



2012 Positions Taken

March 19, 2012

Resolution: The California Legislature to Provide for verification of early release parolee residential addresses before their release to local authority supervision - **Support**

"Whereas, a large number of persons are being released early from state prison on parole and the responsibility for supervising these parolees falls on local cities and counties according to state law and

Whereas, of those being released to local supervision an unspecified yet substantial number of parolees are providing inaccurate information about their place of domicile thereby frustrating law enforcements attempt to properly provide supervision and increasing the risk to the public of new criminal activity.

Therefore be it Resolved, The United Chambers of Commerce calls upon the California legislature, in response to concern over **prisoners** being transferred early from state prison and placed under the supervision of local authorities not providing state prison authorities with a verifiable and accurate residential address at the time of transfer from state prison custody to the supervision of local authorities, require that parolee addresses be verified before parolees are transferred to local authorities. Further, be it understood that United Chambers of Commerce does not recommend the method or means of verification but that the state legislature use all reasonable means available to it and provide that information to local law enforcement before the **parolee** is released."

April 25, 2012

Support: AB 1374 ~ Senator Harman

Reliance on State Agencies' Written Advice: Protects employers from inappropriate litigation by affirming they can rely as a defense upon the state government to provide them with written guidance regarding how to comply with the law.

Oppose: AB 1450 ~ Assemblymember Michael Allen

Expansion of Discrimination Litigation: Proposes to outlaw employment discrimination based on applicant's unemployed status: but subjects employers to charges of discrimination for legitimately inquiring into an applicant's employment history.

Support: AB 2043 ~ Assemblymember Wagner

Existing law specifies the judgments and orders from which an appeal may be taken to the court of appeal. This bill would add an order granting or denying class action certification, allowing appeal from the order at the discretion of the court of appeal.

May 21, 2012

Oppose: Proposition 28, the California Change in Term Limits

Reduce the total number of years a politician can serve in the California State Legislature from 14 years to 12 years

Permit a legislator to serve these 12 years in either the California State Senate or the California State Assembly. This change would increase the number of years that a legislator could serve in

either of those Chambers. Prop 28 would increase the number of years a legislator could remain in the California State Assembly from 6 years to 12 years. It would increase the number of years a legislator could remain in the California State Senate from 8 years to 12 years.

The changes would not apply to any legislator who is already in office at the time that the initiative goes into effect (if it does go into effect): the rules governing the terms of those who are in the California State legislature as of June 5, 2012 would be calculated under the previous rules.

Oppose: Proposition 29, Tobacco Tax for Cancer Research Act

If Prop 29 is approved by California's voters, the tax on cigarettes in the state will increase by \$1.00 per pack. California's current cigarette tax is .87 cents per pack. The total tax per pack of cigarettes, if Prop 29 passes, will be \$1.87 per pack. The additional tax revenue will be used to fund cancer research, smoking reduction programs, and tobacco law enforcement.

Prop 29 would generate about \$735 million a year in new tax revenues, according to a 2012 report by the California Legislative Analyst's office. In 2011 the Legislative Analyst's Office had projected the revenue to be an \$850 million a year, but later updated that analysis.

The last time a cigarette tax was on the California ballot was in 2006, when Prop 86 was narrowly defeated. Prop 86 would have imposed an additional tax of \$2.60 per pack of cigarettes.

July 16, 2012

Oppose: Extension of Measure R

In 2008 the voters approved a half cent sales tax for transportation improvements throughout Los Angeles County for the next 30 years. Now we are being asked to extend the half cent sales tax for another 30 years. On November 6, 2012 this will be on the ballot and a 2/3 voter approval is required

Support: AB 2659 - Troops to Trucks

This will allow military personnel who drove commercial motor vehicles while serving in the military two years prior to discharge, and meet other strict standards, to waive the driving skills test when applying for a commercial driver's license for a similar vehicle.

