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<Summary>
This research material consists of a chronology of mainly statewide initiatives and referenda on nuclear power generation and deals with some other related issues such as renewable energy in the United States, mainly from the 1970s to date. Some temporal hypotheses which emerged from this chronology are that, the majority of people are afraid of a shortage of energy and job losses, are concerned about high level radioactive nuclear waste, think that an investor-owned utility should take responsibility for its own investment failure instead of passing its losses to ratepayers, have a tendency to oppose tax increases, have a tendency of preferring that their voice be heard in policy making. However, these hypotheses should be analyzed in detail through voter’s pamphlets.
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1 Preface
This research material consists of a chronology of mainly statewide initiatives and referenda on nuclear power generation and deals with some other related issues such as energy policy in the United States mainly from the 1970s to date. This excludes initiatives and referenda relating to nuclear weapons\(^1\). I made this chronology as a stepping stone for future research regarding the public sphere of nuclear power generation policy.
Throughout the world, nuclear power generation has been controversial in relation to the risk of severe accidents, health risks to local residents, disposal of high level radioactive waste over tens of thousands of years, the industry’s long and expensive history of taxpayer subsidies and excessive charges to utility ratepayers, and the potential ability to manufacturing nuclear weapons.

Japan is no exception. Particularly after the tragic accident at Fukushima Daiichi nuclear power plant in 2011, the direction of energy policy and the problems of vertically integrated power businesses with a regional monopoly have become the main target of interests and arguments not only among politicians and bureaucrats of the Agency for Natural Resources and Energy in the Ministry of Economy, Trade and Industry, but also among consumers of electric power who lead their lives surrounded by all kinds of electric appliances, also among residents around the nuclear power plants, and, of course, in the various industries which rely on electric power. Furthermore, a sizable number of people have raised the question of who has been making decisions on energy policy in Japan. As the reality of the policy dominance of the so called “Japan’s nuclear power village” becomes clearer through coverage by various media, some people have raised the question of why lay-citizens have not been able to have an influential voice on the policy in this field. Some have started referendum campaigns in big cities like Tokyo and Osaka to decide whether Tokyo Electric Power Co. and Kansai Electric Power Co. should be allowed to run nuclear plants. Besides these movements, residents living near nuclear power plants which are considered to have the risk of being hit by big earthquakes have started seeking local referenda in Shizuoka and Niigata prefectures. In December 2012, the citizen group, “Let’s Decide Together / Citizen-initiated National Referendum” began a petition seeking signatures for a national referendum. None of these petitions were successful and no referenda have yet been realized since the Fukushima accident.

It is well-known that the western states of the United States have had a political tradition of direct democracy since the “Progressive era” of more than a century ago. At that time, given the obvious corruption in state governments, the lack of sovereign public control over the output of state legislatures was seen as the fundamental defect in the nation’s legislative machinery. In order to realize the idea of the Founding Fathers of the nation, a number of people thought that the way to change this situation was to take back the people’s ultimate sovereign power through Initiative and Referendum, two methods of direct lawmaking by the people.

Although at federal level, the previous and present government’s nuclear power
generation policy have not much differed, at state level, particularly in several states in the west where the tradition of self-governance is strong and where there are the political institutions of initiatives and referenda, people have been asked repeatedly whether they would allow a utility to construct a new nuclear power plant or not, and whether they would allow a nuclear power plant to keep operating or not. As a stepping stone for future research on the “public sphere of nuclear power generation policy”, I made this chronology, which I am sure reveals what were the major issues concerning nuclear power generation for ordinary people, and what was decided as the will of a majority of residents.

