



LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS®

Voter Guide for Los Angeles County

STATEWIDE GENERAL ELECTION

TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 6, 2018

Polls open 7 AM - 8 PM



- OCTOBER 22:** Last day to register or re-register to vote
- OCTOBER 30:** Last day to request a Vote-By-Mail ballot
- NOVEMBER 6: ELECTION DAY**
Polls open 7 AM - 8 PM



ALL VOTERS WILL BE VOTING:

- For UNITED STATES SENATOR
- For UNITED STATES REPRESENTATIVE
- For GOVERNOR, LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR, SECRETARY OF STATE, TREASURER, CONTROLLER, ATTORNEY GENERAL, INSURANCE COMMISSIONER, AND SUPERINTENDENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION
- For MEMBER OF THE STATE ASSEMBLY PAGE
- On COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES MEASURE W 1
- For LOS ANGELES COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT JUDGES
Offices 4, 16, 60, and 113 2-5
- For LOS ANGELES COUNTY SHERIFF 6-7
- For LOS ANGELES COUNTY ASSESSOR 8-9
- On STATE PROPOSITIONS 1-12 10-21

SOME VOTERS WILL BE VOTING:

- For CALIFORNIA STATE SENATOR (Even-numbered Districts)
- On LOCAL OFFICES and/or BALLOT MEASURES

For more information about candidates, issues, and voting, go to:
www.votersedge.org/ca or www.lavote.net



About the Voter Guide

This Voter Guide is provided by the League of Women Voters' Education Fund. The Education Fund encourages active and informed participation in government and increased understanding of public policy through education.

Esta guía también está disponible en español. Para más información, llame (213) 368-1616.



California Statewide General Election ★ November 6, 2018

This election is a county, state, and federal election. Some cities and special districts hold elections or vote on ballot measures as well. For the county of Los Angeles, voters will be selecting the Superior Court Judges for Offices 4, 16, 60, and 113 as well as Sheriff and County Assessor. They will also vote on Los Angeles County Measure W. This guide contains information about the candidates for county office and about Measure W.

At the state level, all voters will be selecting their preferred candidate for statewide office (Governor, Lieutenant Governor, Secretary of State, Controller, Treasurer, Attorney General, Insurance Commissioner, and Superintendent of Public Instruction) and their representative to the State Assembly. Voters in even-numbered districts will select their state Senator. They will also vote on 11 state ballot measures.

All voters will also be voting for their representative to the United States Congress and for Senator from California.

Visit www.votersedge.org/ca to see everything on your ballot, and your polling place, and get information about your voting choices. Candidates provide information about themselves in their own words.

Voters registered in Los Angeles County will receive a sample ballot at the address on record after September 27. This sample ballot shows the candidates and measures that will be on your ballot. The State of California will mail each household a pamphlet about the state propositions.

Go to www.lavote.net in Los Angeles County to:

- ★ Check your registration status—including your party choice
- ★ Register to vote if you have moved or changed your name
- ★ Register to vote if you want to change your political party

Find your path at the Los Angeles Public Library

Los Angeles Public Library offers a variety of free in-person and online educational opportunities including:



Education and Lifelong Learning

ONLINE COURSES TO SUPPORT YOUR CAREER AND LIFE GOALS.

www.lapl.org/collections-resources/online-learning



Money Matters

LEARN HOW TO MAKE YOUR MONEY WORK FOR YOU. KNOW MORE, MAKE MORE.

www.lapl.org/money-matters



Health Wellness

WORKSHOPS AND RESOURCES ON AN ARRAY OF HEALTH TOPICS

www.lapl.org/health



Cultural Enrichment and Exploration

YOUR COMMUNITY DESTINATION TO STIMULATE CREATIVITY & IMAGINATION

www.lapl.org/whats-on

Ready to start on your path?
Visit one of our 73 libraries, call, or visit us online.
213.228.7272 www.lapl.org

LOS ANGELES
PUBLIC LIBRARY



LOS ANGELES COUNTY FLOOD CONTROL DISTRICT - MEASURE W

Los Angeles Region's Public Health and Safe, Clean Water Program.

THE QUESTION: Shall an ordinance improving/protecting water quality; capturing rain/stormwater to increase safe drinking water supplies and prepare for future drought; protecting public health and marine life by reducing pollution, trash, toxins/plastics entering Los Angeles County waterways/bays/beaches; establishing a parcel tax of 2.5¢ per square foot of impermeable area, exempting low-income seniors, raising approximately \$300,000,000 annually until ended by voters, requiring independent audits, oversight and local control be adopted?

THE SITUATION:

A lot of water, some 100 billion gallons or more, flows annually as wastewater from Los Angeles County to the ocean. In the process much of it picks up trash and contaminants from roadways, driveways, parking lots, drainage ditches and other impermeable surfaces.

If rainwater runoff is captured and treated, it could be a source of drinking water, or could help prepare for future drought by, for example, recharging groundwater aquifers. Runoff carrying trash or contaminants poses threats to marine life and public health.

Regarding public health, some disadvantaged communities (DACs) are at particular risk of exposure due to flooding, exposed waste piles, or poor drainage infrastructure. DACs tend to have less greenery and park features of the sort that capture or absorb runoff and protect communities from flooding.

THE PROPOSAL:

Measure W would amend the law governing the Los Angeles County Flood Control District, which covers most of the inhabited area of the county, to raise funds via a parcel tax and require the district to administer a new "Safe, Clean Water Program". Low income seniors who own land parcels could apply to be exempt from the parcel tax. The Antelope Valley, on the other side of mountains from the ocean, would not be taxed and would be excluded from the program. The funds would be used for varied infrastructure projects, technical assistance, scientific studies, education programs, job training, and possibly incentive programs. A "Regional Oversight Committee" of subject matter experts appointed by county and municipal authorities would monitor progress and submit reports.

The estimated median cost of this parcel tax for a residential property owner would be \$83 per year. A calculator is available at <http://safecleanwaterlacounty.org/calculator/>.

FISCAL EFFECTS

The county estimates that the impermeable area-based parcel tax would raise \$300,000,000 annually. Parcel owners could appeal tax calculations, and permitted water control features would be eligible for credits, which could reduce revenue.

Forty percent (40%) of annual tax revenue would be allocated for use by individual municipalities, in proportion to the revenue collected from within each. Fifty percent (50%) of the annual revenue would be allocated to "Watershed Areas" established to facilitate implementation of the program, again in proportion to revenue collected within each area. Watershed Areas would have to fund projects that benefit DACs slightly in greater proportion to DACs' fractional population of each Area. Ten percent (10%) of revenue would go to Program administration.

SUPPORTERS SAY

Measure W would:

- Capture and save enough rainwater to supply 1/4 of the County's population.
- Help prepare us for future droughts.
- Protect rivers, lakes, bays and beaches by reducing stormwater pollution.

OPPONENTS SAY

Measure W would:

- Hand officials a blank check without requiring any specific projects.
- Take advantage of the drought to raise our taxes ... with no required end date.
- Not be necessary in areas like the Upper San Gabriel Valley, where the county already does a great job of collecting stormwater runoff.