Oppose: SB 1234 - Retirement Bill

SB 1234 would mandate that all business that do not current have qualifying retirement plans, be required to facilitate, withhold employee payroll deductions, transmit those deductions and provide other administrative services to a yet to be created State of California run Pension Trust. The Bill would create an enormous new state bureaucracy and put the state in direct competition with private business in the administration of private pension plans. An area in which the State has no current expertise. The Co-author of the stated that he has no intention of complying with ERISA, the Federal body of law that governs Employee Benefits. This fact would then call into question the deductibility of contributions and expenses on a Federal Tax level.

August 20, 2012

Oppose: Prop 30

This is the Governor's proposal to increase income taxes on taxpayers earning over \$250,000 a year and to increase the sales tax by 1/4 cent for 4 years. 89 percent of revenue raised would go to K-12 education and the remaining 11 percent would go to community colleges.

Oppose: Prop 37

This Proposition is designed to attack alleged mislabeling of food as "natural"

where ingredients in the food have been genetically engineered. The measure would prohibit claims that the food is "natural" where such engineering has taken place and additionally would require labeling indicating such engineering has occurred.

Oppose: Prop 38

This is the alternative to Governor Brown's proposal (Prop 30) to **increase the income tax** on individual earnings over \$250,000 a year and to increase the sales tax. Prop 38 would for a 12 year period increase income taxes on virtually everyone from a .4% increase on very low earners (\$7,316/year) to a 2.2% increase on individuals earning over 2.5 million annually. The monies raised would be devoted exclusively to schools, early childhood education programs and repayment of State debt.

Oppose ~ Prop 39

This is the tax treatment for multistate businesses, clean energy and energy efficiency funding. Prop 39 if enacted, would require businesses with multistate sales to pay State **income taxes according to the businesses percentage of total sales being made in California**. Presently, multistate businesses can base their California tax liability on a formula that gives weight to payroll and property outside the State, usually resulting in more favorable tax treatment than would exist if Prop 39 becomes law.

September 10, 2012

No Position: Prop 34

This Proposition would end the death penalty in California.

Support: Prop 35

This Proposition will ban human trafficking and sex slavery. This bill will increase the fines and prison sentences for human trafficking convictions and will require any offender to register as a sex offender. This will also require them to disclose internet activity and identities to authorities. This measure will increase costs at state and local government levels for activities related to prosecution of human trafficking offenders. Law enforcement training and activities regarding human trafficking will increase in costs as well.

Oppose: Prop 36

This Proposition will modify the "Three Strikes Law". With this law, life sentences would be harder to issue because criminals would only be sentenced to life in prison if their crime was "serious or violent". Those serving life sentences whose third strike crime was "non violent or serious" can be eligible for a re-sentencing if the judge deems it so. Life sentencing for third strikes would still be in effect if it involved child molestation or firearm possession. Despite cutting costs of around \$80 million dollars a year our streets are more important than the savings our state will receive.

October 15, 2012

Oppose: Prop 31

State Budget, State & Local Government, Initiative Constitutional Amendment and Statute:

*** Establishes two-year state budget cycle**

* Prohibits Legislature from creating expenditures of more than 25 million unless offsetting revenues or spending cuts are identified

Support: Prop 32

Political Contributions by Payroll Deduction, Contributions to Candidates, Initiative Statute

- * Prohibits unions from using payroll - deducted funds for political purposes. Applies same use prohibition to payroll deductions, if any, by corporations or government contractors
- * Permits voluntary **employee contributions** to employer-sponsored committee or union if authorized yearly in writing

Support: Prop 33

Auto Insurance Companies, Prices Based on Driver's History of Insurance Coverage, Initiative Statute

- * Changes current law to allow insurance companies to set prices based on whether the driver previously carried auto insurance with any insurance company
- * Allows insurance companies to give proportional discounts to drivers with some history of prior insurance coverage

Support: Prop 40

Redistricting, State Senate Districts, Referendum

- * A "Yes" vote approves and a "No" vote rejects, new State Senate districts drawn by the Citizens Redistricting
- * If the new districts are rejected, the State Senate district boundary lines will be adjusted by officials supervised by the California Supreme Court

