



STAFF REPORT

Meeting Date: September 17, 2018

To: Honorable Mayor & City Council

From: Helen Morales, Deputy Director Rent Stabilization Division
Cynthia Owens, Policy and Management Analyst

Subject: Request for the City Council to Consider Taking a Position on California Proposition 10, Expanding Local Governments' Authority to Enact Rent Control on Residential Property

Attachments:

1. Title and Summary for Proposition 10
2. Summary from the State Legislative Analyst Office
3. Summary from Shaw/Yoder/Antwih, Inc.

INTRODUCTION

The City Council has historically taken positions on proposed state legislation of interest to Beverly Hills because of the City's location, economy, programs, and policies. This item requests the City Council provide direction to staff on drafting a letter of support/opposition, adopting a resolution in support/opposition, or remaining neutral on California Proposition 10 - Expands Local Governments' Authority to Enact Rent Control on Residential Property ("Proposition10"). Proposition 10 would repeal the Costa-Hawkins Rental Housing Act ("Costa-Hawkins"), allowing local governments to adopt rent control ordinances regardless of when the rental housing was built (Attachment 1).

The City Council Legislative/Lobby Committee (Liaisons Vice Mayor Mirisch and Councilmember Freidman) reviewed Proposition 10 on August 6, 2018 and their recommendations are included in this report. Additionally, the City's state lobbyist, Andrew Antwih with Shaw/Yoder/Antwih Inc., will be present at the City Council Study Session on September 17, 2018 to provide information on Proposition 10 in conjunction with City staff.

DISCUSSION

Costa-Hawkins is a state statute that limits the use of rent control in California. Costa-Hawkins provides that cities cannot enact rent control on:

- (a) Housing built after February 1, 1995, and
- (b) Housing units where the title is separate from connected units, such as single-family dwellings, condominiums and townhouses.

Costa-Hawkins also provides that landlords have a right to increase rent prices to market rates when a tenant voluntarily moves out. Prior to the enactment of Costa-Hawkins, local governments were permitted to enact rent control, provided that landlords would

Meeting Date: September 17, 2018

receive just and reasonable returns on their rental properties. The California State Legislature passed Costa-Hawkins in 1995.

Should Proposition 10 pass, it would add the following language to the state's civil code:

A city, county, or city and county shall have the authority to adopt a local charter provision, ordinance or regulation that governs a landlord's right to establish and increase rental rates on a dwelling or housing unit.

As proposed, Proposition 10 would require a jurisdiction's rent control ordinance allow a landlord to receive a fair rate of return on their rental property. Proposition 10 does not require a jurisdiction without a rent stabilization program to create one. It also does not require a jurisdiction to add single-family homes, condominiums, or properties built after February 1, 1995 into an existing program.

Proponents of Proposition 10 include the Coalition on Affordable Housing, the AIDS Healthcare Foundation (AHF), Alliance of Californians for Community Empowerment (ACCE Action) and Eviction Defense Network (EDN). It has earned the broad support of over 150 labor, housing advocacy, community, and faith-based organizations throughout the state.

Supporters for Proposition 10 state the rising cost of housing as a major factor in the increase in rent that tenants are paying, making it unaffordable for people to stay in their homes or live near where they work. The proponents argue that median rents are higher in California than any other state in the country.

Additionally, the state has determined more than half of California renter households pay more than 30 percent of their income towards housing costs and one-third of renter households pay more than 50 percent of their earnings towards rent. The federal government has concluded that rent is not affordable if tenants spend more than 30 percent of their income on housing costs.

Other officials, parties, and unions in support of Proposition 10 include, but are not limited to:

- Mayor Eric Garcetti, Los Angeles
- Mike Bonin, Los Angeles City Council – District 11
- Lindsey Horvath, West Hollywood City Council
- California Democratic Party
- SEIU California

Opponents of the measure argue that rent control would further exacerbate California's housing crisis by disincentivizing construction of new multi-family housing. They argue that this would further constrict the housing market, which would result in higher rental cost.

