

SWCLC Southwest California Legislative Council

*A Coalition of
The Temecula Valley, Murrieta, Lake Elsinore Valley and Wildomar Chambers of Commerce*

MEETING AGENDA
Monday, July 15, 2013

Ortega Adult School, 520 Chaney St., Lake Elsinore

Presiding: Dennis Frank, Chair

2013 Strategic Initiatives
Budget & Tax Reform / Job Creation and Retention / Healthcare Reform

Call to Order, Roll Call & Introductions:

Chair Report

Agenda Items

1. Approval of June 2013 Meeting Minutes Action
2. Legislative Report #7 Action
 1. [AB 1333 \(Hernandez\) Local government: contracts](#)
 2. [SB 633 \(Payley\) CEQA](#)
 3. [AB 1383 \(Committee on Labor & Employment\) Employment regulations: local enforcement](#)
 4. [Proposition 90 - Riverside County](#)
3. Sacramento Update [Assemblymember Marie Waldron](#) Information
4. Citizen Legislature - Information Request flyer Information
5. Regional Legislator, Staff and Stakeholder Updates Information

Federal: Senators Feinstein & Boxer. Representatives Calvert & Hunter
State: Governor Brown, Senators Emmerson, Anderson & Roth, Assemblymembers Melendez, Waldron, Jones & Nestande
Local: County, Cities, Utilities, EDC, Healthcare, League of Cities
6. Chamber & Council Member Announcements Information
7. Lunch Sponsor [SIZZLER](#) - thank you Sally Myers Eat There

Adjourn – Next meeting August 19, 2013

For updates that affect your business everyday - LIKE us on



The Southwest California Legislative Council Thanks Our Partners:

Southwest Riverside Country
Association of Realtors
Metropolitan Water District of
Southern California
Near-Cal Corporation
Economic Development Corp of
Southwest California
Elsinore Valley Municipal Water
District

The Gas Company
Abbott Vascular
The Murrieta Temecula Group
Temecula Valley Chamber of
Commerce
Murrieta Chamber of Commerce
Lake Elsinore Valley Chamber of
Commerce

Wildomar Chamber of
Commerce
Southern California Edison
Loma Linda University Medical
Center
Southwest Healthcare Systems
Walmart

Please consider adding your business to the list. The SWCLC is fully funded by sponsorships from various private organizations and businesses. The SWCLC exists solely because of the contributions of these proactive organizations and businesses located throughout the region. Without their support the actions of the SWCLC would not be possible.



Southwest California Legislative Council

**Murrieta Chamber of Commerce
Temecula Valley Chamber of Commerce
Lake Elsinore Chamber of Commerce
Wildomar Chamber of Commerce**

Meeting Minutes

June 17, 2013

Legislative Consultant: Gene Wunderlich

2013 Chair: Dennis Frank, D.R. Frank & Associates

Directors Attendance: Nicole Albrecht, Financial Accounting Services
Glen Daigle, Oakgrove Equities
Jeff George, Superior Quality Construction
Isaac Lizarraga, Rancho Ford Lincoln
Greg Morrison, EVMWD
Don Murray, Commerce Bank of Temecula Valley
Shaura Olsen, Walmart
Joan Sparkman

Directors Absent: Steve Amante, Amante & Associates
Alex Braicovich, CR & R, Inc
Judy Guiliemana, Town & Country Real Estate
Tony Lopicolo, LoPiccolo Consulting
Karie Reuther, The David Reuther Vocal Studio
Gary Thornhill, Tierra Verde

Council Guests: Andy Abeles, Coldwell Banker
Patty Arlt, Metropolitan Water District
Cathy Barrozo, City of Lake Elsinore
Miguel Belmonte, Perris Valley Chamber of Commerce
Tiffany Clark, Temecula Valley Chamber of Commerce
Danielle Coats, EMWD
John Cox, Rescue California Foundation
Brenda Dennstedt, US Congressman Ken Calvert 42nd District
Angel Garcia
Deni Horne, Assemblywoman Melissa Melendez 67th District
Christine Iger, Iger & Associates
Debbie Lynn Kosum, Realty One Group SW
Connie Lynch, SRCAR
David Madsen, South Coast AQMD
Lon Marruffo, Virtual Outsourcing Solutions
Mike Mason, Mason RE

