



LEAGUE OF
WOMEN VOTERS®
OF LOS ANGELES

VOTER GUIDE

CITY OF LOS ANGELES

BALLOT MEASURES



November 8, 2016
Polls open from 7am to 8pm

This Voter Guide contains information about:

- ✓ LA Community College District Measure CC
- ✓ LA City Proposition HHH
- ✓ LA City Initiative Ordinance JJJ
- ✓ LA City Charter Amendment RRR
- ✓ LA City Charter Amendment SSS

LOS ANGELES COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT MEASURE CC
Placed on the ballot by vote of the Board of Trustees of the
Los Angeles Community College District
A 55 percent vote is required for passage

The Question: Should the Los Angeles Community College District issue \$3.3 billion in bonds to construct, renovate and upgrade community college facilities?

Bonds: Bonds are a way of borrowing a large sum of money and paying it back with interest over a number of years. School districts, cities and the state use bonds to raise money to pay for expensive building projects.

The Situation: The Los Angeles Community College District is the largest community college district in the United States, and one of the largest in the world. It consists of nine colleges: Los Angeles City College, East Los Angeles College, Los Angeles Harbor College, Los Angeles Mission College, Los Angeles Pierce College, Los Angeles Southwest College, Los Angeles Trade-Tech College, Los Angeles Valley College, and West Los Angeles College, and serves over 130,000 students annually. The district won the required 55% support for three previous bond measures, in 2001, 2003, and 2008, for the building and renovation of facilities at the nine campuses.

The Proposal: The bond proceeds would be used to fund construction, renovation and upgrading of facilities at the nine community colleges. The funds could only be used for construction, renovation, and durable equipment (air conditioning, heating, computer systems, etc.) and not for any employee salaries. The proposal includes a long list of projects at each college, including upgrading of science, technology and engineering labs, improving classrooms for nursing, health, IT and other technical vocational career education programs, and improving public safety academy training facilities for police officers, firefighters and emergency medical technicians.

An independent citizens' oversight committee would be appointed to oversee the implementation of the projects, and the Board of Trustees would conduct annual financial audits to make sure that the funds are spent only as authorized.

All voters residing in the boundaries of the Los Angeles Community College District will vote on this measure.

Financial Impact: The principal and interest on the bonds would be repaid by a tax on all real property in the district of \$15 per \$100,000 of assessed valuation. The average cost to homeowners (based on a home assessed at \$500,000) would be \$75 per year for approximately 30 years. Homeowners already are paying for the three previous bond measures at a rate of approximately \$33 per \$100,000 of assessed value (about

\$165 per year for a home valued at \$500,000). The total for community college construction would then be about \$240 per year for a property worth \$500,000.

Supporters Say: The district has used previous bond funds to build over 600 projects, including more than 60 new structures district-wide, with a focus on environmentally responsible construction. Science labs, computer labs, classrooms, music and arts facilities, libraries and sports facilities have all been upgraded and more is needed to provide 21st century educational opportunities to our communities. Community colleges are the low-cost, accessible educational option for millions of Angelenos.

Opponents Say: Taxpayers are being asked to spend more and more when public agencies should be managing their money better. The community colleges' previous bond measures have encountered serious mismanagement leading to inadequate construction. In 2011, investigations by the Los Angeles Times and the State Controller's office uncovered massive waste, fraud, and mismanagement in the bond program. We should stop taxing ourselves and force the colleges to manage their resources more effectively.

Supporters:

Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce
Los Angeles County Federation of Labor

Opponents:

Unknown at this time

A Yes Vote Means: You want the Los Angeles Community College District to issue \$3.3 billion in bonds to construct, renovate and upgrade community college facilities.

