

2020 Ballot Proposition Guidance

SUPPORT

Proposition 19

Property Tax Transfers, Exemptions, and Revenue for Wildfire Agencies and Counties

- ✓ Allows seniors to downsize or relocate to be closer to family without facing significant increase in property tax bills
- ✓ Frees up housing inventory by encouraging increased activity in modest priced and “move up” housing inventory
- ✓ Creates additional fire protection revenues by reassessing inherited properties held as second homes or investment properties

Proposition 22

App-Based Drivers as Contractors and Labor Policies

- ✓ Allows companies in the gig economy that provide rideshare or delivery services to continue operating here in CA, while providing individuals the opportunity to earn income and the freedom to set their own schedules
- ✓ Allows gig economy companies to provide benefits and protections to drivers without blurring the legal line between employee and independent contractor status
- ✓ Requires rideshare and delivery companies to implement protections such as criminal background checks and safety training, providing additional protections to the public
- ✓ Eliminates costly and ongoing litigation against ride share and delivery companies by providing a clear designation of independent contractor status for app-based drivers

ABOUT THE CHAMBER

As the leading voice for business in the Santa Maria Valley, the Chamber’s board regularly advocates for legislation that will help advance economic vitality and against proposals that make it more difficult for entrepreneurs and businesses of all size to create jobs and investment in our economy.

This fall, California voters will be asked to decide twelve measures via the general election ballot. Of those twelve proposals, the Board determined that five would have significant and direct impacts on the business climate of our state. Of those five, the Chamber recommends supporting two and opposing three.

Learn more about the Santa Maria Valley Chamber of Commerce at www.santamaria.com. Questions about the Chamber’s advocacy efforts can be directed to Chamber President/CEO Glenn Morris, (805) 925-2403 x 825 or glenn@santamaria.com.

Summaries of each ballot proposition can be found at bit.ly/2020CAVoterGuide.

OPPOSE

Proposition 15

Tax on Commercial and Industrial Properties for Education and Local Government Funding Initiative

- ✗ Raising taxes on businesses is never a good idea, but it is especially cruel in the midst of pandemic-caused recession.
- ✗ The existing acquisition-based assessment system embedded in Proposition 13 keeps property taxes stable and predictable. Changing this system would make the property tax a volatile revenue source for local government, at a time when their budgets are under significant threat.
- ✗ Many split-roll activists have the long-term goal of repealing Proposition 13 protections for homeowners as well as businesses. This initiative is the first step in that effort.
- ✗ The California Assessors Association, representing professional county assessors, has opposed the proposition, citing concerns about the costs of implementation and the volatility that would be added to the market.

Proposition 21

Local Rent Control Initiative

- ✗ California faces dramatic and increasing shortages of housing and needs to focus on incentivizing new units. A substantial body of research, including analysis from Stanford and UC Berkeley, agree that policies like those in this proposition discourage new construction and reduce availability of housing, increasing rents. The Legislative Analyst reported that “rent control will do nothing to increase our supply of affordable housing,” and that “... any attempt to make housing more affordable without increasing the overall supply of housing ... does very little to address the underlying cause of California’s high housing costs: a housing shortage.”
- ✗ Recognizing that Californians support the concept of rent protections generally, the state legislature passed AB1482 in early 2020, including rent caps and protections against unreasonable evictions, making this proposition unnecessary.

Proposition 24

Consumer Privacy Law Amendments

- ✗ Regulations related to the 2018 legislation are just now being implemented and the impacts are yet to be understood. We believe the state should give these new rules time to be fully implemented and to be analyzed to determine what works and what doesn’t before making further changes.
- ✗ The Legislative Analyst and California Director of Finance estimate that annual state costs would increase by at least \$10 million for a new state agency, plus additional millions in increased work at the Department of Justice and the state courts. When the state’s budget is in extreme deficit is not the time to add additional new bureaucracy and related expenses.
- ✗ Businesses need time to develop processes and systems to comply with existing requirements. Adding additional rules and costs now would have negative impacts, at a time when many businesses are struggling to stay open due to the pandemic-induced recession.