Organizations who oppose Proposition 10 include the California Apartment Association (CAA) and the California Rental Housing Association (CalRHA). A third Political Action Committee, known as No On Prop 10, has also been formed. Should Proposition 10 not pass, then Costa-Hawkins would remain in place and continue to prohibit local governments from enacting rent control on certain buildings and would continue to require vacancy de-control. Other officials, parties, or unions opposed to Proposition 10

Meeting Date: September 17, 2018

include, but are not limited to:

- California Republican Party
- Los Angeles Area Chamber of Commerce
- Los Angeles County Business Federation (LA BizFed)

The graphic below depicts the campaign contributions raised by those that support and oppose Proposition 10 as well as the amount of funding they have spent as of August 28, 2018.

California Proposition 10 (2018)				
	Contributions		Expenditures	
Support Committees	\$12,535,696.80		\$2,345,328.24	
Opposition Committees	\$28,813,865.68		\$1,457,824.68	

Source: Ballotpedia

In Beverly Hills, nearly all of the multi-family housing units were built prior to 1980. Only 11 properties were built after the passage of Costa Hawkins. Should Proposition 10 pass this November, then the City Council could consider amending the rent stabilization ordinance (“RSO”) to include these 11 properties. Additionally, rental properties that are considered single-family homes or condominiums could be impacted by Proposition 10 should the City Council amend its ordinance to include them.

On August 6, 2018, the City Council Legislative/Lobby Committee (“Liaisons”) reviewed a request to take a position on California Proposition 10. The Liaisons were not in concurrence on a recommendation for a position on this subject. Vice Mayor Mirisch fully supported Proposition 10 and the repeal of Costa Hawkins. Councilmember Friedman expressed concerns about the applicability of rent control to single-family housing and condominiums. He believed that if these two types of housing were exempt from the repeal than he could support the Proposition; however, as written he was not in favor of supporting the initiative.

After careful consideration, Councilmember Friedman has indicated he is in support of Proposition 10 since the August 6 Liaison meeting. He did qualify that he would not be in favor of the City modifying its current RSO to include single-family housing and condominiums unless certain, and specific, circumstances are established. Councilmember Friedman indicated he would discuss those circumstances at the appropriate forum should modification be proposed for the City’s RSO. Councilmember Friedman also expressed some concerns about vacancy de-control.

As the City Council adopted Legislative Platform contains the following language: “Support and pursue the repeal of state laws that affect local control on housing and land use”, this item is being brought to the City Council for direction on taking a position on Proposition 10.

FISCAL IMPACT

The State Legislative Analyst Office provided the following statement on the potential economic impact to local governments (Attachment 2):

Meeting Date: September 17, 2018

Increased Local Government Costs. If cities or counties create new rent control laws or expand existing ones, local rent boards would face increased administrative and regulatory costs. Depending on local government choices, these costs could range from very little to tens of millions of dollars per year. These costs likely would be paid by fees on owners of rental housing.

The passage of Proposition 10 does not require municipalities to include single-family homes, condominiums, or properties built after February 1, 1995 in a rent stabilization program or to create such a program if one does not exist. Additionally, it does not require rent control programs to automatically eliminate vacancy de-control. It only gives cities the authority to do so should the governing body amend any current ordinance.

Should Beverly Hills decide to add properties built after February 1, 1995, eliminate vacancy de-control, and/or included single-family homes and condominiums to its current RSO, then the City would need to consider adopting fees relative to the impact on the administration of the Rent Stabilization Program ("Program") for cost recovery purposes. Currently, the City charges \$54.00 per unit every other month to recover the costs for Code Enforcement. This does not include the costs of the Program as established in 2017. A fee study is being conducted to determine what the fee should be for the newly established Program.

The overall fiscal impact to the City of the passage of Proposition 10 is unknown. Staff estimates that the 11 properties built after February 1, 1995 will have a minimal impact on the City's finances. Staff anticipates there may be a minimal decrease in potential business tax revenue as a majority of the multi-family properties in the City are already affected by the City's Rent Stabilization Ordinance.

