

SWCLC
Southwest California
Legislative Council
A coalition of the
Temecula Valley, Murrieta, Lake Elsinore Valley, Wildomar & Menifee
Chambers of Commerce

MEETING AGENDA
Monday, September 22, 2014

Realtor House, 26529 Jefferson Avenue, Murrieta CA

Presiding: Alex Braicovich, Chair

2014 Strategic Initiatives

Budget & Tax Reform / Job Creation and Retention / Healthcare / Infrastructure & The Environment

Call to Order, Roll Call & Introductions: 12:00 p.m.

Chair Report

Agenda Items

1. Approval of August 2014 Meeting Minutes Action
2. Qualified Ballot Propositions Action
 1. California Proposition 1, Water Bond 2014 (Formerly Proposition 43)
Patti Arlt, Senior Gov't & Regional Affairs Rep., Metropolitan Water District
 2. Mount San Jacinto College Bond Measure AA
Dr. Roger Schultz, President & Superintendent, MSJC
 3. Murrieta Valley Unified School District Bond Measure BB
Patrick Kelley, Superintendent, Murrieta Valley Unified School District
 4. California Proposition 2, Rainy Day Budget Stabilization Fund Act 2014 (Formerly Prop 44)
4. Legislator, Staff and Stakeholder Updates Information

Federal: Senators Feinstein & Boxer. Representatives Calvert & Hunter
State: Governor Brown, Senators Anderson & Roth, Assemblymembers Melendez, Waldron & Jones
Local: County, Cities, Utilities, EDC, Healthcare, League of Cities

5. Chamber & Council Member Announcements Information

6. Today's lunch sponsored by: Thank you



Adjourn – Next meeting October 20, 2014.

For updates that affect your business everyday - LIKE us on:



The Southwest California Legislative Council Thanks Our Partners:

[Southwest Riverside Country Association of Realtors](#)
[Southern California Edison](#)
[Metropolitan Water District of Southern California](#)
[Elsinore Valley Municipal Water District](#)
[The Gas Company](#)
[Abbott Vascular](#)

[Commerce Bank of Temecula Valley](#)
[Loma Linda University Medical Center](#)
[Southwest Healthcare Systems](#)
[Walmart](#)
[EDC of Southwest California](#)
[CR&R Waste Services](#)
[The Murrieta Temecula Group](#)

[Temecula Valley Chamber of Commerce](#)
[Murrieta Chamber of Commerce](#)
[Lake Elsinore Valley Chamber of Commerce](#)
[Wildomar Chamber of Commerce](#)
[Menifee Valley Chamber of Commerce](#)



**Southwest California Legislative Council
Menifee Valley Chamber of Commerce
Murrieta Chamber of Commerce
Temecula Valley Chamber of Commerce
Lake Elsinore Chamber of Commerce
Wildomar Chamber of Commerce
Meeting Minutes
August 18, 2014**

Legislative Consultant: Gene Wunderlich

2014 Chair: Alex Braicovich

Directors Attendance:

Matt Buck, California Apartment Association
Pietro Canestrelli, Reid & Hellyer APC
Dennis Frank, D.R. & Associates
Judy Guglielmana, Town & Country Real Estate
Jason Hope, JD Promotions

Tony LoPiccolo, LoPiccolo Consultants
Don Murray, Commerce Bank of Temecula Valley
Brad Neet, Southwest Healthcare Systems
Joan Sparkman, Southwest Healthcare Systems

Directors Absent:

Steve Amante, Amante & Associates;
Vicki Carpenter, Coldwell Banker;
Glen Daigle, Oakgrove Equities;

Greg Morrison, EVMWD;
Shaura Olsen, Walmart;
Gary Thornhill, Gary Thornhill Consulting

Council Guests:

Andy Abeles, Rancon Real Estate
Brian Ambrose, City of Murrieta
Patti Arlt, MWD
Jeff Bott, TCA-The Toll Roads
Danielle Coats, EMWD
Brenda Dennstedt, Congressman Ken Calvert
John Denver, City of Menifee
Kenneth Dickson, MVUSD
Erik Dodd, Reid & Hillyer, APC
Michael Garrison, Assemblywoman Melissa Melendez
Jeremy Goldman, SCE
Gina Gonzalez, City of Menifee
Jeff Greene, Supervisor Kevin Jeffries

Victor Guerrero, American West Bank
Roy Holliday, LPL Financial
Verne Lauritzen, Supervisor Jeff Stone
Betsy Lowrey, City of Temecula
Connie Lynch, SRCAR
Remi Malahieude, RILYNN
Myles Ross, Sunbelt Business Sales
Adam Ruiz, 1st Action Real Estate
Yvonne Ruiz, Wine Country Notary
Erin Sasse, League of Cities
Rebecca Shear'Ree, Keller Williams
Michael Underwood, WMWD
Darlene Wetton, Temecula Valley Hospital

Staff:

Patrick Ellis – Murrieta Chamber of Commerce
Wendy Mitchell- Wildomar Chamber of Commerce
Alice Sullivan – Temecula Valley Chamber of Commerce
Laura Turnbow - Temecula Valley Chamber of Commerce
Dorothy Wolons – Menifee Chamber of Commerce

Meeting called to order at: 12:13 by Chairman Alex Braicovich

1. Approval of Minutes Action
Directors reviewed the minutes from the August 18, 2014 meeting. **The motion was made to approve the minutes. The motion was seconded and carried by a unanimous vote.**

2. Legislative Report #8 Action

SB 1139 (Hueso D) – California renewables Portfolio Standard Program. **Following discussion the motion was made to OPPOSE SB 1139. The motion was seconded and carried by a unanimous vote.**

SB 850 (Block) – Public postsecondary education: community college districts; baccalaureate degree pilot program. **Following discussion the motion was made to SUPPORT SB 850. The motion was seconded and carried by a unanimous vote.**

SB 812 (DeLeon-D) – Hazardous waste. **Following discussion the motion was made to SUPPORT SB 812. The motion was seconded and carried by a unanimous vote.**

3. Qualified Ballot Propositions Action

Proposition 43 (LBM) – Bonds: \$1.1 billion bond for California's water system. **Following discussion the decision was made to SCRAP Proposition 43 until the next meeting.**

Proposition 44 (LRCA) - Government Finance: Increase amount of potential savings in the state 'rainy day fund' from 5% to 10% of the General Fund. **Following discussion the motion was made to OPPOSE Proposition 44. The motion was seconded and carried by a unanimous vote.**

Proposition 45 (CISS) – Insurance: Public notice required for insurance company rate initiative. **Following discussion the motion was made to OPPOSE Proposition 45. The motion was seconded and carried by a unanimous vote.**

Proposition 46 (CISS) – Healthcare: Increase the cap on damages that can be assessed in medical negligence lawsuits over \$1 million. **Following discussion the motion was made to OPPOSE Proposition 46. The motion was seconded and carried by a unanimous vote.**

Proposition 47 (CISS) – Criminal Trials: Reduced the penalty for the most nonviolent crimes from a felony to a misdemeanor. **Following discussion the motion was made to OPPOSE Proposition 47. The motion was seconded and carried by a unanimous vote.**

Proposition 48 (VR) – Gambling: Ratification of gaming compacts with the North Fork Rancheria of Mono Indians and the Wivot Tribe. **Following discussion the motion was made to DISREGARD WITH NO POSITION. The motion was seconded and carried by a unanimous vote.**

4. Legislator, Staff and Stakeholder Updates Information

Congressman Ken Calvert

Report by Brenda Dennstedt

Mailers – Communication has been restricted during certain times to constituents. Please check out his website and participate in his survey about the immigration issue. Also, there is a phone survey being conducted with regards to how he can better serve his constituents.

