

**PROP 15    SCHOOLS & COMMUNITIES FIRST****YES**

The Schools & Communities First initiative will raise \$12 billion every year for California's schools, essential workers, and local governments. This will come by ensuring that all corporate properties worth more than \$3 million pay their fair share of property taxes – while protecting homeowners and renters, small businesses, and agriculture. This money is needed now more than ever and is critical to California's recovery and reinvestment.

**Vote YES on Prop 15**

**League Analysis:**

The League of Women Voters of California is a proponent of Prop 15, the Schools & Communities First Initiative. League positions support full funding for critical government services, including schools and services provided by local governments. These services include those related to: libraries, parks, infrastructure maintenance, health care, mental health care, children and family support, and elections. We also support a broad tax base in order to provide more stable funding for these critical services. Prop 15 will provide both increased funding, and a stable source of funding for schools and local governments.

Property taxes fund schools and local governments. Since 1978, property taxes in California have been limited to one percent of the value of the property. More importantly, properties are only reassessed when they change ownership. Some commercial property owners – particularly larger corporations – have not been reassessed for many years for a variety of reasons including corporate structures that make it difficult to determine if property ownership changed. This has led to a decline in funding for schools and local governments.

Under Prop 15, all residential property will continue to be exempt from reassessment until it is sold or transferred. This includes single family houses, apartment buildings, and anywhere else people live, such as: nursing homes, mobile home parks, and the residential part of mixed-use developments. In addition, Prop 15 exempts agricultural land.

Prop 15 only affects commercial property worth more than \$3 million dollars, requiring reassessment at market value once every three years instead of waiting for the property to change ownership. Because of corporate structuring it is often difficult to determine when a commercial property changes ownership with the result of properties never being assessed as a whole. This reduces the amount of property tax revenue available to schools and communities.

Prop 15 does not affect home based businesses which account for nearly half of all small businesses in California. They will continue to be treated as residential property.

Further Prop 15 reduces the tax on tangible personal property (business equipment) up to \$500,000 for all businesses, whether they own commercial property or not. This benefits small businesses.

It is anticipated that 10% of the commercial properties will account for over 90% of the almost \$12 million raised by Prop 15. The money stays within the counties and does not go into the State General Fund.

Given the current pandemic, California is in need of both short and long term recovery measures. We anticipate that short term recovery measures will be established by the state and federal governments. Prop 15 is one piece of that longer-term recovery and reinvestment package.

Taxes matter. They are how we invest in and build strong communities. Schools and local government services are the ways we actually do that – invest in our communities. Strong communities build a healthy economy. These strong communities are places we are all proud to live in, communities in which we all have opportunities to succeed.

### **Prop 15 Related Positions:**

[LWVC State and Local Finances](#)

### **Prop 15 Talking Points:**

Prop 15 is a fair and balanced reform that:

- Closes property tax loopholes benefiting wealthy corporations. Just 10% of California's most expensive nonresidential commercial properties account for 92% of Prop 15's loophole-closing revenues.
- Cuts small business taxes.
- Reclaims billions every year to invest in our schools and local communities.
- Exempts homeowners, renters, small businesses and agricultural land so they continue to be protected by Prop 13.
- Prioritizes transparency and accountability by requiring public disclosure of all new revenues and how they are spent.

Prop 15 was put on the ballot by a record-breaking 1.7 million people who believe that wealthy corporations need to pay their fair share.

- Nurses and doctors on the frontlines protecting our public health.
- Teachers and parents who know our children need smaller class sizes.
- Small business owners who need tax relief.
- Homeowners and renters who are tired of paying more while corporations pay less.
- Mayors and county supervisors managing budgets that have been devastated by COVID.

### **The Opposition**

- Massive out-of-state corporations, special interests and Trump's biggest donors are all bankrolling the opposition to Prop 15.
- These are the same wealthy corporations that avoid reassessment by employing highly paid tax lawyers and accountants to exploit loopholes in the law.
- Now they are engaged in deceptive scare tactics to hold onto their loopholes.

Prop 15 will reclaim billions every year for our schools, community colleges, and essential local services in EVERY county to invest in things like:

- Class sizes
- Health care services
- Fighting homelessness
- Firefighters and their equipment
- Safe drinking water
- Preparing for future disasters such as wildfire, pandemic or earthquake

Click through fact sheets for community-specific benefit.

- [Alameda](#)
- [Butte](#)
- [Contra Costa](#)
- [El Dorado](#)
- [Fresno](#)
- [Kern](#)
- [Los Angeles](#)
- [Marin](#)
- [Merced](#)
- [Monterey](#)
- [Orange](#)
- [Placer](#)
- [Riverside](#)
- [Sacramento](#)
- [San Bernardino](#)
- [San Diego](#)
- [San Francisco](#)
- [San Joaquin](#)
- [San Luis Obispo](#)
- [San Mateo](#)
- [Santa Barbara](#)
- [Santa Clara](#)
- [Santa Cruz](#)
- [Solano](#)
- [Stanislaus](#)
- [Tulare](#)

More on campaign website: [yes15.org](https://yes15.org)

**PROP 16 OPPORTUNITY FOR ALL****YES**

Affirmative action in state hiring, contracting, and education was banned in California by Prop 209 in 1996. Prop 16 will reverse that ban and allow schools and public institutions to take race, ethnicity, color, national origin, and gender into consideration when admitting students to colleges, hiring employees for public jobs, and selecting contractors for public projects. Equal opportunity programs are a time-tested way to fight systemic racism and gender discrimination by leveling the playing field and giving everyone a chance at good public jobs and wages and quality public schools. Prop 16 provides all Californians a fair opportunity in education, employment, and contracting.