Jami McNees, Temecula Insurance
Robbie Motter, Menifee Valley Chamber of Commerce
Morris Myers, EDC
Kimberly Palmer, Mason Real Estate
Andria Poindexter, Live Mobile Solutions
Myles Ross, Waterstone Capital Partners
Erin Sass, League of Cities
Rebecca Shear`Ree, Keller Williams-Temecula
Tom Somers, Pacific Advisors
Tom Stinson, Assemblywoman Marie Waldron 25th District
Michele McKinney Underwood, Western Municipal Water District
Kathy Walker, The Inland Gateway Ass. Of Realtors
Walter Wilson, Coldwell Banker and SRCAR
Dorothy Wolons, Menifee Chamber of Commerce
Roger Ziemer, RC Ziemer & Assoc.

Staff Present: Kim Cousins, Michelle Simon-Lake Elsinore Valley Chamber of Commerce
Alice Sullivan, Laura Turnbow-Temecula Valley Chamber of Commerce
Patrick Ellis-Murrieta Chamber of Commerce
Karen Pollock-Wildomar Chamber of Commerce

Meeting called to order at: 12:08 P.M. by Chairman Dennis Frank

1. Approval of Minutes Action

Directors reviewed the Minutes from the April 15, 2013 meeting.

The motion was made to approve the minutes as written. The motion was seconded and carried by a unanimous vote.

2. Legislative Report #2 Action

1. SB 33 (Wolk) Infrastructure financing districts: voter approval: repeal (revisit)

Following discussion, the motion was made to OPPOSE SB 33. The motion was seconded and carried by a unanimous vote.

2. SB 30 (Correa/Anderson) Taxation: cancellation of indebtedness: mortgage debt forgiveness (Revisit)

Following discussion, the motion was made to SUPPORT SB 30. The motion was seconded and carried by a unanimous vote.

3. SB 516 (Steinberg) Foreign Labor Contractors: Registration

Following discussion, the motion was made to OPPOSE SB 516. The motion was seconded and carried by a unanimous vote.

4. SB 691 Hancock Non-vehicular air pollution control: penalties

Following discussion, the motion was made to OPPOSE SB 691. The motion was seconded and carried by a unanimous vote.

3. Citizen Legislature Proposition John Cox, Rescue California Foundation Information

John Cox provided a presentation on The Citizen Legislature Proposition, which is a comprehensive reform of the California legislature to help government work well on behalf of the people, reduce the power of special interests, and take much of the big money out of California politics. This Proposition is a potential ballot initiative for November 2014.

4. SWCLC 2013 Bill Tracker Information

Gene Wunderlich gave us an update on SWCLC 2013 Bills. There has been 93 total measures considered, 81 state bill positions adopted, 33 bills supported, 48 bills opposed, 8 local issues supported, 4 federal issues

supported, 25 “wins” supported bills passed along & 16 opposed bills failed, 16 “losses” 16 opposed bills passed along, and 13 statewide coalitions joined.

Congressman Ken Calvert

Report by Brenda Dennstedt

Everyone is encouraged to complete letter, if you haven’t already done so please go to the website and sign up.

Senator Joel Anderson

Report by Maggie Sleeper – District Director

SB30 unlinked bills. Classroom safety act, superintendent gets to decide how to spend money in their school district and then they will report back on their initiatives to ensure safe campuses. Education is to be provided more money in the new budget with greater local control on where best to spend.

Assemblywoman Melissa A. Melendez

Report by Deni Horne

5 bills were moved to Senate. AB526 Military reserve deferral bill is moving forward. AB681 Inmate co pay medical expenses was dead on arrival. Other bills are waiting to see what happens. The Assemblywoman will hold her monthly coffee talks on a monthly basis throughout the district.