The temporal hypotheses that emerged from this chronology are as follows: 1) It seems that many people tend to think that they should not put off the problem of the disposal of high-level radioactive waste, and that the federal government must make a decision on how and where the nuclear waste should be disposed of, prior to the construction of a nuclear power plant. 2) A majority of people think that the utilities should naturally take financial risks as businesses when they make huge investments in nuclear power plants, and not transfer losses to ratepayers when investments fails. 3) Many people are concerned about what happens if a power plant’s operation stops. They are naturally worried about a shortage of electricity, the closure of workplaces, and the loss of jobs. 4) Many people tend to prefer to voice their concerns in advance of a certain particular decision when they have been successfully persuaded by one side of a particular political decision that would greatly affect and may change their lives. 5) Many people’s attitudes towards renewable energy are ambiguous when it is estimated that there will be an increase in both a company’s tax burden and also the tax burden of a household. However, these hypotheses must be confirmed more clearly by analysis of material like voters’ pamphlets or voters’ guides, which tell us the claims of both sides regarding the pros and cons of a ballot measure in detail.

2 Chronology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year. Month. Date. State’s Name</th>
<th>Ballot Measure (title, content, result ) and other related items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1930.11.4. Washington</td>
<td>Initiative Measure to the Legislature No.1: Washington Public Utility Districts, was approved: the measure authorized the creation of public utility districts to produce and distribute water and electricity, empowered such districts to levy taxes and defined the powers and duties of such districts. Yes: 53.8% (152,487) No: 46.2% (130,901). (BP) (WashingtonVP)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1934.11.6. Oregon  
Measure 1, *the Grange Power Bill* as a veto referendum was defeated. (BP). Yes: 124,518 No: 139,382. (Oregon Blue Books). The purpose was to provide for the state to acquire and develop water power and hydroelectric energy. All such property exempted from taxation; creating an elective nonpartisan commission of three members for managing such business. (Oregon VP)

1936.11.3. Washington  
Amendments to the Constitution proposed by the legislature as House Joint Resolution 10 known as Washington *Public Energy Amendment*, was defeated. It would have authorized the state to engage in the production and distribution of electric energy. Yes: 38.4% (173,930) No: 61.6% (278,543). (BP) (Washington VP)

1972. California  
California People’s Lobby with $9,000 and about 50 dedicated volunteers succeeded in getting *the Clean Environment (Air) Initiative* on the ballot as proposition 9, but failed in passing as a law. (People's Lobby) [the initiative called for a five year construction moratorium, and it failed, but the campaign became a turning point in California's environmentalist perceptions.](Schmidt:63)

1973-74. California  
Richard B. Spoon, director of the California Citizen Action Group drafted an anti-nuclear power Initiative, representing CCAG, the People's Lobby, the Sierra club, and Friends of the Earth. It proposed to allow nuclear power "only if it can be proven safe". The federation of American Scientists endorsed it, and several celebrities including the actor Jack Lemmon joined the campaign. (Schmidt:64-65)

1974. Western Region  
As a result of the "Critical Mass" conference held in Washington D.C. convened by Ralph Nader, the Western Bloc Safe Power Initiative was formed. The campaign strategy was to have almost all the state that had the initiative process qualify "Safe Power Initiatives" for their states' ballots in 1976. (People's Lobby)

1974. California  
In California, an Initiative named *Nuclear Power Plants Restrictions on Construction and Operation* failed to qualify for the ballot. (California SoS)

1975. 12 states  
Anti-nuclear power initiative measures, which, if the requisite number of signatures were collected, would have placed the question of nuclear power plant development on the ballot, were circulated in at least 12 states. Only the California and Oregon measures qualified for the ballot adopted laws which would impose similar, though less drastic, impediments to nuclear development. (During the 1975 sessions of 24 state legislatures, some 50 widely varying bills were introduced which would, if enacted and sustained by the courts, have substantially restricted or prohibited the development of nuclear power generation.)(Murphy&Pierre:392)

