



2022 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 act 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 2022 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 1		Proposition 30	
Proposition 26		Proposition 31	
Proposition 27		Measure ULA	
Proposition 28		Measure A	
Proposition 29		Measure H	

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.

**California Prop 1:
Constitutional Right to Reproductive Freedom. Legislative Constitutional Amendment.**

Overview: Proposition 1 would change the California Constitution to explicitly express the right to reproductive freedom. Protections of reproductive freedom includes the right to seek abortion care and the right to seek or deny contraceptives. While the right to reproductive freedom is already guaranteed through the constitutional provision of an individual's right to privacy, this amendment would enshrine this right into California law and no longer leave it up to legal interpretation.

Recommendation: Support

Public Health Rationale: Equitable access to abortion and reproductive health care is a public health issue. Since the overturning of Roe V. Wade, over 60 reproductive health clinics across the United States have been forced to close due to the changing legal landscape. This reduction to access has left many without access to abortion care and has poised the state of California as a reproductive health safe haven for neighboring states. By adding additional protections to reproductive rights, the State defends the right to bodily autonomy by allowing the decision to seek reproductive health care to be left to a patient and their medical provider.

Arguments For: Supporters argue that explicitly expressing the right to reproductive freedom will protect rights from being revoked through potential future attacks at the federal level or from the courts.

Arguments Against: Opponents of Proposition 1 have concerns that the measure will change the regulations on limiting abortion after 24 weeks of pregnancy. Opponents also argue Prop 1 will have a fiscal impact from the need to pay for reproductive healthcare.

Groups Supporting/Funding:

- Yes on 1 Committee
- Planned Parenthood Affiliates of California
- NARAL Pro-Choice California
- California Medical Association
- American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists
- League of Women Voters of California
- SEIU California
- Equality California
- Gov. Gavin Newsom, U.S. Sen. Dianne Feinstein, U.S. Sen. Alex Padilla and other Democratic statewide elected officials
- Senate President Pro Tem Toni Atkins, Assembly Speaker Anthony Rendon and dozens of other Democratic legislators
- California Democratic Party
- Health Care for All-California

Fiscal Impact: No estimated fiscal impact is estimated as the state already pays for contraceptives and abortion services for low-income California residents.

**California Proposition 26:
Allows In-Person Roulette, Dice Games, Sports Wagering on Tribal Lands. Initiative Constitutional
Amendment and Statute**

Overview: Proposition 26 changes the California Constitution and State law to allow the State’s privately operated racetracks and tribal casinos to offer in-person sports betting. The Proposition would also allow additional gambling—such as roulette and dice games, including craps—at tribal casinos. As part of the law, sports bets placed at horse racetracks would be taxed, while tribes would not be taxed as sovereign nations; however, they would be required to reimburse the State for the cost of regulating sports betting. Last, the proposition creates a new way of enforcing some gaming laws, allowing anyone to bring a lawsuit if they believe the laws are being violated, and the State Justice Department declines to act. Any penalty and settlement money that result would go to the State.¹

Recommendation: Neutral

Public Health Rationale: Expansion of legalized gambling will likely increase problem gambling and gambling addiction among the State’s population, which can lead to poor mental and physical health, loss of money, conflict with family, friends and co-workers, and increased risk for committing illegal acts to finance gambling.² In states where sports betting is already legal, calls to gambling hotlines spiked after the new form of gambling was allowed, and the National Problem Gambling Helpline Network reported a 45% increase in year-over-year inquiries in 2021, when 11 states went live with some new form of sports betting, according to the *Los Angeles Times*.³ However, we also support the sovereignty of American Indian communities to govern themselves and acknowledge the revenue generated from the gaming industry supports job creation and funds critical education, healthcare, housing, public safety, and cultural preservation in their communities.

Arguments For:

- Regulates and taxes sports betting.
- Grants Indian tribes the right to expand and operate regulated gaming on tribal lands, which has historically helped lift tribes out of poverty by creating jobs and providing revenues for critical services including education, healthcare, housing, public safety, and cultural preservation.
- Supports the sovereignty of American Indian tribes to self-govern without the interference from the Federal and State government.
- Will be an additional source of State revenue.

Arguments Against:

- The Proposition would expand legalized gambling. Already roughly 3.7% of adults are problem or pathological gamblers, an estimated 1.2 million Californians.⁴

¹ Cal Matters. Prop. 26: Legalize Sports Betting and Tribal Casinos. Online at:

<https://calmatters.org/california-voter-guide-2022/propositions/prop-26-sports-betting-tribal-casinos/>.

² Fong, T. The Biopsychosocial Consequences of Pathological Gambling. *Psychiatry* (Edgmont). 2005 Mar; 2(3): 22–30.