**Vote YES on Prop 16**

**League Analysis**

The League is a proponent of Prop 16, an initiative that will repeal Prop 209. In 1996, the League signed ballot arguments against Prop 209, which effectively banned equal opportunity programs – sometimes referred to as affirmative action programs – in public education, employment, and contracting. Each of these areas has since suffered a marked drop in representation of women and people who are Black, Latino, Indigenous, Asian American, and other people of color.

Without equal opportunity programs, schools and public institutions cannot take race, ethnicity, national origin, gender, or other factors into consideration when admitting students to colleges, hiring employees for public jobs, and selecting contractors for public projects. This prevents decisionmakers from getting a full picture of an applicant and their qualifications, which often puts women and people of color at a disadvantage.

In the brief time since its passage, Prop 209 has had far reaching negative consequences. Since 1996, there has been a 12 percent drop in enrollment of students from underrepresented groups across the University of California system. In turn, this caused further declines in college graduation rates, graduate school admission and completion rates, and average wages for underrepresented Californians.

Similarly, public sector jobs have become less attainable for certain groups since the passage of Prop 209. In particular, men and women of color remain underrepresented, especially when it comes to getting top management positions. During the same time period, women and minority-owned businesses lost billions of dollars annually in public contracts.

Prop 209 is a failed experiment. It is time to repeal it by passing Prop 16.

We believe that everyone—Black, Latino, Asian American, White, Native American, man, woman, or non-binary—deserves a fair shot at success. But right now, people are discriminated against based on who they are and where they come from. We support Prop 16 because it is a chance for our public institutions to reinvest in diverse communities. Our government shares the responsibility to provide equality of opportunity in education, employment, and other areas.

Prop 16 will make quality education and robust careers accessible and attainable for more Californians.

Prop 16 won't allow quotas for college admissions. Quotas are and will remain illegal if Prop 16 passes. It also won't allow discrimination in any form. California has some of the strongest anti-discrimination laws in the nation, none of which will be altered by Prop 16.

Since the passage of Prop 209, California has not become a more equitable state. In many ways we have regressed. The nationwide Black Lives Matter demonstrations have surfaced the fact that discrimination and inequity are still deeply ingrained in our institutions. At the same time, the pandemic and its economic repercussions disproportionately impact people of color and other historically marginalized communities. With Prop 16, we will restore an important tool to ensure an equitable recovery, confront racism and unfairness in our state, and empower the next generation of students, public servants, and entrepreneurs.

**Prop 16 Related Positions:**

[LWVUS Equality of Opportunity](#)

**Prop 16 Talking Points:**

- Passing Prop 16 is necessary to actively prevent discrimination and ensure equal opportunity for all.
- Many people in California are currently discriminated against in getting state contracts, employment, pay, and educational opportunities based on their race, ethnic origin, or gender.
- All of us, no matter what we look like or where we come from, deserve equal opportunities to thrive. By coming together to support Prop 16, we can provide opportunities for good jobs, good wages, and quality schools for everyone.
- Women of color are on the front lines of the COVID-19 response, and contribute leadership in every field, yet white men are overrepresented in positions where money is made and power is exercised.

More on campaign website [voteyesonprop16.org](https://voteyesonprop16.org)

**PROP 17 RESTORE VOTING RIGHTS****YES**

Restoring voting rights to Californians who have completed their prison term is a matter of justice, equity, and fundamental fairness. Right now, nearly 50,000 people who have been released from prison and are on parole are denied the right to vote - a right that is owed to every citizen and important to successful reintegration into the community. Our neighbors who are working, paying taxes, raising families, and rebuilding their lives deserve a voice in the policy-making that shapes their lives. And including their voices will help California achieve a more representative democracy.

**Vote YES on Prop 17**

**League Analysis**

Voting is a fundamental right of citizenship, and the League, firm in the belief that the strength of our democratic government depends on the active participation of everyone, has long advocated to expand the voting rights of citizens impacted by the criminal justice system.

By initially refusing to ratify the 14th and 15th Amendments to the U.S. Constitution, California sought to deny both citizenship and the right to vote to African Americans, Chinese Americans and Native Americans. Those foundational amendments became law anyway. But California's denial of voting rights to people convicted of felonies was enshrined in our first state constitution in 1849. Since then it has functioned as a way to perpetuate systemic racism - denying voting rights to the people most impacted by persistent racial bias in arrest and sentencing. Currently, 75 percent of men leaving California prisons are either African American, Latino, or Asian American. Felony disenfranchisement has served to perniciously dilute the voting strength of communities of color.

Over time, and with League support, our state is slowly expanding the franchise. However, we lag behind nineteen other states and Washington, D.C, which either automatically restore voting rights on release from prison or don't remove the right to vote at all. Today Californians may vote if they are in county jail, on probation, or on post-release community supervision, but they are still prohibited from voting if they are living in the community on parole. This hodge-podge system, where some people with past felony convictions can vote and others cannot, is both unfair and causes confusion that deters even eligible voters from going to the polls.

