

# LWW LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS<sup>®</sup> OF LOS ANGELES COUNTY



## ELECTION INFO

for Los Angeles County

Statewide General Election

**TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 5, 2024**

Polls open 7 AM to 8 PM



OCTOBER 3-7 - Vote-by-Mail Ballots mailed

OCTOBER 3 - Ballot Drop Boxes open

OCTOBER 21 - Last day to register or re-register to vote

OCTOBER 26 - Vote Centers open 10 - 7

OCTOBER 29 - Last day to request a replacement Vote-by-Mail ballot

### THIS VOTER INFORMATION NEWS CONTAINS INFORMATION ABOUT:

STATE BALLOT PROPOSITIONS 2 - 6 and 32 - 36

COUNTY MEASURES A, E, and G

LOS ANGELES COUNTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY

LOS ANGELES SUPERIOR COURT JUDGES

### ON NOVEMBER 5, 2024 VOTERS WILL ALSO BE VOTING FOR:

President and Vice-President of the United States

Federal Congressional and Senate candidates

State Assembly and State Senate candidates

Local City, School District, and Special District offices



# Register to Vote!



Official  
Information

## Make your voice heard this election.

The Los Angeles County Registrar-Recorder/County Clerk (RR/CC) has everything you need for the **upcoming 2024 General Election**. It's never been faster or easier to be a voter!

Learn how you can prepare for the election and make your plan to vote today.

## How can I register to vote?

If you've moved, are new to L.A. County, or are voting for the first time, you must register to vote online by October 21, 2024 to receive a Vote by Mail ballot.

The easiest way to register to vote is to visit [PLAN.LAVOTE.GOV](https://plan.lavote.gov).

If you miss the deadline, you can still register in-person at any Vote Center when you come to cast your ballot.



## Key Dates for the 2024 Election

**OCTOBER 3**  
County elections  
office will begin  
mailing ballots

**OCTOBER 21**  
Last day to register  
online to receive a Vote  
by Mail ballot

**NOVEMBER 5**  
Election Day!



**OCTOBER 3**  
Drop Boxes  
Open

**OCTOBER 26**  
Vote Centers open for  
early in-person voting

# CANDIDATES FOR DISTRICT ATTORNEY OF LOS ANGELES COUNTY

**TERM OF OFFICE:** 4 years

**TERM BEGINS:** January 2, 2025

**SALARY:** \$416,462 annually (as of 7-1-2024)

## DUTIES:

The District Attorney's Office is dedicated to protecting our community through the fair and ethical pursuit of justice and the safeguarding of crime victims' rights. The office's top priority is the prosecution of violent and dangerous criminals. The office prosecutes felony crimes for all unincorporated areas and cities throughout LA County. The office also prosecutes misdemeanor crimes in unincorporated areas of the County and in 78 out of 88 cities.

Each candidate for District Attorney was asked to submit a statement of qualifications and respond to the following questions using no more than 100 words.

## Question:

Restorative justice provides opportunities for victims, people who commit crimes, and communities affected by a crime to communicate (directly or indirectly) about the causes, circumstances, and impact of that crime, and to address their related needs. Under what circumstances, if any, would you use the Restorative Justice process to hold someone accountable for causing harm?

## DISTRICT ATTORNEY OF LOS ANGELES COUNTY

### CANDIDATE

**George Gascon**

**Occupation:** LA County District Attorney

**Website:** [www.georgegascon.com](http://www.georgegascon.com)



### Qualifications:

- Police Chief, Mesa Police Dept.
- Police Chief, San Francisco Police
- 28th District Attorney, San Francisco
- 43rd District Attorney, Los Angeles County

### Answers:

Creating and providing restorative justice opportunities is a top priority for me, and I'm proud of what we've been able to accomplish in my first term. For example, I started an innovative approach called the Reconciliation Education and Counseling Crimes of Hate Program (REACCH). It's a fully restorative justice model for low-level hate crimes. Offenders are made to confront the impact of hate on victim(s) and community. The program is based on a new way of looking at a problem that is increasing at tremendous rates and impacting multiple communities, specifically the API, LGBTQIA+, Jewish, and African American communities.