Senator Joel Anderson

Report by Karen

August 31 – Last day of legislative cycle

December 10th – Legislative Open House

SB 545 – Legal name changes for minors – signed into law by Governor Brown on June 25th.

SB 828 – Public safety – passed

SB 702 – Increase fine for impersonation of a peace officer is on the Assembly floor.

Supports water bond because he was told by Water Districts in San Diego and that this bond will deliver the water that we need so badly.

Assemblywoman Melissa Melendez

Report by Michael Garrison

AB 1775 – Protects children from sexual exploitation in cyberspace – this is on Governor Brown's desk.

AB 2217 – Encourages schools to have Automated External Defibrillators and protect those who use them via the Good Samaritan's law in the case something went wrong. It passed the Appropriations committee and is headed to the Senate floor.

Whistle Blower Protection Act – Killed in Committee

Authored Joint Resolution to President Obama for the release of Sergeant Tamoressi with 20 signatures from other State Legislatures.

Water Bond – lack of conveyance

January 15 – gas tax

Supervisor Jeff Stone

Report by Verne Lauritzen

SB 69 – fix property tax funding

AB 1521 – fix property tax funding

County in process of rewriting its Marijuana ordinance. Toured marijuana groves in the area. Large groves being grown in plain sight. Complaints include - close to schools, libraries and they use lots of water.

Governor Kevin Jeffries

Report by Jeff Greene

Good news that on water legislation, Governor Brown signed. Hopefully getting it into the district hands for permanent use. State grant dollars will be used to get water to needed areas in the community. County budget workshop on September 8th at 9 am addressing 2 main issues – 1) jail 2) hospitals. Also, the streamlining of permits for property upgrades should now be available online with a single fee.

City of Murrieta

Report by Rick Gibbs

Ballot Measure BB – 3 Murrieta High Schools are in the top 10 out of the 19,000 high schools in America. This measure tends to keep them there.

Report by Randon Lane

Kaiser is moving forward with CEQA office building next to Loma Linda Hospital, hotels behind Walmart and CarMax is building largest facility in the nation in Murrieta.

City of Menifee

Report by Gina Gonzalez

Proposed Moratorium on development of lot sizes and future apartments on City Council Agenda for August 20th.

City of Temecula

Report by Betsy Lowrey

Sent a letter out to President and leaders for release of Sergeant Tamoressi. Annual College and University Invitational at the Promenade Mall on September 20th.

League of Cities

Report by Erin Sasse

AB 1521 and SB 69 both are co-authors by Assemblywoman Melendez and Assemblyman Linder. These bills have to pass with each other. Sending a letter of support would be appreciated. Marijuana issue – AB 1262 dead. SB 785 keep an eye on it. This bill would allow cities to use their authority to do design builds. Golf Tournament – October 13th at Tukwet Canyon in Beaumont.

MVUSD

Report by Ken Dickson

Thank you for taking a look at Measure BB. The School District has been making great efforts to keep our schools updated and using technology responsibly. The funds would be used to update old buildings and keeping technology updated.

SC AQMD

Report by David Madsen

- 1) 10th Hydrogen filling station at California State University in LA.
- 2) 2014 AQ Management Plan kick off
- 3) USEPA – Tier 3 Emission Standards have been adopted and will go into effect in April 2017 for lower sulfur content in gasoline for fleet vehicles.
- 4) SC AQMD supported May 2014 Alternative Clean Transportation Act Exposition

Metropolitan Water District

Report by Patti Arlt

Supporting Water Bond. Rebate programs – doubled from \$20 million to \$40 million.

EVMWD

Report by Danielle Coats

Drought – EVMWD is offering ways to help water conservation, please visit their website for more information.

Western Municipal Water District

Report by Michele Underwood

WMWD is offering rebates for grass/turf removal at \$5 per sq ft. for commercial accounts and \$1-\$2 for residential accounts.

Temecula Valley Hospital

Report by Darlene Wetton

- 1) TVH is now designed to receive 911 calls for heart attack patients.
- 2) Fallbrook Hospital owned by Fallbrook
 - needs management or it will be closed
 - Senior living community at hospital will be affected.
 - Huge impact on region.
- 3) Fallbrook Hospital will suspend OB-GYN services on September 1st.

City of Lake Elsinore

Free boating is being offered on Wednesdays and Sundays.

Southern California Gas Company

Report by Randon Lane

Automated meters are being tested for 4 months. So Cal Gas is engaged with community in the educational STEM program.

Southern California Edison

Report by Jeremy Goldman
September 1st begins the Non-Profit Grant Cycle

5. Chamber & Council Member
Announcements

Information

Menifee Chamber of Commerce

Report by Dorothy Wolons
Lots of building happening. New areas include Skate Park, Water Park, Jersey Mikes, Applebees, Five Guys, Menifee Vape Shop.
August 27th – Menifee Night at the Storm
September 6th – Soapbox Derby
September 17th – Candidate Forum

Murrieta Chamber of Commerce

Report by Patrick Ellis
August 30th – Murrieta Night at the Storm
September 4th – Visterra Credit Union Mixer
September 19th -21st – Get Shamrocked Irish Festival
September 14th – Candidate Forum

Wildomar Chamber of Commerce

Report by Cheri Zamora
August 21st – SRCAR Mixer at 5:30 pm
September 3rd – Wake Up Wildomar Breakfast with Fire Chief Steve Beach
September 23rd – Candidate Forum

Temecula Valley Chamber of Commerce

Report by Alice Sullivan
August 20th – Mixer at Dan Henderson's Fitness
August 28th – Mixer at Bailey's in Old Town
September 9th – Women in Business at South Coast Winery
September 16th – Candidate Forum
October 9th – Legislative Summit

Lake Elsinore Valley Chamber of Commerce

Report by Tony Amatulli
August 21st – Franchise Workshop
August 21st – Mixer at Summerly
August 28th – Lake Elsinore Night Out at the Diamond

5. Lunch Sponsor Assistance League of Temecula Valley Information
Alex Braicovich thanked the Assistance League of Temecula Valley for sponsoring lunch today.

Motion to Adjourn at 1:44 p.m.

Qualified Ballot Propositions

[California Proposition 1, Water Bond 2014 \(Formerly Proposition 43\)](#)

Recommended action: **SUPPORT** / OPPOSE / NOT BUSINESS RELATED

CalChamber Position: Support

Presentation: Patti Arlt, Senior Gov't & Regional Affairs Rep., Metropolitan Water District

California Proposition 1, the **Water Bond** (Assembly Bill 1471), is on the November 4, 2014, ballot in California as a legislatively-referred bond act. This measure replaced a previous measure known as Proposition 43.