1975.7.2. Oregon  
The legislature adopted a statute creating a Department of Energy Facility and Siting Council. All electric generating plants, including nuclear reactors and the facilities used in the nuclear fuel cycle, must get site certificate from EFSC and must satisfy EFSC safety standards in the construction and operation of power plants etc. Oregon is the
only state which adopted a statute which explicitly provides for the comprehensive regulation of nuclear power plants. (Murphy&Pierre:421-422)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1976.6.8. California</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ballot title &quot;Nuclear Power Plants-Initiative Statute&quot;, generally called &quot;Nuclear Safeguard Initiative&quot;, proposition 15, was rejected. It says that after one year, nuclear power plant construction and the operation of existing plants at more than 60% of the original licensed core power level is prohibited unless federal liability limits are removed or waived by operators and full compensation assured. After five years, the de-rating of existing plants 10% annually is required unless legislature, by two thirds vote, confirms the effectiveness of safety and waste storage and disposal systems. (California SoS)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1976.11.2. Missouri</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Statutory Revision submitted by Initiative titled Ban on “Construction Work in Progress” utility surcharge passed. Yes: 1,132,644(63.1%) No: 663,486. (Missouri:MLA p.11) The initiative overturned the Missouri Public Service Commission’s decision in December 1975 to allow “Construction Work in Progress” of the utilities to recover the construction costs of a reactor before the reactor actually operates. No-CWIP law is a consumer protection statute that prevents utilities from charging rate-payers for power plants before they are “fully operational and for service”. It also prevents utilities from building unnecessary or excessively expensive generating capacity at the customers’ expense. (Schmidt:73) (MVCEF)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1976.11.2. Oregon</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Measure 9: Regulates Nuclear Power Plant Construction Approval. Measure 9 regulates the construction of additional nuclear power plants by prohibiting further construction unless certain requirements are met. Each House of the Senate Legislature is required to find that the requirements, regarding the financial liability of the power companies, the effectiveness of all plant safety systems, radioactivity, radioactive wastes and chemically toxic wastes, have been met by a two-thirds vote. It failed. Yes: 423,008 No: 584,845. (Oregon SoS&amp;VP)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1976.11.2. Washington</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initiative 325: The Washington Conditions on Building Nuclear Power Facilities Initiative was defeated by 66.62% vs. 33.38%. The measure would have allowed new nuclear power plants only if the plan met certain conditions and with a two-thirds vote in the legislature. Initiative 325 was filed on February 3, 1976 by David C. H. Howard of Olympia. 165,000 signatures were submitted. (BP)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1976.11.4. Colorado</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Issue 3 was rejected by 70.7% vs. 29.3%. This initiated constitutional amendment to Article XVIII requiring approval by two thirds of each House of the General Assembly prior to any construction or modification of a nuclear power plant or related facility: providing that prior to any vote, the General Assembly must conduct extensive hearings throughout the state concerning the safe operation of such plant or facility: and requiring the waiver of federally imposed limits on liability for damage resulting from the operation of any such plant or facility. (BP) (Colorado BH)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1978.6.6. California</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposition 3, Tax Exemption for Alternative Energy Systems as a legislative-referred</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A constitutional amendment was defeated. It would allow the Legislature to exempt from property taxation all or any part of property used as alternative energy system which is not based on fossil fuels or nuclear fuels. (BP) (California BP)

1978. California
The petition titled *Nuclear Generation of Electric Power* failed. Proponent was Senator Alfred E. Alqust. (California SoS)

1978.11.7. Oregon
Measure 9: *Limitations on Public Utility Rate Base*, called *Ban on "Construction Work in Progress" utility surcharges*. It was approved. It prohibited a public utility from collecting from its customers’ rates which are derived from a rate base which contains the cost of any construction, building, installation or real or personal property not presently used for providing utility service. Yes: 69% (589,361) No: 31% (267,132). (Schmidt:75) (Oregon VP)

1978.11.7. Montana
Measure 180: Initiative titled *"Giving Montana voter’s power to approve or reject any proposed major nuclear power facility and establishing nuclear safety and liability standards"* passed. Yes: 65% No: 35%. (Schmidt:75)

1980.9.23. Maine
Measure 2: *No Electricity from Nuclear Initiative* was defeated by 40.8% (161,181) vs. 59.2% (233,198). The purpose was to prohibit the generation of nuclear power in the state through nuclear fission. A big earthquake struck Maine on April 17, 1979. (BP) (Schmidt:75)

