County of Los Angeles
CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICE
Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration
500 West Temple Street, Room 713, Los Angeles, California 90012
(213) 974-1101
http://ceo.lacounty.gov

WILLIAM T FUJIOKA
Chief Executive Officer

Board of Supervisors
GLORIA MOLINA
First District

MARK RIDLEY-THOMAS
Second District

ZEV YAROSLAVSKY
Third District

DON KNABE
Fourth District

MICHAEL D. ANTONOVICH
Fifth District

October 20, 2014

To: Supervisor Don Knabe, Chairman
Supervisor Gloria Molina
Supervisor Mark Ridley-Thomas
Supervisor Zev Yaroslavsky
Supervisor Michael D. Antonovich

From: William T Fujioka
Chief Executive Officer

NOVEMBER 4, 2014 GENERAL ELECTION BALLOT MEASURES

This memorandum is to provide the Board with updated information about the six statewide propositions on the November 4, 2014 General Election Ballot. Positions on ballot measures are a matter for Board policy determination. Currently, the Board has no position on these measures. The official titles of the measures are:

- **Proposition 1:** Water Bond. Funding for Water Quality, Supply, Treatment and Storage Projects. Initiative Statute. **No Position.**
- **Proposition 2:** State Budget. Budget Stabilization Account. Legislative Constitutional Amendment. **No Position.**
- **Proposition 45:** Healthcare Insurance. Rate Changes. Initiative Statute. **No Position.**
- **Proposition 46:** Drug and Alcohol Testing of Doctors. Medical Negligence Lawsuits. Initiative Statute. **No Position.**
- **Proposition 47:** Criminal Sentences. Misdemeanor Penalties. Initiative Statute. **No Position.**
- **Proposition 48:** Indian Gaming Compacts. Referendum. **No Position.**

Attachment I includes a summary of each proposition and comments from affected County departments. Attachment II is a list of all local jurisdiction measures which have qualified for the November ballot.

If you have any questions or require additional information, please have your staff contact Manuel Rivas, Jr. at (213) 974-1464.

WTF:RA
MR:OR:ma

Attachments

c: Executive Office, Board of Supervisors
County Counsel
All Department Heads
Legislative Strategist

Attachment I

PROPOSITION 1: WATER QUALITY, SUPPLY, AND INFRASTRUCTURE IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2014. Initiative Statute. COUNTY POSITION: **NONE**

If approved by the voters, Proposition 1, the Water Quality, Supply and Infrastructure Improvement Act of 2014, would enact the following provisions effective January 1, 2015:

- Authorize the issuance of bonds in the amount of $7.12 billion pursuant to the State General Obligation Bond Law to finance a water quality, supply, and infrastructure improvement program; and

- Reallocate $425.0 million of unissued bonds authorized from previously approved measures to finance a water quality, supply, and infrastructure improvement program.

Proposition 1 also contains the following general provisions:

- Funding eligibility requires urban or agricultural water management plans and compliance with the 2009 Water Conservation Act;

- Funds provided by the measure shall not be expended to pay the costs of the design, construction, operation, mitigation, or maintenance of Delta conveyance facilities (the Bay Delta Conservation Plan);

- Costs for the Delta conveyance facilities shall be the responsibility of the water agencies that benefit from the design, construction, operation, mitigation, or maintenance of those facilities;

- Retains protection of existing water rights and reaffirms area of origin protections; and

- Assumes re-purposing of water bonds in the following amounts from previous measures: $105.0 million from Proposition 84 of 2006; $95.0 million from Proposition 50 of 2002; $86.0 million from Proposition 13 of 2000; $25.5 million from Proposition 204 of 1996; $13.5 million from Proposition 44 of 1986; and $100.0 million from Proposition 1E of 2006.

Proposition 1 bond funds would be used for the following purposes:

1) Water Supply - $4.235 billion

    - $2.7 billion for dams and groundwater storage;

- $810.0 million for regional projects to achieve multiple water-related improvements (includes conservation and capturing rainwater); and
- $715.0 million for water recycling, including desalination.

2) Watershed Protection and Restoration - $ 1.495 billion
   - $515.0 million for watershed protection and habitat protection in designated areas around the State;
   - $475.0 million for State commitments for environmental restorations;
   - $305.0 million for restoration programs available to applicants statewide; and
   - $200.0 million for projects to increase water flowing in rivers and streams.
3) Improvements to Groundwater and Surface Water Quality - $1.420 billion
   - $800.0 million for prevention and cleanup of groundwater pollution;
   - $260.0 million for drinking water projects for disadvantaged communities;
   - $260.0 million for wastewater treatment in small communities; and
   - $100.0 million for local plans and projects to manage groundwater.
4) Flood Protection - $395.0 million
   - $295.0 for repairs and improvements to levees in the Delta; and
   - $100.0 million for flood protection around the State.

Background. On August 13, 2014, the Legislature passed, and the Governor signed, AB 1471 (Rendon, Chapter 188, Statues of 2014), the Water Quality, Supply, and Infrastructure Improvement Act of 2014, which repealed the provisions of the previously approved Water Bond measure (drafted in 2009) and replaced it with a reduced bond measure (the 2014 Water Bond) with updated funding priorities to increase the sustainability of California's water system.

If approved by the voters, the 2014 Water Bond will authorize the issuance of $7.21 billion in new State General Obligation Bonds and reauthorize $425 million in unissued bonds from previously-approved ballot initiatives to fund water resources related programs and projects.

The 2014 Water Bond contains provisions meant to ensure neutrality in regards to the Bay Delta Conservation Plan (BDCP) and contains a provision which states that funds shall not be expended to pay the costs of the design, construction, operation, mitigation, or maintenance of Delta conveyance facilities (i.e. the BDCP tunnels). In addition, according to the Assembly Water, Parks and Wildlife Committee, the 2014 Water Bond maintains Delta neutrality in three ways: 1) it does not include a specific "Delta Sustainability" chapter, but instead, funds all statewide ecosystem projects together; 2) it gives specific policy guidance regarding Delta projects in its general provisions; and 3) it requires public processes and provides specific parameters for instream flow purchases.

Legislative Analyst's Office Report. The Legislative Analyst's Office (LAO) indicates that this measure would specify that the water bonds sold would be offered as State General Obligation Bonds secured by the full faith and credit of the State of California. The State would pay principal and interest during the repayment period. Costs would depend on factors such as the actual interest rate paid, the timing of the bond sales (bonds are often sold over a number of years), and the time period over which the bonds are repaid. According to the Legislative Analyst's Office, assuming a five percent flat interest rate with a 30-year repayment period, the annual debt service payments (principal and interest costs) for the 2014 Water Bond would be $360 million and would require total debt-service payments of $14.4 billion over the 40-year period during which the bonds would be paid off.

The Legislative Analyst's Office reports that redirecting the $425.0 million in unsold bonds from previously approved ballot measures would not increase the State's anticipated debt payments because, without Proposition 1, those bonds likely would have been sold in the future to support other projects.

The Legislative Analyst's Office indicates that the availability of State bond funds for local water projects could reduce local spending on water projects if State bond funds replace monies that local governments would have spent on projects. Local savings would also occur in cases where State bond funds allow local governments to build projects that reduce operating costs, such as by increasing water efficiency or using a new water source that allows them to purchase less water.

The Legislative Analyst's Office notes that, in some cases, the availability of State bond funds could increase spending by local governments by encouraging them to build additional or substantially larger projects than they would have otherwise, and which may be more expensive to operate.

Affected County Departments. The Department of Public Works (DPW) reports that, if approved by voters, Proposition 1 would bring hundreds of millions of dollars to the Los Angeles region via several earmarked programs, including:

- $98.0 million to Integrated Water Management (IRWM) for multi-benefit projects in the Los Angeles and Ventura regions;

- $170.5 to Los Angeles area conservancies, including direct allocations for the Baldwin Hills Conservancy ($10.0 million); the San Gabriel and Lower Los Angeles Rivers and Mountains Conservancy ($30.0 million); the Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy ($30.0 million), and the State Coastal Conservancy ($100.5 million); and

- $100.0 million for Los Angeles river protection and enhancement projects to be administered by the San Gabriel and Lower Los Angeles River Conservancy and the Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy.