The measure, upon voter approval, would enact the **Water Quality, Supply, and Infrastructure Improvement Act of 2014**. Proposal 1, if approved, would:

- Authorize \$7.12 billion in general obligation bonds for state water supply infrastructure projects, such as public water system improvements, surface and groundwater storage, drinking water protection, water recycling and advanced water treatment technology, water supply management and conveyance, wastewater treatment, drought relief, emergency water supplies, and ecosystem and watershed protection and restoration.
- Appropriate money from the General Fund to pay off bonds.
- Require certain projects to provide matching funds from non-state sources in order to receive bond funds.

Specific spending proposals in the proposition include:

- \$520 million to improve water quality for "beneficial use," for reducing and preventing drinking water contaminants, disadvantaged communities, and the State Water Pollution Control Revolving Fund Small Community Grant Fund.
- \$1.495 billion for competitive grants for multi-benefit ecosystem and watershed protection and restoration projects.
- \$810 million for expenditures on, and competitive grants and loans to, integrated regional water management plan projects.
- \$2.7 billion for water storage projects, dams and reservoirs.
- \$725 million for water recycling and advanced water treatment technology projects.
- \$900 million for competitive grants, and loans for, projects to prevent or clean up the contamination of groundwater that serves as a source of drinking water.
- \$395 million for statewide flood management projects and activities.

Gov. Jerry Brown called on the legislature to replace the previous \$11.14 billion bond (Proposition 43) with a cheaper \$6 billion bond on June 25, 2014. Brown called the previous water bond "a pork-laden water bond... with a price tag beyond what's reasonable or affordable." The legislature passed the new \$7.12 billion bond on August 13, 2014.

The original water bond was moved twice. Originally certified to be on the state's 2010 ballot, it was removed and placed on the 2012 ballot. On July 5, 2012, the state legislature approved a bill to take the measure off the 2012 ballot and put it on the 2014 ballot.

Fiscal impact statement:

(Note: The fiscal impact statement for a California ballot initiative authorized for circulation is jointly prepared by the state's Legislative Analyst and its Director of Finance.)

- Increased state bond repayment costs averaging \$360 million annually over the next 40 years.
- Savings to local governments related to water projects, likely averaging a couple hundred million dollars annually over the next few decades.

State Bond Cost Estimates	
Authorized new borrowing	\$7.1 billion
Average annual cost to pay off bonds	\$360 million
Likely repayment period	40 years
Source of repayment	General tax revenues

Support

Officials

- Gov. Jerry Brown
- US Sen. Dianne Feinstein
- US Sen. Barbara Boxer

Organizations

- California Farm Bureau Federation
- The Nature Conservancy
- Audubon California
- California Chamber of Commerce
- Delta Counties Coalition
- Los Angeles Area Chamber of Commerce
- Ducks Unlimited
- American Rivers
- Silicon Valley Leadership Group
- Friant Water Authority
- San Diego Water Authority
- Metropolitan Water District of Southern California
- Natural Resources Defense Council
- Northern California Water Association
- State Building and Construction Trades Council of California
- Association of California Water Agencies
- Fresno Irrigation District
- Western Growers
- League of California Cities
- California State Association of Counties

Arguments

Gov. Jerry Brown, Paul Wenger, President of California Farm Bureau Federation, and **Mike Sweeny**, California Director of The Nature Conservancy, wrote the argument in favor found in the state's official voter information guide:

YES ON PROPOSITION 1 ENSURES A RELIABLE WATER SUPPLY FOR FARMS AND BUSINESSES DURING SEVERE DROUGHT — PROTECTING BOTH THE ECONOMY AND THE ENVIRONMENT

California is in a severe, multi-year drought and has an aging water infrastructure. That is why Republicans and Democrats and leaders from all over California came together in nearly unanimous fashion to place this fiscally responsible measure on the ballot...

YES ON 1 IS FISCALLY RESPONSIBLE

Proposition 1 will not raise taxes. It is a no-frills investment in critical projects that doesn't break the bank - it even reallocates money from unused bonds to make better use of the money.

YES ON 1 GROWS CALIFORNIA'S ECONOMY

California's economy depends on a reliable water supply. Proposition 1 secures our water future, keeps our family farms and businesses productive, and puts Californians to work building the new facilities we need to store, deliver and treat water.

YES ON 1 SAFEGUARDS OUR EXISTING WATER SUPPLIES

Proposition 1 will clean up our contaminated groundwater which serves as a critical buffer against drought by providing additional water in years when there is not enough rainfall or snow.

Proposition 1 expands water recycling and efficiency improvements making the best use of our existing supplies.

Proposition 1 provides funding for clean drinking water in communities where water is contaminated.

YES ON 1 STORES WATER WHEN WE HAVE IT

Proposition 1 invests in new storage increasing the amount of water that can be stored during wet years for the dry years that will continue to challenge California.

YES ON 1 PROTECTS THE ENVIRONMENT

Proposition 1 protects California's rivers, lakes and streams from pollution and contamination and provides for the restoration of our fish and wildlife resources.

PROPOSITION 1 CONTAINS STRICT ACCOUNTABILITY REQUIREMENTS INCLUDING ANNUAL AUDITS, OVERSIGHT AND PUBLIC DISCLOSURE TO ENSURE THE MONEY IS PROPERLY SPENT.

YES ON 1 - Supported by REPUBLICANS, DEMOCRATS, FARMERS, LOCAL WATER SUPPLIERS, CONSERVATION GROUPS, BUSINESS AND COMMUNITY LEADERS...

Opposition



The campaign against the measure is being led by *Vote NO on Proposition 1*.

Opponents

Organizations

- California Sportfishing Protection Alliance
- California Striped Bass Association
- California Water Impact Network
- Center for Biological Diversity
- Central Delta Water Agency
- Concerned Citizens Coalition of Stockton
- Factory Farm Awareness Coalition
- Friends of the River
- Food and Water Watch
- Pacific Coast Federation of Fishermen's Associations
- Restore the Delta
- San Francisco Crab Boat Association
- Sherman Island Duck Hunters Association
- Small Boat Commercial Salmon Fishermens' Association
- South Delta Water Agency
- Southern California Watershed Alliance
- Winnemem Wintu Tribe

Arguments

The **California Sportfishing Protection Alliance** issued a "statement of opposition" to Proposition 1. The group provided 14 reasons to vote against the proposition. The following is a selection from those reasons:

1. Undermines the public trust doctrine.

Water in rivers and streams, like the air people breathe, belongs to the people of California as part of the public trust... Private interests have a right to use the public's water for beneficial purposes, as long as the public's ownership in healthy rivers is protected. The Bond requires taxpayers to enrich a few wealthy water users by purchasing water the public already owns, at inflated prices, to protect the public's rivers and environment. It's a retread of previously discredited programs that allowed speculators to reap millions in profit selling the public's water back to the public.

2. Undermines the principle of beneficiary pays.

The major reason more dams and other environmentally damaging projects have not been constructed "

in recent decades is the principle, stemming from approval of the State Water Project in 1960, that beneficiaries of water projects, not taxpayers, must pay for new projects. The Bond turns the beneficiary pays principle on its head by requiring taxpayers to pay for projects benefiting special interests...

3. Undermines the principle that projects should mitigate adverse impacts.

Projects have long been legally responsible for mitigating their adverse impacts. Many, if not most, of the watershed protection and restoration projects that will be funded by the Bond are efforts to repair and mitigate environmental damage caused by projects that were constructed by and for special interests... Taxpayers should not be on the hook because regulators failed to require special interest projects to mitigate their adverse impacts.

