

County of Lassen
ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES



CHRIS GALLAGHER

District 1

DAVID TEETER

District 2

JEFF HEMPHILL

District 3

AARON ALBAUGH

District 4

TOM HAMMOND

District 5

Richard Egan

County Administrative Officer

email: coadmin@co.lassen.ca.us

Julie Morgan

Assistant to the CAO

email: jmorgan@co.lassen.ca.us

County Administration Office

221 S. Roop Street, Suite 4

Susanville, CA 96130

Phone: 530-251-8333

Fax: 530-251-2663

MEMORANDUM

DATE: October 4, 2018

TO: Board of Supervisors
Agenda Date: October 16, 2018

FROM: Richard Egan, County Administrative Officer

SUBJECT: November 6, 2018, Statewide Ballot Propositions

RECOMMENDATION: That the Board: Receive information. Provide direction to staff.

PREVIOUS BOARD ACTIONS: At your September 25, 2018, regular meeting, Supervisor Albaugh had requested staff to provide this information to the Board.

DISCUSSION: For your information, please see the attached:

- List of California ballot measures and positions taken on those ballot measures by the California State Association of Counties (CSAC), Rural Counties Representatives of California (RCRC), California Chamber of Commerce, and California Farm Bureau Federation.
- RCRC staff summaries of Propositions 3, 5, 6, 11

Copies of the 'official' Voter Information Guide from the California Secretary of State will be made available at the Board meeting. The Guide is also available online on the California Secretary of State website: <https://www.sos.ca.gov/elections/voting-resources/voter-information-guides/>

FISCAL IMPACT: Unknown

RE:ts

CALIFORNIA BALLOT PROPOSITIONS AND POSITIONS TAKEN BY ORGANIZATION

PROP#	November 6, 2018, Statewide Ballot Measures TITLE:	ORGANIZATION/POSITION TAKEN			
		RCRC	CSAC	CalChamber	CA Farm Bureau Federation
1	AUTHORIZES BONDS TO FUND SPECIFIED HOUSING ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS. LEGISLATIVE STATUTE.	<i>"No Position"</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>"No Position"</i>
2	AUTHORIZES BONDS TO FUND EXISTING HOUSING PROGRAM FOR INDIVIDUALS WITH MENTAL ILLNESS. LEGISLATIVE STATUTE.	<i>"Neutral"</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>"No"</i>
3	AUTHORIZES BONDS TO FUND PROJECTS FOR WATER SUPPLY AND QUALITY, WATERSHED, FISH, WILDLIFE, WATER CONVEYANCE, AND GROUNDWATER SUSTAINABILITY AND STORAGE, INITIATIVE STATUTE.	<i>Support</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>"Yes"</i>
4	AUTHORIZES BONDS FUNDING CONSTRUCTION AT HOSPITALS PROVIDING CHILDREN'S HEALTH CARE. INITIATIVE STATUTE.	<i>"No Position"</i>	<i>"No Position"</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>"No Position"</i>
5	CHANGES REQUIREMENTS FOR CERTAIN PROPERTY OWNERS TO TRANSFER THEIR PROPERTY TAX BASE TO REPLACE PROPERTY. INITIATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT AND STATUTE.	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>"Yes"</i>
6	ELIMINATES CERTAIN ROAD REPAIR AND TRANSPORTATION FUNDING. REQUIRES CERTAIN FUEL TAXES AND VEHICLE FEES BE APPROVED BY THE ELECTORATE. INITIATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT.	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>"Yes"</i>
7	CONFORMS CALIFORNIA DAYLIGHT SAVING TIME TO FEDERAL LAW. ALLOWS LEGISLATURE TO CHANGE DAYLIGHT SAVING TIME PERIOD. LEGISLATIVE STATUTE.	<i>"No Position"</i>	<i>"No Position"</i>	<i>"No Position"</i>	<i>"No Position"</i>
8	REGULATES AMOUNTS OUTPATIENT KIDNEY DIALYSIS CLINICS CHARGE FOR DIALYSIS TREATMENT. INITIATIVE STATUTE.	<i>--</i>	<i>"No Position"</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>"No"</i>

PROP#	November 6, 2018, Statewide Ballot Measures TITLE:	ORGANIZATION/POSITION TAKEN			
		RCRC	CSAC	CalChamber	CA Farm Bureau Federation
9	ON JULY 18, 2018, PROPOSITION 9 WAS REMOVED FROM THE BALLOT BY ORDER OF THE CALIFORNIA SUPREME COURT.				
10	EXPANDS LOCAL GOVERNMENTS' AUTHORITY TO ENACT RENT CONTROL ON RESIDENTIAL PROPERTY. INITIATIVE STATUTE.	<i>"No Position"</i>	<i>"No Position"</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>"No"</i>
11	REQUIRES PRIVATE-SECTOR EMERGENCY AMBULANCE EMPLOYEES TO REMAIN ON-CALL DURING WORK BREAKS. ELIMINATES CERTAIN EMPLOYER LIABILITY. INITIATIVE STATUTE.	<i>Support</i>	<i>"No Position"</i>	<i>"No Position"</i>	<i>"No Position"</i>
12	ESTABLISHES NEW STANDARDS FOR CONFINEMENT OF SPECIFIED FARM ANIMALS; BANS SALE OF NONCOMPLYING PRODUCTS. INITIATIVE STATUTE.	<i>--</i>	<i>"No Position"</i>	<i>"No Position"</i>	<i>"No"</i>

CSAC: California State Association of Counties
RCRC: Rural County Representatives of California
CalChamber: California Chamber of Commerce

QUICK-REFERENCE GUIDE

PROP 1

AUTHORIZES BONDS TO FUND SPECIFIED HOUSING ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS. LEGISLATIVE STATUTE.

SUMMARY

Put on the Ballot by the Legislature

Authorizes \$4 billion in general obligation bonds for existing affordable housing programs for low-income residents, veterans, farmworkers, manufactured and mobile homes, infill, and transit-oriented housing. Fiscal Impact: Increased state costs to repay bonds averaging about \$170 million annually over the next 35 years.

WHAT YOUR VOTE MEANS

YES A YES vote on this measure means: Allows the state to sell \$4 billion in general obligation bonds to fund veterans and affordable housing.

NO A NO vote on this measure means: The state could not sell \$4 billion in general obligation bonds to fund veterans and affordable housing.

ARGUMENTS

PRO YES on Prop. 1 means affordable housing for veterans, working families, seniors, people with disabilities and Californians experiencing homelessness from California's severe housing crisis. Prop. 1 doesn't raise taxes! Veterans, Habitat for Humanity, Congress of CA Seniors, Coalition to End Domestic Violence and more all agree: Yes on Prop. 1.

CON Proposition 1 would authorize the State to borrow \$4 billion (by selling bonds) for housing programs. The housing shortage stemming from the influx of millions to California requires far bigger solutions. A bad solution proposed earlier this year (Senate Bill 827) would have destroyed existing neighborhoods. There are BETTER APPROACHES.

FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

FOR

David Koenig
(916) 974-9411
info@vetsandaffordablehousingact.org
Vetsandaffordablehousingact.org

AGAINST

Gary Wesley
Mountain View, CA

PROP 2

AUTHORIZES BONDS TO FUND EXISTING HOUSING PROGRAM FOR INDIVIDUALS WITH MENTAL ILLNESS. LEGISLATIVE STATUTE.

SUMMARY

Put on the Ballot by the Legislature

Amends Mental Health Services Act to fund No Place Like Home Program, which finances housing for individuals with mental illness. Ratifies existing law establishing the No Place Like Home Program. Fiscal Impact: Allows the state to use up to \$140 million per year of county mental health funds to repay up to \$2 billion in bonds. These bonds would fund housing for those with mental illness who are homeless.

WHAT YOUR VOTE MEANS

YES A YES vote on this measure means: The state could use existing county mental health funds to pay for housing for those with mental illness who are homeless.

NO A NO vote on this measure means: The state's ability to use existing county mental health funds to pay for housing for those with mental illness who are homeless would depend on future court decisions.

ARGUMENTS

PRO YES on Prop. 2: Supportive housing and treatment for homeless people living with serious mental illness. Prop. 2 won't raise taxes. It will help people off the streets and into comprehensive mental health services and addiction treatment. Homeless advocates, social workers, doctors and emergency responders agree: Yes on Prop. 2.

CON Taking up to \$5.6 BILLION away from the severely mentally ill to fund bonds to build them just housing without *requiring* treatment will force many more into homelessness. It is unnecessary, because last year the Legislature authorized county use of MHSA funds for housing without the need to borrow money.

FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

FOR

David Koenig
(916) 974-9411
info@CAyesonprop2.org
CAyesonprop2.org

AGAINST

Gigi R. Crowder
NAMI Contra Costa
550 Patterson Blvd.
Pleasant Hill, CA
(510) 990-2670
gigi@namicontracosta.org
www.namicontracosta.org

QUICK-REFERENCE GUIDE

**PROP
3**

AUTHORIZES BONDS TO FUND PROJECTS FOR WATER SUPPLY AND QUALITY, WATERSHED, FISH, WILDLIFE, WATER CONVEYANCE, AND GROUNDWATER SUSTAINABILITY AND STORAGE. INITIATIVE STATUTE.

SUMMARY

Put on the Ballot by Petition Signatures

Authorizes \$8.877 billion in state general obligation bonds for various infrastructure projects. Fiscal Impact: Increased state costs to repay bonds averaging \$430 million per year over 40 years. Local government savings for water-related projects, likely averaging a couple hundred million dollars annually over the next few decades.

WHAT YOUR VOTE MEANS

YES A YES vote on this measure means: The state could sell \$8.9 billion in general obligation bonds to fund various water and environmental projects.

NO A NO vote on this measure means: The state could not sell \$8.9 billion in general obligation bonds to fund various water and environmental projects.

ARGUMENTS

PRO YES ON 3 secures safe, reliable, and clean water for California. YES ON 3 provides safe drinking water; repairs unsafe dams; provides drought protection; improves water quality in our ocean, bays, and rivers; and captures, treats, and reuses stormwater. YES ON 3 provides water for people, farms, and the environment.

CON Prop. 3 gives money to lots of organizations. That's the whole idea. But it will not produce one drop of new, usable water. Interest payments on the bonds will double the amount that has to be repaid to bond holders. Think about it . . . seriously. Vote NO.

FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

FOR

Jerry Meral
P.O. Box 1103
Inverness, CA 94937
(415) 717-8412
jerrymeral@gmail.com

AGAINST

John F. Takeuchi
Central Solano Citizen/
Taxpayer Group
P.O. Box 3532
Fairfield, CA 94533
(707) 422-4491
taksan@comcast.net
www.thetaxwatchers.org

**PROP
4**

AUTHORIZES BONDS FUNDING CONSTRUCTION AT HOSPITALS PROVIDING CHILDREN'S HEALTH CARE. INITIATIVE STATUTE.

SUMMARY

Put on the Ballot by Petition Signatures

Authorizes \$1.5 billion in bonds, to be repaid from state's General Fund, to fund grants for construction, expansion, renovation, and equipping of qualifying children's hospitals. Fiscal Impact: Increased state costs to repay bonds averaging about \$80 million annually over the next 35 years.

WHAT YOUR VOTE MEANS

YES A YES vote on this measure means: The state could sell \$1.5 billion in general obligation bonds for the construction, expansion, renovation, and equipping of certain hospitals that treat children.

NO A NO vote on this measure means: The state could not sell the \$1.5 billion in general obligation bonds proposed for these purposes.

ARGUMENTS

PRO California Children's Hospitals provide specialized care for over 2 million sick children each year—cancer, sickle cell, organ transplants—no matter what families can pay. 85% of children with leukemia are cured. Proposition 4 increases capacity, provides the latest technology, and advances pediatric research to cure more children.

CON Proposition 4 would authorize the State to borrow \$1.5 billion for construction and expansion at "non-profit" children hospitals by selling bonds that would need to be repaid with interest. We should look at the bigger picture and ask how to improve health care outcomes in California.

FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

FOR

Yes 4 Children's Hospitals—
Yes on Proposition 4
YesOnProposition4.org

AGAINST

Gary Wesley
Mountain View, CA

QUICK-REFERENCE GUIDE

PROP 5

CHANGES REQUIREMENTS FOR CERTAIN PROPERTY OWNERS TO TRANSFER THEIR PROPERTY TAX BASE TO REPLACEMENT PROPERTY. INITIATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT AND STATUTE.

SUMMARY

Put on the Ballot by Petition Signatures

Removes certain transfer requirements for homeowners over 55, severely disabled homeowners, and contaminated or disaster-destroyed property. Fiscal Impact: Schools and local governments each would lose over \$100 million in annual property taxes early on, growing to about \$1 billion per year. Similar increase in state costs to backfill school property tax losses.

WHAT YOUR VOTE MEANS

YES A YES vote on this measure means: All homeowners who are over 55 (or who meet other qualifications) would be eligible for property tax savings when they move to a different home.

NO A NO vote on this measure means: Certain homeowners who are over 55 (or who meet other qualifications) would continue to be eligible for property tax savings when they move to a different home.

ARGUMENTS

PRO Prop. 5 eliminates the "moving penalty" that currently hurts SENIORS (55+) and SEVERELY DISABLED Californians. YES means SENIORS and SEVERELY DISABLED can purchase a new primary residence and not face this property tax penalty. YES allows SENIORS/ SEVERELY DISABLED to move near family or purchase more practical, safer homes.

CON Prop. 5 doesn't build any new housing or help first-time homebuyers purchase homes. It will cut up to \$1 billion in local revenue from public schools, fire, police, health care and other services for tax breaks for wealthy Californians and to help its authors—corporate real estate interests. NoProp5.com

FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

FOR

Cary Davidson
Yes on 5 Committee
515 S. Figueroa Street,
#1110
Los Angeles, CA 90071
(888) 384-8467
info@propertytaxfairness.com
voteyesonprop5.com

AGAINST

No on Prop 5
1510 J Street, Suite 210
Sacramento, CA 95814
(916) 443-7817
info@NoProp5.com
NoProp5.com

PROP 6

ELIMINATES CERTAIN ROAD REPAIR AND TRANSPORTATION FUNDING. REQUIRES CERTAIN FUEL TAXES AND VEHICLE FEES BE APPROVED BY THE ELECTORATE. INITIATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT.

SUMMARY

Put on the Ballot by Petition Signatures

Repeals a 2017 transportation law's taxes and fees designated for road repairs and public transportation. Fiscal Impact: Reduced ongoing revenues of \$5.1 billion from state fuel and vehicle taxes that mainly would have paid for highway and road maintenance and repairs, as well as transit programs.

WHAT YOUR VOTE MEANS

YES A YES vote on this measure means: Fuel and vehicle taxes recently passed by the Legislature would be eliminated, which would reduce funding for highway and road maintenance and repairs, as well as transit programs. The Legislature would be required to get a majority of voters to approve new or increased state fuel and vehicle taxes in the future.

NO A NO vote on this measure means: Fuel and vehicle taxes recently passed by the Legislature would continue to be in effect and pay for highway and road maintenance and repairs, as well as transit programs. The Legislature would continue not to need voter approval for new or increased state fuel and vehicle taxes in the future.

ARGUMENTS

PRO VOTE YES ON 6 to immediately LOWER GAS PRICES. Californians are struggling with the high cost of living. VOTE YES on Proposition 6 to repeal the unfair regressive gas and car tax increase and require voter approval for any future increase. VOTE YES on Prop. 6 for lower gas prices!

CON California Professional Firefighters, California Association of Highway Patrolmen, American Society of Civil Engineers and first responders URGE NO on Proposition 6 because it jeopardizes the safety of bridges and roads. Prop. 6 eliminates \$5 billion annually in local transportation funding, stopping thousands of road safety, congestion relief and transportation improvement projects in every California community. www.NoProp6.com

FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

FOR

Give Voters a Voice—Yes on 6
www.GiveVotersAVoice.com

AGAINST

No on Prop 6: Stop the Attack on Bridge & Road Safety
1121 L Street, Suite 910
Sacramento, CA 95814
(800) 958-1194
info@NoProp6.com
www.NoProp6.com

QUICK-REFERENCE GUIDE

**PROP
7**

**CONFORMS CALIFORNIA DAYLIGHT SAVING TIME TO
FEDERAL LAW. ALLOWS LEGISLATURE TO CHANGE
DAYLIGHT SAVING TIME PERIOD. LEGISLATIVE STATUTE.**

SUMMARY

Put on the Ballot by the Legislature

Gives Legislature ability to change daylight saving time period by two-thirds vote, if changes are consistent with federal law. Fiscal Impact: This measure has no direct fiscal effect because changes to daylight saving time would depend on future actions by the Legislature and potentially the federal government.

WHAT YOUR VOTE MEANS

YES A YES vote on this measure means: The Legislature, with a two-thirds vote, could change daylight saving time if the change is allowed by the federal government. Absent any legislative change, California would maintain its current daylight saving time period (early March to early November).

NO A NO vote on this measure means: California would maintain its current daylight saving time period.

ARGUMENTS

PRO Proposition 7 will end the biannual time changes that medical researchers and economists agree are hazardous to the health and productivity of schoolchildren, the workforce and seniors. Vote Yes on Proposition 7 to keep our children, workplaces and roadways safe.

CON Proposition 7 allows for permanent Daylight Saving time, subject to federal approval. It would be light in the evening in the summer, as it is now, but winter mornings would be dark for an extra hour so children would be going to school in the dark.

FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

FOR

Yes on Proposition 7
YesProp7@gmail.com
www.YesProp7.info

AGAINST

Senator Hannah-Beth Jackson

**PROP
8**

**REGULATES AMOUNTS OUTPATIENT KIDNEY DIALYSIS CLINICS
CHARGE FOR DIALYSIS TREATMENT. INITIATIVE STATUTE.**

SUMMARY

Put on the Ballot by Petition Signatures

Requires rebates and penalties if charges exceed limit. Requires annual reporting to the state. Prohibits clinics from refusing to treat patients based on payment source. Fiscal Impact: Overall annual effect on state and local governments ranging from net positive impact in the low tens of millions of dollars to net negative impact in the tens of millions of dollars.

WHAT YOUR VOTE MEANS

YES A YES vote on this measure means: Kidney dialysis clinics would have their revenues limited by a formula and could be required to pay rebates to certain parties (primarily health insurance companies) that pay for dialysis treatment.

NO A NO vote on this measure means: Kidney dialysis clinics would not have their revenues limited by a formula and would not be required to pay rebates.

ARGUMENTS

PRO Dialysis is a life-saving treatment, but big dialysis corporations making huge profits don't invest enough in basic sanitation and patient care. YES ON 8 supports investment in quality patient care and stops overcharging that drives up costs for Californians. The California Democratic Party, veterans, healthcare advocates and religious leaders agree: www.YesOn8.com

CON Proposition 8 is **OPPOSED** by thousands of nurses, doctors, patients, the American Nurses Association\California, California Medical Association, American College of Emergency Physicians of CA because it would result in the closure of many dialysis clinics in California—dangerously reducing access to care, putting the lives of vulnerable dialysis patients at risk, and increasing costs for California taxpayers. Vote NO. www.NoProp8.com

FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

FOR

Suzanne Jimenez
Yes on 8
777 S. Figueroa Street,
Ste. 4050
Los Angeles, CA 90017
(888) 501-8119
info@YesOn8.com
www.YesOn8.com

AGAINST

No on Proposition 8: Stop the
Dangerous Dialysis
Proposition
(888) 663-9997
info@NoProp8.com
www.NoProp8.com

QUICK-REFERENCE GUIDE

On July 18, 2018, Proposition 9 was removed from the ballot by order of the California Supreme Court.

**PROP
10**

EXPANDS LOCAL GOVERNMENTS' AUTHORITY TO ENACT RENT CONTROL ON RESIDENTIAL PROPERTY. INITIATIVE STATUTE.

SUMMARY

Put on the Ballot by Petition Signatures

Repeals state law that currently restricts the scope of rent-control policies that cities and other local jurisdictions may impose on residential property. Fiscal Impact: Potential net reduction in state and local revenues of tens of millions of dollars per year in the long term. Depending on actions by local communities, revenue losses could be less or considerably more.

WHAT YOUR VOTE MEANS

YES A YES vote on this measure means: State law *would not* limit the kinds of rent control laws cities and counties could have.

NO A NO vote on this measure means: State law *would continue* to limit the kinds of rent control laws cities and counties could have.

ARGUMENTS

PRO Prop. 10 restores authority to establish rent control in local communities, putting fair, annual limits on the amount landlords can raise rent. This keeps tenants in their homes rather than being pushed far away or into homelessness. *TEN protects TENants.*
Supporters: CALIFORNIA DEMOCRATIC PARTY, California Nurses Association, California Teachers Association, ACLU of California, Housing California, Eviction Defense Network, SEIU, National Urban League, Southern Christian Leadership Conference of Southern California.

CON Prop. 10 will make the housing crisis worse, not better. Affordable housing advocates agree that Prop. 10 is bad for renters and bad for homeowners! It allows regulation of single-family homes and puts bureaucrats in charge of housing by letting them add fees on top of rent. **VOTE NO ON 10!**

FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

FOR
YES on Prop 10—Coalition for Affordable Housing
(424) 307-5278
team@VoteYesOnProp10.org
www.VoteYesOnProp10.org

AGAINST
No on Prop 10—A Flawed Initiative That Will Make The Housing Crisis Worse
(530) 586-4940
info@Prop10Flaws.com
www.Prop10Flaws.com

QUICK-REFERENCE GUIDE

**PROP
11**

REQUIRES PRIVATE-SECTOR EMERGENCY AMBULANCE EMPLOYEES TO REMAIN ON-CALL DURING WORK BREAKS. ELIMINATES CERTAIN EMPLOYER LIABILITY. INITIATIVE STATUTE.

SUMMARY

Put on the Ballot by Petition Signatures

Law entitling hourly employees to breaks without being on-call would not apply to private-sector ambulance employees. Fiscal Impact: Likely fiscal benefit to local governments (in the form of lower costs and higher revenues), potentially in the tens of millions of dollars each year.

WHAT YOUR VOTE MEANS

YES A YES vote on this measure means: Private ambulance companies could continue their current practice of having emergency medical technicians (EMTs) and paramedics stay on-duty during their meal and rest breaks in order to respond to 911 calls. Private ambulance companies would attempt to reschedule meal and rest breaks that are interrupted by a 911 call.

NO A NO vote on this measure means: Private ambulance companies would be subject to labor laws for this industry. Based on a recent court decision, these laws likely would require ambulance companies to provide EMTs and paramedics with off-duty meal and rest breaks that cannot be interrupted by a 911 call.

ARGUMENTS

PRO California faces disasters too often. Prop. 11 ensures EMTs and paramedics are paid to be reachable during breaks to save lives, gives them better disaster training that meets FEMA standards and mandatory mental health coverage. In an emergency, seconds are the difference between life and death. YES on 11! It's commonsense.

CON No argument against Proposition 11 was submitted.

FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

FOR

Californians for Emergency Preparedness and Safety
2350 Kerner Boulevard,
Suite 250
San Rafael, CA 94901
(916) 836-4301
info@YESon11.org
www.YESon11.org

AGAINST

No contact information was provided.

**PROP
12**

ESTABLISHES NEW STANDARDS FOR CONFINEMENT OF SPECIFIED FARM ANIMALS; BANS SALE OF NONCOMPLYING PRODUCTS. INITIATIVE STATUTE.

SUMMARY

Put on the Ballot by Petition Signatures

Establishes minimum requirements for confining certain farm animals. Prohibits sales of meat and egg products from animals confined in noncomplying manner. Fiscal Impact: Potential decrease in state income tax revenues from farm businesses, likely not more than several million dollars annually. State costs up to \$10 million annually to enforce the measure.

WHAT YOUR VOTE MEANS

YES A YES vote on this measure means: There would be new minimum requirements on farmers to provide more space for egg-laying hens, breeding pigs, and calves raised for veal. California businesses would be banned from selling eggs or uncooked pork or veal that came from animals housed in ways that did not meet these requirements.

NO A NO vote on this measure means: Current minimum space requirements for confining egg-laying hens, pregnant pigs, and calves raised for veal would continue to apply. Current ban on businesses in California selling eggs not meeting these space requirements for hens would remain in effect.

ARGUMENTS

PRO Confining a baby veal calf, mother pig, or egg-laying hen inside a tiny cage is cruel. Products from these suffering animals threaten food safety. YES on Prop. 12 endorses: Nearly 500 California veterinarians, ASPCA, Humane Society of the United States, California family farmers and animal shelters, Center for Food Safety.

CON This outrageous sell-out to the egg industry betrays animals and voters. Californians already voted to ban cages by 2015. This cruel measure legalizes cages until at least 2022! And hens get just ONE SQUARE FOOT of space. Vote NO on farm animal cruelty by voting NO on Proposition 12. www.StopTheRottenEgginitiative.org

FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

FOR

Crystal Moreland
Prevent Cruelty California Coalition
119 North Fairfax Ave. #613
Los Angeles, CA 90036
(323) 937-0600
info@preventcrueltyca.com
preventcrueltyca.com

AGAINST

Bradley Miller
Californians Against Cruelty, Cages, and Fraud
P.O. Box 3577
San Rafael, CA 94912
(855) NO CAGES (662-2437)
INFO@NoOnProposition12.org
www.NoOnProposition12.org

Proposition #	Title	CSAC Position
Prop 1	SB 3: Veterans and Affordable Housing Bond Act of 2018	Support
Prop 2	AB 1827: No Place Like Home Act of 2018	Support
Prop 3	Authorizes Bonds to Fund Projects for Water Supply and Quality, Watershed, Fish, Wildlife, Water Conveyance, And Groundwater Sustainability and Storage.	Support
Prop 4	Authorizes Bonds Funding Construction at Hospitals Providing Children's Care.	No position
Prop 5	Changes Requirements for Certain Property Owners to Transfer their Property Tax Base to Replacement Property.	Oppose
Prop 6	Eliminates Recently Enacted Road Repair and Transportation Funding by Repealing Revenues Dedicated for those Purposes. Requires any Measure to Enact Certain Vehicle Fuel Taxes and Vehicle Fees be Submitted to and Approved by the Electorate.	Oppose
Prop 7	AB 807: Daylight Savings Time	No position
Prop 8	Authorizes State Regulation of Kidney Dialysis Clinics. Limits Charges for Patient Care.	No position
Prop 10	Expands Local Governments' Authority to Enact Rent Control on Residential Property.	No position
Prop 11	Requires Private-Sector Emergency Ambulance Employees to Remain on Call During Work Breaks. Changes Other Conditions of Employment.	No position
Prop 12	Establishes New Standards for Confinement of Certain Farm Animals; Bans Sale of Certain Non-Complying Products.	No position