A No Vote Means: You do not want the district to issue these bonds

LOS ANGELES CITY PROPOSITION HHH
HOMELESSNESS REDUCTION AND PREVENTION,
HOUSING AND FACILITIES BOND
Placed on the ballot by vote of the Los Angeles City Council
A 2/3 vote is required for passage

The Question: Should the city issue \$1.2 billion in bonds to provide safe, clean affordable housing for the homeless and those in danger of being homeless, and provide facilities to increase access to mental health care, drug and alcohol treatment and other services?

Bonds: Bonds are a way of borrowing a large sum of money and paying it back with interest over a number of years. School districts, cities and the state use bonds to raise money to pay for expensive building projects.

The Situation: According to the Los Angeles Homeless Services Authority (LAHSA), there are approximately 26,000 homeless individuals in Los Angeles, a growth of 11% in the past year. Homelessness and homeless encampments have increased citywide and are a safety and public health issue. In February, 2016, the city adopted the “Comprehensive Homeless Strategy” that determined that 13,000 units of new housing, including 10,000 units of supportive housing, are needed to house the homeless, at an estimated cost exceeding \$1 billion. The city’s strategy, in accordance with the position of the U. S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) and LAHSA, is that providing stable housing to homeless individuals as a first step is more effective than providing services without guaranteed housing.

The Proposal: Proposition HHH would authorize the city to issue general obligation bonds in the amount of \$1.2 billion to develop housing and facilities for the homeless and affordable housing for those at risk of homelessness, including temporary shelters, showers, storage facilities and facilities to be used to provide supportive services. Bond proceeds may not be used to finance services or operations, or to replace any existing sources of funds dedicated to developing similar housing and facilities.

An annual plan to prioritize funding would be required, as well as the establishment of Citizens Oversight and Administrative Oversight Commissions to monitor the bond program, and annual financial audits which would be available to the public.

Financial Impact: Principal and interest on the bonds will be paid from additional property taxes to be levied on taxable property in the city according to its assessed value. Over the life of the bonds, the estimated annual tax rate would be \$9.64 per \$100,000 of assessed value. For the owner of a home assessed at \$341,000, the estimated average tax would be \$32.87 for 29 years.

The best estimate of the total debt service that would have to be repaid if all the bonds were issued, including the principal (\$1.2 billion) and interest (\$693 million) is \$1,893,000,000.

Once all the bonds are issued and all bond proceeds spent, there would be additional costs to administer the program, estimated at \$1.6 million each year.

Supporters say:

Proposition HHH is a common-sense, cost-effective approach to solving the problem of growing homelessness, increasing encampments and at-risk populations of homeless women and children, seniors and veterans. It will provide the resources we need to reduce the number of people living on our streets, build more supportive housing, and facilitate access to necessary services.

Opponents Say:

Proposition HHH is an unnecessary and unfair tax that would not be levied equally on all property owners. Recent homeowners would pay much more, while renters, even wealthy ones, would pay nothing. The bonds can only be used for land and buildings and not for operating homeless shelters, mental health or substance abuse treatment or extra policing.

Signers of Arguments in Favor::

Elise Buck, *United Way of Greater Los Angeles*; Gary Toebben, *Los Angeles Area Chamber of Commerce*; Michael Alvidrez, *Skid Row Housing Trust*; Antonia Hernandez, *California Community Foundation*; Dr. Mitchell Katz, MD, *Los Angeles County Department of Health Services*; Rusty Hicks, *Los Angeles County Federation of Labor*; Richard Close, *Sherman Oaks Homeowners Association*; Faye Washington, *YWCA of Greater Los Angeles*; Hon. Zev Yaroslavsky, *Supervisor 3rd District (ret.)*; Charles E. Blake, Sr., *West Angeles Church of God in Christ*.

Signers of Arguments Against::

G. Rick Marshall, *California Taxpayers Action Network*; Jack Humpreville, *Neighborhood Council Budget Advocate*; Mark Ryavec, *former Chief Deputy Assessor*; Jay Handal, *Citywide Budget Advocates*; Gary Aminoff, *Alliance for Liberty*; Denny Schneider, *Community Activist*.

