



2020 California Voter Guide

Public Health Awakened is a national network of public health professionals organizing for health, equity, and justice. We work with social justice movements on strategic and collective action to create a world in which everyone can thrive and to resist the threats faced by communities of color and low-income communities. The Los Angeles Chapter was formed in 2019 and is organizing local public health professionals to take action on local, regional, and state social justice issues that impact health and equity in partnership with local organizations and campaigns to support their work.

The intention of this voter guide is to apply a public health lens to the different measures and propositions on the upcoming November 2020 ballot for the purpose of providing voter recommendations based on our assessment of their impact on health, equity, and racial justice. Below is a summary of our recommendations, in addition to our [two-page snapshot](#). Further content takes a deeper dive on each ballot measure for your information and consideration.

Proposition 14		Proposition 19		Proposition 24	
Proposition 15		Proposition 20		Proposition 25	
Proposition 16		Proposition 21		LA Measure J	
Proposition 17		Proposition 22		LAUSD RR	
Proposition 18		Proposition 23			

These ballot measure positions reflect the views of the Public Health Awakened LA Chapter's volunteer members, and not necessarily that of Human Impact Partners.

Two-page snapshot voter guide can be found here:

<https://publichealthawakened.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/10/LA-Chapter-2020-Voter-Guide-2-Page.pdf>

Proposition 14: Stem Cell Research Institute Bond Initiative

Overview: Prop 14 extends support of Proposition 71 (2004), establishing \$5.5 billion in state general obligation bonds to fund stem cell medical research and create changes to the existing governing board. \$1.5 billion of the funding would be earmarked for diseases directly affecting the central nervous system.

Recommendation: [Neutral](#)

Public Health rationale: Dedicating government funding to support advances in health research is a high priority for public health professionals, positively affecting health for those experiencing illness and disease. However we do not feel we can weigh in with a well-informed perspective given the information regarding oversight and accountability that is available. While we support health research in general, this allocates \$5.5 Billion from the already limited state budget, which may restrict funding for other needed areas.

Arguments For:

- CIRM has funded 1000+ research projects at 70 institutions, leading 2,500+ medical discoveries, accelerating human clinical trials with the mission of treating and curing chronic illnesses. 2,000+ patients have benefited directly from CIRM-funded clinical trials.¹
- The work of CIRM is directly improving lives: 55,000 full time jobs in California were created and upwards of \$3 billion was generated in matching funds, affirming the voter’s decision to approve initial funding.
- Continue life-saving medical therapies: without add on funding, promising human clinical investigation would be forced to stall and ultimately limit life-saving research into public health crisis like cancer, diabetes, HIV/AIDs, heart disease, and more.

Arguments Against:

- Limited institutional oversight and visibility: “it does nothing to address CIRM’s built-in conflicts of interest, or its lack of legislative oversight — despite it being an agency supported wholly by public funds.” (Center for Genetics and Society); however, more than 80 patient advocacy organizations endorse the invaluable implications and commitment toward advancing medical research.

Groups supporting/ Funding

- Yes: \$9.3 Million: Californians for Stem Cell Research, Treatments & Cures PAC, Yes on 14: Californians for Stem Cell Research, Treatments and Cures, Robert N. Klein II (Klein Financial Corporation), Juvenile Diabetes Research Foundation, Open Philanthropy Action Fund
- No: \$0.00

Fiscal Impact

- Increased state costs to repay bonds estimated at about \$260 million per year over the next roughly 30 years

¹ Ballotpedia. California Proposition 14, Last retrieved October 1, 2020 from: [https://ballotpedia.org/California_Proposition_14,_Stem_Cell_Research_Institute_Bond_Initiative_\(2020\)](https://ballotpedia.org/California_Proposition_14,_Stem_Cell_Research_Institute_Bond_Initiative_(2020)).

Proposition 15: Tax on Commercial & Industrial Properties for Education & Local Government Funding

Overview: Prop 15 would raise \$12 billion per year to invest in schools and local communities by closing commercial property tax loopholes that allow corporations to avoid paying their fair share. California's schools and community services have always been underfunded and are facing even bigger budget cuts because of the economic crisis caused by the pandemic. Proposition 15 does not change residential property taxes and would protect homeowners, renters, small businesses, and agriculture.

Recommendation: [Support](#)

Public Health Rationale: Prop 15 would reinvest funds into California's schools and local communities to fill critical budget gaps and provide services that are critical to our health and wellbeing. Improvements in health require significant investment in the social, economic, and environmental conditions that keep us healthy. If passed, Prop 15 would invest in things we all value: healthy families, strong communities, and quality education.