The Department of Public Works notes that Proposition 1 also contains several competitive grant categories that could result in additional funding opportunities to support DPW's water resources priorities of providing a sustainable water supply and healthy watersheds. DPW indicates that it would be eligible to compete for grants in the following funding areas:

- $200.0 million for stormwater capture for multi-benefit projects that may include green infrastructure, rain and stormwater capture, and stormwater treatment;

- $100.0 million for water conservation projects;

- $520.0 million for safe drinking water projects;

- $275.0 million for water recycling projects;

- $900.0 million for groundwater sustainability projects that prevent and reduce contaminants or provide sustainable groundwater management planning and implementation; and

- $395.0 million for flood management projects and activities.

The Department of Public Works notes that the Los Angeles area is not eligible for funding from the $2.7 billion Statewide Water System Operational Improvement and Drought Preparedness category (Water Storage).

The Department of Public Works reports that Proposition 1 is generally consistent with existing Board-adopted policy to support proposals that increase the reliability of State and local water supplies with appropriate infrastructure and equitable funding levels utilizing the following principles: Local Water Reliability and Conservation, Protection and Improvement of Water Quality, New Water Supplies, Conveyance and Storage, Equitable Allocation Criteria for Regional Projects, Bond Funding and Appropriations consistent with other County principles, and Delta Sustainability.

Support and Opposition. Proposition 1 is supported by: Governor Edmund G. Brown; U.S. Senator Dianne Feinstein; U.S. Senator Barbara Boxer; California State Association of Counties; Audubon California; California Chamber of Commerce;

California Labor Federation; California League of Conservation Voters; City of Los Angeles; Delta Counties Coalition; Los Angeles Area Chamber of Commerce; Silicon Valley Leadership Group; Firant Water Authority; San Diego Water Authority; Metropolitan Water District of Southern California; Natural Resources Defense Council; State Building and Construction Trades Council of California; Association of California Water Agencies; Fresno Irrigation District; and Western Growers, among others.

Proposition 1 is opposed by: Assembly Member Wesley Chesbro; Conner Everts (Southern California Watershed Alliance); and Barbara Barridon-Parilla (Restore the Delta).

PROPOSITION 2: STATE BUDGET. BUDGET STABILIZATION ACCOUNT. Legislative Constitutional Amendment. COUNTY POSITION: **NONE**

Proposition 2 would amend the Constitution to change the State's rules regarding how the State's Budget reserve is managed and maintained. The new rules would transform the manner in which the State pays down its debt and would stipulate how the State is to set aside reserves. Specifically, Proposition 2 would:

- Require the annual transfer of 1.5 percent of State General Fund (SGF) revenues to the State Budget Stabilization Account (BSA);
- Require that half of the BSA revenues be used to repay State debt and unfunded liabilities;
- Cap the balance of funds in the BSA to 10 percent of SGF revenues and direct any remaining available funds to infrastructure;
- Allow for only a limited use of funds in the event of an emergency or a State Budget deficit; and
- Require an additional transfer of funds to the BSA if revenues generated from the State's capital gains tax exceed eight percent of SGF revenues and, under certain conditions, to a dedicated K-14 school reserve fund known as the Public School System Stabilization Account.

Proposition 2 requires that from FY 2015-16 through FY 2029-30, 50 percent of the revenues that would otherwise be deposited into the BSA be used to pay for unfunded prior year SGF obligations, budgetary loans to the SGF, local government claims for State-mandated costs incurred prior to FY 2004-05, and unfunded liabilities related to State-level pension plans. Beginning with FY 2030-31 and every fiscal year thereafter, no more than 50 percent of these revenues may be used for the above-listed purposes (in lieu of being deposited into the BSA).

Should the State's BSA reach the 10 percent cap established under Proposition 2, the excess revenues that would have otherwise been deposited into the reserve fund may only be used to support infrastructure and related deferred maintenance costs. For the purposes of Proposition 2, infrastructure is defined as real property, including land and improvements to the land, structures and equipment integral to the operation of structures, easements, rights-of-way and other forms of interest in property, roadways, and water conveyances.

Under the provisions of Proposition 2, the Legislature may suspend or reduce deposits to the reserve fund and appropriate these monies if the Governor declares a budget emergency. Accordingly, the Governor may only declare a budget emergency if: 1) a natural disaster occurs; or 2) sufficient funds do not exist to maintain SGF spending at the highest level of the past three years (after adjusting for changes in the State's

population and the cost of living). Proposition 2 limits the amount of funding that can be redirected from the BSA to only the amount needed for the natural disaster or the amount needed to maintain spending at the highest level of the past three years. Proposition 2 also stipulates that no more than 50 percent of the reserve fund balance may be withdrawn from the BSA in the first year of a declared budget emergency; however, all remaining funds may be withdrawn in the second consecutive year of a declared budget emergency.

Proposition 2 would establish the Public School System Stabilization Account and would ensure that monies are deposited into this new reserve fund when revenues generated from State capital gains taxes exceed 8 percent of SGF revenues. Monies from this reserve fund could be used by the State to mitigate the impact of difficult budgetary situations on schools and community colleges. Should Proposition 2 be approved by the voters, a new State law would also go into effect establishing a maximum amount of reserves that a school district could maintain at the local level (between three and 10 percent of their annual budget). It should be noted that county education officials may exempt school districts from the newly established reserve limits, and the new law may ultimately be changed by the Legislature in the future.

Background. In his January Budget for FY 2014-15, the Governor proposed revisions to the State's Budget reserve policy via a Constitutional amendment. The Governor's proposal included the following:

- Require deposits to the BSA when revenues generated from capital gains taxes exceed 6.5 percent of SGF revenues;

- Create a reserve equal to 10 percent of the Proposition 98 guarantee, whereby revenue spikes related to capital gains are retained for future years funding deficits to mitigate program/service reductions;

- Increase the size of the State's Rainy Day Fund from 5 percent to 10 percent of SGF revenues and allow supplemental payments to the State's "Wall of Debt" or other long-term liabilities, in lieu of a year's deposits; and

- Require a finding by the Governor that there is a budget emergency to halt deposits to the reserve and for funds to be withdrawn, as well as limit the amount of funds that may be withdrawn from the reserve during the first year of a budget emergency to no more than half of the reserve fund's balance.

On May 15, 2014, the Legislature unanimously approved ACAx2-1 (Pérez, J.), a proposed legislative Constitutional amendment to the State's existing budget reserve requirements. ACAx2-1, which contains many of the same principles that were included in the Governor's January Budget proposal, replaces ACA 4 (Chapter 174, Statutes of 2010) on the November 2014 statewide General Election ballot. ACA 4 was a previously approved legislative Constitutional amendment to the State's Budget reserve policy.

Legislative Analyst's Office Report. The Legislative Analyst's Office (LAO) indicates that Proposition 2 would likely result in existing State debt being paid down faster and that by doing so the total cost of these debts, over the long-term, would be reduced. The LAO indicates that the amount of available funds in the BSA, over the long-term, would be contingent on the strength of the economy, capital gains revenues, and the decisions made by both the Legislature and the Governor in implementing the measure. The LAO also notes that if Proposition 2 results in more money being deposited into the BSA over time, this may reduce the amount of fluctuation in State spending that occurred previously.

