
STATE OF CALIFORNIA 2018 BALLOT MEASURES

THE VOICE OF LOCAL FARMERS



PROPOSITION 1

- Housing assistance bonds
- Authorizes \$4 billion for existing programs
 - Low-income residents
 - Veterans
 - Farmworkers
 - Transit-oriented housing

PROPOSITION 1

- Placed on the ballot by state legislature
 - Assembly 56-21 (70%)
 - Senate 30-8 (75%)

PROPOSITION 1

- Arguments for Prop 1
 - Aids those with greatest housing needs
 - Eases state's housing crunch
 - Job creation
 - Repayment = .1% of state's General Fund

PROPOSITION 1

- Arguments against Prop 1
 - More state debt
 - State should not be funding these projects
 - Does not require infill projects
 - Doesn't remove regulations that block housing

PROPOSITION 1

- Support
 - DAV, Habitat for Humanity, People Assisting the Homeless (PATH), labor, League of California Cities
- Opposition
 - Gary Wesley aka the “Lone Dissenter”

PROPOSITION 2

- Housing bonds for mentally ill
 - Authorizes \$2 billion for No Place Like Home Program from Prop 63 (2004) 1% tax on \$1 million
 - Allows county mental health funds to repay bonds
 - Will require court concurrence that new program can be funded under previous bond measure

PROPOSITION 2

- Placed on the ballot by state legislature
 - Assembly 72-1
 - Senate 35-0

PROPOSITION 2

- Arguments for Prop 2
 - Finances 20,000 new living units
 - Helps mentally ill get off the street
 - Housing will reduce public health costs
 - No new cost, just a cut of red tape

PROPOSITION 2

- Arguments against Prop 2
 - Needed treatment funds moved to housing
 - Counties can already choose housing
 - Doesn't alleviate neighborhood opposition to housing for the mentally ill

PROPOSITION 2

- Support
 - Habitat for Humanity, People Assisting the Homeless (PATH), labor, League of California Cities, Mental Health Association of California
- Opposition
 - National Alliance on Mental Health Contra Costa, CFBF

PROPOSITION 3

- \$8.87 billion water bond
 - \$3.03 B drinking water and water quality
 - \$2.895 B watersheds and fisheries
 - \$940 MM habitat protection
 - \$855 MM water conveyance
 - \$685 MM groundwater
 - \$472 MM dam repairs

PROPOSITION 3

- San Diego Interests
 - \$200 MM Salton Sea
 - \$40 MM stormwater management
 - \$40 MM SD River Conservancy
 - \$35 MM Borrego
 - \$200 MM Oroville Dam
 - \$15 MM San Diego Bay

PROPOSITION 3

- Placed on the ballot by signatures
 - Ducks Unlimited \$400M
 - Western Growers \$275M
 - American Pistachio Growers \$160M
 - California Waterfowl Association \$275M
 - California Wildlife Foundation \$200M

PROPOSITION 3

- Arguments for Prop 3
 - Drought preparedness
 - Safe drinking water
 - Mountain water runoff
 - Conveyance and storage infrastructure repairs
 - Groundwater quality

PROPOSITION 3

- Arguments against Prop 3
 - 8 water bond measures since 1996 (\$29 billion)
 - Creates no new water
 - Builds no new dams
 - “Scheme” for special interests

PROPOSITION 3

- Support
 - Donors, labor, ag organizations (CFBF), water agencies (CWA), environmental groups
- Opposition (no registered committee)
 - Central Solano Citizen Taxpayer Group, Sierra Club, LOWV

PROPOSITION 4

- Hospital bonds for children's healthcare
- Authorizes \$1.5 billion
 - 72% to private non-profits
 - 18% UC acute care
 - 10% chronic complex health services

PROPOSITION 4

- Placed on the ballot by signature
 - Funding for signatures and campaign supplied by eight non-profit children's hospitals (San Diego Rady's) providing \$1.363 million each
 - Together they constitute the California Children's Hospital Association

PROPOSITION 4

- Arguments for Prop 4
 - 2 million children per year receive care at eligible hospitals regardless of parents' ability to pay
 - Main pediatric research centers
 - Bonds have been the historic funding source for constructing and maintaining these hospitals