4. Ushers in a new era of big dams.

The Bond includes the largest appropriation for new dams in the state's history... A number of dam projects that had been abandoned because of low water yield and financial infeasibility are being resurrected in response to the Bond's commitment of billions of taxpayer dollars for dams. If the Bond passes, fishermen and environmentalists can expect to find themselves spending decades fighting new dam schemes on rivers throughout the state...

7. Provides little cost-effective near-term drought relief.

Funds for recycling, conservation and groundwater cleanup were slashed 36% in the final version of the Bond in order to provide money for expensive water purchases and speculative new dams that will not be operational for decades... In essence, the Bond sacrifices funds for proven near-term projects that would create "new" lower cost water, contribute to regional self-sufficiency, reduce dependency on the Delta and provide drought relief in order to subsidize long-term pie in the sky projects benefiting the hydraulic brotherhood...

9. Sabotages efforts to meaningfully resolve California's continuing water crisis.

Prop. 1 is a red herring that diverts attention from the real causes of the state's water crisis and the steps and resources required to address it. The water crisis is the result of the over-appropriation, waste and inequitable distribution of limited water supplies and the failure to balance the public trust...

10. Crowds out other critical investments.

The Bond imposes an insidious hidden cost by crowding out critical investments in public schools, roads, public health and safety. California cannot afford to provide lavish subsidies to special interests, while ignoring existing and urgent infrastructure needs...

11. Is fiscally irresponsible.

California is staggering under a \$777 billion debt and voters have already approved \$128 billion in general fund Bonds that must be repaid by taxpayers. The Bond would add over \$7 billion in taxpayer indebtedness that must be repaid with interest, which can easily double the original amount. Subsidies for special interests are inherently fiscally irresponsible.

12. Is a hogfest of projects unrelated to water supply or drought relief.

Bond proponents carefully disguised pork projects by not identifying specific projects in general funding allocations to various groups. Associated Press, in a widely published article, reported that Conservancies and other groups have acknowledged they will use Bond funds for pedestrian and bike trails, parkways, interpretive centers, trash cleanups and other projects with no direct connection to the stated intent of the water Bond...

13. Shamefully holds a few worthy projects hostage to fiscally irresponsible and environmentally damaging projects.

The fact that the Bond contains a few worthy projects fails to justify sacrificing core environmental principles and fiscal responsibility. Approximately, 6.9% of the Bond will provide safe drinking water and clean water programs to disadvantaged communities. This commitment is long overdue and should have been presented as a standalone proposition. It's shameful to use the long-ignored plight of those lacking safe drinking water in disadvantaged communities as justification for eviscerating

environmental protection and providing extravagant subsidies to special interests....

—California Sportfishing Protection Alliance

Other arguments against the proposition include:

- Barbara Barrigan-Parrilla, field director of *Vote NO on Proposition 1*, argued, "Proposition 1 is a corporate money grab aimed at bankrolling special interests with taxpayer dollars while providing tragically inadequate funding for projects that provide safe, clean water for the people of California. Proposition 1 is the wrong investment for California."

Polls

[hide]California Water Bond (2014)					
Poll	Support	Oppose	Undecided	Margin of Error	Sample Size
Tulchin Research 1/20/2010 - 1/25/2010	34.0%	55.0%	11.0%	+/-4.0	600
Public Policy Institute of California 3/11/2014 - 3/18/2014	50.0%	32.0%	19.0%	+/-3.6	1,702
Public Policy Institute of California 7/8/2014 - 7/15/2014	61.0%	22.0%	17.0%	+/-3.7	1,705
The Field Poll 8/14/2014 - 8/28/2014	52.0%	27.0%	21.0%	+/-4.8	467
Lake Research Partners 8/26/2014 - 8/29/2014	42.0%	24.0%	34.0%	+/-4.0	600
AVERAGES	47.8%	32%	20.4%	+/-4.02	1,014.8
<p>Note: The polls above may not reflect all polls that have been conducted in this race. Those displayed are a random sampling chosen by Ballotpedia staff. If you would like to nominate another poll for inclusion in the table, send an email to editor@ballotpedia.org.</p>					



THE METROPOLITAN WATER DISTRICT
OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA

**BOARD
ACTION**

Board of Directors
Communications and Legislation Committee
9/9/2014 Board Meeting

8-3

Subject

Ratify Support for Proposition 1, The Water Quality, Supply and Infrastructure Improvement Act of 2014

Executive Summary

On August 13, 2014, the Legislature, on a bipartisan vote, approved and Governor Jerry Brown subsequently signed, AB 1471 (Rendon, D-Lakewood) the Water Quality, Supply and Infrastructure Improvement Act of 2014. AB 1471 replaces the \$11.14 billion bond measure with a \$7.545-billion water financing package on the November 2014 ballot. Metropolitan supported AB 1471, based on the board-adopted water bond principles. Staff recommends the board ratify Metropolitan's support for AB 1471 which will appear as Proposition 1) on the November 2014 ballot.

Details

Legislative History

In November 2009, the California Legislature passed and then-Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger signed into law a comprehensive package of water policy to address California's water management needs. The 2009 package codified in statute the coequal goals of ecosystem restoration and water supply reliability and established state requirements related to conservation, groundwater monitoring and reporting of water diversions.

The comprehensive package also included an \$11.14-billion general obligation bond to help finance local resource development, Delta ecosystem restoration, watershed improvements and the public benefits associated with groundwater and surface storage projects. The bond was to appear on the November 2010 general election ballot.

Subsequent to passage of the bond legislation in 2009, the California Legislature twice delayed placing the water bond before the voters. Governor Brown and the Legislature remained concerned, however, over the long-term fiscal impacts of an \$11.14 billion general obligation bond for water infrastructure and the potential impact to financing other state infrastructure priorities.

After more than five years of negotiations to adjust the bond, on August 13, 2014, the Legislature, on a bipartisan vote, approved and Governor Jerry Brown subsequently signed, AB 1471 (Rendon, D-Lakewood). AB 1471 replaces the \$11.14-billion bond measure with a \$7.545-billion water financing package which will appear as Proposition 1 on the November 2014 ballot.

Proposition 1, The Water Quality, Supply and Infrastructure Improvement Act of 2014, largely follows the structure of the 2009 bond, and provides funding to advance Governor Brown's California Water Action Plan. When AB 1471, and an identical bill, SB 866 (Wolk, D-Davis), were pending before the Legislature, Metropolitan staff had signaled support for both measures based upon the board-adopted water bond priorities. Board ratification of Metropolitan's support would formalize Metropolitan's position on Proposition 1.

Proposition 1 would provide funding in support of California's objectives for long-term water supply reliability and environmental stewardship as follows:

Chapter 5. Clean, Safe and Reliable Drinking Water

\$520 million for projects that improve water quality or help provide clean, safe, and reliable drinking water to all Californians.

Chapter 6. Protecting Rivers, Lakes, Streams, Coastal Waters, and Watersheds

\$1.495 billion for multi-benefit ecosystem and watershed protection and restoration projects.

Chapter 7. Regional Water Security, Climate, and Drought Preparedness

\$810 million to the Integrated Regional Water Management Program for projects that respond to climate change and contribute to regional water security.

