



ABC
Alliance for a
Better Community

2022 VOTER GUIDE

FOR AN EQUITABLE LOS ANGELES





Our mission is to advance social, economic, racial equity and justice for the Latino/a community and the Los Angeles region through power building and policy advocacy.

Alliance for a Better Community (ABC) is dedicated to educating and empowering all Latino/a voters in the Los Angeles area to make their voices heard by casting a ballot. By doing this, we may fight for a bright future in which Latino/as are completely integrated into and gain from a prosperous community with enhanced quality of life in education, health, housing, and civic participation. Latino/a voters have the power to shift resources and drive investments into communities. The purpose of ABC's voter guide is to aid you in understanding your ballot and assisting you in supporting local and state initiatives that advance and broaden possibilities for all communities, with a particular focus on the impact on the Latino/a community in the Los Angeles region.

YOUR VOTE MATTERS.

Los Angeles has the highest percentage of Latino/a voters in the entire country

There are nearly **1.2 million** Latino/a voters in Los Angeles County

This November, Latino/a voters will make up more than **two in five** of all Los Angeles County voters

IMPORTANT DATES

October 10

Vote-by-mail ballots begin to be mailed out

October 10 - November 7

Early voting sites are open

October 24

Last day to register to vote

October 25 - November 8

Same day registration available

November 8

Election Day: Polls will be open from 7:00 am to 8:00 pm. Remember you can cast your ballot at any voting location!



Refer to this symbol throughout the voter guide to learn how each issue directly affects Latino/as.

STATE PROPOSITIONS

YES ON PROP 1

Proposition 1 would amend the California Constitution to establish a right to reproductive freedom, including the right to an abortion. Abortion has been legal in California since 1967, but this would declare through the state constitution the right for Californians to choose to have an abortion and right to choose or refuse contraceptives. **Vote Yes on Proposition 1 to guarantee Californians the right to reproductive freedom and choice!**

 Latina/xs make up 25% of abortion patients across the country and generally have less access to reproductive healthcare and experience poorer health outcomes.

NO ON PROP 26

Proposition 26 would legalize sports betting at Native American tribal casinos in California for professional, college, or amateur sports and athletic events, with the exception of high school sports and events featuring a California college team. It also allows the state's four privately operated racetracks to offer sports betting to people 21 years of age and older with all bets required to be made in person at the track. **Vote No on Props 26 and 27 to keep online and in-person sports gambling out of reach from our communities!**

 The effects that Proposition 26 has on Latino/as are similar to that of Proposition 27, and therefore have been combined under the Proposition 27 explanation.

NO ON PROP 27

Proposition 27 would allow licensed tribes and gaming companies to offer mobile and online sports betting for adults 21 and older outside Native American tribal lands. The proposition creates a new division within the state's Justice Department to regulate online sports wagering and also gives the Justice Department additional powers to address illegal sports betting. Prop 27 would authorize a massive expansion of online sports gambling in California, turning every cell phone, laptop, tablet, and even video game console into a gambling device, opening up online gambling to anyone, anywhere, anytime. **Vote No on Props 26 and 27 to keep online and in-person sports gambling out of reach from our communities!**

 A survey by the Global Sport Institute at Arizona State University shows young Latino males are more likely than other racial groups to place bets on sports most frequently. Additional research shows approximately 631,873 Latino/as in the U.S. suffer from disordered gambling - covering both the clinical diagnosis of a gambling disorder and subclinical problem gambling. Studies have shown that Latino/as with gambling disorders are more likely to have other mental health conditions, including mood, anxiety, personality, and substance use disorders than their white counterparts, who also gamble regularly. There are fewer resources for Latino/as with gambling addiction to access the proper treatment and care that represent the cultural and linguistic needs of this demographic.

YES ON PROP 28

Proposition 28 would require the state of California to allocate 1% of Proposition 98 funding - money required to go to public schools and community colleges in the state budget - for music and arts education. The allocated funding, estimated at about \$1 billion, will be distributed based on enrollment data and will prioritize schools with high levels of low-income students. This will directly benefit Black and Latino/a students that make up 77% of public school enrollment in low-income communities across the state. Eighty percent of the funding going towards school districts must be spent on hiring arts and music instructors, and districts will be required to publish annual reports on how they spend the money. **Vote Yes on Prop 28 to bring more resources into arts and music education for our students!**

 Only one in five public schools in California have a dedicated teacher for traditional arts programs like music, dance, theater, and art, or newer forms of creative expression like computer graphics, animation, coding, costume design, and filmmaking. Arts and music education improves cognitive development, reasoning, and language acquisition. It corresponds with higher student achievement in reading and math and leads to increased school attendance. Black and Latino/a children are most likely to lack access to arts education. In the Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD), 80% of our students are low-income and therefore would benefit from the increased allocation of resources.



STATE PROPOSITIONS

YES ON PROP 29

Proposition 29 would require a physician, nurse practitioner, or physician assistant with at least six months of relevant experience to be on site during treatment at outpatient kidney dialysis clinics. It would also require clinics to disclose to patients all the physicians with clinic ownership interest of 5% or more, and require clinics to report dialysis-related infection data to the state. This proposition would prohibit clinics from closing or substantially reducing services without state approval and it prohibits clinics from refusing to treat patients based on source of payment. **Vote Yes on Prop 29 to increase accountability and improve worker and patient safety in California dialysis clinics!**

 About 14% of Latino/as have chronic kidney disease which requires dialysis treatment. Since 2000, the number of Latino/as with kidney failure has increased by more than 70%. Latino/as are 1.5 times more likely than non-Latino/as to develop kidney failure.

NEUTRAL ON PROP 30

Proposition 30 would impose a 1.75% personal income tax increase on Californians making more than \$2 million per year to fund state subsidy programs for zero-emission vehicles and also fund wildfire response and prevention. The proposition is estimated to raise between \$3 to \$5 billion annually. However, California currently already has existing state programs to help subsidize the purchase of low-emission or zero-emission vehicles. Since 2010, California has allocated more than \$1.84 billion to three programs: the Clean Cars 4 All Program, the Clean Vehicle Rebate Project, and the Clean Vehicle Assistance Program. Over those 12 years, about half a million Californians have received grants or rebates for buying cleaner cars or replacing older cars. Additionally, the state has recently dedicated an additional \$10 billion over the next five years to those programs in this year's budget. **ABC is taking a Neutral position on Proposition 30.**

 Due to a lack of clarity on how this will directly impact the Latino/a community, separate from the existing and future programs and initiatives, ABC has a neutral position on Proposition 30.

YES ON PROP 31

Proposition 31 is the flavored tobacco products ban referendum. This is based on the 2020 Senate Bill 793 which was designed to ban the sale of flavored tobacco products and tobacco product flavor enhancers and was signed into law by Governor Newsom in 2020. Prop 31 will decide whether to overturn the 2020 law that prohibits the sale of some flavored tobacco products. A "yes" vote upholds the current law; a "no" vote would strike down the law and allow the sale of flavored tobacco products. **Vote Yes on Prop 31 to keep flavored tobacco products out of our communities and out of children's reach!**

 The tobacco industry specifically targets and entices the Latino/a community with products using Spanish words in the name and other cultural references. Data has also shown that Latino/a communities have higher densities of tobacco retailers, especially if they have high proportions of both Latino/a and low-income residents. Flavored tobacco products are particularly popular among youth and have demonstrated to be a significant issue in our communities. In 2021, 80.2% of high school students and 74.6% of middle school students who used tobacco products in the past 30 days reported using a flavored tobacco product during that time.

**JOIN US
IN OUR
MISSION**
afabc.org

 @afabcla
 @afabc_la
 @afabc_la



LA COUNTY MEASURES

YES ON MEASURE A

Measure A would give the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors the authority to remove an elected Los Angeles County Sheriff for cause. Grounds for removal would include a violation of any law related to the performance of Sheriff duties; flagrant or repeated neglect of duties; a misappropriation of public funds or property; willful falsification of a relevant official statement or document; or obstruction of any investigation into the conduct of the Sheriff by the Inspector General, Sheriff Civilian Oversight Commission, or any government agency with jurisdiction to conduct such an investigation. This measure would create the process to remove an elected Sheriff for cause, requiring a four out of five majority vote by the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors to remove the Sheriff. **Vote Yes on Measure A to ensure that we hold all Los Angeles County Sheriffs accountable to their duties and to the communities they serve!**

 Los Angeles County has had a history of “cop gangs” that have unjustly targeted young men of color in minority communities, particularly Black and Brown men. Although several elected Sheriffs have been called into question about these said “cop gangs,” all have refused to participate in active investigations.



Note: ABC also conducted an analysis on Los Angeles County Measure C: Cannabis Business Tax. However, ABC did not take a position on Measure C and therefore it is not included in the Voter Guide.

NO ON LACCD BOND MEASURE

The Los Angeles Community College District (LACCD) Bond Measure would authorize a \$5,300,000,000 bond, creating a property tax for homeowners in Los Angeles County that would levy about \$25 per \$100,000 of property value. This would generate about \$345,000,000 annually while bonds are outstanding. This measure would aim to repair and/or upgrade local community colleges classrooms, water pipes, sewer, gas lines, technology, and science labs for nurses, paramedics, firefighters, and veterans; prepare students for jobs or university transfer; remove asbestos and lead paint; and acquire, construct, and repair facilities, sites, and equipment. If this Proposition were to pass there would be no tiered implementation plan which would disproportionately impact low income homeowners. **Vote No on the LACCD Bond Measure to protect struggling homeowners in Los Angeles County and to help slow the rising cost of living!**

 A recent survey done by the Public Policy Institute of California (PPIC) said that Californian’s name the economy and inflation as the top issue facing the state. And that 38% of Californians—and 50% of lower-income adults—report serious hardships from rising prices. Many Latino/a homeowners in Los Angeles County are already struggling to get by, and increasing property taxes right now could be detrimental to some of our most vulnerable Latino/a communities.

ABC Choice of Terminology

The U.S. Census defines “Latino/a” as any person of “Cuban, Mexican, Puerto Rican, South or Central American, or other Spanish culture or origin.” Latino may be of any race, such as White, Black, or Asian, and may speak any language, such as Spanish, Portuguese, Mixteco, or English. ABC does not use the term “Hispanic,” which typically relates to Spanish-speaking countries. The term “Chicano” refers only to individuals of Mexican origin or descent and was a symbol of pride during the Chicano Movement of the 1960s. Recently, the term “Latinx” has emerged as an alternative to “Latino/a” replacing the Spanish gendered suffix of “o” and “a” with “x.” Proponents argue the emerging term supports gender neutrality while opponents argue “Latinx” imposes American values onto the Spanish language. ABC uses “Latino/a” in our publications with two exceptions: 1) content by guest authors, and 2) when referring to the LGBTQ+ community because many in the community identify with “Latinx.” The term continues to be under debate.