PROPOSITION 4

- Arguments against Prop 4
 - More state debt

PROPOSITION 4

- Support
 - Hospitals, editorial boards
- Opposition
 - Gary Wesley aka the “Lone Dissenter”

PROPOSITION 5

- Transfer of property tax base
 - Ends requirement that over 55 or disabled must buy equal or lesser valued property to transfer property tax base
 - Includes contaminated or disaster-destroyed property

PROPOSITION 5

- Placed on the ballot by signature
 - California Association of Realtors \$9.7 million
 - National Association of Realtors \$3 million

PROPOSITION 5

- Arguments for Prop 5
 - Allows seniors and disabled to move without penalty
 - Extends benefits and spirit of Prop 13
 - Disabled people trapped in inadequate homes
 - Frees up modest priced homes for young families

PROPOSITION 5

- Arguments against Prop 5
 - Lost local revenue to schools and safety services
 - Tax break for the wealthy
 - Windfall to realtors
 - Does not help first-time homebuyers or the homeless

PROPOSITION 5

- Support
 - Realtors, CA Chamber of Commerce, Congress of California Seniors, CFBF
- Opposition
 - SEIU, CTA, County Supervisors Assoc., Federation of Municipal Employees

PROPOSITION 6

- Road Repair and Transportation Funding
 - Repeals 2017 legislative initiated transportation taxes and fees
 - Requires voter approval on any future taxes or fees on gas and diesel as well as registration fee increases

PROPOSITION 6

- Placed on the ballot by signature
 - California Republican Party \$465M
 - Kevin McCarthy for Congress \$300M
 - John Cox for Governor \$250M
 - Howard Jarvis Taxpayers Assoc. \$250M

PROPOSITION 6

- Arguments for Prop 6
 - Blocks tax increases by legislators
 - Californians pay \$.95 per gallon in taxes
 - 2nd highest gas tax in nation (PA)
 - Current funds for roads diverted to other uses
 - State has \$16 billion budget surplus

PROPOSITION 6

- Arguments against Prop 6
 - Stopping transportation projects will jeopardize public safety
 - Projects underway will be stopped
 - 1600 bridges and overpasses are deemed structurally deficient

PROPOSITION 6

- Support \$3MM
 - Donors, National Federation of Independent Business, Reform California (Carl DeMaio), CFBF
- Opposition \$31MM
 - Gov. Brown, cities and counties, CA Democratic Party, ACLU, labor (\$5MM)

PROPOSITION 7

- Daylight Savings
 - Sets daylight savings at 2 am on the 2nd Sunday of March to 2 am on the first Sunday of November
 - Permits legislature by two-thirds vote to make future changes to daylight savings time if allowed under federal law (current law forbids year round DST)

PROPOSITION 7

- Placed on the ballot by state legislature
 - Assembly 68-9
 - Senate 26-9

PROPOSITION 7

- Arguments for Prop 7
 - Changing time creates health risks
 - Sleep patterns disturbed 2x per year
 - Lost productivity due to adjustment
 - Natural that summer days are longer, winter shorter

PROPOSITION 7

- Arguments against Prop 7
 - Morning darkness
 - Dangerous for children traveling to school
 - Morning commutes and activities in the dark
 - 1974 experiment (energy crisis) was halted early

PROPOSITION 7

- Support
 - State legislators
 - No campaign, no \$ raised
- Opposition
 - State legislators
 - No campaign, no \$ raised

PROPOSITION 8

- Outpatient kidney dialysis
 - Clinics can charge no more than 115% of costs
 - Annual reporting to the state on costs, charges, and revenues
 - Clinics must accept all forms of payment

PROPOSITION 8

- Placed on the ballot by signature
 - SEIU \$18 million
 - CA State Council of Service Employees \$1 million

PROPOSITION 8

- Arguments for Prop 8
 - Excess profits not used to improve services must be returned
 - Reduced costs to patients
 - Reduced costs for all medical insurance
 - Unhealthy conditions exist at clinics

PROPOSITION 8

- Arguments against Prop 8
 - Clinics would face losses (not all costs allowed in the 115% calculation, i.e. only “non-managerial”)
 - Would limit access to dialysis if providers exit
 - Patients would be forced into hospitals and ERs
 - Clinics already are highly regulated