### CANDIDATE

**Nathan Hochman**

**Occupation:** Criminal Law Attorney

**Website:** [www.nathanhochman.com](http://www.nathanhochman.com)



### Qualifications:

- 34 years of legal experience
- JD, Stanford Law
- Former Assistant U.S. Attorney General
- Former Assistant U.S. Attorney
- Former President, City of L.A. Ethics Commission

### Answers:

I see restorative justice as a valuable tool for many first-time and non-violent offenders where the victim is open and willing to participate. It can be used to facilitate healing and restitution through community service, dialogue, and other non-incarceration remedies. Public safety remains my priority, and I believe that serious crimes require traditional prosecution - there must be a balance. I would carefully evaluate each case to determine if restorative justice is appropriate, ensuring it aligns with the best interests of the victim, community, and public safety.

# CANDIDATES FOR JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT OF LOS ANGELES COUNTY

**SALARY:** \$243,940 annually (set by the State Legislature 7-1-2024)

**TERM OF OFFICE:** 6 years

**TERM BEGINS:** January 2, 2025

Elections for Superior Court Judges in Los Angeles County are held in even numbered years at the scheduled Primary Election. The California Constitution requires that a candidate for Superior Court Judge be a member of the State Bar or serve on a court of record for ten years. A vacancy in a Superior Court office is to be filled by appointment by the governor. The appointed judge must stand for election at the next general election.

There are 490 judicial offices in 12 judicial districts in Los Angeles County. When a judge runs for re-election and there is no other candidate for the same office, his/her name does not appear on the ballot. In cases where more than two candidates are running and no one candidate receives more than 50% of the votes, a run-off is held at the November General Election. There are 5 run-off elections on this ballot.

Each candidate for Superior Court Judge was asked to submit a statement of qualifications and respond to the following questions using no more than 125 words.

1. What personal qualities and experience make you particularly well suited to serve as a judge?
2. What are your views on whether the court, as a whole, deals effectively with racial and gender bias?

## SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE OFFICE 39

### CANDIDATE

**George A. Turner, Jr.**

**Occupation:** Deputy Public Defender

**Website:** [www.georgeaturner.com](http://www.georgeaturner.com)



#### Qualifications:

- BA, UCLA Political Science  
Summa Cum Laude
- JD, UCLA Critical Race Studies
- Trial attorney, Public Defender's Office 15 years
- Deputy in Charge Homeless Mobile Unit

#### Answers:

1. I am a hardworking and inquisitive community member that is dedicated to bridging the gap between the community and the court. I am a husband and a father who is pragmatic, patient and committed to finding solutions that reduce harm.
2. The court and the legal profession in general has quite a way to go in achieve true equity. The numbers are staggering when you consider the number of African Americans in custody and the lack of culturally competent representation across the legal field. I am a part of the generation that continues the struggle to defeat bias and finally achieve substantive equality.

### CANDIDATE

**Steve Napolitano**

**Occupation:** Attorney, Mayor of Manhattan Beach

**Website:** [www.stevenapolitano.com](http://www.stevenapolitano.com)



#### Qualifications:

- State Appointed Parole Attorney
- Administrative Law Judge/Hearing Officer
- 5 Term Mayor/Councilmember with more than 30 years of public service in LA County

#### Answers:

1. I've spent my life improving communities and making a difference and I want to put that experience to work as your judge. I believe judges should be fair, unbiased and independent, and will make decisions without fear or favor, and without political agendas. That's who I am and why I've earned the support of the LA Times and elected officials across LA County.
2. Our courts can and should do more to address bias and I support regular training to identify both explicit and implicit bias regarding race and gender. I also think the court should do more regarding economic bias, because the middle class does not have the help it needs to access court in an affordable way. That needs to change too.

## SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE OFFICE 48

### CANDIDATE

#### Renee Rose

**Occupation:** Deputy District Attorney

**Website:** [www.reneeroseforjudge.com](http://www.reneeroseforjudge.com)



#### Qualifications:

- 30 years Deputy District Attorney, Currently Deputy-in-Charge, Elder Abuse Unit
- Past: Hardcore Gang Unit, Major Narcotics
- Rated "Well-Qualified" by LACBA

#### Answers:

1. I have been a prosecutor for over 30 years. I am also a dedicated community volunteer, spending countless hours donating time to causes like caring for animals, thanking our veterans and service members and helping to raise money for Alzheimer's research. I believe this makes me a more well-rounded candidate as someone who is not just Well Qualified to serve as a Judge, but is deeply invested in our communities.

2. There is much work left to be done when it comes to racial and gender bias. As a woman, I see these biases regularly - both obvious and implicit, and I work to improve how victims and defendants are treated regardless of their gender, race or economic status.

### CANDIDATE

#### Ericka J. Wiley

**Occupation:** Deputy Public Defender

**Website:** [www.wileyforjudge.com](http://www.wileyforjudge.com)



#### Qualifications:

- Deputy Public Defender 25 years
- Conducted 100+ trials
- Committed to safety, empathy, fairness and ending mass incarceration
- Endorsed by L.A. County Democratic Party & L.A. Times

#### Answers:

1. My 25 years as a Deputy Public Defender, handling thousands of cases, have given me a deep understanding of the challenges faced by individuals in our justice system. My background has instilled in me a strong sense of empathy, and a commitment to fairness.

2. Our court system has made strides in addressing racial and gender bias, but more needs to be done. The legacy of historically perpetuated systemic inequalities still disproportionately affects women and people of color today. Addressing these issues requires a multifaceted approach that includes anti-bias training for judges, greater diversity within the judiciary and reforms that promote accountability in judicial decision making.

## SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE OFFICE 97

### CANDIDATE

#### Sharon Ransom

**Occupation:** Deputy District Attorney

**Website:** [www.sharonransomforjudge.com](http://www.sharonransomforjudge.com)



#### Qualifications:

- Deputy District Attorney, 19 years
- Mental Health Unit/Elder Abuse
- Rated Well Qualified by LACBA
- Integrity
- Strong Community Ties
- Advocate for Justice

#### Answers:

1. Growing up in Los Angeles, raised by a single parent, and surviving breast cancer, I learned the importance of fairness, impartiality, and resilience. Balancing work while earning my degree as a single parent deepened my commitment to justice and honed my ability to remain patient and objective under pressure. Experience as a prosecutor and my commitment to community education underscores my dedication to treating everyone with respect and dignity.

2. I believe the court system is taking meaningful steps to address racial and gender bias. Mandatory training to raise awareness of implicit biases and the commitment to bring a diverse judiciary and staff are positive strides. These initiatives reflect the courts ongoing dedication to fairness and equity, and just and impartial treatment under the law.

### CANDIDATE

#### La Shae Henderson

**Occupation:** Deputy Public Defender

**Website:** [www.lashae4judge.com](http://www.lashae4judge.com)



**No Response by Press Time**

## SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE OFFICE 135

### CANDIDATE

#### Georgia Huerta

Occupation: Deputy District Attorney

Website: [www.georgiahuertaforjudge2024.com](http://www.georgiahuertaforjudge2024.com)



#### Qualifications:

- Rated Well Qualified by LAC Bar Association
- Deputy District Attorney 30 years
- 80 Jury Trials to Verdict
- Community Volunteer
- UCLA, USC, Western State College Alumna

#### Answers:

1. I can work with people, stay calm, and listen to others. I possess the work ethic, legal expertise, integrity, and compassion required to serve as a judge. I will always prioritize the well-being of the community and the parties involved.

2. The court provides continuous training for court employees on how to identify and appropriately address racial and gender bias. As a judge, I recognize my decisions must be grounded in evidence and the law. It is inappropriate to base decisions on stereotypes or to prejudge individuals or situations. The courtroom should ensure that all parties have a fair and equal opportunity to present their case.

### CANDIDATE

#### Steven Yee Mac

Occupation: Deputy District Attorney

Website: [www.stevenmacforjudge.com](http://www.stevenmacforjudge.com)



#### Qualifications:

- Deputy District Attorney, LA County
- Judge Advocate, U.S. Army
- B.A., Berkeley
- J.D., UCLA Law
- Criminal, civil, juvenile, corporate, and military law experience
- "Well-Qualified," LACBA

#### Answers:

1. My life and work have given me an understanding of the impact of a judge's decisions. I have seen this impact on victims seeking justice, defendants seeking fairness, and the community seeking peace. This experience has shaped my commitment to serving with dignity and respect to advance these goals for our democracy.

2. As a minority and the son of refugees, I know the pain and turmoil caused by bias. It undermines fairness in our community and shatters the function of a courtroom. A fair court system must actively abolish bias that hurts the fair administration of justice.

## SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE OFFICE 137

### CANDIDATE

#### Tracey M. Blount

Occupation: Senior Deputy County Counsel

Website: [www.traceyblountforjudge.com](http://www.traceyblountforjudge.com)



#### Qualifications:

- Los Angeles County Counsel's Office – 23 years
- San Bernardino District Attorney Appeals Division – 1 year

#### Answers:

1. Tracey Blount works for Los Angeles County Counsel's Office and has over 23 years of experience, including 12 years of daily courtroom appearances handling child abuse and neglect cases and 14 years handling appeals. She also worked for the San Bernardino County District Attorney handling criminal appeals. Tracey has also served on numerous committees. Tracey wants to continue her long career of service to the County of Los Angeles as a Judge of the Superior Court.

2. The courts appear to be addressing racial/gender bias with trainings, education programs, and ethics trainings. It is my understanding that new judges and commissioners have trainings focus on these issues as well.

### CANDIDATE

#### Luz E. Herrera

Occupation: Attorney/ Law Professor

Website: [www.luzherrera.com](http://www.luzherrera.com)



#### Qualifications:

- B.A. Stanford University
- J.D. Harvard Law School
- Member of California Bar for 24 years
- Law Professor
- Represented individuals, businesses and nonprofits
- Access to Justice Advocate

#### Answers:

1. My personal qualities include: Fair, Hard-working, Respectful, Even Temperament, Persistent, Public Servant

2. Courts can mandate that all judges and staff participate in implicit bias and unconscious bias training. When we raise awareness about all of our unconscious biases, we can provide strategies and tools on how to counteract them to assure that our courts are as fair and just for all Los Angeles County residents.

**Parcel Tax to fund Firefighting and Emergency Response****FIRE DISTRICT EMERGENCY RESPONSE AND INFRASTRUCTURE MEASURE**

**THE QUESTION:** Should a parcel tax of 6 cents per square foot of certain parcel improvements be adopted to ensure local firefighter/paramedic emergency response, involving wildfires, house fires, heart attacks, strokes, and car accidents; to hire/train firefighters/paramedics, upgrade/replace aging firefighter safety equipment, fire engines, helicopters, facilities, life-saving rescue tools, and 911 communications technology?

**THE SITUATION:**

In March 2020 the county proposed a parcel tax to fund firefighters and equipment at the rate of \$0.06 per square foot of buildings on properties in the cities served by the County Fire Department. This tax, which required a 2/3s vote, failed. Property owners currently pay a tax for the County Fire Department set by the Supervisors.