Tony Shaw

From: California Farm Bureau Federation <cfbf-email@CFBF.com>
Sent: Tuesday, October 02, 2018 10:48 AM
Subject: RELEASE IMMEDIATE: FARM BUREAU ANNOUNCES POSITIONS ON BALLOT MEASURES



Contact: (916) 561-5550
FAX (916) 561-5695
2300 River Plaza Drive, Sacramento, CA 95833
news@cfbf.com
www.cfbf.com

RELEASE IMMEDIATE

Oct. 2, 2018

Contact: Dave Kranz

Manager, Communications/News Division
California Farm Bureau Federation
Phone: 916-561-5550
Cell Phone: 916-719-2056

FARM BUREAU ANNOUNCES POSITIONS ON BALLOT MEASURES

As the November election nears, California Farm Bureau Federation directors encourage voters to approve a water bond measure but to reject an initiative that would impose new restrictions on how farm animals are raised. CFBF directors considered statewide ballot measures during a meeting in Sacramento.

The CFBF board endorsed passage of Proposition 3, an \$8.9 billion measure to invest in water-system enhancements including groundwater supply, water recycling, efficiency improvements, safe drinking water and repairs to critical water projects.

“One of California’s top priorities must be to enhance our water system,” CFBF President Jamie Johansson said. “Proposition 3 builds on earlier investments. It represents the latest contribution to what must be an ongoing commitment to assure California’s water system can meet its future needs.”

The ballot initiative Proposition 12 would dictate specific requirements for housing egg-laying hens, veal calves and hogs. Johansson called the measure unnecessary.

“Everyone agrees farm animals should be treated with care,” he said, “and California voters passed Proposition 2 on animal housing 10 years ago. California egg farmers who have managed to stay in business comply with those rules. All Proposition 12 does is allow trial lawyers to file predatory lawsuits against egg farmers, who provide some of the healthiest food on the planet. Proposition 12 would push egg prices higher in the state that already suffers from the nation’s highest poverty rate.”

Here is the full list of CFBF ballot recommendations:

Proposition 1—Veterans Housing Bonds	No position
Proposition 2—Shift in Tax Revenue	NO
Proposition 3—Water System Enhancements	YES
Proposition 4—Children’s Hospital Bonds	No position

Proposition 5—Property Tax Assessment Transfer	YES
Proposition 6—Fuel Tax Repeal	YES
Proposition 7—Daylight Saving Time	No position
Proposition 8—Kidney Dialysis Price Setting	NO
Proposition 9 was removed from the ballot	
Proposition 10—Rent Control	NO
Proposition 11—Ambulance Employees	No position
Proposition 12—Farm Animal Housing	NO

The California Farm Bureau Federation works to protect family farms and ranches on behalf of nearly 40,000 members statewide and as part of a nationwide network of more than 5.5 million Farm Bureau members.

#



To: RCRC Board of Directors
From: Paul A. Smith, Vice President Governmental Affairs
Date: September 11, 2018
Re: Upcoming November 2018 Ballot Measures Update

Summary

This memo provides an update on a number of November 2018 statewide ballot measures the RCRC Board of Directors has considered, and is slated to consider. These measures could have impacts in RCRC member counties.

Background

Currently, there are eleven proposed statewide measures slated for the November 2018 General Election Ballot.

Issue

RCRC staff has conducted a review of each measure that has qualified for the November Ballot as to the impact on rural counties. The following list of ballot measures reflects action taken by the RCRC Board of Directors on several items.

	RCRC Position
<i>Proposition 6: Voter Approval for Increases in Gas and Car Tax</i> Eliminates Recently-Enacted Road Repair and Transportation Funding by Repealing Revenues Dedicated for those Purposes	OPPOSE (Board Meeting April 26, 2018)
<i>Proposition 3: Water Supply and Water Quality Act of 2018</i> Authorizes Bonds to Fund Projects for Water Supply and Quality, Watershed, Fish, Wildlife, Water Conveyance, and Groundwater Sustainability and Storage	SUPPORT (Board Meeting January 17, 2018)
<i>Tax Fairness, Transparency and Accountability Act of 2018</i> Expands Requirement for Supermajority Approval to Enact New Revenue Measures MEASURE IS NO LONGER BEING PURSUED	OPPOSE (Board Meeting June 20, 2018)
<i>Proposition 1: Veterans and Affordable Housing Bond Act of 2018</i> Senate Bill 3 (Beall, Chapter 365, 2017)	NO POSITION (Board Meeting June 20, 2018)

Proposition 5: People's Initiative to Protect Proposition 13 Savings Act Changes Requirements for Certain Property Owners to Transfer Their Property Tax Base to Replacement Property	OPPOSE (Board Meeting June 20, 2018)
Proposition 10: Affordable Housing Act Expands Local Governments' Authority to Enact Rent Control on Residential Property	NO POSITION (Board Meeting August 15, 2018)

The following ballot measures are slated for consideration at the September 21, 2018 RCRC Board of Directors Meeting:

	RCRC Position
Proposition 11: Emergency Ambulance Employee Safety and Preparedness Act Requires Private-Sector Emergency Ambulance Employees to Remain on Call During Work Breaks	"Support" TS To Be Determined
Proposition 2: No Place Like Home Act of 2018 Assembly Bill 1827 (Assembly Budget Committee, Chapter 41, 2018)	"NEUTRAL" B To Be Determined
Proposition 4: Children's Hospital Bond Act of 2018 Authorizes Bond Funding Construction at Hospitals Providing Children's Health Care	"NO POSITION" S To Be Determined
Proposition 7: Daylight Saving Time Assembly Bill 807 (Chu, Chapter 60, 2018)	"NO POSITION" TS To Be Determined



To: RCRC Board of Directors
From: Mary-Ann Warmerdam, Senior Legislative Advocate
Date: January 9, 2018
Re: *pol* Water Supply and Water Quality Act of 2018 - **ACTION**

Summary

This memo provides a summary on the Water Supply and Water Quality Act of 2018, also known as the "Meral" bond, currently in circulation for signatures. If successful in securing enough signatures, this bond proposal will be considered by California voters in November 2018.

Background

California has a long tradition of funding water infrastructure (financing the State Water Project, local/regional water supply and treatment facilities, etc.) through a series of general obligation bonds (which require voter approval) and revenue-use bonds. However, even with this legacy of investment, California continues to grapple with long-term water supply and reliability, particularly at the regional level. The state's aging water infrastructure has precipitated discussions to look at bringing a bond proposal before California's voters as a remedy to address some of the current needs.

Issue

In 2017, two bond proposals were formulated: one by the Legislature, and one via the initiative process. Last Fall, the Legislature enacted Senate Bill 5, authored by President pro Tempore Kevin de León (D-Los Angeles), which is primarily focused on park funding with some water financing included. The RCRC Board of Directors considered this proposal at its December 2017 meeting and elected to not take a position on the measure.

The second measure, currently being circulated and likely to qualify for the November 2018 ballot, is known as the "California Water Infrastructure and Watershed Conservation Bond Initiative (#17-0010)." This initiative is backed by a coalition of interests such as water agencies (including the Northern California Water Association), agricultural commodity groups, business organizations, and conservation non-governmental organizations. RCRC was invited to serve on the steering committee and provide guidance relating to those provisions impacting rural California and its constituencies.

Through the efforts of RCRC, accommodation was made in three primary areas: (1) monies for forest health and watershed improvements related to forest health; \$100 million to the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CAL FIRE) and the Sierra Nevada Conservancy (SNC) for post-fire watershed restoration; and \$200 million to SNC for watershed improvement, including dead tree removal activity on federal lands; (2) language was incorporated into the proposal relating to properties acquired with funds from the Wildlife Conservation Board and preference be given to nonprofit purchasers who commit to paying property tax on the acquired properties; and (3) "disadvantaged communities" are defined as those with a household income of less than 80 percent of statewide annual median household income (as set forth in subdivision (a) of Water Code (W.C.) section 79505.5. In addition, "economically distressed areas" are those communities with 20,000 persons or less, a rural county reasonably isolated, with less than 85 percent of statewide median household income (W.C. section 79702(k)).