With respect to funding reserves for schools, the LAO notes that based on the conditions that would have to be met for monies to be deposited into the newly established Public School System Stabilization Account, these deposits may not occur for several years. In terms of the new funding reserve thresholds, the LAO notes that spending patterns amongst school districts may vary widely in terms of how school districts decide to spend available funds in order to remain within their required reserve thresholds. The LAO also notes that the decisions made by some school districts may result in the districts having a smaller amount of reserves available at the time of the next financial crisis. According to the LAO, this would result in these school districts making difficult decisions to balance their budgets.

California State Association of Counties. The California State Association of Counties (CSAC) supports Proposition 2 and indicates that to the extent counties' collective fiscal health depends on the fiscal health of the State, a properly functioning State reserve policy is an important component of responsible budgeting. CSAC further notes that the establishment of a State reserve generally aligns with CSAC's platform to ensure the adequate financing of State-county programs and the prompt payment for mandated obligations.

Affected County Departments. The Los Angeles County Office of Education (LACOE) notes that while they are exempted from the provisions which would establish a maximum on school district reserves, they report that the school districts serving the County's 88 cities have strong concerns that a maximum on their reserves will limit their ability to save for sufficient reserves that can sustain them in future economic downturns.

Support and Opposition. Proposition 2 is supported by: Governor Jerry Brown; Neel Kashkari, Gubernatorial Candidate; Dr. Michael Kirst, President, California Board of Education; California Democratic Party; California Forward Action Fund; California Republican Party; California State Association of Counties; Howard Jarvis Taxpayers Association; League of California Cities; League of Women Voters of California; Los Angeles Area Chamber of Commerce; Los Angeles Times; Orange County Register; Rural County Representatives of California; Sacramento Bee; San Francisco Chronicle; San Jose Mercury News; and Union Tribune San Diego, among others.

Proposition 2 is opposed by: Delaine Eastin, Former California Superintendent of Public Instruction; Ellen Brown, Candidate for California Treasurer; Alliance of Californians for Community Empowerment Action; California Partnership; Californians United to Reform Education; and Educate Our State, among others.

PROPOSITION 45: HEALTH CARE INSURANCE. RATE CHANGES. Initiative Statute. COUNTY POSITION: **NONE**

If approved by the voters, Proposition 45, the Insurance Rate Public Justification and Accountability Act of 2014, would enact the following provisions effective January 1, 2015:

- Require the State Insurance Commissioner to approve changes in health insurance rates for individual and small group employer health plans provided by companies with 50 or fewer employees;

- Provide for public notice, disclosure, and hearings on health insurance rate changes, and subsequent judicial review;

- Require sworn statement by health insurers regarding the accuracy of information submitted to the Insurance Commissioner to justify the rate change;

- Prohibit health, auto and homeowners insurers from determining policy eligibility or rates based on lack of prior coverage or credit history; and

- Exempt large group health plans for companies with more than 50 employees, from these requirements.

It is important to note that this measure would not impact publicly-funded health programs such as: Medi-Cal, health coverage for uninsured persons, or Medicare.

Background. Currently, health insurance companies must file information on proposed rate changes for all individual and small group health insurance with either the California Department of Managed Health Care (CDMHC) or the California Department of Insurance (CDI) before those rates can go into effect. Insurance companies are not required to file large group rate information. The CDMHC is administered by a Governor-appointed director. The CDI is administered by the elected Insurance Commissioner.

Both the California Department of Managed Health Care and the California Department of Insurance review the rate information to determine whether the rates are reasonable or not. In completing this review, CDMHC and CDI may consider a variety of factors such as: 1) which medical benefits are covered; 2) the proportion of the costs enrollees pay through copayments and deductibles; and 3) whether a company's administrative costs are reasonable. However, CDMHC and CDI currently have no authority to reject or approve rates before they take effect.

Proposition 45 would require the State Insurance Commissioner only to approve all rate changes for health care products offered in individual and small group employer plans. This would be similar to the process for approving rates for automobile and homeowner's insurance established in voter-approved Proposition 103, the Insurance Rates and Regulation Act of 1988.

Legislative Analyst's Office Report. According to the Legislative Analyst's Office (LAO), Proposition 45 would result in moderate increased State administrative costs to regulate health insurance not likely to exceed the low millions of dollars annually in most years. The LAO notes that these costs would be funded from additional fee revenues collected from health insurance companies.

The Legislative Analyst's Office indicates that Proposition 45 could result in additional administrative costs to Covered California, the State's health benefit exchange established under the Federal Affordable Care Act. As noted by the LAO, under State law, the Covered California Board has the authority to approve health care products sold through Covered California. The Board negotiates plan provisions, such as rates, with health insurance companies seeking to sell products on the health benefit exchange.

The Legislative Analyst's Office indicates that the new rate approval process established in Proposition 45, in which the CDI approves rates, would likely result in a longer approval process for some individual and small group health insurance plans. If there is a long delay, the LAO notes that this could result in the health care plan not being offered through Covered California during an open enrollment period. According to the LAO, this could have a fiscal impact to Covered California to provide consumer assistance to individuals who may need to switch to a different health insurance plan. However, the LAO qualifies that it is unclear whether long delays in rate approvals would occur under Proposition 45, and if they do occur, how often.

Affected County Departments. None.

Support. Proposition 45 is supported by: U.S. Senator Dianne Feinstein; U.S. Senator Barbara Boxer; Insurance Commissioner Dave Jones; Superintendent of Public Instruction Tom Torlakson; Board Member Betty Yee, State Board of Equalization; Candidate for State Controller; State Senator Alex Padilla; the California Nurses Association; California Federation of Teachers; Consumer Watchdog; Consumer Federation of California; Congress of California Seniors; Consumer Attorneys of California; Coalition of California Welfare Rights Organizations; AFSCME Local 685 - L.A. County Deputy Probation Officers; United Teachers Los Angeles; California Democratic Party and Democratic Parties of 44 counties, among others.

Opposition. Proposition 45 is opposed by: over 40 health care groups including the California Hospital Association, California Medical Association, Los Angeles County Medical Association, California Children's Hospital Association, and California Academy of Physicians; over 40 business groups including the California Chamber of Commerce,

California Business Roundtable, Los Angeles County Business Federation, Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce; over 40 labor groups including the State Building and Construction Trades, International Union of Boilermakers, Southern California Pipe Trades - DC 16, and Sailors' Union of the Pacific, among others.

PROPOSITION 46: DRUG AND ALCOHOL TESTING OF DOCTORS. MEDICAL NEGLIGENCE LAWSUITS. Initiative Statute. COUNTY POSITION: **NONE**

If approved by the voters, Proposition 46 would enact the following provisions effective January 1, 2015:

- **Increase the Medical Injury Compensation Reform Act Cap.** Proposition 46 would increase the current $250,000 cap on non-economic damages due to medical malpractice established in the Medical Injury Compensation Reform Act (MICRA) of 1975. The cap would increase to $1.1 million effective January 1, 2015 based on the rate of inflation since 1975 and would be adjusted annually thereafter to reflect any increase in inflation as measured by the Consumer Price Index.

- **Require Drug and Alcohol Testing of Physicians.** Proposition 46 would require hospitals to conduct drug and alcohol testing of physicians affiliated with the hospital as follows: 1) on a random basis; 2) immediately upon the occurrence of an adverse event on physicians responsible for the care and treatment of the patient during or 24 hours prior to the event; and 3) at the direction of the State Medical Board upon receipt of a referral from a third party indicating that a physician may have been impaired by alcohol or drugs while on duty. Hospitals would be required to bill the physician for the cost of the test. In addition, this measure would require every health care practitioner to report to the State Medical Board information regarding a physician who is impaired by drugs or alcohol while on duty, or who was responsible for the treatment of a patient during an adverse event and failed to follow the appropriate level of care. Physicians found to be drug or alcohol impaired while on duty, or who refuse or fail to comply with testing provisions, would be subject to disciplinary action.