Prop 17 allows Californians who are no longer incarcerated to fully participate in our democracy. Parole is a time of reintegration into society after a prison term is served. Giving people returning home from prison access to civic participation is one of the ways to ensure their successful re-entry into the community. Governmental decisions impact their lives just as much as they impact everyone else's lives. The opportunity to meaningfully express an opinion through the vote gives people a stake in the decisions made. Blocking their voting rights is fundamentally undemocratic. It means our neighbors who are working, paying taxes, and raising families in this state are deprived of the ability to have a say in the policies and representatives that shape their daily lives. Furthermore, our democracy benefits from the contribution of everyone's voice at the ballot box.

**Prop 17 Related Positions:**

[LWVC Voting Rights](#)

[LWVUS Voting Rights](#)

[LWVC Criminal Justice](#)

**Prop 17 Talking Points:**

- Prop 17 allows Californians on parole to fully participate in our democracy.
- Parole is a time of reintegration into society after a prison term is served. During this time people are holding down jobs, going to school, paying taxes, and raising families. Governmental decisions impact their lives just as much as they impact everyone else's lives.
- California has a hodge-podge system. where some people with past felony convictions can vote and others cannot. This is irrational, unfair, and causes confusion that deters even eligible voters from going to the polls.
- Denial of voting rights to people with past felony convictions perpetuates systemic racism by disenfranchising the people most impacted by persistent bias in arrest and sentencing. This serves to dilute the voting strength of communities of color.

More on campaign website [yeson17.vote](https://yeson17.vote)

**PROP 18 VOTING RIGHTS FOR 17-YEAR OLDS****YES**

Seventeen-year-olds who will be 18 by the next general election should be able to vote in primary and special elections. Prop 18 will give them that right. Young people are significantly underrepresented in California's electorate. Allowing 17-year-olds to vote in primary and special elections will engage young voters while they are studying the issues in high school and have a strong interest in participation. Once voting begins it becomes a life-long habit. Furthermore, fairness dictates that people who will be eligible to vote in a general election should be able to help choose the candidates who will be on that ballot. Finally, many 17-year-olds are civically engaged and at the forefront of movements to improve the communities in which they live. We would all benefit from their voices at the ballot box.

**Vote YES on Prop 18****League Analysis:**

California's youth are deeply underrepresented in government due to low voter participation rates. Our eligible youth turnout rate in the 2016 presidential general election was only 36 percent. Despite this, we have seen a surge of civic engagement by youth, many of whom are in high school, on matters ranging from gun control to climate change to racial justice.

Prop 18 provides an opportunity to engage youth at a moment of high interest – while they are studying government and beginning to exercise their voices. Furthermore, encouraging them to vote during a time when they have established ties to their communities will set them on the path to future participation in our political process. Once voting begins it continues as a life-long habit.

As a matter of fundamental fairness, it makes sense to give 17-year olds a voice in the selection of the nominees who will appear on their general election ballots. Prop 18 would also align California with 23 states, plus the District of Columbia, which allow 17-year-olds to vote in primary elections or caucuses.

Prop 18 will help address the current low voter participation rates among youth and involve young people in determining California's future.

**Prop 18 Related Positions:**[LWVUS Citizen's Right to Know/Citizen Participation](#)[LWVC Voting Rights](#)[LWVUS Voting Rights](#)**Prop 18 Talking Points**

- People who will be eligible to vote in a general election should be able to help choose the candidates who will be on that ballot.



- Young people are significantly underrepresented in California's electorate. Allowing 17-year-olds to vote in primary and special elections will engage young voters while they are studying the issues in high school and have a strong interest in participation.
- Once voting begins it becomes a life-long habit.
- Many 17-year-olds are civically engaged and at the forefront of movements to improve the communities in which they live. We would all benefit from their voices at the ballot box.

Prop 18 Facebook page: [facebook.com/YesProp18](https://facebook.com/YesProp18)

**PROP 19 PROPERTY TAX BREAKS****NO**

Prop 19 exacerbates an already inequitable property tax system - offering tax breaks to people who do not need them. Providing tax breaks to homeowners over 55 who purchase a replacement home, and allowing them to “transfer” their current tax assessment to a new home anywhere in the state, does nothing to help low-income seniors or families struggling to find housing. This proposition would allow not just one, but three such transfers. Senior citizens are already allowed to keep their current tax assessment when they purchase a home of equal or lesser value. And while the plan to put state revenue from increased home sales into a fund to support firefighting may sound appealing, it will make it more difficult for the legislature to fund the state’s response to other natural disasters or public health crises. While Prop 19 eliminates a tax break for some property inherited by children from parents, this beneficial element is not sufficient to merit support.

**Vote NO on Prop 19**

**League Analysis:**

Current law allows homeowners over the age of 55, or those living with severe disabilities, to purchase another home at the same or lower market value and retain the same assessment as they have on their current residence. They can only do this within the county of their current residence or across counties when the counties have agreed to permit the retention. This allowance can only be made once.