Oppose: Measure MM / HH

Woodland Hills, Encino and Tarzana Mountains Recreation & Conservation Authority Parcel Tax

- * To protect, maintain and conserve local open space, parklands and wildlife corridors
 - * A special tax of \$19.00 annually for 10 years
- Santa Monica Mountains Recreation and Conservation Authority Parcel Tax
- * To protect, maintain and conserve local open space, parklands and wildlife corridors
 - * A **special tax** of \$24.00 annually for 10 years

Oppose: Measure A

County of Los Angeles Appointed County Assessor

- * Los Angeles County Charter should be changed to make the position an appointed position
- * Currently is an elected position

Oppose: Measure B

Los Angeles Porn Actors required to Wear Condoms Act

- * Would require the LA County Public Health to license and permit movie productions
- * Estimated initial start up costs for program would be in excess of \$300.00

December 17, 2012

Oppose: Los Angeles County (Clean Water, Clean Beaches Measure)

A protest hearing has been scheduled for January 15, 2013 in the Board of Supervisor's Hearing Room at Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration located at 500 West Temple Street, Los Angeles, Ca 90012 beginning at 9:30 am. It will be at this hearing Residential and Commercial owners will have the opportunity to PROTEST this measure that has been purposed for storm water cleanup fees. United Chambers Government Affairs Committee voted to **OPPOSE** this Public Hearing due to the insufficient and untimely notice given to Los Angeles Residential and Commercial property owners.

Oppose: Los Angeles County (Clean Water, Clean Beaches Measure)

This **stormwater cleanup fee** is purposed to be added to your property owner's tax bill with the **existing Flood Control tax that** property owners already pay. The initiative is state driven, in that its purpose is to generate revenue to comply with State storm water regulations but funded by county taxpayers.

Los Angeles County "Clean Water, Clean Beaches" Measure,

The United Chambers of Commerce of the San Fernando Valley opposed the proposed L.A. County Storm water cleanup parcel fee (tax). We have heard the arguments in favor of and opposed to the tax and voted to OPPOSE the imposition of the \$54 per parcel fee for the following reasons:

Notice of the \$54 per parcel fee was inadequate as it was part of the property tax bill and was missed by most property owners as they paid their November tax bill. Many property owners who have their taxes impounded never received the notice and therefore missed the opportunity to object to the fee.

- * There is no uniformed way to object to the fee. If a property owner wishes to object they must send a letter including their parcel number, street address, stating whether they are the owner or the owner's agent and their objection. These requirements are confusing and inject an unnecessary degree of uncertainty into the process that may be unconstitutional. The county should be required to mail a separate letter and ballot to property owners so they can object or not.
- * Fees and measures to reduce trash in storm water already exist including fees on plastic bottles and bans on plastic bags. It is unclear why additional more fees are required at this time.
- * The Clean Water Act requires that Los Angeles County take care of the regions' storm water issues however, it does not proscribe how the water should be cleaned
- * The objectives of the property fees are unclear and require further elaboration before voters can decide whether or not to support the \$54 per parcel fee. While the county has a city by city strategy the overall plan is unclear. Further are there better options such as building water treatment plants along the Los Angeles River?
- * Is there a hidden agenda in the plans including purchasing more private property for the new Los Angeles River Revitalization project? The Los Angeles Daily News recently criticized the Army Corp of engineers for decimating large sections of the river environment. Is this what we can expect?
- * The \$54 per parcel fee does not sunset. The county flood control department will collect and spend \$200 million per year with no clear end in sight.
- * Local cities, school districts, hospitals, markets, shopping centers, airports, factories, and every local entity will have to pay a fee based on the size of the property they occupy. The fee will place a burden on everyone at a time when all our taxes are on the rise.

AB 109 ~ The Early Prisoner Release Program

The program is not working therefore United Chambers of Commerce will ask our Elected Officials to revisit this issue and to work on an realignment.