³ Kreidler, M. Addiction experts fear the fallout if California voters legalize sports betting. *Los Angeles Times*, October 5, 2022. Online at:

<https://www.latimes.com/california/story/2022-10-05/addiction-experts-fear-the-fallout-if-california-legalizes-sports-betting>.

⁴ California Department of Alcohol and Drug Programs Office of Problem and Pathological Gambling . 2006 California Problem Gambling Prevalence Survey. Online at:

<https://calpg.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/09/2006-California-Prevalence-Study.pdf>.

- It plays into special interests that unfairly benefits the Proposition's supporters.
- It may lead to more competition for cardrooms, as well as frivolous lawsuits against them, jeopardizing current jobs and tax revenue.
- Supports racetracks, which is an industry accused of abusing animals and leading to more than 1,600 dead horses over the last ten years.⁵

Groups supporting/ Funding: The [Yes on 26, No on 27 - Coalition for Safe, Responsible Gaming](#) is leading the campaign in support of the ballot initiative. The coalition is supported by several American Indian Tribes, including the top donors to the campaign—the Pechanga Band of Luiseno Indians, Yocha Dehe Wintun Nation, Agua Caliente Band of Cahuilla Indians, Federated Indians of Graton Rancheria, and the Barona Band of Mission Indians⁶

Fiscal Impact: The Proposition could generate tens of millions annually for the State, but several variables make it difficult to estimate an exact amount. Any revenue would first go to education spending commitments and regulatory costs. If there's any money left over, it would go to the State's discretionary fund, as well as to problem gaming and mental health research, and the enforcement of gaming rules.

⁵ NO on Prop 26: A Massive Bailout for the Racetrack Industry: https://animalwelfare.tasimcoalition.org/?gclid=Cj0KCQjw4omaBhDqARIsADXULuVhTwqvXFkpMoYhrzJa_C7MnFNU_RLHJM8foOUSFvCbHYXWCj9cUiRoaAg4zEALw_wcB

⁶ Ballotpedia. California Proposition 26, Legalize Sports Betting on American Indian Lands Initiative (2022). Online at: [https://ballotpedia.org/California_Proposition_26_Legalize_Sports_Betting_on_American_Indian_Lands_Initiative_\(2022\)](https://ballotpedia.org/California_Proposition_26_Legalize_Sports_Betting_on_American_Indian_Lands_Initiative_(2022)).

**California Proposition 27:
Allows Online and Mobile Sports Wagering Outside Tribal Lands. Initiative Constitutional Amendment
and Statute**

Overview: Prop. 27 would allow licensed tribes and gaming companies to offer mobile and online sports betting for adults 21 and older outside Native American tribal lands. The proposition also creates a new division within the State's Justice Department to regulate online sports wagering. That Division could also decide whether to approve new forms of gambling, such as betting on awards shows and video games. It also gives the Justice Department additional powers to address illegal sports betting. Tribes and gaming companies would pay fees and taxes to the State that could total several hundred million dollars a year, state analysts estimate. The actual amount is uncertain, in part, because gaming operators are allowed to deduct certain expenses to reduce their tax bill.⁷

Recommendation: Oppose

Public Health Rationale: Like Proposition 26, Proposition 27 would expand legalized gambling and likely increase problem gambling and gambling addiction in the State. Additionally, online gambling has been found to be even more addictive than casino gambling,⁸ and young people are especially vulnerable. Between 60% and 80% of high school students report having gambled for money in the past year, and the percentage of high school students with a gambling problem is double that of adults.⁹ The Proposition will most likely support out of state gambling corporations and drive business away from local businesses, including Indian casinos. This poses a direct threat to many tribes, which use current gaming profits to fund healthcare, education, and housing in tribal communities.

Arguments For:

- Regulates and taxes sports betting.
- Will be an additional source of State revenue, some of which will be earmarked to fund homelessness prevention.

Arguments Against:

- Makes gambling easier and more accessible through online devices. Already roughly 3.7% of adults are problem or pathological gamblers, an estimated 1.2 million Californians.¹⁰ The National Council on Problem Gambling also reports online sports bettors are up to three or more times more likely to develop problem gambling than other types of gamblers.¹¹

⁷ Cal Matters. PROP. 27: Allow Online Sports Better. Online at:

<https://calmatters.org/california-voter-guide-2022/propositions/prop-27-sports-betting-online>.

⁸ University of Nevada, Los Vegas. July 16, 2008. New Study Shows Online Gambling More Addictive than Casino Gambling. Online at:

<https://www.unlv.edu/news/release/new-study-shows-online-gambling-more-addictive-casino-gambling>.

⁹ Pew. July 2022. As Sports Betting Grows, States Tackle Teenage Problem Gambling. Online at:

<https://www.pewtrusts.org/en/research-and-analysis/blogs/stateline/2022/07/12/as-sports-betting-grows-states-tackle-teenage-problem-gambling>.