1980.10.7. Florida
Amendment 1, *The Florida Renewable Energy Tax Exemption Amendment*, legislatively-referred constitutional amendment was approved. Yes: 75% (1,042,685) No: 25% (347,766). (BP)

1980.11.4. Oregon
Measure 7: *Nuclear Plant Licensing Requires Voter's approval and Waste Disposal Facility Existence*. It required federally licensed permanent disposal facilities for spent nuclear fuel and high level radioactive wastes, before a site certificate for a nuclear power plant is granted or the Public Utility Commissioner approves plant financing. Voter’s approval of site certificate issuance at statewide election also required. Yes: 53% (608,412) No: 47% (535,049). (Schmidt:75-76) (Oregon SoS)

1980.11.4. South Dakota
Measure 2: Black Hills Alliance proposed a ballot measure to give the voters veto power over any construction nuclear power plants, disposal of nuclear waste and uranium mining. Yes: 146,381 (48.4%) No: 156,293 (52.6%). (Schmidt:75-76) (South Dakota SoS)

1980.11.4. Montana
Initiative 84: *Ban on disposal of low level nuclear waste*. It won. Yes: 172,909(51.1%) No: 172,493(49.9%). It tried to ban nuclear waste dumping and make uranium mining uneconomical by prohibiting the dumping of uranium mill tailings. (Schmidt:75-77) (Montana SoS)
1980.11.4. Washington
Initiative 383: *The Washington Ban on the Transportation and Storage of Radioactive Waste Initiative*. Yes: 75.49% (1,211,606) No: 24.51% (393,415). Initiative 383 was filed on February 7, 1980 by Allan H. Jones of Seattle. 148,166 signatures were submitted to qualify it for the ballot. (BP) (Washington SoS)

1982.11.2. Maine
Measure 1: *The Maine Nuclear for Electricity Initiative*. It was defeated. If it had passed, it would have made it illegal for electricity to be generated through the use of nuclear power starting five years from the time of passage. Yes: 201,617 No: 256,124. (Maine SoS)

1983.1. California
The 9th circuit court of appeal decided to void the Initiative 394’s bond referendum requirement for 3 of the WPPSS(Washington Public Power Supply System),’s five partially constructed nuclear plants. (Schmidt:93)

1983.4.5. Wisconsin
*The Wisconsin Radioactive Waste Disposal Question* was defeated. No: 88.9% (628,414) Yes: 11.1% (78,328). The question was “Do you support the construction of a national or regional high-level radioactive waste disposal site in Wisconsin?” (BP)

1984.11.6. South Dakota
Initiated Measure 1 requires the voter approval on questions of disposal of nuclear waste or participation in nuclear waste disposal compacts. It passed. Yes: 182,952 No: 112,161. (BP) (South Dakota SoS)

1986.6. California local
In California, countrywide Initiative to shut down Rancho Saco nuclear plant got 49.7% favorable vote. “Sacramentants for Safe Energy” sponsored it. (Schmidt:95)

1986.11.4. Oregon
Measure 14: *Prohibits Nuclear Power Plant Operation Until Permanent Waste Site Licensed*. This measure prohibits the operation of all Oregon nuclear power plants until the Oregon Energy Facility Siting Council finds that a federally licensed high level radioactive waste disposal site is available to immediately accept plant waste for permanent disposal. Waste retrieval option for reprocessing is not required. (Oregon VP in 1986). It failed. Yes: 375,241 to No: 674,641. The measure was sponsored by the environmentalist group named Forelaws on Board fighting for the shutdown of the Trojan nuclear plant near Portland. Portland General Electric fought back with a $2 million "Vote No" campaign. (Schmidt:95)

1986.11.4. Oregon
Measure 15: *Supersedes "Radioactive Waste" definition* changes the energy facility study payment procedure. It adds uranium mine and mill waste as defined by federal law. There are three landfills in Oregon with radioactive waste that would have fallen under the definition in the Initiative petition. It failed. Yes: 424,099 No: 558,741. (Oregon SoS)