Groups supporting/ Funding

- Yes/Support: \$42,933,295.63: California Teachers Association, Chan Zuckerberg Initiative Advocacy, SEIU California State Council, Million Voter Project Action Fund, Pico California Action.
- No/Against: \$29,906,729.40: California Business Roundtable Issues PAC, California Taxpayers Association - Protect Taxpayer Rights, California Business Properties Association Issues PAC, AMERCO, California Farm Bureau Federation.²³

Fiscal Impact: Increased property taxes on commercial properties worth more than \$3 million providing \$6.5 billion to \$11.5 billion in new funding to local governments and schools.

² Yes on 15 - Schools and Communities First. Campaign page. Last retrieved October 1, 2020, from: <https://www.yes15.org/>.

³ Ballotpedia.org. California Proposition 15. Last retrieved October 1, 2020, from:

[https://ballotpedia.org/California_Proposition_15,_Tax_on_Commercial_and_Industrial_Properties_for_Education_and_Local_Government_Funding_Initiative_\(2020\)](https://ballotpedia.org/California_Proposition_15,_Tax_on_Commercial_and_Industrial_Properties_for_Education_and_Local_Government_Funding_Initiative_(2020)).

Proposition 16: Repeal Proposition 209 Affirmative Action Amendment (2020)

Overview: Proposition 16 aims to repeal the anti-affirmative action law, Proposition 209 (1996), to once again allow state government, local governments, and public universities to consider race, sex, color, ethnicity, or national origin when making decisions about public employment, public education, and public contracting. Currently, Proposition 209 prohibits government and public institutions from discriminating against or granting preferential treatment with affirmative action programs.

Recommendation: [Support](#)

Public Health Rationale: Women and people of color have historically been disadvantaged due to unfair policies and practices that continue to limit their employment, education, and contracting opportunities. Without affirmative action policies, these opportunities have been further concentrated among a privileged few, reducing the diversity and representation of all Californians in our schools and workplaces. This accumulation of opportunities and access turns the concept of meritocracy into a myth by essentially shutting the door on--and shutting out--the people behind them. Don't be fooled by the opposition's plea for equality. A vote for Proposition 16 is a vote for equity - a level playing field that allows everyone a chance to compete fairly.

- Ensures women and people of color who have been historically disadvantaged due to the effects of sexism and racism can compete on equal footing for jobs, promotions, and contracts.
- Family money, connections, and status are greater predictors of success and social mobility than hard work and ability. It's time to level the playing field for communities of color who are less likely to have these privileges bestowed at birth.
- Representations of women and people of color in the public sector workforce and on college campuses haven't kept pace with the State's changing demographics. For example, Black and Latino students make up [60% of California's high school enrollment](#), but they comprise [just 28%](#) of UC freshmen admitted in 2019, and the percent of enrollment among Black, Latino and Native American students have declined at the most competitive UC schools from 1995-2019. We can turn this around with targeted outreach and hiring practices meant to increase diversity.⁴

Groups supporting/ Funding

- **Yes: Opportunity for All Coalition PAC in support of Proposition 16 raised \$12,493,052.45.** The largest donor was M. Quin Delaney, Founder and Board Chair of Akonadi Foundation.
- **No: Californians for Equal Rights PAC against Proposition 16 raised \$961,116.28.** The largest donor was Students for Fair Admissions, headed by Edward Blum that seeks to recruit students who have been rejected by selective universities and file lawsuits on their behalf.

Fiscal Impact: This proposition has no direct fiscal impact on the State budget.

⁴ Times Editorial Board. (September 2020). Endorsement: Yes on Prop. 16, because the U.S. is not a meritocracy, *Los Angeles Times*. Last retrieved October 1, 2020, from: <https://www.latimes.com/opinion/story/2020-09-11/endorsement-affirmative-action-ban>.

Other sources: Ballotopia. California Proposition 16, Repeal Proposition 209 Affirmative Action Amendment (2020). Last retrieved October 1, 2020, from: [https://ballotpedia.org/California_Proposition_16,_Repeal_Proposition_209_Affirmative_Action_Amendment_\(2020\)](https://ballotpedia.org/California_Proposition_16,_Repeal_Proposition_209_Affirmative_Action_Amendment_(2020)).

CalMatters. California Nov 2020 Election Guide: Proposition 16. Last retrieved October 1, 2020, from: <https://calmatters.org/election-2020-guide/proposition-16-affirmative-action>. Yes on 16, the Opportunity for All Coalition. Campaign page. Last retrieved October 1, 2020, from: <https://voteyesonprop16.org>.