- **Tracking Prescriptions for Controlled Substances.** Proposition 46 would require health care practitioners and pharmacists to consult the Controlled Substance Utilization Review and Evaluation System (CURES) prior to prescribing or dispensing controlled drugs that have a higher potential for abuse, such as OxyContin, Vicodin, or Adderall, to a patient for the first time. If the check on CURES finds that the patient has an existing prescription for one of these drugs, the health care practitioner must determine if there is a legitimate need for an alternative medication. Failure to do so would be cause for disciplinary action by the practitioner's licensing board.

Background. In 1975, doctors and other health care providers were leaving California due to the rapidly rising costs of medical liability insurance. In response to this issue, the Legislature, with bipartisan support, enacted the Medical Injury Compensation Reform Act (MICRA) of 1975. This measure was signed by then Governor Jerry Brown in September 1975, and sought to improve access to health care by stabilizing medical liability and limiting the rate of growth in health care costs.

The Medical Injury Compensation Reform Act capped the amount for non-economic damages such as: pain, suffering, inconvenience, emotional stress, loss of companionship, and loss of enjoyment of life, for medical malpractice at $250,000. MICRA also established a cap on plaintiff attorneys' fees based on the percentage of the amount of damages awarded, with the percentage declining as the amount of the award increases. Under MICRA, there is no cap or limit on the amount of economic or punitive damages an injured patient may be awarded in a medical malpractice case.

Since the enactment of the Medical Injury Compensation Reform Act, attempts have been made to increase the $250,000 cap on noneconomic damages. Most recently, in February 2014, Senate President pro Tempore Darrell Steinberg introduced SB 1429, which cited legislative intent to bring interested parties together to develop a solution to issues surrounding medical malpractice injury compensation. However, this measure did not move forward because the parties could not reach an agreement. Concurrently, proponents seeking to increase the MICRA cap successfully gathered sufficient voter signatures to qualify an initiative to increase the cap for placement on the November 2014 State General Election ballot. This measure became Proposition 46.

Legislative Analyst's Office Report. According to the Legislative Analyst's Office (LAO), Proposition 46 would have a wide variety of fiscal effects on State and local governments, as described below:

- **Increasing the MICRA Cap.** The LAO notes that raising the MICRA cap on non-economic damages would result in higher costs due to an increase in the amount of awards and settlements in medical malpractice cases, and higher costs due to an expected increase in the number of injury claims filed. The LAO indicates that higher malpractice costs would, in turn, increase costs for health care providers that self-insure and increase premiums for providers who purchase malpractice insurance. The LAO estimates that raising the cap on non-economic damages would increase medical malpractice costs for State and local government health care purchasers and providers by an average of 10 percent resulting in increased costs for health care at least in the low millions of dollars annually, potentially ranging to over $100.0 million.

- **Drug and Alcohol Testing of Physicians.** The LAO indicates that the requirement to test physicians for alcohol and drugs could have different fiscal effects. The testing could prevent some medical errors, thus resulting in reduced medical costs. According to the LAO, this could offset some of the costs of increasing the MICRA cap. Conversely, while hospitals would be required to bill physicians for the cost of testing, the LAO assumes that these costs could be passed on to the State and local governments in the form of higher prices for health care services provided by the physicians.

- **Tracking Prescriptions of Controlled Substances.** As reported by the LAO, the Department of Justice administers California's prescription drug monitoring program, known as CURES. Pharmacies are required to provide the DOJ with specified information on patients who are prescribed controlled drugs that have a potential for abuse. Currently, physicians and pharmacists have the option to register on CURES if they wish to review a patient's drug history prior to dispensing a controlled substance. This is intended to prevent prescription drug abuse and improve clinical care. Effective January 1, 2016, all health care providers will be required to register on CURES; however, they will not be required to check the database prior to prescribing or dispensing a controlled substance. The State is currently in the process of updating the CURES database to handle the higher level of use expected to occur when health care providers are registered in 2016.

  If Proposition 46 is approved by voters, the LAO notes that many health care providers will not be able to check the CURES database until at least the summer of 2015, when system upgrades are scheduled to be complete.

  The LAO also notes that Proposition 46 would require health care providers to take additional time to check CURES. As a result, the providers would have less time for other patient care activities. The LAO estimates that this could result in additional costs for hospitals and pharmacies to hire additional staff to care for the same number of patients. However, the LAO indicates that checking the CURES database could reduce costs by lowering the number of prescription drugs dispensed and could reduce costs associated with drug abuse such as law enforcement, social services, and other health care services.

Affected County Departments. The Department of Health Services (DHS) reports that judgments and settlements arising from medical malpractice claims are generally incurred as net County costs. DHS indicates that any increase in the current MICRA cap would increase County costs and would inevitably result in reduced resources available for every facet of patient care. DHS is committed to providing vital, high-quality health services to vulnerable populations, and diverting funds to pay for increased litigation expenses would not necessarily improve patient outcomes or produce higher quality medical care.

County Counsel reports County costs of approximately $36.5 million in medical malpractice claims and settlements from September 2008 through March 2013, and concurs that an increase in the MICRA cap would result in significant increased County costs and exposure to additional claims for medical malpractice.

County Counsel indicates that the drug and alcohol testing provisions of Proposition 46 could result in employment issues for the County. For example, this could expand the ability of the County to discipline or discharge physicians who fail to submit a required drug or alcohol test. With regard to the requirement that every health care practitioner

report suspected drug or alcohol abuse while on duty to the State Medical Board, County Counsel notes that it is unclear whether or not these reports would be made anonymously. Some physicians who are reported may claim that the accusation is false and that they are the subject of retaliation or harassment.

Support. Proposition 46 is supported by: U.S. Senator Barbara Boxer; Consumer Watchdog; Consumer Federation of California; Congress of California Seniors; Consumer Attorneys of California; 38 Is Too Late; California Teamsters Public Affairs Council; and California Conference Board-Amalgamated Transit Union.

Opposition. Proposition 46 is opposed by: over 75 doctor and health groups including the California Hospital Association, California Medical Association, California Dental Association, the Los Angeles County Medical Association, Community Clinics Association of Los Angeles County; over 100 hospitals including California Hospital Medical Center, Cedars-Sinai Medical Center, Community Hospital of Long Beach, Glendale Adventist Medical Center, Good Samaritan Hospital, Hollywood Presbyterian Hospital, Long Beach Memorial Medical Center, Palmdale Regional Medical Center, USC Norris Cancer Hospital, USC Verdugo Hills Hospital, and White Memorial Medical Center; and over 300 entities including the California State Association of Counties, League of California Cities, Urban Counties Caucus, California Special Districts Association, California Chamber of Commerce, Service Employees International Union (SEIU) California, AFSCME California PEOPLE, California NAACP, American Civil Liberties Union, California Republican Party, and the Los Angeles County Democratic Party.

PROPOSITION 47: CRIMINAL SENTENCES. MISDEMEANOR PENALTIES. Initiative Statute. COUNTY POSITION: **NONE**

Proposition 47, the Safe Neighborhoods and Schools Act, would reduce certain non-serious and nonviolent drug and property offenses from felonies to misdemeanors, and would redirect anticipated State savings into programs for victim services, truancy prevention, and recidivism reduction. Specifically, Proposition 47 would:

- Require misdemeanor sentences for petty theft, receiving stolen property, and forging/writing bad checks when the value is $950 or less; and for certain drug possession offenses, except for those convicted of severe crimes including rape, murder, and child molestation;

- Allow re-sentencing to misdemeanors of persons serving felony sentences for the above offenses, unless the court finds they pose an unreasonable public safety risk; and

- Beginning FY 2016-17, redirect anticipated State savings into grants for K-12 truancy prevention programs, victim services, and local programs aimed at reducing recidivism.

Background: The Public Safety Realignment Act of 2011 (AB 109) enacted statutory changes in which offenders of certain lower-level felonies can be sentenced to county jails instead of State prison. Currently, the offenses targeted for sentence reduction by Proposition 47 can be sentenced as county-jail sentences pursuant to AB 109 of 2011, unless offenders have prior serious, violent and/or sex-related convictions. By reducing time served for the identified crimes, proponents estimate this initiative could yield State savings of $150 million to $250 million a year.

