



California and Local Ballot Measures What Do They Mean?

November 6, 2018 General Election



10/21/2018



1

General Information

- Pro & Con informs voters about the ballot measures. The League does not support or oppose or endorse candidates or political parties.
- This presentation explains the measures, gives the pro and con arguments, and who supports or opposes each measure and the contribution they have made.
- State measures are followed by Butte County measures.
- Election Websites:
 Official California Voters Guide: <http://voterguide.sos.ca.gov/>
 Pros & Cons: <https://cavotes.org/vote/elections/ballot-measures>
 Voter's Edge: State and Local Ballot information: <http://votersedge.org>
 EZ Voter: <http://easyvoterguide.org/>
 Butte County cities measures https://clerk.recorder.buttecounty.net/elections/archives/el139/39_local_measures.html



2

Definitions of Measures

Bonds

Revenue Bonds. Are backed by a revenue stream. Example: Bridge tolls repay a bridge building bond. Because they are not repaid with state funds, voters do not vote on revenue bonds.

General obligation bonds are issued by the state and add to state debt. They are repaid with interest by the state until the bond is retired. Voter's must approve General Obligation bonds.

A **Referendum** is a vote on an act passed by the Legislature. Seeks to overturn the law.

An **Initiative** means that the measure was placed on the ballot by petition; requires signatures of 5% of voters that voted for governor in the last election

A **Constitutional Amendment** adds the measure to the state constitution, and it can only be removed by another vote.

A successful **Statute** adds it to the California Code but does not amend the Constitution.

Several propositions are **Constitutional Amendments** and **Statutes**.

10/21/2018



3

November 2018 Propositions

1. Housing Bond (Legislative Statute / Bond)
2. Housing Bond for Individuals with Mental Illness (Legislative Statute/Bond)
3. Water Infrastructure Bond (Initiative Statute/Bond)
4. Children's Health Care Bond (Initiative Statute/Bond)
5. Portable Prop. 13 Benefits (Initiative Constitutional Amendment/Statute)
6. Gas Tax Repeal (Initiative/Constitutional Amendment) 0
7. Year-Round Daylight Savings Time (Legislative Statute)
8. Regulation of kidney dialysis clinics (Initiative Statute)
9. Divide California into 3 States [Removed from ballot]
10. Expanded Rent Control (Initiative Statute)
11. Regulates private sector ambulance employment (Initiative Statute)
12. New standards of confinement for farm animals. (Initiative Statute)

10/21/2018



4

Prop 1: Affordable Housing Bond

Legislative Statute / General Obligation Bond



10/21/2018

5

1: Affordable Housing Bond

A YES VOTE: Gives the state permission to borrow \$4 billion to fund affordable housing construction (\$3 billion) and to subsidize home loans for veterans (\$1 billion). Has specific amounts for multifamily housing, infrastructure, parks and transportation.

ESTIMATED COST: The cost of the \$3 billion bond is \$5.9 billion over 35 years, approx. \$170 million per year for principal and interest. The \$1 Billion bond for veterans' assistance is repaid as veteran's pay off their loans.



10/21/2018



6

1: Pros

Supporters say:

- Provides relief from the housing crisis by building housing and helping those struggling with high real estate costs in California
- Honors veterans by helping them to afford housing.
- \$5,523,958 – Contributions as of October 11, 2018
 - Affordable housing Now – Yes on Props 1 & 2 Coalition: Housing California, California Housing Consortium, State Building and Construction Trades, Council of California and Silicon Valley Leadership Group.
 - Chan Zuckerberg Advocacy
 - Essex Property Trust, Inc.
 - Members' Voice of the State Building and Construction Trades Council
- 569 Organizations support Prop. 1

10/21/2018



7

1: Cons

Opponents say:

- This bond will result in a one time boost in housing construction, a blip in supply that will do nothing to combat the long-term and persistent shortage that the state faces.
- For that minimal benefit, taxpayers will be saddled with billions more in debt.