Proposition 17: Voting Rights Restoration for Persons on Parole

Overview: This proposition would amend the California constitution to allow people on parole for felony convictions to vote.

Recommendation: [Support](#)

Public Health Rationale: Everyone should be able to contribute their voice to the political process and participate in communicating their needs and values by voting. Voter participation is an indicator of both social power and social cohesion. Voting has strong, but indirect, connections to health. Communities with higher rates of voter participation typically have more social and political power than other communities and are often better positioned to successfully influence the local conditions that shape local health outcomes.

- Currently, 19 other states allow people with felony convictions who are on parole to vote.
- California has about 50,000 people who have completed prison terms but cannot vote while on parole. These Californians should be encouraged to reenter society and have a stake in their community.
- Civic engagement may decrease crimes committed by people on parole and recidivism
- Voting demonstrates personal agency and may help remove stigma of past actions.
- People who complete their prison sentences deserve the right to participate in democracy.
- Stripping the right to vote from formerly incarcerated people is a form of voter suppression.⁵

Groups supporting/ Funding

- Yes/Support: \$582,000: Free the Vote, Yes on 17 PAC -largest donors include Secure Democracy (a voting rights advocacy group), Brennan Center for Justice, and Susan Pritzker (philanthropist and democratic donor).
- No: \$0

Fiscal Impact: Increased one-time state costs, likely in the hundreds of thousands of dollars, to update voter registration cards and systems.

⁵ Ballotpedia. California Proposition 17. Last retrieved October 1, 2020, from: [https://ballotpedia.org/California_Proposition_17,_Voting_Rights_Restoration_for_Persons_on_Parole_Amendment_\(2020\)](https://ballotpedia.org/California_Proposition_17,_Voting_Rights_Restoration_for_Persons_on_Parole_Amendment_(2020)).

Yes on 17; Free the Vote. Campaign homepage. Last retrieved October 1, 2020, from: <https://yeson17.vote/>.

Cal Matters. California Nov 2020 Election Guide: Proposition 17. Last retrieved October 1, 2020, from: <https://calmatters.org/election-2020-guide/proposition-17-parole-vote/>.

UCLA Policy Brief (September 2020). Better Health, Greater Social Cohesion Linked to Voter Participation. Last retrieved October 1, 2020, from: <https://healthpolicy.ucla.edu/publications/search/pages/detail.aspx?PubID=1963>.

Public Health Alliance of Southern California, California Healthy Places Index Policy Guide - Voting. Last retrieved October 1, 2020, from: <https://healthyplacesindex.org/policy-actions/voting/>.

Proposition 18: Primary Voting for 17-Year-Olds Amendment

Overview: This proposition would amend the CA Constitution to allow 17-year olds to vote in primaries and special elections if they will be 18 by the next general election

Recommendation: [Support](#)

Public Health Rationale: Voter participation is an indicator of both social power and social cohesion. Voting has strong, but indirect, connections to health. Communities with higher rates of voter participation typically have more social and political power than other communities and are often better positioned to successfully influence the local conditions that shape local health outcomes.

- Currently, 18 other states and Washington DC allow 17 year olds to vote early when they will be eligible to vote in the next general election.
- Allowing first-time teen voters to participate early can increase interest in voter participation among young people.
- If someone will be 18 years old by the general election, they should be allowed to help choose the candidates on the November ballot.
- At 17 years old, many teens are employed, pay taxes and are able to enlist in the military. Voting access, if eligible, makes sense.
- Allows young people to weigh in on important issues and leadership choices that will impact their adult life. ⁶

Groups supporting/ Funding

- Yes: \$342,000: Yes on Proposition 18 PAC - Largest donors include the California Nurses Association, Committee to Innovate for California's Future, Assemblymember Evan Low's Ballot Measure Committee, and Kevin Mullin for Assembly 2020
- No: \$0

Fiscal Impact: Increased costs for counties, likely between several hundreds of thousands of dollars and \$1 million every two years, to send and process voting materials to eligible registered 17-year-olds.

⁶ Ballotpedia. California Proposition 18. Last retrieved October 1, 2020, from:

[https://ballotpedia.org/California_Proposition_18_Primary_Voting_for_17-Year-Olds_Amendment_\(2020\)](https://ballotpedia.org/California_Proposition_18_Primary_Voting_for_17-Year-Olds_Amendment_(2020)).

Cal Matters. California Nov 2020 Election Guide: Proposition 18. Last retrieved October 1, 2020, from: <https://calmatters.org/election-2020-guide/proposition-18-primary-voting-17-year-olds/>.

