



Voters Guide

The League of Women Voters of Palo Alto Nonpartisan information for the June 2018 Ballot

Pros and Cons	Pages
California Propositions 68-72 & Other State Information	1-7
Regional Measure 3	8
Rules for California Primaries	9
What is a Recall?	10

The League is a broadly-based organization that encourages informed and involved participation in government through voter service and influences public policy through education and advocacy. The League does not support or oppose political candidates or parties. This *Voters Guide* is a non-political explanation of ballot measures, with supporting and opposing arguments. The arguments come from many sources and are not limited to those presented in the *Official Voter Information Pamphlet*. The League does not judge the merits of the arguments or guarantee their validity.

League of Women Voters of Palo Alto
3921 E. Bayshore Road
Palo Alto, CA 94303
Telephone 650-903-0600 <http://lwvpaloalto.org/>

MAKE DEMOCRACY WORK

June 2018 Primary Election Calendar

Find the location of your precinct poll and other election information at: Voter's Edge: <http://votersedge.org/ca>

May 7, 2018	First day for mailing Vote-by-Mail Ballots
May 7 – June 4, 2018	Early voting available at Registrar's office 1555 Berger Dr., Bldg. 2, San Jose
May 26 – June 4, 2018	Early voting available at other locations in Santa Clara County (see https://www.sccgov.org for locations and schedule)
May 21, 2018	Last day to register to vote for June 5 Primary Election
May 21, 2018	Last day to request Vote-by-Mail Ballot. Requests must be received by the Registrar by 5 p.m.
June 5, 2018	Election Day: polls are open from 7:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. All Mail ballots must be received by Registrar by 8:00 p.m. or submitted to drop-off centers in the county. (see https://www.sccgov.org for locations)



PROS & CONS

Press Date: March 30, 2018

The League of Women Voters of California Education Fund (LWVCEF), a 501(c)(3) nonpartisan organization, encourages informed and active participation in government and works to increase understanding of major public policy issues. The LWVCEF does not support or oppose candidates, political parties, or ballot measures.

The *Pros & Cons* is a nonpartisan explanation of state propositions, with supporting and opposing arguments. The arguments come from many sources and are not limited to those presented in the *Official Voter Information Guide*. The LWVCEF does not judge the merits of the arguments or guarantee their validity.

The LWVCEF grants permission for the *Pros & Cons* to be reproduced. This publication is available online at CAvotes.org.

League of Women Voters of California Education Fund

921 11th Street, Suite 700
Sacramento, CA 95814
916.442.7215 • 888.870.VOTE



Easy Voter Guide
www.easyvoter.org

FOR NEW & BUSY VOTERS
IN MULTIPLE LANGUAGES

Primary Election • June 5, 2018

In this primary election, California voters will find all candidates for state and federal elective offices on their ballots, regardless of the party preference of the candidates or of the voter. The two candidates who win the most votes in each contest will advance to the November general election—even if both are in the same political party, and even if one of them has received a majority of the votes for that office.

California voters will also decide on five state propositions, which are explained in this Pros & Cons. Propositions on the June primary ballot are placed there by action of the state Legislature and the Governor. Any qualified initiative measures, which are placed on the ballot through the petition and signature gathering process, will appear on the November General Election ballot.

Visit Voter's Edge California to see everything on your ballot, your polling place, and to unbiased information on all your voting choices.

How to Evaluate Ballot Propositions

- ★ Examine what the measure seeks to accomplish. Do you agree with those goals?
- ★ Is the measure consistent with your ideas about government? Do you think the proposed changes will make things better?
- ★ Who are the real sponsors and opponents of the measure? Check where the money is coming from on the Voter's Edge California website: votersedge.org/ca
- ★ Is the measure written well? Will it create conflicts in law that may require court resolution or interpretation? Is it "good government," or will it cause more problems than it will resolve?
- ★ Does the measure create its own revenue source? Does it earmark, restrict, or obligate government revenues? If so, weigh the benefit of securing funding for this measure against the cost of reducing overall flexibility in the budget.
- ★ Does the measure mandate a government program or service without addressing how it will be funded?
- ★ Does the measure deal with one issue that can be easily decided by a YES or NO vote? Or, is it a complex issue that should be thoroughly examined in the legislative arena?
- ★ If the measure amends the Constitution, consider whether it really belongs in the Constitution. Would a statute accomplish the same purpose? All constitutional amendments require voter approval; what we put into the Constitution would have to come back to the ballot to be changed.
- ★ Be wary of distortion tactics and commercials that rely on image but tell nothing of substance about the measure. Beware of half truths.

