



## ELECTION INFO

for Los Angeles County

Statewide General Election

**TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 8, 2022**

Polls open at 7 AM to 8 PM



OCTOBER 6-10 – Vote-by-Mail Ballots mailed

OCTOBER 10 – Ballot Drop Boxes open

OCTOBER 24 – Last day to register or re-register to vote

OCTOBER 29 – Vote Centers open 10 - 7

NOVEMBER 1 – Last day to request a replacement Vote-by-Mail ballot

---

### THIS VOTER INFORMATION NEWS CONTAINS INFORMATION ABOUT:



STATE BALLOT PROPOSITIONS 1 and 26 – 31

County Measures A and C

LOS ANGELES COUNTY SHERIFF

LOS ANGELES SUPERIOR COURT JUDGES

LOS ANGELES COUNTY SUPERVISOR, DISTRICT 3

### ON NOVEMBER 8, 2022 VOTERS WILL ALSO BE VOTING FOR:



Candidates for statewide office – Governor, Lieutenant Governor, Secretary of State, Treasurer, Controller, Attorney General, Insurance Commissioner, and Superintendent of Public Instruction

Board of Equalization candidates

Federal Congressional and Senate candidates

State Assembly and State Senate candidates

Local City, School District, and Special District offices



# CANDIDATES FOR LOS ANGELES COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

**TERM OF OFFICE:** 4 years

**TERM BEGINS:** December 1, 2022

**SALARY:** \$223,829 annually (same as set by the State Legislature for Superior Court judges 7-1-2021)

Elections for Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors are held in even numbered years. In 2022 Supervisors in the First and Third Districts are up for election. In the 1st District, Supervisor Hilda Solis received more than 50 % of the vote in June and was elected. In the 3rd District there is a run-off between the two candidates who received the most votes.

**DUTIES:** The five member Board of Supervisors acts as the governing body of Los Angeles County; has administrative, legislative, and quasi-judicial duties; provides for county-wide services; is local government in unincorporated areas; governs many special districts; adopts County budget. Each district has a population of approximately 2 million residents. District boundaries were adjusted as a result of the Independent Redistricting Commission process so some voters will find themselves in a different district.

Each of the candidates for Supervisor was asked to provide a 25-word biographical statement and to respond to two specific questions using a total of no more than 125 words for both.

1. *Environmental Justice is a long-term problem in Los Angeles County. What role should the Supervisors take to address issues related to low income housing, polluted transportation corridors, and industrial sites which create hazards such as the recent Dominguez Channel crisis?*
2. *What aspects of Measure J, (now called the CARE act), dedicating 10% of unrestricted county revenue to community investment and alternatives to incarceration, are you determined to see accomplished? How do you envision implementation?*

## SUPERVISORIAL DISTRICT 3

### CANDIDATE

**Lindsey Horvath**

**Occupation:** Councilmember/Small Business Owner

**Website:** lindseyhorvath.com

**Qualifications:**

- Former or current: Mayor and Councilmember – West Hollywood
- President – California Contract Cities Association (CCCA)
- Planned Parenthood Advocacy Project Endorsed Candidate



### CANDIDATE

**Robert “Bob” Hertzberg**

**Occupation:** State Senate Majority Leader Emeritus (California State Senator)

**Website:** hertzbergforsupervisor.com

**Qualifications:**

**Answers:**  
(as of 9-21-22 NO Response)



**Answers:**

1. We must prioritize intersectional climate crisis solutions that address the disproportionate impacts on communities of color.

First, the County's award-winning Sustainability Plan requires actual implementation. We must also develop higher standards actualizing net-zero development. Energy efficiency upgrades, elevated housing development sustainability standards, decarbonizing buildings and properly decommissioning defunct oil wells is critical.

2. We must make our communities safer. I support Measure J and alternatives to incarceration that address the longstanding, structural inequalities and prioritize systems of care.

I've led efforts alongside the Justice LA Coalition, CCCA and my City to support full funding of ATI. I support the end to cash bail, development of just pretrial programs and have authored successful legislation to deprioritize enforcement of low-level traffic stops.

**GET THE FACTS  
BEFORE YOU VOTE!**



- Get in-depth information on candidates, measures, and who supports them
- Use your address to get a personalized ballot
- Check where, when, and how to vote
- Keep track of your choices and use them to vote
- Share and start the conversation!

[www.votersedge.org](http://www.votersedge.org)

Brought to you by

MapLight

LWV LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF CALIFORNIA EDUCATION FUND

# CANDIDATES FOR LOS ANGELES COUNTY SHERIFF

**TERM OF OFFICE:** 4 years (Term limits revoked by court 10-29-2004)  
**TERM BEGINS:** December, 2022  
**SALARY:** \$354,940 annually (Effective 7/1/21)

**DUTIES:** Administers the police function of the County, and is responsible for enforcement of all laws and regulations as required or requested by statute, participates in programs for rehabilitation, prevention of crime and suppression of delinquency; directs and coordinates emergency services; maintains security and assists in the functions of the Superior Courts; and operates five County jail facilities.

Each candidate for Sheriff was asked to submit a 25 word statement of qualifications and to answer two questions using no more than 100 words.

1. How would you address the problem of deputy cliques within the structure of the department?
2. What are the most important issues facing the Sheriff's Department today? How do you propose to address those problems?

## LOS ANGELES COUNTY SHERIFF

### CANDIDATE

#### Robert Luna

**Occupation:** Retired Long Beach Police Chief

**Website:** [lunaforsheriff.com](http://lunaforsheriff.com)

**Qualifications:**

- Long Beach Police Chief from 2014-2021
- 36 years in law enforcement
- 20+ years of executive law enforcement management experience
- Major Cities Chiefs Association executive board



**Answers:**

1. LASD's history of deputy gangs is unacceptable. I will rid the Department of deputy gangs and I will change the Department's culture to prevent gangs from resurfacing in the future.
2. The greatest challenge facing the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department is leadership. The current Sheriff has created chaos and dysfunction, which has put our public safety at risk.

