

COMPARISON OF PROP. 98 (Rent Control Rollback) & PROP. 99 (Homeowner Protection Act)

PROVISIONS	Prop. 98 (Rent Control Rollback)	Prop. 99 (Homeowner Protection Act)
EMINENT DOMAIN FOR PRIVATE DEVELOPMENT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Redefines “public use” to prohibit taking any property to convey to private party, including homes and commercial properties. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Constitutional prohibition on taking owner-occupied homes for conveyance to private party.
RENT CONTROL	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Prop. 98 would abolish rent control laws in California. ▪ More than 85% of funding to qualify Prop. 98 comes from mobile home and apartment owners and associations that represent them. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No changes to state or local rent control laws or ordinances.
IMPACT ON AFFORDABLE HOUSING AND TENANT PROTECTION LAWS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ According to Western Center on Law and Poverty, Prop. 98 will invalidate inclusionary housing requirements that require a certain number of units to be affordable to low-income families. ▪ According to Western Center on Law and Poverty, Prop. 98 will likely eliminate tenant protection laws, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Laws governing return of rental deposits. ○ Tenant notice periods, such as 60-day notice requirement prior to forcing renters out of unit. ○ Protections regarding terminations of tenancy. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No changes to laws dealing with tenant protections and or affordable housing requirements
EMINENT DOMAIN FOR TRADITIONAL PUBLIC WORKS PROJECTS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Prop. 98 includes provisions that will increase taxpayer costs and cause delays for traditional public works projects like schools, roads, bridges and other projects. ▪ Section 19(b)(5) changes constitutional definition of “just compensation”, adding new requirements that will make all property acquisitions vastly more expensive, including required payments for attorneys fees if jury awards even \$1 more than agency offered. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Does not change or limit acquisitions for traditional public works like schools, roads, bridges and other projects.

<p style="text-align: center;">PROVISIONS</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Prop. 98 (Rent Control Rollback)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Prop. 99 (Homeowner Protection Act)</p>
<p>REGULATORY TAKINGS PROVISIONS</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Contrary to claims by opponents, buried in definitions section of initiative are new constitutional changes that would prohibit certain regulatory actions regulating use of real property. ▪ Section 19(b)(3) prohibits “<i>regulation of the ownership, occupancy or use of privately owned real property or associated property rights in order to transfer economic benefit to one or more private persons at the expense of the property owner</i>”. ▪ According to an analysis conducted by one of the state’s leading environmental law firms, Shute, Mihaly & Weinberger, “nearly all regulation provides an economic benefit to some private person. Accordingly, although the Initiative is ambiguous in several significant areas, a court could interpret it to restrict a host of environmental and land use regulations...” 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No changes to laws surrounding regulatory takings.
<p>IMPACT ON ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTIONS AND LAND-USE REGULATION</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Prop. 98 changes existing law and would wreak havoc on local land-use planning and environmental protections. ▪ According to the Shute, Mihaly & Weinberger analysis, “there is a substantial risk... that (the initiative) would be broadly construed to prevent the enforcement of many existing environmental regulations as well as the adoption of new laws and policies to protect the environment”. ▪ SMW legal analysis also warns that Prop. 98 “appears to impair a broader class of environmental protections than did Proposition 90.” ▪ Unlike Proposition 90 (which required compensation for regulations that caused economic damages), Proposition 98 outright <i>prohibits</i> such laws and regulations that “transfer economic benefits”. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No changes to environmental laws or regulations.

<p style="text-align: center;">PROVISIONS</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Prop. 98 (Rent Control Rollback)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Prop. 99 (Homeowner Protection Act)</p>
<p>IMPACT ON WATER PROJECTS</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Prop. 98 would prohibit the use of eminent domain to acquire land and water to develop <i>public</i> water projects. ▪ The Association of California Water Agencies warns Prop. 98 could “<i>derail efforts to build the infrastructure and other water projects we need to ensure an adequate supply of safe, clean drinking water.</i>” ▪ The Western Growers Association warns Prop. 98 could “<i>block future development of surface water storage and conveyance.</i>” ▪ That’s because Prop. 98’s proposed amendment to Section 19(a) of the constitution prohibits the taking of private property for “private use.” Proposed section 19(b)(3)(ii) defines “private use” as including: <i>transfer of ownership, occupancy or use of private property or associated property rights to a public agency for the consumption of natural resources</i> or for the same or a substantially similar use as that made by the private owner; (Emphasis added.) ▪ Since virtually all elements of a public water project involve the “consumption of natural resources”, Prop. 98 would prohibit property acquisitions for public water projects. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No change and no impact on public water projects or any other traditional public works project.
<p>PUBLIC HEALTH AND SAFETY EXEMPTIONS</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Changes to Section 19(b)(3) contain <i>no exceptions for actions taken to protect health and safety.</i> ▪ Land-use decisions (such as restrictions on building in unsafe areas, or zoning decisions to protect residents from undesirable or unsafe businesses) could be ruled prohibited under Proposition 98. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Measure preserves ability to protect public health and safety. ▪ Prop. 99 contains specific public health and safety exemptions to eminent domain restrictions. Language permits the use of eminent domain to protect public health and safety; preventing serious and repeated criminal activity; response to an emergency; and to remedy environmental contamination. <i>Proposed Sec 19(i).</i>

PROVISIONS	Prop. 98 (Rent Control Rollback)	Prop. 99 (Homeowner Protection Act)
CHANGES TO BALANCE OF POWER BETWEEN JUDICIARY AND LEGISLATIVE BRANCHES OF GOVERNMENT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Prop. 98 would shift power from locally elected legislative bodies to the courts by: (a) mandating that courts essentially ignore the local governments' legislative deliberations in all eminent domain proceedings when cases are challenged in court, and (b) permitting the introduction of new evidence in court cases that was never presented to the public agency. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No changes to balance of power.
PROVISIONS DEALING WITH OTHER MEASURE ON SAME BALLOT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ NONE 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Should Prop. 99 pass with more votes than Prop. 98, Proposition 98 would be nullified.
TIMING OF APPLICATION	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Regulatory takings provisions in Prop 98 could apply to EXISTING laws and regulations, as well as future laws. ▪ Provisions abolishing rent control apply to future rent control laws and rent control protections abolished when unit is vacated. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Applies to future eminent domain actions.