

**THE FAITHFUL CENTRAL BIBLE CHURCH
COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT MINISTRY
Formerly known as THE POLITICAL ACTION MINISTRY**

URGES YOU TO

**VOTE!!
TUESDAY, November 3, 2020**

“Submit yourselves to every ordinance of man for the Lord’s sake...” – 1 Peter 3:13a

INTRODUCTION:

The FCBC/CEM Proposition and Ballot Measure Analyses Team has carefully read and analyzed each proposition and ballot measure. However, we heartily recommend that you read and prayerfully consider them all, and be guided by the Holy Spirit and your own conscience as you cast your ballot in the upcoming November 3, 2020 Election. Whether you vote-by-mail, drop off your ballot, or cast your ballot at a polling place, please vote!

FOLLOWING ARE THE PROPOSITIONS AND BALLOT MEASURES ANALYSES

- **STATE OF CALIFORNIA PROPOSITIONS 14 THROUGH 25**
- **LOS ANGELES COUNTY MEASURE J**
- **CITY OF INGLEWOOD MEASURE I**

STATE OF CALIFORNIA PROPOSITIONS

- 14** **AUTHORIZES BONDS CONTINUING STEM CELL RESEARCH. INITIATIVE STATUTE.** Authorizes \$5.5 billion state bonds for: stem cell and other medical research, including training; research facility construction; administrative costs. Dedicates \$1.5 billion to brain-related diseases. Appropriates General Fund moneys for repayment. Expands related programs. Fiscal Impact: Increased state costs to repay bonds estimated at about \$260 million per year over the next roughly 30 years.

Analysis

YES on this proposition would mean that the state could sell \$5.5 billion in general obligation Bonds primarily for embryonic stem cell research and therapy development, training, and research facility construction programs and the development of new medical treatments in California for other brain and central nervous system diseases and conditions and the state would repay the bonds over the next 30 years from the General Fund. While the language in the proposition does not specifically mention embryonic stem cell research, it is important to note what it does mention, which is in “Section 2. Findings and Declarations. The people of the State of California hereby find and declare all the following: (a) In 2004, California voters rejected efforts by the federal government to limit stem cell research...” Whether or not you support embryonic stem cell research, it is important that you understand the true intent of this proposition, which is to continue **embryonic** stem cell research paid for by the taxpayer.



NO on this proposition means the state could not sell \$5.5 billion in general obligation bonds primarily for embryonic stem cell research and the development of new medical treatment in California and monies authorized from previous proposition 71 in 2004 will run out unless additional funding is found. Which means the state may continue to receive less money from the federal government for embryonic stem cell research than for non-embryonic stem cell research, and may have to seek funding from private foundations to continue its work in this area.

- 15 **INCREASES FUNDING SOURCES FOR PUBLIC SCHOOLS, COMMUNITY COLLEGES, AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT SERVICES BY CHANGING TAX ASSESSMENT OF COMMERCIAL AND INDUSTRIAL PROPERTY. INITIATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT.** Taxes such properties based on current market value, instead of purchase price. Fiscal Impact: Increased property taxes on commercial properties worth more than \$3 million providing \$6.5 billion to \$11.5 billion in new funding to local governments and schools.

Analysis

YES on this proposition would result in increased revenue for school districts, community colleges, and local governments. According to the language of the proposed law, and not the arguments of those for or against the proposition, Section 3. Paragraph (a) this law will “Preserve in every way Proposition 13’s protections for homeowners and for residential rental properties. This measure only affects the assessment of taxable commercial and industrial property.” Opponents of this law, primarily big business owners of the commercial property in question, have written a deceptive argument suggesting that somewhere down the line proponents will come after residential properties protected by Prop. 13, however, whether or not this law passes they could do that anyway. This law, in and of itself, has no effect one way or the other on what future attempts might be made to repeal Prop. 13. Don’t be fooled, read the law itself. This proposition does NOT in any way affect residential property owners.

NO on this proposition means that big business owners of **COMMERCIAL** property **ONLY** valued at \$3 million or more would continue to pay less than their fair share of taxes on those properties, and school districts, community colleges, and local government economies would continue to suffer as a result.

- 16 **ALLOWS DIVERSITY AS A FACTOR IN PUBLIC EMPLOYMENT, EDUCATION, AND CONTRACTING DECISIONS. LEGISLATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT.** Permits government decision-making policies to consider race, sex, color, ethnicity, or national origin in order to address diversity by repealing constitutional provision prohibiting such policies. Fiscal Impact: No direct fiscal effect on state and local entities. The effects of the measure depend on the future choices of state and local government entities and are highly uncertain.

Analysis

YES on this proposition will restore balance and fairness in the areas of education, employment and contracting. It, in effect, repeals the deceptive and misleading Prop. 209, which resulted in the denial of education, employment and contracts to qualified minorities and women that were freely granted to their male white counterparts, who may or may not have been more qualified than competing minorities and women.

NO on this proposition means that Prop. 209 will remain in effect, and qualified minorities and women will continue to be denied opportunities for education, employment and government contracts.

- 17 **RESTORES RIGHT TO VOTE AFTER COMPLETION OF PRISON TERM. LEGISLATIVE**



CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Restores voting rights upon completion of prison term to persons who have been disqualified from voting while serving a prison term. Fiscal Impact: Annual county costs, likely in the hundreds of thousands of dollars statewide, for voter registration and ballot materials. One-time state costs, likely in the hundreds of thousands of dollars, for voter registration cards and systems.

Analysis

Yes on this proposition would mean individuals on state parole who are U.S. citizens, residents of California, have completed their prison term, paid their debt to society, and are at least 18 years of age would be able to register to vote, and exercise their right to vote. It's important to note that currently, individuals who are in county jail, or on county probation, are eligible to register to vote. However, our State Constitution prohibits those who are in state prison or on state parole, from registering and voting.

No on this proposition would mean individuals on state parole would continue to be denied the right to register and subsequently, vote in California.

- 18 **AMENDS CALIFORNIA CONSTITUTION TO PERMIT 17-YEAR-OLDS TO VOTE IN PRIMARY AND SPECIAL ELECTIONS IF THEY WILL TURN 18 BY THE NEXT GENERAL ELECTION AND BE OTHERWISE ELIGIBLE TO VOTE. LEGISLATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT.** Fiscal Impact: Increased statewide county costs likely between several hundreds of thousands of dollars and \$1 million every two years. Increased one-time costs to the state of hundreds of thousands of dollars.

Analysis

YES on this proposition presupposes that primary elections lack the importance or the need for wisdom of general elections. Quite the contrary. Primary elections decide who will be the presidential candidate in the general election. Even being allowed to vote as early as 18 according to psychologists has the disadvantage of a lack of maturity since the decision making and judgement part of the brain is not fully developed until age 25. An excellent example of the importance of the primary elections is demonstrated by the Democratic 2020 Primaries. The "judgement" of most Millennials (1980-1994) and Gen Zs (1995-2012) was that Bernie Sanders was their candidate based on the promises he made. However, more mature voters took into consideration which candidate could most likely win against Donald Trump. Imagine if this law had been in place during the 2020 Primary. The decision as to who would be the Democratic Presidential nominee could have been made by a segment of the population not yet legally eligible to vote. In effect, allowing 17-year olds to vote, before they are eligible, deprives those who are eligible to vote of the right to decide who their candidate will be in the general election.

No on this proposition would mean that 17-year olds who are U.S. citizens can pre-register to vote in California, but they can only vote if they have turned 18 by the date of the Election in which they are voting.

- 19 **CHANGES CERTAIN PROPERTY TAX RULES. LEGISLATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT.** Allows homeowners who are over 55, disabled, or wildfire/disaster victims to transfer primary residence's tax base to replacement residence. Changes taxation of family-property transfers. Establishes fire protection services fund. Fiscal Impact: Local governments could gain tens of millions of dollars of property tax revenue per year, probably growing over time to a few hundred million dollars per year. Schools could receive similar property tax gains.

Analysis

YES on this proposition would mean homeowners who are 55 years of age or over, severely disabled, or whose home was destroyed by wildfire/disaster, would be able to transfer their primary residence's property tax base value to a replacement property of any value anywhere in the state. In addition, it would limit



FAITHFUL
CENTRAL
BIBLE
CHURCH
THE FAMILY OF CHAMPIONS



certain property taxes between family members while expanding some tax benefits for transfers of family farms. Passage of the proposition would also allocate most of the additional money raised to wildfire response.

NO on this proposition would mean homeowners would not be able to take advantage of these tax benefits. The current rules on tax assessment transfers would be maintained.

- 20 **RESTRICTS PAROLE FOR CERTAIN OFFENSES CURRENTLY CONSIDERED TO BE NON-VIOLENT. AUTHORIZES FELONY SENTENCES FOR CERTAIN OFFENSES CURRENTLY TREATED ONLY AS MISDEMEANORS. INITIATIVE STATUTE.** Limits access to parole program established for non-violent offenders who have completed the full term of their primary offense by eliminating eligibility for certain offenses. Fiscal Impact: Increase in state and local correctional, court, and law enforcement costs likely in the tens of millions of dollars annually, depending on implementation.

Analysis

YES on this proposition supports the initiative to add petty crimes to the extensive list of violent felonies for which early parole is already restricted. This initiative packs penal institutions with non-violent offenders and expands DNA testing requirements, thereby funneling tens of millions of taxpayer dollars into prisons. Since the crimes this initiative impacts are non-violent crimes, it will have no impact on the safety and welfare of our neighborhoods, and will cut funding for mental health, homelessness, and other public safety programs.

NO on this proposition would leave current parole eligibility for petty crimes and misdemeanor offenders as is. Penalties for people who commit certain theft-related crimes would not be increased. There would be no change to the state's process for releasing certain inmates from prison early, and DNA samples would continue to only be required from adults who are arrested for a felony, or who are required to register as sex offenders or arsonists.

- 21 **EXPANDS LOCAL GOVERNMENTS' AUTHORITY TO ENACT RENT CONTROL ON RESIDENTIAL PROPERTY. INITIATIVE STATUTE.** Allows local governments to establish rent control on residential properties over 15 years old. Local limits on rate increases may differ from statewide limit. Fiscal Impact: Overall, a potential reduction in state and local revenues in the high tens of millions of dollars per year over time. Depending on actions by local communities, revenue losses could be less or more.

Analysis

YES on this proposition would expand rent control to include buildings that were constructed after 1995 and are more than 15 years old. It would also call for the establishment of non-elected rental boards who would in-turn dictate to property owners what they can and cannot do with their property. Furthermore, it would prohibit rental property owners from raising rents to market value when tenants move out. However, it doesn't do anything to properly address the effects of homelessness and building new affordable and middle-class housing. Additionally, instructing property owners on how much they are allowed to charge in rent will in some cases make housing availability even worse.

NO on this proposition would mean state law would maintain current limits on the rent control laws that cities and counties can apply. Currently, under state law most rental housing cannot be increased by more than 5 percent plus inflation in a year. It is always best to check with your city officials for the current rates, and policies that govern rent control in your area.

- 22 **EXEMPTS APP-BASED TRANSPORTATION AND DELIVERY COMPANIES FROM PROVIDING EMPLOYEE BENEFITS TO CERTAIN DRIVERS. INITIATIVE STATUTE.** Classifies app-based drivers as



**FAITHFUL
CENTRAL
BIBLE
CHURCH**
THE FAMILY OF CHAMPIONS



"independent contractors," instead of "employees," and provides independent-contractor drivers other compensation, unless certain criteria are met. Fiscal Impact: Minor increase in state income taxes paid by rideshare and delivery company drivers and investors.

Analysis

YES on this proposition means that app-based drivers for (Uber and Lyft) and delivery companies (DoorDash and Postmates) would operate as independent contractors, much as they are currently operating, choosing their own work days and hours with great flexibility. However, it also allows those companies to continue to rack up billion dollar profits while denying the drivers basic benefits that are afforded to employees, i.e., sick leave, healthcare, and unemployment.

NO on this proposition means that app-based drivers would be reclassified as employees with the basic benefits that are afforded to employees, including sick leave, healthcare and unemployment, but they would also be subject to the work hours and days set by the companies, which could still mean an independently flexible work schedule, if permitted by the companies. Plus they would be protected by current state employment laws.

- 23** **ESTABLISHES STATE REQUIREMENTS FOR KIDNEY DIALYSIS CLINICS. REQUIRES ON-SITE MEDICAL PROFESSIONAL. INITIATIVE STATUTE.** Requires physician, nurse practitioner or physician assistant on site during dialysis treatment. Prohibits clinics from reducing services without state approval. Prohibits clinics from refusing to treat patients based on payment source. Fiscal Impact: Increased state and local government costs likely in the low tens of millions of dollars annually.

Analysis

YES on this proposition simply puts the welfare of the patients over the fiscal bottom line of the dialysis clinics. It would require that a doctor be onsite while patients are being treated, as well as prohibit these facilities from reducing services without state approval, and from refusing treatment to anyone based on the source of payment.

NO on this proposition puts the financial wealth of the dialysis clinics over the health and safety of the patients. The current status of no doctor being required to be onsite, the reduction in services without state approval, and discrimination against patients based on payment source would continue at the peril of the patient.

- 24** **AMENDS CONSUMER PRIVACY LAWS. INITIATIVE STATUTE.** Permits consumers to: prevent businesses from sharing personal information, correct inaccurate personal information, and limit businesses' use of "sensitive personal information," including precise geolocation, race, ethnicity, and health information. Establishes California Privacy Protection Agency. Fiscal Impact: Increased annual state costs of at least \$10 million, but unlikely exceeding low tens of millions of dollars, to enforce expanded consumer privacy laws. Some costs would be offset by penalties for violating these laws.

Analysis

YES on this proposition means that as a consumer, you can and should know who is collecting your personal information and that of your children, how it is being used, and to whom it is disclosed so that you have the information necessary to exercise meaningful control over businesses' use of your and our children's personal information.



NO on this proposition means that businesses will continue to have unfettered access to the personal information of you and your children, and can sell that information to third parties without your knowledge or consent.

- 25 **REFERENDUM ON LAW THAT REPLACED MONEY BAIL WITH SYSTEM BASED ON PUBLIC SAFETY AND FLIGHT RISK.** A "Yes" vote approves, and a "No" vote rejects, law replacing money bail with system based on public safety and flight risk. Fiscal Impact: Increased costs possibly in mid hundreds of millions of dollars annually for a new process for release from jail prior to trial. Decreased county jail costs, possibly in high tens of millions of dollars annually.

Analysis

YES on this proposition will mean that many poor people awaiting trial would not have to remain in jail because they lack the resources to pay bail. In effect, they would be released on their own recognizance (OR), based on their assessed risk of committing another crime or not appearing in court if released. This would be especially meaningful for members of the African-American community, who are arrested disproportionately more often than whites, and who often end up spending a lot of time in jail before trial, even when they are ultimately found not guilty.

NO on this proposition means that many poor people would continue to languish in jail awaiting trial. And those who are found not guilty will have spent time in jail for a crime they did not commit, and that they cannot get back.

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES MEASURE J

- J **COMMUNITY INVESTMENT AND ALTERNATIVES TO INCARCERATION MINIMUM COUNTY BUDGET ALLOCATION.** Shall the measure, annually allocating in the County's budget no less than ten percent (10%) of the County's locally generated unrestricted revenues in the general fund to address the disproportionate impact of racial injustice through community investment and alternatives to incarceration and prohibiting using those funds for carceral systems and law enforcement agencies as detailed in the ordinance adopting the proposed charter amendment, be adopted?

Analysis

YES on this ballot measure will require that no less than 10% of unrestricted revenue generated through taxpayers' sales dollars be allocated to programs that will assist law enforcement, by stepping in to address non-law enforcement issues in areas where law enforcement lacks the expertise, i.e., Community-based youth development programs; Community-based restorative justice programs; Pre-trial non-custody services and treatment; and Community-based health services, health promotion, counseling, wellness and prevention programs, and mental health and substance-use disorder services, and more.

NO on this ballot measure means that, in the absence of funding for restorative justice programs, and mental health and social services assistance, more tragic losses of life and more incarcerations in minority communities are more likely to occur. This will be as a result of the fact that police lack the expertise to handle crisis issues, i.e., encounters with members of the homeless population that have mental health issues.

CITY OF INGLEWOOD MEASURE I



I **INGLEWOOD UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT STUDENT SAFETY/HEALTH/ACHIEVEMENT, REPAIR MEASURE.** To repair/upgrade classrooms, including instructional technology, vocational/career education, roofs, plumbing, security/fire safety, remove asbestos, lead paint, mold; provide safe drinking water; acquire, construct, repair sites, facilities, equipment; shall Inglewood Unified School District's measure authorizing \$240,000,000 in bonds, at legal rates, levying 6¢ per \$100 of assessed valuation raising on average \$15,000,000 annually while bonds are outstanding, be adopted, requiring oversight, and all funds invested in local schools?"

Analysis

YES on this ballot measure, in which a 55% approval is required, will provide much needed upgrading and improvement of classroom facilities, technology and educational equipment.

NO on this ballot measure will mean that the conditions in Inglewood School District will remain in disrepair.

ONE LAST REMINDER TO VOTE IN THE NOVEMBER 3, 2020 ELECTION!
It is a right for which many of our ancestors fought and died!



Special Thanks to the Proposition and Ballot Measure Analyses Team
(In alphabetical order)

Kris Bailey ▪ Bobby Blanks ▪ Deanna Blanks
Charles Nelson ▪ Art Scott ▪ Andrea Tieul ▪ Jonae Watts