Prop 19 would allow homeowners to take advantage of this tax break up to three times. It could be applied anywhere in the state of California, not just in the county where the homeowner currently lives or by agreement among counties. It would apply to homes worth more than the currently held home. Qualified persons, age 55 and older or those living with severe disabilities, would retain their current assessment on that portion of the purchase price that equals the market value of their current residence. The assessed value will be adjusted upward based on the value of the new home. The end result is that the newly purchased home will be assessed at less than the full market value of the home. For example, a person selling a home worth \$300K but assessed at \$150K and purchasing a home for \$425K would have an initial assessment of \$275K (\$150K current assessment on property worth \$300K) + \$125K (\$425K-\$300K). Similar provisions would apply to homeowners whose home is destroyed by wildfire.

One reasonable aspect of Prop 19 is that it eliminates a tax break for most property passed from parent to child (inherited property) that is not used as a residence. A child could retain the current assessment only if the property becomes their primary residence and only up to the point at which the fair market value exceeds the current assessment by \$1M. Inherited second homes and business properties would be assessed at full market value.

The League believes that earmarked funds or taxes should be adopted sparingly, be subject to periodic review, and have a fixed sunset date. The two funds that would be created by this initiative meet none of these criteria. Alarmingly, no one has even estimated the probable dollar

amount that would be automatically appropriated into these funds. California has faced many disasters over the last thirty years – power shortages, earthquakes, and a pandemic as well as forest fires. The legislature needs the flexibility to budget based on current needs and priorities.

**Prop 19 Related Positions:**

[LWVC State and Local Finances](#)

**Prop 19 Talking Points:**

- Prop 19 exacerbates an already inequitable property tax system - offering tax breaks to people who do not need them.
- Providing tax breaks to homeowners over 55 who purchase a replacement home, and allowing them to “transfer” their current tax assessment to a new home anywhere in the state, does nothing to help low-income seniors or families struggling to find housing.
- Senior citizens are already allowed to keep their current tax assessment when they purchase a home of equal or lesser value.
- While the plan to put state revenue from increased home sales into a fund to support firefighting may sound appealing, it will make it more difficult for the legislature to fund the state’s response to other natural disasters or public health crises.
- While Prop 19 eliminates a tax break for some property inherited by children from parents, this beneficial element is not sufficient to merit support.

**PROP 20      ROLLBACK ON CRIMINAL JUSTICE REFORMS****NO**

Over the past decade, California has made progress enacting laws that reduce the prison population and create a more effective and equitable public safety system. Prop 20 would roll back many advances in criminal justice reforms and reinstate a “get tough” law enforcement system that believes longer incarceration is a solution to crime. It would make minor theft of some goods worth over \$250 punishable as a felony. It allows the state to collect DNA from people convicted of misdemeanors like shoplifting and drug possession. Prop 20 sends California in the wrong direction at a time when there is forward momentum toward smart justice approaches that increase public safety and reduce costs to the state.

**Vote NO on Prop 20****League Analysis:**

Proposition 20 would result in longer incarceration for many people caught up in the criminal legal system. Its proponents believe this will keep the community safer, but it does not. Longer sentences do not lower recidivism rates and reducing non-violent crimes to misdemeanor charges does not increase violent crime. This measure attempts to weaken voter-enacted measures that the League has supported, like [Prop 47 \(Nov 2014\)](#) and [Prop 57 \(Nov 2016\)](#).

This measure will make it more difficult for incarcerated people to get Prop 57 relief. For example, incarcerated people sentenced to life with the possibility of parole or convicted of certain types of assault would never be eligible for local supervision post-release. It also reverses some of the Prop 47 reforms in which wobbler offenses (crimes that can be charged as either a misdemeanor or a felony) were lowered to misdemeanor charges.

The measure also expands DNA collection that is allowed by [Prop 69](#), which the League opposed back in 2004. Prop 20 would further erode individual rights because even if a person is proven innocent, the onus for removing that person’s DNA information from records is placed on the individual, not on the state. Furthermore, some of the DNA expansion in the measure extends to Prop 47 misdemeanors such as shoplifting, check forgeries under \$950, and petty theft. While these “wobbler offenses” became misdemeanors under Prop 47, Prop 20 would effectively increase penalties by encroaching on the individual liberties of suspects through DNA collection by law enforcement.

Vote NO on Proposition 20’s proposed rollback of criminal justice reforms that California has thoughtfully developed and implemented to create a more equitable public safety process and reduce our prison population.

**Related Positions:**[LWVUS Sentencing Policy](#)[LWVC Criminal Justice](#)[LWVUS Individual Liberties](#)[LWVUS Equality of Opportunity](#)

**Prop 20 Talking Points:**

- Proposition 20 rolls back criminal justice reforms that were made to reduce our prison populations and make our public safety system more just and humane.
- Privacy rights are violated under Proposition 20 which allows DNA collection from suspects of low-level crimes such as shoplifting, petty theft and check forgeries.
- Prop 20 makes it more difficult for those incarcerated due to non-violent crimes to have their sentences reduced to supervised post-release.
- Prop 20 takes us backward at a time of Black Lives Matter and as we confront racism in our system.

**PROP 24 CONSUMER DATA PRIVACY****NO**

The League of Women Voters supports the protection of consumers' private data. Prop 24 includes some beneficial elements, but we oppose due to the complexity of a 52-page initiative with impacts and nuances that are difficult for voters to discern and rollbacks to existing protections. Among the troubling aspects of Prop 24 is its expansion of "pay for privacy" through the addition of loyalty and rewards programs, allowing businesses to charge consumers more or provide worse service if they choose to exercise their privacy rights. The initiative also allows businesses to require consumers to direct each individual website and app not to sell information - weakening the current legal requirement that companies respect a global opt-out for all services. These burdens are fundamentally inequitable, placing the onus on the average consumer to protect their own privacy. Working people don't have the time to do the paperwork and they can't afford to pay companies to respect their wishes. Finally, the initiative comes less than a year after the 2018 California Consumer Privacy Rights Act went into effect, before we have had an opportunity to see how the new law works or the legislature has had a chance to address any defects.

**Vote NO on Prop 24****League Analysis:**

In 2018 California passed the California Consumer Privacy Act (CCPA). The CCPA guarantees consumers certain rights and protections with respect to the collection and sale of their personal information. Consumers have the right to know about and access the personal data a business collects and if it's sold or disclosed, opt-out of the sale of personal information to third parties, and request the deletion of personal information collected from them. Either consumer or parent/guardian permission is required to sell personal information of those under the age of 16, and parent/guardian permission is required to sell personal information of consumers under the age of 13. The CCPA also provides a right to equal service and price whereby businesses may not discriminate or provide inferior service if the consumer exercises their privacy rights. However, businesses may offer financial incentives for the collection or sale of personal information.

Prop 24, the California Privacy Rights Act of 2020 (CPRA), proposes to revise the CCPA. It would:

- ❖ Create the California Privacy Protection Agency to hold companies accountable and impose penalties for infractions.
- ❖ Allow consumers to request that businesses not share sensitive information about health, genetic data, finances, race or ethnicity, religion, sexual orientation, private communications, and precise geolocation.
- ❖ Triple the fines for violations involving children's privacy.
- ❖ Make data breaches of email addresses along with information that would permit access to an account (such as a password) subject to penalties.
- ❖ Eliminate the ability of businesses to avoid penalties by addressing violations within 30 days of being told of the violation.

The League of Women Voters supports the protection of consumers' private data. We oppose Prop 24 because its beneficial elements are outweighed by its privacy rollbacks and numerous shortcomings. Furthermore, consumer data protection is enormously complex. Prop 24 attempts to address the issues in a densely worded 52-page initiative that will be difficult for most voters to understand. It is the role of the legislature to grapple with matters like this in an open and transparent manner through a process that offers an opportunity for hearings, debate, and public engagement. From a practical point of view, California's businesses are now working to implement the 2018 CCPA legislation that went into effect in January 2020. It is too soon to ask businesses to respond to a new set of regulations that still do not meet privacy standards required to protect consumer data from misuse.

Our concerns, flagged by leading consumer and privacy organizations, include the following:

- ❖ **Pay for Privacy.** Prop 24 expands the ability, which already exists in the CCPA, for businesses to provide inferior service for consumers who don't pay to protect their confidential information, and superior service for Californians who do pay. [Under current law](#) a charge is allowed if it's reasonably related to the value provided to the business by the consumer's data. Prop 24 expands current law by exempting loyalty clubs and rewards programs from existing limits and allows businesses to withhold discounts unless they can harvest data about shopping habits.
- ❖ **Opt-out versus Opt-In.** Prop 24 misses an opportunity to enact a consumer-friendly opt-in system and keeps the burden on consumers to opt-out of the retention and sale of their information.
- ❖ **Opting out is more difficult.** Prop 24 allows businesses to post a Do Not Sell link on their website as an alternative to complying with global opt-out browser or phone settings chosen by the consumer. While global settings may not be available yet, they will be soon. Unfortunately, Prop 24 would throw us back into the world of placing an exhausting burden on consumers to notify every online business, website, and app to preserve their privacy.
- ❖ **Inequitable.** Prop 24 preserves and exacerbates the problem of inequitable access to privacy rights. From its pay for privacy components to a complicated opt-out structure, it places the burden on the average consumer to protect their own privacy. Working people don't have the time to do the paperwork and they can't afford to pay companies to respect their wishes. As a result, Prop 24 will disproportionately harm vulnerable communities, like the poor and elderly.
- ❖ **Impedes minimization of data collection.** Instead of limiting the collection of a consumer's personal information to what is necessary to provide the service or good a consumer seeks, Prop 24 allows the business to collect consumer information according to the business' view of what data is needed to accomplish its commercial purposes.
- ❖ **Weakens biometric data protections.** Prop 24 weakens consumer protections for businesses collecting biometric information, such as DNA or faceprints. Current law protects biometric data if it "can be used" to identify a consumer, but Prop 24 protects it only if it "is used or intended to be used" to identify a consumer.
- ❖ **Exposes social media data to mining.** Prop 24 expands the definition of publicly available information to include information collected from social media sources. This opens the

door to the sort of problem we saw with Clearview where the company amalgamated images of people, created a facial recognition database, and then sold access to that database to law enforcement, including federal immigration authorities. Nota Bene: Clearview has since announced that they are no longer selling to private companies.