Chapter 8. Statewide Water System Operational Improvement and Drought Preparedness

\$2.7 billion in continuously appropriated funds to the California Water Commission for public benefits associated with water storage projects that improve the operation of the state water system, are cost effective, and provide a net improvement in ecosystem and water quality conditions.

Chapter 9. Water Recycling

\$725 million for water recycling and advanced treatment technology projects.

Chapter 10. Groundwater Sustainability

\$900 million to the State Water Resources Control Board for projects to prevent or clean up the contamination of groundwater that serves or has served as a source of drinking water.

Chapter 11. Flood Management

\$395 million to the Department of Water Resources and the Central Valley Flood Protection Board for the purpose of statewide flood management and to reduce levee failure and floods in the Delta.

A more detailed summary of the funding allocation in Proposition 1 is attached to this letter

Impacts to Metropolitan

Metropolitan and its member agencies would be eligible to compete for funding for water projects under various provisions of Proposition 1. Additionally, funding for projects in other areas of the state may indirectly benefit Metropolitan by enhancing watershed functions, improving water quality and/or increasing reliability in the areas from which Metropolitan imports water supplies. Proposition 1 would also provide a means for the state to co-fund multi-benefit projects to reduce future statewide reliance on Delta water supplies, as called for in the 2009 Delta Reform Act.

AB 1471 was supported by a broad coalition of water, business, conservation, labor, and agriculture organizations. Several organizations are now considering formal positions on Proposition 1. Attached is a set of the draft ballot statements, arguments in support and opposition and rebuttals to those arguments that are proposed to be included in the California Supplemental Voter Information Guide. These statements are not yet final and subject to court ordered changes. The law requires the Secretary of State's Office to place the Official Supplemental Voter Information Guide on public display for 20 days before publishing and distributing it to voters. The public inspection period runs from August 23, 2014, through September 12, 2014. Staff will provide an update at the Communications and Legislation Committee meeting on arguments and organizations in support of and in opposition to Proposition 1.

Policy

2014 Water Bond Priorities, M.I. 49353 – March 12, 2013

California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)

CEQA determination for Option #1:

The proposed action is not defined as a project under CEQA because it involves continuing administrative activities, such as general policy and procedure making (Section 15378(b)(2) of the State CEQA Guidelines). In addition, the proposed action is not subject to CEQA because it involves other government fiscal activities, which do not involve any commitment to any specific project which may result in a potentially significant physical impact on the environment (Section 15378(b)(4) of the State CEQA Guidelines).

The CEQA determination is: Determine that the proposed action is not subject to CEQA pursuant to Sections 15378(b)(2) and 15378(b)(4) of the State CEQA Guidelines.

CEQA determination for Option #2:

None required

Board Options

Option #1

Adopt the CEQA determination that the proposed action is not subject to CEQA and authorize the General Manager to ratify Metropolitan’s support for Proposition 1.

Fiscal Impact: None

Business Analysis: If passed by the voters, state funding could be available for various water projects as well as to implement state policy to advance ecosystem restoration in the Delta and the Delta watersheds and to reduce future reliance on imported water supplies within Southern California.

Option #2

Take no position on Proposition 1.

Fiscal Impact: None

Business Analysis: Could risk funding for local projects as well as the state’s share of public benefits to support coequal goal of Delta ecosystem restoration and statewide water system improvements

Staff Recommendation

Option #1





Dee Zinke
Deputy General Manager, External Affairs

Jeffrey Kightlinger
General Manager

9/3/2014

2014 Water Bond Priorities

1. Fund the state's share of public benefits to support the coequal goals of water supply reliability and Delta ecosystem restoration including:
 - a. Habitat restoration beyond any mitigation obligations of any party or interest;
 - b. Improvements consistent with the Bay Delta Conservation Plan; and
 - c. No local matching funds required.
2. Fund public benefits associated with Delta sustainability projects including:
 - a. Flood protection;
 - b. Water quality improvements;
 - c. Addressing other "stressors" including, but not limited to, invasive species, predator control and unscreened diversions; and
 - d. Require local matching funds as appropriate.
3. Fund multi-benefit projects to reduce future reliance on imported water supplies:
 - a. Equitably allocate funds consistent with Proposition 84 criteria;
 - b. Fund projects that require public incentives to be locally cost-effective;
 - c. Require local matching funds as appropriate;
 - d. Eligible projects in urban areas would include: conservation, recycling, groundwater remediation, storm water capture and desalination;
 - e. Eligible projects in agricultural areas would include on-farm efficiency and system improvements;
 - f. Provide special consideration for disadvantaged communities
 - g. Provide funding for watershed and reservoir management for water quality protection; and
 - h. Provide start-up funds for a low-interest revolving loan program as proposed under AB 1349 (Gatto, D-Silver Lake).
4. Fund statewide system improvements:
 - a. Fund the public benefits associated with surface and groundwater storage;
 - b. Eligible projects must meet public benefit criteria as developed by the California Water Commission (pursuant to SBX7-2/Cogdill from 2009);
 - c. Bond funds to be awarded on competitive basis; and
 - d. Require local matching funds as appropriate.

9/9/2014 Board Meeting 8-3 Attachment 1, Page 1 of 1

Mount San Jacinto College Bond Measure AA

Recommended action: SUPPORT / OPPOSE / NOT BUSINESS RELATED

Presentation: Dr. Roger Schultz, President & Superintendent, MSJC

After hearing an unprecedented string of support from community leaders, the Mt. San Jacinto College District Board of Trustees voted during a special meeting on Monday, Aug. 4, 2014 to place a districtwide funding measure on the November 2014 ballot. If passed by voters, the measure would expand college career and educational facilities and programs that help students transfer to four-year universities and prepare for jobs. It would also ensure that buildings are upgraded for disabled accessibility.

Supporters of the bond measure included Riverside County Supervisor Marion Ashley, Menifee Mayor Scott Mann, Banning Mayor Debbie Franklin, Beaumont Unified School District Superintendent Dr. Maureen Latham, Cal State University San Marcos - Temecula Associate Dean Suzanne Lingold, Hemet-San Jacinto Chamber CEO Andy Anderson and former MSJC Vice President Dennis Anderson. MSJC Academic Senate President Lorraine Slattery-Farrell told the board that faculty, classified staff and students all supported a bond measure. Former MSJC Trustee Joan Sparkman wrote a letter in support of a bond measure, which was read into the record by MSJC Superintendent/President Dr. Roger Schultz.

Board President Ann Motte said a bond for MSJC was critical to the prosperity of the region. She praised the list of specific projects outlined under the bond that would benefit each site in the district – Banning, Temecula, San Jacinto, Menifee and the I-15 corridor. She cited the need for more facilities to serve the growing population and increase the college-going rate, which would help build economic strength in the region.

"I'm normally a tax hawk," Motte said. "I've been on this board for 20 years and I didn't vote for the previous two (bonds)...but I really think it's time."

"With voter approval, this bond measure would allow Mt. San Jacinto College to continue to support student success and create a brighter future for our region on many levels," Dr. Schultz said. "The measure would allow us to proceed with improvements and upgrades to buildings that house our nursing, emergency response and law enforcement classes. Vocational training classrooms would get the necessary upgrades. Outdated math and science labs will be improved. Our students, including returning military veterans, will benefit by receiving education in state-of-the-art facilities that prepare them for today's highly competitive workforce. Our communities benefit because the bond would allow MSJC to build the facilities it needs to meet the area's growing demand for higher education. A skilled local workforce helps to attract more high paying jobs and businesses to our region."