Voters Edge. Measures - California General Election; Proposition 18. Last retrieved October 1, 2020, from: <https://votersedge.org/en/ca/ballot/election/2020-11-03/measure/proposition-18>.

Public Health Alliance of Southern California, California Healthy Places Index Policy Guide - Voting. Last retrieved October 1, 2020, from: <https://healthyplacesindex.org/policy-actions/voting/>.

UCLA Policy Brief (September 2020). Better Health, Greater Social Cohesion Linked to Voter Participation. Last retrieved October 1, 2020, from: <https://healthpolicy.ucla.edu/publications/search/pages/detail.aspx?PubID=1963>.

Proposition 19: Property Tax Transfers, Exemptions & Revenue for Wildlife Agencies & Counties

Overview: The ballot measure would allow eligible homeowners to transfer their tax assessments anywhere within the state and allow tax assessments to be transferred to a more expensive home with an upward adjustment. The number of times that a tax assessment can be transferred would increase from one to three for persons over 55 years old or with severe disabilities (disaster and contamination victims would continue to be allowed one transfer).

Recommendation: [Neutral](#)

Public Health Rationale: While we agree that it is a good idea to close the inheritance loophole and reinvest the subsequent tax revenue in wildlife agencies and local government, it doesn't go far enough. It still allows homeowners who inherit property to transfer their tax assessment if it's their primary residence and we are troubled by the potential unintended consequences of expanding the ability to transfer tax assessments outlined in the proposition.

Arguments For

- Local governments and schools could gain tens of millions of dollars of property tax revenue per year with a large portion going toward fire protection by closing the inheritance loophole. [In Los Angeles County, almost two-thirds of homes inherited under the current system were second residences or rental properties; similar trends exist in other counties.](#)

Arguments Against

- Allows eligible homeowners to transfer their tax assessments anywhere within the state and be transferred to a more expensive home with an upward adjustment;
- Increases the number of times that persons over 55 years old or with severe disabilities can transfer their tax assessments from one to three;
- Benefits those who were lucky enough to buy a home years ago and hold onto it as values skyrocketed. It would give them a huge tax break and greater buying power in an already expensive real estate market. It would skew tax breaks further away from people who don't own a home or who may be struggling to buy one. (LA Times)⁷

Groups supporting/ Funding

- Yes: \$36,000,000; California Association of Realtors Issues Mobilization PAC, National Association of Realtors, California Nurses Association
- No: \$45,000; Howard Jarvis Taxpayers Association

Fiscal Impact: Local governments and schools could gain tens of millions of dollars of property tax revenue per year. These gains could grow over time to a few hundred million dollars per year.

⁷ Ballotopia. California Proposition 19, Last retrieved October 1, 2020, from:

[https://ballotpedia.org/California_Proposition_19_Property_Tax_Transfers_Exemptions_and_Revenue_for_Wildfire_Agencies_and_Counties_Amendment_\(2020\)](https://ballotpedia.org/California_Proposition_19_Property_Tax_Transfers_Exemptions_and_Revenue_for_Wildfire_Agencies_and_Counties_Amendment_(2020)).

CalMatters. California Nov 2020 Election Guide: Proposition 19. Last retrieved October 1, 2020, from: <https://calmatters.org/election-2020-guide/proposition-19-property-tax-break> Editorial Board. (September 2020). Endorsement: Vote no on Prop. 19, an unwelcome combo of good and bad tax proposals, *Los Angeles Times*. Last retrieved October 1, 2020, from:

<https://www.latimes.com/opinion/story/2020-09-17/vote-no-on-proposition-19>.

Bend the Arc. (October 2020). November 2020 Voter Guide California Propositions.

Proposition 20: Criminal Sentencing, Parole, and DNA Collection Initiative

Overview: Proposition 20 offers three changes: 1) reclassifies certain misdemeanor crimes (including shoplifting) as felonies, 2) expands the list of offenses that disqualify inmates from parole, and 3) would require inmates to submit DNA samples to state databases

Recommendation: [Against](#)

Public Health Rationale: Incarceration creates adverse long-term physical and mental health outcomes, negatively impacts social, educational, and economic opportunities for incarcerated people, and primarily affects low-income communities and communities of color. Overcrowding prisons, especially during the COVID-19 pandemic, creates unnecessary infection risks for inmates and staff, and this proposition would only add more people to California prisons. Claims that bills that are “tough on crime” prevent further crime are unfounded, and historically have shown the opposite effect.