This measure would issue a total of \$8.365 billion in bonds for a number of existing water-related programs, including the following, many of which will benefit rural counties (underlined below):

- \$750 million for drinking water infrastructure on public and private properties;
- \$800 million for wastewater recycling projects and desalination of brackish groundwater projects;
- \$150 million for flood control projects within the jurisdiction of the Central Valley Flood Protection Board;
- \$100 million for matching grants to local agencies to repair reservoirs that provide flood control;
- \$200 million for grants for flood management, wetlands restoration, and other projects within the jurisdiction of the San Francisco Bay Restoration Authority;
- \$600 million for projects to capture and use urban dry weather runoff and stormwater runoff;
- \$5 million for Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) planning and implementation efforts;
- \$2.055 billion for the protection, restoration, and improvement of watershed lands;
- \$100 million for grants for improving rangelands, meadows, wetlands, riparian areas, and aquatic areas to increase groundwater recharge;
- \$40 million for the California Conservation Corps to provide projects to protect, restore, and improve watershed lands;
- \$400 million for the restoration of native fish and fish habitat in the Central Valley;
- \$675 million for grants to protect or improve groundwater supplies including implementation of the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA);
- \$300 million to acquire storage and delivery rights to fish and wildlife habitat in streams, rivers, wildlife refuges, wetland areas, and estuaries;
- \$50 million to provide incentives for private landowners to improve water supplies for fish and wildlife;

- \$300 million for salmon and steelhead fisheries restoration projects in the Central Valley;
- \$280 million for habitat acquisition to protect migratory birds;
- \$250 million for the Bay Area Regional Reliability Partnership's surface water storage;
- \$750 million to restore the capacity of the Friant Kern Canal, including groundwater management; and,
- \$200 million for the repair and reconstruction of the spillways at the Oroville Dam.

It should be noted that general obligation bonds are issued with the security of the full faith and credit of the state. Amounts must be approved by the voters and sold at the lowest interest rate possible. These bonds are less costly to issue than other types of bonds issued by the state that are not subject to voter approval. Bonded indebtedness is repaid on an annual basis through a General Fund budget appropriation. General obligation bond payments take priority over most other types of appropriation, consistent with the state Constitution.

One indicator of the state's debt situation is its debt-service ratio. This ratio indicates the portion of the state's annual General Fund revenues that must be set aside for debt-service payments on infrastructure bonds, and therefore, are not available for other state programs. The state's debt-service ratio is currently about 5 percent.

Staff Recommendation

RCRC staff recommends the RCRC Board of Directors adopt a "Support" position on the Water Supply and Water Quality Act of 2018. This measure provides specific allocations to program areas of importance to rural counties, and is generally viewed as complementing ongoing efforts to improve/re-invest in needed water-related infrastructure and projects.

Attachments

- ~~• Copy of "Water Supply and Water Quality Act of 2018"~~
- ~~• Copy of "Advancing a Water Bond for the November 2018 Ballot: An Update"~~
- ~~• Copy of "Water Supply and Water Quality Bond Act of 2018, Circulating for Signatures, Would Establish Bad Water Policies"~~



To: RCRC Board of Directors
From: Paul A. Smith, Vice President Governmental Affairs
Date: June 12, 2018
Re: *1005* People's Initiative to Protect Proposition 13 Savings Act – **ACTION**

Summary

This memo provides an analysis of the "People's Initiative to Protect Proposition 13 Savings Act," which is slated for the November 2018 General Election ballot. RCRC staff is recommending the RCRC Board of Directors adopt an "Oppose" position for this measure.

Background

Under Proposition 13, the value of a home for property tax purposes is reassessed to market level whenever a change in ownership takes place. This reassessment usually results in higher property taxes for the homebuyer. Proposition 60 was enacted in 1986 to allow qualified seniors to keep their property tax base assessment when they move within the same county. In 1988, California voters approved Proposition 90, which allows a residential property owner over the age of 55 to move from one county to another without undergoing a change in their base property tax provided the replacement dwelling is of equal or lesser value than the departing home. Proposition 90 provides each county Board of Supervisors the option of participating and accepting another county's tax base for a particular real property owner. If the county that the property owner is moving from does not have a Proposition 90 ordinance, this does not affect the eligibility of the owner.

Currently, two RCRC member counties (El Dorado and Tuolumne) allow intercounty transfers pursuant to resolutions adopted by the Boards of Supervisors in those counties. Two RCRC member counties (Inyo and Modoc) had previously adopted ordinances to implement Proposition 90, but later repealed these ordinances. A homeowner can transfer their assessed value only once in their lifetime.

In the past several years, the legislature has considered several measures to dramatically alter both Proposition 60 and Proposition 90, including:

- Senate Bill 378 (Beall) & Senate Constitutional Amendment 9 (Beall) – 2015, would have allowed base year value transfers to properties of greater value than the current home.

- Assembly Bill 2668 (Mullin) & Assembly Constitutional Amendment 12 (Mullin) – 2016, would have allowed base year value transfers to properties of equal or greater value for seniors and those with a disability.
- Assembly Bill 1322 (Bocanegra) & Assembly Constitutional Amendment 7 (Bocanegra) – 2017, would authorize intercounty base year values, regardless of whether the local board of supervisors has adopted an ordinance to deny or permit such transfers.

RCRC opposed each of these measures on the basis of revenue loss and/or the elimination of local discretion. Each measure failed in the legislative process.

Issue

The California Association of Realtors (CAR) is the lead proponent of the “People’s Initiative to Protect Proposition 13 Savings Act,” which changes the current parameters for base year value transfers by expanding the program in several ways.

<u>Current Law</u>	<u>CAR Initiative</u>
<i>Elderly and/or Severely Disabled Persons</i>	
Elderly (55+) and/or severely disabled persons may transfer their property tax “base year value” of their home to a replacement home <u>once in a lifetime</u> .	Allows elderly (55+) and/or severely disabled persons to transfer “base year value” of their home an <u>unlimited number of times</u> .
Boards of Supervisors <u>may elect</u> to accept “base year values” transferred from other counties by elderly and/or severely disabled homeowners.	Counties <u>are required</u> to accept “base year values” transferred from other counties by elderly and/or severely disabled homeowners.
To be eligible for “base year value” transfer, the elderly and/or severely disabled person’s replacement home must be <u>of equal or lesser market value</u> .	Allows elderly and/or severely disabled homeowners to transfer their “base year value” <u>regardless of the value of the replacement dwelling</u> .
If the elderly and/or severely disabled person’s replacement dwelling has a <i>lower</i> (or equal) market value than their current home, their <u>current “base year value” is transferred</u> to the new home.	If the elderly and/or severely disabled person’s replacement dwelling has a <i>lower</i> market value than their current home, their “base year value” <u>will be reduced</u> (based upon a formula reflecting the difference in market value).
If the elderly and/or severely disabled person’s replacement dwelling has a <i>higher</i> market value than their current home, their “base year value” <u>will not transfer, and their property taxes will be based on the value of the new home</u> .	If the elderly and/or severely disabled person’s replacement dwelling has a <i>higher</i> market value than their current home, their “base year value” <u>will transfer, with an upward adjustment</u> (based upon a formula reflecting the difference in market value).

If former co-owners (who are both either elderly or disabled) purchase separate replacement homes, they must <u>mutually agree which one</u> will take the "base year value" transfer property tax benefit.	Allows former co-owners (who are both either elderly or disabled) who purchase separate replacement homes to transfer the base year value to <u>each new home in proportion to their respective ownership interests</u> in the original property.
<i>Property Damaged or Destroyed by a Disaster</i>	
Boards of Supervisors <u>may elect</u> to accept "base year values" transferred from other counties by persons whose former property was substantially damaged or destroyed by a declared disaster.	Counties <u>are required</u> to accept "base year values" transferred from other counties by persons whose former property was substantially damaged or destroyed by a declared disaster.
To be eligible for "base year value" transfer, the replacement property must be " <u>comparable</u> " to the damaged or destroyed property.	Allows "base year value" transfer <u>regardless whether the replacement property is "comparable"</u> to the damaged or destroyed property.
If the market value of the replacement property is <i>lower</i> than (or up to 120% of) the market value of the damaged or destroyed property, the <u>current "base year value" is transferred</u> to the new property.	If the market value of the replacement property is <i>lower</i> than the market value of the damaged or destroyed property, the " <u>base year value</u> " <u>will be reduced</u> (based upon a formula reflecting the difference in market value).
<i>Contaminated Property</i>	
Boards of Supervisors <u>may elect</u> to accept "base year values" transferred from other counties by persons whose former property was contaminated (as defined).	Counties <u>are required</u> to accept "base year values" transferred from other counties by persons whose former property was contaminated.
To be eligible for "base year value" transfer, the market value of the replacement property must be <u>equal or less than the value</u> that the contaminated property would have if uncontaminated.	Allows "base year value" transfer <u>regardless of the value of the replacement property</u> .
If the replacement property has a <i>lower</i> (or equal) market value than the contaminated property, the <u>current "base year value" is transferred</u> to the new property.	If the replacement property has a <i>lower</i> market value than the contaminated property, the " <u>base year value</u> " <u>will be reduced</u> (based upon a formula reflecting the difference in market value).
If the replacement property has a <i>higher</i> market value than the contaminated property would have if uncontaminated, the " <u>base year value</u> " <u>will not transfer</u> , and <u>property taxes will be based on the value of the new property</u> .	If the replacement property has a <i>higher</i> market value than the contaminated property, the "base year value" <u>will transfer</u> , with an <u>upward adjustment</u> (based upon a formula reflecting the difference in market value).