¹⁰ California Department of Alcohol and Drug Programs Office of Problem and Pathological Gambling . 2006 California Problem Gambling Prevalence Survey. Online at:

<https://calpg.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/09/2006-California-Prevalence-Study.pdf>.

¹¹ National Council on Problem Gambling. 2018. National Survey on Gambling Attitudes and Gambling Experiences. Online at: <https://www.ncpgsurvey.org/executive-summary/>.

- The Measure creates extremely high thresholds for gaming companies to do business in California, making it all but impossible for smaller gaming companies to compete.¹²
- It is likely to benefit out-of-state gambling corporations versus local business and drive business away from local Indian casinos—posing a direct threat to many tribes, which use current gaming profits to fund healthcare, education and housing in tribal communities.

Groups supporting/ Funding: Yes on 27 - Californians for Solutions to Homelessness and Mental Health Support is leading the campaign in support of Proposition 27. Its top three donors include BetMGM LLC, Betfair Interactive US LLC (FanDuel Sportsbook), and Crown Gaming, Inc. (DraftKings).¹³

Fiscal Impact: The Proposition could generate revenue reaching the mid-hundreds of millions of dollars annually, from online sports wagering-related taxes, licensing fees, and penalties, while increased State regulatory costs could potentially reach the mid-tens of millions of dollars annually. After covering the State's new regulatory costs, most of the new revenue would be used to address homelessness and support gambling addiction programs, while 15% would go to Native American tribes that aren't involved in sports betting.^{14,15}

¹² Ballotpedia. California Proposition 27, Legalize Sports Betting and Revenue for Homelessness Prevention Fund Initiative (2022). Online at: [https://ballotpedia.org/California_Proposition_27,_Legalize_Sports_Betting_and_Revenue_for_Homelessness_Prevention_Fund_Initiative_\(2022\)](https://ballotpedia.org/California_Proposition_27,_Legalize_Sports_Betting_and_Revenue_for_Homelessness_Prevention_Fund_Initiative_(2022)).

¹³ Ibid.

¹⁴ California Secretary of State. Secretary of State Shirley Weber Assigns Numbers to November Ballot Measures, Invites Ballot Arguments. Online at: <https://www.sos.ca.gov/administration/news-releases-and-advisories/2022-news-releases-and-advisories/proposition-numbers>.

¹⁵ Calmatters.org. PROP. 27: Allow Online Sports Better. Online at: <https://calmatters.org/california-voter-guide-2022/propositions/prop-27-sports-betting-online>.

Proposition 28:

Provides Additional Funding for Arts and Music Education in Public Schools. Initiative Statute.¹⁶

Overview: Requires the State to provide additional funding to increase arts and music education in all K-12 public schools (including charter schools). Requires schools with more than 500 students to spend at least 80% of funding to employ teachers and allocates a greater proportion of the funds to schools serving economically disadvantaged students. Requires transparency from local governing bodies and limits administrative costs to 1% of funding.

Recommendation: Support

Public Health Rationale: Prop 28 would invest funds into California's K-12 public schools to support arts and music education, which is important to the health and well-being of students. Arts and music education drives well-being for young people by reducing stress, supporting social-emotional learning and spatial reasoning, improving school attendance, and increasing individual student self-confidence and motivation to learn – particularly among low-income and other marginalized students.³

Arguments For: Budget cuts and an emphasis on reading and math has led to reduced funding for arts and music education. Prop. 28 provides additional funding to ensure every student in K–12 public schools have access to arts and music education without raising taxes. Increased equity in access to arts and music education under Prop 28 would improve student mental health, support cognitive development, and ensure the future workforce in media and technology is reflective of the diversity of children in K-12 public schools.

Arguments Against: There is no organized opposition.

Groups Supporting/Funding

- Yes: \$11 Million: Vote Yes on 28 PAC, Austin Beutner (former Superintendent of LAUSD), California Teachers Association, California Democratic Party, SEIU California, local arts organizations, and local music and arts education groups.
- No: There is no organized opposition.

Fiscal Impact

- Increased State costs estimated at \$800 million to \$1 billion annually, representing at least 1 percent of the Constitutionally required State and local funding that public schools received the year before, beginning in 2023-2024. The additional funding would be considered a payment above the Constitutionally required amount of funding for public schools.

¹⁶ References used:

Ballotpedia. California Proposition 28. Online at:

[https://ballotpedia.org/California_Proposition_28_Art_and_Music_K-12_Education_Funding_Initiative_\(2022\)#cite_note-text-1](https://ballotpedia.org/California_Proposition_28_Art_and_Music_K-12_Education_Funding_Initiative_(2022)#cite_note-text-1).