- This proposition will increase prison populations and lengthen sentencing to already overpopulated prisons
- Eliminating parole possibility and/or extending parole length can lead to further violence/gang activity within prisons
- This proposition threatens to cut funding for ongoing rehabilitation programs known to reduce recidivism
- Adding more people to California prisons is an unnecessary burden on taxpayers that could be better spent in public sector areas like health, education, or housing
- Combining 3 different components in this Proposition is intentionally confusing to voters⁸

Groups supporting/ Funding

- **YES:**\$4,4304,653: Largely police unions and grocery stores looking to prevent shoplifting: Association of Los Angeles Deputy Sheriffs, Los Angeles Police Protective, Peace Officers Research Association of California, Albertsons Safeway & Kroger, California Grocers Association
- **NO:** \$5,636, 760: \$1 million from Jerry Brown \$1.25 million from Chan Zuckerberg Initiative, SEIU California State Council, ACLU of Northern California, California Partnership to End Domestic Violence, California Teachers Association, League of Women Voters

Fiscal Impact: Increased state and local correctional costs likely in the tens of millions of dollars annually, primarily related to increases in county jail populations and levels of community supervision.

⁸ Hussain, S. (September 2020). Grocery stores are pushing California to be tougher on crime. Here's why, *Los Angeles Times*. Last retrieved October 1, 2020, from <https://www.latimes.com/business/story/2020-09-16/california-grocery-industry-supports-tougher-crime-laws>.

Legislative Analyst Office. Proposition 20. Last retrieved October 1, 2020, from: <https://lao.ca.gov/BallotAnalysis/Proposition?number=20&year=2020>.

Robert Wood Foundation. (March 2020). Mass Incarceration Threatens Health Equity in America. Last retrieved October 1, 2020, from:

<https://www.rwjf.org/en/library/research/2019/01/mass-incarceration-threatens-health-equity-in-america.html#:~:text=People who are incarcerated face,term physical and mental health.>

California Partnership to End Domestic Violence. Addressing the Criminal Legal System. Last retrieved October 1, 2020, from: <https://www.cpedv.org/post/addressing-criminal-legal-system>.

No on Prop 20. Campaign page. Last retrieved October 1, 2020, from: <https://noprop20.vote/facts/>.

CalMatters. California Nov 2020 Election Guide: Proposition 20. Last retrieved October 1, 2020, from: <https://calmatters.org/election-2020-guide/proposition-20-crime>.

Proposition 21: Local Rent Control Initiative

Overview: The proposition would allow local governments to enact rent control on residential property, except those that (a) are first occupied within the last 15 years and (b) units owned by landlords who own no more than two housing units with separate titles or subdivided interests. This ballot measure would require local governments to adopt rental control where landlords can increase rental rates of up to 15 percent over the first three years of a new tenancy. The rising cost of rent and lack of affordable housing, especially in cities like Los Angeles, is a major cause of housing insecurity and homelessness. While rent has steadily increased, incomes have not gone up to match living costs. This means more households are spending greater portions of their income to pay for rent and causes greater financial burden on low-wage earners.

Recommendation: [Support](#)

Public Health Rationale: Housing insecurity and homelessness are a critical social determinant of health. Individuals experiencing chronic homelessness or housing insecurity have higher rates of physical and mental health conditions and increased risk of mortality⁹. With rising costs of rent and other essential household items, rent control is a strong preventive measure against displacement and homelessness¹⁰.

- Proponents argue renters in CA typically pay 50 percent more than renters in other states. In some parts of the state, rent is more than double the national average rent.
- Housing insecurity disproportionately impacts low-wage workers, people of color, and immigrants. This has exacerbated during the pandemic, where BIPOC and immigrant residents are more likely to live in crowded conditions or face constant fear of eviction.

Groups supporting/ Funding

- **Yes:** \$24 Million
 - AIDS Healthcare Foundation, California Democratic Party, ACLU of Southern California
- **No:** \$40 Million
 - Gavin Newsom, California Council for Affordable Housing, California NAACP State Conference, several Real Estate corporations

Fiscal Impact: Overall, a potential reduction in state and local revenues in the high tens of millions of dollars per year over time. Depending on actions by local communities, revenue losses could be less or more.

⁹ Taylor, L. "Housing And Health: An Overview Of The Literature," Health Affairs Health Policy Brief, June 7, 2018. DOI: 10.1377/hpb20180313.396577

¹⁰ Times Editorial Board. (September 2020). Endorsement: Yes on Prop. 21. California has a housing crisis and cities should be able to protect tenants, *Los Angeles Times*. Last retrieved October 1, 2020, from: <https://www.latimes.com/opinion/story/2020-09-10/yes-prop-21>.