FOR MORE INFORMATION

Supporters: Los Angeles County Government
(Put on ballot by a 4-to-1 vote of the Board of Supervisors)
<http://safecleanwaterla.org>

Opponents: California Taxpayers Organization
<http://www.caltax.org/action/elections.html>;
Valley Industry & Commerce Association;
California Small Business Alliance

Los Angeles County Superior Court Judge

TERM: 6 years
TERM BEGINS: January 2019
SALARY: \$190,219 per year

Elections for Superior Court Judges in Los Angeles County are held in even numbered years at the scheduled Primary Election. The California Constitution requires that a candidate for Superior Court Judge be a member of the State Bar for ten years or serve on a court of record. A vacancy in a Superior Court office is to be filled by appointment by the governor. The appointed judge must stand for election at the next general election.

In this November 2018 election, there are four run-off races for judge.

Superior Court Judge Office 4



Alfred A. Coletta

OCCUPATION:
Deputy District Attorney,
County of Los Angeles

WEBSITE:
www.colettaforjudge.com

QUALIFICATIONS:

- ◆ Served every day in the courtroom for 31 years
- ◆ Prosecuted 43 murderers and other violent criminals.
- ◆ Prosecuted sexual predators and domestic violence perpetrators
- ◆ Prosecuted hardcore gang members and major drug traffickers

PRIORITIES:

- ◆ Provide equal access to justice for all
- ◆ Provide a fair opportunity to be heard
- ◆ Exercise fairness, impartiality, respect, and balance in well-reasoned judicial decisions

QUESTION: *How can courts and judges better assure that all people have adequate access to legal help and the legal system?*

Coletta: A Judge can assist people to have more effective access to the legal system by being a good listener, respectful to all persons, not failing to rule, and issue decisions that are simple to understand and well reasoned. Sometimes litigants (including persons representing themselves), fail to follow legal procedure and/or fail to establish a legal element in proving up a matter. An understanding judge can assist without being an advocate for the individuals cause of action. A judge should point out what is lacking so the individual may decide if they wish to proceed or withdraw their request and amend their motion to conform to what is legally required.



A. Verónica Saucedo

OCCUPATION:
Superior Court Commissioner,
County Los Angeles

WEBSITE:
www.saucedaforjudge.com

QUALIFICATIONS:

- ◆ Superior Court Commissioner, Los Angeles County (2015-present)
- ◆ Non-profit attorney (2002-2015); helped clients assert rights; removed barriers and helped them access justice
- ◆ J.D. UCLA School of Law, 2001
- ◆ B.A. Political Science and Chicana/o Studies, UCLA 1997

PRIORITIES:

- ◆ Ensure access to justice
- ◆ Maintain a fair and impartial courtroom
- ◆ Empathetic in resolving conflicts presented to me for adjudication

Saucedo: Courts and judges need to be aware of the diversity of the public it serves, including the various obstacles faced by court users. Access to justice and the legal system includes: having interpreters available for monolingual speaking court users; ensuring that litigants understand the court process (signage and information in their native language); court websites that are user friendly and easy to navigate; referrals to the courts own self-help centers or facilitators. Courts and judges need to understand the needs of the diverse populations they serve and make decisions that are both practical and empathetic when adjudicating cases. The public need to know that they will be treated with dignity and respect and that their voice matters.

See complete candidate information at: http://votersedge.org/ca/en/ballot/election/area/73/contests/contest/17252?&county=los%20angeles%20county&election_authority_id=19



Patricia "Patti" Hunter

OCCUPATION:
Deputy City Attorney,
City of Los Angeles

WEBSITE:
www.pattihunter4judge.com

QUALIFICATIONS:

- ◆ Over 30 years legal experience
- ◆ Dedicated to public service
- ◆ Prosecutor in LA City Attorney's office for over 24 years
- ◆ Prosecuted thousands of criminal cases
- ◆ Jury trials include: Domestic Violence, Child Endangerment, Driving Under the Influence, Firearm Crimes and more

PRIORITIES:

- ◆ Protecting the Public
- ◆ Maintaining a courtroom where the law is followed and all parties are treated fairly and respectfully in an unbiased and impartial forum
- ◆ Helping parties find creative resolutions to cases



Sydne Jane Michel

OCCUPATION:
Senior Deputy City Prosecutor,
City of Redondo Beach

WEBSITE:
www.michelforjudge.com

QUALIFICATIONS:

- ◆ Senior Deputy City Prosecutor
- ◆ Prosecuted complex criminal cases, including serious violent crimes
- ◆ Partner in premiere international civil law firm
- ◆ Endorsed early by Hon. Steve Cooley, Former District Attorney for Los Angeles County, numerous Superior Court Judges

PRIORITIES:

- ◆ Be an independent judge. Make decisions based on the law, not based on political pressure, or ideology. Deliver justice equally. Treat everyone equal regardless of their station.
- ◆ Ensure that justice is administered free from passion, emotion or bias, but with compassion for both sides.
- ◆ Employ Alternative Sentencing Options and Diversion Programs such as Military and Drug Diversion when possible and appropriate to maximize rehabilitative opportunities.

QUESTION: *How can courts and judges better assure that all people have adequate access to legal help and the legal system?*

Hunter:

- ◆ Ensuring that courts are run in an efficient manner by minimizing unnecessary court dates and aiding in early resolutions would mean that there is more time for more people to have access to the courts. If the courts are efficient, then people do not have to wait unreasonable amounts of time to get justice.
- ◆ Supporting and encouraging pro bono or low cost services would help people get access to the legal system. One way would be to provide on-line or posted notices as to where litigants can find such services.
- ◆ Ensuring proper funding and staffing to the extent the courts and judges have a say in that would provide more courts and thus more access.

Michel:

This takes judicial initiative by courthouse administrators and judges and local bar associations to work collectively to address the problems. Some of this is being done now.



Holly Hancock

OCCUPATION:
Attorney at Law

WEBSITE:
www.hancock4judge.com

QUALIFICATIONS:

- ◆ 12-year defense counsel to thousands of clients.
- ◆ Tried to verdict 55 cases; 34 felonies; Acquittals in 29 felonies and 18 misdemeanors.
- ◆ Straight not guilty verdicts on the last 11 trials.
- ◆ Flight attendant for United and union representative for AFA.

PRIORITIES:

- ◆ If elected, I am interested in pursuing rehabilitation and reconciliation in sentencing as a priority.
- ◆ The youth of our county need to be prepared to enter adult life, I will endeavor in my review of juvenile cases to make their preparation a priority.
- ◆ Looking at all sides of the issues involved, listening to the attorneys with respect and dignity.



Tony C. Cho

OCCUPATION:
Deputy District Attorney,
County of Los Angeles

WEBSITE:
www.cho4judge.com

QUALIFICATIONS:

- ◆ Over 17 years of legal experience in both civil and criminal law
- ◆ 13 years as a LA County Deputy District Attorney, with 68 jury trials
- ◆ Specialized in elder abuse prosecution for the past 5 years
- ◆ 8 years as a Military Lawyer with the California State Military Reserve

PRIORITIES:

- ◆ Through the fair administration of Justice, I hope to increase public confidence in the judicial system.
- ◆ I hope to provide equal access to the courts for all.
- ◆ I will efficiently and effectively manage my courtroom, to ensure all parties have a fair opportunity to be heard.

QUESTION: *How can courts and judges better assure that all people have adequate access to legal help and the legal system?*

Hancock:

Courts have been designed to help the homeless, veterans, and those afflicted with drug addiction. People from the community reintegrate through better access to medical and life skills help. In this way, alternative sentencing helps the individual navigate the legal challenges [s]he is faced with. Judges are the administrators of the court budget and determine when and how many of these alternative courts are created within the confines of the state funding. Individually, judges can sentence young adults, teens, and juveniles to school, training and correctional classes. Recent changes in the law allow judges to create diversion programs for the mentally ill and veterans suffering from PTSD. All of these measures allow people to return to the community better than when they intersected the legal system.

