<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LA COUNTY</th>
<th>LA CITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>H</strong> YES</td>
<td>Funding to help the homeless</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M</strong> YES</td>
<td>Marijuana Regulation With Community Input</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N</strong> NO</td>
<td>Inflexible Marijuana Regulation System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>P</strong> YES</td>
<td>Change Length of Harbor Department Contacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S</strong> NO</td>
<td>Restrict affordable and mixed-use housing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LA FORWARD VOTER GUIDE**

Your **thoughtful, comprehensive,** and **progressive** introduction to the March 7, 2017 ballot.

From a **new generation** of leaders working to create a Los Angeles that’s **fair, vibrant,** and **sustainable.**

Learn more about LA Forward, sign up for updates, and download the full guide, with complete explanations at LosAngelesForward.org

/f/LosAngelesForward  /@losangelesfwd  /@LAForward
Where We Go From Here

Every day we confront disturbing political realities. Cruel xenophobic nationalism is on the rise. Economic inequality is accelerating. People are finding it increasingly difficult to secure decent-paying jobs and to gain access to quality healthcare, education, and housing. The earth is heating up. Struggles for equal rights are encountering fierce resistance. Criminalization as the way our society deals with human beings is rampant. These were troubling trends even before the results of the November elections. Now the dominant political forces are doubling down on destructive policies that make all of these problems worse.

The good news is that Americans and Angelenos have risen to the challenge like never before. From massive protests to a tidal wave of phone calls, we are awake and fighting back, eyes wide open. Something powerful is happening.

And there is so much we can do from Los Angeles to make our city a better place and to make an impact in the struggle for democracy and justice nationally.

LA Forward is committed to helping you participate in this movement, whether it's your first time getting involved or the fiftieth.

We came together in the Fall of 2016 as young leaders who saw an opportunity for Los Angeles to realize its highest potential as a fair, vibrant and sustainable city. Our first voter guide reached thousands of people like you. Then we mobilized hundreds of people to make a successful final push to decriminalize street vending in LA, protecting immigrants most at risk under the Trump administration.

Now more than ever, Los Angeles must offer a shining example of what is possible if we put our progressive values into practice. We will make our streets into vibrant public spaces, invest in our public schools and infrastructure, fight for quality jobs and a robust social safety net, preserve and construct housing for all communities, and stamp out bias so law enforcement truly values Black and Brown lives.

You can count on us for more voter guides, more educational events, and more action alerts on the critical issues before our city and county governments.

But our city cannot be an island unto itself, disconnected from the troubles around us — we need to figure out ways to impact national politics.

So we are mapping out next steps to build a powerful movement that lasts beyond this moment.

There will be house parties coming to a neighborhood near you, so we can organize quickly and powerfully. These meetings include three key parts — an expert overview of today’s political situation, a quick training on effective techniques to build power, and a menu of ways for you and your group to make change by getting involved in campaigns in LA, nearby, and beyond.

*Interested in hosting a house party for you and your friends or neighbors?*

Drop us a line at hello@losangelesforward.org
LA Forward supports Measure H, a quarter cent sales tax increase that will generate $3.55 billion over the next decade to address our county’s homelessness crisis.

Measure H will fund services in the areas of mental health, substance abuse treatment, health care, job training, transportation, outreach, and prevention. These services complement the 10,000 new units of housing for the homeless that LA City is building as a result of the November 2016 bond measure approved by voters. This is a big deal. Combining housing and services is the single most effective way to address chronic homelessness. Together they ensure that homeless individuals can successfully transition into a calm, safe living environment.

Spending will be guided by the results of a comprehensive planning process, which included 18 policy summits since 2015 and which brought together 25 LA County departments, 30 cities, and over 100 community partners and stakeholders. The County now has well thought out strategies and policies, but without funding, they won’t have the chance to succeed. For less than $50 per household annually, we can ensure the work gets done and people’s needs are served.

With conservatives in control of the White House and Congress, local funding sources are more important than ever. And the needs of the homeless in our community are both staggering and urgent. Los Angeles has the largest unsheltered homeless population in the nation — more than 47,000 human beings — and the problem is getting worse.

Providing affordable housing to homeless individuals along with wrap-around services is a proven method of ending homelessness for individuals with a long history of homelessness and/or a disabling condition that makes it difficult to retain housing, like mental illness, chronic conditions, or substance abuse. From a purely fiscal perspective, housing the homeless is far more economical than the approach of neglect and criminalization. Homeless shelters, emergency rooms, hospitals, jails and prisons are an incredibly expensive approach to the problem. As a result of this troubled system, the County spends $64,000 per year in public services per homeless individual. Providing housing and supportive services only costs $17,000 annually. Neglect and criminalization is a failed approach to the spread of homelessness, financially, practically, and morally.
In general, LA Forward and other progressive groups are skeptical of sales taxes as a funding mechanism, as they are inherently regressive. But the burden on low-income communities here is lessened by the fact that groceries, rent, utilities, transit, medicines and doctor visits aren’t taxed under California law.

Los Angeles’ lackluster response to homelessness is a moral and economic failure. It is morally outrageous that a county as wealthy as Los Angeles devotes so few resources to housing and caring for its neediest. As Angelenos, we must come together in these troubled times to protect our most vulnerable. We urge a YES vote on Measure H.

**SUPPORTERS**

**Faith**
- LA Voice – a multiracial network of 60+ churches, synagogues & mosques
- One LA – a coalition of 24 faith, nonprofit & school groups
- Bend the Arc: A Jewish Partnership for Justice
- Clergy & Laity United for Economic Justice

**Community & Social Justice Groups:**
- ACLU Southern California; Alliance for Community Transit-LA (ACT-LA); Anti-Recidivism Coalition;
- Children’s Defense Fund; Coalition for Economic Survival; Inner City Law Center; Instituto de Educacion Popular del Sur de California (IDEPSCA); Los Angeles Alliance for a New Economy (LAANE);
- Leticia Aguilar Jaguelli Foundation For The Poor; LA Community Action Network (LA CAN); LA Kitchen; Little Tokyo Service Center; Pacoima Beautiful; Public Counsel; Santa Monicans for Renters’ Rights (SMRR);
- Southern California Association of Nonprofit Housing (SCANPH); Thai Community Development Corporation; U.S. VETS; WORKS.

**Civic Organizations:**
- League of California Cities, LA County Division; LA County Democratic Party; League of Women Voters of LA County;
- South Bay Council of Governments; United Way of Greater Los Angeles.

**Health:**
- Hospital Association of Southern California; Mental Health Advocacy Services; Mental Health America of Los Angeles; National Alliance on Mental Illness (NAMI); Westside Family Health Center.

**OPPONENTS**

- LA County Republican Party
- Jack Humphreville, Citywatch LA
SUPPORTERS

Homeless Serving Groups: Bless Our Neighbors – Clothing our Homeless Neighbors; California Housing Partnership; Chrysalis; Corporation for Supportive Housing; Covenant House California; Downtown Women’s Center; East San Gabriel Valley Coalition for the Homeless; First Place for Youth; Homeless Health Care Los Angeles; Hope of the Valley Rescue Mission; Housing Works; Integrated Recovery Network; Jovenes; LA Family Housing; Monday Night Mission; National Center of Excellence in Homeless Services; New Directions for Veterans; PATH (People Assisting the Homeless); Prevention Institute; Rainbow Service; Safe Place for Youth; Sanctuary of Hope; Shelter Partnership, Inc.; Skid Row Housing Trust; South Bay Coalition to End Homelessness; Southern California Health & Rehab Program; SRO Housing Corporation; St. Anne’s; St. John’s Well Child and Family Center; St. Joseph Center; The People Concern – OPCC & Lamp Community United; Union Station Homeless Services; Venice Community Housing Corporation; Worksite Wellness LA.

Labor
LA County Federation of Labor, AFL-CIO; AFSCME District Council 36, Local 3634; Amalgamated Transit Union Local 1277; Communication Workers of America Southern California Council, Local 9003; California Association of Professional Employees; IBEW Local 11; International Longshore & Warehouse Union Local 63; International Union of Operating Engineers Local 12; Ironworkers Local 416; Laborers’ International Union of North America Local 777; Plumbers & Fitters Local 761; SEIU 721; Teamsters 42, 396, 848, 986; UFCW Local 770, 1429, 1442; United Nurses Association of California; UNITE HERE Local 11; UTLA-AFT 1021.

Business
LA Chamber of Commerce; LA Business Council; South Bay Association of Chambers of Commerce; Torrance Chamber of Commerce; Valley Industry & Commerce Association (VICA).
Measure S is a far reaching shift in LA City’s planning and zoning power that will exacerbate our city’s lack of affordable housing, homelessness crisis, and crushing traffic congestion. Despite backers’ attempts to co-opt these concerns behind their backward-looking, NIMBY (not in my backyard) agenda, the vast majority of progressive leaders oppose S alongside counterparts in the civic, labor, business, homeless services, academic, and community arenas. Most important, ample evidence and independent research demonstrates that Measure S would worsen the problems it cynically purports to solve.

Several of the initiative’s provisions pose existential threats to the city’s prosperity and vibrancy. And its two more reasonable components are rapidly becoming superfluous as elected officials implement them through legislation.

1. The provision that threatens the most harm is a permanent ban on “spot-zoning” where specific properties get what is called “general plan amendment.” This may seem sensible but the underlying problem is that the City’s planning documents are badly out of date. The result is that a significant proportion of new construction of even the most sensible and appropriate kind needs the general plan amendments. The solution is updating the City’s community plans and thankfully, the Mayor and City Council have embarked on an accelerated effort to do this.

2. Another sweeping provision is a two-year ban on all development projects that require a zone change or “general plan amendment.” This ban would include the vast majority of the 100% affordable housing buildings targeted at the formerly homeless that we’re gearing up to build thanks to the passage of Measure HHH in November 2016. Measure S proponents claim that affordable developments are exempt, but that is true of only buildings that need a zone change, not ones that need a general plan amendment. Many of the 100% affordable complexes created already and in the works will need these amendments. Proponents’ response has been to make a classic NIMBY claim that affordable housing shouldn’t be built in certain neighborhoods. Moreover, this ban would include many of the mixed-use, mixed-income buildings that are emerging on previously commercial or vacant land on major boulevards across the city, including affluent neighborhoods that have under-built over the last couple decades.
3. The third troubling component of Measure S is that it permanently and rigidly limits the ability of the City Planning Commission to reduce the amount of on-site parking required for a new building. This provision reveals the true intent of the initiative’s sponsors. They claim to care about the lack of affordable housing and the increase in car traffic, but high parking requirements contribute to these problems. Every additional parking space increases construction costs by upwards of $50,000, ensuring that new apartments rent only to the wealthiest Angelenos. Including ample parking also encourages more vehicle use. If we concentrate new housing near mass transit, and include less parking, we can decrease car use and reduce the cost of housing at the same time.

Two of Measure S’s more reasonable concepts — more regular update of the City’s 35 Community Plans and more impartial assessments of development impacts — are already in the process of being implemented. In any case, their merits wouldn’t outweigh the immense danger posed by the initiative’s core components.

There are real problems in Los Angeles related to the city’s outdated zoning, the crisis of housing affordability, traffic congestion, and a pay-to-play culture at City Hall. But there are better solutions to those problems — some of which were just approved by the city’s voters in November — and Measure S will interfere with these far more intelligent approaches.

Measure S backers’ claims to care about affordable housing quickly evaporate on closer inspection. Nearly the entire multi-million dollar budget for their campaign comes from the AIDS Healthcare Foundation, led by Michael Weinstein, which has long since strayed from its stated mission. Weinstein is the force who railroaded through onerous workplace requirements on adult actors, contrary to their expressed wishes. He only entered land use and planning issues when the construction of two towers in Hollywood threatened views from the 22nd floor of his organization’s offices in Hollywood. The other major part of the initiative’s funding comes from LA’s former Republican Mayor, Richard Riordan. Riordan was never known to advocate for housing affordability. Most recently, he’s been quoted decrying new development for making it difficult to drive from his Brentwood home to the downtown theatre.

Measure S will accelerate the destruction of housing that is naturally lower priced and older housing that is rent-controlled and thus affordable to long-time tenants. A ban on zone changes means that developers will no longer look to construct new housing on boulevards or other areas that are currently zoned in ways that don’t allow for the mixed use buildings (retail on the street, housing on top) that we love for creating a vibrant urban street life. So in the search for profit, developers will naturally turn to places where they won’t encounter any legal obstacles. The prime areas for that development are existing residential neighborhoods, full of older, rent-controlled apartment buildings, which are already zoned for more height and density.
For the last several decades, LA has not constructed enough new housing to keep up with its growing population. Despite claims of a rabid over-construction, new units are coming up at a slower rate than any time since the 1940s. This constrained supply is a big part of the reason that market-rate prices are rapidly rising. It would have made sense to build more housing on the Westside, for example, where there’s a huge concentration of jobs, but NIMBYs who feared any changes to the “character” (e.g. architecture and ethnic demographics) of their neighborhoods staved off up-zoning and new construction in general by pressuring their City Council members to steer developers toward other parts of the city. So developers focused their new construction on places with less power to resist, namely neighborhoods that were predominantly inhabited by low-income people and communities of color. Rising rents citywide and displacement specific to gentrifying neighborhoods are major factors in the ever-increasing number of people without homes in our city.

It is the height of hypocrisy and a sad irony that the NIMBY homeowner-backed Measure S coalition is now highlighting these developments as a reason to freeze all development across the city. When new community plans are prepared over the next decade (whether or not Measure S passes), you can be sure that most of Measure S’ home-owning supporters will be sure to lobby intensely against new housing and especially new affordable housing in their own neighborhoods. It is also worth emphasizing that Measure S does not contain any tools that actually produce or preserve affordable housing, contrary to claims of its backers.

Developer influence at City Hall, fueled by their generous campaign contributions, is a real problem, but banning all of the City’s discretion is not the answer. In fact, the problem of City Hall handing out favors to developers without any benefit to community in return has been squarely addressed by Measure JJJ, which voters overwhelmingly approved in November 2016. Backed by a wide coalition of community, environmental, tenants rights, social justice, and labor groups, that initiative requires that affordable housing and quality local jobs be part of any new development that receives a zone change or general plan amendment.

The negative economic impacts of Measure S are staggering. A recent study found that least 12,000 jobs would be lost if it passed. The city’s economic activity would decrease by almost $2 billion annually. And government revenue from fees and taxes would decline by over $100 million a year, forcing cutbacks in all kinds of city services.

Measure S is a dishonest disaster; we strongly urge you to vote against it. Tell your friends too — NO on S. This is going to be a very low turnout election so every single vote is going to matter immensely.
SUPPORTERS

The Coalition to Preserve LA, led by former LA Weekly editor Jill Stewart, is the umbrella group spearheading S. Nearly all of the funding comes from the AIDS Healthcare Foundation, led by Michael Weinstein, and from Republican billionaire Richard J. Riordan. Most of the supporters are homeowner and property owners associations in more affluent parts of LA. The only renters group in support is the upstart LA Tenants Union. There are a small number of older generation liberal groups in support such as the Progressive Democrats of the Santa Monica Mountains, Ballona Wetlands Institute, and Southern California Americans for Democratic Action.

OPPONENTS

Homeless-Serving Organizations: Chrysalis; Concerned Citizens of South Central Los Angeles; Downtown Women's Center; Homeless Health Care Los Angeles; Hope of the Valley Rescue Mission; Housing Works; Midtown Los Angeles Homeless Coalition; PATH Ventures; Shelter Partnership;

Political: LA County Democratic Party; LA County Green Party; East Area Progressive Democrats; San Fernando Valley Young Democrats; North Valley Democratic Club; Miracle Mile Democratic Club; Stonewall Democratic Club.

Environment: Climate Resolve; League of Conservation Voters; Natl Resources Defense Council (NRDC); People for Parks; Trust for Public Land.

Community, Tenants and Social Justice Organizations:
Alliance for Community Transit – Los Angeles (ACT-LA)
American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) Southern California
Bend the Arc: A Jewish Partnership for Justice
Bet Tzedek
Coalition for Economic Survival (CES)
Community Health Councils (CHC)
East LA Community Corporation (ELACC)
Inner City Law Center
Investing in Place
Koreatown Immigrant Workers Alliance (KIWA)
LA Neighborhood Land Trust
LA Voice – a multiracial network of 60+ churches, synagogues & mosques
Leadership for Urban Renewal Network (LURN)
Little Tokyo Service Center (LTSC)
Multicultural Communities for Mobility (MCM)
Neighborhood Housing Services of LA County (NHS)
National Organization for Women (NOW), Hollywood
Pacoima Beautiful
Physicians for Social Responsibility – Los Angeles (PSR-LA)
Public Counsel
Southeast Asian Community Alliance (SEACA)
Southern California Association Of Non-Profit Housing (SCANPH)
Strategic Actions for a Just Economy (SAJE)
St. John’s Well Child and Family Center
Streets are for Everyone (SAFE)
United Way of Greater LA
Thai Community Development Center
TRUST South LA
Youth Policy Institute

**Labor:** LA County Federation of Labor; UNITE HERE Local 11; IBEW Local 11; LA County United Firefighters of LA City

With the passage of Prop 64 in November, California voters moved to legalize and regulate marijuana. A key part of this initiative was strong local control over commercial marijuana operations. So now the City of Los Angeles needs to determine how best to regulate this rapidly growing industry. Setting fair guidelines and appropriate business taxes through a deliberative democratic process is imperative. Measure M is the consensus solution because of the flexibility and opportunities for community input and democratic deliberation it requires. Measure N was an alternate “one-size-fits all” approach but it has been abandoned by its initial backers, who have rallied behind M instead. We recommend a Yes on M vote and a No on N.

**Measure M regulates commercial marijuana activity – both for existing medical and newly legalized recreational marijuana – through a system of public input, new business taxes, and penalties for violations.** Sponsored by City Council members, Measure M will allow the City Council and the Mayor to create a new regulatory framework after conducting extensive public hearings to take community input into consideration.

The regulation of marijuana is relatively uncharted territory for the City of Los Angeles. California has had medical marijuana thanks to a 1996 ballot proposition. In 2013, LA voters passed Proposition D to limit the proliferation of medical marijuana dispensaries. It granted “limited legal immunity” from prosecution to 135 already established businesses, but didn’t enable any other forms of regulation/taxation, allow the formation of new stores or provide enforcement mechanisms. With the passage of Prop 64 this past November, California now has a legal framework for all commercial activity related to marijuana including transportation, testing, research, manufacturing, and cultivation. New local regulations need to be established under this framework.

Measure M allows City Council and mayor permission to repeal Proposition D and institute a new, comprehensive system. It requires the City to hold public hearings around the city that will enable community input before these regulations are developed and adopted. There are provisions to 1) institute civil and criminal penalties for those who violate the regulations and 2) empower the City’s Department of Water and Power to shut off utilities in illegal establishments. The measure sets a local gross receipts tax of 10% for recreational retailers, 5% for medical retailers (down from 6%), and 1-2% for businesses who engage in cultivation, research and transportation.
This new system developed by the City will not be set in stone. The City Council and Mayor will have the power to revise the regulations in response to issues that come up in the process of implementation so Angelenos don’t need to legislate fixes at the ballot box again.

Prop 64’s legalization of pot was an important step in stemming the disproportionate targeting of communities of color for arrest and sentencing for possession of substances. It allowed non-violent marijuana offenders to petition for resentencing and imposed infractions upon youth offenders instead of automatic arrests and incarceration. That said, many community members have raised important concerns for the uneven impact of legalization on disadvantaged communities. In Denver, for instance, pot shops have disproportionately located in low-income neighborhoods. Likewise, those previously criminalized for the sale of marijuana ought to have equitable access to newly legal business opportunities. Profits should flow back into communities and not just to wealthy well-connected investors. Last but not least, we hope that workers, in this now legalized environment, receive union representation that advocates strongly for decent working conditions and living wages.

One of our favorite aspects of Measure M is its built-in correction mechanism, which allows for immediate feedback and reassessment. With the right coordination and effort, communities will be able to really shape this policy into something that works for everyone.

Voting for Measure M is just the first step. We must show up at public hearings and City Council meetings to ensure equity is incorporated into the implementation of this policy.

**SUPPORTERS**
- NAACP
- LA County Democratic Party
- LA County Federation of Labor
- UFCW Local 770
- LA Business Council
- Southern California Coalition
- Greater Los Angeles Collective Alliance
- United Cannabis Business Alliance (trade association medical marijuana dispensaries initially supporting Measure N)
- Charlie Beck, LA City Chief of Police

**OPPONENTS**
- No formally organized opposition we could find through our research.
No one currently supports Measure N. The initial proponents of Measure N have swung their support to Measure M. There is general agreement that Measure M better serves the City’s best interests.

Measure M contains provisions for extensive public input and wide latitude for the LA City Council, which will allow for a more democratic and more finely-tuned system of permitting, regulating, and taxation.

Measure N would not allow community input, democratic deliberation, or the ability to fix problems if/when they arise during implementation process.

Measure N's original sponsors were a coalition of LA city’s existing dispensaries — the United Cannabis Business Alliance. Measure N would establish a Department of Marijuana Regulation with responsibility for designing a permitting process and appropriate regulations. It would ban dispensaries within a small range of schools and other youth-serving facilities, while establishing a tax on recreational sales of 8%.

In general Measure N limits community input and democratic control. We urge you to vote NO.
Measure P changes the maximum term for franchise, concession, permit, license, and lease agreements issued by the Harbor Department from the current fifty (50) years to a new maximum of sixty-six (66) years.

Why are we voting on this? Because the length of leases is included in the City Charter so any amendments have to be voted on by the public. Why now? Because state law recently changed to allow leases up to 66 years, instead of 50 years as previously set. Why? Because it allows for more economic and financial certainty, which is good for business and good for government.

The City Council will still be required to give its approval for any long-term leases.

There is no organized opposition to this measure. It’s a technical fix with no obvious downside. There is no anticipated impact on the City’s general fund.

LA Forward recommends a YES vote on Measure P.