

**CFRW Official 2018 General Election  
Proposition Positions**

**Prop 1: Housing and Veteran's Housing Bond**

**CFRW Position: NO**

**Official Summary:** Authorizes \$4 billion of state general obligation bonds to fund existing housing programs. Includes \$1.5 billion for Multifamily Housing Program for low-income residents, \$1 billion for loans to help veterans purchase farms and homes, \$450 million for infill and transit-oriented housing projects, \$300 million for farmworker housing program, and \$300 million for manufactured and mobile homes. Provides housing assistance for buyers, infrastructure financing, and matching grants to expand affordable housing stock. Increased state costs to repay bonds averaging about \$170 million annually over the next 35 years.

**Our Rationale:** This will be billed as a Vet Housing bond... it is only in part. 1/4 of the bond funds are dedicated to veterans' housing. The rest is doled out to programs that won't do much, if anything, to address our housing crisis. The legislature could have truly made this a bond for veterans' housing... but they didn't. Instead the taxpayer will be on the hook for \$7 billion dollars.

**Prop 2: Millionaire's Tax Reallocation to Homeless Housing**

**CFRW Position: NO**

**Official Summary:** Ratifies existing law establishing the No Place Like Home Program, which finances permanent housing for individuals with mental illness who are homeless or at risk for chronic homelessness, as being consistent with the Mental Health Services Act approved by the electorate. Ratifies issuance of up to \$2 billion in previously authorized bonds to finance the No Place Like Home Program. Amends the Mental Health Services Act to authorize transfers of up to \$140 million annually from the existing Mental Health Services Fund to the No Place Like Home Program, with no increase in taxes.

**Our Rationale:** It is easy to see both sides of this reallocation of Prop 63 (2004) monies. Right now, the 1% tax on millionaire income is just sitting in a "mental health fund" and has contributed nothing in a decade to improving lives. The legislature virtually unanimously approved the No Place Like Home Act which would use the \$2 billion sitting in the mental health fund to build temporary housing for the homeless who suffer from mental illness or those who are at risk of being homeless because of mental health issues. It's a tough call and truly an ideological one, but ultimately the CFRW Voting Body decided to oppose the measure, citing that the fund should be used for mental health programs, not homeless housing.

**Prop 3: \$8.9 Water Bond**

**CFRW Position: NO**

**Official Summary:** Authorizes \$8.877 billion in state general obligation bonds for various infrastructure projects: \$3.03 billion for safe drinking water and water quality, \$2.895 billion for

watershed and fisheries improvements, \$940 million for habitat protection, \$855 million for improved water conveyance, \$685 million for groundwater sustainability/ storage, and \$472 million for surface water storage/dam repairs. Requires certain projects to provide matching funds from non-state sources; gives priority to disadvantaged communities. State costs of \$17.3 billion to pay off principal (\$8.9 billion) and interest (\$8.4 billion) on bonds over a 40-year period. Annual payments would average \$433 million.

**Our Rationale:** Again, another tough call. It is hard to justify another water bond, especially one with this price tag (total cost to taxpayers will be \$17 billion). There is some to like in this bond-Oroville Dam repairs, groundwater infrastructure repairs and canal repairs for our Central Valley farmers... but there is more to dislike. The lion's share of the bond monies would be for conservancy grants, regional and state parks, and what the state calls "disadvantaged communities". Very little is allocated to water storage or infrastructure. The California Republican Party took a Neutral position. The CFRW Voting Body decided enough was enough, with \$83 billion in outstanding bond debt and not a whole lot to show for it.

#### **Prop 4: Children's Hospital Bond**

**CFRW Position: NO**

**Official Summary:** 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. Designates 72 percent of funds to qualifying private nonprofit hospitals providing comprehensive services to high volumes of children eligible for governmental programs and children with special health needs eligible for the California Children's Services program, 18 percent of funds to University of California general acute care children's hospitals, and 10 percent of funds to public and private nonprofit hospitals providing services to children eligible for the California Children's Services program. State costs of \$2.9 billion to pay off principal (\$1.5 billion) and interest (\$1.4 billion) on bonds over a 35-year period. Annual payments would average \$84 million.

**Our Rationale:** Children's hospitals have no problems fundraising privately. I suspect this is a money grab for several UC hospitals disguised as a Children's hospitals bond.

#### **Prop 5: Senior Property Tax Transfer**

**CFRW Position: YES**

**Official Summary:** Removes the following current requirements for homeowners who are over 55 years old or severely disabled to transfer their property tax base to a replacement residence: that replacement property be of equal or lesser value, replacement residence be in specific county, and the transfer occur only once. Removes similar replacement-value and location requirements on transfers for contaminated or disaster-destroyed property. Requires adjustments to the replacement property's tax base, based on the new property's value.

**Our Rationale:** This will strengthen Prop 13 protections for those over 55 buying homes. Their property tax value on their previous home will be transferred to their new home purchase, regardless of how many homes they own or how many times they've moved. In an era where Democrats are trying to chip away at Prop 13, this is one good way to protect it and encourage seniors to move so that their homes can be made available for young families.