PROPOSITION 8

- Support
 - Unions, CA Democratic Party
- Opposition
 - CA Medical Assoc., American Nurses Assoc., editorial boards, CA Dialysis Council (\$98 million), CFBF

PROPOSITION 9

- Split California into 3 states
- Private party paid for signature gathering
- Declared unconstitutional by CA Supreme Court and removed from ballot
- Author now says topic is dead

PROPOSITION 10

- Expand local authority for residential rent control
 - Repeals current state law limiting rent control
 - Allows for local government to limit rental rates on new tenants, new construction, and single-family homes

PROPOSITION 10

- Placed on the ballot by signatures
 - AIDS Healthcare Foundation \$20 million
 - CA Teachers Assoc. \$500,000
 - California Nurses Assoc. \$350,000

PROPOSITION 10

- Arguments for Prop 10
 - Rents are too high, protects tenants
 - Low earners and seniors particularly hard hit
 - Forcing families to leave the state
 - Does not require rent control, just gives power to local communities

PROPOSITION 10

- Arguments against Prop 10
 - Adds a layer of bureaucracy telling private property owners what they can do
 - Conversion into condos and short-term rentals
 - Reduced number of new rental units

PROPOSITION 10

- Support
 - Donors, Bay-area cities, housing advocates, CRLA, labor unions, CA Democratic Party, LOWV
- Opposition
 - Apartment Owners Assoc. (\$40 MM), CA Assoc. of Realtors (\$5 MM), business organizations, CFBF

PROPOSITION 11

- Requires private sector EMTs to be on-call during work breaks
 - Labor law exception on breaks for private-sector emergency ambulance employees
 - Eliminate employer liability for violations of existing law on work breaks

PROPOSITION 11

- Placed on the ballot by signature
 - American Medical Response \$22MM

PROPOSITION 11

- Arguments for Prop 11
 - *Augustus v. ABM Security* requires off-duty breaks for private ambulance and security workers
 - 75% of all emergency ambulance rides provided by private services
 - Requiring breaks means more personnel and equipment, raising costs for all

PROPOSITION 11

- Arguments against Prop 11
 - None filed

PROPOSITION 11

- Support
 - AMR
- Opposition
 - CTA, Assemblymember Freddie Rodriguez

PROPOSITION 12

- Standards for animal confinement
 - Sets minimum space requirements for hens, veal calves, breeding pigs
 - All hens cage free by December 31, 2021
 - Compliance by out of state producers
 - State to set implementing standards

PROPOSITION 12

- Placed on the ballot by signatures
 - Humane Society of the United States \$1.75MM
 - Activists Deborah Stone & Kyle Vogt \$2.1MM
 - American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals \$200,000
 - The Humane League \$135,000

PROPOSITION 12

- Arguments for Prop 12
 - Prevents animal cruelty
 - Prevents factory farm pollution
 - Helps family farmers
 - Protects against food poisoning

PROPOSITION 12

- Arguments against Prop 12
 - DC based HSUS “bought” a place on the CA ballot
 - Moves the Prop 2 goalpost for farmers
 - Gives hens just 1 sq. ft. instead of Prop 2’s “fully spread both wings without touching”
 - Alliance between HSUS and United Egg Producers

PROPOSITION 12

- Support
 - HSUS, animal rights groups (San Diego Humane Society), Center for Biological Diversity
- Opposition
 - Assoc. of Calif. Egg Producers, National Pork Producers Council, PETA, CFBF

COUNTY CHARTER AMENDMENTS

- A – Charter cleanup (BOS)
- B - 3 supervisors to have unincorporated land in their district and 2 predominately (BOS)
- C – Pension stabilization funds solely used for pension liabilities (BOS)
- No opposition or rebuttal to A, B, or C

COUNTY CHARTER AMENDMENTS

- D – Two candidates with most votes move from Primary to General Election
 - Countywide offices
 - Currently, if candidate gets a majority in Primary, that candidate is elected

COUNTY CHARTER AMENDMENTS

- Arguments for D
 - Small turnout in Primary favors incumbents
 - Same top-two process used for state and congressional offices
 - Special interests can have bigger impact in Primary

COUNTY CHARTER AMENDMENTS

- Arguments against D
 - Second election is redundant and costly
 - Put on ballot by “special interests”
 - Better measure coming in 2020