No organizations are recorded as opposed to Prop. 1

No contributions have been reported

10/21/2018



8

Prop. 2: Bonds to Fund Existing Program for Housing for Individuals with Mental Illness

Initiative Statute / Bond



9

10/21/2018

2: Mental Health Housing

- **A YES vote:** Approves the No Place Like Home Act of 2016 and issuance of \$2 billion in bonds to fund supportive housing for those suffering with mental illness and repay the cost of that bond with money dedicated to mental health services (Mental Health Services Act).
- **History:** In 2004, voters approved Proposition 63, imposing a 1% income tax on millionaires to fund mental health services. A 2016 bill to spend \$2 billion from Prop 63 funds on permanent supportive housing was challenged in court for lack of voter approval. Counties are now sitting on millions of dollars reserved for the homeless and unsure how to spend it. Rather than wait out the court battle, state lawmakers are taking the question to voters.
- **Cost:** No direct impact on State budget. Paid Back with \$140 million annually from funds generated by Prop. 63. Paid off in 30 years at 4.2% interest at \$120 million per year



10

10/21/2018

2: Pro

Supporters say:

- Providing housing paired with social and health services is one of the most effective ways to help the chronically homeless who suffer from mental illness.
- This is entirely within the spirit of Prop 63.
- Uses funds already earmarked for mental health services

\$5,523,958 – Contributions Total (October 11, 2018)

- Affordable housing Now – Yes on Props 1 & 2 Coalition: Housing California, California Housing Consortium, State Building and Construction Trades, Council of California and Silicon Valley Leadership Group.
- Chan Zuckerberg Advocacy
- Essex Property Trust, Inc.
- Members' Voice of the State Building and Construction Trades Council

569 Organizations support Prop. 1



10/21/2018

11

2: Con

Opponents say:

- Builds housing at the expense of basic mental health treatment.
- Prop. 63 already allows counties to use revenue to offer housing to severely mentally ill patients.
- Does not address the difficulty of changing zoning laws to build housing for this population.

No organizations oppose Prop. 2

No contribution data reported



10/21/2018

12

Prop 3: Water Infrastructure Bond

Initiative Statute / General Revenue Bond



10/21/2018



13

3: Water Infrastructure Bond

A YES vote: Permits the State to borrow \$8.9 billion to fund watershed protection, wastewater projects, groundwater management, as well as upgrades and repairs to traditional water infrastructure, like canals and dams.

Details:

- Water supply and quality – \$2.1 billion
- Fish and Wildlife habitat oo \$1.4 billion
- Water facilities for projects at Oroville Dam, Central Valley and Bay Area – \$1.2 billion
- Groundwater recharge and storage –\$1.1 billion

Cost: \$17.3 billion over 40 years, about \$435 million per year.

10/21/2018



3: Pros

Supporters say:

- From the Oroville Dam to groundwater depletion in the Central Valley to the Salton Sea, California faces no shortage of water woes.
- Bonds provide long-term, recession-proof, dedicated revenue stream.
- Savings to counties and local governments reduces local share of total cost
- Helps communities access to clean drinking water.

\$ 5,063,486 – Contributions total (as of October 11, 2018)

- Ducks Unlimited
- California Wildlife Federation
- Western Growers
- California Waterfowl Association
- California Fresh Fruit Association

418 Organizations are supporting Prop 3.



15

10/21/2018

3. Cons

Opponents say:

- No money for more dams to increase storage and supply.
- Panders to special interests by giving recreation and wildlife priority over agriculture.
- Raised taxes to repay bonds.
- The state hasn't spent all of the money it borrowed in 2014.
- 17 organizations are recorded as opposed to Prop. 1
- No contribution data reported



16

10/21/2018

Prop 4: Bond for Construction at Hospitals Providing Children's Health Care

Initiative Statute / Bond



10/21/2018

17

4: Children's Hospital Bond

A YES vote

- allows the state to sell \$1.5 billion in bonds for renovations, expansions, and new equipment at hospitals that treat children.
- Hospitals must prove that money will benefit low income and non-insured patients.
- 72% of funding would go to 8 private non-profit hospitals; remaining 18% to University of California and public hospitals.

COST

- Total cost of \$2.9 billion; made up of the original \$1.5 billion and \$1.4 billion in interest over 35 years.
- Annual repayment would be \$80 million.



10/21/2018

18

4: Pros

Supporters say:

- Prop. 4 helps over 2 million sick children each year.
- Medical technology is constantly changing so upgrading facilities and equipment is vital.
- the low reimbursement rates from Medi-Cal mean that hospitals the can't afford to make these kinds of investments.