Authorizes Bonds Funding Parks, Natural Resources Protection, Climate Adaptation, Water Quality and Supply, and Flood Protection.

THE QUESTION: Should the State sell \$4.1 billion in bonds to fund parks, natural resources protection, climate adaptation, water quality and supply, and flood protection?

THE SITUATION

California operates programs to protect the environment, conserve natural resources, prevent floods, ensure safe drinking water, other water related programs, and parks. The State also provides grants and loans to local governments and other organizations for similar programs. Almost \$5 billion each year is spent on such programs. The money comes from a combination of the sale of general obligation bonds issued by the State, revenue generated by fees, and the State's General Fund, which is the state's main operating fund.

During the past 17 years voters approved almost \$27 billion in general obligation bonds for various natural resources projects, of which the State still has almost \$9 billion available. Most of that money is available for water quality, supply and infrastructure purposes authorized by Proposition 1 in 2014.

General obligation bonds are sold to investors and are paid off from the State's General Fund. The State repays the principal and interest over time, often several decades.

THE PROPOSAL

This proposition will allow the State to sell \$4.1 billion in bonds. The amount includes \$4 million new bonds and \$100 million previously authorized, but unsold bonds.

The proposition provides funding to state departments and local agencies for specific natural resources related purposes. The money is designated for a wide range of projects across the State including: natural resource and wildlife conservation; climate preparedness to address the effects of climate change; ocean, coastal, and river improvements; maintenance of and creation of parks and recreation projects; flood protection; and water quality and groundwater preservation projects.

Proposition 68 requires at least 15%-20% of the funds for each use specified for use in "disadvantaged communities." Local governments will be affected by this proposition because they can use bond money by agreeing to cost sharing to pay for projects.

FISCAL EFFECTS

Repaying the bonds is expected to cost an estimated \$200 million each year for 40 years, resulting in a total cost of \$7.8 billion. There may be savings to local governments in tens of millions of dollars because the bond money available will relieve the local governments from paying for all of a project. There are unknown costs and savings associated with the actual operation and impacts of the projects produced.

SUPPORTERS SAY

- ★ Prop 68 is an investment to safeguard water quality and to protect natural resources in uncertain environmental conditions.
- ★ Prop 68 brings safe drinking water and parks for communities in need.

OPPONENTS SAY

- ★ Not enough money is actually dedicated to improving parks in all parts of the state.
- ★ California has enough debt and does not need to add to it by having to pay for a new bond measure.

FOR MORE INFORMATION

Supporters: This proposition is on the ballot by action of the Legislature and the Governor.

Yes on 68 Californians for Clean Water and Safe Parks.

yes68ca.com

Opponents: Howard Jarvis Taxpayers Association:

www.hjta.org

(The president of this group wrote the opposing argument in the Voter Information Guide. At press time, there is no known campaign opposing this Proposition.)

More Information on Bonds

For more information on bonds, see page 7 of this guide.

Requires That Certain New Transportation Revenues Be Used for Transportation Purposes.

THE QUESTION: Should the Legislature be required to dedicate and direct revenues from the Road Repair and Accountability Act of 2017 (SB 1) to transportation purposes and exempt this revenue from California’s annual spending limit?

THE SITUATION

This Proposition was part of a legislative package which included SB 1, signed by Gov. Brown in April 2017.

SB 1 increased the state’s excise tax on gasoline and diesel fuel, dedicating this revenue to transportation purposes as provided by the Constitution. In addition, SB 1 increased sales taxes on diesel fuel and created a new vehicle registration fee, the Transportation Improvement Fee (TIF) based on a vehicle’s value. The Constitutional provision restricting the use of the excise tax on diesel fuel to transportation purposes does not to apply sales tax on such fuel; nor does it apply to the newly created TIF.