A YES Vote means: You want to authorize \$1.2 billion in general obligation bonds to pay for affordable housing and facilities for the homeless and those at risk of becoming homeless.

A NO Vote means: You do not want to authorize these bonds.

LOS ANGELES CITY INITIATIVE ORDINANCE JJJ
AFFORDABLE HOUSING AND LABOR STANDARDS
RELATED TO CITY PLANNING
Citizen-Sponsored Initiative
A majority vote is required for passage

The Question: Should the city's ability to deny or amend certain General Plan or zoning changes be limited for residential projects of ten or more units if they provide affordable housing, comply with prevailing wage, local hiring and other labor standards, and meet other requirements?

The Situation: The City's General Plan guides development throughout the city. California law requires that all cities and counties prepare a general plan that includes such elements as land use, open space, housing, seismic safety and public safety.

Amending the General Plan involves the Planning Commission, Director of Planning, the mayor and the council. Public hearings must be held, and the mayor and council must have the opportunity to be heard. If both the mayor and the commission approve an amendment, the council may adopt it by majority vote. If the mayor and/or the commission do not approve, the council would need a greater-than-majority vote to adopt the amendment. The council is responsible for establishing rules for granting changes to the General Plan.

The Proposal: Measure JJJ provides that nothing in the regular amendment procedure could restrict the adoption of a General Plan amendment that permits the development of a residential project of ten or more units if the project meets all of the following:

- The project is located near transit stops or other geographic requirements, or is entirely comprised of affordable housing units.
- The project meets training, local hiring and certain wage requirements.
- The project provides a certain percentage of affordable housing and/or complies with specified affordable housing requirements.
- Labor-related standards including a good-faith effort that at least 30 percent of all construction worker hours be performed by permanent residents of the city, and at least 10 percent be performed by "Transitional Workers" who live in an economically disadvantaged area within a five-mile radius of the project site, and are otherwise disadvantaged in one of several ways, including being homeless or lacking a GED or high school diploma.

This measure also would limit the city's ability to reduce the number of community plans

or make changes to their geographical boundaries, land uses, or other material changes without the Planning Department and Planning Commission reviewing these changes and their impact on the creation and preservation of affordable housing.

With the exception of affordable housing developments of 25 units or less, housing projects receiving funds from the city's Affordable Housing Trust Fund would be required to meet prevailing wage requirements, and there would be an affordable housing incentive program with increased density and reduced parking requirements for projects within a one-half mile radius around a major transit stop.

Financial Impact: This measure is not expected to result in any additional cost to the city or to taxpayers.

Supporters say:

This measure ensures that developers who ask the city for special planning or zoning changes will have to follow strict requirements for affordability, and that 30 percent of the jobs building affordable housing will go to people in Los Angeles who need the jobs most. It will produce more affordable housing without relying on taxpayer funding.

Opponents say:

This measure is deeply flawed, does not produce new jobs and will not increase the availability or affordability of housing. This is the wrong approach, because it will drive up rental costs, make homes more unaffordable for first-time buyers, add delays and red tape to the construction of needed housing, and increase construction costs.

Signers of Arguments in Favor: Alton Wilkerson, *Electrician*; Rusty Hicks, *Veteran*; Ronald Miller, *Plumber*; Angella Gains, *Renter*; Josefina Castillo, *First-time home buyer*.

Signers of Arguments Against: Tim Plasky, *Coalition for Jobs and Attainable Housing*; Beverly A. Kenworthy, *California Apartment Association*; Carol Schatz, *Central City Association*, Gary Toebben, *Los Angeles Area Chamber of Commerce*; Stuart Waldman, *Valley Industry & Commerce Association*; Mike Balsam, *Building Industry Association of Southern California*.

A YES Vote means:: You want to limit the city's ability to deny or amend General Plan amendments for certain residential projects of ten or more units that provide affordable housing and meet training, local hiring, prevailing wage and other requirements.