There could also be additional costs for the administration of the Program if single-family homes and/or condominiums are included as it would increase the stock of residential property subject to rent stabilization.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff requests the City Council provide direction on drafting a letter of support/opposition, adopting a resolution in support/opposition, or remaining neutral on California Proposition 10 - Expands Local Governments' Authority to Enact Rent Control on Residential Property

Susan Healy Keene

Concurred By



George Chavez

Approved By

Attachment 1

Affordable Housing Act

The People of the State of California do hereby ordain as follows:

Section 1. Title.

This Act shall be known and may be cited as "Affordable Housing Act."

Section 2. Findings and Declarations.

The People of the State of California hereby find and declare all of the following:

- a) Rents for housing have skyrocketed in recent years. Median rents are higher in California than any other state in the country, and among all 50 states, California has the 4th highest increase in rents.
- b) Research by Apartment List indicates that the median rent for a one-bedroom apartment in California is \$1,410, an increase of 4.5% in just one year. A one-bedroom apartment in Los Angeles costs \$1,350 per month. In San Francisco, it costs \$2,450. In San Diego, the cost is \$1,560.
- c) The federal government has concluded that rent is not affordable if renters spend more than 30% of their income on housing costs. The State of California has found that more than half of California renter households (3 million) pay more than 30% and one-third of renter households (over 1.5 million) pay more than 50% of their income toward rent.
- d) According to the National Low Income Housing Coalition, a Californian earning minimum wage would have to work 92 hours per week in order to afford to rent an average one-bedroom apartment.
- e) More Californians (5.8 million households) are renting than ever before, because overall home ownership rates in California have fallen to their lowest level since the 1940s, according to the state. One quarter of older millennials (25-34 years of age) still live with their parents. (U.S. Census Bureau)
- f) Statewide labor unions, such as California Nurses Association, Service Employees International Union and the California Teachers Association, have made affordable housing a priority for their members. For example, teachers in California's urban centers are paying 40% to 70% of their salaries on housing and many are being forced to live an hour or more from their jobs in order to afford a home.
- g) Three times as many Californians are living in overcrowded apartments as compared to the U.S. as a whole. (U.S. Census Bureau)

- h) Even though the state represents only 12% of the total U.S. population, California is home to 22% of the nation's homeless population. (California Department of Housing and Community Development)
- i) Homelessness is a major public health issue. People who are homeless are 3 to 4 times more likely to die prematurely and are more likely to have a communicable disease, according to the National Health Care for the Homeless Council.
- j) The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention warn that vulnerable populations face lower life expectancy, higher cancer rates and more birth defects when their homes are displaced due to the gentrification of their neighborhoods.
- k) The increased cost of housing is worsening traffic congestion and harming the environment by forcing commuters to live farther away from their places of employment and increasing commute times. A report by the Pew Charitable Trust noted that the number of Californians who commute more than 90 minutes each way increased by 40% between 2010 and 2015; the increase is a direct result of the dearth of affordable housing near jobs.
- l) A major factor in California's housing crisis is a 20-year-old law known as the Costa-Hawkins Rental Housing Act. Costa-Hawkins gives permission to landlords of residential apartments and houses to raise rents as much as they want in buildings built after 1995; despite local laws that would otherwise prohibit such increases, landlords in Los Angeles can raise rents as much as they want on buildings built after 1978 and in San Francisco, on buildings built after 1979.
- m) Costa-Hawkins also allows a landlord to raise the rent in any building built before 1995 to the market value when it becomes vacant, and lets the landlord decide what market value is.
- n) Costa-Hawkins prevents cities from implementing laws that keep rents affordable for their residents.

Section 3. Purposes and Intent.

The People of the State of California hereby declare the following purposes and intent in enacting this Act:

- a) To restore authority to California's cities and counties to develop and implement local policies that ensure renters are able to find and afford decent housing in their jurisdictions.
- b) To improve the quality of life for millions of California renters and reduce the number of Californians who face critical housing challenges and homelessness.
- c) To repeal the Costa-Hawkins Rental Housing Act.