Proposition 22: App-Based Drivers as Contractors and Labor Policy Initiative

Overview: Proposition 22 will define the designation of app-based drivers as independent contractors rather than full-time employees. This proposition would overrule AB 5, specifically with regards to app-based drivers who provide delivery services on-demand, such as rideshares through Uber or Lyft, or food delivery through companies like DoorDash and Postmates.

Recommendation: [Against](#)

Public Health Rationale: We believe that app-based drivers should receive healthcare benefits, have control over their schedules, and make guaranteed wages; all of which would be denied by passing Proposition 22. Supporting this proposition would constitute a win for profit-driven corporations that have long denied benefits to their employees and will likely have long-lasting effects on contract work in other industries. Taking a strong stance against Proposition 22 will set a precedent for future unionized work and create a just working environment for millions of Californians who rely on gig-work.

- Prop 22 would deny app-based drivers for Lyft and Uber paid sick leave and disability insurance, as well as reduce drivers' guaranteed wages to only \$5.64 an hour.
- Prop 22 would make these essential workers accept below-minimum wages, which has widespread negative implications for the health and well-being of drivers, their families, and our communities.

Groups supporting/ Funding

- **Yes:** \$185 Million - Major ride-share corporations such as Uber, Lyft, DoorDash, Instacart as well as Chambers of Commerce throughout California
- **No:** \$10 Million - Major workers unions such as International Brotherhood of Teamsters, California State Council of Laborers, SEIU

Fiscal Impact: Minor increases in state income taxes paid by rideshare and delivery company drivers and investors.

Proposition 23: Dialysis Clinic Requirements Initiative

Overview: Requires a minimum of one Physician present on site while patients are being treated

Recommendation: [Neutral](#)

Public Health Rationale: This proposition may lead to greater quality care for dialysis patients and proposes greater accountability for for-profit kidney dialysis clinics. However, we have concerns that if passed, it may not increase quality of care significantly but rather increase patient costs and reduce the availability of clinics for low-income communities and communities of color who will be hardest hit.

Argument For

- It mandates a licensed physician on site at all times. In case of emergencies, the physician can respond immediately.
- It requires clinics to report dialysis-related infection data to state and federal governments, leading to greater accountability.
- It prohibits clinics from closing or reducing services without state approval.
- It prohibits clinics from refusing to treat patients based on the source of payment for care.

Argument Against

- News costs for on site doctors at all times would raise costs, potentially causing clinics to reduce their hours and open few locations to control costs.
- It will likely drive up the cost of services, disproportionately impacting Californians who are covered by Medicare and must cover the 20% copay out of pocket.
- These measures will not increase quality of care as promised, while the number of reported problems at clinics in California are lower than the national average.

Groups supporting/ Funding

- **Yes:** \$ 6 Million - SEIU West
- **No:** \$93 Million - DaVita, Fresenius Medical Care, California Medical Association

Fiscal Impact: Increased state and local government costs likely in the low tens of millions of dollars annually.

Proposition 24: Consumer Personal Information Law and Agency Initiative

Overview: Prop 24 expands the 2018 California Consumer Privacy law; creates a California Privacy Protection Agency; and permits consumers to: (1) prevent businesses from sharing personal information; (2) correct inaccurate personal information; and (3) limit businesses' use of "sensitive personal information."

*It is noteworthy that major silicon valley technology corporations have remained silent on this proposition.

Recommendation: [Neutral](#)

Public Health Rationale: Safeguarding personal privacy online as it pertains to protecting health records and private information is important, but we don't feel well-informed enough about this proposition or its potential unintended consequences to strongly support or oppose it.

Arguments For

- This proposition would safeguard privacy online, expand consumer rights, and create online transparency
- Prop 24 would fine corporations for exposing personal data of minors
- Allows consumers to tell businesses to limit use of sensitive data like location, health, race and religion

Arguments Against

- This overly complicated proposition will allow tech corporations to charge consumers additional costs in exchange for privacy, and those who refuse to pay will be likely to encounter service downgrades and more pop-up ads, ultimately create inequity based on ability to pay
- The CCP Law is still new and should be assessed before expanding it further
- Lacks backing from a larger coalition of privacy advocates¹¹

Groups supporting/ Funding

- **Yes:** \$5.5 Million - Andrew Yang, Consumer Watchdog, California NAACP State Conference, LA Times Editorial Board
- **No:** \$48,000 - Dolores Huerta, ACLU of California, Consumer Action, Color of Change, League of Women Voters of California

Fiscal Impact: Increased state costs of at least \$10 million annually for a new state agency to oversee and enforce consumer privacy laws; Increased state costs, not likely to exceed the low millions of dollars annually, for increased court and Department of Justice enforcement workload. Some or all of these costs would be paid by penalties collected for violations of consumer privacy laws.