\$10, 932,096 – Contributions total (October 11, 2018)

Yes on Children's Hospital, California Children's Hospital Association /
8 private non-profit hospitals

60 Organizations support Prop. 4



10/21/2018

19

4. Cons

Opponents say:

- We should look at improving the entire health-care system and lowering costs
- The debt obligation of the bond may increase taxes
- Uneven distribution between private hospitals (72%) and public hospitals (18%)
- 17 organizations oppose Prop. 4
- No contribution data reported



10/21/2018

20

Prop 5: Portable Prop. 13 Benefits

Initiative/Constitutional Amendment & Statute



21

10/21/2018

5: Revised Property Tax Rules

A YES vote

- Expands the property tax rules for homeowners over 55 or older and those whose homes have been affected by natural disaster.
- These homeowners would be allowed to keep paying similar property tax no matter where or how many times they move.
- Moving to a less expensive house would lower the property tax.

COST:

- Net effect would reduce property tax revenue by about \$100 million annually at first, but would grow to \$1 billion over time.
- School revenue loss would start at \$100 million annually at first, but would grow to \$1 billion over time.
- Losses to local school districts would be offset by increasing state funding.



22

10/21/2018

5: Pros

Supporters say:

- Older homeowner's on fixed-incomes need this protection.
- Empty-nesters are living in large houses and large apartments because of Prop. 13 property tax savings.
- A better large dwelling supply will benefit younger and first-time home buyers. Encouraging the first group to sell to the second is a win-win.
- Protects Prop. 13 benefits

\$10,932,096 Contributions total (as of October 11, 2018)

- Home Ownership for Families and Tax Savings for Seniors.
- California Association of Realtors
- National Association of Realtors
- 5 organizations support Prop. 5

10/21/2018



23

5: Cons

Opponents say:

- It strips millions of dollars from our already cash-strapped school districts and local governments.
- Those over 55 are not necessarily low-income, many young families cannot afford housing
- This is one of the least direct ways to address the state's housing crisis.

\$2,862,680 - Contributions total (as of October 11, 2018)

- SEIU California State PAC
- California Teachers Association
- California Federation of Teachers
- California Firefighters Ballot Issues Committee
- 54 Organizations oppose Prop. 5

10/21/2018



24

Prop 6: Gas Tax Repeal

Initiative Constitutional Amendment



25

10/21/2018

6: Gas Tax Repeal

A YES vote

- Repeals a recent increase in the gas tax and other fuel and car fees and requires voter approval for any new taxes on vehicles and fuels.

History:

- Last year, lawmakers passed a bill (SB1) to raise the state tax on gasoline for the first time in over two decades to fund repairs and maintenance of roads and highways.
- The bill also raised taxes on diesel fuel and introduced a new car fee.

Cost:

- In 2018/19 SB1 revenues will decrease from \$4.4 billion to \$2 billion.
- The loss of funding will affect state highways, local streets and roads and mass transit maintenance and rehabilitation



26

10/21/2018

6: Pros

Supporters say:

- High gas taxes fall the hardest on lower income citizens
- One-third of the increase is diverted to non-road related projects like parks and training released felons through the Workforce Development Board.
- Lawmakers should be forced to trim spending and improve efficiency before asking drivers for more money.
- Spend some of California's rainy day fund on roads.

\$5,316,713 – Contributions Total (October 11, 2018)

- California Republican Party
- Howard Jarvis Taxpayers Association
- John Cox for Governor
- Making Investments Majority Insured PAC

•17 organizations support Prop. 6



10/21/2018

27

6: Cons

Opponents say:

- California hasn't raised its gas tax in decades and the transportation infrastructure is crumbling as a result.
- Conditions are unsafe for drivers and bad for business.
- Money spent on roads and highways provides many good paying jobs.
- Roads and highways will continually need upgrades.
- Can we afford to let roads, bridges and highways get worse?
- This should not be a Constitutional Amendment, would require another initiative process to repeal.

\$36,307,304 – Contributions total (as of October 11, 2018)

California Alliance for Jobs
Laborers Pacific Southwest Regional Coalition
State Building and Trade Construction Council
Southwest Regional Council of Carpenters
Working for Working America,
Northern California Carpenters Council, United Contractors

492 organizations oppose Prop. 6

10/21/2018



28

Prop 7: Daylight Savings Time

Legislative Statute



10/21/2018

29

7: Daylight Savings Time

A YES vote:

- If this proposition passes, it does not mean that California can act immediately to enact year-round Daylight Savings Time.
- Overturns 1949 California law to mandate DST.
- Passage would indicate that Californians would like the legislature to begin the process of asking the federal government to add the option of year-around DST to the Federal Uniform Time Act. This would take an act of Congress and a Presidential signature.
- Changing the Federal Law would add year-around DST to the current options of a) year-around standard time (Arizona and Hawaii currently) and b) the switch from Standard to Daylight and back to Standard on the nationally mandated dates.