### CANDIDATE

#### Alex Villanueva

**Occupation:** Sheriff, Los Angeles County

**Website:** [alexvillanueva.org](http://alexvillanueva.org)

**Qualifications:**

- PhD Public Administration
- Decade of military service
- As Sheriff, decreased citizen complaints by 31%
- 100% deputy worn body cameras
- Raised hiring standards, now hire locally



**Answers:**

1. We established a first of its kind policy to discipline deputies who participate in sub-groups that violate rights of other personnel or the public. We have zero tolerance of deputy misconduct. If evidence is brought to the department of illegal activity by deputy subgroups we will act.
2. Our biggest challenges are homelessness and crime. We will continue to work with community partners to get the homeless needed services, keep public spaces open and businesses bustling. To fight crime we need to get back to full staffing. We are now at just 70% across our patrol stations.



The League of Women Voters of California Education Fund (LWVCEF) produced these nonpartisan explanations of state propositions, with supporting and opposing arguments. The arguments come from many sources and are not limited to those presented in the Official Voter Information Guide. The LWVCEF does not judge the merits of the arguments or guarantee their validity.

Visit our website, [CAvotes.org](http://CAvotes.org), to:

- Learn more about the ballot measures and voter registration
- See a list of local Leagues
- Sign up and become a member, and to donate or volunteer

# CANDIDATES FOR JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT OF LOS ANGELES COUNTY

**SALARY:** \$223,829 annually (set by the State Legislature 7-1-2021)

**TERM OF OFFICE:** 6 years

**TERM BEGINS:** January 2, 2023

Elections for Superior Court Judges in Los Angeles County are held in even numbered years at the scheduled Primary Election. The California Constitution requires that a candidate for Superior Court Judge be a member of the State Bar or serve on a court of record for ten years. A vacancy in a Superior Court office is to be filled by appointment by the governor. The appointed judge must stand for election at the next general election.

There are 490 judicial offices in 12 judicial districts in Los Angeles County. When a judge runs for re-election and there is no other candidate for the same office, his/her name does not appear on the ballot. In cases where more than two candidates are running and no one candidate receives more than 50% of the votes, a run-off is held at the November General Election. There are 6 run-off elections on this ballot.

Each candidate for Superior Court Judge was asked to submit a statement of qualifications and respond to the following questions using no more than 75 words.

1. Why are you running for Superior Court Judge?
2. What do you perceive as the greatest obstacles to justice, if any?

## SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE OFFICE 60

### CANDIDATE

#### Abby Baron

**Occupation:** District Attorney

**Qualifications:**

- Practicing for 15 years
- Child Molestation Prosecutor
- Endorsed by 80 judges, the LA Times, and LA Fed
- Commitment to community service
- Experience, Empathy and Respect



**Answers:**

1. I am running to ensure compassion and respect are prioritized in the courtroom. I will apply the law intelligently and fairly with an individualized assessment. I seek to serve our community.
2. Fear of unknown or disproportionate consequences prevent many from seeking justice. Lack of language services prevent many from serving on a jury. These obstacles can be addressed by a judge who remembers they are there to serve the people, and I will do that.

### CANDIDATE

#### Anna Slotky Reitano

**Occupation:** Deputy Public Defender

**Website:** reitanoforjudge.com

**Qualifications:**

- Trial attorney for cases from misdemeanors
- to serious felonies
- Well rounded legal experience in civil and criminal
- Extensive knowledge of community based Crime prevention



**Answers:**

1. I am seeking to be the change I want to see and offer a more balanced perspective, fairness, and engage with solutions that will truly make "Justice for All"
2. A failure to recognize the root causes of crime, and knowledge of how to address them. We need judges who understand community-oriented and evidence-based solutions that serve to promote public safety, while supporting victims of crime and upholding the constitution.

## SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE OFFICE 67

### CANDIDATE

#### Fernanda Maria Barreto

**Occupation:** Deputy District Attorney, Los Angeles County

**Website:** fernandabarreto4judge.com

**Qualifications:**

- Sixteen years as Deputy District Attorney protecting vulnerable community members from crimes victimizing women, children, and seniors
- Eleven years - law school professor
- Civil law experience



**Answers:**

1. I am running for Superior Court Judge because I am capable and qualified. I will treat every person in my courtroom with dignity and fairness. As the only Latina running for judge, my experiences with racism and sexism will bring a much-needed perspective to the bench.
- 2 Access: Justice requires financial resources and expertise that are too often out of reach. Diversity: Our courts must reflect the communities they serve.

### CANDIDATE

#### Elizabeth Lashley-Haynes

**Occupation:** Deputy Public Defender, Los Angeles County

**Website:** lashley-haynesforjudge2022.com

**Qualifications:**

- Law Clerk (law school): Federal Court of Appeals
- Trial Attorney
- 19+ years LA County Public Defender
- Resource Attorney
- Indigent Criminal Defense
- Family Law Contempt Defense



- Answers:**
1. I have fought for justice and constitutional rights my entire career. We are at an inflection point in criminal justice reform that requires judges who are independent, innovative, and willing to uphold the ideals of equality and justice for all.
  2. Most people in our legal system are struggling to overcome addiction, mental health challenges, homelessness, or joblessness. We need to reimagine a justice system that repairs and restores communities rather than focuses exclusively on incarceration.



## SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE OFFICE 70

### CANDIDATE

#### Renee Yolande Chang

**Occupation:** Child Molestation Prosecutor

**Website:** reneechangforjudge.com

**Qualifications:**

- UC Berkeley and Columbia Law School
- Child molestation prosecutor, Deputy District Attorney
- Advocates for victims and public safety
- Rated "Well Qualified" by LA Bar Association

**Answers:**

1. In today's charged political climate, it is imperative that judges remain non-partisan, fair and impartial. I am running to keep the judiciary independent and to apply the law as passed by the law makers, without a political or social agenda.

2. Obstacles to justice include lack of access, high cost, and unfamiliarity with legal procedures. I will work to improve access to justice, increase courtroom efficiency, and handle all proceedings in an open and transparent manner.



### CANDIDATE

#### Holly L. Hancock

**Occupation:** Deputy Public Defender, Los Angeles County

**Website:** hancock4judge.com

**Qualifications:**

- 16-Year Deputy Public Defender
- Deputy-In-Charge of the Criminal Record Clearing Unit.
- Advocate and mentor for attorneys and paralegals.
- Various organizations; NAACP, Black Public Defenders, etc.

**Answers:**

1. As a Deputy Public Defender. I approach cases from a different perspective. I look at the root causes and determine a long-term solution to prevent recidivism. I deal with the individual's needs and rights. I look at both sides of the issue for the best outcome.

2. People are dispossessed first by lack of resources. Implied and express biases drive who is charged, what is charged, sentencing and rehabilitation considerations. Long-term solutions create long-term community safety.



## SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE OFFICE 90

### CANDIDATE

#### Leslie Gutierrez

**Occupation:** Deputy District Attorney, Los Angeles County

**Website:** lesliegutierrezforjudge2022.com

**Qualifications:**

- 10 years experience as Deputy District Attorney
- J.D. Southwestern Law School, Los Angeles, 2010
- M.A. in Economics 2005, foreign institution
- B.A. in Economics 2001, foreign institution

**Answer:**

1. Women are underrepresented. Electing more women judges is necessary to send a powerful message that the judicial system is legitimate, inclusive, and accessible to all.

2. Mental health and drugs rehabilitation programs are not funded properly which leads to the unavailability of treatment for low-income individuals.



### CANDIDATE

#### Melissa Lyons

**Occupation:** Deputy District Attorney, Los Angeles County

**Website:** melissalyons4judge.com

**Qualifications:**

- Deputy District Attorney for the last 15 1/2 years.
- Supervisor for Compton Juvenile Division
- Handled a wide spectrum of crimes, from theft to murder and have extensive trial experience.

**Answer:**

1. I am running because representation matters. I am running because diverse perspectives and life experiences amongst decision makers are important. I am running to serve the Los Angeles County community in a different aspect of the decision making process.

2. To have a truly independent, unbiased judiciary. To make the judiciary an active part of reforming our justice system. Until we have a truly independent, unbiased justice system justice can not fully be served.



## SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE OFFICE 118

### CANDIDATE

#### Melissa Hammond

**Occupation:** Deputy District Attorney, Los Angeles County

**Website:** melissahammondforjudge.com

**Qualifications:**

- Deputy District Attorney in Los Angeles
- Prosecute serious and violent felonies
- Former Deputy Public Defender
- Former Civil Litigator
- UCLA School of Law graduate

**Answers:**

1. I want to contribute my uniquely well-rounded legal experience to my community. I have served the public for almost my entire career, and I want to spend the rest of my career serving the public as a Superior Court Judge.

2. The public is divided. In my court, I resolve disputes and I would continue to resolve disputes to the maximum ability as a Superior Court Judge. We need a meeting of the minds, not divisiveness.



### CANDIDATE

#### Carolyn "Jiyoung" Park

**Occupation:** Attorney at Law

**Website:** parkforjudge2022.com

**Qualifications:**

- J.D. Loyola Law School
- B.A. Tulane University
- Governing Board Member, Silver Lake Neighborhood Council
- Sustainable Economies Legal Fellow
- Just Transition Lawyering Institute, First Cohort Member

**Answers:**

1. I am running to bring a fair and community-informed perspective to decision-making about the lives of Angelenos and provide a real choice on the ballot.

2. A lack of access to affordable legal representation. A lack of diversity among judges and attorneys in terms of legal background and demographics. A complicated legal system that is primarily designed for use by attorneys and judges. An approach to justice that is not holistic.



# SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE OFFICE 151

## CANDIDATE

### Karen A. Brako

**Occupation:** Deputy District Attorney, Los Angeles County

**Website:** karenbrakoforjudge.com

#### Qualifications:

- Over 30 years of courtroom experience as an attorney
- Deputy District Attorney for over 25 years
- Over 100 jury trials fighting for justice



#### Answers:

1. Women make up only 30 percent of the bench, I am running for judge because there needs to be more diversity on the bench. There is also a need for judges with my experience, who can be fair to all sides.
2. A lack of trust in the system is a great obstacle to justice. Diversity on the bench and being more transparent as to why decisions are made will help reestablish trust in the system.

## CANDIDATE

### Patrick Hare

**Occupation:** Deputy Public Defender, Los Angeles County

**Website:** patrickhareforjudge.com

#### Qualifications:

- Rated "Well Qualified" by the Los Angeles County Bar Association'
- Los Angeles County Deputy Public Defender
- 32 years criminal and civil trial experience
- Endorsed by the Los Angeles County Democratic Party



#### Answers:

1. I am running for judge because of my deep conviction that Justice Matters. I will be a judge who values the kind of justice that restores our community to wholeness – for victims of crime, as well as those accused of crimes.
2. For too many people in our society, class, gender and race play an unacceptable role in who has access to the courts, who has effective representation, and who gets fair and equitable results.

## MEASURE A

## Los Angeles County Charter Amendment

### Providing Authority To Remove An Elected Sheriff For Cause

**THE QUESTION:** Shall the Los Angeles County Charter be amended to grant the Board of Supervisors authority to remove an elected Sheriff from office for cause?