Cho:

Adequate access to the legal system begins with efficient courtrooms and courthouses. Mandating that the parties are ready when the courtroom opens and efficiently running a courtroom calendar is critical in access to Justice.

Judges set the tone in their courtrooms. I would promptly take the bench every morning, and be fully prepared to handle every case on calendar. I would also expect the attorneys and parties who appear in my courtroom to be similarly prompt, prepared, and effectively use the time allotted.

The courts should also provide adequate and easily accessible resources to the public by way of self-help centers, readily available information on websites, and easy to follow instructions to navigate the legal system.

See complete candidate information at: http://votersedge.org/ca/en/ballot/election/area/73/contests/contest/17253?&county=los%20angeles%20county&election_authority_id=19



Javier Perez

OCCUPATION:
Deputy District Attorney,
County of Los Angeles

WEBSITE:
www.javierperez2018.com

QUALIFICATIONS:

- ◆ Prosecutor for approximately 27 years
- ◆ I have tried misdemeanor and felony trials, assigned to special units such as Major Narcotics and Environmental Crimes
- ◆ Worked throughout the county in nine different courthouses
- ◆ Supervised in excess of one-hundred employees over seven years

PRIORITIES:

- ◆ Ensure a fair trial to all people who have cases in the courtroom where I am assigned
- ◆ Run an efficient court calendar, making sure that there are not endless delays
- ◆ To set the tone in court, where everyone is treated with respect



Michael P. Ribons

OCCUPATION:
Arbitrator/Lawyer

WEBSITE:
www.ribonsforjudge.com

QUALIFICATIONS:

- ◆ Judge Pro Tem, Los Angeles County; 8 years hearing approximately 300 calendars and over 7,500 cases
- ◆ Fee Arbitrator, San Fernando Valley Bar, State Bar
- ◆ Civil Litigator 22 years
- ◆ Realtor
- ◆ J.D., Whittier Law School

PRIORITIES:

- ◆ Maintaining a just, expedient, efficiently-run courtroom
- ◆ Ensuring equal access to justice by applying the law impartially
- ◆ Treating all individuals with empathy and respect

QUESTION: *How can courts and judges better assure that all people have adequate access to legal help and the legal system?*

Perez:

The first thing that a judge can do is run an efficient court. Allowing endless continuances on cases clutters the courts and makes court access to all people difficult. Ensuring a fair trial or day in court to all people also helps assure legal access.

Ribons:

There is no question that the gap between the legal needs of vulnerable individuals and the legal services available to them is far too large. As a judge pro tem in our courts, I have seen that often those who need legal help the most do not get it. Though judges have a duty to apply the law impartially, that does not mean they must do so with a lack of compassion.

Experience has shown me that many individuals lack information about how to get the legal help they need to ensure fair representation in court. Our courts could do a better job of making this information more easily available to potential litigants well in advance of their day in court.

Los Angeles County Sheriff

TERM: 4 years

TERM BEGINS: December 1, 2018

SALARY: \$303,098 per year

The County Sheriff administers the police function of the County, and is responsible for enforcement of all laws and regulations as required or requested by statute, participates in programs for rehabilitation, prevention of crime and suppression of delinquency; directs and coordinates emergency services; maintains security and assists in the functions of the Superior Courts; and operates five County jail facilities.



Jim McDonnell

OCCUPATION:

**Sheriff,
County of Los Angeles**

WEBSITE:

www.sheriffjimcdonnell.com

QUALIFICATIONS:

- ◆ Sheriff of Los Angeles County, 2014-present
- ◆ Chief of Police, City of Long Beach, 2010-2014
- ◆ Served 29 years with the L.A.P.D., reaching a position of Second-in-Command under former Chief of Police William Bratton, 1981-2010

PRIORITIES:

- ◆ Maintain our momentum in bringing much-needed reforms to the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department
- ◆ Focus on our core mission of reducing crime across Los Angeles County
- ◆ Continue the work of the Human Trafficking Bureau to protect the most vulnerable in our society, including our children

QUESTION 1: *What can the Sheriff do to deal more effectively with mentally ill prisoners incarcerated in County jail?*

Sheriff McDonnell believes that jail isn't the appropriate place for the treatment of the mentally ill. McDonnell has quadrupled the number of response teams that pair patrol deputies with mental health workers to divert some inmate patients into community treatment programs. The Sheriff is working with the Board of

Supervisors on a new correctional facility for inmate patients in need of mental health care and substance abuse programs. This new facility is intended to be a national model that unites the County's mental health and medical professionals to provide compassionate care for this population while focusing on public safety.

QUESTION 2: *What steps do you feel should be taken to correct the problems of brutality that have been identified within the County jails?*

McDonnell served on a commission where he gained awareness of the problems plaguing the jail system. The Commission issued a report with 63 recommendations, which McDonnell aggressively uses as a baseline for change within jails. McDonnell negotiated agreements with the Department of Justice to increase staffing, training, and the oversight of federal monitors.

Since 2014, the federal monitors report a 'sea change' inside jails in the reduction of use of force and increased deputy morale, resulting in a decline in inmate complaints. This is the result of increased accountability with supervision, cameras in facilities, and de-escalation training techniques for deputies.

See complete candidate information at: http://votersedge.org/ca/en/ballot/election/area/73/contests/contest/17256?&county=los%20angeles%20county&election_authority_id=19



Alex Villanueva

OCCUPATION:
Sheriff's Lieutenant,
County of Los Angeles

WEBSITE:
www.alexvillanueva.org

QUALIFICATIONS:

- ◆ Sworn member, Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department, 1986-2018
- ◆ Planning Commissioner, La Habra Heights, 2015-present
- ◆ Adjunct Professor, Criminal Justice, California State University, Long Beach 2006-2010
- ◆ Doctor of Public Administration, University of La Verne, 2005

PRIORITIES:

- ◆ Enforce the California Values Act and keep the LASD out of the immigration enforcement business
- ◆ Reorganize the sheriff's department around the principles of community policing and improve relations between the community and the department.
- ◆ Clean house after twenty years of unchecked corruption, dismal morale, low recruitment, severe staffing shortages, and irresponsible fiscal management.

QUESTION 1: *What can the Sheriff do to deal more effectively with mentally ill prisoners incarcerated in County jail?*

We can start by diverting many of those who suffer from mental illnesses from ever setting foot in the County jail. Those initial contacts in the community are the vital first step towards triaging the mentally ill person and finding ways to accommodate the intervention and treatment in the least restrictive environment available.

That means finding alternative housing and sufficient support resources to keep them engaged with their individual treatment and deescalate their threatening behavior. Once at this point they will not be perceived to be a threat to the community. This will require working closely with the Board of Supervisors ...

QUESTION 2: *What steps do you feel should be taken to correct the problems of brutality that have been identified within the County jails?*

In order to properly address the issue of brutality, or better yet described as violence within the County jails, requires a healthy organizational culture within the entire department, one that values the services provided by those who are assigned to the County jails. There needs to be a robust force prevention effort, coupled

with quality training that complies with Standards of Training for Corrections (STC), mandated by the state. Accountability for force and force prevention policies are vital. They cannot be so absolute, however, that they hinder the ability of deputies to make sound decisions in critical situations....