Cost: No direct fiscal impact on the state has been identified.



10/21/2018

30

7: Pro & Con

Supporters say:

- Medical studies indicate that clock-switching increases traffic accidents, heart attacks, workplace accidents and other hazards as people.
- Difficult to change sleep schedules.
- All-year daylight savings time saves energy.

3 organizations support Prop. 1

No contribution data reported

Opposing arguments

- Dangerous for children and commuters to have to walk and drive in the dark in winter.
- No conclusive studies that it would save energy or money.

6 organizations are opposed to Prop. 1

No contribution data reported

10/21/2018



31

Prop 8: Dialysis Clinic Profit Limit

Initiative Statute



10/21/2018



32

8: Dialysis Clinic Profit Limit

A YES vote:

- Requires companies that operate dialysis clinics to pay back insurers any profits over 15 % of qualifying business costs.

History: There are 588 licensed clinics in California. The majority are owned by two for-profit companies. Estimated annual revenue is \$3 billion. Most dialysis paid for by Medicare and Medicaid at a fixed rate closely tied to the cost of treatment. Private insurers rates are much greater.

Cost:

- Budget effects would depend on how clinics react to the law and how the courts and Dept. of Public Health interpret the law.
- Either savings or costs to state and local governments would be significant.

10/21/2018



33

8: Pro

Supporters say:

- Lowers cost without compromising patient care.
- If Dialysis costs less, insurance rates should decrease.
- The two companies that operate most of California's dialysis clinics are enormously profitable. In 2017, for example, DaVita netted \$1 billion.

\$20,394,117 - Contributions Total (as of October 11, 2018)

- Service Employees International Union
- California Democratic Party
- Int'l Brotherhood of Electrical Workers

147 Organizations support Prop. 8

10/21/2018



34

8. Con

Opponents say:

- Sets arbitrary limits on what insurance companies for dialysis that will not cover the cost of treatment.
- Clinics will have fewer hours or close making dialysis more inconvenient and creating an increased risk or poor medical outcomes.

\$99,302,518 - Contributions total (as of October 11, 2018)

- Fresenius Medical Care North America
- Da Vita
- US Renal Care, Inc.
- American Renal Management LLC

168 organizations oppose Prop. 8

10/21/2018



35

10/21/2018

Prop 9: Three California's

Taken off ballot pending court challenge



36

Prop. 10: Expand Local Government Authority to Enact Rent Control on Residential Property

Initiative Statute



10/21/2018

37

10: Expanded Rent Control

A YES vote:

- Repeals the Costa-Hawkins Act to allow cities & counties to regulate rents for housing of any type.
- Does not change existing rent-control laws.
- Retains the landlord's right to a fair return on investment.
- Gives control to communities

Cost:

- Difficult to predict
- If passed landlord's may sell rental property reducing the amount of rental housing available.
- There will be impact on property, sales and income tax revenues.
- State and local government revenue will be reduced, but hard to know how much.



10/21/2018

38

10: Pro

Supporters say:

- The high cost of rent hurts seniors, families and anyone with a low or fixed income.
- Allows communities to decide whatever make the best sense for their rental housing situations.

\$23,069,275 - Contributions total (as of October 11, 2018)

- Aids Healthcare Foundation
- California Teachers Association
- American Federation of County & Municipal Employees, Local 329
- California Nurses Association

298 Organizations support Prop. 10



10/21/2018

39

Prop 10. Con

Opponent's say:

- Rent control laws reduce the amount of rental property available.
- Does not encourage building new rental housing.
- Allows creation of new bureaucracies to regulate rental property.
- Could cause landlord's to avoid controls by selling property and reducing the supply of rental housing

\$59,685,453 - Contributions total (as of October 11, 2018)

- Western National Group
- Blackstone Property Partners
- California Association of Realtors
- Equity Residential

115 Organizations oppose Prop. 10



10/21/2018

40

Proposition 11 – Paramedic Break Time

Initiative Statute



LWV
LEAGUE OF
WOMEN VOTERS®

41

10/21/2018

11: Paramedic Break Time

A YES vote:

- Private ambulance companies would require their EMS employees to remain on call for emergencies during meal and rest breaks.
- An interrupted break would require an equivalent break during the same shift.
- Protects ambulance companies from having to pay employees retroactively
- Also guarantees EMS technicians additional training and some paid medical health services.
- Does not apply to public ambulance employees.

