

CALIFORNIA GENERAL ELECTION

November 8, 2022

KATHY'S PICS

Orange County Voting Recommendations from conservative, Kathy Dittner

Kathy's Pics can be viewed on Robyn Norrell's Conservative California Election Website:
<http://www.robynnordell.com/countyorange.aspx>

About Kathy: I am a Christian conservative who spends many hours researching candidates and issues. I have been involved in politics since being elected to the Orange County Central Committee in 1992. My "Pics" reflect a Biblical world view that is pro-life, pro-family, pro-Constitution, pro-choice in education, as well as a view that supports decentralized and limited government in both size and spending. I generally do not recommend anyone from the Democrat Party, as it does not reflect the values and issues I support.

As a reminder, a "bipartisan" committee redesigned our voting districts to better reflect diversity. Translation: there are too many districts that do not have enough Democrat voters. Therefore, they branched out into other cities/counties that have more Democrat voters even though they may be in other Counties. In Orange County, four new districts went from majority Republican to Democrat. This is how Orange County will be controlled by the Democrat majority for the next 10 years. (For example, the 71st Assembly District, has Mission Viejo, Rancho Santa Margarita, Coto de Casa, Ladera Ranch, the canyons, portions of San Clemente and now includes Riverside County's Murrieta, Wildomar and Temecula.)

***Important note: do not put your ballot in an envelope and drop it in the mail or dropbox!
Please read the reason why and **VOTE IN PERSON.** [vote_safe_2.pdf](http://www.eip-ca.com/vote_safe_2.pdf) (eip-ca.com)***

All candidates listed are one or more of the following in order of importance:

- **Pro-life**
- **Pro-marriage/pro-family**
- **Endorsed by the California Republican Assembly (Ronald Reagan called it “The Conscience of the Republican Party”) or The California Republican Party**

FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

UNITED STATES SENATE

Full Term: Mark P. Meuser

Partial/Unexpired Term: Mark P. Meuser

REPRESENTATIVES IN CONGRESS

40th District: Young Kim

47th District: Scott Baugh

48th District: Darrell Issa

49th District: Brian Maryott

CALIFORNIA STATE GOVERNMENT

Governor: Brian Dahle

Lieutenant Governor: Angela Underwood Jacobs

Secretary of State: Rob Bernosky

Controller: Lanhee Chen. (He is our only hope for a Republican to be in State office. He is highly qualified!)

Treasurer: Jack Guerrero

Attorney General: Nathan Hockman

Insurance Commissioner: Robert Howell

Board of Equalization District 4. (Unfortunately, the 2 top candidates were Democrats so leave it blank.)

Superintendent of Public Instruction: Lance Christensen

STATE SENATE

Senate 36th District: Janet Nguyen

Senate 38th District: Matt Gunderson. (I am NOT voting for Matt and here's why: on his web site, Matt says *I am 100% pro-choice, and I support and will continue to support California law, which enshrines the right to choose.* That statement means he is for abortions minus late term abortions. He does support parental notification. He wants to take a lead on climate change, preventing new offshore oil, and move rapidly towards getting 100% of our energy from renewables. Even though he is a Republican and up against a radical pro-abortion Democrat, I cannot recommend him in good conscience. You decide.)

STATE ASSEMBLY

Assembly 71st District: Kathryn Sanchez

Assembly 72nd District: Diane Dixon

Assembly 73rd District: Steven Choi

Assembly 74th District: Laurie Davies

SUPREME COURT ASSOCIATE JUSTICE

Associate Justice, Court of Appeals, 4th Appellate District, Division 1-3 Judge of the Superior court, Office 30: **Peggy Huang**

STATE SCHOOL

Superintendent of Public Instruction: Lance Christensen

ORANGE COUNTY GOVERNMENT

Supervisor District 5: Senator Pat Bates (Pat is pro-life, pro-marriage, pro-family and the best candidate for O.C. Supervisor. She has served Orange County as Mayor of Laguna Niguel, State Assembly Board of Supervisors, and State Senate and wants to return to the Board of Supervisors. With her extensive experience and wisdom on state and Orange County politics, she can be trusted to vote conservative values in every office she holds.)

CALIFORNIA COURTS

I am giving YES or NO based on the Governor who appointed them, Republican or Democrat, as well as Craig Pics.

SUPREME COURT

Chief Justice: Patricia Guerrero- NO. Gavin Newson.

Martin Jenkins – NO. Gavin Newson. First openly gay Justice

Joshua Groban – NO. Jerry Brown. Brown's legal counsel.

Goodwin Liu - NO. Jerry Brown. Clerked for Ruth Ginsburg.

CALIFORNIA 4TH DISTRICT COURT OF APPEALS

Division 1- NO. Judith McConnell. Grey Davis

Division 2- YES. Manuel Ramirez. Deukmejian

Division 2- YES. Carol D. Codrington. Schwarzenegger

Division 2- NO. Michael J. Raphael. Jerry Brown

Division 2 -NO. Frank J, Menetrez. Jerry Brown

Division 3 -NO. Kathleen O'Leary. Grey Davis

Division 3 -NO. William Bedsworth. Pete Wilson

Division 3 -NO. Eileen Moore. Grey Davis

Division 1 -NO. Truc T. Do. Gavin Newson

Division 3 -NO. Maurice Sanchez. Gavin Newson & Jerry Brown

Division 3 -NO. Joanne Motoike. Gavin Newson

Division 1- NO. Martin Buchanan. Gavin Newsom

SCHOOLS DISTRICTS

South Orange County Community College District

Area 4: Derek Reeve

Area 6: Pramod Kunju

Capistrano Unified School District

Trustee Area 2: Kira Davis

Trustee Area 4: Jim Glantz

Trustee Area 7: Judy Bullockus

Saddleback Valley Unified School District

Trustee Area 1: Greg Kunath

Trustee Area 5: Jennifer L. Richter

CITY COUNCIL

Aliso Viejo:

Max Duncan

Tara Lea Rickson

Dana Point:

District 1 - John Gabbard

District 2 - Matthew Pagano

District 3 - Jamie Frederico

Laguna Hills:

Don Caskey

Erica Pezold

Josh Sweeney

Dave Wheeler

Laguna Niguel:

Jeff Von Wallberg

Ray Gennawey

Laguna Woods: All 3 candidates are Democrats so I cannot recommend any!

Lake Forest:

District 2 - Benjamin Yu. (He is a special man who is a Christian conservative, Chinese immigrant, loves America, volunteered to serve his country in the military, and has run for school board and city council before. He has been endorsed by the CRA.)

District 3 - Scott Voigts

District 4 - Mark Tettermer

Mission Viejo:

Comment: The State Bureaucracy has been forcing all cities in California to change their mode of voting to District voting (carving cities into districts where candidates can only be voted on in your district). This dilutes your vote and now you only have 1 vote when you used to have 5. The CA state legislature thinks all conservative Republican city councils are discriminatory and minorities cannot be represented. Democrats cannot get elected in conservative areas, so they rigged the process so Democrats can take over the city's councils.

You will be getting mail pieces that are accusing three of my Pics, Greg, Brian, and Wendy of cheating the system and extending their term from two to four years. At the time, the Council was considering cumulative voting where all 5 candidates had to run in the election, so a judge ruled they could extend their term to 4 years. Mission Viejo has always had 4-year terms since 1988 when we became a city, so it was not illegal.

District 1 - Bob Reusch

District 2 - Brian Goodell

District 3 - Greg Raths (Unfortunately, Ed Sachs, another Republican, is also running. When Republicans run against each other, they cancel out each other and the Democrat wins. Do NOT vote for Cynthia Vasquez – Democrat!)

District 4 - Trish Kelly

District 5 - Wendy Buckman

Rancho Santa Margarita:

Ann Figueroa

Jerry Holloway

Brad J. McGirr

San Clemente:

Steve Knoblock
Arron Washington
Victor Cabral

San Juan Capistrano:

District 2 - Troy Bourne
District 3 - John Campbell
District 4 - John Taylor

SCHOOL MEASURE

G. School Bond. NO! Capo School district wants you to approve a \$114 million Bond to improve buildings. Why isn't this already in school budgets? Where did they use the Covid cash windfall they got from the State last year? What about all the money from the state lottery? This Bond will increase taxes for *30 years* and the next generation will pay for something they didn't vote for.

CITY MEASURES

Aliso Viejo

Measure I – Term Limits. YES

This is to limit consecutive years of service by members of the City Council to a combined total of two 4-year terms with the ability to again serve as a member after a lapse of service of at least two years.

Laguna Woods

Measure T – Cannabis Business Tax. NO

This measure is asking voters to vote on taxing cannabis businesses, even though there are no cannabis businesses currently in Laguna Woods. What? If you vote for this measure, the Council will interpret that you approve of cannabis businesses in your city. The City Council wants the tax revenues and does not care if weed ruins their city. This is what you get when Democrats run a city. (Mission Viejo voted cannabis businesses down just recently because the City Council is Republican, and they believe drugs do not belong here. Cannabis is proven to bring crime, addiction, and family breakdown.

San Clemente

Measure U - Appoint a City Clerk. NO

It's always better to have citizens vote instead of appointments made by friends on the City Council.

Measure V – Appoint a City Treasurer. NO

ORANGE COUNTY

Board of equalization District 4. The top two candidates are Democrats so I cannot recommend any!

WATER DISTRICTS

Moulton Niguel Water District Directors:

William “Bill” Moorhead

Donald R. Froelich

CALIFORNIA PROPOSITIONS

I refuse to use the State Attorney's verbiage, as it is misleading and confusing.

Prop 1. NO! NO! NO! Puts the unlimited right to “kill” unborn babies into the State Constitution.

This pro-abortion amendment is unnecessary, radical and deceptive. The truth is the text of this ballot measure will repeal the current ban on abortion after 23 weeks and allow the right to an abortion up to the moment of birth. This measure would give California one of the most extreme abortion laws in the country. By placing it in the Constitution, abortion could never be appealed. without another Constitutional change put before the voters. For more information, read: [Real Impact Survey Reveals Californians Are Being Deceived About Proposition 1... Trusted Pastor Warns Pulpits— ‘Silence Is Approval’ | Harbingers Daily](#)

Prop 26. NO! Sports Betting and the Increase of Gambling on Tribal Lands.

This proposition would expand and usher in the more addictive games of roulette, dice, and sports wagering. So many minds, livelihoods, and marriages have been ruined by gambling and it does not promote tribal self-sufficiency or independence. Has gambling really improved tribal communities?

Prop 27. NO! NO! NO! Increases Gambling Outside Tribal Lands.

This rival proposition was placed on the ballot by out-of-state online gambling corporations. Prop 27 interests would permit “on-line and mobile sports wagering” so *anyone* (including teens) with an internet connection could gamble at home, work, or school. This measure is not a “solution” for homelessness! California has spent over \$30 *billion* on homeless programs over the last 5 years. New funding would only replace existing State and local homeless/mental health budget, so we should more effectively manage the billions the State is already spending.

Prop 28. NO! Requires More Funding from Existing State Education Budget for Arts and Music Programs.

Even though The Teachers Union is saying Prop 28 will not raise taxes, the proposition would add additional funding of \$1 billion by taking from the State’s General Fund. 40% of the state budget already goes towards education. California is in the *lowest percentile in the nation* on reading, math and science, but Teachers Unions want more money for “art and music?” Why can’t California live within its budget? Noteworthy is Prop 28 requires at least 80% of additional funding to be used to hire - guess what? More teachers! The Teachers Union always want money for teachers and administrators under the guise of helping “the children.” Let’s eliminate costly programs of radical sex education, critical race theory, transgender studies, and social justice. Maybe that would provide adequate funding for the Arts and Music programs.

Prop 29. NO! Decreases California kidney dialysis clinics, resulting in more deaths.

If you don’t remember this measure, it is the **third** time it is on the ballot! Why does this keep coming back and who profits if one of these finally passes? Prop 29 will increase clinic costs by hundreds of thousand dollars by requiring clinics to have a “state licensed medical professional” and will close or reduce the hours of many clinic locations. This will put a high risk of closures and limit dialysis availability. Fewer clinics = unnecessary lives at risk.

Prop 30. NO! Will increase Californians’ income tax and the cost of living.

Prop 30 will increase the state income tax another 1.75% on the wealthiest to pay for increased purchases of electric cars and to “prevent wildfires.” This is a terrible proposition:

- We already pay the highest state income taxes (13.3%), gas taxes, sales taxes and one of the highest costs of living in the nation.
- Different tax rates on different incomes is unfair and unbiblical (Scripture uses a tithe, or 10% of income). If the income tax is the same for everyone,

those who earn more, pay more. “Progressive” tax rates are unjust because they punish those who are the most productive or successful.

- Taxpayer-funded rebates to buyers of electric cars which require “rare earth” lithium will increase the U.S. dependence on China. If they decide to stop supplying the U.S. (look at what’s happening in Europe and Russian oil), the electric car industry would be crippled. Also, our electric grid is unreliable because of the government’s so-called “green energy” which cannot supply us with reliable, stable electricity. (Does everyone remember August 31, 2022, when the temperatures were 100+ degrees and everyone was asked to conserve energy, air conditioning was draining the State’s electricity, and they told Californians not to charge their electric cars?)
- A proposition cannot reduce wildfires! To do that, they would have to find the arsonists, irresponsible campers, and stop the lightning strikes. In addition, the State should haul out 150 million dead trees from wilderness areas, thin out crowded live groves and dead/live brush. *This* is what fuels the deadly fires.

Prop 31. NO! State law banning the sale of flavored tobacco

The Democrat-supported bill SB 793, which was passed by the Democrats and signed by Newsom in 2020, prohibits stores and vending machines from selling most flavored tobacco products or enhancers. SB 793 is promoted as a protection for minors. However, State law already makes it illegal to sell or give any vapor products to those under 21. Governments should not have control over personal choices, even if unhealthy. The real intent is to reduce adult freedom of choice. To “veto” SB 793 and keep freedom of choice, vote **No on Prop 31**.