Assemblywoman Marie Waldron

Report by Tom Stenson

State Budget is being reported as a balanced budget even though there is a \$50 billion unfunded pension issue.

City of Lake Elsinore

Report Cathy Barrozo

City Council approved a resolution for the RDA zone and the Wild land fire protection agreement. The city is having their Rosetta Canyon Fire Station Dedication on June 22, 2013 @ 9:00 A.M. The City Council will be going over their budget on 6/25/13 for the next fiscal year.

5. Chamber & Council Member Announcements Information

Lake Elsinore Valley Chamber of Commerce

Report by Kim Joseph Cousins

The Lake Elsinore Valley Chamber of Commerce will be hosting their luncheon at the Diamond club in Lake Elsinore on June 20th at 11:30AM. Topic: “A Conversation with Southwest California City Managers”.

Murrieta Chamber of Commerce

Report by Patrick Ellis

The Murrieta Chamber of Commerce will their Mega Mixer on 6/20/13 and their Annual Awards at Pechanga on 7/20/13.

Wildomar Chamber of Commerce

Report by Karen Pollock

The First Wednesday of each month is their Breakfast program at the Landing Zone in Lake Elsinore.

Temecula Chamber of Commerce

Report by Alice Sullivan

The Temecula Chamber of Commerce acknowledges this week as small business week. Announcements: June 19, monthly mixer at Amante & Associates Insurance Solutions & June 28th the Annual Golf Tournament at Temecula Creek Inn Golf Course.

EDC of Southwest CA

Report by Morris Myers

Continues to track the progress of the Workforce Investment Act reauthorization. More information to come.

Metropolitan Water District

Reported by Patty Arlt

Thank you for the board support on public finances. Special thank you to Jeff George on his help with Solar Cup.

Eastern Water District

Reported by Danielle Coats

6. Lunch Sponsor Freddy Ray's BBQ Eat There

Motion to Adjourn at 1:44 P.M.

AB 1333 (Hernandez) Local government: contracts**Recommended action:** **OPPOSE****Presentation:** Gene Wunderlich

Background: An evergreen contract is an agreement between two parties that is automatically renewed after each maturity period until one of the contracting parties gives notice at a specified interval and in the manner required to terminate the otherwise perpetual agreement. The specified interval could be annual or as long as several years. This type of contract differs from fixed-term agreements, where both parties are required to affirmatively agree to extend the term of the contract beyond the initial term. Local governments commonly use evergreen contracts for service contracts, including waste hauling, park maintenance, road maintenance, and public safety.

Some public employees' advocates are concerned that automatic renewal provisions make local governments' decisions to renew contracts insufficiently transparent. They want the Legislature to require local governments to renew evergreen contracts by adopting resolutions in open and public meetings.

Arguments in SUPPORT: **SOME** local governments' contracts for solid waste disposal have been extended over many decades. By requiring a local legislative body to act in an open and public meeting to affirm its desire to renew a contract for an additional year, AB 1333 ensures that evergreen contracts regularly command the attention of elected officials and members of the public, not just local agency staff.

- AB 1333 does not limit the discretion that local officials have under current law to decide whether to renew existing evergreen contracts
- The bill ensures that a contract renewal must result from an affirmative decision made in a public forum
- By restoring transparency and accountability to evergreen contract renewals, AB 1333 will help local officials and members of the public ensure that taxpayers are getting the best possible value from evergreen contracts.

Arguments in OPPOSITION: Long-term contracts with evergreen clauses allow recycling and waste disposal facilities to be financed by the private sector because these contracts are what financial institutions require to extend financing over a 10- to 20-year term. In addition, smaller service providers are able to amortize the costs of expensive facilities and equipment over an extended period of time, allowing them to compete against larger companies. In exchange, local governments receive a stabilized rate of service from the recycling and waste disposal provider.

Contrary to AB 1333's presumption that local officials fail to thoroughly review evergreen contracts, local government officials strive to provide their communities' residents with the best services at the most reasonable cost. Local elected officials have to answer to residents who are displeased with the quality and cost of their services. As a result, local governments regularly conduct rate reviews of their evergreen contracts, which often also involves reviewing the service provider's performance.