Los Angeles County Assessor

TERM: 4 years
TERM BEGINS: December 1, 2018
SALARY: \$209,912 per year

The County Assessor locates all taxable property in the County and identifies ownership, values all property taxation, reassesses property upon change of ownership or completion of new construction, appears before the Assessment Appeals board, lists the value of all property on the assessment roll by Assessor's parcel number, produces Assessor's parcel maps, and processes all property tax exemptions.



Jeffrey Prang

OCCUPATION:
Assessor,
County of Los Angeles

WEBSITE:
www.jeffreyprang.com

QUALIFICATIONS:

- ◆ Los Angeles County Assessor since 2014
- ◆ West Hollywood Mayor/Councilmember, 1997-2014
- ◆ Over 25 years in public service in L.A. County
- ◆ Assessor Jeffrey Prang's leadership has earned the endorsements of U.S. Senator Kamala Harris, and L.A. County Supervisors Sheila Kuehl, Hilda Solis, Janice Hahn, and Mark Ridley-Thomas

PRIORITIES:

- ◆ Upgrade and replace technology systems
- ◆ Fairly and accurately assess property values and provide excellent public service
- ◆ Enhance transparency and accountability through open access to assessment data

QUESTION 1:

What criteria should voters use to evaluate candidates for Assessor? What are your strongest qualifications for office?

With 1400 employees and a nearly \$200 million budget, the Assessor's Office is a complex agency that requires an experienced administrator. The Assessor needs to work effectively with other county departments to support vital local services.

As the incumbent, with extensive experience as an elected official and public administrator, I have under-

taken substantial technological innovation, increased public access to information, and worked with other county offices and the State to improve the quality of public service. Under my administration, the Office of the Assessor has received international recognition from the International Association of Assessing Officers (IAAO) with their "Certificate of Excellence in Assessment Administration," ...

QUESTION 2:

What steps would you take to reduce the possibility of favoritism or corruption when reassessing property in Los Angeles County?

I can proudly say that I have worked successfully in my first term to address these issues. Our new technology system has multiple layers of security to prevent abuse at any level. Additionally, we have implemented a Quality Assurance Unit, and new policies that limit the

assessment authority of any individual employee and mandate supervisorial review of assessment changes. If reelected, I will continue to ensure the utmost integrity in the Assessment process.

See complete candidate information at: http://votersedge.org/ca/en/ballot/election/area/73/contests/contest/17243?&county=los%20angeles%20county&election_authority_id=19



John "Lower Taxes" Loew

QUALIFICATIONS:

None provided

OCCUPATION:

**Deputy Assessor,
County of Los Angeles**

WEBSITE:

www.facebook.com/JohnLowerTaxesLoew

PRIORITIES:

- ◆ I will bring integrity to the executive staff of the Office of the Assessor.
- ◆ I will bring competence to the executive staff of the Office of the Assessor
- ◆ I will bring fairness to the Office of the Assessor

QUESTION 1:

What criteria should voters use to evaluate candidates for Assessor? What are your strongest qualifications for office?

QUESTION 2:

What steps would you take to reduce the possibility of favoritism or corruption when reassessing property in Los Angeles County?

No answers provided.

See complete candidate information at: http://votersedge.org/ca/en/ballot/election/area/73/contests/contest/17243?&county=los%20angeles%20county&election_authority_id=19

MAKING DEMOCRACY WORK®

The *League of Women Voters* is a non-partisan political organization of women and men that encourages informed and active participation in government, works to increase understanding of major public policy issues, and influences public policy through education and advocacy.

Join Us Now!



**LEAGUE OF
WOMEN VOTERS®**

*Contact your local chapter of
the League of Women Voters today!*

Antelope Valley

(661) 274-2704

www.lwvav.org

Beach Cities

(310) 793-0569

www.lwvbeachcities.org

Claremont Area

(909) 624-9457

www.claremont.ca.lwvnet.org

East San Gabriel Valley

(626) 967-8055

www.esgv.ca.lwvnet.org

Glendale-Burbank

(818) 925-4598

www.gb.ca.lwvnet.org

Long Beach Area

(562) 930-0573

www.lba.ca.lwvnet.org

Los Angeles

(213) 368-1616

www.lwvlosangeles.org

Palos Verdes Peninsula

(310) 784-7787

www.lwvpalosverdes.org

Pasadena Area

(626) 798-0965

www.lwv-pa.org

Santa Monica

(310) 692-1494

www.lwvsantamonica.org

Torrance

(310) 223-6897

www.lwvtorrancearea.org

Whittier

(562) 947-5818

www.whittier.ca.lwvnet.org

Press Date: September 1, 2018

The League of Women Voters of California Education Fund (LWVCEF), a 501(c)(3) nonpartisan organization, encourages informed and active participation in government and works to increase understanding of major public policy issues. The LWVCEF does not support or oppose candidates or political parties.

The *Pros & Cons* is a nonpartisan explanation of state propositions, with supporting and opposing arguments. The arguments come from many sources and are not limited to those presented in the *Official Voter Information Guide*. The LWVCEF does not judge the merits of the arguments or guarantee their validity.

The LWVCEF grants permission for the *Pros & Cons* to be reproduced. This publication is available online at CAvotes.org.

League of Women Voters of California Education Fund

921 11th Street, Suite 700
 Sacramento, CA 95814
 916.442.7215 • 888.870.VOTE



General Election • November 6, 2018

At this election, California voters will choose the governor, lieutenant governor, secretary of state, controller, treasurer, attorney general, insurance commissioner, and superintendent of public instruction for the next four-year term, elect one of two U.S. senators to represent the state in Congress, and elect state and federal legislative representatives.

California voters will also be deciding on 11 state propositions that are explained in this *Pros & Cons*. Propositions 1, 2, and 7 were placed on the ballot by the state legislature and the others were placed on the ballot by supporters who gathered sufficient signatures and seek to make changes in state laws or the California Constitution. One initiative, Proposition 9, was removed from the November 6, 2018 ballot by the California Supreme Court.

Visit VotersEdge.org/ca to see everything on your ballot, find your polling place, and get unbiased information on all your voting choices.

How to Evaluate Ballot Propositions

- ★ Examine what the measure seeks to accomplish. Do you agree with those goals?
- ★ Is the measure consistent with your ideas about government? Do you think the proposed changes will make things better?
- ★ Who are the real sponsors and opponents of the measure? Check where the money is coming from on the Voter's Edge California website: votersedge.org/ca
- ★ Is the measure written well? Will it create conflicts in law that may require court resolution or interpretation? Is it "good government," or will it cause more problems than it will resolve?
- ★ Does the measure create its own revenue source? Does it earmark, restrict, or obligate government revenues? If so, weigh the benefit of securing funding for this measure against the cost of reducing overall flexibility in the budget.
- ★ Does the measure mandate a government program or service without addressing how it will be funded?
- ★ Does the measure deal with one issue that can be easily decided by a YES or NO vote? Or, is it a complex issue that should be thoroughly examined in the legislative arena?
- ★ If the measure amends the Constitution, consider whether it really belongs in the Constitution. Would a statute accomplish the same purpose? All constitutional amendments require voter approval; what we put into the Constitution would have to come back to the ballot to be changed.
- ★ Be wary of distortion tactics and commercials that rely on image but tell nothing of substance about the measure. Beware of half truths.

Authorizes Bonds to Fund Specified Housing Assistance Programs.

THE QUESTION: Should the state issue \$4 billion in bonds for housing programs for low-income residents, veterans, farmworkers, plus for mobile homes and transit-oriented housing?