Section 4. Affordable Housing Act shall be codified by repealing the following sections of the Civil Code:

Sections 1954.50, 1954.51, 1954.52 and 1954.53 of Chapter 2.7 of Title 5 of Part 4 of Division 3 of the Civil Code are repealed.

Section 5. Affordable Housing Act shall be further codified by adding the following section to the Civil Code:

Section 1954.54. (a) A city, county, or city and county shall have the authority to adopt a local charter provision, ordinance or regulation that governs a landlord's right to establish and increase rental rates on a dwelling or housing unit.

(b) In accordance with California law, a landlord's right to a fair rate of return on a property shall not be abridged by a city, county, or city and county.

Section 6. Liberal Construction

This Act shall be broadly construed to accomplish its purposes.

Section 7. Amendment and Repeal

Pursuant to Article II, Section 10, Subdivision (c), of the California Constitution, the Legislature may amend this Act to further its purposes by a statute passed in each house by roll call vote entered in the Journal, two-thirds of the membership concurring, signed by the Governor. No statute restricting or eliminating the powers that have been restored by this Act to a city, county, or city and county to establish residential rental rates shall become effective unless approved by a majority of the electorate.

Section 8. Severability

If any provision of this Act or the application thereof to any person or circumstances is held invalid, that invalidity shall not affect other provisions or applications of the Act which can be given effect without the invalid provision or application, and to this end the provisions of this Act are severable.

Section 9. Conflicting Measures

In the event that this Act and any other measure addressing the authority of local government agencies to establish residential rental rates shall appear on the same statewide election ballot, the provision of the other measure or measures shall be deemed to be in conflict with this Act. In the event that this Act receives a greater number of affirmative votes than another measure deemed to be in conflict with it, the provisions of this Act shall prevail in their entirety, and the other measure or measures shall be null and void.

Section 10. Legal Defense

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, if the State, a government agency, or any of its officials fail to defend the constitutionality of this Act, following its approval by the voters, the proponents shall have the authority to intervene in any court action challenging the constitutionality of this Act for the purpose of defending its constitutionality, whether in state or federal court, and whether such action is in any trial court, on appeal, or on discretionary review by the Supreme Court of California or the Supreme Court of the United States. The reasonable fees and costs of defending the action shall be a charge on funds appropriated to the California Department of Justice, which shall be satisfied promptly.

Section 11. Effective Date

Except as otherwise provided herein, this Act shall become effective the day after its approval by the voters.

Attachment 2

Proposition 10
Expands Local Governments' Authority to Enact Rent Control on Residential Property. Initiative Statute.

Yes/No Statement

A **YES** vote on this measure means: State law *would not* limit the kinds of rent control laws cities and counties could have.

A **NO** vote on this measure means: State law *would continue to* limit the kinds of rent control laws cities and counties could have.

Summary of Legislative Analyst's Estimate of Net State and Local Government Fiscal Impact

- Potential net reduction in state and local revenues of tens of millions of dollars per year in the long term. Depending on actions by local communities, revenue losses could be less or considerably more.

Ballot Label

Fiscal Impact: Potential net reduction in state and local revenues of tens of millions of dollars per year in the long term. Depending on actions by local communities, revenue losses could be less or considerably more.

BACKGROUND

Rental Housing Is Expensive in California. Renters in California typically pay 50 percent more for housing than renters in other states. In some parts of the state, rent costs are more than double the national average. Rent is high in California because the state does not have enough housing for everyone who wants to live here. People who want to live here must compete for housing, which increases rents.

Several Cities Have Rent Control Laws. Several California cities—including Los Angeles, San Francisco, and San Jose—have laws that limit how much landlords can increase rents for

housing from one year to the next. These laws often are called rent control. About one-fifth of Californians live in cities with rent control. Local rent boards administer rent control. These boards are funded through fees on landlords.

Court Rulings Limit Local Rent Control. Courts have ruled that rent control laws must allow landlords to receive a “fair rate of return.” This means that landlords must be allowed to increase rents enough to receive some profit each year.

