



MEETING AGENDA

Monday February 24, 2020
Realtor House, 26529 Jefferson Ave, Murrieta

Presiding: Adam Ruiz, Chair

2020 Strategic Initiatives

Budget & Tax Reform / Job Creation and Retention / Healthcare / Infrastructure & the Environment/ Public Safety

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

Chair Report

Approval of Minutes

Action

2020 Legislative Report #2

Action

1. [SB-850 \(Leyva\) Work hours: scheduling.](#)
2. [AB-1921 \(Diep\) Unlawful entry of a vehicle](#)
3. [AB-2140 \(Melendez\) Initiative and referendum measures: title and summary.](#)
4. [AB-1928 \(Kiley/Melendez\) Employment standards: independent contractors and employees.](#)
 - a) [AB 1925 \(Obernolte\) Worker status: independent contractors: small businesses.](#)
 - b) [SB-867 \(Bates\) Worker status: independent contractors: newspaper distributors or newspaper carriers.](#)
 - c) [SB-868 \(Bates\) Worker status: independent contractors: freelance journalists.](#)
 - d) [SB-875 \(Grove & Jones\) Worker status: independent contractors: court interpreters.](#)
 - e) [SB-881 \(Jones\) Worker status: independent contractors: musicians and music industry professionals.](#)
 - f) [SB-963 \(Morrell\) Worker status: independent contractors: referees and umpires for youth sports.](#)
 - g) [SB-965 \(Nielsen\) Worker status: independent contractors: healthcare industry.](#)
 - h) [SB-966 \(Nielsen\) Worker status: independent contractors: pharmacists.](#)
 - i) [SB-967 \(Borgeas\) Worker status: independent contractors: franchiser and franchisees.](#)
 - j) [SB-975 \(Dahle\) Worker status: independent contractors: alarm services industry.](#)
 - k) [SB 990 \(Moorchach\) Worker status: independent contractors: transportation network companies.](#)

Ballot Propositions, Proposition 13 Action/Information

Guest speaker Jennings Immel, U.S. Chamber of Commerce Information

Lunch sponsor The Mill Thank you

Speaker and Chamber Announcements Information

Adjourn – Next Meeting March 16, Anne Mayer, Executive Director, RCTC guest speaker

Follow us on:



The Southwest California Legislative Council Thanks Our Partners:

Southwest Riverside County
Association of Realtors
Metropolitan Water District of
Southern California
Elsinore Valley MWD
Western MWD
CR&R Waste Services
Abbott Vascular

Temecula Valley Chamber of
Commerce
Murrieta/Wildomar Chamber of
Commerce
Lake Elsinore Valley Chamber of
Commerce
Menifee Valley Chamber of Commerce
Southwest Healthcare Systems

Temecula Valley Hospital
Economic Development Coalition
The Murrieta Temecula Group
Southern California Edison
The Gas Company
California Apartment Association

SWCLC 1/27/2020 Meeting Synopsis

Legislative Actions:

1. SB-56 (Roth) AB-1740 (Medina): These companion measures 1) require the University of California to construct a new facility at the UCR School of Medicine upon receipt of an appropriation (SB56) and 2) provide the funding mechanism (AB 1740).

Action for Support of Bills passed unanimously.

2. AB-1772 (Chau) This bill would specify that if the value of the property taken or intended to be taken exceeds \$950 over the course of distinct but related acts, whether committed against one or more victims, the value of the property taken or intended to be taken may properly be aggregated to charge a count of grand theft, if the acts are motivated by one intention, one general impulse, and one plan.

Action for Support of Bill passed unanimously

3. AB-1905 (Chiu): This bill would propose to further reduce the mortgage interest deduction allowed homeowners from the current rate of \$1,000,000 /\$500,000 to \$750,000/\$375,000 and disallow any deduction for other than a primary residence, for the purpose of funding the Homeless Coordinating and Financing Council.

Action for Opposition of Bill passed unanimously

4. AB-1908 (Chen): This bill establishes procedures for the Department of Transportation to deal with homeless encampments on department property.

Action for Opposition of Bill passed unanimously

5. AB-1928 (Kiley/Melendez). This bill would repeal last year's AB 5 (Gonzalez) which codified the presumption that a worker who provides a service to a hirer is an employee rather than an independent contractor.