¹¹ PR Newswire, Prop 24 is a Pay for Privacy Scheme, Experts Warn. Last retrieved October 1, 2020, from: <https://www.prnewswire.com/news-releases/prop-24-is-a-pay-for-privacy-scheme-experts-warn-301142434.html>.

Yes on 24. Campaign page. Last retrieved October 1, 2020, from: <https://www.caprivacy.org/>.

Cal Matters. California Nov 2020 Election Guide: Prop 24. Last retrieved October 1, 2020, from: <https://calmatters.org/election-2020-guide/proposition-24-data-privacy/>.

Ballotopia, California Proposition 24. Last retrieved October 1, 2020, from:

[https://ballotpedia.org/California_Proposition_24_Consumer_Personal_Information_Law_and_Agency_Initiative_\(2020\)](https://ballotpedia.org/California_Proposition_24_Consumer_Personal_Information_Law_and_Agency_Initiative_(2020)).

Proposition 25: Replaces Cash Bail with Risk Assessments for Suspects Awaiting Trial

Overview: This proposition would transform how people get out of jail while awaiting trial — making California the first state to replace cash bail with an algorithm.

Recommendation: [Against](#)

Public Health Rationale: Incarceration impacts one’s housing, job security, and general health, and the current bail system predominately—and unfairly—keeps low-income individuals and communities of color awaiting trial in jail. While cash bail reform is important to public health, this is not the solution. Computer algorithms have been shown to exhibit and perpetuate bias towards the very folks this proposition hopes to help.

- Voting “no” would reject a 2018 law (SB 10, which California’s three ACLU affiliates opposed) that was misleadingly promoted as pretrial reform
- In reality, a yes vote would replace cash bail (which is inherently classist, racist, and unfair) with a system that is even more unfair (using racially biased risk assessment tools, giving judges nearly unlimited discretion to incarcerate, and increasing funding and power for law enforcement).
- Civil rights activists are against it.
- Californians should focus efforts on replacing the existing money bail system with reforms that *reduce* pretrial incarceration and guarantee meaningful due process for all accused people. Keeping the 2018 law will likely result in more pretrial incarceration and will make achieving meaningful reform impossible.
- NOTE: The bail industry also wants people to vote against this.¹² However, just because we happen to agree about voting against this specific proposition, doesn’t mean we support the bail industry.

Groups supporting/ Funding

- **Yes:** \$ 8.3 Million - California Democratic Party, California Teachers Association, League of Women Voters
- **No:** \$9 Million - California NAACP State Conference, Crime Victims United of California, California Black Chamber of Commerce, California Asian Chamber of Commerce, California Hispanic Chambers of Commerce, American Bail Coalition, Golden State Bail Agent Association

Fiscal Impact

- Increased state and local costs possibly in the mid hundreds of millions of dollars annually for a new process for releasing people from jail prior to trial. Unclear whether some of the increased state costs would be offset by local funds currently spent on this type of workload.
- Decreased county jail costs possibly in the high tens of millions of dollars annually.
- Unknown net impact on state and local tax revenues generally related to people spending money on goods rather than paying for release from jail prior to trial.

¹²

Ballotopia, California Proposition 25. Last retrieved October 1, 2020, from: [https://ballotpedia.org/California_Proposition_25,_Replace_Cash_Bail_with_Risk_Assessments_Referendum_\(2020\)](https://ballotpedia.org/California_Proposition_25,_Replace_Cash_Bail_with_Risk_Assessments_Referendum_(2020)).

Human Rights Watch. US: Californians Should Reject Proposition 25. Last retrieved October 1, 2020, from:

<https://www.hrw.org/news/2020/07/29/us-californians-should-reject-proposition-25>.

Justice LA. 2020 Los Angeles County Voter Guide. Last retrieved October 1, 2020, from: <https://justicelanow.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/08/Coalition-Voting-Guide-2020-9-21.pdf>.

Cal Matters. California Nov 2020 Election Guide: Prop 25. Last retrieved October 1, 2020, from: <https://calmatters.org/election-2020-guide/proposition-25-cash-bail/>.

Human Impact Partners. (February 2020). Liberating Our Health: Ending the Harms of Pretrial Incarceration and Money Bail. Last retrieved October 1, 2020, from:

https://humanimpact.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/02/HIP_HealthNotBailNationalReport_2020.02_reduced.pdf.