1986.11.4. Massachusetts
Initiative Petition for a law: Question 4 was a measure regarding DEQE to identify/clean hazardous waste sites. It passed. Yes: 66%(1,174,676) No: 23%(404,521)
### 1986.11.4. Washington
Referendum Bill 40: *The Washington Nuclear Waste Disposal Bill*. The measure allowed state officials to continue challenging the federal selection of nuclear waste repository locations and provided voters with the means to disapprove if a Washington site was selected. It was approved. Yes: 82.62% (1,055,896) No: 17.38% (222,141). (BP)

### 1987.11.3. Maine
Measure 1: *The Maine Nuclear Waste Initiative on the ballot*. It was approved. It would not allow the continuation of the generation of electric power and high-level radioactive waste in the state, including the Maine Yankee. Yes: 235,069 No: 162,902. Proponents hoped that Maine's voters would decide to shut down the Maine Yankee, if it operated after July 1988 and if it produced high level nuclear waste. (Schmidt:95) (BP) (Maine SoS)

### 1988.11.8. Massachusetts
Question 4 was a measure to *Ban Electric Power Plants That Produce Nuclear Waste*. (BP). The statewide Initiative was defeated by two to one. (Schmidt:95) Yes: 29% (770,800) No: 60% (1,626,402) Blanks: 11% (292,427). (Massachusetts SoCM)

### 1990.11.6. Oregon
Ballot Measure 4: *Prohibits Trojan Operation Until Standards are met*. It was defeated. It tries to make it that no nuclear power plant, especially Trojan, operate unless the Energy Facility Siting Council finds that 1) a permanent radioactive waste repository has been federally licensed and accepts waste, 2) the plant is cost-effective, and 3) the plant can withstand major earthquakes without harm to the public. Yes: 40.33% (446,795) No: 59.67% (660,992). (BP) (Oregon BB)

### 1992.11.2. Oregon
Ballot Measure 5: *Closes Trojan Power Operation Until Nuclear waste, cost, earthquake, Health Conditions Met*. It was defeated. Yes: 40.1% (585,051) No: 59.9% (874,636). (BP) (Oregon VP)

### 1992.11.2. Oregon
Ballot Measure 6: *Oregon Bans Trojan Power Operation Unless Conditions Met*. It was defeated. Act requires independent study of earthquake risk at and near the Trojan site, and the plant’s ability to withstand earthquakes. Unless Siting Council finds Trojan plant can withstand possible earthquakes without harm to life, property, natural resources, the plant must be cease operation. Yes: 42.7% (619,329) No: 57.3% (830,850). (BP) (Oregon VP)

