

ment domain in the June elections. Introducing a second, overlapping ballot question is always an effective tactic by opponents to dilute support for the first.

Voters could probably overcome the confusion caused by that second ballot question, called Proposition 99. Except that's only the beginning. The first and most effective ballot question. Proposition 98, shot itself in the foot by including a separate issue: phasing out rent control.

I'm sorry, but that's just dumb.

Regardless of whether you think rent control is good or bad, it should not be mixed in with eminent domain.

I hate to make predictions – especially in this nutty year in which voters have consistently shredded prognostications – but I'd bet the odds of Proposition 98 passing are about the same as Warren Buffett filing Form 1040EZ next tax season.



COMMENT

CHARLES CRUMPLEY

private property – homes, businesses, churches, etc. – to use for projects owned by taxpayers, such as roads, public hospitals and parks. The government foreclosed, and property owners were given market rates plus a little extra, in a typical case.

But in recent decades, local governments began to do something else. They took private property and turned it over to developers in the private sector to build something that wasn't owned by taxpayers. At first, such projects often could be defined broadly as for the public good, such as sports stadiums. But over time, that definition expanded. More and more routine public-sector projects – shopping centers, condo buildings – started going through the eminent domain route.

What developed was a system in which local governments and their redevelopment agencies got

ment in its 2005 *Kelo vs. City of New Conn.* decision. Alarmed citizens fre ing sea sprang to action. Most passed that curtailed eminent domain in som

In California, Proposition 99 is back ment groups and probably wouldn't do Proposition 98 would restrict eminent c classic use for public projects. Unfortu sition 98 also would phase out rent con because it is partly bankrolled by apartr and partly by folks, such as the Howard payers Association, who agree philosop rent control is similar to eminent domai

California tried eminent domain refor with Proposition 90, which got 47.5 perc percent-plus it needed for approval. But it ing proposition. Unfortunately, Propositio

Charles Crumpley is editor of the Business Journal. He can be reached at ccrumpley@nessjournal.com.

Paparazzi's Dim Bulbs

Recent local actions by the tabloid press, including a Britney Spears hospital escort that cost the city \$25,000, prompted Councilman Dennis Zine to propose a law to curb paparazzi. So the Business Journal asks:

Do you think current laws are sufficient to protect celebrities and businesses from dangerous practices of paparazzi?

► KAREN DIEHL

*Executive Vice President
Casey Sayre & Williams*

I'd like to think that we can deal with public safety concerns and the security of the celebrities and their families without creating new laws. I believe the LAPD is working to use the existing laws that allow them to stop speeding, trespassing, etc., to restrain overzealous paparazzi. We have a free press and it's a slippery slope when you start to regulate or otherwise constrain the media.



Diehl

tion the other day: "Where will these people be in 20 years?" They're just going to be in old photos taken by the paparazzi. But if there are celebrities who are actually trying to lead a normal life without constant cameras in their face, there do need to be minor restrictions about private property and respect for one's fellow human.

► KEN MILES

*Managing Partner
NSBN LLP*

In general I think that the laws that currently exist are sufficient, at the same time individuals and businesses are certainly owed their privacy and space. I would support a buffer zone, but enforcement would be virtually impossible. The unfortunate reality is it comes with the territory of being a celebrity.

► MICHAEL AMIR

*Name Partner
Doll Amir & Eley LLP*

I do think laws are sufficient, and that is

because if the paparazzi are in fact intentionally endangering a celebrity's well-being or I think the police officers or law enforcement have an absolute right to stop that. I think the problem with the paparazzi driving after celebrities at high speeds and trying to scoop, and it appears, especially with this episode, that they are running around w ty. But I think it wouldn't be fair to focus on paparazzi, anyone who endangers some life should be held responsible.

► LYNNE RUE

*Marketing Director
GMPA Architects*

Definitely. There should be laws restricting these paparazzi. It's just a question of if somebody gets hurt. I don't favor a ban on photographers, but there should be some sort of requirement for photographers around celebrities. Something like a restraining order that says you must be X number of feet away from the

► JULIE DU BROW

*Principal
Dubroworks*

Many of these people don't really have any talent per se, so being a celebrity is all that they are able to count on. I was just having this conversa-

Los Angeles Business Journal Poll

Do you think laws are sufficient to protect celebrities and businesses from what some believe are invasive or even dangerous practices of the paparazzi?

