



November 6, 2018 Ballot Propositions Recommendations and Candidate Alignment Values. **REVISION 3.1 10-29-18**

The Cheat Sheet:

The first 2 pages are a Cheat Sheet that you can take with you to the ballot, followed by a more detailed response for what and why. Your ballot may differ depending on which city you live in. When in doubt read the Candidate's "issues" statements then decide.

Vote as late as you can if you are mailing in ballots as we will send updates as we get them (e.g. if we are missing some candidates, or I learn new info and change my recommendations etc.)

| Proposition Title | VACaction Recommendation | Subject |
|---|--------------------------|---|
| Proposition 1 | NO | Bonds |
| Proposition 2 | NO | Bonds |
| Proposition 3 | NO | Bonds |
| Proposition 4 | NO | Bonds |
| Proposition 5 | YES | Taxes - Lowers them |
| Proposition 6 | YES | Taxes - Freezes them |
| Proposition 7 | No recommendation | Freeze to PDT if allowed by Fed |
| Proposition 8 | NO | Healthcare |
| Proposition 10 | NO | Housing |
| Proposition 11 | YES | Labor |
| Proposition 12 | No recommendation | Animals |
| Alameda County Measures H, P, T, X, EE: ALL | ALL NO | Bonds & Taxes |
| Contra Costa County Measures E, H, I, J, P, V | ALL NO | Bonds & Taxes |
| Santa Clara County Measures A, T, V | NO on these 3 | Bonds & Taxes |
| Santa Clara County Measure S | YES | Lowers no bid Contractor selection to \$1M from \$5M |
| Santa Clara County Bond Measure U | YES | Remove City Council's ability to set their own salaries |

| Candidates | Individuals listed here align with Biblical values more than other candidates |
|--|--|
| Governor | John Cox (R) |
| Lt. Governor | Neither align with our values |
| Secretary of State | Mark Meuser (R) |
| State Controller | Konstantinos Reditis (R) |
| Treasurer; California | Greg Conlon (R) |
| Attorney General; California | Steven Bailey (R) |
| Insurance Commissioner | Steve Poizner (I) |
| State Superintendent of Public Instruction | Marshall Tuck (D) Lesser of 2 evils |
| U.S. Senator | Neither align with our values |
| California Supreme Court MUST VOTE YES OR NO | Carol Corrigan: Aligns |
| California Supreme Court MUST VOTE YES OR NO | Leondra Kruger: Does not align |
| Justice, California State Court of Appeal; Sixth Dist MUST VOTE YES OR NO | Nathan Mihara: Aligns Mary J. Greenwood: Does not align Allison Marston Danner: Does not align |
| U.S. House of Representatives, Dist 17 | Ron Cohen (R) |
| U.S. House of Representatives, Dist 18 | Christine Russell (R) |
| U.S. House of Representatives, Dist 19 | Justin James Aguilera (R) |
| U.S. House of Representatives, Dist 20 | Ronald Paul Kabat (NPP) |
| California State Senate Dist 10 | Victor G. San Vicente (R) |
| California State Assembly, Dist 24 | Alex Glew (R) |
| State Assembly, Dist 25 | Bob Brunton (R) |
| State Assembly, Dist 27 | Abstain |
| State Assembly, Dist 28 | Michael L. Snyder (R) |
| State Assembly, Dist 29 | Vicki L. Nohrden (R) |
| State Assembly, Dist 30 | Neil G. Kitchens (R) |
| California Board of Equalization, Dist 2 | Mark Burns (R) |
| Governing Board Trustee of Alum Rock Union Elementary School Dist | Linda Chavez |
| Santa Clara County Sheriff, | Neither align with our Values |
| El Camino Healthcare Dist | Peter Fung |
| Campbell Union High School Dist Board of Trustees | Robert Varich |
| Mayor of Milpitas | Bob Nunez |
| Santa Clara County Board of Education | Gino Borgioli |

Updates for Rev 2:

Added in missing Candidate for Dist 19. Justin James Aguilera (R).
Added YES on Santa Clara County Measure U and S.
Added 2 new judge candidates who do NOT align with our values.

Updates for Rev 3:

Added clarification for why it's a YES for Prop 11. No changes to the recommendation.

Updates for Rev 3.1:

Added a few more points to YES for Prop 11 explanation. No changes to recommendation.

Register to Vote

The last day to register to vote is **15 days before election day: Oct 22 but use OCT 21, 2018**

Register on line here: <https://registertovote.ca.gov/>

To get a copy of this, updates and other voting recommendations, make sure you are registered in our database click here: www.vac.org/signup

Basic Principles:

- Always apply Free Market Principles.
- Free Trade: Government does NOT know better how to make deals between private parties.
- No Crony Capitalism, watch out for rich businessmen pushing legislation that will give them an advantage over their competition or make them money (e.g. High Speed Rail).
- Governments role is to secure the rights we already have been given by God. Not to provide charity or negotiate contracts. They are to enforce contracts as long as those contracts do not violate people's rights.
- Christians and the Church are responsible for Charity not the government.
- Government Charity wastes over 80% of what it takes in. Private Charity gives over 85% to those who need it. Government hates competition and pushes out Churches (e.g. Cities that fined churches for feeding the poor).
- Every time the state takes care of someone, the Church has lost an opportunity to minister and share God's love and the Gospel.

- To the state, success is having more people needing charity as that grows their departments & allows them to hire more employees. To the church, success is getting people to the point where they need no charity.
- Never invite the Government to meddle, it's a like a cancer, you can never cut it out without hurting the victims.
- Education is not a government function. It's a service not a right. Goods and services are not rights. If you allocate a good or service as a right, you have to ask yourself, where will you get those services from that you've promised to others for free? You'll have to use force to extract it. Thus, the government uses a gun to extract a portion of your labor to provide as services to others.
- Always vote for the lesser of two evils
- Lack of money is NOT the problem, for instance CA spends over \$13,000 a year per student in public schools are we are near the bottom in education.
- If something in the public interest really needs new or more money – they must cut some waste elsewhere and use that money. Don't give them any more money. Hold them responsible for fixing it with the money they already have. If I find I need a new car but don't have money to buy one, I cut back on other expenses until I can afford to buy it. I don't take another LOAN!
- A BOND = 2X or 3X a TAX A bond is borrowing on interest. What they are saying is: We have no money so we want to borrow it and then pay back 2x the amount of money that we don't have. BONDS should be illegal unless associated with an immediate tax to start paying it off so people can't push off the payment to their kids.
- Any law that slows down legislators from adding more bad laws is good.
- Any law that creates more transparency in the Legislature is good.
- Any Law that reduces taxes for ANYONE is good. Even if it's Marijuana Seller. Why? Because we don't want government to think they can legalize vices that destroy our communities and gain tax money from them.

For more detailed principles on how to make your voting decisions see:

<http://www.jesusinvolvedinpolitics.com/HowThenShallweVote.pdf>

If you'd like your pastor to understand why we need to be more involved please get him to read this book or have him watch the videos here: www.j3ip.com

Also watch the Jesus Is Involved In Politics video sermon here:

<http://kansasvideo.jesusinvolvedinpolitics.com>

Before we start: I'd rather you read each and every ballot, argued with your friends and then made your own decisions.

But the reality is that we have lives to live and don't always find this stuff interesting until it bites us.

But do consider that I may be wrong.... I don't think I am, but I could be.

If you have new info, a different perspective, email us: neil@vac.org

PROPOSITIONS 1-4 THESE FIRST FOUR ARE ALL BONDS

- ▶ In simple words: Borrow money and then pay back 2-3X the original cost
- ▶ Lots of supposed great causes: Veterans Home Loans, Homelessness, water infrastructure (didn't we just pass \$3B a few years ago?), Children's hospitals.
- ▶ 85% of the money will never get to them.
- ▶ **Recommendation NO**

PROPOSITION 5: Property Tax Transfer Initiative

- ▶ In simple words: Freeze Property Taxes for those over 55 (extends the property tax basis outside Santa Clara county).
- ▶ **Recommendation YES**

PROPOSITION 6 Voter Approval for Future Gas and Vehicle Taxes and 2017 Tax Repeal Initiative

- ▶ In simple words: Repeal the Fuel Tax
- ▶ **Recommendation YES**

PROPOSITION 7: Permanent Daylight-Saving Time Measure

- ▶ If the Federal Government allows it, allows Sacramento to end Daylight Savings and freeze it to PDT.

YES means: We can Freeze it.

NO means: We leave it be.

No Recommendation. I'll be voting Yes because I hate changing clocks.

PROPOSITION 8 Limits on Dialysis Clinics' Revenue and Required Refunds Initiative

- ▶ In simple words: Let's the government fix the prices for Dialysis.

- What? Seriously? When did the government become the expert in determining what things should cost: Here's what can go wrong...
 - Governments hate competition and they sue companies for price fixing. So why do they get to price fix? Are they economic geniuses?
 - When you fix the price and it's too high, nobody can afford the service and the service providers go out of business and Health Insurance goes up.
 - When you fix the price and it's too low, the services providers get out of the business because they can't make money and you end up with extra long wait times and quality suffers because there's no competition.
 - No market feedback loop. How do they know what dialysis should cost?
 - Worse it will kill innovation in that area. Imagine you have an idea that will make dialysis cheaper and easier and less painful. But your idea won't get any traction or venture funding because the price is fixed. Why would you spend money to innovate? I can't think of a better way to hurt those on dialysis.
- **Recommendation NO**

PROPOSITION 10: Local Rent Control Initiative

- In simple words: Allows the Government to set prices for rent.
- Really? No! Here's what could go wrong:
 - People in rent-controlled housing won't leave.
 - People won't build new housing...nothing to gain...resulting in a housing shortage and skewed Commercial vs Residential buildings ratios.
 - People who *should* share housing or may move to smaller apartments won't because the prices are artificially low. Vacancy in non-rent control areas is 7%; in rent control areas it's 2% or less (and landlords are getting less).
 - Landlords have no incentive to fix up housing = slums and abandoned buildings (there are 4x more abandoned homes in NY compared to Homeless in NY)

- **Recommendation NO**

See also: <https://cei.org/blog/rent-control-why-it-so-bad>

<https://peckford42.wordpress.com/2017/04/23/rent-control-and-thomas-sowell/>

PROPOSITION 11: Ambulance Employees Paid On-Call Breaks, Training, and Mental Health Services Initiative

- In simple words: Allow Ambulance Companies to require their employees to remain on call during paid breaks. Right now, the government stops them from

doing that. This law would basically **remove** existing Government control over a freemarket issue

- Here's the basic principle: Government has no place to set prices or intervene between two parties as long as they are not being dishonest or violating rights. Once you allow government to intervene between private parties you have a cancer that starts to control small businesses, effectively driving them out of business with regulations. Most of the time these regulations are easily afforded by large corporations, but the smaller business people can't afford to hire anyone to manage the nitpicking of government. This means it becomes tougher for small companies to grow and worse it allows government to continue interfering with private contracts creating new laws to micromanage the nonsense they created with other laws till you have a labyrinth of crazy regulations raising the cost of everything and reducing competition.
- **Recommendation YES for less government regulations.**

Since I published this, I received a few emails regarding a post in Nextdoor.com and from a few folks who know EMTs. They are well meaning, but all their emails amount to what should be a free negotiation between two parties, not the heavy arm of the law with a gun behind in.

So first the details:

1. Nobody is losing their breaks. If an EMT gets called during a break they must either get a new break (which cannot be close to their start or end times) or they will get paid extra for losing that break.
2. Nobody is not getting paid for breaks when they have to be on alert - as the already get paid for it.
3. The issue and this is the **ONLY** issue that seems to be at hand is that they want to force the employer to have to **PAY** them for losing their break and **NOT** allow the employer to replace that break with a new break.

Well this is an issue between two **private** parties, if you don't want that deal go work for someone else or start your own Ambulance company that will give employees that benefit. This is America after all. When I didn't like the deal my employer was giving me I quit and joined a different company, then after a while I quit and created my own company. This is the freedom I longed for when I came to America. I don't want the government telling me what to do. Don't buy into this socialist principle that it takes Government to make fair deals. Government is not the free market and when was the last time government really made a wise economic decision?

Stick to the principles. Less government the better except when it comes to protecting rights. There is **NO** issue of **ANY** rights being violated here. **NONE**. It's simply a matter of negotiating a deal between two parties.

This is the post that was sent to me, I've provided my response after it.

My daughter has been a Santa Clara County EMT for a few years, a 911 EMT for the past year. This directly affects her and every other EMT/Paramedic in California. Please don't let the wording of this proposition scare you into voting Yes. The true purpose is strictly for the bottom line of AMR who funded this proposition and stands to make millions. They are located in several counties throughout California. One of the scare tactics AMR uses in their "pro" argument is that response times are delayed because medics and EMTs are unreachable during their meal breaks. That is an outright lie. All employees must remain reachable during their half hour meal break and if they are closest to an emergency, they are pulled off their break to respond. When you call 911, units have a certain time limit in which they must reach you. Meal breaks have never interfered with any emergency in this county. ***The law requires that they be compensated for this missed break - that is what AMR wants to stop from happening and that is the REAL reason for this proposition. They don't want to pay for missed breaks because that costs them money.*** See page 65 of the Voter Handbook -- first paragraph on the left references the lawsuits against AMR because they have NOT been compensating as required by law! If this proposition passes not only will they not have to pay moving forward, they don't have to compensate for all the previous violations so the lawsuits go away - see right column "Potential Avoidance of One-Time Costs" Our daughter works 10-12 hours shifts (for all of \$20/hr for helping save someone's life!) and way more often than should happen, she does not get a break. She's lucky if she's able to go to the bathroom, and often doesn't eat. **She and the others SHOULD get compensated for not having a break because not having a break is NOT their choice! First responders WANT breaks!** If this prop passes, AMR won't have to follow the law requiring 1-hour of pay for missed meal breaks so there is NO punishment for not providing its employees with meal breaks. It's the employees and ultimately the communities that suffer while AMR is able to watch their bottom line. Mental health services provided by the company is seriously lacking, and there is no language in the prop that states how it will improve its practices (so its likely nothing will change in that regard). Natural disasters and acts of terrorism training is already required.

My response: You'll see the basic theme from above repeated a few times here.

The principles behind the YES on Prop 11:

While the issues change, at the end of the day the principles must remain.

The principle here is that it's not the government's job to interfere in a contract between two private parties as long as rights are not being violated. Why? Because legislators in congress and/or the "masses" have no right to determine how you and I can do business as long as both of us are being honest in our dealings. Remember the Constitution is put there to protect the people from the government (and the masses - the mob voting in what our founders called the mobocracy). Once we let the government or the people dictate terms between private parties we let them control our lives, our businesses and our destinies, which is a violation of our rights. A right we cannot give up (they are inalienable).

Government's role is purely to ensure that rights are not being violated. One of those rights is the freedom to enact contract between ourselves without government interference.

It also looks like nobody is reading the actual verbiage in the proposition. Read the proposition folks if you want to defend it.

This proposition **removes** a restriction on a business that was put in place in the past. Yes, it may be true that AMR violated this law in the past, but it was a bad law. Remember bad laws should be nullified by the people and juries.

The principles we hold are that if an employer requires an employee to do something they prefer not to do, but is not immoral or a violation of their rights, the employer can replace them and/or the employee is allowed to quit (or wait till an alternative becomes available). If enough issues exist, a new company will rise up (usually created by a disgruntled ex-employee) to compete with the first that will allow employees to do the alternative. This is healthy for the marketplace.

The post said this:

"The law requires that they be compensated for this missed break - that is what AMR wants to stop from happening and that is the REAL reason for this proposition. They don't want to pay for missed breaks because that costs them money."

And

"She and the others SHOULD get compensated for not having a break because not having a break is NOT their choice! First responders WANT breaks!"

But the law states this:

Section 885. Meal and Rest Periods.

*(b) Emergency ambulance employees **shall be compensated** at their regular hourly rate of pay during meal and rest periods.*

And then:

Section 886. Staffing for Meal Periods.

*(b) If an emergency ambulance employee is contacted during a meal or rest period, that particular meal or rest period **shall not be counted** towards the meal and rest periods the employee is entitled to during his or her work shift.*

*(c) If an emergency ambulance employee is not contacted during a meal or rest period, that particular meal or rest period **shall be counted** towards the meal and rest periods the employee is entitled to during his or her work shift.*

So, they would still get the break they were due. The break is not taken away. And they get their pay for all their breaks. I don't get paid for my breaks....

Yes, it is true that it would allow them not to be paid an EXTRA hour's work for skipping a meal because they'd just be given that break later (which is the opposite of what the post claims: I.e. that they don't get enough breaks and can't go to the restroom).

Yet based on the first principles as far as I can tell it's an acceptable contract between two parties who can choose to work with each other or not. I also did not see any other issues that were relevant. At the end of the day, the government and the masses should not get to make these decisions.

If anyone still has doubts, they simply need to read the actual proposition. I've copied the core of it below. It's short. Read it and see what you think, it's clear language and quite straight forward.

Let me know if you think I'm reading it incorrectly.

From: <https://vig.cdn.sos.ca.gov/2018/general/pdf/topl.pdf#prop11>

Section 885. Meal and Rest Periods.

(a) All emergency ambulance employees are hereby entitled to meal and rest periods as prescribed elsewhere by the Industrial Welfare Commission.

(b) Emergency ambulance employees shall be compensated at their regular hourly rate of pay during meal and rest periods.

Section 886. Staffing for Meal Periods.

(a)(1) An emergency ambulance provider shall not require an emergency ambulance employee to take a meal period during the first or last hour of a work shift, and must allow an emergency ambulance employee to space multiple meal periods during a work shift at least two hours apart.

(2) An emergency ambulance provider shall manage staffing at levels sufficient to provide enough inactivity in a work shift for emergency ambulance employees to meet the requirements of this subdivision.

(b) Any meal period that does not comply with paragraph (1) of subdivision (a) shall not be counted towards the meal periods an employee is entitled to during his or her work shift.

Section 887. Communication to Protect Public Health and Safety.

Notwithstanding any provision of law to the contrary:

(a) In order to maximize protection of public health and safety, emergency ambulance employees shall remain reachable by a

portable communications device throughout the entirety of each work shift.

(b) If an emergency ambulance employee is contacted during a meal or rest period, that particular meal or rest period shall not be counted towards the meal and rest periods the employee is entitled to during his or her work shift.

(c) If an emergency ambulance employee is not contacted during a meal or rest period, that particular meal or rest period shall be counted towards the meal and rest periods the employee is entitled to during his or her work shift.

PROPOSITION 12: Require Animals to have adequate space to move

- ▶ In simple words: Ensure animals like Veal Cows are not kept in inhumane claustrophobic spaces.
- ▶ Animals do not have the same rights as humans. That does not mean we should not be humane, but the right way to do this is to boycott companies that mistreat their livestock in these ways. For instance, I do not buy or order veal unless there's a notice that says the Veal Cows are humanely treated.
- ▶ **No Recommendation.**

Santa Clara County Ballot Measures -

- A – Countywide sales tax extension – **NO** -No taxes or bonds
- S – No Bid Contracts lowered from \$5M to \$1M – **YES** -The city shouldn't just give contracts to their friends with no bids. It does raise another threshold from 100,000 to 600,000 so I'm not overly happy with it.
- T – San Jose infrastructure bond – **NO** -No taxes or bonds
- U – City Council Salaries set by a Salary Commission/Competing Ordinances – **YES**
- We can't have politicians setting their own salary.**
- V – San Jose housing bond – **NO** -No taxes or bonds

Alameda County Ballot Measures - NO ON ALL OF THEM

- H – Hayward school bond – **NO** -No taxes or bonds
- P – Berkeley tax on property sales – **NO** -No taxes or bonds
- T – Hayward tax on property sales – **NO** -No taxes or bonds
- X – Oakland tax on property sales – **NO** -No taxes or bonds
- EE – Union City tax on property sales – **NO** -No taxes or bonds

Contra Costa County Ballot Measures - NO ON ALL OF THEM

- E – Orinda \$50 million school bond – **NO** -No taxes or bonds
- H – Richmond tax on property sales – **NO** -No taxes or bonds
- I – Orinda \$55 million school bond – **NO** -No taxes or bonds
- J – Mt. Diablo school bond – **NO** -No taxes or bonds

P – Pittsburg school bond – **NO** -No taxes or bonds

V – El Cerrito tax on property sales – **NO** -No taxes or bonds

CANDIDATES

★★★★ indicates level of agreement with our principles.

Most of these taken from <https://www.electionforum.org/santa-clara-county-voter-guide/>

While not always true, in this cycle, the Republican candidates align far more with our values than the other parties. It's not too late to financially support your candidate or to help them with phone bank calling. This is quite easy. You connect with them and they give you phone numbers of people to call who are most likely to align with your values. You merely call them and encourage them to register and vote.

Where available we've provided links to the various candidates who've contacted us. Click on the underlined text to donate, contact or help.

Statewide Offices

Governor

- [John Cox \(R\)](#) ★★★★★
- Gavin Newsom (D)

Lt. Governor

- Ed Hernandez (D) 🚫 Abstain
- Eleni Kounalakis (D) 🚫

Secretary of State

- [Mark Meuser \(R\)](#) ★★★
- Alex Padilla (D)

State Controller

- [Konstantinos Roditis \(R\)](#) ★★★★★
- Betty Yee (D)

Treasurer; California

- Fiona Ma (D)
- [Greg Conlon \(R\)](#) ★★★

Attorney General; California

- [Steven Bailey \(R\)](#) ★★★★★
- Xavier Becerra (D)

Insurance Commissioner

- Ricardo Lara (D)
- [Steve Poizner \(I\)](#) ★★★

State Superintendent of Public Instruction

- Tony Thurmond (D)
- [Marshall Tuck \(D\)](#) ★★★ (Lesser of 2 evils)

U.S. Senator

- Dianne Feinstein (D) 🚫
- [Kevin de Leon \(D\)](#) 🚫

Dianne Feinstein is bad and has made herself rich in the Senate, but her opponent de Leon is a full-bore Socialist. It's a toss up. However, it seems like as usual, DiFi will win. My recommendation is to vote for Leon because if he wins he'll not have any seniority in the Senate.

California Supreme Court (Must vote Yes/No)

- [Carol Corrigan: 7 \(JI: 7, Q: 8\) Yes](#) ★★★
- [Leondra Kruger: 3 \(JI: 3, Q: 3\) No](#) 🚫

Justice, California State Court of Appeal; Sixth District

- [Nathan Mihara: 7 \(JI: 6, Q: 8\) Yes](#) ★★★
- [Mary J. Greenwood: 4 \(JI: 1, Q:7\) No](#) 🚫
- [Allison Marston Danner: 4 \(JI: 1, Q: 8\) No](#) 🚫

U.S. House of Representatives**U.S. Representative, 17th District**

- Ro Khanna (D)
- [Ron Cohen \(R\)](#) ★★

U.S. House of Representatives, District 18

- [Christine Russell \(R\)](#) ★★★
- Anna G. Eshoo (D)

U.S. Representative, 19th District

- Zoe Lofgren (D) 
- **Justin James Aguilera (R)**

U.S. House of Representatives, District 20

- **Ronald Paul Kabat (NPP)** ★★★★★
- Jimmy Panetta (D)

California State Senate**California State Senate, District 10**

- **Victor G. San Vicente (R)** ★★★★★
- Bob Wieckowski (D)

California State Assembly**State Assembly, District 24**

- Marc Berman (D)
- **Alex Glew (R)** ★★★★★

State Assembly, 25th District

- Kansen Chu (D)
- **Bob Brunton (R)** ★★★★★

State Assembly, District 27

- Ash Kalra (D)  Abstain

State Assembly, District 28

- Evan Low (D)
- **Michael L. Snyder (R)** ★★★★★

State Assembly, District 29

- Mark Stone (D)
- **Vicki L. Nohrden (R)** ★★★★★★

State Assembly, District 30

- Robert Rivas (D)
- **Neil G. Kitchens (R)** ★★★★★

California Board of Equalization

California Board of Equalization, Member, District 2

- **Mark Burns (R)** ★★☆☆
- Malia Cohen (D)

Local (CLICK TO FOLLOW THEIR LINKS WHERE PROVIDED)

Governing Board Trustee of Alum Rock Union Elementary School District

- [Linda Chavez](#) ★★★★★

Campbell Union High School District Board of Trustees

- [Robert Varich](#)

Santa Clara County Board of Education

- [Gino Borgioli](#)

Santa Clara County Sheriff, General Election, 2018

- Laurie Smith Incumbent vs John Hirokawa: **NO RECOMMENDATION AT THIS TIME**

Santa Clara County Board of Supervisors, District 4 General Election, 2018

- Susan Ellenberg vs Don Rocha None align with our values. **NO RECOMMENDATION AT THIS TIME**

Cities:**Mayor of Santa Clara**

No recommendation at this time. Watch for updates.

Mayor of Milpitas

Bob Nunez.

Other local elections (click to follow their link).

- ▶ [Peter Fung –El Camino Healthcare District](#)

If you are not in Santa Clara County you can go to:

<https://www.electionforum.org> and look up your county.

Now go out and Vote.