Action for Support of Bill passed unanimously

6. AB-1941 (Gallagher). CACA-17 (Gray) CACA-18 (Cunningham): this bill and companion Constitutional Amendments, would specify that the generation of hydroelectric and nuclear energy be defined as renewable energy resources compliant to meeting the goal of 100% renewable energy and zero carbon resources by 2045. ACA 18 would also prohibit the Legislature from enacting any law related to energy unless the law is technology neutral

Action for Support of Bill passed unanimously

Presentation:

Captain Tony Conrad, Murrieta PD gave update on Murrieta PD operations and programs.

SB-850 (Leyva) Work hours: scheduling.**Recommended action: OPPOSE****Presentation: Gene Wunderlich**

*Introduced by Senator Leyva
(Principal coauthor: Assembly Member Chiu)*

Summary:

SB 850 would require an employer, including grocery stores, restaurants or retail stores, to provide employees with a work schedule at least 7 calendar days ahead of their first shift. If that schedule is modified, the employer would need to provide 'modification pay' equal to no less than 2 hours nor more than 4 at the employees rate of pay in addition to their normal pay.

This bill has been identified as a **JOB KILLER** by the CalChamber. Mandated Scheduling Requirement. Eliminates worker flexibility and exposes employers to costly penalties, litigation, and government enforcement, by mandating employers in the retail, grocery, or restaurant industry, including employers who have hybrid operations that include a retail or restaurant section, to provide a 21-day work schedule and then face penalties and litigation if the employer changes the schedule with less than 7 days notice.

Description:

Existing law governs the relationship between an employer and an employee with regard to hiring, promotion, discipline, wages and hours, working conditions, and administrative and judicial remedies. Existing law authorizes the Labor Commissioner to investigate employee complaints and to conduct a hearing in any action to recover wages, penalties, and other demands for compensation.

This bill would require an employer, which includes a grocery store establishment, restaurant, or retail store establishment, to provide its employees with a work schedule at least 7 calendar days prior to the first shift on that work schedule, except as specified. The bill would require an employer, except as specified, to pay its employees modification pay for each previously scheduled shift that the employer cancels or moves to another date or time, for any previously unscheduled shift that the employer requires an employee to work, or for each on-call shift for which an employee is required to be available but is not called in to work that shift. The bill would require an employer to post a poster containing specified information regarding an employee's right to receive modification pay and would require the Labor Commissioner to create the poster and make it available. The bill would define terms for those purposes, including, among others, a grocery store establishment, restaurant, or retail store establishment.

The bill would require the Labor Commissioner to enforce these requirements, including the investigation, mitigation, and relief of violations of these requirements. The bill would authorize the Labor Commissioner to impose specified administrative fines for violations and would authorize the commissioner, the Attorney General, an employee or person aggrieved by a violation of these provisions, or an entity a member of which is aggrieved by a violation of these provisions to recover specified civil penalties against an offender who violated these provisions on behalf of the aggrieved, as well as attorney's fees, costs, and interest.

If less than 24 hours' notice is given to the employee, the employee shall receive modification pay equal to or greater than half of that shift's scheduled hours at the employee's regular rate of pay, but in no event for less than two hours nor more than four hours.

Modification pay required by this subdivision shall be in addition to an employee's regular pay for working that shift.

The requirements in subdivisions (e) and (g) shall not apply, and an employer shall not be deemed to have violated subdivision (e) or (g), under any of the following circumstances:

- (1) Operations cannot begin or continue due to threats to employees or property, or when civil authorities recommend that work not begin or continue.
- (2) Operations cannot begin or continue because public utilities fail to supply electricity, water, or gas or there is a failure in the public utilities or sewer system.
- (3) Operations cannot begin or continue due to an act of God or other cause not within the employer's control, including, but not limited to, an earthquake or a state of emergency declared by a local government or the Governor.
- (4) Another employee previously scheduled to work that shift is unable to work due to illness, vacation, or employer-provided paid or unpaid time off required by existing law or bona fide collective bargaining agreement when the employer did not receive at least seven days' notice of the other employee's absence.
- (5) Another employee previously scheduled to work that shift has not reported to work on time, is fired, sent home as a disciplinary action, or told to stay at home as a disciplinary action.
- (6) Two employees have mutually agreed to trade shifts.

Arguments in support:

According to the author, shift work employees must be able to count on a work schedule well in advance so as to be able to plan their own schedule for child care, doctors' appointments, etc.