- Contracts can be revisited at any time and revoked if problems arise
- AB 1333 erodes decades of longstanding authority entrusted to local governments to contract for solid waste services at a time when the State has set an ambitious solid waste diversion goal of 75% by 2020
- The Legislature recently declared the importance of preserving local control over aspects of solid waste handling in order to achieve the state's solid waste diversion goals (AB 341, Chesbro, 2011)

- AB 1333 may make it more difficult to meet those goals by unnecessarily diminishing local officials' autonomy to contract for solid waste services.

Unintended consequences. The new requirements AB 1333 imposes on local governments' evergreen contracts may jeopardize some of these carefully negotiated contracts and financing that relies on the contracts. Because many solid waste disposal companies are family-owned local businesses, they have fewer financing options than do some larger companies. The most important issue that financial institutions review when analyzing a disposal company's loan package is the term of the company's contract. The remaining term must be sufficient to guarantee that the business will have sufficient time to pay off any borrowed funds. A contract with a fixed-term clause that automatically renews each year can play a vital role in allowing some companies to finance new equipment and make other investments necessary to comply with state laws.

Some waste disposal firms are concerned that financial lenders may interpret any changes to the manner in which evergreen contracts are renewed as increasing the risks associated with those contracts. As a result, lenders may make fewer loans based on evergreen contracts and may increase interest rates on the financing they do provide. AB 1333 may have the unintended effect of encouraging the use of less flexible and less accountable long-term fixed contracts in order to ensure that waste disposal companies can obtain financing.

Double standard? Some local governments' collectively bargained contracts with employees contain provisions that allow the contracts to automatically renew after a fixed term unless one of the contracting parties acts to terminate the contracts. AB 1333 exempts from its provisions specified collectively bargained employment contracts. The bill's proponents suggest that collectively bargained contracts, in practice, are subject to substantial public scrutiny and don't require additional transparency. On principle, however, the bill appears to establish a double-standard in how state law treats local government contracts with automatic renewal provisions.

Supporting: (As of 6/27/13)

American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees
 California Labor Federation
 California School Employees Association
 California Teamsters Public Affairs Council
 Glendale City Employees Association
 Maintenance Cooperation Trust Fund
 Organization of SMUD Employees

San Bernardino Public Employees Association
 San Luis Obispo County Employees Association
 Santa Rosa City Employees Association;
 Service Employees International Union
 California State Council
 United Food and Commercial Workers Western States Council

Opposing:

Advance Disposal Company and Recycling Center
 Amador Valley Industries
 American California Bank
 American Medical Response
 Association of California Cities Orange County
 Athens Services
 Atlas Disposal Industries
 Autocar
 Bay Counties SMaRT
 BLT Enterprises
 Burrtec Waste Industries, Inc.
 California Ambulance Association
 California Association of Sanitation Agencies

California Contract Cities Association
 Cal Disposal
 California Refuse Recycling Council
 California Special Districts Association
 California Waste Recovery Systems;
 Calmet Services, Inc.
 Cities of Brea, Buena Park, Encinitas, Imperial Beach, Lakewood, La Mirada, Lemon Grove, National City, Poway, Rancho Palos Verdes, Sacramento, Turlock
 Clara Mateo Garbage Collector's Association

Clean Energy
 Clean Street
 Clover Flat Resource Recovery Park
 Concord Disposal Service
 Consolidated Fabricators Corp.
 Congressman Jared Huffman
 Contra Costa Waste Service
 County of Los Angeles
 Crown Disposal Co., Inc.
 CR&R Incorporated
 Desert Valley Disposal, Inc.
 East Bay Sanitary Co., Inc.
 EDCO Waste and Recycling Services
 EPIC
 Escondido Disposal, Inc.