THE PROPOSAL

Prop 69 would amend the State Constitution to:

- ★ Restrict the new diesel sales tax revenue and a Transportation Improvement Fee (TIF) on vehicles from SB 1, to be used solely for transportation purposes,
- ★ Prohibit borrowing from the Public Transportation Account for non-transportation purposes or using TIF revenues to repay state transportation bonds without voter approval.
- ★ Allow revenues from SB 1 to be excluded from California’s spending limit which places an “upper bound” each year on the amount of monies that can be spent from state tax proceeds.

FISCAL EFFECTS

Because Prop 69 does not change the tax and fee rates established in SB 1, there is no direct fiscal effect. Prop 69 could affect how some monies are spent in the future by restricting the use of revenues from diesel sales taxes and TIF fees.

SUPPORTERS SAY

- ★ Prop 69 won’t raise taxes one cent. It ensures recently-enacted transportation revenues we pay at the pump and when we register our vehicles can be used only for road and transportation improvement projects.
- ★ Prop 69 constitutionally protects transportation funds by prohibiting the Legislature from using these revenues for non-transportation purposes and prioritizes repair of deteriorating roadways.
- ★ We need Prop 69 to protect revenues to fix the poor condition of our roads which pose a major safety threat to California drivers and to provide smoother, less congested roads and highways.

OPPONENTS SAY

- ★ Sacramento has had plenty of money to fix crumbling roads through transportation-related fees and taxes, but the state has repeatedly spent money on everything but transportation.
- ★ Proponents say Prop 69 will safeguard dollars to fix the poor condition of our roads, but a portion of the money is for transit, including high speed rail and bike lanes, not roads.
- ★ Prop 69 fails to protect ALL transportation dollars such as the \$1 billion annually collected in vehicle weight fees used to backfill the State’s General Fund through debt service.

FOR MORE INFORMATION

Supporters: This proposition is on the ballot by action of the Legislature and the Governor.

Yes on 69 Committee

fixcaroads.com/yes-prop-69/

Opponents: At press time, there is no known formal campaign opposing this Proposition.

Choosing YES or NO on a Proposition

A YES vote means that you approve of the change a proposition would make,
and a NO vote means that you want to leave things as they are now.

Requires Legislative Supermajority Vote Approving Use of Cap-and-Trade Reserve Fund.

THE QUESTION: Should (a) California’s cap-and-trade greenhouse gas reduction disbursements and (b) a related partial sales tax exemption be made subject to a two-thirds vote in the state Legislature in 2024 to continue the program and the exemption?

THE SITUATION

Greenhouse gases (GHGs) including carbon dioxide, arising from sources like gasoline-powered cars and industry, contribute to climate change. One of California’s programs to reduce GHGs is referred to as “cap-and-trade,” beginning in 2012 and continuing until 2030.

The state issues a limited number of permits to emit GHGs, about half to be given away and half to be sold at auction. Companies must obtain a permit for each ton of GHG they emit. Permit auction receipts are deposited in a special Fund and are disbursed for GHG programs through the annual budget process, requiring a majority vote in both houses of the Legislature. The Legislative Analyst’s Office (LAO) estimates that about \$3 billion will be disbursed from the Fund in 2017-18.

California charges a sales tax on retail sales of most goods but not on the purchase of certain types of equipment through 2030. The LAO estimates that this exemption currently reduces state revenue by about \$250 million annually.

THE PROPOSAL

Prop 70 requires that, beginning in 2024, (a) cap-and-trade disbursements and (b) the sales tax exemption would be suspended until the state Legislature, by a two-thirds vote in both house (rather than by a majority), passes a bill authorizing both to continue. Thereafter, future disbursements would only require a majority vote and the exemption would be reinstated.

FISCAL EFFECTS

The suspension of the sales tax exemption could increase sales tax revenue, by an amount dependent on the length of the suspension period. For a lengthy delay, the increase could be up to a few hundred million dollars annually.

The 2024 two-thirds vote requirement could, temporarily, delay and/or change the mix of state and local programs disbursements compared to what would otherwise occur. The fiscal results are unclear.

SUPPORTERS SAY

- ★ Prop 70 forces two-thirds of the legislature reach agreement in 2024 to evaluate if the cap-and-trade has been beneficial for all Californians.
- ★ Prop 70 is part of a historic bipartisan effort to achieve our climate goals, retain good paying jobs to sustain our economy, and protect air quality and public health.

OPPONENTS SAY

- ★ The 2024 two-thirds vote requirement is not achievable, undermining clean energy progress, and empowering special interests out of step with most Californians.
- ★ Prop 70 was passed in only four days with a single committee hearing and no opportunity for public comment. Why was it passed with such speed and secrecy?

FOR MORE INFORMATION

Supporters: This proposition is on the ballot by action of the Legislature and the Governor. At press time, there is no known campaign supporting this Proposition.

Opponents: Vote No on Proposition 70, No to Big Oil, a coalition of environmental groups.

stopprop70.org

Choosing YES or NO on a Proposition

A YES vote means that you approve of the change a proposition would make, and a NO vote means that you want to leave things as they are now.

Sets Effective Date for Ballot Measures.

THE QUESTION: Should ballot measures approved by a majority of voters take effect five days after the Secretary of State certifies the results of the election?

THE SITUATION

California’s Constitution states that approved measures take effect on the day after the election unless otherwise specified by the measure.

Election officials in each county must count every legally cast ballot, including vote-by-mail ballots received soon after Election Day and provisional ballots once a voter’s eligibility is confirmed. The current vote counting process lasts for several weeks after Election Day. The amount of time required to validate a signature on a vote-by-mail ballot and to confirm a voter’s eligibility when casting a provisional ballot can take a minimum of two to five minutes and sometimes up to half an hour to research databases to determine if a voter’s address has changed and didn’t cast a ballot elsewhere.

Each county then forwards the results to the Secretary of State who certifies a formal “statement of the vote” no later than 38 days after Election Day.

THE PROPOSAL

Prop 71 would amend the State Constitution so that:

- ★ The effective date for state initiatives and referenda passed by a majority of voters shall be on the fifth day after the Secretary of State files the “statement of the vote,” or no later than forty-three days after the election.
- ★ If a referendum petition is filed against a part of a statute, the remainder of the statute shall not be delayed from going into effect.
- ★ A measure may provide that it becomes operative after its effective date.

FISCAL EFFECTS

Little or no fiscal effect is likely with Prop 71 because it is rare for state ballot measures to create substantial changes in revenues or spending in forty-three days after an election.

SUPPORTERS SAY

- ★ Ballot measures should not go into effect until all votes have been counted.
- ★ Prop 71 is an update of our election laws that also allows authors to specify the date a measure becomes effective.

OPPONENTS SAY

- ★ Prop 71 is not necessary. The law as it exists works well.
- ★ There may be times when it is good for laws to go into effect immediately after Election Day.

FOR MORE INFORMATION

Supporters: This proposition is on the ballot by action of the Legislature and the Governor.
California Democratic Party
cadem.org

Opponents: Gary Wesley
E-mail: Gary.wesley@yahoo.com
(Mr. Wesley, a northern California attorney, wrote the opposing argument as an individual. At press time, there is no known campaign opposing this Proposition.)

Primary Election • Tuesday, June 5, 2018
Polls open 7:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m.

May 21
Last day to register to vote

May 7 - May 29
Mailing period for Vote-by-Mail Ballots

(Request yours before the May 29 deadline)

Permits Legislature to Exclude Newly Constructed Rain-Capture Systems From Property-Tax Reassessment Requirement.

THE QUESTION: Should the value of new construction of rain-capture systems be excluded from reassessment of property for property taxes purposes?

THE SITUATION

California property taxes are typically charged at 1.1% of the full cash value of the property, initially assessed at the time of purchase or construction. This taxable value can be adjusted for inflation at a rate of no more than 2% per year. Normally a property's value is not fully updated until it is sold or changes owners, but certain improvements can also trigger an updated value. In that case, only the value of the improvement (usually a major renovation or new construction) is considered, and this value is then added to the taxable base value of the property. A few types of improvements are already excluded from reassessment: solar energy systems, fire sprinkler systems, changes to increase accessibility for people with disabilities, and seismic retrofitting.

THE PROPOSAL

Prop 72 would add systems installed by property owners or developers to catch rainwater and store it for use on the property to the list of improvements excluded from reassessment for property taxes. The exclusion is only for systems installed between January 2018 and the end of 2028. The exclusion ends when the property is sold.

FISCAL EFFECTS

Tax exemptions are generally thought to provide incentives, in this case to encourage property owners to install rain-capture systems by exempting them from property tax reassessments at the time of installation. Because these systems are usually not very expensive compared to the total cost of real estate, individual tax savings would be fairly small. The loss to local government revenue from property taxes would also be correspondingly small, though this amount would increase if the incentive succeeds in encouraging construction of more rain-capture systems. The property owner would save money on water bills by using the water captured by the system, also conserving water from public utilities for other uses, including drinking water and agricultural irrigation.

SUPPORTERS SAY

- ★ In a state prone to drought, Prop 72 provides a financial incentive for homeowners to help conserve water.
- ★ Savings from Prop 72 will extend to lower water bills for people with rain-capture systems.

OPPONENTS SAY

- ★ There are no official arguments against and no opponents to this bill.

FOR MORE INFORMATION

Supporters: This proposition is on the ballot by action of the Legislature and the Governor. At press time there is no known formal campaign supporting this Proposition.

Opponents: At press time there is no known formal campaign against this Proposition.

Who can vote?

You may register to vote in California if:

- ★ You are a U.S. citizen and California resident.
- ★ You will be at least 18 years old on election day.
- ★ You are not in prison or on parole for a felony.
- ★ You have not been judged mentally incompetent.

When must you re-register to vote?

You need to fill out a new voter registration form if:

- ★ You change your residence address or mailing address.
- ★ You change your name.
- ★ You want to change your political party affiliation.

If you registered and your name does not appear on the voter list at your polling place, you have a right to cast a provisional ballot at any polling place in your county.



Find answers to your questions about voting and the Top-Two primary

Visit our website, CAvotes.org, to:

- Learn more about the ballot measures and voter registration
- See a list of local Leagues
- Sign up and become a member, and to donate or volunteer



facebook.com/cavotes



[@CAvotes](https://twitter.com/CAvotes)

Primary Election



Tuesday, June 5, 2018

Polls open from 7:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m.

May 21

Last day to register to vote

May 29

Last day to request a Vote-by-Mail ballot

About Bonds

Proposition 68 on the June election ballot is a bond issue. This proposition was placed on the ballot by the state Legislature. Below is background information regarding the state's current bond debt, as well as the impact that approval of Proposition 68 could have on the amount of debt and on the State's annual budget.

What Are Bonds? Bonds are a form of long-term borrowing that the state uses to raise money for infrastructure projects. The state sells bonds to investors and agrees to repay the investors, with interest, according to a specified schedule.

Why Are Bonds Used? Projects such as roads, educational facilities, prisons, parks, office buildings, and housing for veterans involve large dollar costs, and are used over many years. The use of bonds helps to fund the initial large dollar costs, which would be hard to fund out of day-to-day operating revenues. Also, the repayment of these bonds over time means that future taxpayers who benefit from the facilities will help to pay for them.

What Types of Bonds Does the State Sell? General Obligation Bonds are the most significant type of bonds and are largely repaid from the state's General Fund which is supported primarily by income and sales tax revenues. These bonds must be approved by the voters, and their repayment is effectively guaranteed by the state. The bonds proposed in Proposition 68 are general obligation bonds.

There are also **Revenue Bonds**, repaid from a designated revenue stream—such as bridge tolls—and **Lease-Revenue Bonds**, repaid from lease payments by state agencies using the leased facilities. Neither type requires voter approval, nor is their repayment guaranteed by the state.

What Are the Direct Costs of Bond Financing? The state must repay the principal amount of the bonds, plus interest, over time to the investors until the bonds are fully paid off. The interest cost of repaying bonds depends primarily on the current interest rate and on the time period over which the bonds have to be repaid. It is expected that the \$4 billion in new bonds proposed by Proposition 68 would be sold over a 10-year period and that the bonds will be repaid over 30 years at an interest rate of 5%. The bonds sold at the end of the 10-year period would be repaid 40 years later. Based on those figures the annual cost to the State will be about \$200 million per year over the next 40 years.

Amount of General Fund Debt. The state has about \$83 billion of General Fund-supported infrastructure bonds on which it is making principal and interest payments. In addition, the voters and the Legislature have approved about \$36 billion of General Fund-supported bonds that have not yet been sold. Most of these bonds are expected to be sold in the coming years as additional projects need funding. In 2017-18, the General Fund's infrastructure bond repayments total close to \$6 billion.

This Election's Impact on the Amount of State Revenues Used to Repay Debt. One indicator of the state's debt burden is the portion of the state's annual general revenues that must be set aside to make yearly payments on the debt, called "debt service ratio" (DSR). The DSR is now somewhat below 5% of annual General Fund revenues. If voters approve Proposition 68, it is estimated that the DSR will increase by less than one-fifth of a percentage point.

Bay Area Traffic Relief Plan

THE QUESTION

(Region-wide majority vote required to approve) Shall voters authorize a plan to reduce auto and truck traffic, relieve crowding on BART, unclog freeway bottlenecks, and improve bus, ferry, BART and commuter rail service as specified in the plan in this voter pamphlet, with a \$1 toll increase effective in 2019, a \$1 increase in 2022, and a \$1 increase in 2025, on all Bay Area toll bridges except the Golden Gate Bridge, with independent oversight of all funds?

THE SITUATION

The San Francisco Bay Area's growing economy and population place a large burden on the aging transportation infrastructure. Population and jobs are forecast to continue to grow in the next 20 years along with traffic congestion. This ballot measure intends to improve the quality of life and sustain the economy of the region by improving mobility and enhancing travel options on the bay bridges and corridors by increasing the toll rate on the seven state-owned bridges.

THE PROPOSAL

Approval of this measure will allow the Bay Area Toll Authority (BATA) to raise the rates by a maximum of \$3 over 6 years on the rate charged by the state-

owned toll bridges in the area to be used for specific projects and programs.

FISCAL EFFECTS

The Regional Measure 3 Expenditure Plan identifies projects that would be funded if voters approve a toll increase of \$3 over 6 years. Funds from this increase would be used to finance a \$4.5 billion slate of highway and transit projects and would provide \$60 million each year to operate new bus and ferry services in congested bridge corridors and improve regional connectivity at the soon-to-open Transbay Transit Center in downtown San Francisco. The Expenditure Plan matches investment in each county to the anticipated toll burden on its residents.

SUPPORTERS SAY

- Reduces truck traffic congestion and improves air quality
- Extends BART to San Jose and Silicon Valley
- Improves Transbay bus service and carpool access to improve times across bridges
- Provides funding to plan and design a second Transbay rail crossing, to provide additional rail service and expand BART capacity by 45%

FOR MORE INFORMATION'

Yesonrm3.com

OPPONENTS SAY

- Encourages single-occupant drivers to use the road by converting HOV lanes to variable toll "Hot Lanes"
- Raises bridge tolls, thus discriminating against low-income drivers who cannot afford to live closer to their workplace
- No guarantee against diversion of voter-approved funds by the Bay Area Toll Authority from their specified use
- No guarantee that funds allocated to later projects would still be there when needed

FOR MORE INFORMATION

OccupyMTC.org

TOP TWO OPEN PRIMARY SYSTEM

On June 8, 2010, California voters approved the “**Top-Two Candidates Open Primary Act.**” The “Top-Two Candidates Open Primary Act provides that elections for the following offices are defined as Voter-Nominated Offices:

VOTER-NOMINATED OFFICES [formerly “partisan”]

Governor	Treasurer	State Senator
Lt. Governor	Attorney General	State Assembly
Secretary of State	Insurance Commissioner	U.S. Senator
Controller	Board of Equalization	U.S. Representative

Under the “Top-Two Candidates Open Primary Act,” all candidates running for Voter-Nominated Offices, regardless of their party preference, will appear on a single ballot so that voters can vote for any candidate from any political party. The “Top-Two Candidates Open Primary Act” requires that only the two candidates for each Voter-Nominated Office who receive the highest and second-highest numbers of votes cast at the Primary shall appear on the ballot as candidates at the ensuing General Election regardless of party affiliation.

PARTY-NOMINATED OFFICES

Party Central Committees are Party-Nominated Offices. Voters who have registered in a party can vote only for the candidates of their political party. Some parties allow “No Party Preference” voters to cross-over and join their primary for members of their Central Committee. Party Central Committees candidates who receive the most votes in the Primary win outright.

NON-PARTISAN OFFICES

Non-Partisan Offices include the Superintendent of Public Instruction as well as judicial, county, city, school, and special district offices. All candidates for non-partisan offices appear on the ballot and a candidate's political party preference is not listed.

In majority vote contests, candidates that receive a majority of the votes (more than 50%) in the Primary win outright. Otherwise, the top two candidates who receive the most votes in the Primary move on to the General Election.

VOTER SERVICE PROGRAMS PUBLIC IS WELCOME

Pros and Cons on the Ballot Measures

Thursday, May 10, 1:30 pm
Avenidas Senior Center, Room 5
Cubberley Community Center
4000 Middlefield Road, Palo Alto

Thursday, May 17, 7 pm
Channing House
850 Webster Street, Palo Alto

Saturday, May 19, 2 pm
Downtown Public Library
270 Forest Avenue, Palo Alto
(with Palo Alto City Library)

Midpen Media Center
Watch on air or internet streaming
For schedule and information see:
<http://midpenmedia.org/>

Candidates Forum

Santa Clara County Sheriff

Wednesday, May 16, 7pm
Cupertino Community Hall
10350 Torre Avenue
Cupertino 95014

INFORMATION ABOUT RECALL LAW

WHAT IS A RECALL ELECTION?

In 1911, California voters approved three state constitutional amendments that have been coined as “direct democracy.” These amendments established the initiative process, procedures by which voters could revoke laws and the power to recall elected officials. (California Constitution, Article II, sections 13 and 14) The June 2018 primary ballot includes a vote on the recall of Santa Clara County Superior Court Judge Aaron Persky.

HOW IS A RECALL PLACED ON THE BALLOT?

- Proponents of a recall for a local elected official, file a Notice of Intention to Recall with the local Registrar of Voters (ROV). The Notice containing a statement by the proponents of the reasons for the recall is published and delivered to the incumbent of the office.
- The ROV approves the Petition for Signature Gathering. Only registered voters in local jurisdiction are allowed to sign the petition. Twenty percent of the number of votes cast in the last vote for the office are required to qualify the recall.
- After inspecting a 5% sample of the signatures and finding that there is a sufficient number of valid signatures to hold a recall election, the ROV officially qualifies the recall for the next scheduled election in the jurisdiction.

WHAT HAPPENS WHEN YOU VOTE IN THE JUNE 2018 ELECTION?

- The Voter Information Guide will include the question “Shall Judge Aaron Persky be removed from the office of Superior Court Judge in Santa Clara County?” The Guide will include the proponents’ statement of the reasons that the recall was initiated and the incumbent’s answer. Candidates for the office, if it is vacated, may also file a candidate’s statement.
- The ballot contains two items related to the recall:
 - The question stated above. Answer: “Yes” or “No”
 - Vote for one of the candidates or write in a candidate to replace Judge Persky should the recall succeed.
- Voters may choose to vote only on the first item, only on the second item, or on both.
- A majority vote is required to recall the incumbent. If the recall passes, the candidate receiving the highest number of votes will take the office.

For More Information on the Ballot Measures

League of Women Voters of Palo Alto
<http://lwvpaloalto.org/>

LWV Voter’s Edge. Who is giving \$\$ to the
campaigns <http://votersedge.org/ca>

Calif. Official Voter Information
Guide <http://voterguide.sos.ca.gov/>
Santa Clara County Voter
Information Pamphlet: sccvote.org

The League of Women Voters, born out of suffrage, now educates and advocates. League membership is open to both men and women. Voting membership is open to all citizens, non-citizens and individuals 16 years of age and older.

Join or Donate to: League of Women Voters of Palo Alto

Mail to: 3921 E. Bayshore Rd., Palo Alto, CA 94303

Donate Online: <http://lwvpaloalto.org/donation.html>

Join Online via PayPal: <http://www.lwvpaloalto.org/join.html>

It's easy to join the League of Women Voters—Do it now! You will be glad you did. Joining at the local level makes you a member at all levels: National, State, Bay Area & Palo Alto.

Name _____

Address _____

City _____ State _____ Zip Code _____

Phone (day) _____ (evening) _____ email _____

Annual Membership: \$85.00 Additional membership, same address: \$40.00

Student membership: \$40.00

Membership dues to the LWVPA are not tax deductible

Donate to the League of Women Voters of Palo Alto

Name _____

Address _____

City _____ State _____ Zip Code _____

Amount Enclosed \$ _____ Phone (opt) _____

I wish my contribution to remain anonymous.

I wish my contribution to be tax deductible where allowed by law. My check is made out to the "*League of Women Voters Education Fund*" which is a 501(c)(3) organization.