Legislative Analyst's Office Report. The Legislative Analyst's Office (LAO) indicates that there is limited data available, particularly at the county level, to determine potential savings estimates, but provides some general projections. The LAO estimates Proposition 47 would net State criminal justice system savings in the low hundreds of millions of dollars annually. The LAO reports that with fewer offenders eligible for State prison, the State could see an on-going reduction of several thousand inmates. Additionally, LAO states that under the resentencing provisions, several thousand inmates could be released within a few years, temporarily reducing the prison population. The LAO notes that one-time increase costs for the State courts would be off-set by the larger system savings.

At the county level, the LAO estimates net savings that could reach several hundred million dollars annually for counties statewide, but provides no specific dollar amount. The LAO estimates that the reductions in county jails, from offenders serving shorter sentences and those re-sentenced and released, would be slightly offset by an increase of offenders previously eligible for State prison. The LAO further notes that while the total number of statewide county jail beds freed up could reach the low tens of

thousands annually within a few years, this would not necessarily result in a reduction in a county jail of a similar size, as currently overcrowded county jails could use the available jail space to reduce the early release of inmates.

Given limited data on the makeup of the current prison populations and other factors, the LAO cautions that the fiscal effects of this initiative are subject to significant uncertainty.

County Fiscal Impact:

Potential Impact to AB 109 Funding. With certain exceptions, the crimes identified by Proposition 47 can currently be charged as lower-level felonies served in county jails per AB 109. This initiative would lower these crimes to misdemeanors, for which related costs are generally assumed by counties. Under Proposition 30 of 2012, any legislation enacted after September 30, 2012 that increases local agency costs for services mandated by the 2011 Public Safety Realignment would require State funding. Proposition 30 excludes from State subvention legislation that would define a new crime or change an existing definition of a crime. However, Proposition 47 would instead change the penalties for existing crimes, including AB 109-related crimes. It is unknown to what extent the State, under Proposition 30, would be required to fund AB 109 workload impacted by this initiative. In response to questions from this office, the LAO noted this is a very complex issue. The LAO reports they are in the process of consulting with legislative counsel; however, they do not expect to have conclusive answers before the election. County Counsel concurs that under Proposition 47 there would be concerns as to the impact to, and applicability of, AB 109 funding.

Grant Funding for Local Programs. Under Proposition 47, 65 percent of anticipated State savings would be redirected to the Board of State and Community Corrections to administer grants for public agencies to expand mental health, substance abuse, and diversion programs aimed at reducing recidivism. The County could be eligible to compete for this grant funding, which must be used to expand services and could not supplant State or local funds. Every two years, the State Controller would audit these grant programs to ensure the funds are expended solely according to the measure.

Affected Departments.

Criminal Justice System. The Sheriff's Department reports concerns that this initiative could create notable operational challenges to the County's overall criminal justice system. Based on the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation's estimate that approximately 3,000 inmates would be impacted in the first year by this initiative, the Sheriff's Department indicates that many, an estimated 1,000 inmates in the first few months, would need to be transported back to the County for re-hearing and re-sentencing. The Sheriff's Department notes that although most would be sentenced to time served and released, the impact on the system's infrastructure and staffing resources would be substantial. For example, for those re-sentenced and released, the County would need: 1) additional staff resources to conduct complex

case reviews prior to release, in particular for those with prior serious/violent offenses; and 2) to develop a more comprehensive mechanism to alert the Probation Department about supervision issues prior to release. Additionally, the Sheriff's Department reports that jail design proposals would likely be complicated by the new sentencing requirements. Lastly, the Sheriff's Department notes that the County would need to factor how this initiative would interplay with current release time policies, including for those serving AB 109 sentences. For example, the County would have to decide if to treat misdemeanors under this initiative as a county-sentence (as little as 36 days) or as an AB 109 sentence (up to 180 days), creating a housing versus a public safety issue.

The Probation Department agrees with the issues raised by the California State Association of Counties (CSAC), including concerns as to: 1) how the additional layer of responsibilities created by Proposition 47 would impact an already strained public safety system; and 2) how the new sentencing changes will affect counties' ongoing efforts to implement AB 109. Additionally, CSAC notes that future application and costs and/or savings of the new sentencing scheme are largely speculative, as it is difficult to predict how future crime trends would drive workload and how offenders would be resentenced.

County Counsel concurs with concerns regarding: 1) the notable uncertainty on the kind of impact Proposition 47 would have over local caseloads; and 2) the skepticism over the estimated level of savings, both State and local, that the initiative would yield. County Counsel reports serious concerns with how a new set of sentencing changes will affect the County's ongoing efforts to implement AB 109. Additionally, County Counsel reports that the initiative process severely limits any future amendments to the initiative's statutory changes. They report that the Safe Neighborhoods and Schools Act could only be modified by a two-thirds vote of the Legislature, and only if the changes furthered the purpose of the original measure. Most importantly, County Counsel notes that the non-supplantation clause means that the County will have to create new programs with the assumed savings as it cannot use these funds to support existing programs. Finally, County Counsel indicates that due to the fact that the County Jail operates under over-crowded conditions with a population cap, it is unlikely that Proposition 47 would create any meaningful reduction in the County's jail population.

Local Programs Aimed at Reducing Recidivism. The Department of Public Health (DPH) agrees with the LAO's analysis that the fiscal effects of this initiative are subject to significant uncertainty. DPH notes that although 65 percent of the estimated savings from Proposition 47 would be allocated to support mental health and substance abuse treatment services, it is unclear how funding would specifically be distributed to these programs. DPH further notes that while the proposed availability of additional funds to support mental health and substance abuse treatment services would be beneficial for those in need of these services, Proposition 47 does not identify a mechanism for individuals charged with misdemeanors to access treatment services. DPH indicates that without any guidelines set in place, this may lead to further alcohol and drug use/abuse by drug offenders and contribute to larger criminal justice and public health problems.

The Department of Mental Health (DMH) indicates that there are elements of Proposition 47 which would be beneficial. According to DMH, any increase in funding for mental health treatment for offenders would help relieve the County's financial burden to serve this population. DMH also notes that provisions in Proposition 47 that would reduce convictions for non-serious, non-violent crimes from felonies to misdemeanors could help these offenders re-enter the community. According to DMH, persons with a felony conviction, who also have mental health issues, are limited in their ability to obtain employment. This often hampers efforts for rehabilitation and successful community re-entry.

However, the Department of Mental Health is concerned with the number of persons who could become eligible for re-sentencing and services provided under Proposition 47. DMH notes that currently 40,000 offenders statewide annually are eligible for mental health services under AB 109. According to DMH, AB 109 requirements have stretched the County's available resources. As reported by the LAO, DMH notes the projected State savings from Proposition 47 to provide services for this new population of offenders may not be realized for several years. DMH indicates that, if this is correct, Proposition 47 would result in an immediate fiscal burden to the County when these persons return to their home county. DMH also reports that the State savings generated under Proposition 47 would not be appropriated directly to counties. Instead, savings would be allocated to the Board of Community Corrections. According to DMH, it is unclear how the funding would be used, what types of services and treatment would be available, and whether or not the State would contract with county mental health departments to provide the necessary services. Additionally, DMH does not believe that currently, sufficient resources exist to provide appropriate community housing, a prerequisite to recovery, for the large number of offenders that could be released in the County under Proposition 47.

