PROPOSITION 1: HOUSING PROGRAMS AND VETERANS’ LOANS BOND

Prop 1 is a part of a legislative package to increase affordable housing in California. It would authorize 4 billion dollars in bonds for housing-related programs for Veterans. This includes grants, multi-housing projects, development of homes for low-income families, 1 billion dollars for farm loans and housing assistance.

The break down of the bond funding:
- $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
- $300 million for manufactured and mobile homes.
- The proposition also provides housing assistance for buyers, infrastructure financing, and matching grants to expand affordable housing stock.

BWW RECOMMENDATION: YES

This is one of three propositions that are on the ballot about affordable housing in California. Bonds, in general, are not the best way to fund projects in California. But it has been the go-to for funding projects that for whatever reason, can not get through the traditional budget process. However, with that said, California is an incredibly high-cost state to live in. It currently requires the third highest wage for fair market rent in the country, behind Hawaii and Washington D.C. Additionally, approximately one out of 4 homeless veterans live in the state of California and homelessness is a top line issue for many Californians. Because of this, even though we dislike the bond process as a way to fund much-needed safety net programs, we need to start investing in affordable housing and this is an important piece to start that investment.

PROPOSITION 2: USE MILLIONAIRE’S TAX REVENUE FOR HOMELESSNESS PREVENTION HOUSING BONDS MEASURE - NO PLACE LIKE HOME ACT

This is a tricky one. This proposition is on the ballot because it is an attempt to reallocate funds from the Mental Health Act, a proposition passed in 2004. The act instituted a 1% tax on Californians who make over 1 million dollars to fund mental health services.

As a part of the California legislature package for homelessness, the state proposed to reallocate 2 billion dollars of funds from the Mental Health Act to the No Place Like Home Act.

The proposition:
- Allows the State to use 140 million dollars per year of county mental health funds to repay the 2 billion dollars in bonds.
- Authorizes the department to contract and pay out services related to supportive housing for the targeted population i.e. people impacted by severe mental health issues.
- Authorizes the department to enter into loan agreements

The proponents of Prop 2 say that the money will go to building 20,000 homes across California, as well as strengthening partnerships with law enforcement, doctors and mental health services. Those who oppose the initiative bring up concerns over misuse of funds and the high administrative cost. It is important to note that this is not a new tax just redirecting the funds of an existing tax.

BWW RECOMMENDATION: YES

Like most bonds and propositions, it’s not perfect and there should be a better way to reallocating the fund without going through the proposition process. However, this is an example of not letting the perfect be the enemy of the good. Any money to address both the homelessness crisis and the lack of mental health resources in California is much needed so that’s why we are recommending yes.

PROPOSITION 3: WATER INFRASTRUCTURE AND WATERSHED CONSERVATION BOND INITIATIVE

This proposition would authorize an 8.8 billion dollars bond to address the water infrastructure of California. This includes repairing dams, water storage, and habitat rehabilitation and restorations.

The state fiscal analyst says that “California residents will pay about 8.4 billion dollars in interest over the 40-year bond”. The total cost will be 17.3 billion dollars.

BWW RECOMMENDATION: YES

Sad face, yes it’s another bond proposition. However, until we get more elected officials who are willing to put the very boring infrastructure projects in the budget and a public that is willing to push and support legislation to fund said boring infrastructure, this is our best bet to fund vital projects needed to shore up our water supplies.

PROPOSITION 4: CHILDREN’S HOSPITAL BONDS INITIATIVE

Proposition 4 is another bond measure, this one specifically is for funding hospitals.

The breakdown is as follows (ballotpedia)
- 72 percent ($1.08 billion) to seven nonprofit hospitals providing comprehensive services that have high volumes of children eligible for governmental programs and children with special health needs eligible for California Children’s Services.
- 18 percent ($270 million) to five University of California hospitals, Davis Children’s Hospital (UCD), Mattel Children’s Hospital (UCLA), Irvine (UCI), San Francisco Children’s Hospital (UCSF), San Diego Children’s Hospital (UCSD).
- 10 percent ($150 million) to public and private hospitals that provide pediatric services to children eligible for California Children’s Services.

This is the third bond measure Californians will be voting on. The two other hospital bond propositions, one for 980 million dollars and one for 750 million dollars...
dollars both passed. **BWW RECOMMENDATION: NO RECOMMENDATION**

As much as we know that infrastructure is necessary and ensuring that hospitals have the money they need is incredibly important; for the cost of the bond, plus increased interest, create a couple more logistics on how this is going to impact our most vulnerable residents. Many times people of color, low income and low-income people of color are subject to bias and substandard care. Additionally, with the booming healthcare industry, it does beg the question, why do we need to provide another bond to our hospitals. On the other hand, this Proposition is aimed at helping the citizens of California, which is a hard thing to say no. You’re on your own with this one. But many of BWW’s partners are suggesting a yes vote.

**PROPOSITION 5: PROPERTY TAX TRANSFER INITIATIVE (2018)**

Proposition 5 is an attempt to amend the infamous Proposition 13. It is specifically targeted to allow folks who are 55 or over or disabled to be able to transfer their current property tax on their home to a new property. People in the above-mentioned categories can transfer their current property taxes on their home to (a) the new home’s market value; (b) the new home’s location in the state, or (c) the buyer’s number of moves. Essentially this proposition eliminates the sales price in the purchase and sales price in the property taxes.

This was an attempt by certain entities as a red herring to confuse people about another proposition. They had thought was going to be on the ballot. That proposition was aimed at re-forming Proposition 13. It, however, is not on this ballot.