THE SITUATION

An average house in California cost 2.5 times the national average and average rent in California is about 50% higher than the national average. About 100,000 houses and apartments are constructed each year in California, most by private interests, and not by the government. In some instances, the state provides assistance with grants or low-cost loans for construction of housing to be sold or rented to low income individuals. California also receives about \$2 billion each year from the federal government to support housing projects.

General obligation bonds are sold to investors and repaid from the State's General Fund. The State repays the principal and interest over time, approximately thirty-five years for these bonds. A general rule is that principal and interest payments usually are about twice the principal amount of the bonds. Bonds used to fund home loans for veterans are repaid by the veterans through their mortgage payments.

THE PROPOSAL

Proposition 1 permits the state to issue \$4 billion in new general obligation bonds for the following housing programs:

- \$1.8 billion for building or renovating affordable multifamily housing (apartments)
- \$450 million for infrastructure (parks, water, sewage and transportation) to support housing construction
- \$450 million for down payment assistance to low and moderate-income home ownership
- \$300 million for farmworker housing (rental and owner-occupied)
- \$1 billion for home loans to eligible veterans.

This proposal would provide assistance to 30,000 multifamily and 7,500 farmworker households as well as home loans to about 3,000 veterans.

FISCAL EFFECTS

The cost to taxpayers for \$3 billion in bonds would be about \$5.9 billion over a 35 year period or approximately \$170 million a year in order to pay back both the principal and the interest on the general obligation bonds. The \$1 billion set aside for veterans' assistance is repaid as the veterans pay off their loans.

SUPPORTERS SAY

- Proposition 1 provides relief from the housing crisis by building some housing and helping those who struggle to buy housing.
- The measure honors veterans by helping them to buy a home.

OPPONENTS SAY

- Proposition 1 will help a very limited number of persons.
- Californians are being asked to borrow more money through these bonds, which will end up costing everyone.

FOR MORE INFORMATION

Supporters: VetsAndAffordableHousingAct.org

Opponents: At press time, there is no known campaign in opposition to this proposition.

More Information on Bonds

For more information on bonds, see Overview of State Bond Debt in the *Official Voter Information Guide*, Page 72

VoterGuide.sos.ca.gov

Authorizes Bonds to Fund Existing Housing Program for Individuals with Mental Illness.

THE QUESTION: Should \$2 billion in bonds be issued and the Mental Health Services Act be amended to fund the No Place Like Home Program?

THE SITUATION

In 2004, California voters approved Proposition 63 (Prop. 63) which was also called the Mental Health Services Act. It provided funding for county mental health services by increasing the income tax paid by people with an income over \$1 million. Counties are responsible for providing mental health care for people that lack private health insurance. Some counties also provide for other housing, substance abuse treatment and other services for those suffering mental illness

The Legislature passed the No Place Like Home Act of 2016 (NPLHA). This Act authorizes \$2 billion in bonds for use by counties for permanent supportive housing to house people who are eligible for treatment under Prop. 63 and are homeless or at risk of chronic homelessness. The bonds were to be paid off with interest over 30 years using money from the revenue raised by Prop. 63. A system for awarding the bond money to counties and for establishing programs to use it was also created by these bills.

No bonds were issued under the NPLHA because the state must ask for a court decision that the legislation is within the scope of Prop. 63 in extending housing to people with substance abuse and other issues rather than for severely mentally ill patients. The court is to determine if voters must approve the bond. The court decision is pending.

THE PROPOSAL

This proposition approves the No Place Like Home Act of 2016 and approves the issuance of \$2 billion in bonds to support the program. It also amends the provisions of Prop. 63 to allow use of the revenue for NPLHA. No more than \$140 million each year can be used for this program.

FISCAL EFFECTS

There is no direct impact on the state budget because the bonds would be paid back up to \$140 million annually from the funds generated by Prop. 63 to repay up to \$2 billion in bonds used to pay for the No Place Like Home programs. It is estimated that the bonds would be paid off in 30 years at 4.2% interest for approximately \$120 million each year.

SUPPORTERS SAY

- Prop. 2 alleviates the problem of homelessness complicated by mental illness.
- Supportive housing allows coordinated care of individuals who need treatment and housing stability.
- This uses funds already earmarked for mental health services.

OPPONENTS SAY

- Prop. 2 spends money on buildings instead of on badly needed treatment.
- Counties already use Prop. 63 revenue to offer housing to severely mentally ill patients.
- Restrictive zoning laws that make it difficult to build housing is not addressed.

FOR MORE INFORMATION

Supporters: Yes on Props 1&2 Coalition

This proposition is on the ballot by action of the Legislature and the Governor.

CAYesOnProp2.org

Opponents: At press time, there is no known formal campaign in opposition to this Proposition.

Choosing YES or NO on a Proposition

A YES vote means that you approve of the change a proposition would make, and a NO vote means that you want to leave things as they are now.

Authorizes Bonds to Fund Projects for Water Supply and Quality, Watershed, Fish, Wildlife, Water Conveyance, and Groundwater Sustainability and Storage.

THE QUESTION: Should the State sell \$8.9 billion in bonds to fund projects related to water supply and quality, watershed and fisheries restoration, habitat protection, water conveyance and groundwater sustainability and storage?

THE SITUATION

California's water supply faces challenges. The amount and location of available water varies widely from year to year. Unusually wet or dry years can result in local flooding or water shortages. Water may be polluted and unsuitable for any use.

Various government agencies in California spend about \$30 billion annually in the water sector. Over three-quarters of that is spent locally and largely paid for by individual ratepayers for water and sewage treatment plants and cleanup of storm runoff. The State and Federal government play a role by creating regional water supply infrastructure and by setting and enforcing water quality standards.

Over the past 17 years voters have approved \$31 billion in general obligation bonds for various natural resource projects, including \$4.1 billion from Prop. 68 in June 2018. The State has several billion dollars available from those measures, mostly to be used for water quality, supply and infrastructure purposes authorized by Proposition 1 in 2014. The principal and interest on general obligation bonds are repaid from the State's General Fund, usually over 40 years.

THE PROPOSAL

This measure authorizes \$8.9 billion in general obligation bonds for various water-related programs and projects. The proposition's broad spending categories include:

- Water supply and quality - \$2.1 billion;
- Fish and wildlife habitat \$1.4 billion;
- Water facility upgrades for specific projects in the Central Valley, Bay Area, and Oroville Dam, - \$1.2 billion;
- Groundwater recharge and storage projects - \$1.1 billion.
- Watershed land improvements - \$2.5 billion

Most funds will be distributed as grants to agencies that must provide equal matching funds. The measure provides reduced cost-sharing requirements for projects benefiting disadvantaged communities.

FISCAL EFFECTS

Bond repayment is expected to cost the State an estimated \$17.3 billion over 40 years. The effect on local governments will depend on the size of any grant received. Savings are recognized because a grant reduces the local share of a project's cost. However, a project could also increase future operating costs, such as for a new desalination facility. The annual net effect on local governments and ratepayers is likely to be small.

SUPPORTERS SAY

- Proposition 3 will fund projects to help increase water supply from a variety of sources such as storm water capture and desalination.
- It will help insure that disadvantaged communities can access safe drinking water.
- Watershed restoration will improve water quality and protect agricultural interests.

OPPONENTS SAY

- We need more dams to collect rain and snow melt from the Sierras. Proposition 3 provides no money for new dams.
- It panders to special interests by making recreation and wildlife a priority over farmers.
- Paying back these new bonds will result in raised taxes.

FOR MORE INFORMATION

Supporters: Californians for Safe Drinking Water and a Clean and Reliable Water Supply

WaterBond.org

Opponents: At press time, there is no known formal campaign in opposition to this Proposition.