- ❖ **Makes data deletion more difficult.** Prop 24 reduces a business's duty to send the consumer's deletion request to downstream entities who also received that consumer's data from the business. In this way, service providers are more able to combine sets of consumer data collected from different businesses or from consumers.
- ❖ **Limits privacy rights to California.** Under current California law, your privacy follows you wherever you go. Under Prop 24, while a user's data would be protected within California, any stored data could be collected and used by a business when the user leaves California.

#### **Prop 24 Related Positions:**

[LWVUS Individual Liberties](#)

#### **Prop 24 Talking Points:**

- A 52-page, complex, technical ballot measure should not be put before voters who may not be equipped to fully comprehend all of its nuances and proposed changes.
- Prop 24's beneficial elements are outweighed by its privacy rollbacks and numerous shortcomings.
- Prop 24 places the burden on the average consumer to protect their own privacy. Working people don't have the time to do the paperwork and they can't afford to pay companies to respect their wishes.
- We should allow the new California Data Privacy Act to be fully implemented before we make changes that could impede progress on the new standards.

More on campaign website: [noon24ca.org](https://noon24ca.org)



**PROP 25    END CASH MONEY BAIL****YES**

A YES vote on Prop 25 is a vote to replace the money bail system with the use of pretrial risk assessment tools that focus on safety and flight risk. It is estimated that almost 46,000 Californians, a disproportionate number of whom are Black and Latinx, are being held in jail but not yet sentenced. Cash bail both criminalizes poverty and reflects the systemic racism that plagues our criminal legal process. California must move away from the money bail system to create a fairer and more equitable criminal legal system that balances public safety with the presumption of innocence. People who pose little threat to public safety should not be subject to losing their jobs, homes, and families simply because they lack the money to pay for release from jail while awaiting their day in court. While the new law that would go into effect with a YES vote is not perfect, it can be amended by the legislature. A NO vote, however, could enshrine cash bail and prevent future legislative action to curtail the commercial bail industry.

**Vote YES on Prop 25**

**League Analysis:**

The move away from money bail is important for reasons of equity and justice. Under a money bail system, those who remain in jail awaiting a hearing – despite a presumption of innocence – are often those who cannot afford to pay bail rather than those truly deemed a threat to society. Millions of taxpayer dollars are spent on needless pretrial detention of individuals. In addition, the money bail system perpetuates racial inequities in the criminal legal system by disproportionately keeping people of color incarcerated before they are tried in a court of law.

The League of Women Voters of California supports a criminal justice system that is just, effective, and equitable at all stages, including in pretrial practices. The constitutional presumption of innocence is vital in pretrial detention considerations, and all instances of detention while awaiting trial must be narrowly tailored exceptions to that constitutional protection.

Detention in jail because of a financial inability to “make bail” means that a person may lose their job, their housing, their children, and more, despite the fact that there has been no judgment of the person’s guilt. It also dramatically increases the pressure on someone to agree to a plea bargain to avoid extended detention in jail awaiting trial. Because of our country’s history of structural racism, poverty continues to impact communities of color more heavily and a money bail system magnifies that inequity by disproportionately keeping people of color detained in jail awaiting trial. Money bail systems have long been criticized for being unrelated to public safety and reduction of flight risk. Instead, access to wealth too often determines who is released pretrial and who remains detained.

Pretrial risk assessment tools as alternatives to money bail are controversial as there is some evidence that these tools can be designed and used in ways that increase racial bias and inequity in the pretrial process. However, a California law was recently passed that requires that pretrial risk assessment tools go through a validation process at least once every year. That process measures the accuracy and reliability of the tools in assessing whether a defendant will

appear in court, what the risk to the public is, and any bias the tool might have with regard to gender, race, or ethnicity. Validation reports, as well as other information on the risk assessment tools, must be made available to the public.

SB 10, which is the law that would be preserved by the passage of Prop 25, is criticized by some criminal justice advocates for not going far enough to rectify racial inequities in our legal system. However, if this referendum succeeds in overturning SB 10, it may legally prevent future legislative action to curtail use of cash bail and the commercial bail industry. Furthermore, one of the main obstacles to reform has consistently been the \$3 billion bail bond industry that profits from the money bail system. Shortly after SB 10 was signed into law, the American Bail Coalition organized the referendum campaign to repeal SB 10 by placing it on the ballot as Proposition 25. Passage of Prop 25, which would eliminate the impediment of cash bail and its well-funded industry lobbyists, will allow for further legislation to improve on SB 10 and fulfill its promise of a fair and more equitable justice system.

**Prop 25 Related Positions:**  
[LWVC Criminal Justice](#)

**Prop 25 Talking Points:**

- Cash bail creates an inequitable system that unfairly punishes and penalizes the poor and disproportionately affects Blacks and Latinos.
- VOTE YES on this referendum and stand up to the well-funded bail industry and support legislation passed in California to reform our justice system and create one that is more equitable.
- Thousands of innocent-until-proven guilty people, or those awaiting sentencing are being held in jails and detention because they cannot afford bail.