Mt. San Jacinto College provides career training and support for more than 18,000 students a year in the 1,700-square-mile district that stretches from the San Gorgonio Pass to Temecula. In her letter, Sparkman praised MSJC for providing military veterans with education and services. MSJC also has two Veterans Resource Centers to serve its veteran population. MSJC received the Military Friendly School designation in 2014, ranking MSJC in the top 20 percent of colleges serving military students.

In addition to the improvements to classrooms and labs, the bond would help repair leaky roofs, deteriorating gas and sewer lines, upgrade old bathrooms and remove asbestos.

Many of the speakers, including Mann, said they would personally work to help support the bond out in the communities.

"Please put this on the ballot and let the voters decide," Mann told the board. "It will be a huge economic boon not only for my city, but for the region as a whole."

The \$295 million measure passed by trustees contains strict accountability requirements, including an independent 9-member Citizens' Oversight Committee comprised of representatives from throughout the district and annual financial audits to make sure money is being spent as promised. No funds from the measure would go toward salaries or pensions and all funds are required to stay local. The bond, which must

be approved by 55 percent of the voters, would cost \$13.20 a year per \$100,000 of assessed value of a home. **The average homeowner would pay about \$26 a year, or slightly more than \$2 a month.**

Measure AA Frequently Asked Questions

Background

The Mt. San Jacinto College Board of Trustees voted on Aug. 4, 2014 to place a bond measure on the November 2014 ballot.

A measure would provide MSJC with the funding to expand classes for job training, educational services for our returning military veterans and increase opportunities for students to transfer to four-year universities.

Students depend on MSJC to provide them with quality education at an affordable price. Students save about \$40,000 by attending MSJC on their way to earning a four-year degree.

Regional employers depend on MSJC to provide them with a skilled workforce to fill jobs in nursing, emergency medical technicians, law enforcement, auto and computer technicians and other jobs important to our region.

Q) Why now?

MSJC is a 52-year-old community college and some of its buildings are temporary modulars from the 1960s.

MSJC's General Fund dollars currently support: Classrooms; Programs; Student Services; Maintenance and Repairs; New Construction.

If approved by voters, bond funds would be used for maintenance, repairs and construction and Free-Up General Fund dollars to create and expand programs, add more classes and boost student services.

The San Jacinto Campus is nearly 50 years old, the Menifee Valley Campus is not yet complete and MSJC must build new facilities for our growing communities in the I-15/I-215 corridor, including Temecula, Murrieta and Lake Elsinore, and meet the educational needs in Banning and Beaumont as those areas grow.

A recently commissioned independent survey shows as much as 64% of respondents support a local funding measure in November 2014. The measure requires 55% approval for passage.

Q) What is the bond amount?

- A \$295 million bond would cost voters **\$13.20 a year per \$100,000 of a property's assessed value.**
- The average assessed home value across the district is \$190,000.
- That's about **\$26 a year**, or slightly more than \$2 a month.

Q) What would a bond pay for?

Here are a few of the improvements:

All Locations Districtwide

- Improve disabled access
- Expand educational services for military veterans
- Expand services for students
- Upgrade technology

- Install money-saving energy conservation equipment

Modernization of the nearly 50-year-old San Jacinto Campus

- New Math/Science Building
- New Cultural & Performing Arts Center with multi-use Classrooms

Completion of Menifee Valley Campus (now about 60 percent complete)

- A Math/Science building (a local bond would make MSJC eligible for matching funds when available from the state)
- Athletics facilities for students in the I-15/I-215 corridor

I-15/I-215 corridor

- Wildomar site – MSJC is purchasing 80 acres just off of Clinton Keith Road.
- STEM (science, technology, engineering and math) programming
- Secure Temecula location

San Gorgonio Pass

- Expand veteran/student services
- Expand job training programs
- Expand 4-year transfer pathways

Q) Can bond money be used for salaries?

- No. By law, bond measure funds cannot be used for salaries.
- A 9-member Citizen's Bond Oversight Committee comprised of representatives from throughout the district will be formed to watch how the money is spent.
- Annual Financial Audits will be conducted to monitor spending.

MSJC Student & Institutional Achievements:

- Top 150 Aspen Institute – chosen out of more than 1,000 nationwide based on student success rates and other data
- 2013 Military Friendly Institution – Top 20 % in the nation to serve veterans
- Full Accreditation
- High number of students earning Jack Kent Cooke Scholarships, Coca-Cola Scholars and more.
- Awarding-winning faculty
- Bill & Melinda Gates Grant recipient to start a Massive Open Online Class available to students around the world

MSJC Fast Facts

Headcount

Academic Year 2012-13

District wide headcount: 17,946
San Jacinto Campus: 7,031
Menifee Valley Campus: 11,220
San Geronio Pass: 847
Temecula: 3,230
(many students attend more than one campus)

Graduation

2014

Number of students: 1,093
Degrees and/or certificates awarded: 1,736
(some students earned more than one degree, certificate or a combination)

Past MSJC Bond Measures

Bond Measure needs 55 % approval from voters to pass.

MSJC is one of only 8 colleges in California without a bond.

1978 - \$3 million approved by voters. MSJC had only the San Jacinto Campus at that time.

2006 Measure G - \$720 million bond measure failed

<http://www.utsandiego.com/news/2006/jun/08/mt-san-jacinto-college-bond-fails/>

2010 Measure U - \$47 million bond measure, received nearly 52 percent approval. Needed 55 percent.

School Facilities Improvement District (SFID) for the Banning/Beaumont and surrounding communities.

<http://www.msjc.edu/PublicInformationOffice/Pages/Measure-U-Results.aspx>

Murrieta Valley Unified School District Bond Measure BB

Recommended action: **SUPPORT** / OPPOSE / NOT BUSINESS RELATED

Presentation: Patrick Kelley, Superintendent, Murrieta Valley Unified School District



Murrieta Valley Unified School District – Prop 39 School Bond Measure BB – Fall 2014

Measure BB Fact Sheet

Background: Over the past year, Murrieta Valley Unified has worked with our community to identify critical educational needs – especially educational technology needs – that require attention to protect the superior quality of education that helps our schools rank among the best in the state. Leading the way in Education technology is key to our success. By dedicating our instructional resources to stay aligned with the technology change curve, Murrieta students will be better prepared for college and careers in fields like science, engineering, technology and skilled trades. Measure BB has been placed on the November 2014 ballot to align with this vision and ensure peak performing K-12 schools for Murrieta Valley's future.

Measure BB DEFINED: Measure BB is a local ballot measure on the November 2014 ballot seeking voter authorization for funds to complete the next level of upgrades to Murrieta Valley USD education technology and school facilities. A “YES vote” approves funding for the District’s plan to improve schools; a “NO vote” rejects the plan. All MVUSD voters registered by October 20th will be eligible to vote on Measure BB.