Cal Matters. California Nov 2022 Election Guide: Proposition 28. Online at:

<https://calmatters.org/california-voter-guide-2022/propositions/prop-28-arts-education/>.

Official Voter Information Guide: California Secretary of State, Proposition 28. Online at:

<https://voterguide.sos.ca.gov/propositions/28/>

**Proposition 29:
Requires On-Site Licensed Medical Professional at Kidney Dialysis Clinics and Establishes Other State Requirements. Initiative Statute.¹⁷**

Overview: Proposition 29 requires kidney dialysis clinics to have at least one physician, nurse practitioner or physician assistant with six months of relevant experience available on site or, in some cases, via telehealth. It also requires clinics to report infection data to the State and to publicly list physicians who have ownership interest of 5% or more in a clinic. In addition, the Proposition prohibits clinics from closing or reducing services without State approval and from refusing treatment to people based on their insurance type. **Note: This proposition differs from the 2020 edition in that it allows NPs and PAs as part of the requirement versus solely requiring a physician.*

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, there are 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.

Arguments for:

- Increased investment in patient care and safety.
- Required on site physician, nurse practitioner or physician assistant will allow for expedited care response to patient emergencies and reduce hospitalizations.
- Added reporting requirements increases transparency in the for-profit dialysis business.
- Increases equity and quality of care for patients.

Arguments against:

- New 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.

Group supporting/funding campaign:

- Service Employees International Union-United Healthcare Workers West (funding the measure at \$7.97 million)

¹⁷ References used included:

Cal Matters. Prop. 29: Impose New Rules on Dialysis Clinics. Online at:

<https://calmatters.org/california-voter-guide-2022/propositions/prop-29-kidney-dialysis/>

The Legislative Analyst's Office. Proposition 29 Requires On-Site Licensed Medical Professional at Kidney Dialysis Clinics and Establishes Other State Requirements. Initiative Statute. Online at:

<https://lao.ca.gov/ballot/2022/Prop29-110822.pdf>

Politico. California Ballot Tracker: Interest groups prepare for expensive 2022 fights. Online at:

<https://www.politico.com/interactives/2022/california-ballot-measures-propositions-guide-2022/>

Additional supporters:

- California Democratic Party
- Yes on 29 committee
- California Labor Federation

Groups against:

- No Prop. 29 committee (\$86.3 million from DaVita and Fresenius Medical Care)
- DaVita, Inc.
- Fresenius Medical Care
- American Academy of Nephrology PAs
- American Nurses Association
- California Medical Association
- California Chamber of Commerce
- California Republican Party

Fiscal impact

- Increased costs for dialysis clinics.
- Increased costs for CDPH administration for monitoring new clinic requirements (likely will not exceed low millions annually)
- If dialysis companies negotiate higher rates with payers to assist with covering increased clinic costs, the Proposition could increase state and local government costs in the tens of millions of dollars annually (approximately 0.5% of General Fund).

**Proposition 30:
Provides Funding for Programs to Reduce Air Pollution and Prevent Wildfires by Increasing Tax on
Personal Income Over \$2 Million. Initiative Statute.¹⁸**

Overview: Proposition 30 proposes a 1.75% personal income tax increase on Californians making more than \$2 million per year to fund programs that reduce air pollution and prevent wildfires (i.e., climate programs) to help achieve State greenhouse gas emission goals. Eighty percent (80%) of revenue will be used for buying zero emission vehicles to help households, business, governments pay for part of cars, vans, trucks, and large trucks/buses and to create charging stations. At least half of the money must be spent on projects that benefit people who live in or near heavily polluted and/or low-income communities. Twenty percent (20%) of revenue for hiring and training firefighters. The tax would be in place from 2023-2043 or until emissions are decreased at least 80% below 1990 levels for 3 consecutive years.

Recommendation: Neutral

Public Health Rationale: Although this proposition may assist the State in reaching Statewide climate goals and help fight climate change, there are concerns that the proposition creates a revenue stream that benefits ride sharing organizations (which are required to increase zero emission vehicles to 90% by 2030) by putting the onus on individuals. The proposition also ignores other investments, such as public transportation infrastructure, needed to reduce the number of vehicles on the road and thereby traffic congestion and pollution. Improvements to public transportation would additionally have an arguably greater benefit to low-income individuals and their families than help in buying zero emission cars.

Arguments for:

- Generates funding to address leading causes of air pollution: (1) transportation/gas power vehicles and (2) wildfires.
- Increases State's ability to meet climate goals.

Arguments against:

- Unnecessary tax hike; funds should/can come from the recent \$10 million climate investment and State's budget surplus of \$97.5 million.
- Proposition switches payor of zero emission vehicles (ZEV) from businesses to taxpayers.