#### **Prop 6: Gas Tax Repeal**

**CFRW Position: YES**

**Official Summary:** Repeals a 2017 transportation law's tax and fee provisions that pay for repairs and improvements to local roads, state highways, and public transportation. Requires 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 the electorate for approval.

**Our Rationale:** The importance of this prop cannot be overstated. This single proposition could help us win other races across the state, even secure the House for Republicans. It is crucial we get the word out and support Prop 6! The fact of the matter is, the state has enough money in the General Fund to repair our roads and ease traffic through infrastructure, but the Democrats have siphoned off money for roads for three decades. SB 1 should have never been passed without voter approval first!

#### **Prop 7: Permanent Daylight Savings**

**CFRW Position: NO**

**Official Summary:** Establishes the time zone designated by federal law as "Pacific standard time" as the standard time within California. Provides that California daylight saving time begins at 2 a.m. on the second Sunday of March and ends at 2 a.m. on the first Sunday of November, consistent with current federal law. Permits the Legislature by two-thirds vote to make future changes to California's daylight saving time period, including for its year-round application, if changes are consistent with federal law.

**Our Rationale:** There are many more important measures on the ballot. We have a system that works and much more pressing matters affecting our state. This is not the proposition you want to spend any time educating on. Even if it's passed, the legislature and the Federal Government would have to approve it. It's not worth our time (pun intended!).

#### **Prop 8: Dialysis Clinic Revenue**

**CFRW Position: NO**

**Official Summary:** Limits the charges to 115 percent of the costs for direct patient care and quality improvement costs, including training, patient education, and technology support. Requires rebates and penalties if charges exceed the limit. Requires annual reporting to the state regarding clinic costs, patient charges, and revenue. Prohibits clinics from refusing to treat patients based on the source of payment for care

**Our Rationale:** This proposition is one of the most important ones but may get lost in the shuffle if we aren't careful. This is a thinly veiled power grab by the SEUI and UHW to unionize dialysis clinics. Voters won't understand the importance of this ballot box power play... so we must educate them. Prop 8 would mandate that if dialysis clinics make more than 115% of their costs, they must "payback" their patients' payers. Consumers won't see any of the revenue, and this may make it more difficult for patients to receive care if clinics are forced to shut down. It is despicable. The ballot box is not the place to unionize.

**(Prop 9 was taken off the ballot by the CA Supreme Court, so we skip to 10)**

### **Prop 10: Local Rent Control**

**CFRW Position: NO**

**Official Summary:** Repeals state law that currently restricts the scope of rent-control policies that cities and other local jurisdictions may impose. Allows policies that would limit the rental rates that residential-property owners may charge for new tenants, new construction, and single-family homes. In accordance with California law, provides that rent-control policies may not violate landlords' right to a fair financial return on their rental property.

**Our Rationale:** Local, unelected "rent control boards" would wreak havoc on our local economies and would do nothing but make our housing crisis worse. This would shrink supply and repealing Costa-Hawkins would create a superficial bubble. It also does not allow landlords to bring a rental back to market value if it is vacated. The CRP said no to Prop 10 as well.

### **Prop 11: Ambulance Employee Paid Breaks**

**CFRW Position: YES**

**Official Summary:** Makes labor law entitling hourly employees to take work breaks for meals and rest, without being on-call, inapplicable to private-sector emergency ambulance employees. Regulates timing of meal breaks for these employees. Eliminates employers' liability—in actions pending on or after October 25, 2017—for violations of existing law regarding work breaks. Requires employers to provide training regarding certain emergency incidents, violence prevention, and mental health and wellness. Requires employers to provide employees certain mental-health services. Local government net savings likely in the tens of millions of dollars annually due to lower emergency ambulance contract costs.

**Our Rationale:** This is good for the consumer and good for taxpayers by circumventing frivolous lawsuits. Prop 11 allows ambulatory companies to pay their employees for "on-call" breaks, instead of the mandated, unpaid hour-long breaks before and after their shifts that the unions love.

### **Prop 12: Space Requirements for Consumable Farm Animals**

**CFRW Position: NO**

**Official Summary:** Establishes new minimum space requirements for confining veal calves, breeding pigs, and egg-laying hens. Requires egg-laying hens be raised in cage-free environment

after December 31, 2021. Prohibits certain commercial sales of specified meat and egg products derived from animals confined in noncomplying manner. Defines sales violations as unfair competition. Creates good faith defense for sellers relying upon written certification by suppliers that meat and egg products comply with new confinement standards. Requires State of California to issue implementing regulations

**Our Rationale:** You may be thinking... didn't we already vote on chicken coop space? Why yes, yes we did. Back in 2008. But the Humane Society is coming back for more, just as all the farmers and ranchers complied with the original law. If they don't comply in time with Prop 12, they are banned from selling their meat or eggs. The Human Society sees dollar signs while the burden will be passed onto consumers. This may create shortages, frivolous lawsuits, and is unnecessarily burdensome on our farmers and ranchers who have already complied with the 2008 law.