Support and Opposition. Proposition 47 is supported by the following organizations: American Federation of State and Municipal Employees; American Civil Liberties Union of California; Alliance of Californians for Community Empowerment; A New PATH (Parents for Addiction Treatment and Healing); California Association of Alcohol and Drug Program Executives, Inc.; California Catholic Conference of Bishops; California Democratic Party; California Federation of Teachers; California Teachers Association; California Labor Federation; Children's Defense Fund of California; Crime Survivors for Safety and Justice; Latino Coalition for a Healthy California; The League of Women Voters of California; Life After Uncivil Ruthless Acts (LAURA); Los Angeles Metropolitan Churches; NAACP - San Diego Branch; NAACP - San Jose Branch; Open Society Policy Center; PICO California; Potrero Hill Democratic Club; Progressive Christians Uniting; The Sentencing Project; Service Employees International Union; Victims/Survivors Network of Los Angeles; Victims/Survivors Network of San Diego; and The Women's Foundation. It is supported by the following officials: Mary Jane Burke, Marin County Superintendent of Schools; George Gascón, San Francisco District Attorney; Paul Gallegos, Humboldt County District Attorney; Newt Gingrich, former

Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives; Loni Hancock, California State Senator; William Lansdowne, former San Diego Police Chief; Mark Leno, California State Senator; Jeff Rosen, Santa Clara District Attorney; Nancy Skinner, California State Assembly Member; and Darrell Steinberg, California State Senator.

Proposition 47 is opposed by the following organizations: California Coalition Against Sexual Assault; California District Attorneys Association; California Fraternal Order of Police; California Grocers Association; California Narcotics Officers Association; California Peace Officers Association; California Police Chiefs Association; California Retailers Association; California Republican Party; California State Association of Counties; California State Sheriffs Association; Crime Victims Action Alliance; Crime Victims United; National Association of Drug Court Professionals; National Association of Drug Court Professionals; Riverside County Board of Supervisors; and San Mateo County Board of Supervisors. It is opposed by the following officials: Thomas Allman, Mendocino County Sheriff; John Anderson, Madera County Sheriff; Kirk Andrus, Siskiyou County District Attorney; Bill Brown, Santa Barbara County Sheriff; Thomas Cavallero, Merced County Sheriff-Coroner; Thomas Cooke, Mariposa County District Attorney; Bonnie Dumanis, San Diego County District Attorney; Joyce Dudley, Santa Barbara County District Attorney; David Eyster, Mendocino County District Attorney; Birgit Fladager, Stanislaus County District Attorney; Steve Freitas, Sonoma County Sheriff; Lisa Green, Kern County District Attorney; Dean Growdon, Lassen County Sheriff; Greg Hagwood, Plumas County Sheriff; Bruce Haney, Trinity County Sheriff; David Hollister, Plumas County District Attorney; Scott Jones, Sacramento County Sheriff; Jackie Lacey, Los Angeles County District Attorney; Jon Lopey, Siskiyou County Sheriff; John McMahon, San Bernardino County Sheriff-Coroner; Nancy O'Malley, Alameda County District Attorney; Mark Peterson, Contra Costa County District Attorney; Jill Ravitch, Sonoma County District Attorney; Todd Riebe, Amador County District Attorney; John Robertson, Napa County Sheriff; John Scott, Los Angeles County Sheriff; Jan Scully, Sacramento County District Attorney; Greg Strickland, Kings County District Attorney; Stephen Wagstaffe, San Mateo County District Attorney; Michael Webb, Redondo Beach City Attorney; and Shelley Zimmerman, San Diego Chief of Police.

PROPOSITION 48: 2014 INDIAN GAMING COMPACTS. Referendum. COUNTY POSITION: **NONE**

Proposition 48 would ratify the tribal gaming compacts between the State of California and the North Fork Rancheria of Mono Indians and the Wiyot Tribe, and would omit certain projects related to executing the compacts or amendments to the compacts from the scope of the California Environmental Quality Act.

Background. AB 277 (Chapter 51, Statutes of 2013) approved gaming compacts between the State and the North Fork Rancheria of Mono Indians in Madera County and the Wiyot Tribe in Humboldt County. Under the State Constitution, enacted legislation can generally be placed before voters as a referendum to determine whether it can go into effect. Proposition 48 is a referendum on AB 277. If Proposition 48 is approved by voters, the gaming compacts between the State and the above two tribes would go into effect.

As required under Federal law, Governor Brown previously negotiated and signed tribal-state compacts with North Fork on August 31, 2012, and with Wiyot on March 20, 2013. Each compact would be in effect for 20 years, until December 31, 2033. Specifically, the State's negotiated compacts with the two tribes would allow the North Fork tribe to begin gaming in Madera County and move forward with the construction and operation of a new casino with up to 2,000 slot machines on the specified land that was accepted into Federal trust for gaming. The compact with the Wiyot tribe prevents gaming on their tribal land in Humboldt County, which is near the Humboldt Bay National Wildlife Refuge, but allows the tribe to receive 2.5 percent to 3.5 percent of the annual slot machine net revenue from the North Fork casino.

Additionally, the North Fork compact requires the tribe to make annual payments to the existing Revenue Sharing Trust Fund (RSTF) in which all funding is allocated directly to other California tribes. The payments would depend on the casino's annual slot machine net revenue and the total amount of payments made by North Fork to other state entities, local governments, and tribes. North Fork estimates that total payments to the RSTF would average about $15.0 million annually over the life of the compact. The compact and the associated Memorandum of Understanding require North Fork to make one-time and annual payments to local governments in the Madera County area to offset potential impacts of the casino on the local community. Furthermore, any State or local governmental agency that assists in the construction of the North Fork casino, such as through the construction of a road to the casino, would be exempt from certain State environmental regulations.

Legislative Analyst's Office Report. The Legislative Analyst's Office (LAO) estimates that, after adjusting for inflation, Madera County and the City of Madera would likely receive between $16.0 million and $35.0 million in one-time payments from North Fork for specified services. Similarly, Madera County, the City of Madera, and the Madera

Irrigation District would receive about $5.0 million in annual payments once the casino opens through the end of the compact. In addition, other local governments could receive $3.5 million annually over the life of the compact.

According to the LAO, State and local governments currently receive revenues from other forms of gaming, such as the California Lottery, horse racing, and cardrooms, and expanded gaming on tribal lands could reduce these other sources of State and local revenues. The LAO indicates that Californians would spend more of their income at tribal facilities, which are exempt from most types of State and local taxes, and would spend less at other businesses that are subject to these taxes, and would result in reduced tax revenues for the State and local governments. However, the LAO notes that these potential revenue reductions would not be significant.

Furthermore, the LAO notes that the opening of North Fork's new casino would result in people coming to Madera County from outside the area to gamble and purchase goods and services, increasing spending on both tribal lands and in surrounding communities, and the tribe would likely hire employees for the facility who would also purchase goods and services. As a result, local governments in Madera County would likely experience a growth in revenues from increased economic activity. These increased revenues would generally be offset by revenue losses from decreased economic activity in surrounding counties.

Affected County Departments. Proposition 48 would have no impact on County Departments.

Support and Opposition. Proposition 48 is supported by: California Association of Tribal Governments; California Democratic Party; California Labor Federation; California Professional Firefighters; California State Building & Construction Trades Council; Central California Hispanic Chamber of Commerce; City of Chowchilla; City of Madera; City of Madera Democratic Club; City of Madera Police Officers Association; Fresno Area Hispanic Chamber of Commerce; Fresno County Democratic Women's Club; Fresno Metro Black Chamber of Commerce; Friends of the Eel & Van Duzen Rivers; Governor Edmund G. Brown, Jr.; Humboldt Baykeeper; Los Angeles Times; Madera Coalition for Community Justice; Madera County Board of Supervisors; Madera County Democratic Central Committee; Madera County Sheriff; Madera County Chambers of Commerce for Madera, Chowchilla, Oakhurst, Coarsegold, Bass Lake, Golden Valley, Madera Hispanic, and North Fork; Madera Latinas Unidas; Madera NAACP Branch #1084; Monterey County Herald; Northcoast Environmental Center; Oakhurst Democratic Club; Redwood Chapter of the Sierra Club; State Assembly Member Frank Bigelow (R-O'Neals); State Senator Tom Berryhill (R-Modesto); State Senator Anthony Cannella (R-Ceres); Trees Foundation; UniteHERE; and U.S. Representative Tom McClintock (R-CA).