Groups supporting/funding the measure:

- Lyft (main funder who has raised approximately \$47 million)

Additional Supporters:

- Yes on 30 Clean Air Coalition

¹⁸ References used included:

Cal Matters. Prop. 30: Tax Millionaires for Electric Vehicle Programs. Online at:

<https://calmatters.org/california-voter-guide-2022/propositions/prop-30-income-tax-electric-cars/>.

The Legislative Analyst's Office. Proposition 30: Provides Funding for Programs to Reduce Air Pollution and Prevent Wildfires by Increasing Tax on Personal Income Over \$2 Million. Initiative Statute. Online at:

<https://lao.ca.gov/BallotAnalysis/Proposition?number=30&year=2022>

Ballotpedia. California Proposition 30, Tax on Income Above \$2 Million for Zero-Emissions Vehicles and Wildfire Prevention Initiative (2022). Online at:

[https://ballotpedia.org/California_Proposition_30_Tax_on_Income_Above_\\$2_Million_for_Zero-Emissions_Vehicles_and_Wildfire_Prevention_Initiative_\(2022\)](https://ballotpedia.org/California_Proposition_30_Tax_on_Income_Above_$2_Million_for_Zero-Emissions_Vehicles_and_Wildfire_Prevention_Initiative_(2022))

- Cal Fire Local 2881
- California State Association of Electrical Workers
- Unite HERE
- California Democratic Party
- State Building and Construction Trades Council
- California Environmental Voters

Groups against (raised \$14.7 million):

- No on Prop 30 committee
- Gov. Gavin Newsom
- California Republican Party
- California Teachers Association
- California Chamber of Commerce
- California Small Business Association
- Howard Jarvis Taxpayers Association
- State Treasurer Fiona Ma

Fiscal impact:

Increased state tax revenue ranging from \$3.5 billion to \$5 billion annually, with the new funding used to support zero-emission vehicle programs (80 percent) and wildfire response and prevention activities (20 percent).

Proposition 31:

Referendum on 2020 Law That Would Prohibit the Retail Sale of Certain Flavored Tobacco Products

Overview: A “yes” vote on this Referendum means that SB 793 goes into effect. A “no” vote means that SB 793 does not go into effect. SB 793 bans most sales of flavored tobacco products and tobacco product flavor enhancers. It also prohibits in-person stores and vending machines from selling most flavored tobacco products or tobacco product flavor enhancers. It does not ban shisha (hookah) tobacco sold and used at the store, certain cigars, or loose-leaf tobacco.¹⁹

Recommendation: Support

Public Health Rationale: Tobacco companies develop flavored products to appeal to youth, who are more likely to experiment with these types of products and potentially become addicted; 4 out of 5 kids who have used tobacco started with a flavored product.²⁰ Research has also found bans of flavored tobacco products are an effective prevention strategy. One important issue that we would like to highlight if this Proposition passes is *our opposition to school policies that punish youth for having these products in their possession*; rather, we support the provision of health education, prevention, and services to youth who may use these products or be found with them on campus.

Arguments for:

- Efforts to limit and prevent youth tobacco use and lifelong addiction.
- Cigarette smoking cost the United States more than \$600 billion in 2018, including more than \$240 billion in healthcare spending, nearly \$185 billion in lost productivity from smoking-related illnesses and health conditions, nearly \$180 billion in lost productivity from smoking-related premature death, and \$7 billion in lost productivity from premature death from secondhand smoke exposure.²¹

Arguments against:

- These regulations single out the non-cigarette or cigar substances. However, cannabis has lots of flavors as edibles and there is no prohibition on cannabis flavoring.
- Manufacturers are getting creative and could sidestep any such bans with concept flavors like “Puff”, “Pink,” and “Fuzzy”. The specific reference in the proposition to fruity and other “food-ish” flavors may be too specific and less effective.
- Products could still be sold in the underground market with less control over product quality and safety.

Groups supporting or funding the measure:^{22,23}

- Governor Gavin Newsom (D)
- Political Parties

¹⁹ The Legislative Analyst's Office. Proposition 31. Online at: <https://lao.ca.gov/BallotAnalysis/Proposition?number=31&year=2022>

²⁰ Ambrose, BK, et al., “Flavored Tobacco Product Use Among US Youth Aged 12-17 Years, 2013-2014,” Journal of the American Medical Association, published online October 26, 2015.

²¹ CDC. Economic Trends in Tobacco. Online at: https://www.cdc.gov/tobacco/data_statistics/fact_sheets/economics/econ_facts/index.htm.

