



A coalition of the  
**Temecula Valley, Murrieta, Lake Elsinore Valley, Wildomar, Menifee Valley and Perris Valley  
Chambers of Commerce**

### **2018 Strategic Initiatives**

*Budget & Tax Reform / Job Creation & Retention / Healthcare / Infrastructure & The Environment / Public Safety*

**Based on our 2018 Strategic Initiatives, the Council has adopted the following  
positions on the California State November 2018 ballot initiatives:**

#### **Proposition 1**

**Vote NO**

##### [The Housing Programs and Veterans' Loans Bond](#)

A "yes" vote supports this measure to authorize \$4 billion in [general obligation bonds](#) for housing-related programs, loans, grants, and projects and housing loans for veterans.

A "no" vote opposes this measure to authorize \$4 billion in [general obligation bonds](#) for housing-related programs, loans, grants, and projects and housing loans for veterans.

Proposition 1 would authorize \$4 billion in [general obligation bonds](#) for housing-related programs, loans, grants, and projects and housing loans for veterans.

#### **Proposition 2**

**NP**

##### [The Use Millionaire's Tax Revenue for Homelessness Prevention Housing Bonds Measure](#)

A **yes** vote supports authorizing the state to use revenue from [Proposition 63 \(2004\)](#)—a 1 percent tax on income above \$1 million for mental health services—on \$2 billion in [revenue bonds](#) for homelessness prevention housing for persons in need of mental health services.

A **no** vote opposes authorizing the state to use revenue from [Proposition 63 \(2004\)](#) on \$2 billion in [revenue bonds](#) for homelessness prevention housing for persons in need of mental health services.

The [California State Legislature](#) passed legislation to spend revenue from Proposition 63 on revenue bonds for homelessness prevention housing in 2016. The legislation, however, did not go into effect because of pending litigation over whether revenue from the millionaire's tax could be spent on homelessness prevention housing. Unlike general obligation bonds, [revenue bonds](#) do not require a public vote in California. Proposition 2 was referred to the ballot because the revenue for the bond would come from a tax that was created through a ballot initiative, Proposition 63. In California, changes to ballot initiatives require a vote of the public.

## **Proposition 3,**

**Vote YES**

### **The California Water Infrastructure and Watershed Conservation Bond Initiative**

A "yes" vote supports this measure to authorize \$8.877 billion in [general obligation bonds](#) for water infrastructure, groundwater supplies and storage, surface water storage and dam repairs, watershed and fisheries improvements, and habitat protection and restoration.

A "no" vote opposes this measure to authorize \$8.877 billion in [general obligation bonds](#) for water infrastructure, groundwater supplies and storage, surface water storage and dam repairs, watershed and fisheries improvements, and habitat protection and restoration.

Proposition 3 would issue \$8.877 billion in [general obligation bonds](#) for water-related infrastructure and environmental projects. The state fiscal analyst said the bond would generate about \$8.4 billion in interest over a 40-year period, meaning the bond would cost the state a total of \$17.3 billion.

## **Proposition 4,**

**Vote YES**

### **Children's Hospital Bonds Initiative (2018)**

A **yes** vote supports authorizing \$1.5 billion in bonds for the construction, expansion, renovation, and equipping of children's hospitals in California.

A **no** vote opposes authorizing \$1.5 billion in bonds for the construction, expansion, renovation, and equipping of children's hospitals in California.

Proposition 4 would authorize \$1.5 billion in general obligation bonds to provide for the Children's Hospital Bond Act Fund. The fund would be used to award grants to children's hospitals for construction, expansion, renovation, and equipment projects.

## Proposition 5,

Vote YES

### The Property Tax Transfer Initiative

A "yes" vote supports amending [Proposition 13 \(1978\)](#) to allow homebuyers who are age 55 or older or severely disabled to transfer their tax assessments, with a possible adjustment, from their prior home to their new home, no matter (a) the new home's market value; (b) the new home's location in the state; or (c) the buyer's number of moves.

A "no" vote opposes amending [Proposition 13 \(1978\)](#) to change how tax assessments are transferred between properties for homebuyers who are age 55 or older or severely disabled.

Proposition 5 would amend [Proposition 13 \(1978\)](#) to allow homebuyers who are age 55 or older or severely disabled to transfer the tax-assessed value from their prior home to their new home, no matter (a) the new home's market value; (b) the new home's location in the state; or (c) the number of moves. As of 2018, homebuyers over 55 years of age were eligible to transfer their tax assessments from their prior home to their new home if the new home's market value is equal to or less than the prior home's value and once in their lifetimes. Furthermore, counties, not the state, decide whether tax assessments can be transferred across county lines.

If the new home is a different value than the prior home, the initiative would allow for an adjusted value between the old and new values. If the new home has a higher market value than the prior home, the assessed value would be adjusted upward. If the new home has a lower market value than the prior home, the assessed value would be adjusted downward.

## Proposition 6, 'Repeal the Gas Tax'

Vote YES

### The Voter Approval for Future Gas and Vehicle Taxes and 2017 Tax Repeal

A **yes** vote supports this initiative to:

- repeal fuel tax increases and vehicle fees that were enacted in 2017, including the [Road Repair and Accountability Act of 2017 \(RRAA\)](#) and
- require voter approval (via ballot propositions) for the [California State Legislature](#) to impose, increase, or extend fuel taxes or vehicle fees in the future.

A **no** vote opposes this initiative, thus:

- keeping the fuel tax increases and vehicle fees that were enacted in 2017, including the [Road Repair and Accountability Act of 2017 \(RRAA\)](#), in place and
- allowing the [state legislature](#) to continue to impose, increase, or extend fuel taxes or vehicle fees through a two-thirds vote of each chamber and without voter approval.