Proposition 48 is opposed by: U.S. Senator Dianne Feinstein; Butte County Supervisor Bill Connelly; Chukchansi Tribe; Contra Costa Times; Fresno County Supervisor Henry Perea; Fresno Bee; Former Fresno City Councilmember Mike Dages; Madera

County Supervisor David Rogers; Madera Mayor Pro Tem Derek Robinson; Madera City Councilmember-Elect Charles Rigby; Madera Unified School District Ricardo Arredondo; Marin County Board of Supervisors; Merced Sun-Star; Modesto Bee; Napa County Board of Supervisors; Nisei Farmers League President Manuel Cunha, Jr.; Oakland Tribune; Orange County Register; Table Mountain Rancheria Tribe; Tribal Chairman Mooretown Rancheria Gary Archuleta; Sacramento Bee; San Francisco Chronicle; San Jose Mercury News; Stand Up for California; Stop Reservation Shopping; Sutter County Supervisor James Gallagher; Yuba County Board of Education Trustee Lou Binninger; Yuba County Supervisor Andy Vasquez; Yuba County Supervisor Roger Abe; among others.

Attachment II

LOCAL JURISDICTION MEASURES APPEARING ON THE NOVEMBER 4, 2014 GENERAL ELECTION BALLOT

LOS ANGELES COUNTY

Measure P. SAFE NEIGHBORHOOD PARKS, GANG PREVENTION, YOUTH/ SENIOR RECREATION, BEACHES/ WILDLIFE PROTECTION MEASURE - To ensure continued funding from an expiring voter-approved measure for improving the safety of neighborhood parks and senior/youth recreation areas; assisting in gang prevention; protecting rivers, beaches, water sources; repairing, acquiring/preserving parks/natural areas; maintaining zoos, museums; providing youth job-training, shall Los Angeles County levy an annual $23/parcel special tax, requiring annual independent financial audits and all funds used locally?

ABC UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

Measure AA. To renovate and equip classrooms and school facilities District-wide; increase student access to modern technology; expand career technical education facilities including science, technology, engineering and math; and replace roofs and outdated heating and air conditioning systems, shall ABC Unified School District be authorized to issue $195,200,000 of bonds, with interest rates within legal limits, independent citizen oversight, no money for administrator salaries, and all funds controlled locally?

ALTADENA LIBRARY DISTRICT

Measure A. Shall the Altadena Library District be authorized to continue to levy a special per parcel tax annually for ten years to replace library funding lost due to the elimination of State funding?

ARTESIA CITY

Measure Y. Shall the Artesia Public Safety, Parks, and General City Services Ordinance be adopted to enact a general purpose utility user tax at a rate of 4.9 percent for charges made for certain utility services, to provide funding for general fund purposes, including, without limitation, 9-1-1 response, crime/gang prevention, and neighborhood police patrols; community center improvements for teen, after-school recreation and senior programs; neighborhood streets, alleys, potholes sidewalks and roads; and other general City services?

AZUSA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

Measure K. To improve the quality of local school facilities; make health and safety improvements; replace leaky roofs; upgrade electrical systems; improve student access to computers and modern technology; replace outdated heating, ventilation and air-conditioning systems; and modernize and renovate classrooms, restrooms and school facilities, shall the Azusa Unified School District issue $92,000,000 of bonds, at legal rates, with an independent citizens' oversight committee, NO money used for administrative salaries and all funds controlled locally?

BASSETT UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

Measure V. Bassett Schools Safety, College/Career Readiness Measure. To improve school facilities with funding that cannot be taken by the State, replace leaky roofs, improve student access to computer/modern technology, replace/upgrade outdated heating, air conditioning, electrical systems, modernize outdated classrooms and restrooms, acquire, construct, repair classrooms, facilities, sites and equipment, shall Bassett Unified School District issue $30 million of bonds at legal rates, appoint an independent citizens' oversight committee and no money for teacher or administrator salaries?

CLAREMONT CITY

Measure W. Shall the City of Claremont be authorized to issue water revenue bonds up to $135 million to pay for acquisition of the Claremont Water System and incidental expenses payable only from the water system's revenues?

COMPTON COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT

Measure C. Compton Community College District Classroom Repair, Job Training/Campus Safety Measure. To update aging classrooms/buildings, prepare students/returning veterans for good-paying jobs/university transfer, repair deteriorating gas/sewer lines, electrical wiring/leaky roofs, improve classroom technology, handicapped accessibility, science labs, nursing, paralegal, automotive/other career education programs, upgrade campus safety/security, repair, construct/acquire facilities, sites/equipment, shall Compton Community College District issue $100 million in bonds at legal rates, with independent financial audits, and all funds used locally?

DOWNEY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

Measure O. CLASSROOM REPAIR/SCHOOL SAFETY, AND COLLEGE/CAREER READINESS MEASURE. To upgrade classrooms, improve education for each student by upgrading science labs for 21st century technology and career/vocational training, improve school security/fire safety, repair old restrooms and plumbing, improve disabled

access, electrical systems/wiring, and repair, construct, and acquire educational facilities, sites, and equipment, shall Downey Unified School District issue $248,000,000 in bonds, at legal rates, requiring independent audits, citizens' oversight, for administrators' salaries/pensions, and all funds used locally?

EL MONTE CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT

Measure M. El Monte Elementary School Repair and Upgrade Measure. To upgrade schools and improve the quality of education and ensure safe school campuses, upgrade classroom technology to meet current teaching standards, shall El Monte City School District repair, acquire, construct, equip classrooms, sites and facilities, complete safety and energy-efficiency upgrades, replace aging roofs, heating, electrical, cooling systems, upgrade technology/add new computer labs, by issuing $78,000,000 in bonds at legal rates, with independent oversight, no money for administrators' salaries, and all funds benefiting local elementary schools?

FULLERTON JOINT UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT

Measure I. Fullerton Joint Union High School District Improve Our Excellent Local High Schools Measure. To improve Buena Park, Fullerton Union, La Habra, Sonora, Sunny Hills, and Troy High Schools, and prepare students for college and careers shall the Fullerton Joint Union High School District upgrade classrooms, science labs, sites, facilities; repair roofs, floors, plumbing, heating, ventilation and electrical systems; improve student safety and security; upgrade career training facilities and technology infrastructure by issuing $175 million in bonds at legal rates, with mandatory audits, independent oversight, and all funds staying local?

HERMOSA BEACH CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT

Measure Q. To reduce student overcrowding by reopening a school and to make safety, security, and health improvements; modernize, repair, construct, equip and upgrade classrooms and other school facilities; replace aging roofs; provide technology improvements for students; and upgrade/replace outdated electrical, plumbing, heating and air conditioning systems, shall Hermosa Beach City School District issue $54,000,000 of bonds at legal interest rates, with an independent citizens' oversight committee, no money for administrative salaries and no funds taken by the State?

LOS NIETOS SCHOOL DISTRICT

Measure E. To improve Ada S. Nelson, Aeolian, and Rancho Santa Gertrudes elementary schools by repairing/updating aging classrooms; keeping schools safe and clean; providing up-to-date learning technology for 21st century education; repairing leaky roofs/windows; removing asbestos, lead, other hazardous materials; and

renovating, constructing, and equipping classrooms/facilities/sites; shall Los Nietos School District issue $15,000,000 in bonds at legal rates, requiring strict accountability, Independent Citizens' Oversight, annual audits, with no fund for administrator salaries or pensions?