²² Ballotpedia. California Proposition 31, Flavored Tobacco Products Ban Referendum (2022). Online at: [https://ballotpedia.org/California_Proposition_31_Flavored_Tobacco_Products_Ban_Referendum_\(2022\)](https://ballotpedia.org/California_Proposition_31_Flavored_Tobacco_Products_Ban_Referendum_(2022)).

²³ Cal Matters. Prop. 31: Uphold Ban on Flavored Tobacco Products. Online at: <https://calmatters.org/california-voter-guide-2022/propositions/prop-31-flavored-tobacco-ban/>.

- Peace and Freedom Party of California
- California Teachers Association
- Yes on 31 committee
- American Lung Association
- American Heart Association
- SEIU California
- Campaign for Tobacco Free Kids
- California State PTA
- California Democratic Party

Fiscal impact: Decreased state tobacco tax revenues ranging from tens of millions of dollars annually to around \$100 million annually.²⁴

²⁴ The Legislative Analyst's Office (LAO). Proposition 31. Online at:
<https://lao.ca.gov/BallotAnalysis/Proposition?number=31&year=2022>

**Measure United to House LA (ULA):
Funding For Affordable Housing and Tenant Assistance Programs Through a Tax on Real Property
Transfers Over \$5 Million. Initiative Ordinance. Initiative Ordinance ULA.**

Overview: Measure ULA enacts a 4% tax on the sale or transfer of properties in Los Angeles valued at more than \$5 million and a 5.5% tax on the sale or transfer of properties valued at more than \$10 million. Qualified affordable housing and government entities would be exempt from the tax. It also establishes the House LA fund within the City treasury to collect additional tax revenue and allocates revenue to permanently affordable homes that address housing availability at certain income thresholds and programs to keep people in their homes and prevent homelessness. Last, the measure would create a citizens' oversight committee tasked with developing funding guidelines, assessing project needs, and auditing expenditures.²⁵

Recommendation: Support

Public Health Rationale: Affordable housing is a primary social determinant of health. Without it, people may experience housing instability, which can lead to a host of physical and mental health concerns. These include stress, depression, inability to afford other essential needs (e.g., nutritious food, necessary health care expenses, and transportation), and social and education instability for children.²⁶ Unstable housing can also eventually lead to homelessness, adding other concerns such as increased vulnerability to abuse, exploitation, and violence, as well as higher risks of serious mental illness, disordered substance use, infectious disease, and chronic illness.²⁷ 37% of households in Los Angeles City own their own home, and only 1 in 5 (20%) of households in Los Angeles City can afford to buy the \$792,470 median-priced home.²⁸ A big factor to unaffordability has been the failure to produce or preserve housing affordable to low-income communities. This measure aims to change this by tackling the root causes of housing instability and homelessness. Revenue generated would be earmarked for homelessness prevention efforts and permanently affordable housing – including land trusts and limited equity housing cooperatives. Last, the tax affects the most fortunate to ensure our larger community has access to what they need to live well and thrive.

Arguments For: Measure ULA will create more than 26,000 homes for people who are experiencing homelessness or are at risk of homelessness, as well as help approximately 69,000 people who experience homelessness every night over the next decade. It will also provide essential support to people experiencing homelessness—and those at risk of homelessness—with rental assistance, income

²⁵ Ballotpedia. Los Angeles, California, Proposition ULA, Tax on \$5_Million House Sales Initiative (November_2022). Online at: [https://ballotpedia.org/Los_Angeles_California_Proposition_ULA_Tax_on_\\$5_Million_House_Sales_Initiative_\(November_2022\)](https://ballotpedia.org/Los_Angeles_California_Proposition_ULA_Tax_on_$5_Million_House_Sales_Initiative_(November_2022)).

²⁶ County of Los Angeles Department of Public Health. February 2015. Social Determinants of Health Housing and Health in Los Angeles County, Online at: http://publichealth.lacounty.gov/ha/reports/LAHealthBrief2011/HousingHealth/SD_Housing_Fs.pdf.

²⁷ Kuhn, R., Richards, J., Roth, S., and Clair, K. 2020. Homelessness and Public Health in Los Angeles. UCLA Campuswide Homelessness Initiative. Online at: <https://escholarship.org/uc/item/2gn3x56s>.

²⁸ Dreier, P., Ling, J., Phillips, S., Cummings, S., Pastor, M., Rodnyansky, S., Loop, J. (September 2022). An Analysis of Measure ULA: A Ballot Measure to Reform Real Estate Transfer Taxes in the City of Los Angeles. UCLA Lewis Center for Regional Policy Studies. Online at: <https://www.lewis.ucla.edu/research/an-analysis-of-measure-ula-a-ballot-measure-to-reform-real-estate-transfer-taxes-in-the-city-of-los-angles/#:~:text=September%202022,typically%20paid%20by%20the%20seller>.

assistance for low-income seniors, and access to permanent housing. Those who can afford multimillion dollar homes can also afford and pay their fair share to help support innovative solutions to our City's housing crisis.²⁹

Arguments Against: Critics claim this will raise property taxes on every single renter, homeowner, and small business. They also say the tax would impact some for-profit new construction projects and unfairly benefits a select few affordable housing developers. However, research by the UCLA Lewis Center for Regional Policy Studies found no to limited evidence, respectively, of such claims.