**THE PROPOSAL:**

**Measure E** will levy an additional parcel tax on all property in the 59 cities and unincorporated areas served by the County Fire Department.

- Rate of \$0.06 per square foot of buildings on the property beginning in 2025-26
- Proceeds used to replace and upgrade communications and technology systems, purchase and maintain fire engines and helicopters, acquire life saving tools, improve wildfire protection, and hire and train firefighters and paramedics.
- Tax will be in effect until voters petition to remove it. Tax can go up by 2% per year
- Low income seniors over age 62 may apply for exemption.
- Proceeds to be deposited in a special account in the county
- Independent Citizen’s Oversight committee will review expenditures for compliance

**FISCAL EFFECTS:**

Measure E could raise around \$150 Million per year for fire and emergency personnel, technology and equipment at a cost of \$60 to \$600 per single family residence.

**YES Vote Means:** An additional tax of \$60 per 1000 square feet of buildings will be added to LA County property taxes for firefighting and emergency services with no sunset date.

**NO Vote Means:** No additional parcel tax will be assessed for fire and emergency services protection.

**SUPPORTERS SAY:**

1. Measure E will provide critically needed funds to replace firefighting and emergency equipment including trucks, helicopters, and life-saving tools to improve service in emergencies.
2. Measure E will upgrade the county’s aging 911 system to improve communication and response time
3. More paramedics and firefighters will hired and trained.

**OPPONENTS SAY:**

1. This is a tax increase of \$60/1000 feet of buildings which will go up every year
2. If the Supervisors managed their \$45 Billion budget wisely they could pay for increased fire and emergency services and equipment without a tax increase.
3. The County has underfunded the Fire Department for years.

**Supporters:** David Gillotte, LA County Firefighters Union  
Freddie Rodriguez, CA Assemblymember 53rd District

**Opponents:** Jon Coupal, Howard Jarvis Taxpayers  
Michael Antonovich, Retired Supervisor 5th District

**Choosing YES or NO on a Proposition**

A YES vote means that you approve of the change a proposition would make, and a NO vote means that you want to leave things as they are now.

## HOMELESSNESS SERVICES & AFFORDABLE HOUSING ORDINANCE

**THE QUESTION:** To require accountability and results, create affordable housing, support home ownership, provide rental assistance, increase mental health and addiction treatment, reduce and prevent homelessness; and provide services for children, families, veterans, domestic violence survivors, seniors, and disabled people experiencing homelessness; shall the measure repealing the Measure H tax and replacing it with a ½ cent sales tax, raising approximately \$1,076,076,350 annually until voters decide to end it, with new audits and oversight, be adopted?

### THE SITUATION:

2024 Homeless Count found 75,000 unhoused individuals in LA County. The count plateaued this year; this number is down slightly from 2023. The number of unsheltered individuals dropped 5%. (Unsheltered: 52,365; Sheltered: 22,947) Numbers are based on the Annual Homeless Point-In-Time Count. These results are submitted to HUD, which allocates federal funding.

LA County Measure H (2017), a ¼ cent sales tax, funds homeless services and prevention. It passed with nearly 70% of the vote and was to be in effect for 10 years, until 2027.

SB 1338 (Umberg, Eggman) passed in 2022; it establishes a new civil court called Community Assistance, Recovery and Empowerment (CARE) Court, which would engage individuals living with psychotic disorders into treatment under the court's jurisdiction. The courts will be set up in each county by the end of 2024.

Prop 1 was barely approved statewide in March 2024. It reallocates the 1% tax on income above \$1M (Mental Health Services Act to Behavioral Health Services Act). \$6.38B in bonds to fund homeless housing, veteran housing; \$4.4B for mental health/drug and alcohol treatment or treatment facilities; \$2B for housing unhoused.

June 2024 Supreme Court Grants Pass ruling allows jurisdictions to enforce anti-camping ordinances, even if there is no place for individuals to go.