Measure N. To repair and improve Los Nietos Middle School by updating aging middle school classrooms/labs with 21st century learning technology; providing educational resources to prepare students to successfully transition to high school and college; improving facilities for Science, Technology, Engineering and Math programs; renovating, constructing, and equipping classrooms/facilities/sites; shall Los Nietos School District issue $13,000,000 in bonds at legal rates, requiring strict accountability, Independent Citizens' Oversight, annual audits, with no funds for administrator salaries or pensions?

MALIBU CITY

Measure R. Shall an ordinance be adopted that: 1) requires voter-approved specific plans for commercial and commercial-residential projects over 20,000 square feet; and 2) allows formula retail businesses in tenant spaces between 1400 square feet and 5000 square feet in existing civic center shopping centers but imposes stricter requirements (including 2500 square foot limit per business and limit of 30 percent of shopping center's tenants) on some such businesses in any new shopping center or existing ones outside the civic center?

NORTH ORANGE COUNTY COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT

Measure J. Fullerton/Cypress Colleges Repair and Student/Veteran Job Training Measure. To upgrade nursing, science, technology, engineering, math/technical job training facilities, repair decaying walls/leaky roofs, update outdated computer technology, fire safety/electrical systems, ensure disabled accessibility, repair, construct, acquire facilities, sites/equipment so local students/returning veterans are prepared for universities/jobs, shall North Orange County Community College District issue $574,000,000 in bonds at legal rates, with audits, oversight and NO money for administrators' salaries, pensions or Sacramento?

NORWALK CITY

Measure B. Without raising current tax rates, shall an ordinance be adopted modernizing the City's utility users tax ordinance to require equal treatment of taxpayers by ensuring the tax applies regardless of technology used; exempting seniors, low-income disabled/blind residents; funding current gang prevention, youth, after-school, senior and disabled programs; neighborhood patrols/school crossing guards, pothole repairs, and other general services; subject to financial audits, local control of funds/no rate increase without voter approval?

NORWALK - LA MIRADA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

Measure G. Norwalk-La Mirada Unified School District Classroom Repair/School Safety Measure. To repair classrooms, leaky roofs, upgrade school security, fencing, fire safety, update science, math, computer lab technology, upgrade physical education/athletic facilities, remove asbestos, and repair, construct/acquire educational facilities, sites/equipment to improve education at every school in Norwalk and La Mirada, shall Norwalk-La Mirada Unified School District issue $375,000,000 in bonds, at legal rates, requiring independent audits, citizens' oversight, no money for administrators' salaries or pensions, and all funds used locally?

POMONA CITY

Measure PPL. Special Library Tax. To provide revenue dedicated solely for the Pomona Public Library, shall $42.00 per parcel be assessed commencing 7/1/2015? Restores Library hours to 38 hours/week minimum and provides for professional staff. Assessment expires in 10 years. Revenue raised is additional to monies from City's General Fund. Ensures City's annual contribution to Library remains no less than current general fund allocations. Revenue use is subject to annual audit and citizen oversight.

REDONDO BEACH CITY

Measure CT. Redondo Beach Charter Amendment. Shall Section 11.1 of Article XI of the Redondo Beach Charter be amended by deleting the requirements that the City Treasurer shall devote his full time to the duties of the office and shall not engage in private business practice during City business hours; and adding new language to have the authority to audit all moneys collected by the City from any source in order to prepare monthly reports mandated by the Charter?

Measure CM. Redondo Beach Charter Amendment. Shall Section 26 of Article XXVI of the Redondo Beach Charter be amended to permit a person to serve up to three full terms as a Councilman, from any combination of districts, and up to three full terms as Mayor by extending term limits from two to three terms?

Measure BE. Redondo Beach Charter Amendment. Shall Section 16.7 of Article XVI of the Redondo Beach Charter be amended to permit a person to serve up to three full terms as a member of the Board of Education by extending term limits from two to three terms?

ROSEMEAD SCHOOL DISTRICT

Measure RS. Rosemead Neighborhood School Safety and Repair Measure - To improve schools by repairing deteriorating classrooms, bathrooms and plumbing; leaky roofs/windows; removing asbestos/lead paint; upgrading school security/ fire safety; upgrading classroom technology/science labs; and repairing, constructing, and

acquiring educational facilities, sites, and equipment; shall Rosemead School District issue 30 million dollars in bonds, at legal rates, requiring annual independent financial audits and independent citizens' oversight, no money for administrators' salaries and pensions, and all funds used locally?

SANTA CLARITA CITY

Measure S. Shall Ordinance No. 14-02 adopting a Development Agreement with Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (METRO) for the removal of 62 advertising structures, within the City, by METRO or any other means, and construction and operation of the three digital billboards, adjacent to the Interstate 5 and State Route 14 freeways, and the dedication to the City of revenue received from digital billboards, which creates an ongoing revenue stream, be adopted?

SANTA MONICA CITY

Measure D. Shall the Santa Monica City Charter be amended to require the City to continue to operate the Santa Monica Airport in a manner that supports its aviation uses unless the voters approve the Airport's closure or change in use, and until that voter approval occurs, the city shall be prohibited from imposing additional restrictions on aviation support services to tenants and airport users that inhibit fuel sales or the full use of aviation facilities?

Measure FS. Shall the City Charter be amended to establish a maximum annual registration fee of up to $288 per controlled rental unit and to limit the amount that landlords may pass through to tenants to 50 percent of the registration fee?

Measure H. Shall an ordinance be adopted that amends the real estate transfer tax so that for commercial and non-commercial real estate sold for one million dollars or more, the tax rate would be $9 for each thousand dollars of sales price?

Measure HH. Advisory Vote Only. If the proposed transfer tax on commercial and non-commercial real estate sales is approved by voters, should the revenue be used to preserve, repair, renovate and construct affordable housing for low-income people who work or live in Santa Monica, including seniors, veterans, working families and persons with disabilities?

Measure LC. Shall the City Charter be amended to: (1) prohibit new development on Airport land, except for parks, public open spaces and public recreational facilities, until the voters approve limits on the uses and development that may occur on the land; and (2) affirm the City Council's authority to manage the Airport and to close all or part of it.

SAUGUS UNION SCHOOL DISTRICT - SCHOOL FACILITIES IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT

Measure EE. To improve local neighborhood elementary schools, by upgrading instructional technology, science labs, libraries to modern academic standards; upgrading classrooms, school safety and security, repairing/replacing deteriorated roofs, lighting, and electrical systems where needed, and reducing water/energy use to save money, shall Saugus Union District issue $148,000,000 in bonds for School Facilities Improvement District No. 2014-1, at legal interest rates, with mandatory audits, independent citizen oversight, no money for administrators, and all funds staying in our community benefiting local children grades K-6?

SNOWLINE JOINT UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

Measure L. Snowline Joint Unified School District Education Facilities Repair, Upgrade and Safety Measure. To upgrade outdated classrooms, science labs, career/vocational education facilities; improve school security/drinking water/fire safety systems; repair electrical wiring, leaky roofs, plumbing and bathrooms; replace old portables; repair, construct, acquire educational facilities, sites/equipment, shall Snowline Joint Unified School District issue $60,000,000 in bonds at legal rates, requiring independent audits, Independent Citizens' Oversight Committee, no money for administrators' salaries, and requiring all funds be used locally for Snowline schools?

TORRANCE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

Measure T. To upgrade classrooms and science labs, improve technology, make student safety and security improvements, provide emergency safety and disaster equipment, repair roofs and plumbing, install low-water-usage irrigation systems, renovate or build facilities as needed, including high school auditoriums and auxiliary gyms, shall Torrance Unified School District issue $144.3 million in bonds under a no-tax-rate-increase financing plan, at legal interest rates, with citizen oversight and independent audits?

Measure U. To repair playgrounds and playfields to meet current health and safety standards, improve physical education facilities and restrooms, construct an aquatic facility to serve students and the community, and renovate and replace playgrounds and fields, shall Torrance Unified School District issue $50 million of bonds, at legal interest rates, with independent citizen oversight and no money for administrator salaries.