### 1996.5.21. Oregon
Ballot Measure 24: *Amends Constitution: Initiative Petition signatures must be collected from each congressional district*. The Measure would have amended the state Constitution to prevent initiatives from reaching the ballot unless one fifth of the signatures on petitions come from each of Oregon's five Congressional districts. "Coalition for Initiative Rights" tries to protect the Initiative Process. (Oregon VP) Oregon voters refused to make it tougher to get initiative measures on the state ballot. (The Daily Astorian May 22, 1996) No: 157,817 54% Yes: 134,310 46%. (Statesman Journal May 22, 1996)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Initiative/Question</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Supporters</th>
<th>Opponents</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1996.11.5.</td>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>Proposition 3</td>
<td>Agreement for the receipt of additional radioactive waste</td>
<td>Defeated</td>
<td>62.5% (304,886)</td>
<td>37.5% (182,716)</td>
<td>(BP) (Idaho SoS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998.11.8.</td>
<td>California</td>
<td>Proposition 9</td>
<td>Prohibition on Use of Taxes, Bonds or Surcharges to Pay for Nuclear Power</td>
<td>Defeated</td>
<td>73.44% (5,711,888)</td>
<td>26.56% (2,065,674)</td>
<td>Supporters of Proposition 9 spent $1,403,513. Opponents of Proposition 9 spent $38,171,046. (BP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000.11.7.</td>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>Ballot Measure 90</td>
<td>Authorizes Rates Giving Utilities Return On Investments In Retired property</td>
<td>Defeated</td>
<td>73.44% (5,711,888)</td>
<td>26.56% (2,065,674)</td>
<td>Voters defeated Measure 90 by a vote of 1,208,545 (over 88%) to 158,810. (BP) (Oregon VP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002.11.11.</td>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>Initiative 1</td>
<td>Radioactive Waste Restrictions Act</td>
<td>Defeated</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>(BP) (NCSL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003.11.4.</td>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>Question 2</td>
<td>Constitutional Amendment to Expand Uses of Dedicated Tax Revenue to Fund Hazardous Discharge Cleanups</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>61.29% (684,613)</td>
<td>38.71% (432,443)</td>
<td>&quot;Clean and Green Coalition&quot; raised $54,100 for a campaign on behalf of a &quot;yes&quot; vote on Question 2. (BP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004.11.2.</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>Initiative 297</td>
<td>The Radioactive Waste Initiative</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>The initiative adds new provisions concerning 'mixed' radioactive and non-radioactive hazardous waste, requires the cleanup of contamination before additional waste is added, prioritizes cleanup, and provides for public participation and enforcement through citizen</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
lawsuits. The fiscal impact statement says that over the first five years of implementation, additional grant funding of $4.8 million and implementation costs of $3.5 million would be paid, primarily by the federal government through surcharges on current mixed waste fees. Yes: 1,102,996 No: 810,795. (BP) (Washington SoS)

2004.11.2. Colorado
Amendment 37: The Colorado Renewable Energy Act as initiated by state statute was approved. Yes: 53.6% (1,066,023) No: 46.4% (922,577). It is the nation’s first voter-initiated Renewable Portfolio Standard endorsed by Colorado’s voters. In 2007 it passed into law of HB07-1281. Colorado is served by 60 utilities that generate electricity using primarily coal and natural gas, and some hydroelectric power. The proposal requires Colorado utilities with 40,000 or more customers to generate or purchase a percentage of their electricity from renewable sources according to the following schedule: 3% from 2007 through 2010, 6% from 2011 through 2014, and 10% by 2015 and thereafter. (BP)

2006.11.4. Washington
Initiative Measure 937, Washington Energy Conservation as an Initiative to the people was approved. Yes: 61.7% (1,042,679) No: 48.3% (972,747). I-937 requires investor-owned and consumer-owned utilities with 25,000 or more customers to meet designated targets for energy conservation, including cogeneration as defined, and use of eligible renewable energy resources. Renewable energy resource targets may be met by designated investment levels, including energy resource credits. Utilities not meeting conservation and renewable energy resource targets would pay penalties to the state, to be used for purchase of renewable energy credits or certain energy conservation purposes. (BP) (Washington SoS)

2006.11.7. California
Proposition 87, Alternative Energy Oil Tax was defeated. Yes: 45.4% (3,861,217) No: 54.6% (4,635,265). It would have imposed a severance tax, effective in January 2007, on oil production in California to generate revenues to fund $4 billion in an alternative energy program over time. The question on the ballot was “Should California tax oil producers fund the establishment of a $4 billion Clean Alternative Energy Program with the goal of reducing oil and gasoline consumption through incentives for alternative energy education and training?” (BP) (California BP-BP)

2008.11.4. Idaho
Nuclear Power Regulation Initiative was proposed as an initiative, but the measure did not qualify for the ballot. The measure, if passed, would have prohibited the building of nuclear power plants in Idaho until voted on and approved at a statewide election and with the attainment of a state permit. (BP)

2008.11.4. California
Proposition 7 titled Renewable Energy Generation. Initiative Statute was defeated. Yes: 35.5% (4,502,235) No: 64.5% (8,155,181). Had proposition 7 been approved, it would have required California utilities to procure half of their power from renewable resources by 2025. It also would have required California utilities to increase their purchase of electricity generation from renewable resources by 2% annually to meet Renewable Portfolio Standard., and would have allowed penalties. Under current law, investor owned utility companies must comply with an RPS of 10% by 2010 and there is no waiver for non-compliance. (BP) (California BP-BP)
2008.11.4. California