Fallbrook Waste and Recycling Services
 Freeman and Williams, LLP
 Garaventa Enterprises
 Garden City Sanitation
 Gilton Solid Waste Management, Inc.
 Green Hasson Janks
 Harrison Industries
 Haulaway
 Heffernan Insurance Brokers
 Inland Empire Disposal Association
 JR Miller and Associate, Inc.
 League of California Cities
 Los Angeles County Waste Management Association
 MarBorg Industries
 Marin County Council of Mayors and Councilmembers
 Marin Sanitary Service
 Midstate Solid Waste and Recycling
 Mill Valley Refuse Service
 Mission Trail Waste Systems
 Mt. Diablo Recycling
 Napa Recycling and Waste Services, LLC
 Nationwide Environmental Services

Northern Recycling & Waste Services
 Olympic Wire and Equipment, Inc.
 Palm Springs Disposal Services
 Park Waste & Recycling Services
 Peninsula Sanitary Service, Inc.
 Pleasanton Garbage Service, Inc.
 R.J. Proto Consulting Group
 Rainbow Environmental Services
 Ramona Disposal Service
 Refuse Power Systems
 Rehrig Pacific Co.
 Reliable Pump Stops
 RF Dickson Co.
 Rio Vista Sanitation Service
 RJ McConnell Insurance Services
 Rural County Representatives of California
 San Diego County Disposal Association
 Schaeffer Systems
 International

Signal Hill Waste & Recycling Services
 Solid Waste Insurance Managers
 Soft-Pak
 Solid Waste Disposal
 Association of Orange County
 South Lake Refuse and Recycling
 South San Francisco Scavenger Company, Inc.
 Specialty Solid Waste & Recycling
 Standard Iron and Metals
 Stanford Recycling Center
 Teamsters Local Union No. 70
 Teamsters Local Union No. 665
 The Rule Group
 Tracy Material Recovery and Solid Waste Transfer
 TRG Insurance Services
 Turlock Recycling
 Turlock Scavenger
 Turlock Transfer
 Upper Valley Disposal and Recycling
 Varner Bros., Inc.
 Waste Connections, Inc.
 Westhoff, Cone and Holmstedt

Status: Passed Assembly - Referred to Senate Governance & Finance.

Votes: Melendez 'No', Waldron 'No', Jones 'No'

Legislative Report Item 2	Action Item
----------------------------------	--------------------

[SB 633 \(Pavley\) CEQA](#)

Recommended action: **SUPPORT**
Presentation: Gene Wunderlich

Background:

In 2012 the SWCLC adopted a position of SUPPORT on SB 973(Vargas), a bill written to exempt special events and park use permits from environmental impact reviews under CEQA for a limited duration event. This bill was a response to a decision of a San Diego Superior Court judge on a 2010 case about coastal fireworks that inadvertently affected not only San Diego's special events, but the entire state as well. The ruling in *Coastal Environmental Rights Foundation v. City of San Diego* triggered California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) review for marathons, parades, farmers' markets, and charitable events potentially threatening special events, fireworks displays, our wineries, Susan G, Komen races etc. The case is still under appeal.

Unfortunately the Vargas bill was amended, watered down, rendered ineffective for its stated purpose, and ultimately failed.

Summary:

SB 633 Authorizes, on or before July 1, 2015, the Office of Planning and Research (OPR) to draft revisions to the CEQA Guidelines to include a class of projects involving minor temporary uses of land and public gatherings that have been determined not to have a significant effect on the environment and that shall be exempt from CEQA.

The bill also Clarifies that when an environmental impact report has been prepared for a project pursuant to CEQA, a subsequent or supplemental EIR is not required unless, among other things, new information becomes available that was not known and could not have been known by the lead agency or any responsible agency at the time the environmental impact report was certified as complete

The Senate analyst notes that concerns by potentially impacted groups may have been exaggerated because it is likely that most of the events will qualify under the minor temporary use of land exemption already contained in CEQA. This bill is an attempt to help calm these concerns by authorizing OPR to propose revisions to the CEQA Guideline for temporary events of all sorts that it determines do not have a significant effect on the environment and are qualified to be exempt from CEQA. This should provide expert guidance to local governments about how properly to consider local events in their jurisdictions under CEQA and how to apply the existing CEQA exemptions.