Los Angeles County Measure J: Budget Allocation for Alternatives to Incarceration Charter Amendment

Overview: Measure J amends the Los Angeles County charter to require a minimum of 10% of locally controlled, unrestricted tax revenue to be allocated to community reinvestment and alternatives to incarceration annually. This amount, growing close to \$1B once fully phased in – will be invested in programs to improve community health by addressing social determinants of health like access to housing, jobs, capital for small, POC-owned businesses, and health and mental health services.

Recommendation: [Support](#)

Public Health Rationale: Today, LA County spends \$1.75 billion of its unrestricted budget on law enforcement and incarceration and only \$230 million on programs and services designed to promote community health and wellness. This over-investment in systems that harm communities, especially communities of color, drives poor health and social outcomes. This ballot measure represents a critical opportunity to properly invest in the critical resources, programs, and services we all need to thrive, and align our budget with public health priorities.

- Measure J represents systemic change. Instead of advocating for proper funding for community reinvestment and alternatives to incarceration every year, this measure permanently secures funding for key priorities
- Allows for greater community involvement by authorizing the Board of Supervisors to develop a transparent, participatory process to allocate funds
- County forbidden to spend these funds on prisons, jails or law enforcement (where 42% of current budget is allocated)
- The County has already developed a roadmap for allocating funds through the Alternatives to Incarceration Initiative. Measure J funds can be used to move the recommendations in the *Care First, Jails Last* Alternatives to Incarceration Workgroup Report, which was approved by the Board of Supervisors earlier this year.¹³

Groups supporting

- The coalition behind Measure J, the Re-imagine LA Coalition, is a coalition of over 100 grassroots, civil rights, labor, and faith-based organizations. Key members of the coalition include Black Lives Matter-LA, ACLU Southern California, and the United Way of Los Angeles.
- Measure J has been endorsed by a number of important elected officials, including four of the five members of the Board of Supervisors.

¹³ Times Editorial Board. (September 2020). Endorsement: Yes on Measure J. Shift L.A. County spending from punishment to treatment, *Los Angeles Times*. Last retrieved October 1, 2020, from: <https://www.latimes.com/opinion/story/2020-09-28/yes-measure-j>.

The Re-imagine L.A. Coalition. Campaign page. Last retrieved October 1, 2020, from: <https://yesonj.reimagine.la/faq/>.

Los Angeles County. Alternatives to Incarceration Work Group Final Report. Last retrieved October 1, 2020, from: https://lacialternatives.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/03/ATI_Full_Report_single_pages.pdf.

Denkmann, L. (September 2020). Measure J: LA County Prop Could Shift \$110 Million From Sheriff To Community Investment, *LAist*. Last retrieved October 1, 2020, from: <https://laist.com/elections/2020/props/los-angeles-county-voters-ballot-charter-amendment-divest-sheriffs-department-10-percent-budget.php>.

Ballotopia. Measure J. Last retrieved October 1, 2020, from:

[https://ballotpedia.org/Los_Angeles_County,_California,_Measure_J,_Budget_Allocation_for_Alternatives_to_Incarceration_Charter_Amendment_\(November_2020\)](https://ballotpedia.org/Los_Angeles_County,_California,_Measure_J,_Budget_Allocation_for_Alternatives_to_Incarceration_Charter_Amendment_(November_2020)).

LAUSD Measure RR: School Upgrades and Safety Measure

Overview: Creates a \$ 7 Billion bond to support renovation of LAUSD sites

Recommendation: [Support](#)

Public Health Rationale: Measure R supports public health by improving learning conditions on campus and keeping buildings safe and up to code.

- Continues needed renovations of old LAUSD buildings, upgrading earthquake proofing, fire alarms, water systems etc.
- Continues renovation and modernization programs that created 350,000 jobs
- Voted for unanimously by the LAUSD Board of Education¹⁴

Fiscal Impact: Measure RR extends without increasing the tax rate currently authorized for voter-approved Los Angeles Unified School District bonds

¹⁴ Habber, S. (August 2020). Board Places \$7 Billion School Construction Bond Issue On the Ballot for November 3, 2020. Los Angeles Unified School District. Last retrieved October 1, 2020, from: <https://achieve.lausd.net/site/default.aspx?PageType=3&DomainID=4&ModuleInstanceID=4466&ViewID=6446EE88-D30C-497E-9316-3F8874B3E108&RenderLoc=0&FlexDataID=94008&PageID=1>.

Yes on RR. Campaign page. Last retrieved on October 1, 2020, from: yesonrrforlaschools.com/about.