The Measure BB Ballot Question: “To upgrade outdated Murrieta K-12 classrooms, labs, career-training facilities, and education technology; rehabilitate deteriorated roofs, plumbing, electrical, lighting, HVAC, flooring, buildings and grounds; acquire/construct/equip sites, classrooms, and facilities; upgrade safety/security systems; and improve science, technology, engineering, and math instructional facilities required for college/career success; shall Murrieta Valley Unified School District issue \$98,000,000 of bonds at legal rates, with independent citizen oversight, no money for administrator salaries, and all funds benefitting Murrieta Valley K-12 schools?”

Measure BB Project Summary – Measure BB will:

- Expand educational technology and keep it up-to-date
- Upgrade classrooms, labs and equipment for advanced math, science, engineering, and technology instruction to meet rising college/university admission requirements
- Improve career-training classrooms for college and career success in fields like health sciences, engineering, technology, and skilled trades
- Repair or replace leaky roofs, old plumbing, failing electrical, lighting and HVAC systems, indoor and outdoor safety hazards, and other facilities to improve student and staff safety;
- Construct new classrooms and school facilities to accommodate growth in student enrollment

Measure BB FACTS:

- By law, ALL Measure BB funds STAY LOCAL dedicated to Murrieta Valley USD schools ONLY.
- The State CANNOT take Measure BB funding away.
- Measure B is for school technology and facilities ONLY.
- NO funds are allowed for administrators' salaries.
- Independent Citizens' Oversight and mandatory audits will ensure funds are spent properly.

For more information please contact: Karen Parris (951) 696-1600 x. 1022 or email

kparris@murrieta.k12.ca.us or visit our website <http://www.murrieta.k12.ca.us/measurebb>

Measure BB Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ)

What is Measure BB?

Measure BB is a local ballot measure on the November 2014 ballot seeking voter authorization for funds to complete the next level of upgrades to Murrieta Valley USD education technology and school facilities. A “YES vote” approves funding for the District’s plan to improve schools; a “NO vote” rejects the plan. All MVUSD voters registered by October 20th will be eligible to vote on Measure BB.

Why has the Murrieta Valley Unified School District (MVUSD) placed Measure BB on the ballot?

Over the past year, Murrieta Valley Unified has worked with our community to identify critical educational needs – especially educational technology needs – that require attention to protect the superior quality of education that helps our schools perform among the best in the state. Leading the way in **Education technology** is key to our success. By dedicating our instructional resources to stay aligned with the technology change curve, Murrieta students will be better prepared for college and careers in fields like science, engineering, technology and skilled trades. **Measure BB** has been placed on the November 2014 ballot to align with this vision and ensure peak performing K-12 schools for Murrieta Valley’s future.

What is the actual question that voters will be asked to decide in November?

"To upgrade outdated Murrieta K-12 classrooms, labs, career-training facilities, and education technology; rehabilitate deteriorated roofs, plumbing, electrical, lighting, HVAC, flooring, buildings and grounds; acquire/construct/equip sites, classrooms, and facilities; upgrade safety/security systems; and improve science, technology, engineering, and math instructional facilities required for college/career success; shall Murrieta Valley Unified School District issue \$98,000,000 of bonds at legal rates, with independent citizen oversight, no money for administrator salaries, and all funds benefitting Murrieta Valley K-12 schools?"

How will Measure BB funds be used?

- See the [Measure BB Project list](#)
- Expand educational technology and keep it up-to-date
- Upgrade classrooms, labs and equipment for advanced math, science, engineering, and technology instruction to meet rising college/university admission requirements
- Improve career-training classrooms for college and career success in fields like health sciences, engineering, technology, and skilled trades
- Repair or replace leaky roofs, old plumbing, failing electrical, lighting and HVAC systems, indoor and outdoor safety hazards, and other facilities to improve student and staff safety;
- Construct new classrooms and school facilities to accommodate growth in student enrollment

By law, ALL Measure BB funds MUST stay local, dedicated to Murrieta Valley K-12 schools.

Who is eligible to vote on Measure BB?

All of the nearly 48,000 registered voters within the Murrieta Valley Unified School District will be eligible to vote on Measure BB. The last day to register to vote and be eligible to vote on Measure BB in the November Election is Oct. 20th 2014.

What's required for Measure BB to pass (win)?

At least **55%** of the voters who cast their ballots in the November 4th Election must vote in favor of Measure BB for it to be approved. Measure BB is being sought under the provisions of Proposition 39, which prohibits use of bond funds for operations, administrator salaries or pensions, and also requires independent financial and performance audits on the use of bond proceeds.

Will Measure BB improve instruction?

YES! Our local schools strive for teaching and learning excellence in **every** educational setting. Modern school facilities and education technology are essential to maintaining peak performing schools and giving our students a competitive edge. As school facilities and classroom technology are improved, teaching and learning will benefit. Without Measure BB funds, the money earmarked for educational programs may have to go toward facility repairs.

What about ongoing maintenance at MVUSD Schools?

District facilities staff work hard to maintain our neighborhood schools and keep them in good working condition with limited resources. However, the types of upgrades that the District's current needs assessment has identified, particularly in the area of ongoing upgrades to education technology, go far beyond the scope and means of regular school maintenance budgets.

How much will Measure BB cost?

The \$98 million bond translates to **\$25 per year for every \$100,000 of assessed valuation**. The assessed valuation refers to taxable value, not the market value of your property. The taxable value of your home or business will depend on when you purchased it. If Measure BB is approved, the typical homeowner in our school district will pay about \$72 a year.

Will businesses share in the cost of Measure BB?

Yes, both commercial and residential property owners will be subject to assessment.

What about the Lottery or Proposition 30? Weren't they supposed to take care of and fix our schools?

The money our school district receives from the Lottery each year comprises approximately 2% of our annual General Fund Revenues. Proposition 30, approved in November 2012, is restricted to instructional use and only amounts to approximately 15% of our General Fund Revenues. Lottery and Proposition 30 funds alone cannot fund the extensive upgrades that our schools need.

No one in my household attends MVUSD schools. Why should I care about Measure BB?

Quality schools are the foundation of a quality community. Good schools help maintain property values. Home resale values are directly impacted by the quality of our schools.

Who makes the final decision on a local school bond?

The locally elected Board of Education of Murrieta Valley Unified School District is the legal entity that has called for the Measure BB election. Ultimately, Murrieta Valley USD REGISTERED VOTERS will have the final say when they vote for or against the measure.

Have there been other Murrieta Valley USD school bonds? If so, when was the last bond?

Murrieta Valley USD strives to be a model of financial responsibility, making every effort to spend taxpayer dollars wisely. Our last school bond, Measure E, was approved by voters in 2006 to relieve overcrowding by building Lisa J. Mails Elementary School, Dorothy McElhinney Middle School and Murrieta Mesa High School and to repair and renovate existing school facilities. All Measure E funds were spent on time and within budget. Our new (2014) measure, Measure BB, authorizes critically needed education technology upgrades as well as the next set of essential school **facility** upgrades.

How can we be assured that Measure BB money will be spent properly?

Taxpayer protections are REQUIRED. All measure BB funds stay local - they cannot be taken away by the State or used for other purposes. ONLY facilities, technology and equipment upgrades are allowed. NO funds can be spent on administrators' salaries. Measure BB requires the establishment of a Citizens Oversight Committee within 60 days after a successful election result is certified. The Committee is responsible for monitoring bond finances to ensure the public that the money is being spent properly. Measure BB also requires independent annual audits on use of bond proceeds.