**BWW RECOMMENDATION: NO**

Although most Californians need all the breaks they can get in this high-cost state, this proposition is not the way. It really is just an attempt by folks to further entrench proposition 13 into California’s constitution. This proposition could slash up to 2 billion dollars in funds from our local cities and schools, that very much need and depend on those taxes.

**PROPOSITION 6: REPEALS 2017’S FUEL TAX AND VEHICLE FEE INCREASES AND REQUIRES PUBLIC VOTE ON FUTURE INCREASES**

Proposition 6 repeals a 2017 law called The Road Repair and Accountability Act of 2017 or Senate Bill 1. This bill increased a fuel tax on gasoline and diesel fuel, as well as increased vehicle license fees and enacted a transportation improvement fee. SB 1 increased the base gasoline tax by 12 cents and diesel tax by 4 percent. It also added an additional fixed rate on both fuels. The transportation improvement fee added an additional $25 - $175 on vehicles per year (paid usually with your registration).

The state expects about $4.4 billion dollars raised every year to fund infrastructure projects. Unlike the other propositions, this is a referendum, meaning that this bill is current law and the proposition is an attempt to strike down the law. In short, voting no on this proposition means you support The Road Repair and Accountability Act and voting yes means you would want to strike down this legislation.

**BWW RECOMMENDATION: NO**

So I know we are all a bit fed up with the tax increases that we seem to see part two years, but if we ever want to get out of the cycle of bonds that almost all the other propositions this Fall are about, this is that alternative. The funding for this proposition goes to fixing the crumbled up roads, bridges, and streets in California. If you’ve ever driven over a bridge and felt a bit uneasy about the safety of the road or had to repair your tire unexpectedly then you hit a pothole then you know first hand about the condition of California’s roads. In addition, this propositions has created thousands of jobs across California in the public works spaces. Although this is a regressive tax and the registration fees are not cheap, we need to make sure we fund the very important non-sexy infrastructure road projects in California.

**PROPOSITION 7: PERMANENT DAYLIGHT SAVING TIME MEASURE**

Proposition 7 would allow California to have permanent daylight saving time if the federal government law changes to allow states to opt into permanent daylight saving time. This would also require a two-thirds vote from the California legislature in order to move to permanent daylight saving.

**BWW RECOMMENDATIONS: NO**

Friends, out of all the important things that need changing in California, this has to be near the bottom if not the bottom. First, the federal government would need to pass a new law saying that states can do this before the law would pass. Second, it actually is not all that helpful. During the winter months, we get less daylight as it is, because of, well, science. Having permanent daylight saving time doesn’t permanently change the light of the long winter months, makes it that during the winter months many of us would be sending our kids to school, going to work and exercising in the dark.

**PROPOSITION 8: LIMITS ON DIALYSIS CLINICS’ REVENUE AND REQUIRED REFUNDS INITIATIVE**

Proposition 8 is aimed directly at dialysis clinics. It would limit the charges to 115 percent of the cost for direct patient care and quality improvement cost including education and technology. In addition, it requires a rebate if dialysis companies exceed that limit, as well as prohibit clinics from refusing patient care based on the source of payments. If passed, the proposition would require the dialysis clinics to calculate the amount of revenue that exceeds a specific cap then require that the money be given back to payers (excluding government entities).

Currently, there are 588 licensed clinics in the state of California serving about 80,000 patients each month. The vast majority of dialysis clinics are owned by two for-profit companies, DaVita which owns 50% of the market and Fresenius Medical Care owned by two for-profit companies, DaVita which owns 50% of the market and Fresenius Medical Care that owns about 22%. There is an estimated total profit of $3 billion annually from dialysis clinics.

**BWW RECOMMENDATION: YES**

Unfortunately, dialysis is something alive and well in too many communities of color throughout California. Whether it was from lack of access to good food, lack of education around health or nutrition or lack of access to good health care, many folks across California spend three to four days a week in a dialysis center. There are an estimated 10,000 African-Americans with kidney failure is need of dialysis to stay alive.

This proposition is rooted from legislation SEIU UHW tried to get passed earlier this year. The legislation, that died attempted to 1) implement safe staffing levels to better serve patients, 2) establish a 45 minute turnaround time to allow patients to receive treatment, and 3) require dialysis companies to report every 5-6 years. Prop 8 is another attempt for UHRW to try to tackle the behemoth task of overhauling the very profitable business of dialysis care. Our belief is that any increase for dialysis care can come from the money that we spend on the training and treatments of patients is a priority.
towards the breaks the worker is required to receive. To be honest ya’ll. This feels like we should take the lead from the folks who are directly impacted by this law, which is not us. They are 17,000 emergency medical technicians (EMTs) and paramedics in California. This proposition would only affect the private sector EMT and paramedics (which is 75% of the market).

EMTs and paramedics often are called to duty on their break when there is an emergency. However current California laws dictates that it is illegal to have people on-call while they are on break. Particularly, workers must be provided breaks that are off duty and not interruptible even if an emergency occurs. This law would allow, for example, if an EMT is taking their break and got an emergency call, they would answer the emergency call and get their break back later. Seems pretty fair to us, but we know the devil is in the details here.

**PROPOSITION 11: AMBULANCE EMPLOYEES PAID ON-CALL BREAKS, TRAINING, AND MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES INITIATIVE (2018)**

Prop 12 would require that chicken/hens that are used for laying eggs, veal calves and breeding pigs would have baseline minimum space requirements for cages. All egg-laying hens, after Dec 31, 2021, will be required to be in a cage-free environment. It also requires the state of California to issue regulations and ban the sale of products that do not meet the new standards once it goes into effect.
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