State Law Limits Local Rent Control. A state law, known as the Costa-Hawkins Rental Housing Act (Costa-Hawkins), limits local rent control laws. Costa-Hawkins creates three main limitations. First, rent control cannot apply to any single-family homes. Second, rent control can never apply to any newly built housing completed on or after February 1, 1995. Third, rent control laws cannot tell landlords what they can charge a new renter when first moving in.

State and Local Government Tax Revenues. Three taxes are the largest sources of tax revenue for the state and local governments in California. The state collects a personal income tax on income—including rent received by landlords—earned within the state. Local governments levy property taxes on property owners based on the value of their property. The state and local governments collect sales taxes on the retail sale of goods.

PROPOSAL

Repeals Costa-Hawkins. The measure repeals the limits on local rent control laws in Costa-Hawkins. Under the measure, cities and counties can regulate rents for *any* housing. They also can limit how much a landlord may increase rents when a new renter moves in. The measure itself does not make any changes to local rent control laws. With a few exceptions, cities and counties would have to take separate actions to change their local laws.

Requires Fair Rate of Return. The measure requires that rent control laws allow landlords a fair rate of return. This puts the results of past court rulings into state law.

FISCAL EFFECTS

Economic Effects. If communities respond to this measure by expanding their rent control laws it could lead to several economic effects. The most likely effects are:

- To avoid rent regulation, some landlords would sell their rental housing to new owners who would live there.
- The value of rental housing would decline because potential landlords would not want to pay as much for these properties.
- Some renters would spend less on rent and some landlords would receive less rental income.
- Some renters would move less often.

These effects would depend on how many communities pass new laws, how many properties are covered, and how much rents are limited. Voters in some communities have proposed expanding rent control if this measure passes. If many localities enacted strong rent regulation, other economic effects (such as impacts on housing construction) could occur.

Changes in State and Local Revenues. The measure's economic effects would affect property tax, sales tax, and income tax revenues. The largest and most likely impacts are:

- ***Less Property Taxes Paid by Landlords.*** A decline in the value of rental properties would, over several years, lead to a decrease in property tax payments made by owners of those properties.

- ***More Sales Taxes Paid by Renters.*** Renters who pay less in rent would use some of their savings to buy taxable goods.
- ***Change in Income Taxes Paid by Landlords.*** Landlords' income tax payments would change in several ways. Some landlords would receive less rental income. This would reduce their income tax payments. On the other hand, over time landlords would pay less to buy rental properties. This would reduce expenses they can claim to lower their income tax payments (such as mortgage interest, property taxes, and depreciation). This would increase their income tax payments. The measure's net effect on income taxes paid by landlords in the long term is not clear.

Overall, the measure likely would reduce state and local revenues in the long term, with the largest effect on property taxes. The amount of revenue loss would depend on many factors, most importantly how communities respond to this measure. If several communities expand moderate rent control to cover most of their rental housing, revenue losses could be in the tens of millions of dollars per year. If few communities make changes, revenue losses would be minor. If many communities pass strong rent control, revenue losses could be in the hundreds of millions of dollars per year.

Increased Local Government Costs. If cities or counties create new rent control laws or expand existing ones, local rent boards would face increased administrative and regulatory costs. Depending on local government choices, these costs could range from **very little to tens of millions of dollars** per year. These costs likely would be paid by fees on owners of rental housing.

Attachment 3



SHAW/YODER/ANTWIH, inc.
LEGISLATIVE ADVOCACY • ASSOCIATION MANAGEMENT

July 30, 2018

To: Cindy Owens, City of Beverly Hills

From: Andrew K. Antwih, Partner, Shaw / Yoder / Antwih, Inc.
Melissa Immel, Legislative Advocate, Shaw / Yoder / Antwih, Inc.
Tim Sullivan, Legislative Aide, Shaw / Yoder / Antwih, Inc.

Re: Proposition 10: Affordable Housing Act.