#### THE SITUATION:

The LA County Sheriff leads one of the largest law-enforcement agencies in the US. The LA County Board of Supervisors has recently expressed concern over lack of accountability and transparency in the Sheriff's Department. In 2016 the Board implemented a Sheriff Civilian Oversight Commission whose charter is to improve public transparency and accountability with respect to the Department. There has been resistance to the Commission's oversight by current and previous Sheriffs.

The California Constitution allows a county charter to provide for the terms and removal of any elected or appointed county officer. This measure was placed on the ballot by a vote of the Los Angeles County Supervisors.

#### THE PROPOSAL

Measure A would amend the Charter of the County of Los Angeles to allow the Board of Supervisors to remove a Sheriff from office for cause. For the purposes of this measure, "cause" is defined as:

- Violation of a law related to the Sheriff's duties
- Flagrant or repeated neglect of the Sheriff's duties
- Misappropriation of funds or property
- Willful falsification of a relevant official statement or document
- Obstruction of any investigation into the conduct of the Sheriff or the Department

The action would require a four-fifths vote by the Board and the Sheriff would have to be given written notice and an opportunity to be heard.

#### FISCAL EFFECTS

If Measure A were to pass, the fiscal effects would be negligible.

#### SUPPORTERS SAY:

- ★ The Sheriff wields an exceptional amount of power, as opposed to some other elected county officials such as the County Assessor.
- ★ Voters should decide whether this is the right way to enhance accountability of the Sheriff.

#### OPPONENTS SAY:

- ★ This measure should apply to all seven elected county officials, including the Supervisors.
- ★ The Board is attempting to cheat the system and create a "fast-track" pathway to remove a duly elected Sheriff.

#### FOR MORE INFORMATION

**Supporters:** LA County Supervisors Sheila Kuehl, Hilda Solis, Holly Mitchell, Janice Hahn

**Opponents:** LA County Supervisor Kathryn Barger and LA County Sheriff Alex Villanueva

**General Tax On Cannabis Businesses In Unincorporated Los Angeles County**

**THE QUESTION:** Should the County enact a tax in the unincorporated areas of Los Angeles County on cannabis businesses at annual rates not to exceed \$10 per square foot for cultivation and a percentage of gross receipts for various cannabis businesses until ended by voters?

**THE SITUATION:**

At present Cannabis businesses are prohibited in the unincorporated parts of Los Angeles, however there is illegal cultivation and sale of cannabis products taking place. Many cities within the county have established licensing and tax rates for cannabis businesses within their boundaries.

**THE PROPOSAL**

Measure C would authorize taxing gross receipts of retail, manufacturing, distribution and testing businesses involving cannabis at rates of between 1% and 4%. Cultivation businesses, which must be indoor only, would be taxed at between \$2 and \$7 per square foot. Personal cannabis cultivation or use would be exempt from this tax. Other provisions of Measure C include the following:

- The proposed tax rates would become effective in July of 2023 following a simple majority vote including all registered Los Angeles County voters.
- The proposed tax rates are adjustable by the Board within designated limits after July 1, 2026. Additionally, beginning on July 1, 2027 the tax rates for cannabis cultivation will be adjusted for inflation annually in accordance with the Consumer Price Index (CPI).
- Illegal growing and distribution/sales of cannabis products will be subject to the tax provisions to allow prosecution for tax evasion.
- Revenue derived from the tax, projected to be from \$10.3 to \$15.2 Million annually, will be deposited into the County's General Fund and may be used for any County governmental purpose throughout the county.

**SUPPORTERS SAY:**

- ★ Measure C promotes the distribution and consumption of safe and unadulterated cannabis through a legal, regulated market.
- ★ Low starting tax rates are strategically designed to ensure the viability of the legal market.
- ★ Tax revenue will be redistributed to all Los Angeles County residents through projects funded by the General Fund.

**OPPONENTS SAY:**

- ★ Cannabis business tax rates for incorporated areas of LA County are classified and measured differently, prompting considerations of fairness.
- ★ The tax rates might be effectively lowered if inflation isn't addressed until 2027.
- ★ Because so few licensing permits will be granted, the illicit cannabis market might continue to exist for years to come.

Measure C was placed on the ballot by a four-fifths vote of the Board of Supervisors.

**Supporters:** Campaign Committees have not been identified as of press time

**Opponents:** Campaign Committees have not been identified as of press time

**Who can vote?**

You may register to vote in California if:

- ★ You are a U.S. citizen and California resident.
- ★ You will be at least 18 years old on election day.
- ★ You are not in prison or on parole for a felony.
- ★ You have not been judged mentally incompetent.

**When must you re-register to vote?**

You need to fill out a new voter registration form if:

- ★ You change your residence address or mailing address.
- ★ You change your name.
- ★ You want to change your political party affiliation.

***If you registered and your name does not appear on the voter list at your polling place, you have a right to cast a provisional ballot at any polling place in your county.***



## Constitutional Right To Reproductive Freedom

**THE QUESTION:** Should the California Constitution expressly provide that the State of California shall not deny or interfere with an individual's reproductive freedom in their most intimate decisions, including the right to choose to have an abortion and their right to choose or refuse contraception?

### THE SITUATION

The right to privacy, including the right to decide whether to give birth, has been largely eliminated at the Federal level by a recent U.S. Supreme Court decision. There is concern that the right to obtain and use contraceptives under the U.S. Constitution's implied right to privacy may also be under similar threat.

Currently the California Constitution provides that all people are by nature free and independent and have inalienable rights, including, among others, the right to privacy. It also provides that a person may not be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law or denied equal protection of the laws. There is a California Supreme Court case which holds that the state Constitution's express right to privacy extends to an individual's decision about whether or not to have an abortion.

Existing California statutory law also provides, under the Reproductive Privacy Act, that the Legislature finds and declares every individual possesses a fundamental right of privacy with respect to personal reproductive decisions; therefore, it is the public policy of the State of California that every individual has the fundamental right to choose or refuse birth control, and every individual has the fundamental right to choose to bear a child or to choose to obtain an abortion.

The State can only restrict abortions when needed to meet certain state interests such as public health and safety. State statute says abortions can only be performed on a viable fetus if the pregnancy puts the health or life of the pregnant person at risk. Under state law, a fetus is considered viable if the fetus likely would be able to survive outside the uterus.

However, in light of the above-mentioned U.S. Supreme Court's recent decision, concerns have been expressed as to whether a future California court might overturn existing case law or statutory law to eliminate the right to reproductive choice.

### THE PROPOSAL

Prop 1:

- 1) Prohibits the State from denying or interfering with an individual's reproductive freedom in their most intimate decisions, which includes their fundamental right to choose to have an abortion and their fundamental right to choose or refuse contraceptives.
- 2) Specifies that this constitutional amendment is intended to further the constitutional right of privacy and the constitutional right to not be denied equal protection.
- 3) Specifies that nothing contained in the measure narrows or limits the right to privacy or to equal protection.

### FISCAL EFFECTS

There are no estimated fiscal effects from the passage of Prop 1.

### SUPPORTERS SAY

- ★ Prop 1 will enshrine the fundamental right to an abortion and a fundamental right to contraception in the California State Constitution.
- ★ Doctors, nurses, and health providers all agree that Yes on Prop 1 is necessary to keep reproductive medical decisions where they belong—with individuals and their health care providers based on scientific facts, not political arguments.

### OPPONENTS SAY

- ★ Women already have the right to choose under current California law. The recent U.S. Supreme Court ruling did not and will not change this. Prop 1 is not needed to protect women's health or their reproductive rights.
- ★ Prop 1 is an extreme and costly proposal that allows unrestricted late term abortions and punishes taxpayers; abortion seekers from outside California will swamp California resources.

### FOR MORE INFORMATION

**Supporters:** Protect Constitutional Abortion Rights  
[protectabortionca.com/](https://protectabortionca.com/)

**Opponents:** California Catholic Conference  
<https://www.cacatholic.org/article/california-bishops-oppose-ca-constitutional-amendment-protect-abortion>

## Allows In-Person Roulette, Dice Games, Sports Wagering on Tribal Lands

**THE QUESTION:** Should California (a) increase the allowable gambling activities at American Indian owned casinos and (b) allow betting on sports events at casinos and horse racing tracks?

### THE SITUATION

The California Constitution and California statutes define what types of gambling are allowed in the State. Currently the California Lottery, card rooms, betting on horse racing, and gambling in American Indian owned casinos are allowed. No dice games or “Nevada casino” style gaming, or betting on sports events is legal in California.

The rules governing American Indian owned casinos are set by individual agreements between the owner tribe(s) and the State of California (“Compacts”).

### THE PROPOSAL

If passed Prop 26 would:

- Allow tribal casinos to run roulette and dice games like craps.
- Allow tribal casinos and four horse racetracks to offer onsite betting on sports events like football games. No betting would be allowed on high school sports or on California college sports.
- Limit sports betting to those 21 or more years old.
- Impose a 10% tax on net sports betting at racetracks. The tax revenue would go to a new fund created by this Proposition.
- Allow negotiation of any tax coming from betting on sports in casinos and whether it would be directed to the new fund in the Compacts.
- Tax revenue left after deducting the costs of sports betting regulation would be divided to send 70% to the state General Fund, 15% for programs dealing with gaming, mental health research, and 15% to the Department of Justice for enforcing gaming laws.
- Allow a person or entity who is aware of violations of the gaming law to file a civil action if the California Attorney General declines to act. Any penalty assessed in a civil action goes to the new fund.
- Prop 26 and Prop 27 both legalize sports betting in some way. If both pass it is possible that both will take effect. It is also possible that some provisions conflict. If a court finds that parts of the propositions are in conflict the one that received the most yes votes will be law.

### FISCAL EFFECTS

Predictions of the impact of this law on state and local revenue are difficult to determine because much depends on the terms of the agreements between the casinos and the State and on how much people who play the games or bet on sports will spend.

Prop 26 could increase state revenues from tax payments made on sports betting at racetracks and civil penalties for violations of the law, potentially reaching the tens of millions of dollars each year.

There will also be increased costs to enforce and regulate the new betting, potentially reaching the low tens of millions of dollars each year. This amount could be offset by increased revenue. There also would be increased state enforcement costs, not likely to exceed several million dollars each year related to a new civil enforcement tool for enforcing certain gaming laws.

### SUPPORTERS SAY

- ★ Prop 26 would continue the 20 year legacy of allowing closely regulated gaming to support American Indian economies.
- ★ Prop 26 is the most responsible approach to authorizing sports wagering, and would promote American Indian self-reliance.

### OPPONENTS SAY

- ★ Prop 26 would massively expand gambling in California for the benefit of large tribal casinos.
- ★ Prop 26 would leave casino workers unprotected from worker safety, wage-and-hour, harassment, and anti-discrimination laws.

### FOR MORE INFORMATION

**Supporters:** Yes on 26 - No on 27 - Coalition for Safe, Responsible Gaming

[yeson26.com](http://yeson26.com)

**Opponents:** No on 26 - Taxpayers Against Special Interest Monopolies

[tasimcoalition.org](http://tasimcoalition.org)

## Allows Online And Mobile Sports Wagering Outside Tribal Lands

**THE QUESTION:** Should California allow online and mobile sports betting for people 21 years of age or older?

### THE SITUATION

The California Constitution and California statutes define what types of gambling are allowed in the State. Currently the California Lottery, card rooms, betting on horse racing, and gambling in American Indian owned casinos are allowed. The casinos are allowed to operate slot machines, lottery games, and certain types of card games. The rules governing American Indian owned casinos are set by compacts that are agreements between the owner tribe(s) and the State. Betting on sports events is not legal in California.