More Information on Bonds

For more information on bonds, see Overview of State Bond Debt in the *Official Voter Information Guide*, Page 72

VoterGuide.sos.ca.gov

Authorizes Bonds Funding Construction at Hospitals Providing Children's Health Care

THE QUESTION: Should the State of California issue \$1.5 billion in general obligation bonds to expand and improve the buildings and equipment at children's hospitals?

THE SITUATION

Children's hospitals provide specialized physical and mental healthcare services to infants and children. There are eight private nonprofit hospitals, five University of California children's hospitals, and more than 100 other nonprofit hospitals that serve children with complex chronic health conditions eligible for the California Children's Services program. Over half the patients receive Medi-Cal benefits. Only a small amount of funding remains from the previous bonds and is expected to be used by mid 2018.

THE PROPOSAL

Prop. 4 would raise \$1.5 billion through the sale of general obligation bonds and use the funds to improve and expand children's hospitals. The money could be used to build new facilities, to improve and expand current facilities, and to purchase new equipment. To obtain funding a hospital would apply to the California Health Facilities Financing Authority of the State Treasurer's Office which would award the grants based on factors such as improving healthcare access and patient outcomes. The 8 private nonprofit children's hospitals would be eligible for 72% of the funds. The rest of the funds would go to University of California children's acute care centers and to nonprofit hospitals that care for children eligible for governmental programs.

FISCAL EFFECTS

The State would need to repay a total of \$2.9 billion. The \$2.9 billion is made up of the original \$1.5 billion bond and \$1.4 billion in interest to be paid back over 35 years. The yearly repayment amount is approximately \$80 million.

SUPPORTERS SAY

- Prop. 4 helps over 2 million sick children each year and leads to better health outcomes.
- Previous bonds have been used to add more beds and purchase new technology.

OPPONENTS SAY

- The bond would need to be repaid, potentially through higher taxes.
- We should first look at improving the entire healthcare system including lowering costs

FOR MORE INFORMATION

Supporters: YesOnProposition4.org

Opponents: At press time, there is no known formal campaign in opposition to this Proposition.

General Election • Tuesday, November 6, 2018
Polls open 7:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m.

October 22
Last day to register to vote

October 8 - October 30
Mailing period for Vote-by-Mail Ballots

(Request your ballot before the **October 30** deadline)

Changes Requirements for Certain Property Owners to Transfer Their Property Tax Base to Replacement Property.

THE QUESTION: Should the California constitution be amended to increase the ability of certain homeowners to obtain tax relief by transferring their Prop. 13-related tax base to a replacement property?

THE SITUATION

Taxes based on the value of real property provide a major revenue source for local governments, schools, and special districts. Such taxes equal a property's assessed value times the applicable tax rate. Proposition 13, as amended, limits property taxes by limiting both value and rates. The tax rate is capped at 1% of the assessed value, which can grow annually by no more than 2%. Reassessment to market value is required for newly purchased or newly constructed property, or if ownership changes.

Exemptions from these reassessment triggers are allowed for homeowners over the age of fifty-five or who have a severe disability. They may transfer the assessed value of a prior home to a replacement residence of equal or lesser market value. The new home must have been purchased within two years of selling the prior home and be located within the same county or in another that permits inter-county transfers. This exemption can be used only once.

THE PROPOSAL

Prop. 5 would expand a homeowner's ability to transfer assessed value to a new home. The market value of the replacement home could be greater or lesser than that of the prior home. The transferred value will be adjusted through the use of a formula. It would be increased if the new home is worth more, or decreased if it is worth less. An increased value will still be less than that based on the current market value. The house could be anywhere in California and the homeowner is not limited to a single exemption. The new home still must be the owner's principal residence and be acquired within two years of the original home's sale. Prop. 5 also applies to situations in which the original property is damaged by a declared disaster or made unusable by contamination.

FISCAL EFFECTS

Local governments. Prop. 5 would have a net effect of reducing local revenue by about \$100 million per year at first, growing to \$1 billion over time. Increased sales would generate property transfer taxes of tens of millions of dollars, while county administrative costs would rise by tens of millions of dollars at first.

Schools. Annual reduction in school revenue would begin at about \$100 million and grow to \$1 billion. Most school losses would be offset by equivalent increases in state funding, thereby increasing State spending by the same amounts.

SUPPORTERS SAY

- Older adults on fixed incomes need this protection.
- More houses will become available for younger families.
- Prop. 5 will protect Prop. 13 tax reductions.

OPPONENTS SAY

- Essential local services and schools will be affected.
- Loss of local revenue will become worse every year.
- Seniors already receive Prop. 13 protection.

FOR MORE INFORMATION

Supporters: Homeownership for Families and Tax Saving for Seniors

At press time, there is no active website.

Opponents: No on Prop. 5

At press time, there is no active website.

Who can vote?

You may register to vote in California if:

- You are a U.S. citizen and California resident.
- You will be at least 18 years old on election day.
- You are not in prison or on parole for a felony.
- You have not been judged mentally incompetent.

When must you re-register to vote?

You need to fill out a new voter registration form if:

- You change your residence address or mailing address.
- You change your name.
- You want to change your political party affiliation.

If you registered and your name does not appear on the voter list at your polling place, you have a right to cast a provisional ballot at any polling place in your county.

Eliminates Certain Road Repair and Transportation Funding. Requires Certain Fuel Taxes and Vehicle Fees be Approved by the Electorate.

THE QUESTION: Should the increase in vehicle fuel taxes and fees enacted by the Legislature in 2017 be reversed and should the Constitution be amended to require voter approval of any transportation related taxes and fees?

THE SITUATION

In 2017 lawmakers passed the Road Repair and Accountability Act (SB 1) increasing state funding for transportation purposes from \$6.6 billion in 2016-17 to \$12.1 billion in 2018-19. By 2020-21 when all the taxes will have been in effect, SB 1 revenue is estimated to total \$5.1 billion annually.

On November 1, 2017 State fuel excise taxes per gallon increased 12 cents for gasoline and 20 cents for diesel. Diesel State sales tax increased by 4 percent. A new transportation fee was added to the cost of registering a vehicle, including a fee for electric cars starting in 2020. After July 1, 2020, fuel excise taxes will be adjusted for inflation.

Voters restricted the new SB 1 tax revenues to transportation purposes by approving Prop. 69 in June 2018.

In March 2018 US News & World Report rated California 49th in road quality, 11th in bridge quality, and 46th in commute times among the fifty states.

THE PROPOSAL

Prop. 6 would:

- Repeal the fuel tax increases and vehicle fees enacted by SB 1.
- Amend the State Constitution to require any future legislatively-imposed taxes on fuels and vehicles to take effect only if the voters of the state vote to approve it.

FISCAL EFFECTS

If Prop. 6 is approved, SB 1 transportation tax revenues will be reduced in 2018-19 from \$4.4 billion to \$2 billion. After that time SB 1 will no longer exist and transportation tax revenue will be reduced by \$5.1 annually. According to the Legislative Analyst, the loss of funding will affect state highway maintenance and rehabilitation, local streets and roads, and mass transit.

Adding the requirement that most transportation-related taxes must also be approved by the voters will make it more difficult to impose such changes in the future.

SUPPORTERS SAY

- Gas taxes and fees are too high, fall the hardest on hardworking families, and are unnecessary in a state that has a budget surplus.
- One third of the gas tax increase will be diverted to non-road related pet projects including building parks and training for formerly incarcerated felons through the Workforce Development Board.
- Tax increases on gasoline that directly affect people's lives are "too big" for just the governor and Legislature to decide.