### THE PROPOSAL:

Measure A would establish a permanent half percent (0.5%) sales and use tax to reduce and prevent homelessness and provide affordable housing. This measure would repeal the one quarter percent (0.25%) sales and use tax enacted in 2017 that would otherwise expire in 2027.

Of the \$1.1B raised in its first year, 61% would go to the County for Comprehensive Homelessness Services, the Local Solutions Fund, etc; 36% would go to the LA County Affordable Housing Solutions Agency for Affordable Housing & Prevention; and 3% to the LA County Development Authority for Local Housing Production. Approximately 0.5% would be used to collect and distribute the tax.

### THE FISCAL EFFECT:

According to the LA County Registrar-Recorder/County Clerk's Office, the sales tax increase imposed by Measure A would raise approximately \$1.1B annually until voters decide to end it. [2017's Measure H expires in 2027; it raises about half this amount annually]

**A YES vote means:** You support a ½ cent sales tax to fund homelessness and housing efforts in LA County.

### A NO vote means:

You do not support a ½ cent sales tax to fund homelessness and housing efforts in LA County.

### SUPPORTERS SAY:

These funds will pay for:

- New affordable housing, immediate and interim housing.
- Mental health and substance abuse treatments for homeless people.
- Rental or legal assistance for tenants at risk of eviction; homelessness prevention.

There will be greater accountability by the county executive committee, with the Board of Supervisors and LA County Affordable Housing Solutions Agency. Programs will be required to conduct audits and set targets.

### OPPONENTS SAY:

- We haven't gotten our money's worth with current tax – huge increase (37%) in our unhoused population since 2017. No guarantee in reduction of homelessness.
- Do we need more taxes? Doubling the tax now will hurt those who are already struggling.
- More oversight, transparency and accountability required.
- Measure A is "rushed" - still 3 years left in Measure H tax.
- Proposed tax is "forever."

### Supporters:

United Way of Greater Los Angeles, ACLU, PATH, St. Joseph Center, Abundant Housing LA  
Los Angeles County Supervisors, SEIU Local 721

### Opponents:

LA County Business Federation (BizFed)



## COUNTY GOVERNMENT REFORM

**QUESTION:** Should the Los Angeles County Charter be amended to create an elected county Executive with full responsibility for executive authority, to expand the number of Supervisors from 5 to 9, and create other administrative and Ethics offices, as well as make other restrictions and requirements?

**BACKGROUND:**

By state law counties in California are administrative arms of the state and law provides that each county be governed by 5 Supervisors. Counties were given power to become charter counties in 1911. LA County drew up its first charter in 1912.

In the 70s the Public Commission on Los Angeles County Government studied ways to make county government more effective and published a report, To Serve Seven Million, which recommended increasing the Board to nine supervisors and creating an elected Executive to administer the operations of the many county functions. Voters rejected these reforms in both 1976 and 1978 and again in 2004.(?) Now the county has 10 million people or 2 million per Supervisor.

**PROVISIONS :**

1. Create and implement an elected County Executive Officer by 2028 with detailed responsibilities and powers including all executive powers of the Board. (Replaces the appointed Executive Director.) Salary to be \$1 more than any other county office
2. Create an independent County Ethics Commission, and an Ethics Compliance Officer in the Office of Ethics Compliance by 2026
3. Create the positions of a Director of Budget and Management and County Legislative Analyst by 2028 and require the Budget to be presented at a public hearing
4. Expand the number of supervisors from 5 to 9 effective in 2032 after new districts have been created in 2031 based on the 2030 census. (Detailed procedure for determining which seats will be on 2032 and subsequent ballots.)
5. Establish a Governance Reform Task Force to guide implementation of reforms to 2028 and Charter Review Commission to begin in 2034
6. Prohibit former County officials from lobbying the County for a minimum of two years after leaving County service(currently one year)
7. Require implementation of the Charter amendments using existing County funding sources, with no additional taxes.