Cost:

- Does not add to California's debt
- Lower costs for private ambulance companies.
- Cities and Counties would save money.

LWV
LEAGUE OF
WOMEN VOTERS®

42

10/21/2018

11: Pro

Supporters say:

- While most EMS responders are employees of private ambulance companies, they are just like police and firefighters and need to be on-call in emergencies.
- This proposition would ensure that workers are compensated for missed or interrupted breaks.
- Essential that EMS responders be able to respond quickly.

\$21,900,786 – Contributions total (as of October 11, 2018)

American Medical Response

27 Organizations support Prop. 11



10/21/2018

43

11. Con

- No arguments in opposition have been received.
- No contribution data reported (October 11, 2018)
- 5 organizations oppose Prop. 11

10/21/2018

44

Prop. 12 –Bigger Farm Animal Cages

Initiative Statute



45

10/21/2018

12: Bigger Farm Animal Cages

A YES vote:

- Creates specific rules about the size of cages for pregnant pigs, egg-laying hens and veal cows.
- By 2022, would require all egg-laying hens be raised in specified "cage-free" conditions.
- Would be illegal to sell meat or eggs from non-compliant providers.
- Would apply to anyone selling related food products in California, even if the farms are out of state.
- Expands the provisions of Prop 2 (2008) requiring farm animals to be able to stand up and turn around in their cages.

Cost:

- It would cost up to \$10 million annually to enforce the new rules.
- If farmers raised fewer animals, the state would receive less tax revenue.
- New enclosures would have to be purchased, raising prices of meat and eggs.



46

10/21/2018

12: Pros

Supporters say:

- Strengthen and clarify California's decade-old farm animal anti cruelty law.
- It is cruel and unsafe to keep animals in small cages.
- Increased cage sized will reduce the risks of food poisoning and farm pollution.

\$11,699,473 - Contributors (as of October 11, 2018)

- Humane Society of the United States
- Open Philanthropy Action Fund
- Deborah Stone

58 Organizations support Prop. 12



47

10/21/2018

12: Cons

Opponents say:

- Requires many farmers to completely overhaul the way they do business, leading to higher food prices.
- Even the cages called for in Prop 12 would not be large enough for all types of egg-laying hens.
- These new rules also overlook the fact that animals are often kept in cages to reduce aggression and protect them from themselves.

\$566,360 – Contributions total (October 11, 2018)

- Human Farming Action Fund

10 Organizations oppose Prop. 12.



10/21/2018

Local Measures

More information at

https://clerk-recorder.buttecounty.net/elections/archives/el39/39_local_measures.html

Chico: Measure S: Charter Amendment– Term Limits for City Council Members

Oroville: Measure U: Cannabis Business Tax

Oroville: Measure T: Transactions Use Tax

Paradise: Measure V: Extension of General Transactions and Use Tax

School Bonds: Biggs, Durham, Marysville, Paradise, Thermalito

10/21/2018



Chico: Measure S: Term Limits for City Council Members (Charter Amendment)

The proposal

- Amends the Chico Charter to add term limitations for the members of the City Council.
- Would eliminate the ability to serve unlimited terms
- Any time served by a person serving in office before November 6, 2018, would not count toward the term limit thereafter.
- After term limit is reached, can run again in 2 years

A YES vote

- would eliminate the ability of persons serving as a City Council Member to serve unlimited terms, and would impose a term limit after 12 years

Cost: no increased cost.

10/21/2018



50

Measure S: Pro & Con

Supporters say

- Term limits encourage greater citizen participation in government by ensuring regular turnover on the City Council.
- Term limits are mandated for national and state elected officers, why not Chico?
- More Chico residents can and will run for office.

Opponents say

- Experience matters, no evidence that inexperienced people make better decisions than those with more experience.
- People should be able to vote for the person they believe to be most qualified.
- The best term limits happen at the ballot box.

10/21/2018



51

Oroville / Measure T: Cannabis Business Tax

The Proposal:

- Amends the Oroville Municipal Code of up to 10% on gross receipts for cannabis business located in Oroville. City Council can impose a tax of any percentage with a limit of 10%.
- Tax would be imposed on all commercial businesses in retail, manufacture, distribution, nurseries whether for commercial or medical uses.
- Does not, in itself, permit commercial activity
- Does not imply or authorize activities connected with distribution, possession or sale of cannabis.

Cost:

- No revenue or cost information was included in the impartial analysis of Measure T.

10/21/2018



52

Oroville: Measure T: Cannabis Business Tax

Supporters say:

- No Argument in favor of Measure T was submitted.