Arguments in Opposition:

- SB 850's Threat of Modification Pay and Numerous Avenues of Enforcement, Penalties and Investigation for Schedule Changes Will **Absolutely Eliminate Flexibility** in the Workplace and the Ability for Employees to Earn Additional Wages:
- SB 850 Is **Applicable to Both Large and Small Employers**, as Well as Those Who Do Not Primarily Engage in Selling Merchandise or Food:
- SB 850 Requires a **One-Size-Fits-All** Advance Scheduling Requirement:
- SB 850 **Limits an Employer's Ability** to Respond to Customer Needs:
- SB 850 Forces an Employer to Provide "Modification Pay" to an On-Call Employee **Who Is Already Being Compensated**:
- SB 850 Creates Numerous, Costly Avenues of Litigation:
- SB 850 Eliminates a Key Benefit to Working in the Retail and Food Industries:

Support: (Verified 2/18/2020)

Opposition: (Verified 2/18/2020)

CalChamber

Status: Senate Labor, Public Employment and Retirement Committee

Senate Floor votes:

Assembly floor votes:

AB-1921 (Diep) Unlawful entry of a vehicle**Recommended action: SUPPORT****Presentation: Gene Wunderlich**

*Introduced by Assembly Members Diep and Bauer-Kahan
(Principal coauthor: Senator Wiener)
(Coauthors: Assembly Members Daly, Fong, Lackey, Low, O'Donnell, Quirk, and Rodriguez)
(Coauthors: Senators Jones, Nielsen, and Umberg)*

Summary:

In 2019 the SWCLC adopted a SUPPORT position on SB 23 (Wiener), a bill with substantially the same language. The bill passed out its house of origin but failed in Assembly Appropriations.

Description:

Existing law defines the crime of burglary to include entering a vehicle when the doors are locked with the intent to commit grand or petit larceny or a felony. Existing law makes the burglary of a vehicle punishable as a misdemeanor or a felony.

This bill would make forcibly entering a vehicle, as defined, with the intent to commit a theft therein a crime punishable by imprisonment in a county jail for a period not to exceed one year or imprisonment in a county jail for 16 months, or 2 or 3 years. By creating a new crime, this bill would impose a state-mandated local program.

As used in this section, forcible entry of a vehicle means the entry into a vehicle accomplished through either of the following means:

- (1) Force that damages the exterior of the vehicle, including, but not limited to, breaking a window, cutting a convertible top, punching a lock, or prying open a door.
- (2) Use of a tool or device that manipulates the locking mechanism, including, without limitation, a slim jim or other lockout tool, a shaved key, jigglers key, or lock pick, or an electronic device such as a signal extender.
 - (a) A person who forcibly enters a vehicle, as defined in Section 670 of the Vehicle Code, with the intent to commit a theft therein is guilty of unlawful entry of a vehicle.
 - (b) Unlawful entry of a vehicle is punishable by imprisonment in a county jail for a period not to exceed one year or imprisonment pursuant to subdivision (h) of Section 1170.

Arguments in support:

Under current law, a person arrested for auto burglary can escape a conviction if the prosecutor is unable to prove that the vehicle was locked. The mere fact that a victim's window may have been broken does not, by itself, establish that the vehicle doors were locked. This evidence is especially needed in cases where the victim is unavailable or unknown, which is common amongst tourist victims, since they typically do not return for trials.

Closing this statutory loophole would allow prosecutors to hold auto burglars accountable for their actions, and would help provide peace of mind for both residents and visitors alike throughout all of California's 482 cities.

Status: Assembly – Public Safety

AB-2140 (Melendez) Initiative and referendum measures: title and summary.**Recommended action: SUPPORT****Presentation: Gene Wunderlich***Introduced by Assembly Members Melendez, Patterson, and Kiley***Summary:**

AB 2140 would remove the responsibility of writing ballot title and summary language from the elected, partisan Attorney General and require instead that the non-partisan office of the Legislative Analyst carry it out.

Description:

Existing law requires the Attorney General, upon receipt of the text of a proposed initiative or referendum measure, to prepare a circulating title and summary of the chief purposes and points of the proposed measure that includes an estimate of the financial impact of the proposed measure. Existing law requires the Attorney General to prepare a ballot title and summary for each measure that the Secretary of State determines will appear on the ballot at a statewide election.

This bill would instead require the Legislative Analyst to carry out these responsibilities. The bill would make the operation of this requirement contingent upon approval by the voters of ACA ___ of the 2019–20 Regular Session.