Introduction and Background

Proposition 10 is sponsored by the Coalition for Affordable Housing, which was organized by the AIDS Healthcare Foundation and the Alliance of Californians for Community Empowerment (ACCE). Prop 10 would repeal the Costa-Hawkins Rental Housing Act and allow local governments to adopt rent control ordinances. The Costa-Hawkins Act prohibits cities from enacting rent control on properties first occupied after February 1, 1995, and units where the title is separate from other connected units such as condominiums or townhomes. The initiative follows a similar effort in the Legislature to repeal the Act in Assembly Member Bloom's AB 1506, which failed to pass out of the Assembly Housing and Community Development Committee when it was heard in January of this year.

Status of Legislation

Proposition 10 is on the statewide ballot in California and will be voted on November 6th.

Support and Opposition

Supporters of the bill note the impacts that California's housing crisis is having on renters as rising housing costs drive up rents across the state and more and more people are unable to afford to stay in their homes or live near where they work. The initiative's proponents argue that rent control will allow localities to take steps to keep rental prices affordable and prevent the steep rent increases that force people out of their homes.

Opponents of the measure argue that rent control would further exacerbate California's housing crisis by disincentivizing construction of new multifamily housing. They argue that this would further constrict the housing market which would result in higher rental costs.

Support

Coalition for Affordable Housing, Yes on 10
(Sponsor)
AIDS Healthcare Foundation (Co-Sponsor)
Alliance of Californians for Community
Empowerment (Co-Sponsor)
Mayor Eric Garcetti (D), Los Angeles
Mike Bonin, Los Angeles City Council — District
11
Lindsey Horvath, West Hollywood City Council

California Democratic Party
AFSCME California PEOPLE
California Nurses Association
California Teachers Association
SEIU California
American Federation of State County &
Municipal Employees Local 3299 Issues PAC
California Nurses Association, California Nurses
Association Initiative PAC
ACLU-SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA

ACLU-Northern California
Affordable Homeless Housing Alternatives
Affordable Housing Network of Santa Clara
County
AFSCME Local 3299
AFT Local 2121
AFT Local 1521
Alameda Renters Coalition
Alliance for Community Transit
Allies for Life
Americans for Democratic Action
APAIT (Special Service for Groups)
API Equality - LA
Arcata Lazy J Homeowners Association
Asian Law Alliance
ASIAN PACIFIC ENVIRONMENTAL NETWORK
ASSOCIATED STUDENTS OF UC SANTA BARBARA
BEND THE ARC - SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA
BEVERLY HILLS RENTERS ALLIANCE
BLACK COMMUNITY CLERGY & LABOR ALLIANCE
CALIFORNIA ALLIANCE FOR RETIRED
AMERICANS
CALIFORNIA CALLS
CALIFORNIA DEMOCRATIC PARTY
CALIFORNIA NURSES ASSOCIATION
CALIFORNIA PARTNERSHIP
CALIFORNIA RURAL LEGAL ASSISTANCE
FOUNDATION
CALIFORNIA TEACHERS ASSOCIATION
CAUSE
CENTER FOR COMMUNITY ACTION &
ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE
CENTRAL COAST ALLIANCE UNITED FOR A
SUSTAINABLE ECONOMY
CHERYL WARD MINISTRIES
CHINATOWN COMMUNITY FOR EQUITABLE
DEVELOPMENT
CLERGY & LAITY UNITED FOR ECONOMIC
JUSTICE - LOS ANGELES (CLUE)
COALITION FOR ECONOMIC SURVIVAL
COALITION FOR HUMANE IMMIGRANT RIGHTS
LOS ANGELES (CHIRLA)
COURAGE CAMPAIGN
CREATING FREEDOM MOVEMENTS
CRENSHAW SUBWAY COALITION
DELLUMS INSTITUTE FOR SOCIAL JUSTICE
DEMOCRATIC SOCIALISTS OF AMERICA, LOS
ANGELES