Supporting: (as of 6/13)

California Travel Association

Opposing: None on file.

Status: Passed Senate - Referred to Assembly Committee on Natural Resources

Votes: Anderson Aye, Emmerson Aye, Roth 'Aye'

Legislative Report Item 3	Action Item
----------------------------------	--------------------

AB 1383 (Committee on Labor & Employment) Employment regulations: local enforcement

Recommended action: OPPOSE

Presentation: Gene Wunderlich

Background:

Existing law states that nothing in a specified "part" of the California Labor Code (LAB) shall be deemed to restrict the exercise of local police powers in a more stringent manner.

Existing law states that when a local jurisdiction expends funds that have been provided to it by a state agency, operates a program that has received assistance from a state agency, or engages in an activity that has received assistance from a state agency, labor standards established by the local jurisdiction through exercise of local police powers or spending powers shall take effect with regard to that expenditure, program, or activity, so long as those labor standards are not in explicit conflict with, or explicitly preempted by, state law.

Existing law states that a state agency may not require as a condition to the receipt of state funds or assistance that a local jurisdiction refrain from applying labor standards established by the local jurisdiction to expenditures, programs, or activities supported by the state funds or assistance in question.

This bill explicitly states that nothing in LAB itself prohibits the local enforcement of labor standards in a manner more stringent than enforcement by the state.

Arguments in SUPPORT: According to the sponsor of the bill, California Labor Federation, LAB is intended to provide a floor of set minimum labor standards for all workers in this state. Proponents argue that local communities should be able to raise those standards, such as living wage ordinances or local paid sick days, based on their own assessment of what types of protections are needed. Proponents argue that this bill makes it clear that localities are free to pass local ordinances that supplement and enhance existing statewide protections.

Arguments in OPPOSITION: It is well known that California has some of the most onerous wage and hour requirements in the nation, with even the state Labor Commissioner and courts disagreeing on the proper interpretation/application. Litigation is constantly filed for wage-related disputes, such as whether an employee has been properly classified as exempt versus non-exempt, as an independent contractor versus an employee, or even paid at the appropriate rate for the proper amount of time. Notably, California is also the only state that we are aware of that allows private citizens to step in the shoes of the Attorney General and pursue representative actions, with statutory penalties and employee-only right to attorney's fees for Labor Code violations.

Despite the existing burden and threat of litigation that current Labor Code requirements and Industrial Welfare Wage Orders already impose on employers in California, AB 1383 allows local jurisdictions to impose even more stringent wage and hour requirements. For example, under AB 1383, a local jurisdiction could require employers to provide additional reporting requirements, posting requirements, meal and rest breaks, or even higher overtime rates. This authority will create a patchwork of labor and employment laws throughout California that will make it even more difficult for business to operate, especially small businesses that do not have the capacity to manage new and additional labor laws.

Moreover, as AB 1383 includes all sections of the Labor Code, it is also potentially unconstitutional as the Article XIV, Section 4 of the California Constitution solely vests the Legislature with the authority to impose laws with regard to workers' compensation, not local authorities. Given that workers' compensation laws are included within the Labor Code, AB 1383 violates this portion of the constitution.

Supporting: (as of 7/13)

California Labor Federation, AFL-CIO (source)

Opposing:

Acclamation Insurance Management Services
Allied Managed Care, Inc.
Associated Builders and Contractors of California
California Association of Winegrape Growers
California Chamber of Commerce
California Chapter of American Fence Association
California Employment Law Council

California Farm Bureau Federation
California Fence Contractors' Association
California Framing Contractors' Association
California Grocers Association
California Hospital Association
California Restaurant Association
California Trucking Association
Engineering Contractor's Association
Flasher Barricade Association
Marin Builders Association
AB 1383 Page 3
National Federation of Independent Business

Status: Passed Assembly - Referred to Senate Labor & Industrial Relations

Votes: Waldron 'No', Nestande 'No', Jones 'No', Melendez 'No Vote Recorded'