Arguments in support:

Anybody remember 2018's gas tax fiasco where NO meant YES and the language was deceptive? Anybody read the title and summary for the pending split roll tax initiative? When the original proposition entitled **California Tax on Commercial and Industrial Properties for Education and Local Government Funding Initiative (2020)** didn't poll well, proponents modified the language and the AG cooperated by issuing a new title as well. You would hardly recognize this new version entitled **The California Schools and Local Communities Funding Act of 2020**. Nary a mention of modifying or increasing the tax on commercial properties by \$12 BILLION a year to fund this measure.

It's time to remove this deceptive practice and provide Californian's with honest, accurate information.

Support: (Verified 2/18/2020)

None on file

Opposition: (Verified 2/18/2020)

None on file

Status: Pending referral

5. [AB-1928 \(Kiley/Melendez\) Employment standards: independent contractors and employees.](#)

Recommended action: SUPPORT
Presentation: Gene Wunderlich

Summary:

In January the SWCLC adopted a SUPPORT position on AB 1928, a bill that would repeal last year's AB 5 (Gonzalez). AB 5 codified the presumption that a worker who provides a service to a hirer is an employee rather than an independent contractor and have wreaked havoc on independent contractors statewide, prompting lawsuits, ballot propositions, protests and more. The following new bills have all been introduced in response to AB 5 and, given the assumption that AB 5 will not be repealed, seek to 'carve out' additional categories of independent contractors.

Background:

Existing law, as established in the case of *Dynamex Operations W. v. Superior Court* (2018) 4 Cal.5th 903 (Dynamex), creates a presumption that a worker who performs services for a hirer is an employee for purposes of claims for wages and benefits arising under wage orders issued by the Industrial Welfare Commission. Existing law requires a 3-part test, commonly known as the "ABC" test, to determine if workers are employees or independent contractors for those purposes.

Existing law establishes that, for purposes of the Labor Code, the Unemployment Insurance Code, and the wage orders of the Industrial Welfare Commission, a person providing labor or services for remuneration is considered an employee rather than an independent contractor unless the hiring entity demonstrates that the person is free from the control and direction of the hiring entity in connection with the performance of the work, the person performs work that is outside the usual course of the hiring entity's business, and the person is customarily engaged in an independently established trade, occupation, or business. This test is commonly known as the "ABC" test, as described above. Existing law charges the Labor Commissioner with the enforcement of labor laws, including worker classification.

[AB 1925 \(Obernolte\) Worker status: independent contractors: small businesses.](#)

This bill would expand the above-described exemptions to also include small businesses, as defined.

For purposes of this paragraph, "small business" means a business that meets all of the following:

- *Is independently owned and operated.*
- *Is not dominant in its field of operation.*
- *Has fewer than 100 employees.*
- *Has average gross receipts of fifteen million dollars (\$15,000,000) or less over the previous three years.*

[SB-867 \(Bates\) Worker status: independent contractors: newspaper distributors or newspaper carriers.](#)

Introduced by Senator Bates

(Coauthors: Senators Borgeas, Chang, Dahle, Grove, Jones, Moorlach, Morrell, Nielsen, and Wilk)

Existing law exempts specified occupations and business relationships from the application of *Dynamex* and the provisions described above. These exemptions include a temporary exemption for newspaper distributors or newspaper carriers, as defined, until January 1, 2021.

This bill would delete the above inoperative date of January 1, 2021, applicable to newspaper distributors or newspaper carriers, thereby making the above exemption apply indefinitely.

Status: Senate Labor, Public Employment and Retirement Committee

SB-868 (Bates) Worker status: independent contractors: freelance journalists.

Introduced by Senator Bates

(Coauthors: Senators Borgeas, Chang, Dahle, Grove, Jones, Moorlach, Morrell, Nielsen, and Wilk)

Existing law exempts specified occupations and business relationships from the application of Dynamex and the provisions described above, including various professional services provided by a freelance writer, editor, or newspaper cartoonist who does not provide content submissions to the putative employer more than 35 times per year.

This bill would revise that exemption to instead exempt all freelance journalists, without regard to the number of content submissions per year, from the application of Dynamex and the above provisions.

Status: Senate Labor, Public Employment and Retirement Committee

SB-875 (Grove & Jones) Worker status: independent contractors: court interpreters.

