

## PROPOSAL P

### BALLOT WORDING: A PROPOSAL TO ESTABLISH A MICHIGAN STATE PARKS ENDOWMENT FUND, INCREASE THE MAXIMUM ALLOWABLE AMOUNT OF FUNDS IN THE MICHIGAN NATURAL RESOURCES TRUST FUND AND ELIMINATE THE DIVERSION OF DEDICATED REVENUE FROM THE MICHIGAN NATURAL RESOURCES TRUST FUND.

The proposed constitutional amendment would:

1. Establish a Michigan State Parks Endowment Fund to be funded by certain royalties, bonuses and rentals collected by the state from the drilling of oil and gas or mining of minerals on state-owned land.
2. Require that money in Endowment

Fund be used to operate, maintain and improve Michigan state parks.

3. Limit accumulated principal of the Endowment Fund to \$800 million with annual adjustments for inflation.
4. Increase the maximum principal of the Michigan Natural Resources Trust Fund from \$200 million to \$400 million.
5. Eliminate the diversion of dedicated revenue from the Michigan Natural Resources Trust Fund.

Should this proposal be adopted?  
Yes ☐ No ☐

#### Proponents of Proposal P say:

1. State park funding cuts during the last decade have resulted in a 1/3 reduction of staff, maintenance, security and services. Although the state parks system is a national leader in size, campsites and attendance, General Fund expenditure per visitor is among the lowest in

the country.

2. Proposal P would provide parks with a long-term stable source of funding. Visitor services would be expanded and maintenance greatly improved.
3. State parks are more than a vacation destination. They preserve and protect our state's natural, scenic and historic resources.
4. In 1993, visitors to state parks spent \$260 million, supporting Michigan's tourism economy.
5. Since 1984, \$20 million per year has been diverted from the NRTF for projects unrelated to natural resources. Proposal P will end all further diversions from Michigan Natural Resources Trust Fund.

#### Opponents of Proposal P say:

1. The DNR cannot manage the millions of acres they already have; adding more acres would compound the neglect.

2. Allowing the public to camp in state parks where part of the cost would be subsidized by the state creates unfair competition for private sector campgrounds and resorts.

3. Gas and oil royalties could be better utilized, such as in lowering state taxes generally.

4. Proponents cite a Michigan State University study that identified \$260 million added to the tourist economy, but \$71 million of that total includes wages paid to state workers (\$17 million) and a vague category identified as "economic multipliers" (\$54 million) that may not exist.

5. Michigan citizens could pay higher fees to visit popular state parks, making many of them self-supporting. If certain parks are underused, perhaps they are not necessary.

## index

Governor - Lt. Governor .....	2
U.S. Senator .....	3
U.S. Representative .....	4
Attorney General .....	6
Secretary of State .....	6
State Senator .....	7
State Representative .....	9
County Commissioner .....	14
Circuit Court .....	24

Probate Court .....	26
District Court .....	26
State Board of Education .....	29
Regents University of Michigan ....	29
Trustees Michigan State University..	30
Governors Wayne State University..	31
Michigan Supreme Court .....	31
Michigan Court of Appeals .....	33
Ballot Proposals .....	34