An example of how these changes impact homeowners:

A couple has lived in their suburban home for 30 years. The home's assessed value is \$75,000 and could be sold for \$600,000. They are looking at two options:

- Purchasing a home in the mountains: The couple could buy a home in the mountains for \$700,000. Under the measure, the assessed value of the home would be \$175,000: \$75,000 (assessed value of their prior home) plus \$100,000. The \$100,000 amount is a calculation of the new home's market value, \$700,000, minus the prior home's market value, \$600,000.
- Purchasing a smaller home in the next county over: The couple could buy a smaller home in a neighboring county for \$500,000. Under the measure, the assessed value would be \$62,000: \$75,000 (assessed value of their prior home) multiplied by 0.8 (\$500,000 [the new home's market value] divided by \$600,000 [the prior home's market value]).

The Legislative Analyst's Office (LAO) estimates the resulting property tax losses would total hundreds of millions of dollars per year, with schools and other local governments losing \$150 million annually statewide. Over time, the losses would grow as established base year values move to additional properties, creating abnormally low tax bills based on prior assessment transfers.

Staff Recommendation

RCRC staff recommends the Board of Directors adopt an "Oppose" position on the People's Initiative to Protect Proposition 13 Savings Act. This measure mandates the acceptance of base property taxes from another county, thereby eliminating the local option component of Proposition 90. Without question, this measure would lower the amount of property tax revenues to California counties and other local jurisdictions without any corresponding revenue source or relief/elimination of any current county responsibilities.

Attachment

- ~~Copy of People's Initiative to Protect Proposition 13 Savings Act~~

Tony Shaw

From: Matt Boyer <matt@mcbandassociates.com>
Sent: Monday, October 08, 2018 9:04 AM
To: Tony Shaw
Cc: David Teeter
Subject: RE: County of Lassen prop 6

Good morning Tony ~

Here is a summary of the impacts, as I see it, by program.

- Local Streets and Roads (#1 greatest impact)

City of Susanville \$150,000 estimated (we haven't had a full year of actuals yet) – for Susanville, not clear impact of them possibly not being able to meet the Maintenance of Effort requirement
 County of Lassen \$1,050,000 estimated (we haven't had a full year of actuals yet)

- State Transportation Improvement Program (co-#1 greatest impact) – the conservative estimate is this is \$60,000 year given \$82.5M statewide/year and Lassen has 0.075% of the State population.
- Transit (State of Good Repair Program) - \$45,000/year (I believe this might be shy looking forward as we've not had 1 full year). So, maybe its \$55,000.
- Planning grants – I think LCTC can get an (on average) an extra \$100,000 in transportation planning grants, per year, although these are competitive

At this time, the Lassen region is either not eligible or not likely to compete well, for the following SB 1 programs.

- Trade Corridor Enhancement Program
- Solutions for Congested Corridors Program
- State Transportation Improvement Program – Interregional Share (someday for US 395)
- Active Transportation Program
- Local Partnership Program



To: RCRC Board of Directors
From: Paul A. Smith, Vice President Governmental Affairs
Date: April 17, 2018
Re: *Prop 6* Repeal of Senate Bill 1 (Beall) Initiative - **ACTION**

Summary

This memo provides a summary on an initiative proposal – “Voter Approval for Increases in Gas and Car Tax” - that would repeal the recently-enacted Senate Bill 1 (Beall), which increased taxes and fees on motorists and dedicates those monies for road repair and transportation funding purposes. RCRC staff is recommending the Board of Directors adopt an “Oppose” position on this repeal effort.

Background

In general, the excise taxes and fees on gasoline and diesel fuel serve as the foundation for funding road maintenance and construction at the state and local levels. Fees derived from vehicle registrations are placed in the Motor Vehicle Account and help fund the activities of the Department of Motor Vehicles and the California Highway Patrol. Truck weight fees are currently used to satisfy State General Fund debt associated with Proposition 1B, the transportation bond proposal enacted in 2006.

In March 2017, the RCRC Board of Directors adopted a “Support” position for Senate Bill 1 (Beall) and its Assembly counterpart, Assembly Bill 1 (Frazier), to better fund state and local transportation needs. Shortly after the endorsement, SB 1 was enacted into law to provide approximately \$52 billion in new transportation revenues (over a 10-year period) to address the approximately \$6 billion annual state and \$8 billion annual local transportation maintenance backlog.

Specifically, SB 1 provides the following:

- Transportation Loan Repayments: SB 1 repays \$706 million in transportation loans made to the State General Fund. Most of these repayment funds will be used to fund the road maintenance backlog;
- Gas Excise Tax: SB 1 increased the gas tax by \$0.12 per gallon, and also eliminated the Gas Tax Swap, thereby resetting the price-based gas tax to its 2010 level of \$0.173 (which will occur in July of 2019). The entirety of the gas excise tax would be indexed to inflation once a year, commencing in 2020. When fully implemented, the cumulative state excise tax rate would be \$0.473 per gallon (the current cumulative state excise tax rate is \$0.278 per gallon);

- Diesel Excise Tax: SB 1 increased the diesel excise tax by \$0.20 per gallon and indexes the tax to inflation. Half of the proceeds from the increase in the diesel excise tax would fund trade corridor improvements for freight mobility and the other half for road maintenance (the current state diesel excise tax is \$0.16 per gallon);
- Diesel Sales Tax: SB 1 increased the sales tax on diesel from the current 1.75 percent to 5.75 percent to better fund rail and transit operations, the only source that can fund transit operations under existing state constitutional requirements;
- Zero Emission Vehicles: SB 1 imposes a \$100 surcharge on zero emission vehicles at the time of renewal for model years 2020 and later. This is in addition to the increase in the Vehicle Registration Fee on all vehicles (zero emission vehicles currently do not contribute to road maintenance); and,
- Vehicle Registration Fee (VRF): SB 1 increased the VRF by an amount based on the market value of the vehicle in the following manner:

Vehicle value range	Annual rate	Percent of registered vehicles
\$0 - \$4,999	\$ 25	46.3%
\$5,000 - \$24,999	\$ 50	41.1%
\$25,000 - \$34,999	\$ 100	7.0%
\$35,000 - \$59,999	\$ 150	4.6%
\$60,000 and up	\$ 175	1.0%

More than 60 percent of the proceeds raised directly from SB 1 are to be split evenly between the State and local governments. The anticipated \$1.5 billion annual local government share would be divided equally between cities and counties for local streets and roads under existing distribution formulas. The California Transportation Commission (CTC) is required annually to evaluate each agency receiving funds to ensure that the funds are spent appropriately.

The anticipated \$1.5 billion annual State share of the revenues would be directed to the State Highway Operation and Protection Program (SHOPP). Proceeds would be available for addressing deferred maintenance on the existing State highways.

In addition, SB 1 makes a number of transportation-related reforms, including:

- Creating the Office of Transportation Inspector General within the State Department of Transportation to oversee state spending on transportation; and,
- Increasing CTC oversight and approval of the SHOPP program.

Issue

In late November 2017, an SB 1 repeal effort was launched. As of mid-January, the initiative had reached 25 percent of signatures needed to qualify for the November 2018 ballot. The measure is fully expected to qualify and appear on the November General Election Ballot.

The “Voter Approval for Increases in Gas and Car Tax” measure not only repeals SB 1’s tax and fee provisions, it also would require the Legislature to submit any measure enacting specified taxes or fees on gas or diesel fuel, or on the privilege to operate a vehicle on public highways, to voters for approval.

Staff Recommendation

RCRC staff is recommending that the RCRC Board of Directors adopt an "Oppose" position on the "Voter Approval for Increases in Gas and Car Tax." RCRC staff believes this effort overturns the RCRC Board of Directors' action last year where the Board supported SB 1 by a vote of 19-6 with one abstention. Furthermore, RCRC staff is concerned with the provision that requires all increases in transportation-related taxes or fees be submitted to the voters for approval.

Attachments

- ~~• Copy of the "Voter Approval for Increases in Gas and Car Tax" Measure (17-0033)~~
- Copy of Legislative Analyst Office Summary

[Skip to main content](#)

BALLOT PAGES

[Initiative Fiscal Analyses \(pre-ballot\)](#)

[Proposition Analyses](#)

[Ballot Measures by Type: 1974 to Present](#)

[Ballot Bonds](#)

[Summary of General Obligation Bonds—Election Results 1986 to Present \(Excel File\)](#)

[Related LAO Publications](#)

[Propositions on the November 6, 2018 Ballot](#)

Proposition 6

November 6, 2018

 [PDF Version](#)

Eliminates Recently Enacted Road Repair and Transportation Funding by Repealing Revenues Dedicated for Those Purposes. Requires Any Measure to Enact Certain Vehicle Fuel Taxes and Vehicle Fees Be Submitted to and Approved by the Electorate. Initiative Constitutional Amendment.

Yes/No Statement

A **YES** vote on this measure means: Fuel and vehicle taxes recently passed by the Legislature would be eliminated, which would reduce funding for highway and road maintenance and repairs, as well as transit programs. The Legislature would be required to get a majority of voters to approve new or increased state fuel and vehicle taxes in the future.

A **NO** vote on this measure means: Fuel and vehicle taxes recently passed by the Legislature would continue to be in effect and pay for highway and road maintenance and repairs, as well as transit programs. The Legislature would continue not to need voter approval for new or increased state fuel and vehicle taxes in the future.

Summary of Legislative Analyst's Estimate of Net State and Local Government Fiscal Impact

- Reduced ongoing state revenues of \$5.1 billion from the elimination of fuel and vehicle taxes passed by the Legislature in 2017. These revenues mainly would have paid for highway and road maintenance and repairs, as well as transit programs.
- The requirement that voters approve new or increased fuel and vehicle taxes passed by the Legislature in the future could result in lower revenues from such taxes than otherwise would have been available.

Ballot Label

Fiscal Impact: Reduced ongoing revenues of \$5.1 billion from state fuel and vehicle taxes that mainly would have paid for highway and road maintenance and repairs, as well as transit programs.

Background

Approval of State Taxes

Legislative Requirements. Under the State Constitution, the Legislature can only pass a new tax or increase an existing tax with a two-thirds vote. (The Legislature can pass most other types of laws with a simple majority.) Some state charges referred to as fees (such as vehicle license fees) fall under the constitutional definition of a tax.

Voter Approval Requirements. The Legislature does not need to get voter approval for new or increased taxes that it passes. The voters—through the initiative process—can pass new taxes or increase existing taxes without the Legislature's involvement.

State Fuel and Vehicle Taxes

Fuel Taxes. The state charges excise taxes on gasoline and diesel fuel. These taxes are set on a per-gallon basis. The state also charges sales taxes on gasoline and diesel fuel. These taxes are set as a percent of the price of the fuel. The State Constitution generally requires that the revenues from these fuel taxes be spent on highways, roads, and transit.

Vehicle Taxes. State law requires vehicle owners to pay two specific taxes for the privilege of operating a vehicle on public highways. These are (1) vehicle license fees and (2) recently enacted transportation improvement fees, both of which are based on a vehicle's value. The State Constitution requires that the transportation improvement fee revenues be spent on highways, roads, and transit.

Transportation Funding in California

Transportation funding in California currently is estimated to total \$35 billion. Of this amount, \$16 billion comes from local sources, \$12 billion from state sources, and \$7 billion from federal sources. Local funding mainly comes from sales taxes, transit fares, and city and county general funds, while federal funding mainly comes from federal fuel taxes. State funding mainly comes from state fuel and vehicle taxes. State funding has increased by about three-quarters over the last two years mainly due to recent legislation.

Recent State Transportation Funding Legislation. In 2017, the Legislature enacted Senate Bill (SB) 1 to increase annual state funding for transportation through various fuel and vehicle taxes (shown in Figure 1). Specifically, SB 1 increased the base gasoline excise tax (by 12 cents per gallon) and the diesel sales tax (by 4 percent). It also set fixed rates on a second (add-on) gasoline excise tax and the diesel excise tax, both of which previously could change each year based on fuel prices. Further, SB 1 created the transportation improvement fee (which ranges from \$25 to \$175 per year) and a fee specifically for zero-emission vehicles (set at \$100 per year for model years 2020 and later). It also provides for inflation adjustments in the future. This fiscal year, the state expects the taxes to raise \$4.4 billion. Two years from now, when all the taxes are in effect and the inflation adjustments have started, the state expects the taxes to raise \$5.1 billion. The State Constitution requires that nearly all of these new revenues be spent on transportation purposes. Senate Bill 1 dedicates about two-thirds of the revenues to highway and road repairs, with the remainder going to other programs (such as for mass transit).

Figure 1**Senate Bill 1 Revenues**

	Tax Rates		Annual Revenues (In Billions)	
	Prior Rates	New Rates	Current Year	In Two Years
Gasoline Taxes				
Excise (base)	18 cents	30 cents	\$1.9	\$2.1
Excise (add-on)	Varied ^a	17.3 cents	— ^b	0.2
Diesel Taxes				
Excise	Varied ^c	36 cents	0.7	0.7
Sales	1.75 percent	5.75 percent	0.3	0.4
Vehicle Taxes				
Transportation improvement fee	—	\$25 to \$175	1.5	1.6
Zero-emission vehicle fee	—	\$100	— ^b	— ^d
Totals			\$4.4	\$5.1

^a Set annually based on prices. Current rate is 11.7 cents but rate has ranged from 9.8 cents to 21.5 cents in the past.

^b New rate not yet in effect.

^c Set annually based on prices. Most recent rate was 18 cents but rate has ranged from 10 cents to 18 cents in the past.

^d \$48 million.

Proposal

Requires Legislature to Get Voter Approval for Fuel and Vehicle Taxes. Proposition 6 amends the State Constitution to require the Legislature to get voter approval for new or increased taxes on the sale, storage, use, or consumption of gasoline or diesel fuel, as well as for taxes paid for the privilege of operating a vehicle on public highways. Thus, the Legislature would need voter approval for such taxes as gasoline and diesel excise and sales taxes, vehicle license fees, and transportation improvement fees.

Eliminates Recently Enacted Fuel and Vehicle Taxes. Proposition 6 also eliminates any such fuel and vehicle taxes passed by the Legislature after January 1, 2017 and up to the date that Proposition 6 takes effect in December. This would eliminate the increased fuel taxes and the transportation improvement fees enacted by SB 1.

Fiscal Effects

Eliminates Tax Revenues From SB 1. In the current fiscal year, Proposition 6 would reduce SB 1 tax revenues from \$4.4 billion to \$2 billion—a \$2.4 billion decrease. (The \$2 billion in remaining revenues would be from taxes collected prior to Proposition 6 taking effect in December.) Two years from now, the revenue reduction would total \$5.1 billion annually. The funding reductions would mainly affect highway and road maintenance and repair programs, as well as transit programs.

Makes Passage of Specified Fuel and Vehicle Taxes More Difficult. Proposition 6 would make it more difficult to enact specified fuel and vehicle taxes because voters also would have to approve them. As a result, there could be less revenue than otherwise would be the case. Any reduction in revenues is unknown, as it would depend on future actions by the Legislature and voters.



[California State Legislature](#) | [E-mail Notifications](#) | [Online Voter Registration](#) | [Privacy Policy](#) | [Accessibility](#)

Legislative Analyst's Office | The California Legislature's Nonpartisan Fiscal and Policy Advisor
925 L Street, Suite 1000 Sacramento, CA 95814 | (916) 445-4656



To: RCRC Board of Directors
From: Paul A. Smith, Vice President Governmental Affairs
Date: September 11, 2018
Re: Proposition 11 – “Emergency Ambulance Employee Safety and Preparedness Act” – **ACTION**

Summary

This memo provides an analysis of Proposition 11, the “Emergency Ambulance Employee Safety and Preparedness Act,” which is slated for the November 2018 General Election ballot. RCRC staff is recommending the RCRC Board of Directors adopt a “Support” position on this measure.

Background

Counties are responsible for developing and coordinating local Emergency Medical Services (EMS) systems through EMS agencies. These agencies help organize emergency 911 call response, emergency ambulance service, and local trauma hospitals to ensure that emergency medical care is available throughout the county.

In order to better coordinate care, EMS agencies often divide their geographical area into zones in which a single ambulance provider has primary responsibility for providing emergency medical transportation. In these zones, local EMS agencies then select among several ambulance providers through a competitive bidding process. Subsequently, the local EMS agency signs multi-year contract agreements with ambulance providers to establish services in their jurisdiction. Typically, EMS agencies require that providers meet service requirements, such as responding to 911 calls within a specific amount of time.

In the vast majority of RCRC member counties, privately-owned ambulance crews respond to emergency 911 calls and provide patient transport. Ambulance crews are typically positioned throughout a region depending on the volume and location of 911 to meet response times agreed upon in the contracts.

The Labor Code consists of laws that employers must follow with respect to wages and working conditions. Specifically, the Labor Code dictates when employers must provide their employees meal and rest breaks. Although there are some exceptions, most employers must provide an unpaid thirty minute meal break during each work shift, and a paid ten minute rest break every four hours.