Introduced by Senators Grove and Jones

(Coauthors: Senators Bates, Borgeas, Chang, Dahle, Moorlach, Morrell, Nielsen, and Wilk)

(Coauthors: Assembly Members Gallagher and Lackey)

This bill would also exempt from the ABC test specified individuals working as interpreters and translators.

Status: Senate Labor, Public Employment and Retirement Committee

SB-881 (Jones) Worker status: independent contractors: musicians and music industry professionals.

Introduced by Senator Jones

(Coauthors: Senators Bates, Borgeas, Chang, Dahle, Grove, Moorlach, Morrell, Nielsen, and Wilk)

This bill would expand the above-described exemptions to also include a musician or music industry professional, except as specified.

A person providing services as a musician or music industry professional, except where a collective bargaining agreement applies.

Status: Senate Labor, Public Employment and Retirement Committee

SB-963 (Morrell) Worker status: independent contractors: referees and umpires for youth sports.

Introduced by Senator Morrell

(Coauthors: Senators Bates, Borgeas, Chang, Dahle, Grove, Jones, Moorlach, Nielsen, and Wilk)

This bill would expand the above-described exemptions to also include individuals providing services as a referee or umpire for an independent youth sports organization.

Status: Pending referral

SB-965 (Nielsen) Worker status: independent contractors: healthcare industry.

Introduced by Senator Nielsen

(Coauthors: Senators Bates, Borgeas, Chang, Dahle, Grove, Jones, Moorlach, Morrell, and Wilk)

This bill would expand the above-described exemptions to also include health facilities, as defined, which contract with **companies that employ health care providers who provide services to patients at those facilities.**

Status: Pending referral

SB-966 (Nielsen) Worker status: independent contractors: pharmacists.

Introduced by Senator Nielsen

(Coauthors: Senators Bates, Borgeas, Chang, Dahle, Grove, Jones, Moorlach, Morrell, and Wilk)

This bill would expand the above-described exemptions to also include individuals who are **licensed pharmacists.**

Status: Pending referral

SB-967 (Borgeas) Worker status: independent contractors: franchiser and franchisees.

Introduced by Senator Borgeas

(Coauthors: Senators Bates, Dahle, Grove, Jones, Moorlach, Morrell, Nielsen, and Wilk)

This bill would **prohibit franchisees from being deemed employees of a franchisor**, and would require that they be considered independent contractors, unless a court of competent jurisdiction determines specified requirements are met.

Status: Pending referral

SB-975 (Dahle) Worker status: independent contractors: alarm services industry.

Introduced by Senator Dahle

(Coauthors: Senators Bates, Borgeas, Chang, Grove, Jones, Moorlach, Morrell, Nielsen, and Wilk)

This bill would expand the above-described exemptions to also **include individuals providing services as a licensed timber operator or a registered professional forester**, as provided. The bill would also exempt **licensed geologists, geophysicists, land surveyors, contractors, engineers, and pest control operators, when those persons are performing work on forested landscapes**, as specified.

Status: Pending referral

SB 990 (Moorlach) Worker status: independent contractors: transportation network companies.

This bill would also **exempt transportation network companies** from the application of Dynamex and the above provisions.

Status: Pending referral

Support: (Verified 2/18/2020)

None on file

Opposition: (2/18/2020)

None on file

California Proposition 13, School and College Facilities Bond (March 2020)

A "yes" vote supports this measure to authorize \$15 billion in general obligation bonds for school and college facilities, including \$9 billion for preschool and K-12 schools, \$4 billion for universities, and \$2 billion for community colleges.

A "no" vote opposes this measure to authorize \$15 billion in general obligation bonds for school and college facilities.

What would Proposition 13 use the bond revenue for?

Proposition 13 would authorize \$15 billion in bonds for school and college facilities in California, including \$9 billion for preschool and K-12 schools, \$4 billion for universities, and \$2 billion for community colleges.^[1] According to the California Legislative Analyst, the state would make payments totaling an estimated \$26 billion, including \$15 billion in principal and \$11 billion in interest, over 35 years from the General Fund.