Proposition 10 known as The California Alternative Fuels Initiative was on the ballot as an initiated state statute. It was defeated. If it had been approved, it would have allowed the state to sell $5 billion in general obligation bonds for a variety of renewable energy, alternative fuel, energy efficiency, and air emissions reduction purposes. Yes: 40.5% (5,098,866) No: 59.5% (7,464,154). (BP) (California BP-BP)

Note

1) For example, in the early 80s, nuclear freeze initiatives were on the ballot in ten states (Arizona, California, Massachusetts, Michigan, Montana, New Jersey, North Dakota, Oregon, Rhode Island, and Wisconsin) and thirty-seven cities and counties (including Chicago, Philadelphia, Washington, D.C., Denver, and Miami). Four of the ten initiatives were put on the ballot by state legislatures. (Initiatives for Democratic Change) [(Schmidt: 155-163)]

2) In Japan, the web of connections among people who share interests and benefits in promoting nuclear power, consisted of the nuclear industry, government officials, nuclear scientists and scholars, is now popularly referred to as the “nuclear power village”. Just as people lived in an old Japanese village, they have prospered by supporting and rewarding each other. The words imply collusive interests, dependency, non-transparency, exclusivity etc. The few openly skeptical of nuclear power’s safety become village outcasts, losing out on promotions through their lives.

3) Osaka city assembly rejected the citizen’s ordinance on the 27th March in 2012. Petitioners collected 55,428 valid signatures. (The Asahi: 20120328). Tokyo metropolitan assembly also rejected the ordinance, which asked citizen’s to vote on the operation of nuclear power plants of Tokyo Electric Company by 41 to 82 in the 20th June 2012. 323,076 signatures were submitted. [kokumintohyo.com]. In Shizuoka prefecture, a citizen’s proposal requesting a referendum ordinance asking the pros and cons of Chubu electric power company’s power plant re-operation at Hamaoka was rejected on the 11th October 2012. 165,127 valid signatures were collected. In Niigata prefecture a citizen’s proposal requested the assembly a referendum ordinance asking the pros and cons of TEPCO’s power plant re-operation at Kashiwazaki-Kariwa was rejected by 77 to 7 on the 23rd January 2013. 68,353 valid signatures were gathered. (The Chunichi, 2013.2.10)

4) The initiative, popular initiative is a process that enables citizens to bypass their state legislature by placing proposed statutes and, in some states, constitutional amendments on the ballot. The first state to adopt the initiative was South Dakota in 1898. Since then, 23 other states have included the initiative process in their constitutions, the most recent being Mississippi in 1992. That makes a total of 24 states with an initiative process. There are two types of initiatives: direct and indirect.
In the direct process, proposals that qualify go directly on the ballot. In the indirect process, they are submitted to the legislature, which may or has to respond to act on the proposal. Depending on the state, the initiative question goes on the ballot if the legislature does not approve the proposal, submits a different proposal, or takes no action in a certain period. [S. Maeyama(2008)]

5) The referendum is the principle or practice or referring measures proposed or passed by a legislative body to the vote of the electorate for approval or rejection.

6) The secretary of a state issues a voter’s pamphlet. In Oregon, the state voter’s pamphlet includes information about each measure and candidate in the upcoming election, and is mailed to every household in Oregon about 3 weeks before each statewide election. [Oregon SoS]. In principle, a voter’s pamphlet is edited with non-partisanship, and a committee to watch the process of making a pamphlet is formed, being constituted of representatives from both sides of the pros and cons of a measure. In a voter’s pamphlet, regarding ballot measures, a chief petitioner of a measure and his or her supporters have to pay to get a page for their claims, as do people who are against the measure. [Interview with D. Meek]
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