

## Official Ballot Language Proposal 06-3

### A REFERENDUM ON PUBLIC ACT 160 OF 2004 – AN ACT TO ALLOW THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A HUNTING SEASON FOR MOURNING DOVES

#### **Public Act 160 of 2004 would:**

- Authorize the Natural Resources Commission to establish a hunting season for mourning doves.
- Require a mourning dove hunter to have a small game license and a \$2.00 mourning dove stamp.
- Stipulate that revenue from the stamp must be split evenly between the Game and Fish Protection Fund and the Fish and Wildlife Trust Fund.
- Require the Department of Natural Resources to address responsible mourning dove hunting; management practices for the propagation of mourning doves; and participation in mourning dove hunting by youth, the elderly and the disabled in the Department's annual hunting guide.

Should this law be approved? YES \_\_\_\_\_ NO \_\_\_\_\_

**YES** Proposal 3 supports professional wildlife management. Proposal 3 upholds a law passed by the legislature and signed by the Governor in 2004 that designates the mourning dove a game bird and directs the Michigan Natural Resources Commission to establish a hunting season based upon sound scientific management.

Doves are the most abundant game bird in the US, currently hunted in 40 states. Biologists estimate that there are 475 million doves in this country. That is more than all species of ducks, and geese in the US combined. Michigan's population is estimated to be six million. Doves nest several times each season producing four young a year. Doves' life expectancy is less than a year, with or without hunting. Hunting accounts for less than 10 percent of the dove population's mortality each year.

If Proposal 3 is passed, DNR biologist will establish a season and bag limits based upon sound scientific management. All hunters will be required to purchase a license and a dove stamp which will be used to further management of the birds. Hunting will continue to not be allowed near roads, houses or off power lines.

**Provided by:** *Citizens for Wildlife Conservation*

**NO** VOTE NO ON PROPOSAL 3. Vote NO on Dove Shooting. There's NO good reason to shoot mourning doves: Doves are NOT overpopulated. Doves are shot for target practice, NOT for food. Doves are NOT harmful to humans, property or crops. There are 40 other game bird species in Michigan and there's NO reason to add doves. It has been Michigan's tradition to protect mourning doves since 1905, and there's NO reason to change that now.

It's all about the doves. The Committee to Keep Doves Protected has only one goal – to keep doves protected and restore Michigan's 100-year tradition of protecting mourning doves, Michigan's official bird of peace.

The Committee respects Michigan's strong hunting heritage and represent a broad-based grass-roots coalition of agricultural, conservation, humane, hunting, faith-based and community organizations and thousands of Michigan citizens who want to continue the protection of the mourning dove as a traditional backyard songbird. VOTE NO ON DOVE SHOOTING. VOTE NO ON PROPOSAL 3!

**Provided by:** *The Committee to Keep Doves Protected*

## Official Ballot Language Proposal 06-4

### A PROPOSED CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT TO PROHIBIT GOVERNMENT FROM TAKING PRIVATE PROPERTY BY EMINENT DOMAIN FOR CERTAIN PRIVATE PURPOSES

#### **The proposed constitutional amendment would:**

- Prohibit government from taking private property for transfer to another private individual or business for purposes of economic development or increasing tax revenue.
- Provide that if an individual's principal residence is taken by government for public use, the individual must be paid at least 125% of property's fair market value.
- Require government that takes a private property to demonstrate that the taking is for a public use; if taken to eliminate blight, require a higher standard of proof to demonstrate that the taking of that property is for a public use.
- Preserve existing rights of property owners.

Should this proposal be adopted? YES \_\_\_\_\_ NO \_\_\_\_\_

**YES** Proposal 4 restores homeowners' rights by amending the Michigan Constitution to prohibit local and state government from taking someone's home or property under eminent domain and give it to an independent third party when the only reason is the promise of increased economic development or tax revenue.

Proposal 4 also requires any government that uses the power of eminent domain to take a person's home to pay the property owner 125 percent. It requires a higher standard of proof to declare a property as 'blighted' and puts the burden of proof on government to show that a property meets the definition of blight.

The U.S. Supreme Court said government may use its power of eminent domain to force a property owner to sell his or her home so it can be turned over a developer who wants to make a buck off of it. Only a change in the Michigan Constitution will protect the rights of property owners, and make sure that government cannot use eminent domain just to increase property tax revenues or benefit a private developer. And it will ensure that future legislatures or governors won't erode these property rights. Vote YES on Proposal 4.

**Provided by:** *Sen. Tony Stamas, Legislative sponsor of this proposal*

**NO** Opponents believe economic development is a proper role of government. They say that the state and other units of government should continue to have the power under eminent domain to purchase private property and transfer it to a private entity. There are already limitations on this established by the Michigan Supreme Court in the case of County of Wayne v. Hathcock and this is sufficient as a limitation on the uses of eminent domain. This proposal will mean higher costs for taxpayers in order for their government to use the powers of eminent domain and there will be lost revenues from foregone projects.

Those voting NO believe that governments would no longer have the ability to use the power of eminent domain in an area-wide approach to blight eradication and that it would be harder and more expensive for governments to attack blighted areas. This proposal could discourage redevelopment in cities. Further, it would be difficult to undo these limitations once they are put into the state's Constitution, if these restrictions are found to be too costly or too limiting in their scope.