Groups Supporting/Funding:

- United to House L.A., a coalition of homeless service providers, affordable housing nonprofits, labor unions, and renters' rights groups, is leading the campaign in support of the measure.
- Alliance for Community Transit-Los Angeles, among others.

Groups Against:

- Howard Jarvis Taxpayers Association

Fiscal Impact: The tax is estimated to generate \$600 million to \$1.1 billion annually. At least 92% of the tax revenue would fund affordable housing under the Affordable Housing Program and tenant assistance programs under the Homeless Prevention Program. No more than 8% would fund program administration, reporting, compliance, and implementation.³⁰ In fiscal year 2021-22, only about 4% of all property sales would have been affected by this measure and less than 3% of single-family home and condo sales would have qualified. Only 727 homes or condos sold for more than \$5 million in 2021, and of those, 170 sold for more than \$10 million.³¹

²⁹ Move LA: A Project of Community Partners. MEASURE ULA: A Ballot Measure to Reform Real Estate Transfer Taxes. Online at: https://www.movela.org/measure_ula.

³⁰ Ballotpedia. Los Angeles, California, Proposition ULA, Tax on \$5_Million House Sales Initiative (November_2022). Online at: [https://ballotpedia.org/Los_Angeles,_California,_Proposition_ULA,_Tax_on_\\$5_Million_House_Sales_Initiative_\(November_2022\)](https://ballotpedia.org/Los_Angeles,_California,_Proposition_ULA,_Tax_on_$5_Million_House_Sales_Initiative_(November_2022)).

³¹ Kuhn, R., Richards, J., Roth, S., and Clair, K. 2020. Homelessness and Public Health in Los Angeles. UCLA Campuswide Homelessness Initiative. Online at: <https://escholarship.org/uc/item/2gn3x56s>.

Measure A: Removal of Sheriff for Cause Amendment

Overview: This measure would allow the L.A. County Board of Supervisors to vote to remove the elected sheriff from office for cause, including: violation of laws related to the sheriff's duties; neglect of the sheriff's duties; misuse of public funds or properties; willful falsification of documents; or obstruction of an investigation into the department's conduct. The vote requirement to remove the sheriff would be four-fifths (four supervisors voting in the affirmative).

Recommendation: Support

Public Health Rationale: The LA County Sheriff oversees the largest jail system in the country, a site of incarceration that disproportionately detains Black residents of Los Angeles because of racist policing practices and policies. People held in this system under Sheriff Villanueva's term have been subjected to inhumane conditions, including being chained to chairs for days at a time.³² And throughout his term, Sheriff Villanueva has been accused of endorsing sheriff's gangs that have targeted, murdered, harassed, and intimidated marginalized residents and families.³³ In 2020, Villanueva defended the actions of a deputy who shot and killed a mentally ill patient who was being treated at Harbor-UCLA hospital.³⁴ Sheriff Villanueva recently obstructed an investigation run by the Civilian Oversight Committee into the Department's conduct by raiding the home of the committee leadership as well as the home of County Supervisor Sheila Kuehl.³⁵

Arguments for: No person should be empowered to act with impunity. The LA Sheriff's Department has a long and troubled history with corruption and violence, and this measure can empower voters to demand accountability from an elected sheriff. Unfortunately, the measure doesn't change the nature of the sheriff's position or the scope of power of the sheriff's office.

Arguments against: Sheriff Villanueva opposes the measure. LA County Supervisor Kathryn Barger has stated that allowing the Board of Supervisors the authority to remove an elected sheriff "takes power away from the public." But by definition, the measure poses the question to voters.

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

³² Berberyan, A. ACLU Files over 'Abysmal' Conditions at LA County Jail. The Davis Vanguard. Online at: <https://www.davisvanguard.org/2022/09/aclu-files-over-abysmal-conditions-at-la-county-jail/>.

³³ Fremon, C. Deputy Gangs Hearing #6: Harassment Of Witnesses & Whistleblowers Continues. Witness LA. Online at: <https://witnessla.com/deputy-gangs-hearing-6-harassment-of-witnesses-whistleblowers-continues/>.

³⁴ Winton, R. Patient shot by sheriff's deputy inside Harbor UCLA hospital dies. The Los Angeles Times, November 17, 2020. Online at: <https://www.latimes.com/california/story/2020-11-17/patient-shot-by-sheriffs-deputy-as-he-wield-heavy-medical-device-inside-harbor-ucla-hospital-dies>.