More on campaign website: [yesoncaprop25.com](https://yesoncaprop25.com)

**NO RECOMMENDATIONS ON OTHER STATE PROPOSITIONS ON NOVEMBER'S BALLOT****PROP 14 STEM CELL RESEARCH****NEUTRAL**

While the League of Women Voters of California supports ongoing stem cell research, we are neutral on Prop 14 because of the funding mechanism used and because of the requirement for a supermajority vote to amend its provisions. Prop 14 would authorize the use of general obligation bonds to continue funding stem cell research through the California Institute for Regenerative Medicine (CIRM). However, general obligation bonds are designed for long-term financing of capital projects, purchase of facilities for public use, and repair or retrofitting of public facilities and structures – not for funding specialized research by an entity that has little state oversight. Furthermore, the legislature is prohibited from changing the law without a 70 percent supermajority vote, thereby restricting state representatives' ability to carry out their responsibilities. Finally, profits from intellectual property agreements could only be spent on CIRM-funded research treatments, limiting the state's flexibility to spend funds on matters that might be more urgent.

**League Analysis:**

If Proposition 14 is approved by the voters, \$5.5 billion in general obligation bonds will be available to the California Institute for Regenerative Medicine (CIRM) to fund increased research, educational, and infrastructure objectives.

CIRM was established in 2004 by the passage of Proposition 71, a \$3 billion bond measure to facilitate and support stem cell research in California, with debt payments paid primarily from the General Fund. In 2004 there was a national debate regarding the ethics of stem cell research using embryonic stem cells and a threat of reduced federal funding for ongoing research. Prop 71 authorized CIRM to award grants and loans for stem cell research and research facilities, created an oversight committee, contained a provision that revenues from intellectual property agreements would be deposited into the state's General Fund, and required a 70 percent supermajority vote in the State Assembly for amendments to the bill. At that time, it was anticipated that revenues from property rights would fund future and continuing research.

As of June 2020, only \$30 million of the initial \$3 billion remains for grants. According to the Legislative Analyst's Office, revenue from the intellectual property agreements to the state have amounted to approximately \$350,000.

If Prop 14 passes, the \$5.5 billion bond proceeds will go to CIRM to fund more research, expanded clinical trial sites, establishment of educational programs at the University and Community College level, and increased staffing. Prop 14 modifies the revenue sharing provision with the state by requiring the state to use revenue to offset the costs of CIRM-funded research treatments for patients with insufficient means. Prop 14 retains the 70 percent supermajority vote required for amendments to the bill.



VOTE WITH THE LEAGUE  
PROPOSITION RECOMMENDATIONS  
NOVEMBER 3, 2020 GENERAL ELECTION  
For more info: [bit.ly/LWVCBallotRecs](https://bit.ly/LWVCBallotRecs)

**Prop 14 Related Positions:**

[LWVUS Health Care](#)

[LWVC State and Local Finances](#)

**PROP 21 LOCAL GOVERNMENTS & RENT CONTROL****NEUTRAL**

The League supports efforts to help resolve California's housing crisis. We promote solutions aimed at increasing housing production in a sustainable, accessible, and equitable manner. Rent control policies are one strategy to address California's housing challenges, offer tenant protections, and prevent displacement. Rent control may be an effective short-term solution but studies suggest that its longer-term impact may, in certain cases, stifle the building of high-density and more affordable housing. Some of the modifications in Prop 21 have already been addressed through recently passed legislation. Because there are benefits and drawbacks to rent control, the League has chosen to be neutral on Prop 21.

**League Analysis:**

Prop 21 would make some changes to the 1995 Costa-Hawkins Rental Housing Act (Costa Hawkins), allowing local governments to apply rent control on more properties, along with other changes, including increasing the rental increase cap to 15 percent over three years. Rent control is seen as a tool to provide low and more affordable rent. Recent studies on the longer-term impact of rent control suggests that it may discourage construction of new housing units. For this reason, the League takes a neutral position.

In recent years, the state legislature has passed a series of bills changing the landscape of tenant rent control protection. These bills have dealt with issues such as landlord abuse of eviction policies and gouging, escalating costs of rentals, displacement and homelessness. In 2019 the League supported successful legislation to set a cap of 5 percent (plus inflation) on rental increases - one of the strictest in the nation. As of January 1, 2020 a new set of rent control/eviction protection laws went into effect to prevent landlords from getting around rent increase caps. They addressed leases, tenant evictions, relocation assistance, extended notices for rent increases, mandatory consideration of Section 8 and its criteria, and other changes.

Proposition 21 would modify some of the limitations of Costa-Hawkins, allowing cities and counties to:

- ❖ Apply rent control to more properties than under current law.
- ❖ Allow local limits on annual rent increases to differ from current statewide limits.
- ❖ Expand local government authority to enact rent control on residential property with the authority to apply new rent control ordinances only to homes at least 15 years old.
- ❖ Exempt single family homes owned by landlords with no more than two properties (e.g. single-family homes, condos, and some duplexes or subdivided interests, such as stock cooperatives and community apartment projects.)
- ❖ Allow landlords to increase their rental rate by 15 percent during the first three years following a vacancy, above any increase already allowed by local ordinance.
- ❖ Stipulate rent control policies may not violate landlords' right to a fair financial return on their property.