A NO Vote means: You do not want to limit the city in this way.

LOS ANGELES CITY CHARTER AMENDMENT RRR
CITY OF LOS ANGELES DEPARTMENT OF WATER AND POWER
*Placed on the ballot by vote of the Los Angeles City Council
A majority vote is required for passage*

The Question: Should the Los Angeles City Charter be amended to make certain changes in the governance and administrative functions of the Department of Water and Power and to change the composition and terms of office of the Board of Water and Power Commissioners?

The Situation: The Los Angeles Department of Water and Power (DWP) is the nation's largest municipally-owned utility, serving more than four million residents. It is one of three semi-independent "Proprietary" city departments that receive no funds from the city government. (The other two are the Airports and Harbor Departments). All three departments are managed by unsalaried citizen commissions that have the authority to hire their general manager, subject to the approval of the mayor and City Council.

The Board of Commissioners that manages the DWP is made up of five members, who are appointed by the mayor and confirmed by the City Council for staggered, five-year terms. The board sets water and power rates subject to approval by an ordinance passed by the City Council. The department's revenues come from customer fees for water and power. The board also determines on an annual basis the transfer of revenue from the DWP budget to the general city budget.

The Proposal: The proposed amendments fall into several major categories:

Board composition and qualifications: The board would expand from five to seven seats; terms would be shortened from five years to four years; members would have to have experience in certain areas, such as utility management; and members could receive a stipend set by ordinance.

Appointment of General Manager: Instead of the board appointing the General Manager, the Personnel Department would recruit qualified candidates, The board would review the candidates and provide a pool of candidates to the mayor, who would select a candidate, subject to council confirmation.

Contracting: Council approval would no longer be required for contracts lasting over five years but less than 30 years, but the council would maintain the authority to review certain other contracts. The board, instead of the council, could establish criteria for awarding contracts. The Charter requirement that all power contracts be approved by ordinance would be eliminated.

Civil Service and Salary Setting: The council could approve alternatives to civil service

standards for DWP employees. Such standards would have to be developed through collective bargaining, provide for merit based hiring, and contain retention and discharge provisions. The council would be able to delegate its authority to the board to set salaries for DWP employees.

Offices: Currently, the executive director of the Office of Public Accountability/Ratepayer Advocate serves a five-year term. Charter Amendment RRR would provide that the executive director may be appointed to a second five-year term, and would increase the budget for the office. A new office, the “Water and Power Analyst,” would be established to provide policy and fiscal analysis for the board, and the board would have the power to appoint and remove the office’s executive director.

Other provisions: Beginning on January 1, 2020, the board would have to submit a four-year strategic rate-setting plan to the mayor and council for consideration; and, beginning no later than July 1, 2020, the DWP would have to implement a monthly billing cycle.

Financial Impact: The minimum budget for the Office of Public Accountability/Ratepayer Advocate would be increased by approximately \$1,200,000 annually. The initial estimate for converting the residential billing cycle from every two months to monthly is approximately \$19,000,000 in one-time costs, plus recurring costs of \$4,000,000 annually. The potential cost or savings from the additional governance and operational reforms are unknown until such reforms are undertaken.

These expenses impact the DWP Water and Power Revenue Funds; there is no anticipated impact to the city’s General Fund.

Supporters Say: The DWP has been an example of bureaucratic inefficiency for too long. Charter Amendment RRR will change that, reforming the DWP so that it is more accountable, transparent, and responsive to ratepayers. It will improve rules covering personnel and contracting to make them fairer, and requires board members to be experienced.

Opponents Say: Charter Amendment RRR is a power grab by the DWP that gives voters less oversight over the DWP—not more. The DWP board will have the extraordinary power to spend millions of ratepayer dollars on contracts, rate hikes and salaries without the existing oversight and approvals from voters and elected officials.