Opponents say:

- Cannabis will negatively impact quality of life, youth and unintended consequences.
- Cannabis is being introduced as tobacco was, this normalization and commercialization of cannabis implies that it is a safer product than it is.
- To date, actual revenue has not matched anticipated levels.
- The potential consequences are being ignored because of the interest in added revenue.
- Uncertain if the revenue will surpass the cost of enforcement and management.

10/21/2018



Oroville / Measure U: Transactions Use Tax

Proposal:

- Adds a transaction and use (sales) tax of 1% on the sale and or use of all retail sales and services in Oroville.
- Requires a Citizen's Oversight Committee to make proposals, review and present a public report quarterly on the use and effectiveness of the funds.
- Revenue supports general city operations including police, fire, repair and maintenance, and finance and human resource departments.

Cost:

City Finance Director estimates revenue of \$3.7 million per year.

10/21/2018



Oroville / Measure U: Transactions Use Tax /Pro & Con

Supporters say:

- Prevents cuts to police and fire departments, decreases crime rate.
- Restores library funds, youth and senior programs, and street, road and sidewalk repair.
- Grand Jury report noted losses in public safety with a rise in crime as a result.
- Maintains or improves 911 emergency response times.
- All revenues are spent locally.

Opponent's say:

- General dysfunction of City Council may impact effectiveness of increased revenue.
- Despite fiscal situation, City Council has not prioritized expenditures to highest priority needs.

10/21/2018



55

Paradise: Measure V: Extension of General Transactions and Use Tax

A YES vote:

- Extends the current 0.5% transactions and use tax on all retail transactions for 10 years (March 31, 2031).
- Current transaction and use tax expires in March 31, 2021).
- Supports police, fire, emergency services, animal control and street maintenance.
- Continues the mandatory citizen oversight committee that reviews and makes recommendations on expenditures.

Cost:

Current tax raises \$1.4 million annually



10/21/2018

56

Paradise: Measure V: Transactions and Use Tax Extensions / Pro & Con

Supporters say:

- Improved safety, services and infrastructure will increase property values.
- Extends an existing tax, not an additional tax.
- Basic necessities such as food and prescriptions are not subject to tax.
- Includes accountability, citizen oversight and mandatory financial reviews and quarterly reports to ensure revenues spent as promised.

Opponents say:

- No opposing statement was submitted.

10/21/2018



Butte County School Bond Measures

Biggs -- If passed, District will issue \$9.5 million in bonds to fund safely improvements, facilities upgrades, safety, learning technology, systems repair or replacement, energy efficiency. Total debt service is \$19.1 million until 2010/51. Estimated tax levy is .047 cents per \$100 assessed valuation.

Durham -- If passed, District will issue \$19.7 million in bonds to fund safely improvements, facilities upgrades, safety, learning technology, systems repair or replacement, energy efficiency. Total debt service is \$41.3 million until 2052/53. Estimated tax levy is 6 cents per \$100 assessed valuation.

10/21/2018



School Bonds

- **Paradise** -- If passed, District will issue \$61 million in bonds to fund safely improvements, facilities upgrades, safety, learning technology, systems repair or replacement, energy efficiency. Total debt service is \$125.8 million until 2043/44. Estimated tax levy is 5.7 cents per \$100 assessed valuation.
- **Thermalito** -- If passed, District will issue \$4.5 million in bonds to fund safely improvements, facilities upgrades, safety, learning technology, systems repair or replacement, energy efficiency. Total debt service is \$9.15 million until 2050/51. Estimated tax levy is 3 cents per \$100 assessed valuation.

10/21/2018



59

Dates and Deadlines

- **Vote-By-Mail Deadline** -- Must be postmarked on or before Election Day and received by your county elections office no later than 3 days after Election Day. If you are not sure your ballot will arrive in time if mailed, bring it to any polling place in your county between 7:00 a.m. and 8:00 p.m. on Election Day.
- **October 22** - Last day to register to vote. *Make sure you are correctly registered.*
- **October 30** - Last day for the county election office to receive your vote-by-mail application
- **November 6** -- Election Day (polls open 7am-8pm) (Ballots must be postmarked by Nov 6 & received by Nov 9)

10/21/2018



60

Don't forget to ...

Vote

10/21/2018



Acknowledgements

Several chapters of the California League of Voters contributed to this presentation. Many hands make light work. Our thanks to all of them.

*LWV of Butte County
Voter Service Team*

10/21/2018