DEMOCRATIC SOCIALISTS OF AMERICA, EAST
BAY
DEMOCRATIC SOCIALISTS OF AMERICA,
ORANGE COUNTY
DEMOCRATIC SOCIALISTS OF AMERICA,
PENINSULA
DEMOCRATIC SOCIALISTS OF AMERICA,
SACRAMENTO
DEMOCRATIC SOCIALISTS OF AMERICA, SAN
DIEGO
DEMOCRATIC SOCIALISTS OF AMERICA, SAN
FRANCISCO
DEMOCRATIC SOCIALISTS OF AMERICA, SILICON
VALLEY
EAST AREA PROGRESSIVE DEMS
EMPLOYEE RIGHTS CENTER SAN DIEGO
ENSURING OPPORTUNITY CAMPAIGN TO END
POVERTY IN CONTRA COSTA COUNTY
EQUITY HOUSING ALLIANCE
EVICTED DEFENSE NETWORK
FANNIE LOU HAMMER INSTITUTE
GAMALIEL CA
GLENDALE TENANTS UNION
GOLDEN STATE MANUFACTURED-HOME
OWNERS LEAGUE
GROUND GAME LA
HARVEY MILK LGBT DEMOCRATIC CLUB
HOMELESS STUDENT ADVOCATE ALLIANCE
HOUSING CALIFORNIA
HOUSING LONG BEACH
HOUSING NOW!
HOUSING RIGHTS COMMITTEE SAN FRANCISCO
HUMBOLDT AND DEL NORTE COUNTIES
CENTRAL LABOR COUNCIL AFL-CIO
HUMBOLDT COUNTY DEMOCRATS
HUNGER ACTION COALITION LOS ANGELES
HYDE PARK ORGANIZATIONAL PARTNERSHIP
FOR EMPOWERMENT
INLAND EMPIRE FOR OUR REVOLUTION
INLAND EMPIRE UNITED
INLAND EMPOWERMENT
INNER CITY LAW CENTER LA
INNERCITY STRUGGLE
INSTITUTE OF THE BLACK WORLD 21ST
CENTURY
INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST ORGANIZATION
INQUILINOS UNIDOS
ISLA VISTA TENANTS UNION

JOB WITH JUSTICE SAN FRANCISCO
JUSTICE HOUSE
KENWOOD OAKLAND COMMUNITY ORGANIZATION
KOREATOWN IMMIGRANT WORKERS ALLIANCE
LA CENTER FOR COMMUNITY LAW & ACTION
LA FORWARD
LATINO ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT CENTER
LA VOICE (PICO AFFILIATE)
LAW FOUNDATION OF SILICON VALLEY
LEADERSHIP COUNSEL FOR JUSTICE AND ACCOUNTABILITY CENTRAL VALLEY
LOS ANGELES ALLIANCE FOR A NEW ECONOMY
LOS ANGELES COMMUNITY ACTION NETWORK
LOS ANGELES TENANTS UNION
MANUFACTURED HOUSING ACTION
MILLION VOTER PROJECT
MISSION ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AGENCY
MLK COALITION OF GREATER LA
MOBILIZE THE IMMIGRANT VOTE
NAPA COUNTY GREEN PARTY
NATIONAL ACTION NETWORK - LOS ANGELES
NORTH BAY ORGANIZING PROJECT
OAKLAND EDUCATION ASSOCIATION (OEA)
OAKLAND TENANTS UNION
ORANGE COUNTY CIVIC ENGAGEMENT TABLE
ORGANIZE SACRAMENTO
PAINTERS & ALLIED TRADES 36
PASADENA TENANTS UNION
PASADENANS ORGANIZING FOR PROGRESS
PEOPLE ACTING IN COMMUNITY TOGETHER - PACT SAN JOSE (PICO AFFILIATE)
PEOPLE OF COLOR SUSTAINABLE HOUSING NETWORK
PEOPLE ORGANIZED FOR WESTSIDE RENEWAL
PICO CALIFORNIA
PLACES IN THE CITY
POLICYLINK
POMONA ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY CENTER
PROGRESSIVE ALLIANCE (SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY)
PROGRESSIVE ASIAN NETWORK FOR ACTION
PROPERTY OWNERS FOR FAIR AND AFFORDABLE HOUSING
PUBLIC ADVOCATES
RICHMOND PROGRESSIVE ALLIANCE
RUBICON
RYSE YOUTH CENTER