Proposition 13 was designed to distribute bond revenue as follows:

School and College Facilities Bond (March 2020)	
Amount	Dedication
\$9.0 billion	Preschool and K-12
\$2.8 billion	new construction of school facilities
\$5.2 billion	modernization of school facilities
\$500 million	providing school facilities to charter schools
\$500 million	facilities for career technical education programs
\$4.0 billion	Universities
\$2.0 billion	capital outlay financing needs of the California State University
\$2.0 billion	capital outlay financing needs of the University of California and Hastings College of the Law
\$2.0 billion	Community colleges
\$2.0 billion	capital outlay financing needs of community colleges

When did California last vote on a school facilities bond?

Californians last voted on a [school facilities bond measure](#) in 2016, which passed with 55 percent of the vote. The bond measure, titled [Proposition 51](#), issued \$7 billion for K-12 education facilities and \$2 billion for colleges. Between 1998 and 2019, voters approved five bond measures for school facilities—[Proposition 1A](#) (1998), [Proposition 47](#) (2002), [Proposition 55](#) (2004), [Proposition 1D](#) (2006), and Proposition 51 (2016).

Who is behind the campaigns surrounding Proposition 13?

[Californians for Safe Schools and Healthy Learning](#), also known as [Yes on Prop 13](#), is leading the campaign in support of Proposition 13. There were five committees organized to support the ballot measure, which raised a combined \$6.29 million. There were zero committees organized to fund opposition to the ballot measure. Opponents include the [Howard Jarvis Taxpayers Association](#).

The largest contributors to the committees supporting Proposition 13 were the [California Teachers Association Issues PAC](#) (\$500,000), RMV Community Development, LLC (\$300,000), and [California Democratic Party](#) (\$250,000).

Ballot summary

- “
- Authorizes \$15 billion in state general obligation bonds for public education facilities: \$9 billion for preschools and K–12 (includes \$5.2 billion for modernization, \$2.8 billion for new construction, \$500 million for charter schools, and \$500 million for career technical education); \$6 billion for public universities and community colleges.
 - Projects will improve facilities' health/safety conditions (including earthquake/fire safety and removing lead from water) and increase affordable student housing.
 - Limits administrative costs to 5%.
 - Appropriates money from General Fund to repay bonds.
- ”

Fiscal impact statement

The fiscal impact statement is as follows:

- “
- Increased state costs to repay bonds estimated at about \$740 million per year (including interest) over the next 35 years.
 - Mixed effect on the amount of local bonds issued by school and community college districts and a likely reduction in the amount of developer fees collected by certain school districts going forward.

Support

Californians for Safe Schools and Healthy Learning, also known as **Yes on Prop 13**, is leading the campaign in support of Proposition 13.

Supporters

Parties

- [California Democratic Party](#)^[6]

Officials

- [Gov. Gavin Newsom](#) (D)^[7]
- [Secretary of State Alex Padilla](#) (D)^[8]
- [Superintendent Tony Thurmond](#) (D)^[8]
- [Sen. Ben Allen](#) (D-26)
- [Sen. Bob Archuleta](#) (D-32)
- [Sen. Toni Atkins](#) (D-39)
- [Sen. Jim Beall](#) (D-15)
- [Sen. Bill Dodd](#) (D-3)
- [Sen. Maria Elena Durazo](#) (D-24)
- [Sen. Cathleen Galgiani](#) (D-5)
- [Sen. Steve Glazer](#) (D-7)
- [Sen. Lena Gonzalez](#) (D-33)
- [Sen. Robert Hertzberg](#) (D-18)
- [Sen. Jerry Hill](#) (D-13)
- [Sen. Ben Hueso](#) (D-40)
- [Sen. Melissa Hurtado](#) (D-14)
- [Sen. Hannah-Beth Jackson](#) (D-19)
- [Sen. Connie Leyva](#) (D-20)
- [Sen. Mike McGuire](#) (D-2)
- [Sen. Bill Monning](#) (D-17)
- [Sen. Richard Pan](#) (D-6)
- [Sen. Anthony Portantino, Jr.](#) (D-25)
- [Sen. Richard Roth](#) (D-31)
- [Sen. Nancy Skinner](#) (D-9)
- [Sen. Henry Stern](#) (D-27)
- [Sen. Tom Umberg](#) (D-34)
- [Sen. Bob Wieckowski](#) (D-10)
- [Sen. Scott Wiener](#) (D-11)
- [Sen. Scott Wilk](#) (R-21)
- [Asm. Cecilia Aguiar-Curry](#) (D-4)
- [Asm. Marc Berman](#) (D-24)
- [Asm. Richard Bloom](#) (D-50)
- [Asm. Rob Bonta](#) (D-18)
- [Asm. Ian Calderon](#) (D-57)
- [Asm. Ed Chau](#) (D-49)
- [Asm. David Chiu](#) (D-17)
- [Asm. Kansen Chu](#) (D-25)
- [Asm. Ken Cooley](#) (D-8)
- [Asm. Jim Cooper](#) (D-9)
- [Asm. Jordan Cunningham](#) (R-35)
- [Asm. Tyler Diep](#) (R-72)
- [Asm. Susan Talamantes Eggman](#) (D-13)
- [Asm. Jesse Gabriel](#) (D-45)
- [Asm. Todd Gloria](#) (D-78)
- [Asm. Tim Grayson](#) (D-14)
- [Asm. Reggie Jones-Sawyer](#) (D-59)
- [Asm. Ash Kalra](#) (D-27)
- [Asm. Monique Limón](#) (D-37)
- [Asm. Evan Low](#) (D-28)
- [Asm. Jose Medina](#) (D-61)
- [Asm. Al Muratsuchi](#) (D-66)
- [Asm. Adrin Nazarian](#) (D-46)
- [Asm. Patrick O'Donnell](#) (D-70)
- [Asm. Bill Quirk](#) (D-20)
- [Asm. Sharon Quirk-Silva](#) (D-65)
- [Asm. Anthony Rendon](#) (D-63)
- [Asm. Robert Rivas](#) (D-30)
- [Asm. Miguel Santiago](#) (D-53)
- [Asm. Mark Stone](#) (D-29)
- [Asm. Phil Ting](#) (D-19)
- [Asm. Buffy Wicks](#) (D-15)
- [Asm. Jim Wood](#) (D-2)