³⁵ Norris, C. Sheriff's Dept. Raids Homes of Supervisor Sheila Kuehl and Others. Los Angeles Magazine, September 14, 2022. Online at: <https://www.lamag.com/citythinkblog/sheriffs-dept-raids-homes-of-supervisor-sheila-kuehl-and-others/>.

**Measure H:
The Pasadena Fair and Equitable Housing Charter Amendment**

Overview - Measure H enacts rent control and eviction protection and creates a rental board and rental registry. A landlord would only be allowed to increase rent annually by 75% of the percentage of last year's inflation (based on Consumer Price Index (CPI)). For example, if inflation is 1% and rent is \$3,000, a landlord could only increase rent by \$22.50 that year (\$30 is 1% of \$3,000 and 75% of \$30 is \$22.50). Current CA law (AB1482) limits increases at 5% plus the percentage of inflation up to 10%, which could be a \$180 increase in the previous example. Landlords can only evict tenants for just-cause, including non-payment, breach of lease, owner moving-in. The Rental Board can determine rent adjustments, conduct investigations, establish regulations, and levy fines for non-compliance. The Measure creates a rental registry for people to obtain information on rentals.

Recommendation: Support

Public Health Rationale: A stable and affordable home is a basic necessity for our health, well-being, and dignity. Our homes should be places where we can be with our families and communities, make memories, find refuge in turbulent times, and access the resources we need to be healthy. However, 58% of Pasadena residents are renters, and 56% of them are experiencing housing cost burden³⁶. Average rent in Pasadena is \$2,950, and increased 19% between 2016-21³⁷. When housing costs increase, low-income people struggle to pay for food, healthcare, education, and to save. Housing cost is a major factor affecting health and mental health outcomes and intergenerational inequity.

Higher rental costs also push lower income tenants out, which in turn, has reduced enrollment in Pasadena Unified Schools District³⁸ (PUSD). Fewer than half of school aged children attend PUSD schools³⁹. Many wealthy residents started sending their children to private schools after PUSD was desegregated. This impacts the resources and quality of education for the children in PUSD schools. The legacy of institutional racism in the United States, including Pasadena, continues to negatively impact Black and Brown residents.

Evictions contribute to homelessness; 66% of persons experiencing homelessness in Pasadena were housed in Pasadena before. Eviction is more often the cause of homelessness for Black residents in Pasadena than non-Black residents⁴⁰.

Rent control and eviction protections are policies that could help stabilize communities and housing for existing residents. Additional changes are needed to address housing costs and institutional racism.

Arguments for: Rent control helps keep housing costs down and keeps communities stable. The rental registry provides renters with better information and helps the housing market work more efficiently. Requiring just cause evictions supports stable housing for renters.

³⁶ American Community Survey 2021. US Census.

³⁷ Zumper Average Rent for a two-bedroom apartment in Pasadena April 2016 – April 2021. Online: <https://www.zumper.com/rent-research/pasadena-ca>

³⁸ Dreier, Peter and Maier, Mark. *Pasadena's Tale of Two Cities*. January 2019. Online at:

<http://www.peterdreier.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/01/Pasadenas-Tale-of-Two-Cities-2019-final-pdf-version.pdf>

³⁹ Coleman, Andre. "Fewer than Half of School-Age Children in District Attend Pasadena Unified." Pasadena Now.

Online: <https://www.pasadenanow.com/main/less-than-half-of-school-age-children-in-district-attend-pasadena-unified>

⁴⁰ *Pasadena Homeless Count 2022*. Online: <https://pasadenapartnership.org/homeless-count/>

Arguments against: Opponents argue that rent control can reduce landlords' profits and that landlords and developers may therefore choose to invest less in upkeep, build less new housing, or sell their properties—potentially lowering the amount of rental stock available and raising rents for housing that is not covered by rental control.

Groups supporting or funding the measure

Endorsed by over 62 community-based organizations and faith-based organizations and 13 current and former Pasadena elected officials.

Groups opposing or funding opposition of the measure:

California Apartment Association, National Association of Realtors, California Association of Realtors, and other real estate/landlord groups oppose the measure and have spent \$336,016 to defeat it.⁴¹

Fiscal impact: \$310,000 in start-up costs and annual estimate costs of \$5,453,460 for 26 employees. City of Pasadena would need to pay for initial funds and landlords would be charged an Annual Rental Housing Fee to help pay for on-going expenses.

⁴¹ As of 10/18/2022. Public Portal for Campaign Finance Disclosure. See:
<https://public.netfile.com/pub2/Default.aspx?aid=PSDA&AspxAutoDetectCookieSupport=1>