Who will serve on the Independent Citizens Oversight Committee?

The Committee consists of at least seven member of the public, and cannot include any District employee, vendor or contractor. The members of the Oversight Committee include representatives from the business community, a senior citizens organization, a parent, and a taxpayer association. The role of the Committee is to review copies of the annual independent audits of bond finances; inspect District facilities to ensure the revenues are being spent properly; review copies of maintenance proposals or plans developed by the District; and review the District's efforts to maximize bond revenues by implementing cost-saving programs.

Doesn't the STATE provide funding for facility upgrades?

Very little. In the past, State funding has been available to support local school upgrades but especially now, we cannot count on this uncertain source of funding. Moreover, in order to access state funding, school districts MUST generate local matching funds by passing a local school bond measure. Passing a local bond is the ONLY way to qualify for additional state funding if and when it becomes available. There are no other sources of funding for major facility upgrades.

If voters approve Measure BB, when will the work begin?

Once the measure is approved, a schedule for funding projects will be developed according to the official Measure BB Project List approved by voters so these projects can be completed on time and within budget.

- **For Education Technology Projects:** District staff will immediately meet with all school sites to develop collaborative plans that integrate education technology upgrades into school infrastructure to meet the most critical instructional needs at each site. A comprehensive district-wide implementation schedule will be developed to meet education technology needs district-wide.
- **For other Facility Projects:** Safety upgrades will take highest priority. The schedule of other approved facility projects will take place according to the District's Deferred Maintenance Plan.

What will specific technology projects will happen at my child's school?

The [district project list](#) shows a list of the projects district-wide that can be done with Measure BB. This project list was generated based on input from all the schools' technology plans. These school technology plans provide more specific details on the technology projects and priorities at each individual school. Please contact your child's Principal if you wish to see this plan.

Initiatives that did not make the cut.



Type	Identifying #	Description
CICA/SS	#12-0008	"Government Employee Pension Reform Act"
CISS	#12-0010	"Stop the Bullet Train to Nowhere"
CICA	#12-0012	Eliminate Religion-Based Property Tax Exemptions
CISS	#12-0013	Treatment of Nuclear Waste at the Diablo Canyon and San Onofre Power Plants
CISS	#12-0014	Tax on Oil and Natural Gas
CICA/SS	#12-0015	"Taxes to Fund California Public Universities and Community Colleges"
CISS	#12-0016	Nuclear Waste Act
CISS	#12-0017	Statewide Public Electrical Utility District
CISS	#12-0018	Tobacco Tax Increase for College Tuition

CISS	#13-0001	Regulation of the Timber Industry
CISS	#13-0002	Severance Tax on Oil and Gas
CISS	#13-0005	Eliminate Tax Benefits in Enterprise Zones
CICA	#13-0008	Confidentiality of Personal Identifying Information
CISS	#13-0023	Tobacco Tax/Healthcare
CICA	#13-0026	Pension Reform Initiative
CISS	#13-0040	"Seniors Home Care Cost Accountability"
CICA	#13-0006	Open Presidential Primaries
VR	#13-0029	Referendum on Which Licensed Medical Professionals May Perform Early Abortions
VR	#13-0030	Referendum on Medical Standards Pertaining to Abortion Clinics
CICA	#13-0045	Road Repairs
CICA	#13-0046	Road Repairs
CISS	#13-0051	Control, Regulate and Tax Marijuana
CISS	#13-0061	Control, Regulate and Tax Marijuana
VR	#13-0015	Ratification of AB 1266, Transgender Student Participation Based on Gender Identity
CISS	#13-0009	Regulation of the Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power Plant

CISS	#13-0010	Creation of a Statewide Electrical Utility District
CISS	#13-0011	Increase in Cap on Medical Malpractice Lawsuits
CICA	#13-0012	State Fees on Community Hospitals
CISS	#13-0013	Legalization of Recreational Marijuana
CISS	#14-0002	"Marijuana Policy Reform"
CICA	#13-0014	Freedom of Biblically-Based Speech
CICA	#13-0043	Pension Reform Initiative
CISS	#13-0050	Minimum Wage Increase
CISS	#13-0058	Teacher Performance Initiative
CISS	#13-0062	Teacher Performance Initiative
CISS	#13-0025	"Marijuana Control, Legalization and Revenue"
CISS	#13-0018	Regulation of the Timber Industry
CISS	#13-0024	"Welfare Reform Act"
CICA	#13-0019	Parental Notification for Abortion
CICA	#13-0020	Personhood Begins at Conception
CISS	#13-0042	"Charitable Hospital Executive Compensation Act"

CISS	#13-0041	"Fair Healthcare Pricing Act"
CICA/SS	#13-0055	"Death Penalty Reform and Savings"
CISS	#13-0021	"Fund Schools on Time"
CICA	#13-0028	"Neighborhood Legislature Reform Act"
CISS	#13-0032	Dismissal or Suspension of Teachers for Egregious Misconduct
CISS	#13-0027	Tobacco Tax for Healthcare
CICA	#13-0031	Gun Rights Initiative
CISS	#13-0033	Initiative to Protect Buyers of Used Vehicles
CISS	#13-0034	Time of Distribution of State Funds to Schools
CISS	#13-0035	Initiative to Protect Buyers of Used Vehicles
CISS	#13-0036	Initiative to Protect Buyers of Used Vehicles
CISS	#13-0037	Initiative to Protect Buyers of Used Vehicles
CICA	#13-0038	Parental Notification for Abortion
CISS	#13-0039	"Common Sense Voting Act"
CICA	#13-0044	Term Limits for County Officials
CICA/SS	#13-0047	"Protection of Local School Revenues"

<u>CICA/SS</u>	<u>#13-0063</u>	<u>"Six Californias"</u>
<u>CISS</u>	<u>#13-0049</u>	<u>Split Electoral College Vote Distribution</u>
<u>CISS</u>	<u>#13-0052</u>	<u>Minimum Wage Supplement for Home Health Workers</u>
<u>CISS</u>	<u>#13-0054</u>	<u>Non-Profit Donor Disclosure</u>
<u>CISS</u>	<u>#13-0056</u>	<u>"Stop Corporate Exploitation of Charter Schools"</u>
<u>CISS</u>	<u>#13-0057</u>	<u>"Stop Corporate Exploitation of Charter Schools"</u>
<u>CISS</u>	<u>#13-0059</u>	<u>Regulation of Charter Schools</u>
<u>CISS</u>	<u>#13-0064</u>	<u>"Seniors Home Cost Accountability"</u>
<u>CISS</u>	<u>#13-0065</u>	<u>"Jobs and Development"</u>
<u>CISS</u>	<u>#14-0001</u>	<u>"Transportation Innovation"</u>
<u>CICA</u>	<u>#14-0003</u>	<u>Tobacco Tax for Brain Research</u>
<u>CICA</u>	<u>#14-0005</u>	<u>Tobacco Tax for Brain Research</u>
<u>CISS</u>	<u>#14-0004</u>	<u>"Stop High Speed Rail Investment and Reinvest in Education"</u>
<u>CISS</u>	<u>#14-0006</u>	<u>"Online Privacy"</u>
<u>CISS</u>	<u>#14-0007</u>	<u>"Online Privacy"</u>
<u>CISS</u>	<u>#14-0008</u>	<u>Cannabis Hemp</u>