Proponents of Prop 21 say that these proposed rent control policies would help improve the housing challenges faced by renters and help stem the tide of evictions and displacement. Yet

Prop 21 also authorizes landlords to increase rental rates at a higher level than currently allowed (15 percent within three years), calling into question this measure's claim to protect tenants from rent gouging. Furthermore, some of the modifications in Prop 21 have already been addressed through recently passed legislation.

**Prop 21 Related Positions:**

[LWVC Housing and Homelessness](#)

[LWVUS Meeting Basic Needs](#)

**Prop 21 Talking Points:**

- The League supports actions at all levels of government for the provision of affordable housing and we believe housing is a basic human need that must be met.
- Rent control decisions should be one of the tools local governments may use to ensure affordable housing for low-income tenants but it is not a solution to all of our housing problems.
- It is unclear, but mounting evidence suggests that in some circumstances, long-term use of rent control may hinder future construction of higher-density and affordable housing.

**PROP 23 KIDNEY DIALYSIS CLINICS****NEUTRAL**

This measure will require operators of chronic dialysis clinics to have a minimum of one licensed physician at the clinic whenever patients are being treated, offer the same level of care to all patients regardless of how payment is being made, and make reports about dialysis-related infections to the state's health department and the National Healthcare Safety Network (NHSN). There is disagreement about whether the presence of a doctor is always necessary or could exacerbate a doctor shortage, and over whether costs are manageable or prohibitively high. Furthermore, the League questions why voters should be deciding questions of recordkeeping and medical staffing. The uncertainty of the costs and benefits of the measure leads the League to take a neutral position.

**League Analysis:**

[Prop 8](#) relating to kidney dialysis was on the November 2018 ballot. It was a [complex measure](#) and not easy for most voters to understand without expertise in the content area and the dynamics between the chronic dialysis clinics (CDCs) and the labor union. The League reviewed Prop 8 and took no position because it was too detailed in an area not within League expertise (although the general program area would be healthcare). Furthermore, Prop 8 clearly reflected a battle between for-profit dialysis businesses, the labor union, and other organizations seeking more regulation of CDCs. There was also a question as to whether this was an appropriate issue to ask the electorate to make a decision on, much less an informed decision. The current Prop 23 is a simplified version of the earlier one.

Some of the provisions in Prop 23 are partially covered under current California licensing requirements. The California Department of Public Health (CDPH) is responsible for licensing CDCs to operate in California, using federal regulations as the basis for licensing. All chronic dialysis clinics must be licensed to receive Medicare and Medi-Cal payments. One of the current federal requirements is that a board-certified medical doctor must be affiliated with each CDC and be responsible for quality of care, staff training and clinic practices. The reports to the NHSN on kidney-related infections required by Prop 23 are already a requirement for Medicare and Medi-Cal payments.

The subtext of Proposition 23 is a complex one about payment and reimbursement rates for dialysis treatment. Who pays and how? Private insurers or Medicare or Medi-Cal? Proponents of more regulation raise concerns that CDCs receive higher payment from private insurers than from government entities (Medicare/Medi-Cal). This ballot measure requires equal care regardless of who pays.

Last year, legislation (AB 290) was passed to regulate payments from third-party payers. It addresses some of the concerns listed above.

Prop 23 imposes new regulatory responsibilities on CDPH and requires CDPH to adjust the annual licensing fee paid by CDCs to cover these costs. The annual cost to fulfill its new

responsibilities is estimated not to exceed \$1 million annually. [California's nonpartisan Legislative Analyst](#) estimates that the measure would have no significant fiscal effect on state and local governments.

However, some opponents of the new Prop 23 requirements claim that CDCs will incur higher operating expenses and that there is a potential for rural communities to have trouble meeting all of the newer requirements and therefore, will charge higher rates. According to the Legislative Analyst, having a physician on site at all times *"would increase each (clinic's) costs by several hundred thousand dollars annually on average."*

There is concern that rural dialysis clinics and clinics in disadvantaged communities serving a high volume of Medi-Cal patients would be more likely to reduce services or close due to financial constraints.

Dialysis is a serious life-saving, life-sustaining treatment and should not be left to ballot box decision-making. The League supports quality healthcare, cost controls and equitable distribution of healthcare services. This measure looks simple and direct on its face, but looks can be deceiving. If passed, it can affect both thousands of vulnerable dialysis patients and clinic staff, who are caught between the clinics and the labor union. As with most multi-faceted issues, there is room for improvement on all sides. For this reason, the League takes a neutral position.

**Prop 23 Related Positions:**  
[LWVUS Health Care](#)

**Prop 23 Talking Points:**

- The League supports quality healthcare for all and increasing numbers of people in the United States now require chronic dialysis care. Such care should be high quality and provided to all in an efficient and economic manner.
- Chronic dialysis clinics in California and nationally is a big business, with 70 percent of all clinics operated by two major corporations.
- Proposition 23 intends to improve quality of care and imposes new reporting requirements which may limit revenues for CDC providers.



PROP 22 RIDESHARE AND DELIVERY DRIVERS

NO POSITION

The League of Women Voters of California's [positions](#) do not cover the issues in Prop 22. We therefore take no stand on the proposition.

**VOTE WITH THE LEAGUE ON NOVEMBER 3!**

Check [Voter's Edge](#)  
for more information about what's on your ballot