As of 2018, increasing a tax in California requires a two-thirds vote of each [state legislative](#) chamber and the [governor's](#) signature. Proposition 6 would create the additional step of voter approval (via ballot propositions), along with legislative passage and the governor's signature, to impose, increase, or extend fuel taxes or vehicle fees. The requirement that tax increases receive voter approval would affect taxes and tax rates enacted after January 1, 2017, meaning fuel taxes and vehicle fees that were created or increased in 2017 or 2018 would be repealed. This would have the effect of repealing the [Road Repair and Accountability Act of 2017 \(RRAA\)](#), which the state legislature approved along party lines in April 2017.

## **Proposition 7,**

**NP**

### **The Permanent Daylight Saving Time Measure.**

A **yes** vote supports allowing the [California State Legislature](#) to establish permanent, year-round daylight saving time (DST) in California by a two-thirds vote if federal law is changed to allow for permanent DST.

A **no** vote opposes allowing the [California State Legislature](#) to establish permanent, year-round daylight saving time (DST) in California by a two-thirds vote if federal law is changed to allow for permanent DST.

Proposition 7 would allow the [California State Legislature](#) to establish permanent, year-round daylight saving time (DST) by a two-thirds vote if the federal Uniform Time Act is changed to allow for permanent DST

## **Proposition 8,**

**Vote NO**

### **The Limits on Dialysis Clinics' Revenue and Required Refunds Initiative**

A "**yes**" vote supports requiring dialysis clinics to issue refunds to patients or patients' payers for revenue above 115 percent of the costs of direct patient care and healthcare improvements.

A "**no**" vote opposes requiring dialysis clinics to issue refunds to patients or patients' payers for revenue above 115 percent of the costs of direct patient care and healthcare improvements.

Proposition 8 would require [dialysis](#) clinics to issue refunds to patients or patients' payers, such as insurers, for revenue above 115 percent of the costs of (a) direct patient care, such as wages and benefits of non-managerial clinic staff who furnish direct care to patients, pharmaceuticals, medical supplies, and (b) healthcare improvements, such as staff training and patient education and counseling. Revenue earned above the 115 percent cap would need to be refunded to patients or the patients' payers each year. Clinics that do not issue required refunds within 210 days after the end of the fiscal year would be fined an amount equal to 5 percent of their total required refunds, but

not to exceed \$100,000. The measure would also prohibit dialysis clinics from discriminating or refusing services based on a patient's payer, including the patient himself or herself, a private insurer, Medi-Cal, [Medicaid](#), or [Medicare](#). The initiative would require chronic dialysis clinics to report to the state government information required to enforce the measure, including the costs associated with operating a chronic dialysis clinic, treatment revenue, and the amount of each payer's refund. The state department of public health would enforce the initiative.

## **Proposition 10,**

**Vote NO**

### **The Local Rent Control Initiative**

A **yes** vote supports allowing local governments to adopt rent control, repealing the [Costa-Hawkins Rental Housing Act](#).

A **no** vote opposes the initiative, thus keeping the [Costa-Hawkins Rental Housing Act](#) and continuing to prohibit local governments from enacting rent control on certain buildings.

Proposition 10 is an [initiated state statute](#) that would repeal the [Costa-Hawkins Rental Housing Act \(Costa-Hawkins\)](#), thus allowing local governments to adopt rent control ordinances—regulations that govern how much landlords can charge tenants for renting apartments and houses. Proposition 10 would also state that a local government's rent control ordinance shall not abridge a fair rate of return for landlords.

## **Proposition 11,**

**Vote YES**

### **The Ambulance Employees Paid On-Call Breaks, Training, and Mental Health Services Initiative**

A **yes** vote supports:

- allowing ambulance providers to require workers to remain on-call during breaks paid at their regular rate;
- requiring employers to provide additional training for EMTs and paramedics; and
- requiring employers to provide EMTs and paramedics with some paid mental health services.

A **no** vote opposes:

- allowing ambulance providers to require workers to remain on-call during breaks paid at their regular rate;
- requiring employers to provide additional training for EMTs and paramedics; and
- requiring employers to provide EMTs and paramedics with some paid mental health services.

Proposition 11 would allow ambulance providers to require workers to remain on-call (reachable by a portable communications device) during meal and rest breaks. The measure would require ambulance providers to pay workers at their regular rate during breaks, not make workers take a meal break during the first or last hour of a shift, and space multiple meal breaks during a shift by at least two hours. If a worker is contacted during a meal or rest break, the initiative would mandate that the interrupted break not be counted towards the breaks the worker is required to receive. The measure would require ambulance providers to manage staffing levels sufficient to provide employees with the required breaks.

## **Proposition 12,**

**NP**

### [The Farm Animal Confinement Initiative](#)

A **yes** vote supports banning the sale of meat and eggs from calves raised for veal, breeding pigs, and egg-laying hens confined in areas below a *specific number of square feet*.

A **no** vote opposes banning the sale of meat and eggs from calves raised for veal, breeding pigs, and egg-laying hens confined in areas below a *specific number of square feet*.

In [2008](#), the [Humane Society](#) developed a ballot initiative, titled [Proposition 2](#), to ban the confinement of pregnant pigs, calves raised for veal, and egg-laying hens in a manner that did not allow them to turn around freely, lie down, stand up, and fully extend their limbs. Proposition 2 did not provide specific square feet when defining prohibited confinement. Rather, the size restrictions were based on animal behavior. Opponents, such as the Association of California Egg Farmers, claimed this was too vague. Voters approved Proposition 2, and the law went into effect in 2015.

**\*NP – No position adopted**