorporated by section 223 of the City Charter, permitted city legislative bodies to submit multiple proposals to amend a City charter that were “. . . to be voted upon by the electors separately. . . .” Former Cal. Const. Art XI § 8 (Cal. Stats. 1931).²

The virtually identical language of these provisions indicates the intent to incorporate the separate vote rule from the California constitution into the City Charter, making it applicable to charter amendments submitted by the City Council to the voters. This interpretation is also consistent with Charter section 275(b) that requires City ordinances: “. . . shall be confined to one subject, and the subject or subjects of all ordinances shall be clearly expressed in the title,”³ and section 27.0503 of the San Diego Municipal Code, requiring the City Council to “decide by ordinance the content of the ballot question for each ballot measure. . . .”

² The full sentence in former Article XI, section 8 refers both to amendments proposed by the legislative body and the electors. It provides: “In submitting any such charter or amendment separate provisions, whether alternative or conflicting, or one included in the other, may be submitted at the same time *to be voted on by the electors separately*, and, as between those so related, if more than one receive a majority of votes, the proposition receiving the larger number of votes shall control as to all matters in conflict.”

³ Superseded Charter section 16 also provides: “All ordinances . . . shall be confined to one subject, and the subject or subjects of all ordinances shall be clearly expressed in the title.”

III. The “Reasonably Germane” Test.

The test of whether a particular measure submitted to the voters meets or violates the separate vote rule is the same test used to determine a violation of the single subject rule. *McPherson*, 38 Cal. 4th at 763. The court construes both in an “accommodating and lenient manner so as not to unduly restrict the Legislature’s or the people’s right to package provisions in a single bill or initiative.” *Id.* at 764.

The court has “found the single subject rules to have been satisfied so long as challenged provisions meet the test of being reasonably germane to a common theme, purpose, or subject.” *Ibid.* The court went on to note that, “[i]n setting forth the ‘reasonably germane’ test, several of our prior decisions have stated or repeated language suggesting the standard requires that each of a measure’s parts be reasonably germane *to one another* as well as reasonably germane *to a common theme, purpose, or subject*. . . . In *applying* the reasonably germane test, however, our decisions uniformly have considered only whether each of the parts of a measure is reasonably germane to a common theme, purpose, or subject, and have not *separately* or *additionally* required that each part also be reasonably germane to one another.” *Id.* at 764 n. 29. (citations omitted, emphasis in original.)

Examples of measures that have and have not met this test include:

- In *McPherson*, the California Supreme Court held a two-part legislatively sponsored measure violated the separate vote rule because each part was not reasonably germane to the other. *McPherson*, 38 Cal. 4th at 779. One part of the measure proposed a constitutional amendment to require that a political party’s top vote-getter in a primary election be permitted to run in the following general election. The second part proposed a constitutional amendment to provide a new means for the state to pay bond obligations. *Id.* at 739. The scheme was described as “classic logrolling.” *McPherson*, 38 Cal. 4th at 791 (Moreno, J., concurring).
- The California Supreme Court upheld Proposition 8, known as the Victims’ Bill of Rights, against a single-subject challenge. The Court held each of its several facets was reasonably germane to the general subject of promoting the rights of actual or potential crime victims. The court also cautioned that initiative proponents did not have a blank check to draft measures containing unduly diverse or extensive provisions bearing no reasonable relationship to each other or a general object. *Brosnahan v. Brown*, 32 Cal. 3d 236, 246-253 (1982).
- A trailer bill that amended, repealed or added approximately 150 sections to over 20 codes had as its single subject “fiscal affairs” or “statutory adjustments” and was too broad to comply. *Harbor v. Deukmejian*, 43 Cal. 3d 1078, 1100-1101 (1987).

- A proposed initiative to restrict legislative salaries and transfer reapportionment from the Legislature to the Supreme Court could not be upheld under the general subject of voter involvement or voter approval of political issues. *Senate of the State of Cal.*, 21 Cal. 4th at 1162-1163.

CONCLUSION

Our Office will provide advice as to whether any proposed measure might meet the separate vote test when the Council decides which proposed charter amendments should go to the voters. This Office recommends the Committee and Council keep in mind the purpose behind the separate vote rule, namely, to prevent voter confusion and to avoid “logrolling,” when considering whether certain measures should be considered separately or together by the voters.

Respectfully submitted,

MICHAEL J. AGUIRRE
City Attorney

JAK:als
RC-2007-17