Proposition 90 - Riverside County

Recommended action: **SUPPORT**

Presentation: Gene Wunderlich

Background:**What is Proposition 90?**

Proposition 90 is constitutional amendments passed by California voters that provides property tax relief for persons aged 55 and over. It allows these persons, under certain conditions, to transfer a property's base year value from an existing residence in one county to a replacement residence in another county. The provisions of Propositions 90 may result in substantial tax savings since it allows the adjusted base year value of the original (sold) property to be transferred to the newly purchased or constructed home if eligibility requirements are met. One critical requirement is that the county where the new home is being purchased or constructed must allow Proposition 90 transfers. A separate amendment, authorized by Proposition 60, allows similar property value transfers between properties within a county.

Detailed information and answers to Frequently Asked Questions about Proposition 60 and 90 are available from the California Board of Equalization at:

http://boe.ca.gov/proptaxes/faqs/propositions60_90.htm

Is Proposition 90 in effect in Riverside County?

Not at the present time. Proposition 90 transfers were permitted in Riverside County until 1995 but the law allowing them was not renewed.

Will Proposition 90 be reauthorized in Riverside County?

The Riverside County Board of Supervisors will conduct a public hearing on that question on July 30, 2013 and will vote at the conclusion of that hearing on a proposed ordinance, Ordinance 920, to extend Proposition 90 for five years.

Why wouldn't the Supervisors vote to approve Proposition 90?

The County Auditor Controller has conducted a cost analysis of Proposition 90 which concluded that public agencies in the county could lose up to \$4.7 Million annually from the lower assessments on homes purchased through Proposition 90.

Prop 90 would cause a little property tax loss but aren't there economic benefits for the county from the new residents who would move to Riverside County?

Yes. A study conducted jointly by the Bureau of Economic Analysis, the Harvard Center for Housing Studies and the National Association of REALTORS®, updated in March 2013, found that

every new home sale in California produced approximately \$95,000 in local economic benefits. Those benefits derive from all the goods and services typically associated with a home purchased and the income earned by those who sell the good and perform the services. Other studies show that one permanent job is created from every two home sales. The Auditor Controller estimates that 2300 home sales per year in Riverside County would come under Proposition 90. Applying the Harvard/NAR formula means that by authorizing Prop 90 our county gains almost \$220,000,000 in economic benefits and potentially 1150 new jobs.

Harvard/NAR Economic Impact of Housing Sale:

<http://www.realtor.org/sites/default/files/reports/2013/Economic%20Impact/economic-impact-real-estate-activity-california-2013-03.pdf>

Home Sale Impact on Job Creation:

<http://www.realtor.org/topics/home-ownership-matters/jobs-impact-of-an-existing-home-purchase>

Some might argue that the many of those using Prop 90 benefits would have moved to Riverside anyway so Prop 90 is just a giveaway.

The California Association of REALTOR® conducted a survey that found that at least 52% of those using Prop 90 in other counties based their purchase decision primarily on the availability of Proposition 90 tax benefits. Again applying the Harvard/NAR economic benefit formula, Riverside County would annually reap over \$114,000,000 in benefit and almost 600 permanent jobs just from those whose primary reason for choosing Riverside County over another county is the existence of Prop 90.

Do any other counties allow Prop 90?

Yes, eight other counties currently allow Prop 90 assessment transfers. Most importantly, our neighbor counties of Los Angeles, San Diego and Orange, all provide Prop 90 benefits, giving them an edge in the competition to attract new permanent residents.



EVERY DAY
we're getting more information to
GAIN CONTROL
over our daily lives.



EXCEPT
when it comes to our government
in California...

The Solution: The Neighborhood Legislature.



The Neighborhood Legislature is a **comprehensive reform of the California legislature** to help government work better on behalf of the people, **reduce the power of special interests**, and **take much of the big money out of California politics.**

For more information on this innovative idea:

BECOME A CANDIDATE

OR

BECOME A SUPPORTER