SAN BERNARDINO YOUNG DEMOCRATS
SAN DIEGO CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF THE PEACE AND FREEDOM PARTY OF CA
SAN DIEGO COUNTY PEACE AND FREEDOM PARTY
SAN FRANCISCO ANTI-DISPLACEMENT COALITION
SAN FRANCISCO TENANTS UNION
Scope
SEIU LOCAL 1021
SEIU LOCAL 99
SEIU LOCAL 221
SEIU LOCAL 721
SENIOR AND DISABILITY ACTION
SILICON VALLEY DE-BUG
SOCIAL SECURITY WORKS
SOJOURNER TRUTH PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH
SOLIDARITY - BAY AREA
SOUTHERN CHRISTIAN LEADERSHIP CONFERENCE-SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA
STRATEGIC ACTIONS FOR A JUST ECONOMY
TENANTS TOGETHER
THAI COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT CENTER
THE EAST OAKLAND COLLECTIVE
TRUST SOUTH LA
UC BERKELEY YOUNG DEMOCRATIC SOCIALISTS OF AMERICA (YDSA)
UC STUDENT-WORKERS UNION UAW 2865
UFCW 770
UNION DE VECINOS
UNITE HERE 11
UNITE HERE 2850
UNITED FOR HOUSING JUSTICE (SF)
UNITED TEACHERS OF LOS ANGELES (UTLA)
URBAN HABITAT
VENICE COMMUNITY HOUSING CORPORATION
WAREHOUSE WORKER RESOURCE CENTER
WELLSTONE DEMOCRATIC RENEWAL CLUB
WESTERN CENTER FOR LAW AND POVERTY
WOMEN ORGANIZED TO RESPOND TO LIFE-THREATENING DISEASES (WORLD)
Y VOTE

Opposition

California Apartment Association, Californians for Responsible Housing PAC
California Rental Housing Association, Californians for Affordable Housing PAC
No on Prop 10 PAC
California Republican Party
Michael K. Hayde, including Western National Group & Affiliated Entities
Essex Property Trust, Inc., and Affiliated Entities
Equity Residential
Spieker Companies, Inc.
Avalonbay Communities, Inc.
California Council for Affordable Housing
TELACU
AMCAL Multi-Housing
Urban Housing Communities
GTM Holdings
JH Stark Companies
The Pacific Companies
Highridge Costa Housing Partners
Veterans of Foreign Wars, Department of California
American Legion, Department of California
Military Officers Association of America, California Council of Chapters
AMVETS, Department of California
American G.I. Forum of California
National Guard Association of California
Veterans Services Supportive Services Agency, Inc. (VSSA) of Silicon Valley
LeadingAge California
Civil Justice Association of California
California State Conference of the NAACP
State Building and Construction Trades Council of California
Los Angeles/Orange Counties Building & Construction Trades Council
CalAsian Chamber of Commerce
Greater Los Angeles African American Chamber
Sacramento Asian Pacific Chamber of Commerce
California Chamber of Commerce
Los Angeles Area Chamber of Commerce
Los Angeles County Business Federation (LA BizFed)
The Silicon Valley Organization
Inland Empire Economic Partnership (IEEP)

Los Angeles Business Council
Bay Area Council
Innovation Tri-Valley Leadership Group
Valley Industry and Commerce Association
Central City Association of Los Angeles
California Business Properties Association
California Mortgage Bankers Association
Santa Cruz County Business Council
Greater Bakersfield Chamber of Commerce
Fresno Chamber of Commerce
Sacramento Metropolitan Chamber of Commerce
San Ramon Chamber of Commerce
Sacramento Regional Builders Exchange
Oxnard Chamber of Commerce
El Dorado County Chamber of Commerce
Pleasanton Chamber of Commerce
Chico Chamber of Commerce
Building Industry Association –LA/Ventura
United Chambers of Commerce of the San Fernando Valley Region