### THE PROPOSAL

Prop 27 would:

- Allow adults 21 or older to bet on adult sports events online. No betting could occur on events such as high school sports. The bettor need not be in a casino to make a bet.
- Allow tribes to offer online sports betting under the tribe’s name and branding. Tribes would have to pay a one-time \$10 million licensing fee to the State and a renewal fee every five years.
- Allow gaming companies to offer online sports betting if they strike a deal with a tribe to operate in California and pay a one-time licensing fee of \$100 million plus a renewal fee every five years. Create a new division within the state’s Justice Department to regulate online sports wagering.
- Impose a 10% tax on all companies or tribes offering sports betting. The tax is imposed on a gross amount minus how much money is paid out to winning bets, promotional bets, and federal gambling taxes.
- After paying the State’s regulatory costs, revenue from the tax and the licensing fees would go into a new fund. Of the money in the fund 85% would be used for homelessness and related mental health programs. Fifteen percent of the fund would go to American Indian tribes that are not involved in sports betting.
- None of the revenue or licensing fees would be included in the state’s General Fund for purposes of allocating money to programs such as public education.

Prop 26 and Prop 27 both legalize sports betting in some way. If both pass it is possible that both will take effect. If a court finds that parts of the propositions are in conflict, the one that received the most yes votes will be law.

### FISCAL EFFECTS

The size of Prop 27’s fiscal impacts depends on variables such as the number of entities that offer online betting, the renegotiation (if any) of compacts caused by offering online betting, and the number of people that engage in online betting.

There is a potential for increases in state revenue reaching from hundreds of millions up to \$500 million each year. There will be increased regulatory costs estimated to be in the mid tens of millions of dollars each year. Some or all of these costs would be offset by the payments sports betting operators must pay to the State for regulation.

### SUPPORTERS SAY

- ★ Prop 27 will provide hundreds of millions of dollars to support programs that alleviate homelessness, mental health and addiction in California.
- ★ Prop 27 will benefit every California tribe—especially rural and economically disadvantaged tribes which don’t own big casinos.

### OPPONENTS SAY

- ★ Prop 27 is a deceptive measure promoted by out-of-state companies to legalize online and mobile sports gambling in California.
- ★ Online gambling is not a solution to homelessness or other social ills and will open more people to gambling addictions.

### FOR MORE INFORMATION

**Supporters:** Yes on 27 - Solutions to Homelessness and Mental Health Support  
[yestoprop27.com](http://yestoprop27.com)

**Opponents:** No on 27 - Coalition for Safe and Responsible Gaming  
[noon27.com](http://noon27.com)

No on 27 - Protect Tribal Sovereignty and Safe Gaming  
[nopro27.org](http://nopro27.org)

## Provides Additional Funding for Arts and Music Education in Public Schools

**THE QUESTION:** Should the State provide specific funding for arts and music education in public schools, an amount higher than the existing constitutional minimum amount required for public education?

### THE SITUATION

Because Prop 98 passed in 1988, the California Constitution requires a minimum percentage of the state budget to be spent on K-14 education (kindergarten through two-year community college). This minimum guarantee is calculated annually.

There is currently no guaranteed source of annual funding in the state budget for arts and music education in K-12 public schools. State law requires schools to provide arts and music instruction to all students in grades 1 through 6. In order to graduate, high school students must complete a year in one of three courses of study, one of which being arts and music education. Beyond these requirements, other specifics such as the amount of instruction or when courses are offered is determined by the local governing board.

### THE PROPOSAL

Prop 28 would require the state to set aside a portion of the State's General Fund to pay for arts and music education in K-12 public schools. This funding would be in addition to the funding already guaranteed by Prop 98. Prop 28 would require the funding for arts and music education to be at least 1% of the funding received by schools the prior year under Prop 98.

To address equity issues, Prop 28 would allocate more funding to schools serving many low-income students. Schools would be required to report how funding was used to directly benefit students. Larger schools would be required to spend 80% of the funding to employ new staff and 20% on training and supplies.

### FISCAL EFFECTS

Prop 28 would increase State expenditures by about \$1 billion per year, over and above existing constitutional requirements.

### SUPPORTERS SAY

- ★ Arts and music education can improve a student's personal and academic life.
- ★ Only one in five schools have a dedicated teacher for arts and music programs.
- ★ Prop 28 does not raise taxes.

### OPPONENTS SAY

At press time there is no organized campaign committee

### FOR MORE INFORMATION

**Supporters:** Yes On 28 - Californians for Arts and Music in Schools  
[voteyeson28.org/](http://voteyeson28.org/)

**Opponents:** As of press time there is no organized campaign committee.

### Choosing YES or NO on a Proposition

A YES vote means that you approve of the change a proposition would make, and a NO vote means that you want to leave things as they are now.

## Requires On-Site Licensed Medical Professional at Kidney Dialysis Clinics and Establishes Other State Requirements

**THE QUESTION:** Should outpatient dialysis clinics be required to have a physician, nurse practitioner or physician assistant on site at all hours when patients are being treated, and should they be required to provide various clinic-related information to patients and the State?

### THE SITUATION

About 80,000 patients in California receive dialysis services from 650 Chronic Dialysis Clinics (CDCs). CDCs are licensed by the California Department of Public Health using federal standards. To serve more patients, CDCs often operate 6 days a week for extended hours. Federal law requires clinics to report infections related to treatment. All patients have their own physicians whom they must see once per month. All clinics have a medical director who is a physician.

Two for-profit companies, DaVita Inc. from Colorado and Fresenius Medical Care from Germany, operate almost three quarters of the CDCs in California. The remaining CDCs are operated by a variety of nonprofit and for-profit entities.

Most patients on dialysis are covered by Medicare and/or Medi-Cal, which pay a fixed rate for CDC services. About 10% of CDC patients are covered by group and individual health insurance plans. These plans often pay multiple times the amount for dialysis treatment than the amounts paid by government programs because their rates are negotiated with each insurance company. After a period of time all dialysis patients are covered by Medicare.

### THE PROPOSAL

Proposition 29 would require that:

- A licensed physician, nurse practitioner or physician assistant, in each case with at least 6 months of experience in kidney care, must be on-site at all times when dialysis is being performed. Telehealth may be used for up to one year if no such person is available on-site.
- Clinics report to patients the name of any physician with more than a 5% interest in the clinic.
- Clinics do not discriminate among patients based on their source of payment.
- Clinics report information about dialysis-related infections among their patients.
- Clinics obtain permission from the State to close or reduce hours.

### FISCAL EFFECTS

There are fiscal implications for both the clinics and state and local government if this passes. The clinics would probably have to pay hundreds of thousands of dollars more annually for staff salaries. State and local governments might have to pay tens of millions of dollars more annually if clinics close and patients must go to more expensive facilities such as emergency rooms, or if clinics negotiate higher reimbursement rates.

### SUPPORTERS SAY

- ★ Requiring a physician, nurse practitioner or physician assistant to be present during a dangerous procedure like dialysis, is common sense and a matter of patient safety.
- ★ Dialysis clinics currently face fewer inspections than other health facilities and deficiencies are often uncovered.
- ★ The big corporations operating dialysis clinics can easily make the required staffing changes and still profit hundreds of millions of dollars a year.

### OPPONENTS SAY

- ★ Clinics already use specially trained technicians and every patient is under the care of their own kidney doctor, so more oversight is unnecessary.
- ★ Prop 29 would take thousands of skilled medical staff from hospitals where they're needed and place them in administrative jobs.
- ★ On-site administrators who do not provide patient care would cost hundreds of millions every year, forcing clinics to reduce hours or close.

### FOR MORE INFORMATION

**Supporters:** At press time there is no organized campaign committee.

SEIU-United Healthcare Workers, West

**Opponents:** No on 29: Stop Yet Another Dangerous Dialysis Proposition  
[nopro29.com](http://nopro29.com)



## Provides Funding for Programs to Reduce Air Pollution and Prevent Wildfires by Increasing Tax on Personal Income over \$2 Million

**THE QUESTION:** Should the tax rate on personal income above \$2 million be increased by 1.75 percent and the revenue dedicated to zero-emission vehicle subsidies, zero-emission vehicle infrastructure, such as electric vehicle charging stations; and wildfire suppression and prevention programs?

### THE SITUATION

California is currently experiencing severe drought, increasingly devastating wildfires, and poor air quality. Gas-powered cars and wildfire smoke are the two largest sources of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions in the state. State law requires California to reduce its GHG emissions level to 40 percent below 1990 levels by 2030. State law also requires that ride-sharing companies like Lyft and Uber have 90% of their drivers using zero-emission vehicles (ZEVs) by 2030. But ZEVs, like electric or hydrogen-powered cars, are expensive and therefore unaffordable for many residents, and the state lacks sufficient charging and fueling stations to support increased use of ZEVs. The California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CalFire), the state agency responsible for wildfire suppression and, with other state agencies, prevention, is facing rising costs for its programs as fires become increasingly catastrophic.

The State recently committed to spending \$10 billion over the next five years on ZEVs, and on average it currently spends \$2–4 billion annually on wildfire response.

### THE PROPOSAL

Prop 30 would increase the income tax rate by 1.75% on individual incomes above \$2 million. These funds, net of expenses, would be allocated as follows:

- 45 percent of funds would promote the purchase of ZEVs, including subsidies and rebates for passenger vehicles (cars) and medium- and heavy-duty vehicles like trucks and buses;
- 35 percent of funds would increase the availability of ZEV infrastructure, including electric charging stations close to single- and multifamily dwellings;
- 20 percent would help fund wildfire suppression and prevention.

Prop 30 stipulates that at least half of the funds allocated for ZEVs and ZEV charging must primarily benefit low-income and disadvantaged communities. It also requires that CalFire make hiring and training additional firefighters a top priority for its funds.

The tax increase would end on January 1, 2043; or, earlier if there are three consecutive calendar years in which statewide GHG emissions are 80 percent below 1990 levels.

### FISCAL EFFECTS

Prop 30 would generate \$3.5–5 billion in revenue in most years, increasing over time. That would amount to \$2.8–4 billion annually in ZEV funding and \$700 million to \$1 billion annually for wildfire response. The measure could help decrease state and local costs for wildfire suppression and prevention, though the size of the fiscal effects is difficult to predict.

### SUPPORTERS SAY

- ★ Existing programs are insufficient to address California's poor air quality, which is largely caused by automobile exhaust and wildfire smoke.
- ★ Prop 30 would make electric vehicles more affordable and would create well-paying green jobs.
- ★ Prop 30 would fund critically needed programs to prevent catastrophic wildfires and protect homes.
- ★ Strict accountability would ensure that these funds are spent as intended.

### OPPONENTS SAY

- ★ California is already spending more than \$50 billion for a multiyear climate investment, including \$10 billion for ZEVs.
- ★ There is no guarantee that Prop 30 will make ZEVs affordable for most California families.
- ★ Prop 30 locks money from income taxes, normally a major source of school funding, into special interests.
- ★ Prop 30 is Lyft's attempt to get taxpayers to help foot the bill for the requirement to increase the number of ZEVs used.

### FOR MORE INFORMATION

**Supporters:** Yes on 30: Clean Air California  
[yeson30.org](http://yeson30.org)

**Opponents:** At press time, there is no known campaign in opposition to this proposition.

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

**THE QUESTION:** Should the law enacted by the California Legislature to ban the sale of certain flavored tobacco products be approved?

### THE SITUATION

The California State Legislature passed SB 793 in August 2020. The law as written bans the sale of all flavored tobacco products – from bubblegum to mango to menthol. The prohibition includes pods for vape pens, tank-based systems, menthol cigarettes and chewing tobacco. It does not include premium cigars and hookah tobacco. The ban applies to in store purchases and vending machine purchases.

SB 793 did not go into effect because a petition to demand a referendum on the law qualified for this ballot. When a referendum on a law qualifies for the ballot, the law does not go into effect until the voters decide to approve it.

### THE PROPOSAL

A YES vote on this measure: In-person stores and vending machines could not sell most flavored tobacco products and tobacco product flavor enhancers including menthol cigarettes and adds a \$250 penalty per violation for store and vending machine owners.

A NO vote on this measure: In-person stores and vending machines could continue to sell flavored tobacco products and tobacco product flavor enhancers, as allowed under other federal, state, and local statutes and ordinances.

### FISCAL EFFECTS

Last year, the State's tobacco taxes raised about \$2 billion. These funds are largely used for health care programs including Medi-Cal, tobacco control efforts, and early childhood development.

Overall, the impact of SB793 would decrease state tobacco tax revenues ranging from tens of millions of dollars annually to around \$100 million annually. The wide range in the estimate is because the response by tobacco consumers is uncertain. They may buy other forms of legal tobacco in which case tobacco revenue will not decrease much.

Any impact on state and local government health care programs is unknown. Reduced tobacco use may decrease the need for treatment for tobacco related illness but it could also increase life span leading to more health care costs in the long run.

### SUPPORTERS SAY

- ★ Prop 31 will help decrease smoking rates especially among youth.
- ★ Prop 31 protects our youth by ending the sale of candy-flavored tobacco products that lures them into life-long addiction to nicotine.
- ★ Prop 31 prevents big tobacco from causing more harm to black communities that buy menthol flavored tobaccos.

### OPPONENTS SAY

- ★ Prop 31 is simply prohibition of tobacco sales to adults.
- ★ Prop 31 will drive more tobacco sales into the illegal market that already exists.
- ★ Prop 31 goes too far in banning some products the FDA allows which will cause people to buy other tobacco products that are more harmful.

### FOR MORE INFORMATION

**Supporters:** Yes on Proposition 31– Committee to Protect California Kids  
[voteyeson31.com](http://voteyeson31.com)

**Opponents:** No on Prop 31- Californians Against Prohibition (this campaign has no website as of publication date)

### Looking for more information on the propositions?

#### Official Voter Information Guide

[VoterGuide.sos.ca.gov](http://VoterGuide.sos.ca.gov)

Read nonpartisan analysis, arguments for and against, and even the full text of the proposed law.

#### Voter's Edge

[VotersEdge.org](http://VotersEdge.org)

Type in your address for comprehensive information about everything on your ballot.  
 Look up who is giving money to the YES and NO campaigns.



This election is a local, county, state, and federal general election. California voters will choose among run-off candidates for county, state and congressional elective offices and choose from among all candidates running for local city, school district and special district races. California voters will also decide on 2 county measures on page 7 and 7 state propositions beginning on page 9 of this guide.

**All Los Angeles County Voters** will choose among the candidates for Los Angeles County Superior Court Judge and for Sheriff of Los Angeles County. **Some** Los Angeles County voters will be selecting their representative to the County Board of Supervisors.

Visit [www.votersedge.org/ca](http://www.votersedge.org/ca) to see everything on your ballot, and your polling place, and get information about your voting choices. Candidates provide information about themselves in their own words.

Voters registered in Los Angeles County will receive a sample ballot at the address on record after October 10. This sample ballot shows the candidates and measures that will be on your ballot.

Go to [www.lavote.gov](http://www.lavote.gov) in Los Angeles County to:

- Check your registration status—including your party choice
- Register to vote if you have moved or changed your name
- Register to vote if you want to change your political party

**Making Democracy Work and Contact your local League of Women Voters today!**

The **League of Women Voters** is a non-partisan political organization of women and men that encourages informed and active participation in government, works to increase understanding of major public policy issues, and influences public policy through education and advocacy.

**LIST OF LEAGUES**

Los Angeles County	562-947-5818	<a href="https://www.facebook.com/LWVLACounty">https://www.facebook.com/LWVLACounty</a>
Beach Cities	310-793-0569	<a href="http://www.lwvbeachcities.org">www.lwvbeachcities.org</a>
East San Gabriel Valley	626-967-8055	<a href="https://my.lwv.org/california/east-san-gabriel-valley">https://my.lwv.org/california/east-san-gabriel-valley</a>
Greater Los Angeles Area	213-368-1616	<a href="http://www.lwvlosangeles.org">www.lwvlosangeles.org</a>
Long Beach Area	562-930-0573	<a href="http://www.lwvlongbeach.org">www.lwvlongbeach.org</a>
Palos Verdes Peninsula	320-784-7787	<a href="http://www.lwvpv.clubexpress.com">www.lwvpv.clubexpress.com</a>
Pasadena Area	626-798-0965	<a href="http://www.lwv-pa.org">www.lwv-pa.org</a>
Santa Monica	310-692-1494	<a href="http://www.lwvsantamonica.org">www.lwvsantamonica.org</a>
Torrance Area	310-223-6897	<a href="http://www.lwvtorrancearea.org">www.lwvtorrancearea.org</a>
Whittier	562-947-5818	<a href="https://www.facebook.com/LWVWhittier">https://www.facebook.com/LWVWhittier</a>