



General Meeting — 7p.m. Wednesday, July 10, 2019 Veterans Memorial Building, 4117 Overland Avenue Meeting program: Loraine Lundquist, candidate for Los Angeles City Council, will speak to the Club

President's Message by Pete Rockwell

Why I'm proud to be a Democrat

I was 22 years old the first time I had a chance to vote for President. It was 1968.

Martin Luther King and Robert Kennedy had just been assassinated and Richard Daley, mayor of Chicago, had just stolen the Democratic Presidential nomination and given it to Hubert Humphrey.

I had just become a father.

Humphrey was running against Richard Nixon. I was familiar with Nixon because he'd been Vice President to Eisenhower for eight years. I didn't like him. Nobody in my family did. We were Irish Catholic so we liked the Kennedys. A lot of people liked Kennedys back in those days, but people kept shooting them.

Anyway, it was the first time I was old enough to vote for President and I didn't even vote. I would never have voted for Nixon, but I also just couldn't bring myself to vote for Humphrey. He was too identified with the Vietnam War in my mind.

So I didn't vote. Nixon became President. He ordered the secret bombing of Cambodia. He ordered the Watergate coverup. I never made that mistake again.

Since 1968 I've voted in every Presidential election, and I've always voted for the Democrat.

I have a friend who is very active in politics, but he won't join a political party. He told me he was thinking of becoming a Democrat so he could join the Culver City Democratic Club and

have a vote when the Club endorses candidates. He's reluctant to register as a Democrat though. For years my friend has thought about the Democratic Party as too conservative for him. Now his first choice for President, Bernie Sanders, is running as a Democrat, and, for a while, he was leading in the polls.

I told my friend that he should join the Democratic Party and work to make it better from the inside. The Democrats will always be better for working people than the Republicans because of where the two parties get their support.

Republicans get tidal waves of money from a relatively small group of billionaires.

Democrats would not exist if it weren't for the support of a number of groups: unions, peace groups, women's groups, environmental groups and civil rights groups.

I will always trust the party that's supported by the labor movement, the civil rights movement and the environmental movement before I trust a party like the Republicans, who are supported by the Koch brothers.

The truth is, only two parties matter in the United States: Democrats and Republicans. They are the only two that have a chance to win the White House.

I'm proud to be a Democrat because they're always going to defend the interests of working people. They have to, or they will lose the support of all those worker-friendly groups like labor unions.

Upcoming Events

July 4, 2019

Club Picnic – Blanco Park
Bring your own reusable plates, cups & cutlery

July 8, 2019

City Council Meeting

July 10, 2019

CCDC General Meeting

July 11, 2019

Community Meeting
Regarding Inglewood Oil Field/Amortization Study
City Council Chambers
5:00 PM

July 17, 2019

Robert Mueller testifies
before Congress

July 30 & 31, 2019

Second Democratic
Presidential Candidates'
Debates

August 13, 2019

Runoff election for
LA City Council District 12
Loraine Lundquist
is the only Democrat running

SAVE THE DATE
August 23–25, 2019
Fiesta La Ballona

Di's Corner: by Diane Rosenberg

At our Executive Board meeting on April 13 former President Amy Cherness was made Associate Member of the LACDP. On May 14 at the LACDP meeting Club Treasurer Eric Fine was selected as "Democrat of the Year" by the 54th Assembly District Delegates for 2019. And the Club congratulates both of them.

□ □ □

At our General Meeting on June 12 There was an election of potential delegates to represent the Club at the state pre-endorsement conference. There were eight candidates: Carlene Brown, Amy Cherness, Darryl Cherness, Robert Leahy, Sylvia Moore, Andy Rosenberg, Diane Rosenberg and John Williams. On the first ballot Carlene Brown, Sylvia Moore and Diane Rosenberg were elected. Amy Cherness, Darryl Cherness and Robert Leahy tied. There was a second ballot. Amy Cherness and Robert Leahy got the most votes in the second ballot. The Club congratulates Carlene Brown, Sylvia Moore, Diane Rosenberg, Amy Cherness and Robert Leahy.

Vote on whether to endorse legislation

At the July 10 membership meeting we will vote on whether to endorse three bills that we heard about from the California Clean Money Campaign at our May meeting. They are:

- SB 47, the Petition Disclose Act;
- SB 636, the Ballot Disclose Act; and
- AB 1217, the Issue Ad Disclose Act.

The purpose of all three of these bills is to require much greater transparency and more information about ballot measures for California voters. (The California Clean Money Campaign's website is www.caclean.org)

I've added four pages to the online version of the newsletter with detailed information about these three bills. If you receive the paper newsletter you can find the online version on the Club website: http://culvercitydemocraticclub.com/wp-content/newsletters/2019_07_CCDC_Newsletter.pdf



Loraine Lundquist in runoff with Republican for LA City Council

Democratic Party, the Sierra Club and labor unions among others. At our meeting on July 10, 2019, we will consider adding our endorsement to theirs.

I met Loraine at a meeting of the Progressive Democrats of America, and I can tell you that she is the real deal. She is a scientist, educator, community advocate, and mom. All of that inspires her to be an advocate for solutions to the threat of climate catastrophe. For more information about her impressive qualifications, please go to www.loraineforla.com.

We have invited her to come and speak at our July 10 meeting. Please come and give her a warm Culver City welcome!

— By Cynthia Hart

On August 13, 2019, voters in Los Angeles City Council District #12 will have an opportunity to turn that Council seat blue by electing Loraine Lundquist for City Council. She already carries the endorsement of the Los Angeles Times, the Los Angeles County

Culver City Democratic Club Application/Renewal Form

Name: _____ Phone: _____

Email: _____

Address: _____

I declare that all the individuals listed for membership are registered Democrats

Signed: _____

Membership Dues: Dues may be waived for financial hardship

- Member \$30
- Student \$20
- Supporting Member \$75
- Sustaining Member \$125
- Lifetime Member \$500
- Additional Contribution: \$ _____

Please make your check payable to:
Culver City Democratic Club
P.O. Box 4254, Culver City, CA 90231-4254
OR Click "Join/Renew" on our web site: CulverCityDemocraticClub.com
For questions please call Membership Secretary Diane Rosenberg at (310) 398-5328.

Please check here to receive the **paper** newsletter in the mail

Please renew for 2019 if you haven't already done so.

The dues period runs concurrent to the calendar year.

Renewals are due by January 1st of each year. **NO REFUNDS.**

Tenants and advocates come together for tenant protections as Culver City takes first step towards rent stabilization

On Monday, June 24, the Protect Culver City Renters Coalition held a press conference in front of Culver City Hall with other tenants' rights advocates to show strong support for tenant protections in Culver City and across Los Angeles County. The press conference was held just prior to the Culver City Council's meeting where they voted 4 to 1 to move toward a temporary rent freeze. The rent freeze would be similar to the freeze passed last September and extended this past April in unincorporated Los Angeles County.

"This vote has been four years in the making, and is happening because of the continuous hard work of a few who represent many," said Daniel Lee, Culver City Council member and tenant. "As a tenant myself, I have felt the surge in rents, seen the fear renters have of speaking up, and experienced the devastation it is having on our community, destabilizing homes and pushing people onto the streets. As elected officials, it is our obligation to take action that protects those who are most vulnerable, which means instituting tenant protections now, starting with a rent freeze."

The highly anticipated vote came after Culver City first began debating the human costs of rising rents and rent control as a possible solution in 2015. While that debate did not result in a rent stabilization ordinance, it did lead to the election of a city council more supportive of responsible tenant protections. Now, in an effort to open up the dialogue around the housing crisis and enable renters to share their stories openly, advocates are asking for a temporary rent freeze that caps annual rent increases to 3%, as well as "just cause" eviction protections that will prevent landlords from evicting tenants to skirt the rent caps or intimidate renters.

"The city has welcomed development from large tech corporations without thinking through where these employees will live, nor how the current community will be impacted," said Katy Krantz, an organizer with the Protect Culver City Renters Coalition.

"While renters and homeowners want the prosperity of new development, it cannot continue to be at the cost of our most vulnerable people, some of whom have lived in our community for decades. In the four years since we began the conversation about our housing crisis, we've seen rents continue to rise aggressively. These rents have caused a staggering increase in homelessness, and it is simply unconscionable for us to look the other way as family after family is pushed out of our community and sometimes onto the streets."

While over 40% of Culver City residents rent their homes, tenants in Culver City do not have any legal protections, such as those in Los Angeles, Santa Monica, West Hollywood, and other nearby towns. Since 2009, homeowners' median monthly housing costs have increased only 2%, while renters' costs have risen by almost 40%. These rising costs aren't just leading to a loss of Culver City's racial and economic diversity. It's leading to homelessness.

At the beginning of this month, Los Angeles County released new data showing a 12% increase in the homeless population across the county, and disaggregated data revealed an even sharper increase within Culver City of over 60%. In the release of the data, the county pointed to a connection between rising rents and homelessness, which was further confirmed by a recent report by UCLA School of Law and Public Counsel.

"Rising rents and homelessness are not unique to Culver City," said Pamela Agustin, a tenant leader of the Glendale Tenants Union. All across the county, people are being pushed from their homes because they have little to no protections, but over the last three years, we've been building people power. From Glendale, to Inglewood, to Pomona, more and more tenants are standing up to demand rights that even the playing field between landlords and tenants, and we are winning."

On June 11, advocates in Inglewood achieved a major victory when their city council voted to enact rent stabilization with an annual 5% rent cap.

While the real estate lobby pushed for higher caps of 8%, tenants turned out in large numbers to offer public testimony on why the caps should be lower, which ultimately won over the board.

"What we're seeing is that you cannot beat people and the power of organizing," said Yesenia Miranda Meza, a tenant leader with Pomona United for Stable Housing. "When my neighbors and I faced steep rent increases and were threatened with eviction, we organized, fought back and won the opportunity to stay in our building. Then we collected nearly 3,000 signatures in favor of rent control and are taking our fight to the ballot box in 2020. What we saw in that first win, was more than a victory for ourselves, it was the possibility for a larger movement of empowered tenants who could use their voices to stabilize communities."

"I have the gavel... and I'm not afraid to use it!"



That's how Representative Maxine Waters opened our CDP Region 14 Meeting on April 13th.

She inspired us all to: "Get Ready for 2020"! because "California must lead the way!" Especially, she said, we must register voters! Get people voting so we can strengthen the party and take our country back! "We are not victims. We are voters!"

That's where Field Team 6 comes in. At our May 8, 2019, meeting the Team shared with us their plan to "Register Democrats!" and "Save the World". To join in a voter registration event, go to <https://www.fieldteam6.org/> and click on "Events."

Mueller Still Matters

By Cynthia Hart

Have you read the Mueller report yet? Yeah, me neither! Oh, I dutifully went to Amazon and bought the book. (There are several versions that include commentary from one or the other political perspective.) But read? All 448 pages? Uh, not yet.

I have searched hopefully for a cliff notes version, and that is more or less what Representative Karen Bass gave us at her June 15 town hall meeting on the Mueller report. Her power point primer on the subject is available on-line:

https://bass.house.gov/sites/karen-bass.house.gov/files/Mueller%20Report%20Meeting%20FINAL_0.pdf

It's been uploaded to our Club Facebook group

As for reading all 448 pages, Representative Bass suggests the executive summaries. As for buying the book, she suggests we download the real thing from her website at: Bass.House.gov/muellermaterials. (That way, you can impress your friends by quoting from the original page numbers!)

But why bother, anyway? Mueller didn't indict! Does his report still matter? Representative Bass, member of the House Judiciary Committee, believes it does. John Dean has said that Mueller provided the House with a road map to impeachment. Focus groups have found that people who are exposed to the actual report, change their thinking completely on the matter. The Mueller Report clearly does not say what Barr says it says!

So I plan to read the two executive summaries (one for each volume) before Mueller testifies on July 17. Who's with me?

Comments expressed in the newsletter are the opinions of the authors and do not necessarily represent the position of the Culver City Democratic Club

FOUR EXTRA PAGES

have been added to the online edition.

They contain detailed information on:

SB 47, the Petition Disclose Act;

SB 636, the Ballot Disclose Act; and

AB 1217, the Issue Ad Disclose Act.

General Meeting — 7p.m. Wednesday, July 10, 2019
Veterans Memorial Building, 4117 Overland Avenue
Meeting program: Loraine Lundquist, candidate
for Los Angeles City Council, will speak to the Club



Culver City Democratic Club Fourth of July Picnic

Blanco Park • 5687 Sawtelle Blvd. • Culver City
July 4, 2019 • 11:30 a.m. – 2:30 p.m.

Bring your own food to be put onto the barbecue and a dish to share. The club supplies the watermelon, ice, cold drinks, and charcoal.
In the spirit of our Green Dream pledge, please bring your own reusable plates, cups and silverware.

SB 47 – Petition DISCLOSE Act

SENATOR BEN ALLEN

SUMMARY

SB 47, the Petition DISCLOSE Act, helps voters make informed decisions by requiring initiative signature gatherers to disclose the top three funders of the committee organizing the campaign to voters before they sign to qualify the initiative for the ballot.

BACKGROUND

More than a century ago Governor Hiram Johnson introduced the initiative, referendum, and recall process to give ordinary Californians a fighting chance against powerful interests. But today only interests with lots of money are able to qualify ballot measures.

For the 2018 election, 37 initiatives qualified for circulation and 12 qualified for the ballot. And for 2016, a dizzying 115 initiatives qualified to circulate, and a near record 17 measures appeared on the November ballot. All of the propositions that qualified by signature gathering did so only after a million dollars or more was spent on paid signature gathering, with voters rarely knowing who the funders were.

Although committees supporting or opposing ballot measures must file periodic campaign finance reports, voters who sign petitions do not have easy access to this information when approached by a petition circulator. In fact, circulators are not required to know or disclose this information, even when asked.

Surveys consistently show that voters want improved public disclosure of the sources that fund ballot measures. The Public Policy Institute of California (PPIC) found greater than 70 percent support for increasing public disclosure of funding sources for initiative campaigns each of the eight times that it asked that question. A February 2018 poll by the California Clean Money Campaign found that 79% of likely voters supported “Requiring initiative signature gatherers to show voters the top funders paying for their signature gathering.” Support was across the board: 84% of Democrats, 78% of Independents, and 73% of Republicans.

SOLUTION

SB 47 makes an overwhelmingly popular, commonsense improvement to California’s current campaign disclosure laws by requiring initiative signature gatherers to show voters the top three funders of the committee paying for the petition circulation before they sign. They can do so either by showing voters an easily-printable “Official Top Funders Sheet” or by listing the top three funders on the initiative signature page itself. Committees can optionally also list up to 3 endorsing individuals, corporations, or non-profit organizations.

The top funders must be calculated the same way that the California DISCLOSE Act (AB 249, now in effect) calculates funders of political ads about ballot measures, including AB 249’s follow-the-money earmarking rules that identify the true source of funds for specific ballot measures even if they pass through multiple front groups. The top funders must be updated monthly.

SB 47 also makes printing of initiative petitions less expensive by allowing the text of initiatives to be stapled to the signature page rather than professionally bound, which allows initiative petitions to be printed at home.

Providing Californians with relevant facts about the source of money to qualify an initiative, referendum, or recall, and who endorses it, is a reasonable, important step the legislature can take to help voters make an informed decision about whether or not to sign a petition.

SUPPORT

California Clean Money Campaign (Sponsor)

CONTACT

Zak Castillo-Krings
Office of Senator Ben Allen
(916) 651-4026
zak.castillo-krings@sen.ca.gov

SB 636 – Ballot DISCLOSE Act

SENATOR HENRY STERN

SUMMARY

SB 636, the Ballot DISCLOSE Act, will help voters make informed decisions when they vote on state ballot measures, by modifying the ballot measure labels printed on the ballot to include a short list of supporters and opponents taken from the signers of the arguments in favor and against the measures in the voter pamphlet.

BACKGROUND

The ballot label for each state ballot measure that voters see on the ballot currently provides a limited selection of key information voters need: its title, a very brief objective summary, and a very brief summary of its fiscal analysis — all in a maximum of 75 words.

But one other piece of information voters most want to know about each ballot measure is missing from the ballot label: who's in favor of or against the measure. Putting on the ballot who supports and who opposes a ballot measure would provide voters with extremely important information to help them better evaluate and understand the value of the measure and make more informed decisions how to vote.

Although some well-funded ballot measure campaigns are able to spend enough to inform voters of the most important supporters or opponents (from their point of view), most campaigns don't have the financial resources to directly communicate that information to California's nearly 20 million registered voters in a way they'll remember when they vote. This is another unfair advantage enjoyed by ballot measure campaigns supported by wealthy interests.

Voters can find supporters and opponents of state ballot measures in the voter pamphlet by looking at who signed the official arguments in favor and against. But many voters can't get through the voter pamphlet in part because it is usually very long and dense. The 2018 General Election voter pamphlet was 96 pages long.

SOLUTION

SB 636 will show voters, on the ballot itself, the key information of who supports and opposes state ballot measures as listed in the official voter pamphlet for signers of the arguments in favor and against them.

It does so by allowing state ballot measure proponents to provide to the Secretary of State, when they submit their rebuttal arguments, a maximum 15-word list drawn from the signers of their voter pamphlet arguments in favor of the proposition and signers of their rebuttals to the

argument against the proposition. Likewise, the opponents would provide to the Secretary of State, when they submit their rebuttal arguments, a maximum 15-word listing of the signers of their voter pamphlet arguments against the proposition and signers of their rebuttals to the argument in favor the proposition.

The Secretary of State currently provides to counties a 75-word maximum ballot label for each state ballot measure, composed of the title, summary, and fiscal analysis, to print on the ballot. With SB 636, the Secretary of State will add to the end of each label "Supporters:" followed by the names of the ballot argument signers provided by the proponents, and "Opponents:" followed by the names of the ballot argument signers provided by the opponents.

Including in a ballot measure label the names of the voter pamphlet signers in favor of and against the measure will be a useful condensed summary of the arguments in the voter pamphlet in the same way that the current combination of title, summary, and fiscal analysis is a useful condensed summary of the full analysis by the legislative analyst in the voter pamphlet.

Adding a maximum 15-word list of supporters and opponents to each 75-word ballot label for state ballot measures will result in little if any increase in the overall length of ballots (depending on formatting) while providing voters with the crucial information they need to make better decisions at the time they most need it.

SUPPORT

California Clean Money Campaign (Sponsor)
 California League of Conservation Voters
 Consumer Watchdog
 Courage Campaign
 Endangered Habitats League
 GMO Free California
 Indivisible CA: StateStrong
 Maplight
 Money Out Voters In
 New Progressive Alliance
 People Demanding Action
 RootsAction
 Voices for Progress

STAFF CONTACT

Eusevio Padilla
 Office of Senator Henry Stern
 (916) 651-4027
e.padilla@sen.ca.gov



PURPOSE

AB 1217 seeks to extend the California DISCLOSE Act, AB 249 (Mullin), to cover issue ads that are intended to influence legislative and administrative actions, and also close the loophole for electioneering communications that attack or support candidates during election season without expressly advocating for their election or defeat.

EXISTING LAW

In 2017, AB 249, the California DISCLOSE Act, was signed into law. The DISCLOSE Act made strides in addressing previous lax campaign finance disclosure policies. The measure improved the clarity of the formatting of disclosures of top funders of ballot measure and independent expenditure ads on TV, radio, print, and common forms of electronic media. It also established new earmarking rules to identify original donors to committees and ballot measures.

In 2018, AB 2188, the Social Media DISCLOSE Act, was signed into law to extend AB 249 to cover ads on social media and other online platforms like Facebook, Twitter, and Google.

Existing law requires persons who make \$50,000 or more in electioneering communications, within 45 days of an election, that clearly identify a state candidate but that don't expressly advocate their election or defeat, to report the payment. It does not require any disclosure on such ads.

BACKGROUND & PROBLEM

Issue advertisements that attempt to pressure legislators to influence legislative outcomes are a growing problem in California. For example, last year a group called "CALInnovates" placed over 400 ads on Facebook trying to kill the Net Neutrality bill (SB 822). In another example, while the legislature was debating bills on how to hold PG&E accountable for devastating wildfires, PG&E spent over \$6 million on "grassroots and other advocacy related to state legislative proposals". At the same time, television ads from "The BRITE Coalition" blanketed the

airwaves with messages defusing blame for wildfires, without saying who paid for the ads.

Electioneering communications that target candidates without expressly advocating for their election or defeat — also known as "sham" issue ads — are also a growing problem, with over \$26 million in reported expenditures since 2010. They are a major loophole in AB 249's requirement that independent expenditure ads for and against candidates must clearly show their top 3 funders.

Currently, although payments for electioneering communications of \$50,000 or more must be reported to the Secretary of State, and spending on issue ads attempting to influence legislation must be reported as lobbying expenditures, there are no disclosure requirements on such ads, nor even any way to look up who provided funding to the sometimes misleadingly named entities that reported the expenditures.

SOLUTION

The Issue Ad DISCLOSE Act will build upon the improvements to campaign advertisement disclosure that the California DISCLOSE Act and Social Media DISCLOSE Act established in 2017 and 2018. It:

- Defines "issue advocacy advertisement" as an "advertisement" that must follow the DISCLOSE Act rules and clearly disclose the top 3 funders. This type of ad is defined as one that "clearly refers to and reflects a view on the subject matter, description, or name of one or more clearly identified pending legislative actions, administrative actions, or ballot measures", and either appeals for ad recipients to take action by contacting an elected official or are made within 60 days of the legislative session end.
- Defines "electioneering communication" as an "advertisement" that must follow the DISCLOSE Act rules and clearly disclose the top 3 funders. This type of ad is defined as "an advertisement that refers to one or more clearly identified candidates for elective office, but does not expressly advocate

for the election or defeat of the candidate or candidates, and that is disseminated, broadcast, or otherwise communicated during the period beginning 120 days before the primary or special election and ending on the date of the general or runoff election".

- States that a non-committee only must follow DISCLOSE Act disclosure rules for issue ads if it is a "major advertiser" that spends \$10,000 or more on advertisements in a calendar year.
- Defines "top funders" to be shown on issue ads from major advertisers that are not committees as the "lobbying donors" who gave the 3 largest lobbying-available donations of \$10,000 or more. Has exceptions for donors who restrict the use of their funds, and for ads paid for entirely with nondonor or small donor funds.
- Identifies original donors on issue ads by stating that if a lobbying donor earmarked a payment for lobbying on a clearly identified pending legislative or administrative action, they shall be listed as one of the top 3 funders even if their funds were transferred through multiple layers of entities.
- States that payments made for the purpose of electioneering communications are classified as contributions or expenditures. This will ensure that any Dark Money multipurpose organization that spends \$50,000 or more on electioneering communications must become a campaign committee under Section 84222, the same as if they made \$50,000 in independent expenditures.

AB 1217 will provide needed transparency about the true funders of issue ads that are intended to influence legislative or administrative actions and to close the "electioneering communication" loophole for ads about candidates during election season.

SUPPORT

California Clean Money Campaign

STAFF CONTACT

Laura Fitzgerald

Laura.Fitzgerald@asm.ca.gov | 916.319.2022

Hugh Bower

Hugh.Bower@asm.ca.gov | 916.319.2022