Organizations

- Association of California School Administrators^[6]
- Board of Regents of the University of California
- California Association of School Business Officials
- California Building Industry Association
- California Business Roundtable
- California Chamber of Commerce
- California Coalition for Public Higher Education
- California Community College Board of Governors
- California County Superintendents Educational Services Association
- California Medical Association
- California Retired Teachers Association
- California School Boards Association
- California School Nurses Association
- California State PTA
- California State University Board of Trustees
- Community College League of California
- League of Women Voters of California

Unions

- California Federation of Teachers
- [California Teachers Association](#)

Arguments

- [Sen. Toni Atkins](#) (D-39), president pro tempore of the state Senate, said, "These are funds that our schools desperately need to ensure our children are learning in safe, up-to-date classrooms, and there is no better investment for our state resources than our students. This is money that will fund critical health and safety improvements, such as removing mold and asbestos from classrooms and lead from school drinking water, fund emergency relief for schools struck by disasters, and modernize career and vocational training facilities, including those for veterans returning from duty. And it comes complete with transparency, by providing annual independent audits and public hearings so taxpayers can see how the money is being spent."
- [Tony Thurmond](#) (D), the [California Superintendent of Public Instruction](#), said, "Most school districts struggle just to keep up with basic, basic maintenance and repairs. They need help from our state to be able to handle some of these larger needs that will be able to keep our kids safe and help schools deal with lead and mold and seismic needs."

Opposition

Officials

- [Sen. Brian Jones](#) (R-38)

Organizations

- [Howard Jarvis Taxpayers Association](#)

Arguments

- **Jon Coupal**, president of the Howard Jarvis Taxpayers Association, stated, "Currently, there are strict limits on how much bond debt local school districts are allowed to carry. But a hidden provision of Prop. 13 (2020) nearly doubles the limits school districts can borrow. This means huge increases in property taxes are a near certainty. Who pays property taxes? We all do, either directly in property tax bills or through higher rents and other costs. Unlike the Prop. 13 from 1978, this Prop. 13 puts all taxpayers at risk of higher taxes."

Support

Committees in support of California Proposition 13 (2020)			Totals in support	
Supporting committees	Cash contributions	In-kind services	Total raised:	
Californians for Safe Schools and Healthy Learning, Yes on Prop 13, a Committee Supported by Governor Newsom, Teachers, Nurses, and Firefighters	\$3,895,000.00	\$0.00		\$6,291,572.59
Community College Facility Coalition Issues Committee - Yes on 13	\$268,751.27	\$1,400.00	Total spent:	\$619,430.84

Californians for Quality Schools, Sponsored by the California Building Industry Association - Yes on Prop 13	\$902,385.31	\$0.00
Coalition for Adequate School Housing Issues Committee - Yes on 13	\$450,108.98	\$4,796.85
Yes on Proposition 13 - California Coalition for Public Higher Education Issues Committee	\$769,130.18	\$0.00
Total	\$6,285,375.74	\$6,196.85

Donors

The following were the donors who contributed \$200,000 or more to the support committees.