Under current industry practice, ambulance responders remain “on-call” throughout their work shift to respond to calls. This means that ambulance crews must remain reachable by cell phone, pager, etc. Subsequently, scheduled meal and rest breaks are often interrupted by emergency calls, or by a request to reposition their location (many ambulance providers require that ambulance crews are driving within 60 seconds after receiving an emergency call). Ambulance crews have periods of inactivity during their shifts during which meal and rest breaks might be taken, even though the crew must remain near the ambulance, or their break may be interrupted or irregularly spaced.

In 2016, the California Supreme Court ruled in *Augustus v. ABM Security Services* that the employer practice of requiring on-call rest breaks does not comply with state labor law, and employers must provide rest breaks that are off-duty and uninterruptable – meaning that employees cannot be required to carry a cell phone, pager etc. The *Augustus* decision applies to private security guards; however, it is highly probable that it is applicable to EMTs and paramedics.

To comply with *Augustus*, ambulance providers believe they need to operate additional ambulances and personnel in each service area to provide sufficient coverage without jeopardizing their ability to meet existing response time requirements. To comply, ambulance companies could negotiate increased response times, pay EMS agencies less for the right to provide ambulance services in exclusivity zones, or both. Additionally, in some cases, counties may need to pay ambulance companies to ensure ambulance services remains available in that area.

Issue

Proposition 11, known as “the Emergency Ambulance Employee Safety and Preparedness Act,” makes various changes to state laws – primarily to impact working conditions - that affect private-sector ambulance crews. The measure does not apply to public agencies that operate ambulance services.

Although the new costs associated with complying with the *Augustus* decision could be addressed by ambulance companies in a variety of ways, it appears likely that absent a change in the state’s labor laws, these higher costs would either be borne by counties, or offset through reduced response times.

The measure’s provisions are as follows:

- **Authorizes On-Call Meal and Rest Breaks for Ambulance Crews.** This measure requires private ambulance crews be on-call throughout their shifts. In effect, this abrogates the *Augustus* decision for ambulance franchise operators and continues the long-standing industry practice of requiring crews to remain on-call during breaks. In addition, it requires crew meal breaks not occur in the first or last hours of their shift, and that multiple meal breaks are scheduled at least two hours apart. The measure requires that if a call is received during a meal or rest break, another rest break must be provided. Ambulance providers would be required to operate enough ambulances in an area in order to meet these requirements.

- **Limits Legal Costs for the Past Practice of On-Call Meal and Rest Breaks.** The *Augustus* decision suggests that the practice of requiring ambulance crews to remain on-call during their breaks is in violation of state law. As a result, private ambulance providers may now be legally responsible for penalties and other damages associated with meal and rest break violations. Several lawsuits that allege these types of violations have been brought against private ambulance providers and remain outstanding at this time. Proposition 11 seeks to limit legal liability that ambulance providers face in pending litigation relative to the industry practice of having crews remaining on-call.
- **Requires Employer-Paid Training and Mental Health Services.** Proposition 11 requires ambulance providers offer their crews a variety of service benefits, including: (1) annual natural disaster, active shooter, and violence prevention training; (2) mental health and wellness education; (3) mental health counseling; and, (4) access to long-term mental health services.

Proponents contend that ambulance operators would avoid the new costs of complying with the *Augustus* decision by providing off-duty breaks, as Proposition 11 would allow them to continue using on-call breaks as they have in the past. Therefore, this measure would result in fiscal benefits to local governments, potentially in the tens of millions of dollars each year.

Staff Recommendation

RCRC staff recommends the Board of Directors adopt a "Support" position on the Emergency Ambulance Employee Safety and Preparedness Act.

Attachment

- ~~Copy of Proposition 11~~



News

CalChamber Takes Positions on Propositions 1, 2, and 4; Recaps Positions on All Ballot Measures

📅 September 12, 2018 👤 CalChamber

The California Chamber of Commerce Board of Directors recently voted to support Propositions 1, 2, and 4, on the November 2018 ballot.

Proposition 1—SUPPORT

If approved by voters, Proposition 1, the Veterans and Affordable Housing Bond Act of 2018, would authorize \$4 billion in general obligation bonds for housing-related programs, loans, grants, and projects and housing loans for veterans.

The CalChamber Board supports Proposition 1 because the housing supply and demand imbalance in California is having significant negative impacts on the state economy and businesses.

The housing shortage is estimated to cost California approximately \$140 billion a year—the equivalent of 6% of gross state product—and that does not include lost business opportunities or expansions forgone or relocations instituted by employers because they cannot recruit or keep workers in the state's high-cost housing environment.

Proposition 1 is projected to create more than 100,000 jobs associated with or indirectly related to the construction of new housing and inject billions of dollars back into the state's economy. As this is a state bond measure, the costs associated with Proposition 1 will be spread over the entire California tax paying population, thereby minimizing impacts on any one individual or business.

Proposition 2 — SUPPORT

Proposition 2 is a revenue bond that spends only revenue generated from Proposition 63 (2004), which provides for a 1% tax on income above \$1 million (an estimated \$2.23 billion in the fiscal year 2018–2019). This measure would authorize the state to use the revenue generated from Proposition 63 (2004) on \$2 billion in revenue bonds to address the homelessness crisis in California for those suffering from mental health issues. There would be no additional taxes and no additional spending from the General Fund as a result of this bond.

The CalChamber Board voted to support Proposition 2 because the measure improves the economy by helping the homeless reintegrate and reduces public health care costs.

Proposition 2 builds housing and keeps mental health services in reach for people. More than 134,000 Californians are homeless. It is estimated that as many as a third of the people living in these unsafe conditions are living with an untreated mental illness.

If passed by voters, Proposition 2 will result in the construction of 20,000 permanent supportive housing units. This allows coordination of mental health and substance use services, medical care, case managers, education and job training to help people get the treatment and housing stability they need.

Proposition 4 — SUPPORT

Proposition 4 authorizes the state to sell \$1.5 billion in general obligation bonds for capital improvement projects at the 13 children's hospitals as well as other public or private nonprofit hospitals that provide services for children eligible for the California Children Services (CCS) program.

In 2004, Proposition 61, the Children's Hospital Bond Act of 2004 was approved with 58% of the vote in the general election and authorized the state to sell \$750 million in general obligation bonds for capital improvements at children's hospitals. In 2008, voter approval of Proposition 3, a \$980 million bond, essentially authorized further bond issuance for the same purpose as the Children's Hospital Bond Act of 2004. The CalChamber supported both ballot initiatives.

The previous bonds have enabled the hospitals to build new patient towers that meet 2030 seismic standards and purchase new equipment and new medical technology.

CalChamber Highlights Positions on All Ballot Initiatives

Below is a recap of CalChamber positions on November 2018 Ballot Measures:

SUPPORT

Proposition 1 — Authorizes Bonds to Fund Specified Housing Assistance Programs.

Proposition 2 — Authorizes Bonds to Fund Existing Housing Program for Individuals with Mental Illness.

Proposition 3 – Authorizes Bonds to Fund Projects for Water Supply and Quality, Watershed, Fish, Wildlife, Water Conveyance, and Groundwater Sustainability and Storage.

Proposition 4 — Authorizes Bonds Funding Construction at Hospitals Providing Children's Health Care.

Proposition 5 – Changes Requirements for Certain Property Owners to Transfer their Property Tax Base to Replacement Property.

OPPOSE

Proposition 6 – Eliminates Certain Road Repair and Transportation Funding. Requires Certain Fuel Taxes and Vehicle Fees be Approved by The Electorate.

Proposition 8 – Regulates Amounts Outpatient Kidney Dialysis Clinics Charge for Dialysis Treatment.

Proposition 9 – Three States Initiative – Removed from ballot on 7/18/18 by order of California Supreme Court

Proposition 10 – Expands Local Governments' Authority to Enact Rent Control on Residential Property.

NOT TAKING A POSITION

Proposition 7 — Conforms California Daylight Saving Time to Federal Law. Allows Legislature to Change Daylight Saving Time Period.

Proposition 11 — Requires Private-Sector Emergency Ambulance Employees to Remain On-Call During Work Breaks.

Proposition 12 — New Standards for Confinement of Specified Farm Animals; Bans Sale of Certain Noncomplying Products.

Related Posts

- [CalChamber Takes Positions on Propositions 1, 2, and 4; Recaps Positions on All Ballot Measures](#)
- [Voting Season Begins Today; Key Dates to Remember](#)
- [CalChamber Announces Positions on Propositions 71, 72](#)

📌 2018 Ballot, 2018 General Election, Ballot, Prop 1, Prop 2, Prop 4, Top Stories

← When Thinking Globally, Policymakers Should Remember Local Impacts

CalChamber Takes Positions on Propositions 1, 2, and 4; Recaps Positions on All Ballot Measures →

© 2018 California Chamber of Commerce. Terms of Use, About Our Ads and Privacy Policy