OPPONENTS SAY

- Cracked, potholed roads pose a major safety threat to California drivers; 89% of counties have roads in poor or at-risk condition and more than 1600 bridges and overpasses are structurally unsafe.
- Reliable transportation infrastructure is critical to get Californians to work, move goods and services to the market, and support our economy.
- Requiring voter approval of fuel taxes or vehicles fees already passed by a supermajority in the Legislature risks the unintended consequences of ballot box budgeting.

FOR MORE INFORMATION

Supporters: Give Voters a Voice

GiveVotersAVoice.com

Opponents: No on Prop. 6

NoProp6.com

Choosing YES or NO on a Proposition

A YES vote means that you approve of the change a proposition would make, and a NO vote means that you want to leave things as they are now.

Conforms California Daylight Savings Time to Federal Law. Allows Legislature to Change Daylight Savings Time Period.

THE QUESTION: Should the legislature be allowed to change Daylight Savings Time by a two-thirds vote if federal law authorizes it?

THE SITUATION

Part-year Daylight Savings Time was started during World War II in order to save energy. California voters approved it in 1949 and for that reason, the voters would have to vote to authorize the legislature to change it to year-round.

Federal law requires states to have Daylight Savings Time from early March to early November and standard time the rest of the year (about four months). However, states are permitted to have standard time all year, without federal approval. Hawaii and Arizona stay on standard time all year. In order for a state to switch to year-round Daylight Savings Time, Congress and the President must approve the proposal.

THE PROPOSAL

Prop. 7 is both an advisory measure and a change in law. It encourages the legislature to consider instituting year-round Daylight Savings Time. It would change current law by requiring a two-thirds vote of the Legislature to change the period of Daylight Savings Time, to make it year round, or to stay on standard time. However, even if two-thirds of the legislature passes such a bill, the change to year-round Daylight Savings Time would still have to be approved by a vote of Congress and a Presidential signature.

FISCAL EFFECTS

The proposition has no direct fiscal impact on state and local government because the legislature and the federal government still must act on it. If the change is made, there could be a minor fiscal impact that is unknown at this time.

SUPPORTERS SAY

- Medical studies show that the risk of heart attacks and strokes increases during the days following a time change.
- Changing clocks twice a year increases our use of electricity by 4%, increases the amount of fuel used by cars and costs \$434 million.

OPPONENTS SAY

- The United States tried year-round Daylight Savings Time in 1974 because of the energy crisis. People hated getting up in the dark in the morning.
- There are no conclusive studies that having Daylight Savings Time year-round saves energy or money.

FOR MORE INFORMATION

Supporters: This proposition is on the ballot by action of the Legislature and the Governor. At press time, there is no known formal campaign in support of this Proposition.

Opponents: At press time, there is no known formal campaign in opposition to this Proposition.

Looking for more information on the propositions?

Official Voter Information Guide

VoterGuide.sos.ca.gov

Read nonpartisan analysis, arguments for and against, and even the full text of the proposed law.

Voter's Edge

VotersEdge.org/ca

Type in your address for comprehensive information about everything on your ballot.
Look up who is giving money to the YES and NO campaigns

Regulates Amounts Outpatient Kidney Dialysis Clinics Charge for Dialysis Treatment

THE QUESTION: Should outpatient dialysis clinics be required to rebate money to private insurers if their revenue exceeds allowable costs by more than 15%?

THE SITUATION

People suffering from End Stage Renal Disease, the final stage of kidney disease, must receive dialysis to survive. Dialysis filters out waste and toxins from blood. It is typically done in a chronic dialysis clinic three times a week with each treatment lasting up to four hours each time. These clinics are licensed by the California Department of Public Health (DPH) using federal certification standards.

Approximately 588 licensed clinics operate in California. The majority of the clinics are owned and run by one of two private for-profit companies. Estimated annual revenue of the private companies is \$3 billion. Most dialysis is paid for by Medicare and Medi-Cal. These programs pay a fixed rate established by the regulations and are close to the average cost of treatment. Private insurance also covers dialysis with payment rates fixed by negotiation with the providers. On average those rates are multiple times higher than that paid by the government programs.

THE PROPOSAL

This proposition requires the companies that own clinics to rebate certain payers, mostly private insurance companies, if the clinic chains' corporate annual revenues are more than 15 % higher than a cap defined in the proposition. The cap is based on the total allowable costs of "direct patient services care" and "health care quality improvement costs." The costs of non-managerial staff salary and benefits, drugs and medical supplies, staff training, patient education, and electronic health information systems fall within the cap. Certain staff such as medical directors and nurse managers are required by federal law. It is not clear if such staff falls within the allowable cost category.

Adjustments to the amount of the cap are allowed if the clinic owner operators prove to a court that the revenue cap is so low that it is an unconstitutional taking of the value of the business. The challenger bears the burden of proving what cap would be appropriate.

FISCAL EFFECTS

The fiscal impacts of this proposition are dependent upon the response of the clinics to it and on interpretations of what allowable costs are by the DPH and the courts. It appears that initially rebates will be paid which reduces the profits of the clinics. The impact on state and local governments varies from a net savings of tens of millions of dollars to a similar net cost.

SUPPORTERS SAY

- Prop. 8 provides incentive for dialysis clinic companies to lower their costs and improve the quality of patient care.
- When insurance companies are charged less for dialysis the overall cost of insurance will decrease for everyone.

OPPONENTS SAY

- Prop. 8 sets arbitrary limits on what insurance companies pay for dialysis treatment will not cover the complete cost of running a clinic.
- Clinics will reduce operations or close, depriving patients of access and increasing the risk of poor medical outcomes.

FOR MORE INFORMATION

Supporters: Californians for Kidney Dialysis Patient Protection
YesOn8.com

Opponents: No on Prop. 8: Stop the Dangerous Dialysis Proposition
NoProp8.com

Prop. 9 was removed from the November 6, 2018 ballot by the California Supreme Court.

Expands Local Governments' Authority to Enact Rent Control on Residential Property.

THE QUESTION: Should the current state law that limits the scope of city and county rent-control ordinances be repealed, thereby allowing cities and counties more authority to limit the rental rates that residential property owners may charge for new tenants, new construction, and single-family homes?

THE SITUATION

Thirty years ago 14 cities, mostly in the highly populated parts of California, adopted rent control ordinances designed to limit the amounts and frequency with which landlords could increase rents to their existing tenants.

In 1995 the state legislature adopted the Costa Hawkins Rental Housing Act. This law limited the ordinances so that the rent on single family homes and buildings first rented out in 1995 or later could not be controlled. Landlords could raise rent to market rates if a tenant left the rental property.

Court decisions determined that limits on rent increases must not be so low that landlords do not receive a "fair rate of return" on their investments. In other words, the landlords must be allowed to raise rent enough to receive some profit each year.

Renters in California pay 50% more than the national average. About 20% of Californians live in cities that have rent control. In the last two years more cities are seeking to establish rent control ordinances. So far two have done so. Other cities placed rent control initiatives on their local ballots that did not pass.

THE PROPOSAL

This proposition repeals the Costa Hawkins Rental Act. It allows cities and counties to regulate rents for whatever type of housing property they choose, no matter when it was built or what type of building it is. It does not change existing rent control laws. It does not create rent control laws. The proposition retains the landlord's right to a fair rate of return on their investment.