Donor	Cash	In-kind	Total
California Teachers Association Issues PAC	\$500,000.00	\$0.00	\$500,000.00
RMV Community Development, LLC (and aggregated contributions)	\$320,000.00	\$0.00	\$320,000.00
California Democratic Party	\$250,000.00	\$0.00	\$250,000.00
University of California Los Angeles Foundation	\$200,000.00	\$0.00	\$200,000.00
University of California Santa Barbara Foundation Institution Advancement MC	\$200,000.00	\$0.00	\$200,000.00
University of California San Francisco Foundation	\$200,000.00	\$0.00	\$200,000.00

Media editorials

Support

- Chico Enterprise-Record:** "But this proposition is just a \$15 billion school bond, although it does have a few differences from your run of the mill school bond. We're going to endorse it because of one of those quirks. The bulk of the money — \$9 billion — goes to K-12 schools. But it's not dumped into a single mosh pit for new construction that favors well-off districts able to hire deft grant writers. The

measure steers \$5.2 billion of that \$9 billion toward modernization of existing schools, with things like dealing with lead in water systems and asbestos specifically mentioned in the law's language. These are critical priorities for the state's children, and there are many small districts that wouldn't be able to take those steps without support."

- **Los Angeles Times:** "Proposition 13 on the March ballot – ignore the iconic number, it's just a coincidence – was written to avoid the problems of previous bonds, and it deserves passage. ... California schools already are underfunded compared with other states. The minimum that voters can do is ensure that students attend schools that are safe and modern, reflecting California's commitment to education, perhaps the state's most important investment."
- **San Francisco Chronicle:** "A well-educated workforce is essential to California's future economy — and bringing the state's many substandard school facilities is critical to creating a learning environment. This is a big investment, but it is a wise investment. We recommend a yes vote on Proposition 13."
- **The Sacramento Bee:** "Prop. 13 is more than new funding for school capital projects. It reforms how funding is spent and lowers fees for the dense housing development California critically needs. *The Sacramento Bee* Editorial Board supports Proposition 13 and encourages you to do the same."

Opposition

- **The Mercury News:** "In other words, owners of existing homes would be called on to finance more of the school construction needed for new homes. While Prop. 13 might make some homes near transit slightly more affordable, assuming developers pass on the savings to buyers and renters, it would drive up the cost of housing for existing homeowners, especially in communities that are growing and adding more students to their schools. Many of those homeowners already pay hundreds of dollars annually in property taxes to cover the cost of past school construction measures."
- **The Orange County Register:** "Yet this is no ordinary school-construction bond. In addition to creating state debt, it has a hidden and pernicious provision that raises the debt limit for local districts. School districts have repeatedly asked voters to approve facilities bonds – so much so that many school districts have bumped up against state-imposed caps on local indebtedness. ... We urge voters to embody the spirit of the original Prop. 13 and halt this endless spending cycle – and thereby force state and local officials to do a better job budgeting the money they already have."

Polls

[hide]California Proposition 13, School and College Facilities Bond (March 2020)						
Poll	Support	Oppose	Undecided	Margin of error	Sample size	
PPIC (<i>likely voters</i>) 1/3/2020 - 1/12/2020	53.0%	36.0%	10.0%	+/-4.6	967	
PPIC (<i>likely voters</i>) 11/3/2019 - 11/12/2019	48.0%	36.0%	16.0%	+/-4.3	1,008	
PPIC (<i>likely voters</i>) 9/16/2019 - 9/25/2019	54.0%	40.0%	6.0%	+/-4.2	1,031	
AVERAGES	51.67%	37.33%	10.67%	+/-4.37	1,002	



**2020 Meeting Schedule
w/ Guest speakers**

~~1/27 Open — Capt. Tony Conrad, Murrieta PD~~

2/24 Open – Jennings Immel, U.S. Chamber of Commerce

3/16 Open – Anne Mayer, Executive Director, RCTC

4/20 Open

5/18 Open

6/15 Open

7/20 Open

8/17 Open

9/21 Open

10/19 Open

11/16 Closed

12/16 Dark