

ARLETA NEIGHBORHOOD COUNCIL: COMMUNITY IMPACT STATEMENT

May 17, 2022

RE: *In Opposition to Assembly Constitutional Amendment 1*

Dear Councilmembers:

We write to you to inform that the Arleta Neighborhood Council opposes Assembly Constitutional Amendment 1 (ACA-1 2021-2022). ACA-1 seeks to amend the California Constitution's Sections 1 and 4 of Article XIII A thereof, by amending Section 2 of, and by Section 2.5 to, Article XIII C thereof, by amending Section 3 of Article XIII D thereof, and by amending Section 18 of Article XVI thereof, relating to local finance.¹ To be clear ACA-1 nullifies taxpayer protections that were codified into state law by California voters on June 6, 1978 through Proposition 13, among other things.

The California Constitution, Article XIII D, on assessment and property-related fees, reads:

- (a) No tax, assessment, fee, or charge shall be assessed by any agency upon any parcel of property or upon any person as an incident of property ownership except:
- (1) The ad valorem property tax imposed pursuant to Article XIII and Article XIII A.
 - (2) Any special tax receiving a two-thirds vote pursuant to Section 4 of Article XIII A.
- (Cal. Const., art XIII D, § 3, subd. (a), par. (2)).²

The proposed bill by Assemblywoman Lorena Gonzalez and principal coauthor State Senator Scott Weiner has Section 3(a)(2) read as follows:

Any special tax receiving a two-thirds vote pursuant to Section 4 of Article XIII A or receiving a 55-percent approval pursuant to Section 2.5 of Article XIII C.

This allows local governments to lower the voter approval threshold for tax increases from two-thirds to 55 percent and so not only nullifies Proposition 13 (1978) altogether but suppresses the victorious outcome of the landmark initiative measure process made by California voters 44 years ago. For decades legislators have attacked both Proposition 13 and the California Environmental Quality Act and ACA-1 proves that those attacks continue to this day.

Furthermore, ACA-1 codifies the state of homelessness as a situation that will require **permanent financial backing by California taxpayers**. Read the following proposed material:

Bonded indebtedness incurred by a city, county, city and county, or special district for the construction, reconstruction, rehabilitation, or replacement of public infrastructure, affordable housing, or permanent supportive housing for persons at risk of chronic homelessness, including persons with mental illness, or the acquisition or lease of real property for public infrastructure, affordable housing, or permanent supportive housing for persons at risk of chronic homelessness, including persons with mental illness, approved by 55 percent of the voters of the city, county, city and county, or special district, as appropriate, voting on the proposition on or after the effective date of the measure adding this paragraph... (proposed Cal. Const., art XIII, § 1, subd. (b), par. (4), cl. (A)).

¹ https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billTextClient.xhtml?bill_id=202120220ACA1

² https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes_displayText.xhtml?lawCode=CONS&division=&title=&part=&chapter=&article=XIII%20D

ARLETA NEIGHBORHOOD COUNCIL: COMMUNITY IMPACT STATEMENT

The homelessness industrial complex in California seeks permanence in the state and there is no doubt that more homeless individuals from across the nation, or those opting out of being productive members of society and usefulness locally, will *continue to arrive and thrive in Los Angeles as they seek—and obtain—services absent elsewhere in other states, thus, further exacerbating the homelessness crisis as it is.*

There is no foreseeable end in sight to the homelessness crisis yet the East San Fernando Valley was singled out to receive more than its fair share of homeless shelters via Project Homekey unlike the rest of the San Fernando Valley. The East San Fernando Valley already has a concentration of substance abuse centers and homeless shelters/related services and Project Homekey, a program that local voters did not approve, was not advertised nor promoted in the neighborhood council system or by any office/agency of the City of Los Angeles so as to allow for discussions by members of the public so that residents could have a say so in the matter and be able to either support or oppose the decisions being made by both elected and unelected officials. Impacted residents—voters or not—were never consulted with to host such facilities by any government agency or office. Instead, nonprofit organizations contracted to operate these homeless shelter facilities have been tasked to perform communication with members of the public—an activity not even minuscule to date and unknown if carried out either—on behalf of elected officials and/or government agencies. Just because decisions, votes, and resolutions are passed at City Hall does not mean that the average impacted resident was made aware of a situation that will impact his/her property, privacy, and security. Not informing impacted residents is also disenfranchisement. The residents of Arleta and the San Fernando Valley altogether have not been informed whether these homeless shelters are temporary or permanent. With all the equity discourse taking place in Sacramento and at City Hall the fact remains that again people of color and low-income status (as evident in Van Nuys, Arleta, Sun Valley, Pacoima, and North Hills (east of the 405 freeway)) continue to bear the brunt of inequities and be “stepped on” (or ignored/misrepresented) by their elected officials. Woodland Hills and Studio City have motels and hotels yet they are not being acquired by the City of Los Angeles to be converted into homeless shelters through Project Homekey. Why is that?

Angelenos are not ATMs and yet more taxes are being engineered by the State of California and local governments on top of existing astronomical taxes; therefore, the Arleta Neighborhood Council opposes ACA-1 and it requests that the City Council do the same and communicate with, but not limited to, county and state legislators to also oppose this bill.

Respectfully,

The Arleta Neighborhood Council

Opinions expressed in this Community Impact Statement are those of the Arleta Neighborhood Council and not necessarily those of the City of Los Angeles.

cc:

Council District 1: Gil Cedillo
Council District 2: Paul Krekorian
Council District 3: Bob Blumenfield
Council District 4: Nithya Raman
Council District 5: Paul Koretz
Council District 6: Nury Martinez
Council District 7: Monica Rodriguez
Council District 8: Marqueece Harris Dawson

Council District 9: Curren D Price Jr
Council District 10: Mark Ridley-Thomas
Council District 11: Mike Bonin
Council District 12: John Lee
Council District 13: Mitch O'Farrell
Council District 14: Kevin De Leon
Council District 15: Joe Buscaino

CIC DRAFT

May 3, 2022

0 Yea 0 No 0 Absent 0 Abstain