Signers of Arguments in Favor:

Dr. Frederick Pickel, *Ratepayer Advocate*; Mel Levine, *Board of Water and Power Commissioners*; Veronica Padilla-Campos, *Pacoima Beautiful*; Tony Wilkinson,

Neighborhood Council-DWP MOU Committee; Jessica Goodheart, Los Angeles Alliance for a New Economy; Marcie Edwards, General Manager, DWP; Jill Banks Barad, Valley Alliance of Neighborhood Councils; Jonathan Parfrey, Climate Resolve; Stuart Waldman, Valley Industry & Commerce Association; Bruce Saito, Los Angeles Conservation Corps.

Signers of Arguments Against:

Pastor William D. Smart, Jr., Fix L.A. Coalition; Erwin Chemerinsky, Former Chair, Los Angeles Charter Reform Commission; Ed Begley, Jr., Environmentalist; Robert Farrell, Los Angeles City Councilman (Ret.); Conner Everts, Southern California Watershed Alliance; Laura N. Chick, Los Angeles City Controller (Ret.); Jerilyn Stapleton, California National Organization for Women (NOW); Nate Holden, Los Angeles City Councilman (Ret.); Brenna Norton, Food and Water Watch; Richard Close, Sherman Oaks Homeowners Association; Jamie Court, Consumer Watchdog.

A YES Vote means: You want to make certain changes in the governance and administrative functions of the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power and change the composition and terms of office of the Board of Water and Power Commissioners.

A NO Vote means: You do not want to make these changes.

LOS ANGELES CITY CHARTER AMENDMENT SSS
CITY OF LOS ANGELES FIRE AND POLICE PENSIONS;
AIRPORT PEACE OFFICERS
Placed on the ballot by vote of the Los Angeles City Council.
A majority vote is required for passage

The Question: Should the Los Angeles City Charter be amended to enroll new Airport Peace Officers into the Fire and Police Pension System; allow current Airport Peace Officers to transfer into the Fire and Police Pension System; and allow new Airport Police Chiefs to enroll in the City Employees' Retirement System?

The Situation: All Airport Peace Officers who perform police and firefighting duties for the Airports Department are members of the city's civilian retirement plan, the Los Angeles City Employees' Retirement System (LACERS). Sworn LAPD officers, Los Angeles Fire Department firefighters and paramedics and Harbor Department Peace Officers are members of the sworn employee retirement system, the Los Angeles Fire and Police Pension Plan (LAFPP).

Pension Plan funding is from employee contributions, city contributions, and Pension Fund investments. There are six plan tiers in the LAFPP, depending on the year the employee joined.

The Proposal: Charter Amendment SSS would do the following:

- Enroll all city employees appointed on or after January 7, 2018 who perform police or firefighting duties for the Airports Department in Tier 6 of the sworn employee retirement system (LAFPP).
- Allow sworn peace officers appointed to the Airports Department before January 7, 2018 the option to transfer from the city's civilian employee retirement plan (LACERS) to Tier 6 of the sworn employee retirement system (LAFPP), at their expense.
- Give any Airports Department Chief of Police appointed on or after January 7, 2018 who is not already a member of the sworn employee retirement system the option to enroll in the city's civilian employee retirement plan (LACERS).

Financial Impact: The annual cost of providing future retirement benefits for current and new officers joining LAFPP will be higher than if the same officers were members of LACERS; however, the Airports Department, not the city's General Fund, will pay all future employer contributions to LAFPP for these officers.

No arguments were filed for or against this Charter Amendment.

A Yes Vote Means:

You want to allow new Airport Department peace officers to enroll into the Fire and Police Pension System; allow current Airport Peace Officers to transfer into the Fire and Police Pension System; and allow new Airport Police Chiefs to enroll in the City Employees Retirement System.

A NO Vote Means:

You do not want to allow these officers to enroll in different pension systems.