FISCAL EFFECTS

The fiscal impact of this proposition is difficult to predict because it depends upon the content of any rent control ordinances adopted and upon the reaction of landlords and tenants to them. If rent control is expanded it is likely that landlords will reduce the amount of rental housing offered, the value of rental housing decreases, some renters will pay less for rent, and landlords have less income from rental housing. There will be impact on property, sales, and income tax revenues. Overall, the impact on state and local governments will be reduced revenue in the tens to hundreds of millions of dollars each year. The losses could be less or more.

SUPPORTERS SAY

- The high cost of rent hurts seniors, families and anyone with a low or fixed income. This proposition will protect them.
- This proposition will allow local communities to decide whatever makes sense for their rental housing issues.

OPPONENTS SAY

- Rent control laws reduce the amount of rental property available because landlords will stop renting and does not encourage more building.
- This proposition allows the creation of new local bureaucracies with power to regulate rents on all types of residential property.

FOR MORE INFORMATION

Supporters: Yes on 10

AffordableHousingAct.org

Opponents: No on Prop. 10

NoProp10.org

More information is only a mouse-click away.

Visit our website, CAvotes.org, for more information about the ballot measures, answers to your questions about voting, and a wealth of information on government and public policy. You can see a list of local Leagues in your community, many of which provide ballot measure speakers and candidate forums. We encourage you to sign up and become a member, and to donate or volunteer.



Requires Private-Sector Emergency Ambulance Employees to Remain On Call During Work Breaks. Changes Other Conditions of Employment.

THE QUESTION: Should the Labor Code be amended to allow private ambulance employees to remain on call during work breaks and to exempt their employers from potential liability for violations of existing law regarding work breaks?

THE SITUATION

California counties oversee local Emergency Medical Services (EMS). Private ambulance providers (Providers) enter into contracts to perform EMS in a specific area, subject to performance requirements. Periodic contract renegotiations address changes in Providers' costs. Ambulances are geographically positioned based on service demand. When an ambulance is dispatched, other area ambulances are repositioned.

Historically EMS personnel remain "on call" during work breaks, which are often interrupted by 911 calls or repositioning. In a 2016 case (Augustus) involving private security guards required to remain "on call" during rest breaks, the California Supreme Court held that such breaks do not comply with state labor law; rather they must be off-duty and uninterruptible (even in an emergency). The security guards were awarded penalties and damages.

Given the similarity between EMS personnel and Augustus, it appears probable that Provider personnel practices must change. Providers estimate that, relative to current practice, 25 percent more ambulances would be required to meet the requirements of Augustus.

THE PROPOSAL

Prop.11 would amend state labor laws applicable to Providers' personnel, allowing them to remain on call throughout their breaks. It also would change several other rules regarding meal and rest breaks, while requiring Providers to operate enough ambulances to meet performance requirements.

Prop.11 would limit legal liability that Providers might face if the Augustus decision is applied to Providers' personnel. Several lawsuits regarding the work break practices for ambulance employees are in the court system. The on call rules established by this proposition would be applied retroactively to such lawsuits. The measure also requires ambulance providers to offer EMS personnel additional training, education, counseling and services.

FISCAL EFFECTS

The fiscal effects of Prop.11 are calculated on the assumption that Augustus will be held to apply to Provider personnel, including past period legal liability.

Prop. 11 would relieve Providers of the cost of operating more ambulances to cover off-duty breaks—potentially over \$100 million annually. Other provisions might require Providers to ensure that there are more ambulances in an area. Providers that do not offer training and education at the levels required under Prop. 11 would have new costs, likely in the low tens of millions of dollars annually.

Prop. 11 will result in local government net savings, likely in the tens of millions of dollars annually, due to lower emergency ambulance contract costs.

SUPPORTERS SAY

- Prop. 11 establishes into law the longstanding industry practice of paying medical personnel to be on call during their work breaks.
- It is essential that emergency personnel are able to respond quickly and deliver lifesaving medical care during mass casualty events. Prop. 11 mandates that such personnel receive additional training to meet emergency standards.

OPPONENTS SAY

No arguments have been filed against Prop. 11

FOR MORE INFORMATION

Supporters: Yes on 11—Californians for Emergency Preparedness & Safety

YesOn11.org

Opponents: At press time, there is no known campaign in opposition to this proposition.

Vote Requirement for State Propositions

Any state proposition passes if more than 50 percent of the votes cast on that proposition are YES.

Establishes New Standards for Confinement of Certain Farm Animals. Bans Sale of Certain Non-Complying Products.

THE QUESTION: Should the State revise its current farm animal confinement laws with new confinement space standards for egg-laying hens, pregnant pigs, and calves raised for veal, and prohibit the sale of eggs and meat that do not comply with these standards, including those produced in other states?

THE SITUATION

In 2008 California voters approved a ballot initiative to ban the confinement of egg-laying hens, pregnant pigs, and calves raised for veal in a manner that did not allow them to “turn around freely, lie down, stand up, and fully extend their wings or limbs.” The law took effect in 2015, but problems arose, including complaints that the description of approved confinement space was too vague, and a lack of clarity about implementation and enforcement.

THE PROPOSAL

Proposition 12 would:

- By 2020, comply with the specific standard measurements set out in the proposition for cages of egg-laying hens, and calves raised for veal.
- By 2020, ban the sale of eggs and meat in which egg-laying hens, breeding pigs, and calves raised for veal are confined in areas smaller than a specific measurement by square feet, whether produced within California or originating in other states.
- By 2022, require that egg-laying hens in California be housed in cage-free housing systems, and that eggs from other states conform to California’s confinement standards in order to be sold in California.
- Designate the California Department of Food and Agriculture and the California Department of Public Health jointly responsible for the measure’s implementation.

FISCAL EFFECTS

- Potential decrease in state income tax revenues from farm businesses due to expenses incurred to meet the space requirements, likely not more than several million dollars annually costs up to \$10 million annually to enforce the measure.
- State costs up to \$10 million annually to enforce the measure.
- Consumer prices likely to increase for eggs, pork, and veal while farmers in California and other states change their housing systems to meet the measure.

SUPPORTERS SAY

Proposition 12 would:

- Strengthen and clarify California’s decade-old farm animal anti-cruelty law.
- Prevent egg-laying hens, breeding pigs, and veal calves from being housed inhumanely in small cages for their entire lives.
- Reduce the risk of people being sickened by food poisoning and factory farm pollution by preventing overcrowding of animals in small spaces.

OPPONENTS SAY

Proposition 12:

- Is not a truly cruelty-free alternative to current factory farm practices.
- Would face court or legislative challenges from other states regarding the ban on selling non-conforming eggs and meat.
- Mandates full compliance by 2022, a too-narrow time frame that could result in supply disruptions, price spikes, and shortages of eggs, pork products, and veal.

FOR MORE INFORMATION

Supporters: Prevent Cruelty California
PreventCrueltyCA.com

Opponents: Californians Against Cruelty, Cages, and Fraud
NoOnProposition12.org

Choosing YES or NO on a Proposition

A YES vote means that you approve of the change a proposition would make, and a NO vote means that you want to leave things as they are now.

GET THE FACTS BEFORE YOU VOTE!



- ✓ Get in-depth information on candidates, measures, and who supports them
- ✓ Use your address to get a personalized ballot
- ✓ Check where, when, and how to vote
- ✓ Keep track of your choices and use them to vote
- ✓ Share and start the conversation!

www.votersedge.org

Brought to you by

MapLight

LWV LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS® OF CALIFORNIA EDUCATION FUND

LWV LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS®