LEAGUE OF CALIFORNIA CITIES

REVENUE AND TAXATION POLICY COMMITTEE
Tuesday, September 29th
9:30 am – 11:30 am

Register for this meeting:
https://zoom.us/meeting/register/tJ0vcu2pqTosHN1Ifqew0WdCsfNDw2tvbmAJ
Immediately after registering, you will receive a link and confirmation email to join the meeting.

AGENDA

I. Welcome and Introductions
Speakers: Chair, Olivia Valentine, Council Member, City of Hawthorne
Vice-Chair, Lisa Middleton, Council Member, City of Palm Springs

II. Public Comment

III. 2020 Legislative Review + 2021 Preview

IV. Proposition 19: Tax Savings and Housing Relief for Seniors, Wildfire Victims, and People with Disabilities. *(Attachment A)* *Action*

V. Adjourn

2021 Policy Committee Appointments

REMINDER: The 2020 policy committee appointments will end at the close of the Annual Conference; appointments for 2021 can be requested thereafter. Members seeking appointments for 2021 will need to contact their incoming department, division, or affiliate president immediately following the Annual Conference to request reappointment. A presidential appointment from the League's incoming president may also be requested, but must first exhaust appointment opportunities through their division or department presidents.

Brown Act Reminder: The League of California Cities' Board of Directors has a policy of complying with the spirit of open meeting laws. Generally, off-agenda items may be taken up only if:
1) *Two-thirds of the policy committee members find a need for immediate action exists and the need to take action came to the attention of the policy committee after the agenda was prepared (Note: If fewer than two-thirds of policy committee members are present, taking up an off-agenda item requires a unanimous vote); or*
2) *A majority of the policy committee finds an emergency (for example: work stoppage or disaster) exists.*

A majority of a city council may not, consistent with the Brown Act, discuss specific substantive issues among themselves at League meetings. Any such discussion is subject to the Brown Act and must occur in a meeting that complies with its requirements.

ATTACHMENT A

REVENUE AND TAXATION POLICY COMMITTEE
Ballot Measure Agenda
September 29, 2020

Staff: Nick Romo, Legislative Representative
Johnnie Pina, Legislative Policy Analyst

1. **Proposition 19: Tax Savings and Housing Relief for Seniors, Wildfire Victims, and People with Disabilities.**

Previous League Action:

On June 4, the Revenue and Taxation Policy Committee recommended support for the Family Home Protection and Fairness in Property Tax Reassessment Act initiative by a 26-8 margin.

On June 19, the League of California Cities Board of Directors voted to support the Family Home Protection and Fairness in Property Tax Reassessment Act initiative set for the November 2020 ballot.

On June 20, Assembly Constitutional Amendment (ACA) 11 was gut and amended as a negotiated deal between the California Realtors (Realtors), California Professional Firefighters (CPF) and legislative leaders that aimed to replace the related initiative set for the November 2020 ballot.

Based on the League Board's recent vote and amendments negotiated into ACA 11 which improved the initiative overall by ensuring that any revenue losses would be completely mitigated, the League submitted a letter in support of ACA 11. The Realtors pulled their ballot measure and ACA 11 replaced it. ACA 11 will now appear as Proposition (Prop.) 19 on the November ballot. Given that ACA 11 is now Prop. 19, the ballot measure must now go through the League's policy committee and Board process to determine a position. As a reminder, for the League to take a position on a ballot measure the Board of Directors must approve the decision by a two-thirds vote.

Differences between Proposition 19 and the Family Home Protection and Fairness in Property Tax Reassessment Act

The Family Home Protection and Fairness in Property Tax Reassessment Act is very similar to Prop. 19 as both result in a net increase in revenues statewide, increase housing stock, and strengthen disaster preparedness while maintaining key Proposition 13 of 1978 homeowner protections.

However, in contrast to the Family Home Protection and Fairness in Property Tax Reassessment Act, Prop.19 includes provisions that utilize associated state savings to reimburse local governments for revenue losses they may experience from the expanded allowance of inter-county base year transfers. This is a positive addition to ensure cities are kept whole while homeowners who are over 55, disabled, or victims of a disaster move or replace homes of greater or lesser value throughout the state. Unlike the previously proposed initiative, Prop. 19 also requires the state to use additional revenues accrued as result of this measure to supplement firefighting services, particularly those provided by under-resourced fire protection districts.

The negotiated language of Prop. 19 removed provisions to broaden the types of legal entity ownership changes that trigger property tax reassessment. The original initiative would have required properties owned by a legal entity to be reassessed if 90 percent or more of the ownership of the legal entity is transferred, even if no single person or entity gains more than 50 percent ownership.

Initiative Summary:
Prop. 19 is the ballot replacement to the Family Home Protection and Fairness in Property Tax Reassessment Act, an initiative which received the necessary signatures to be placed on the 2020 ballot. It seeks to protect the Proposition 13 of 1978 protection for seniors and the passing down of family homes to children and grandchildren who will use it as a primary residence. The measure also narrows the tax advantages of inherited properties not used as a primary residence. Additionally, the measure is projected to increase local revenues overall while also protecting cities against any potential losses as result of the proposed changes to existing law.

Specifically, the measure would make the following changes:

- This measure would allow those over 55 years old, severely disabled, displaced by a natural disaster, or moving from contaminated housing to take their base year property value with them when moving to a home of equal or lesser value and would give them a property tax break when moving to a replacement dwelling of greater value.
- This measure would narrow the tax breaks on inherited properties, particularly those not used as primary residences.

Initiative Description:

1. **This measure would allow those over 55 years old, severely disabled, displaced by a natural disaster, or moving from contaminated housing to:**
    - Transfer their primary residence's property tax base value to a replacement residence of any value in the state.
        - These tax breaks would be allowed in all counties; and
        - Individuals would be allowed to make such a transfer up to three times.

Below is an example of how the property base value transfer would work:

- <u>Moving to a home of equal or lesser value:</u>
  For the purposes of this example:
    - *Full Cash Value of Replacement Property = $600,000*
    - *Full Cash Value of Original Property = $700,000*
    - *Base Year Value of Original Property = $300,000*

  In this example, a qualified homeowner who transfers their base year of $300,000 to a replacement property, would keep their base year value of $300,000. In this example for purposes of calculating their new property tax, they would be assessed at half of what they would have otherwise been assessed on. This would result in a $300,000 difference in what the homeowner is being taxed on.

  To put this into dollars, the Legislative Analyst's Office (LAO) states that the typical property owner's property tax rate is 1.1 percent.

  Without this measure, the eligible property owner would pay $6,600 per year in property taxes. Each year after that, the property's taxable value is adjusted for inflation by up to 2 percent.

  $600,000 x 1.1% = $6,600

With this measure, the eligible property owner would pay $3,300 per year in property taxes. Each year after that, the property's taxable value is adjusted for inflation by up to 2 percent.

$300,000 x 1.1% = $3,300

This is a difference of $3,300 per year in this example.

- Formula applicable to moving to a home of greater value:
  (Full cash value of replacement property – Full cash value of original property) + Base year of original property = the base year value of the replacement dwelling
  For the purposes of this example:
  - *Full Cash Value of Replacement Property = $8000,000*
  - *Full Cash Value of Original Property = $600,000*
  - *Base Year Value of Original Property = $300,000*

  ($800,000 – $600,000) + $300,000 = $500,000.

  The base year value of the replacement dwelling = $500,000

  In this example, the qualified homeowner would be now be paying a property tax based on a value that is $300,000 less than the current market value of the replacement home.

  To put this into dollars, the LAO states that the typical property owner's property tax rate is 1.1 percent.

  Without this measure, the eligible property owner would pay $8,800 per year in property taxes. Each year after that, the property's taxable value is adjusted for inflation by up to 2 percent.

  $800,000 x 1.1% = $8,800

  With this measure, the eligible property owner would pay $3,300 per year in property taxes. Each year after that, the property's taxable value is adjusted for inflation by up to 2 percent.

  $500,000 x 1.1% = $5,500

  This is a difference of $3,300 per year in this example.

  In these two examples, the eligible homeowner would be saving the same amount of money in either scenario.

2. **Narrows the Special Rules for Inherited Properties.**
   The measure would narrow the special rules for inherited properties. Specifically, effective January 1, 2021, the measure would:

- **Eliminate Exclusion for Properties Not Used as Primary Residence or for Farming.** The inheritance exclusion would apply *only* to properties used as the *inheritor's primary residence or for farming*. Inherited property used for any other purpose—such as rental homes or business properties—would be reassessed to market value.

- **Cap Amount of the Tax Benefit for Inherited High Value Primary Residences and Farms**
  The assessor would exclude only the first $1 million of value that would be added upon reassessment. If a property is inherited by a child or a grandchild in certain circumstances, the person inheriting the property would also inherit the taxable value.

  Under existing law if a home with a taxable value of $500,000 was sold for $2 million its taxable value would have increased by $1.5 million if the home were reassessed.

  Under this measure, $1 million of this increase would be excluded. Upon inheritance, the home's taxable value in this example would be $1 million.

  For example:
    - Market Value of the Property = $2,000,000
    - Original Taxable Value of the Property = $500,000
    - (Original taxable value) + [Difference between market value and the original taxable value] - $1 million (inheritance exclusion) = New Taxable Value).
      - $500,000 + [$2,000,000 - $500,000] - $1,000,000 =
      - New Taxable Value for the Inherited Property used as a Primary Residence = $1,000,000

  Beginning on February 16, 2023, and every other February 16 thereafter, the State Board of Equalization shall adjust the one million dollar ($1,000,000) amount for inflation to reflect the percentage change in the House Price Index for California for the prior calendar year, as determined by the Federal Housing Finance Agency.

3. **Dedicates Certain Money for Fire Protection in Underfunded Districts.**
The measure requires that most of the new funding available to the state be spent on fire protection. New funding could come from a reduction in state costs for schools. According to the LAO:

   In limited situations, total school funding from property taxes and state taxes could be about the same in some years despite schools' property tax gains. This is because existing state law could cause state funding for schools to decrease by about the same amount as their property tax gains. If this happens, the state would get cost savings in those years. These savings would be a similar amount to school property tax gains. The measure says most of these savings would have to be spent on fire protection.

   In order to allocate the new funding, this measure would establish the California Fire Response Fund in the State Treasury with funds associated with state General Fund savings from increased property transfer activity and limits on inheritance tax breaks. The Legislature would then appropriate moneys in the fund solely for the purpose of funding fire suppression staffing by the Department of Forestry and Fire Protection and underfunded special districts that provide fire protection services, as provided.

- Twenty percent of the moneys in the California Fire Response Fund shall be appropriated to the Department of Forestry and Fire Protection to fund fire suppression staffing;
- Eighty percent of the moneys in the California Fire Response Fund shall be deposited in the Special District Fire Response Fund.
    - Fifty percent of the amount shall be used to fund fire suppression staffing in underfunded special districts that provide fire protection services, were formed after July 1, 1978, and employ full-time or full-time-equivalent station-based personnel who are immediately available to comprise at least 50 percent of an initial full alarm assignment.
    - Twenty-five percent of the amount shall be used to fund fire suppression staffing in special districts that provide fire protection services, were formed before July 1, 1978, are underfunded due to a disproportionately low share of property tax revenue and an increase in service level demands since July 1, 1978, and employ full-time or full-time-equivalent station-based personnel who are immediately available to comprise at least 50 percent of an initial full alarm assignment.
    - Twenty-five percent of the amount shall be used to fund fire suppression staffing in underfunded special districts that provide fire protection services and employ full-time or full-time-equivalent station-based personnel who are immediately available to comprise at least 30 percent but less than 50 percent of an initial full alarm assignment.

Additional funds for under-resourced fire protections districts may have ancillary benefits for cities in regards to reduced cost pressures associated with mutual aid and local property tax sharing.

4. The County Revenue Protection Fund

The measure would also establish the County Revenue Protection Fund with 15 percent of the statewide savings from the provisions of this proposition and continuously appropriate moneys in that fund for the purpose of reimbursing local agencies that incur a negative gain.

The measure would require each county to annually determine the gain of the county and any local agency within the county resulting from the implementation of this measure and, if that amount of gain is negative, provide that specified eligible local agencies may receive a reimbursement from the County Revenue Protection Fund.

The measure would require the California Department of Tax and Fee Administration to provide a reimbursement to each eligible local agency that has a negative gain, determined every three years based on the aggregate gain (+/-) of the eligible local agency, as provided, and require the State Controller to transfer any remaining balance in the County Revenue Protection Fund to the State General Fund at the end of each 3-year period, to be available for appropriation for any purpose.

Background:

Property taxes are a major revenue source for local governments, raising nearly $60 billion annually. Although the state receives no property tax revenue, property tax collections also affect the state’s budget, because state law guarantees schools and community colleges (schools) a minimum amount of funding each year through a combination of property taxes and state funds. If property taxes received by schools decrease, state funding generally must increase.

Specifically, cities receive about $13 billion in property tax revenues yearly. For the average city, property taxes are about 15 percent of total city revenues, and about 40 percent of general revenue (varies widely). For cities, property tax remains amongst the most stable local and discretionary revenue sources. Cities also depend to varying degrees on locally imposed taxes such as the transient occupancy tax, business license tax, and utility user tax.

Proposition 13 of 1978 capped local property taxes levied by cities, counties, schools, and special districts at one percent of full cash value which is based on the full cash value at the time a property is sold. The sale of the property establishes a base year, and the property tax assessment cannot increase by more than two percent annually. Since home values often increase by more than two percent annually, homeowners and other property owners receive an additional benefit when they hold their properties for a longer period. Examples of these scenarios can be drastic in regions like the Bay Area where homes purchased years ago for $100,000 are now valued in the millions.

The California Constitution offers a one-time property tax saving opportunity for four categories of homeowners (those over 55 years old, the severely disabled, individuals displaced by a natural disaster, or moving from contaminated housing) who move to another home. All of these individuals have the ability to transfer their Proposition 13 of 1978 property tax base year value from their current dwelling to a replacement dwelling of equal or lesser value within the same county. Transfers to other counties are prohibited unless the county agrees to allow such transfers.

The policy rationale behind this subsidy is to assist seniors looking to downsize because they are retiring and living on lower incomes, assist the disabled and others who have had homes destroyed by disaster or had to move from a contaminated property. The policy rationale in letting counties decide whether to accept out-of-county transfers is in recognition of the potential financial impacts on "destination" counties where retirees may move to because local services, including medical, library, parks, and other services that support retirees, must be paid for. Currently, 11 counties (Alameda, El Dorado, Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside, San Bernardino, San Diego, San Mateo, Santa Clara, Tuolumne, and Ventura) allow these transfers. Whether within a county or across counties, a homeowner can transfer their assessed value only once in their lifetime.

Some cities and counties also impose taxes on the transfer of homes and other real estate. These transfer taxes are based on the value of the property being transferred. Transfer taxes are equal to $1.10 per $1,000 of property value in most locations but exceed $20 per $1,000 of property in some cities. Statewide, transfer taxes raise around $1.1 billion for cities and counties. Additionally, the state collects a personal income tax on income earned within the state, which includes profits from selling real estate. The personal income tax raises over $90 billion each year.

<u>Inherited Properties</u>
According to the LAO:

> Under existing law… "Special rules also exclude from reassessment certain property transfers between parents and children. These rules also apply to grandparents and grandchildren if the grandchildren's parents are deceased. The rules apply to all types of property including primary residences, vacation homes, and business properties."

This was highlighted in an L.A. Times article titled, *California homeowners get to pass low property taxes to their kids. It's proved highly profitable to an elite group*.

Fiscal Impact:
In 2017, the LAO estimated that Proposition 5 (previous iteration of Prop 19) would have decreased revenue for local governments and school districts by $2 billion or more per year in the long-term. However, this year's measure is expected to have a net positive increase on local and school revenue.

According to the [LAO Analysis of this measure], this measure would have the following major impacts on state and local governments:

- Local governments could gain tens of millions of dollars of property tax revenue per year. These gains could grow over time to a few hundred million dollars per year.
- Schools could gain tens of millions of dollars of property tax revenue per year. These gains could grow over time to a few hundred million dollars per year.
- Revenue from other taxes could increase by tens of millions of dollars per year for both the State and local governments. Most of this new state revenue would be spent on fire protection.

The LAO analysis continues by stating the following:

> 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.

Increased Property Taxes From Narrowed Rules for Inherited Properties. Narrowing the special rules for inherited properties would lead to higher property taxes for some inherited properties. This would increase property taxes for local governments and schools.

Reduced Property Taxes From Expanded Rules for Eligible Homeowners. Expanding the special rules for eligible homeowners could change property tax collections in a few ways. Most importantly, more homeowners could get property tax savings when moving from one home to another. This would reduce property taxes for local governments and schools.

Overall, More Property Taxes for Local Governments and Schools. Some parts of the measure would increase property taxes. Other parts would decrease them. Overall, property taxes for local governments and schools probably would increase. In the first few years, local governments could gain tens of millions of dollars per year. Over time, these revenue gains could grow to a few hundred million dollars per year. Schools could receive similar property tax gains.

Possible Reduction in State Costs for Schools in Some Years. In limited situations, total school funding from property taxes and state taxes could be about the same in some years despite schools' property tax gains. This is because existing state law could cause state funding for schools to decrease by about the same amount as their property tax gains. If this happens, the state would get cost savings in those years. These savings would be a similar amount to school property tax gains. The measure says most of these savings would have to be spent on fire protection.

Other Smaller Changes in Tax Collections. The measure allows more people to buy and sell homes without facing an increased property tax bill. Because of this, the measure probably would increase the number of homes sold each year. This would increase money going to the state and local governments from a number of other taxes collected on the sale of a home. These increases could be in the tens of millions of dollars per year. The measure says most of this increase in state tax revenue would have to be spent on fire protection.

Higher Costs for Counties. Counties probably would need to hire new staff and make computer upgrades to carry out the measure. This would increase costs for counties by tens of millions of dollars per year.

SB 2 (Atkins) Building Jobs and Homes Act Funding
If there are increased real estate transactions there will be an increase in the number of $75 recording fees on real estate documents. This would lead to an increase in the SB 2 pot of money allocated to cities to increase the supply of affordable homes in California.

Because the number of real estate transactions recorded in each county will vary from year to year, the revenues collected will fluctuate.

Existing League Policy:
Over recent years, the League has joined with the California State Association of Counties in opposing similar proposals to this one when they have been proposed in the Legislature, primarily out of a concern for the impacts on local revenue.

Related League Revenue and Taxation policies and principles include:

- Additional revenue is required in the state/local revenue structure. There is not enough money generated by the current system or allocated to the local level by the current system to meet the requirements of a growing population and deteriorating services and facilities.
- Meaningful fiscal reform should allow each level of government to adequately finance its service responsibilities, with each being accountable to taxpayers for its own programs.
- Cities require a greater share of the property tax and other reliable, discretionary revenues in order to finance local services to property.
- Counties require additional funding if they are to fulfill their state-mandated and traditional roles.

In 2018, the League remained neutral on "The People's Initiative to Protect Proposition 13 Savings" which would have expanded property tax breaks for certain categories of individual homeowners when they move. In their analysis of the 2018 measure, the LAO projected that while the reassessments from more homes sold could offset some impacts—overall property taxes would decrease for local governments. That is why League staff recommended the committee take an oppose position.

Related League Housing, Community and Economic Development policy:

- Support the establishment of a secure, balanced, and discretionary local revenue base necessary to provide the full range of needed services and quality land use decisions.

Comments:

- Arguments in support of Prop. 19 and rebuttals can be found on the Prop 19 Voter Guide website.

Other Considerations
Uneven Benefits
Even if the net fiscal impact to cities will be a gain in revenue, the real fiscal gains to individual cities will likely be uneven and challenging to determine.

Possible New Challenge to First Time Homeowners
The policy argument that likely resonates the most with this proposal is whether it would help free up housing stock by providing additional incentives to seniors to sell and move. This proposal will

likely trigger some activity, but how much it tips the balance is debatable. In today's tight housing market, having more homes for sale may moderate price increases in areas where seniors are selling, but perhaps increase prices in areas where seniors are moving to. Since this incentive is not limited to lower income individuals or those seeking to downsize it could create additional challenges for first-time homebuyers who may be competing with seniors able to make cash offers with accumulated equity and have an additional advantage of paying lower property taxes. Even if the homeowner is downsizing, this could put these eligible homeowners in direct competition with the first time homeowner looking at homes at a similar price point. With the value of their previous home, the property tax break, and years to save, these homeowners will have a significant financial advantage when putting in offers on homes.

Policy Questions:

- Other ballot measures on the November 2020 ballot that meticulously avoid changes to residential property tax assessment – should changes be made to residential assessments in this manner?
- The LAO states that there will be gains and losses but the net increase in funding to local governments will increase. However, the net increase will not be evenly distributed to all cities. Given the potentially unknown impact to individual cities, should the League of California Cities position?

Support-Opposition: (as of 09/26/2020):

Support:

Senior/Disability Organizations

Congress of California Seniors
Californians for Disability Rights
California Senior Advocates League
Seniors Council of Santa Cruz & San Benito Counties
Fire & Public Safety Advocates
California Professional Firefighters
Rebuild North Bay Foundation
Association of Los Angeles Deputy Sheriffs
Association of Orange County Deputy Sheriffs
California Statewide Law Enforcement Association
Orange County Coalition of Police & Sheriffs

Wildfire Survivors

Justin Meyers, Camp Fire Survivor and President North State Labor Federation
Jerry Balme, Saddleback Ridge Fire Survivor
Jim Finn, Tubbs Fire Survivor
Kristy Militello, Tubbs Fire Survivor
Ellie Rosebush, Camp Fire Survivor
Marie Stefanisco, Tubbs Fire Survivor
Mike Witkowski, Retired Teacher and Wildfire Survivor

Labor Organizations

AFSCME California
California Nurses Association
California Faculty Association
California State Federation of Labor AFL-CIO
Operating Engineers Local 3
Painters District Council 36

United Domestic Workers – AFSCME Local 3930

Community Advocates
Californians for Disability Rights
NAACP California-Hawaii State Conference
National Diversity Coalition
Baptist Ministers Conference of Los Angeles and Southern California
National Asian American Coalition
New Earth
The Los Angeles Trust for Children's Health
Retired Public Employees' Association

Education Advocates
Schools for Sound Finance
Dianne Macdonald, Immediate Past-President PTA
Sonoma Valley Unified School District
Larry Allen, Middletown Unified School District Trustee
Zima Creason, San Juan Unified School District Trustee
Gina Cuclis, Sonoma County Board of Education Vice President
Pam Franceschi, Retired Teacher, Manhattan Beach Unified
John Kelly, Sonoma Valley Unified School District Board President
Ernie Ochoa, Merced College Board of Trustees President
Sunny Zia, Long Beach City College Trustee

Political Organizations
California Democratic Party
California Young Democrats
California Impact Republicans
Alice B Toklas Democratic Club
Culver City Democratic Club
Democrats for Israel-Los Angeles
District 11 Democratic Club -San Francisco
East Contra Costa Democratic Club
Los Angeles County Democratic Party
Miracle Mile Democratic Club
New Frontier Democratic Club
San Francisco Young Democrats
Shasta County Republican Party
Sonoma Valley Democratic Club
Stonewall Democratic Club
United Democratic Club of San Francisco

Statewide Elected Officials
Governor Gavin Newsom
Treasurer Fiona Ma
State Controller Betty Yee
Senate President pro Tempore Toni Atkins
Senator Bill Dodd
Senator Brian Dahle
Senator Jerry Hill
Senator Mike McGuire

Senator Richard Pan
Senator Scott Wiener
Senator Scott Wilk
Assemblymember Cecilia Aguiar-Curry
Assemblymember Jim Cooper
Assemblymember Megan Dahle
Assemblymember Laura Friedman
Assemblymember James Gallagher
Assemblymember Tom Lackey
Assemblymember Patrick O'Donnell
Assemblymember Jay Obernolte
Assemblymember Chad Mayes
Assemblymember Kevin McCarty
Assemblymember Kevin Mullin

Local Elected Officials and Leaders
Christine Pelosi, California Democratic Party Women's Caucus Chair
Luis Alejo, Monterey County Supervisor
Doug Covil, Sacramento Planning Commissioner
Chris Cate, San Diego Councilmember
Carolyn Fowler, California Democratic Party Women's Caucus Vice Chair, Democratic National Committee member
Lisa Andres, Real Property Appraiser, Los Angeles Assessor's Office and CAPE Union member
Jesùs Andrade, Stockton City Councilmember
Adele Adrade-Stadler, Alhambra City Councilmember
Taisha Brown, African American Caucus Chair, California Democratic Party
Rocky Chavez, Former Assembly Republican Legislator
Bob Dutton, San Bernardino County Assessor
Stevonna Evans, Adelanto City Councilmember
Ray Fernandez, Former La Habra Planning Commissioner
Tammy Flicker, Oroville Planning Commissioner
John Gioia, Contra Costa County Supervisor
Mark Gonzalez, Los Angeles County Democratic Party Chair
James Gore, Sonoma County Supervisor
Ron Greenwood, Carmichael Water District Board Director
Logan Harvey, Mayor of Sonoma
John Haschek, Mendocino County Supervisor
Steven Hofbauer, Palmdale Mayor
Lauren Johnson-Norris, City of Irvine Commissioner
Mark Kersey, San Diego City Councilmember
Paul Koretz, Los Angeles City Councilmember
John Lee, Los Angeles City Councilmember
Toney Lewis, Duarte Councilmember
Scott Lotter, Former Paradise Mayor, Camp Fire Survivor
Lisa Middleton, Palm Springs Councilmember
Eric Nelson, Dana Point Planning Commissioner
Henry Nickle, San Bernardino Councilmember
Kristin Olsen, Stanislaus County Supervisor, former State Assemblymember
Michael Perciful, Hemet City Councilmember
Monica Rodriguez, Los Angeles City Councilmember
Chris Rogers, Santa Rosa City Councilmember

Derek O. Robinson Sr., Madera City Councilmember
Janice Rutherford, San Bernardino County Supervisor
David Sander, Rancho Cordova Mayor
Phil Schaefer, Santa Ana Historic Resources Commissioner
Ed Smith, Monterey City Council Member
Kuldip Thusu, Dinuba Mayor
Michael Tubbs, Stockton Mayor
Debra Vinson, East Contra Costa Democratic Club President
Luis Uribe, Riverbank Vice Mayor
Das Williams, Santa Barbara County Supervisor
Dan Wright, Stockton Vice Mayor

<u>Business Organizations</u>
California Business Roundtable
California Association of Realtors
Valley Industry and Commerce Association
Black Small Business Association
Bay Area Council
California Black Chamber of Commerce
CalAsian Chamber of Commerce
California Hispanic Chambers of Commerce
California Forestry Association
Corona Chamber of Commerce
Compton Chamber of Commerce
Elk Grove Chamber of Commerce
Folsom Chamber of Commerce
Greater Riverside Chamber of Commerce
Latin Business Association
Los Angeles County Business Federation
Monterey Peninsula Taxpayers Association
Oxnard Chamber of Commerce
Regional Hispanic Chamber of Commerce
Sacramento Metro Chamber of Commerce
Santa Maria Chamber of Commerce
Santa Clarita Valley Chamber of Commerce

<u>Opposition</u>:
Howard Jarvis Tax Payers Association
Assemblyman Ken Cooley, District 8
Senator Patricia Bates, District 36

Other Resources:
Prop. 19 Voter Guide
Yes on 19 Website
Prop. 19 LAO Report
Prop. 19: Portable property tax break CalMatters Summary
Prop. 19 CalMatters Summary Video

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends the committee discuss Prop. 19 and make a recommendation to the Board.

Committee Recommendation:

Board Action: