



SAME PAGE/MISMA PAGINA COALITION

**San Fernando Valley/Northeast Los Angeles NOW PAC
California ID# 990464**

P.O. Box 7141 Van Nuys CA 91409-7141 (818) 539-5910 info@sfnvnow.org

**CALLAC/NLLAC, P.O. Box 433 Torrance CA 90508-0433 (213) 787.5476
callac@janbtucker.com**

Also Participating: Miss Revolutionaries, Bring Hollywood Home Foundation, and the United For Education Coalition mentefranca@msn.com, L.A. Progressive, California LULAC Institute (CLI), aaluevano@aol.com, Todos Unidos, aamentor2000@aol.com

Endorsements by the SPC are considered important prizes in Los Angeles area elections. During the 2012 election cycle, both of SPC's endorsees, Representative Brad Sherman and long-shot Steve Fox went on to win their races. Running 10% ahead in the polls, Sherman sent a last minute mailing to every Democratic and Independent registered woman in his district touting the SFV/NELA NOW endorsement and went on to beat his opponent, Rep. Howard Berman, by an astounding 20 points on election night. During the 2013 Los Angeles Municipal elections, all four of the major Mayoral candidates sought and were interviewed by SPC for endorsement. In the runoff, with the exception of SFV/NELA NOW which made a triple endorsement in the primary which became a runoff dual endorsement, all other SPC endorsing groups endorsed Mayor-elect Eric Garcetti for the runoff.

A 2006 professional poll commissioned by then-Assembly member Cindy Montanez demonstrated that amongst San Fernando Valley endorsing organizations, the voters considered the SFV/NELA NOW endorsement to have the highest integrity. SPC attributes the credibility of their endorsements to their strict non-partisanship (member organizations have made past endorsements of Democrats, Republicans, Independents, Greens, and Peace & Freedom Party candidates) and conflict of interest policies to insure that interested individuals cannot participate or must limit participation in specific races, even based upon a mere appearance of impropriety.

SPC recognizes that our joint candidate questionnaire is one of the most difficult in California because it is completely subjective and cannot be "scored." Some candidates bristle at having to answer questions that have nothing to do with the office they are running for. This is because in the era of "term limits"

politicians play musical chairs with greater frequency. You may be running for dog-catcher today and state legislature two years from now. We do not want to help your career if you are diametrically opposed to our positions on critical issues.

For upcoming elections, SPC has added, in addition to its confidential face to face interview, an optional on-record semi-formal press conference in which candidates seeking the endorsement will be encouraged to participate. All media will be invited, but an emphasis will be placed upon seeking participation from alternative and small media outlets, such as community newspapers, on-line publications, and ethnic/non-English language press.

Additionally, SPC will chart your progress in office to “hold incumbents’ feet to the fire” by comparing the promises and representations they made during the endorsement process to your performance in office. SPC will seek periodic face to face meetings with those elected to review their efforts to implement their promises and to help build public support for the reforms they have demanded and we expect you to pledge yourself to such periodic review following the election.

Joint Candidate Interview Committee of the Same Page/Misma Pagina Coalition
2014 Candidate Questionnaire

For candidate convenience, the Same Page/Misma Pagina Coalition will jointly consider candidates’ questionnaires and jointly interview candidates. SFV/NELA NOW and CALLAC will make their own independent endorsements; CLI and Todos Unidos *do not endorse as 501(c)(3) non-profits*, but participate for purposes of political education for the public. The process begins with your submission of responses to the following questionnaire:

Name of Candidate

Office Sought

Party affiliation

Occupation

Organizational Affiliations

Contact information for your campaign, including telephone, address, and email; names of liaisons.

ARE YOU A MEMBER OF ANY OF THE SPC PARTICIPATING ORGANIZATIONS? List any such organizations you belong to. If not, list the organizations you would like to join.

Issues

I-Women, LGBTI & Family Law

1. Define “feminism” and state whether you are a feminist.
2. Are you "pro-choice?" Explain your views on the following issues: (a) legally imposed waiting periods for the termination of pregnancies (b) legally required spousal and/or parental notifications as a requisite for a minor to get an abortion (c) bans on specific termination procedures, such as so-called “partial birth abortion” (d) residency requirements for women to lawfully seek abortions (e) restrictions on government funding (f) codification of Roe vs. Wade
3. How many beds are available in the jurisdiction you are running in for battered women and children? What will/can you do to increase available facilities? Do you support extension of funding for the Violence Against Women Act (VAWA) and how did you vote on it if you have already had an opportunity to do so? Do you support extending VAWA to allow Native Americans to prosecute non-Natives or Natives from other tribes for domestic violence and related crimes within their tribal court systems? Do you support specific wording indicating that VAWA protects LGBTQI community (since 50% of Lesbian victims of domestic violence are turned away from shelters)? Do you support keeping protections for immigrant women such as with U-Visas?
4. Do you support the Equal Rights Amendment and how will you work for its passage? (For further information on the ERA see www.now.org)
5. What have you done to elect (and appoint) more women and more feminists to public office?
6. Do you support a legislatively enacted “Fast Track” mandate for the determination of family/child support issues? If not, explain your views. Regarding child custody/visitation issues, do you support amending the Family Code to provide that the public policy of California is that visitation or custody of children with a violent parent, a domestic abuser, and/or a child molester IS NOT in the “best interests” of the child?
7. Do you support SFV/NELA NOW’s proposed criminalization of aiding and abetting child support non-payment along with its provision creating a private cause of action against the aiders and abettors (download copy from www.sfvnow.org/blank.html)? If you don’t support it, explain your views.
8. Do you support bringing back “intentional cruelty” as a California cause of action for divorce, with automatic bifurcation of marital status, as a ground for a greater

allocation of income and assets to a spouse and/or children who have been the victims of on-going domestic abuse?

9. Do you support amending the California Evidence Code to preclude the introduction of evidence that a spouse failed to have formal police reports of abuse made unless the spouse who wishes to introduce such evidence to disprove allegations of abuse first demonstrates that the police department(s) with jurisdiction had realistic procedures and actual practices in effect that would actually protect women from further abuse following an arrest or report of the alleged abuse?
10. Do you support the California Supreme Court's finding that marriage is a fundamental right that it enunciated in *Perez v Sharp* (declaring laws against interracial marriage unconstitutional) and more recently when striking down laws against same-sex marriage? Do you support the right of people to enter into same-sex marriages as a matter of California law? If not, why not?
11. Do you support federal passage of Employment Non-Discrimination Act (ENDA) to ban discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation and/or gender identity?
12. What is your position about TRAP laws being passed across the country which have the express purpose of closing clinics that provide abortion related services? How many clinics operate in your jurisdiction that provide abortion services, family planning and reproductive health services for patients with limited means? Do you think there need to be more? How would you accomplish this? How can California ensure that there are such services available across our State to everyone who needs them?
13. Do you support public funding for organizations like Planned Parenthood? If not, why not? If so, what will you do to ensure that such funding continues?
14. Do you agree that comprehensive sex education should be a part of school curriculum? How would you support this? Do you agree that access to reliable and reasonably priced birth control should be a fundamental right for everyone? How do you propose countering the attacks against reproductive rights?

II-Human, Civil & International Rights

15. Do you support the Model Ordinance for Citizen Oversight of Police Misconduct (download copy from www.sfvnow.org/blank.html)? If not, explain your views on the issues it raises.
16. Explain your views on the following criminal justice issues:
 - Gun control legislation.

- Programs that stress alternatives to incarceration for individuals whose illegal acts will not harm the community.
- Expansion of prisons and jails.
- Protection of Prisoner civil rights by making Sections 2600-2603 compliant with the International Covenant on Civil & Political Rights
- Presumption of innocence that prohibits incarceration before conviction unless the accused, if released, is a public threat or will not appear for trial.
- Bail that reflects the financial circumstances of the accused and the seriousness of the crime.
- Affirmation of the principle that the criminal justice system be rehabilitative rather than punitive.
- Support and counseling from parole staff to minimize chances of recidivism.
- Community involvement by police to prevent crime.
- Trying juveniles as adults.
- Strengthening preventive programs for juveniles.
- Prompt decisions in juvenile cases.

17. Do you support SFV/NELA NOW sponsored AB 1617 (download materials from www.sfvnow.org/blank.html)? Will you sponsor adoption of it as a policy of the governmental body you are seeking to be a part of? If you do, may we list you as an endorser? If not, explain your views on the issues it raises. (Note: the precepts of AB 1617 have been adopted by California and National LULAC as official legislative policy).

18. As of 2003 only 6.2% of the private investigators admitted to the “panel” created by the Los Angeles Superior Court judiciary were female and less than 20% were minorities. Since then, the number of women have declined while only a handful are even fluent in foreign languages, including Spanish. Do you agree that the State of California should standardize court panel rules, permit panel members to bargain collectively over wages and working conditions, and forbid arbitrary criteria for admission to judicially created panels of attorneys, investigators, and experts? If not, explain your views.

19. The Los Angeles Community College Board of Trustees elects members at-large. This has resulted in a situation in which if a person drives from the West side home of the farthest northern trustee in 90068, to the next south in Beverly Hills, to the 90035 home next south, and finally to the 90045 home of the farthest south West side trustee, the entire trip will take approximately one-half hour. Two other trustees live only minutes apart in zip codes 90041 and 90042 in the Northeast Los Angeles area. This leaves South Central, East and Southeast Los Angeles virtually unrepresented and for years, the San Fernando Valley went unrepresented until a recent appointment. Do you support electing college board trustees by district? Why or why not?

20. A. The “human resources specialists” of the Los Angeles Unified School District who conduct investigations into employee disciplinary matters by their own admission in testimony before a hearing officer, have no formal training in how to detect deception and automatically give more credence to statements made by managerial witnesses, such as principals, than to other witnesses. Additionally, an attorney employed by the General Counsel’s office was overheard by the Presidents of SFV LULAC and SFV MAPA (who are both board members of SFV NOW) laughing and joking about the accent of an immigrant student who’d testified before the LAUSD Personnel Board. In spite of notification of this outrage, then-Superintendent Brewer and the General Counsel’s office never even bothered to interview the witnesses. In another incident, LAUSD refused to conduct an investigation into why Steve Rooney – arrested for child molestation – covered up a criminal assault and battery on a substitute teacher by failing to report it to the police while telling the victim that he had. Will you support establishment of an independent commission of representatives of civil rights organizations and professional investigative organizations to examine the policies and procedures by which the LAUSD human resources department, the General Counsel’s office, and other LAUSD institutions conduct investigations and remediation into employee disciplinary matters and complaints of harassment, retaliation, and discrimination, including examination of whether the principles of AB 1617 should be implemented in the district?

B. Similarly to the LAUSD, the Los Angeles City personnel “investigators” who are assigned to investigate discrimination, harassment, and retaliation have admitted that they have no training in how to detect deception in investigative interviews and have never been tested on their ability to do so. Do you support incorporating the provisions of AB 1617 as a municipal ordinance binding on city employment related investigations?

21. Legislating the goal of the Same Page/Misma Pagina/Ddok Got Eun Page/Haman Safhe Coalition of adopting a Recommended Amendment to Remedy the Chilling Effect of the Ruling in Hoffman Plastics vs. NLRB (by amending Section 1105 of the California Labor Code) (copy available at www.sfvnow.org/blank.html)

22. Amending Section 834c of the California Penal Code:

A. To require mandatory Vienna Convention notifications for Mexican nationals and the citizens of any other Western Hemisphere nation that desires inclusion

B. To place Vienna Convention notifications to detained individuals on a par with Miranda warnings for purposes of suppression of evidence remedies available under the California and United States Constitutions

23. Enacting legislation to make the provisions of the *International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights* self-executing

24. Enacting legislation to make the provisions of *Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women* (CEDAW) self-executing
25. Enacting legislation to make the provisions of the *International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination* self-executing
26. Enacting legislation to make the provisions of the *Convention Against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment* self-executing
27. Passing a resolution supporting an end to United States (E.E.U.U.) unilateralism in legislating immigration law and calling upon President Barack Obama and Secretary of State John Kerry to invoke Article 21 of *the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo* (Treaty) for resolution of all issues between the United States of America and the United States of Mexico, including but not limited to:
 - A. Immigration policy
 - B. Remedies for violations of and non-implementation of the Treaty and the Protocols of Quaretero (Protocols) by the United States of America
 - C. Remedies and recompense for the ethnic cleansing (the “Repatriation” program of the Hoover Administration) of 2,000,000 residents of the United States of America in the 1930s, 1.2 million of whom were American citizens
28. A resolution urging a retroactive pardon for the purported crimes of Joaquin Murrieta and an official apology to his descendants for the failure of the State of California to prosecute *gabachos* who lynched his brother and gang – raped his wife.
29. Legislatively mandating that the affirmative defense of unclean hands in a judicial foreclosure action and/or an unlawful detainer action subsequent to non-judicial foreclosure is an absolute defense and may be used to abate a legal action if the foreclosing party violated public policy in making, selling, trading, and/or servicing the loan or assumed the liability for such a violation when taking possession and/or control of the loan.
30. Strengthening the traditional American abolition of imprisonment for debt by prohibiting municipal governments from criminalizing non-payment of taxes as a stand alone violation.
31. Do you support abolition of the death penalty?
29. Do you support implementation of the Affordable Care Act (“Obamacare”)? If you have had an opportunity to vote on it or on implementing legislation how did you vote? Do you support the ACA provision requiring coverage of contraception for women?

30. Do you support restoration of the right of the East Los Angeles Bobcats sports program for children to conduct activities for free at Ruben Salazar Park by the County of Los Angeles? If not, why not?
31. Do you support an independent investigation into the killing of Ruben Salazar and other participants in activities of the National Chicano Moratorium and unconstitutional surveillance and disruption of peaceful political activities in the late sixties and throughout the seventies? Explain your ideas for creating/empowering an independent investigating commission.
32. Do you support the “Dream Act?” What is your position on immigration reform? What is your position on whether undocumented immigrants should be able to attend public schools, obtain a driver’s license and obtain medical treatment if needed?
33. Do you support amending California Constitution Article I, Section 6 (“Slavery is prohibited. Involuntary servitude is prohibited except to punish crime.”) to strike the words “except to punish crime”? Would you support legislation providing inmates collective bargaining rights along with binding arbitration for disputes?

III **Environmental Justice**

34. What is your position on the expansion of fracking for natural gas within the State of California? What is your position on the passage of SB4 which purports to regulate the practice of “fracking” in California? Would you support a moratorium on fracking in your jurisdiction? An outright ban? Stronger regulations than those set forth in SB4?
35. Are you aware that Valero is proposing to transport 60,000 barrels of tar sands per day into Wilmington for refining and has submitted an application to the AQMD which it refuses to make public? Do you support having the Los Angeles City Council require that this application be made public, be open for a period of public review and comments and the appointment of the AQMD as the overseeing agency for approval of this application? How would you address the fact that the air quality in the Los Angeles Harbor area is some of the worst in the country and that people who live near the refineries are suffering from asthma, cancer and other chronic illnesses at much higher rates than the general population?
36. What is your position on the approval of the Keystone XL Pipeline and tar sands refining?

Bring Hollywood Home Foundation
Special Section

1. Are you aware of the billions of dollars California is losing due to the outsourcing of jobs in film, TV, and commercial production?
2. Do you think corporations that lobby in California and unions that lobby in California should be brought to greater scrutiny when they profit heavily from outsourcing jobs in film, TV, and commercial production?
3. Do you think forcing our entertainment industry artists to work outside of the state and the country making it difficult to raise children, be involved in their communities, and help care for their elderly parents is a good idea?
4. Should California have a "pillow law" that gives families in the film, TV, and commercial production industry incentives for staying home and sleeping on their own pillows raising their children, caring for their aging parents and being involved in their communities?
5. Are you aware that the major studios who lobby at the national, state, and local level only produced less than a dozen films last year?
6. Do you think it is fair to force independent filmmakers in California to be limited to a lottery when they are trying to stay in the state to make films and television?
7. Are you aware that the majority of the TV productions green lighted by major media will not be filmed in California? Do you think the state elected officials are doing enough to stop the outsourcing of jobs in the entertainment industry.
8. Under the current system where the studios and the unions are involved in outsourcing film, TV, and commercial production jobs is it not the job of elected officials to find ways to stop the loss of billions in tax dollars from the loss of these jobs?
9. What would you be willing to do to get involved in calling the outsourcing of jobs 'piracy' of the future of California's youth?

E-Mail your response as a "Word," "Open Office Writer," or "PDF" attached file to:

SFV/NELA NOW info@sfvnow.org

CALLAC callac@janbtucker.com

CLI aaluevano@aol.com

Todos Unidos aamentor2000@aol.com

Miss Revolutionaries learlaw@earthlink.net

Bring Hollywood Home sharonhardeejimenez@gmail.com

United For Education mentefranca@msn.com