8. Require Board agenda items to be posted 120 hours ahead of the meeting and require that the Budget be presented at a public hearing. (currently 72 hours)

**FISCAL EFFECTS**

The measure specifies that the implementation of all provisions must come out of existing county administrative and departmental funds and that no new taxes or costs will be imposed on taxpayers.

**Supporters:**

Supervisors Lindsey Horvath, Janice Hahn and Hilda Solis  
Sara Sadhwani, Politics Professor at Pomona College  
Fernando J. Guerra, Professor of Political Science, Loyola Marymount  
Marjusha P. Culkarni, Exec. Dir., AAPI Equity Alliance

**Opponents:**

Supervisors Kathryn Barger and Holly J. Mitchell  
L A County Firefighters  
Assn. for Los Angeles Deputy Sheriffs  
Alberto Retana, CEO, Community Coalition

**YES Vote Means** the county charter should be amended to create an elected county Executive Officer, increase the number of Supervisors to 9 and make other detailed changes

**NO Vote Means** the Los Angeles county charter should not be amended to change the Executive and legislative organization of the county.

*Continued on Next Page*



## COUNTY GOVERNMENT REFORM

**QUESTION:** Should the Los Angeles County Charter be amended to create an elected county Executive with full responsibility for executive authority, to expand the number of Supervisors from 5 to 9, and create other administrative and Ethics offices, as well as make other restrictions and requirements?

**SUPPORTERS SAY:**

1. Measure G will increase local representation by creating 9 smaller Supervisorial districts with the potential to elect Supervisors who more closely reflect their constituents
2. Measure G will increase checks and balances by creating an elected Executive similar to a Governor or Mayor to manage the many county departments. Supervisors would retain their legislative role
3. Clean up the corruption by creating an Ethics Commission and Compliance Officer to hold politicians accountable and rout out waste
4. Measure G is necessary to create Good Government, a more transparent, ACCOUNTABLE, REPRESENTATIVE AND EFFECTIVE LA COUNTY
5. Specifically will not raise taxes to pay for the additional positions and functions.

**OPPONENTS SAY:**

1. The elected County Executive Officer will have no term limits unlike the Supervisors. There are no requirements for experience or competence to run for County Executive yet they will be expected to manage 30 departments and a \$45B budget.
2. Measure G creates 5 new managerial positions plus staff which will be paid for out of county departmental budgets, taking millions of dollars from essential programs.
3. This measure does nothing to solve the most pressing issues in the county such as mental illness, housing, homelessness, and decrepit jail facilities.



The League of Women Voters of California Education Fund (LWVCEF) produced these nonpartisan explanations of state propositions, with supporting and opposing arguments. The arguments come from many sources and are not limited to those presented in the Official Voter Information Guide. The LWVCEF does not judge the merits of the arguments or guarantee their validity.

Visit our website, [CAvotes.org](https://CAvotes.org), to:

- Learn more about the ballot measures and voter registration
- See a list of local Leagues
- Sign up and become a member, and to donate or volunteer



## GENERAL ELECTION • NOVEMBER 5, 2024

- ★ In this general election, California voters will vote for President;
- ★ U.S. Senator; Representatives in U.S. Congress and the California State Legislature; and other candidates and proposed laws depending on where you live.
- ★ California voters will also decide on 10 state propositions that are explained in this Pros & Cons. Propositions 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6 were placed on the ballot by the State Legislature. Propositions 32, 33, 34, 35, and 36 have been placed on the ballot by people who collected enough signatures.
- ★ Visit [Vote411.org](http://Vote411.org) to see everything on your ballot, find your polling place, and get unbiased information on all your voting choices.

### HOW TO EVALUATE BALLOT PROPOSITIONS

- ★ Examine what the measure seeks to accomplish. Do you agree with those goals?
- ★ Is the measure consistent with your ideas about government? Do you think the proposed changes will make things better?
- ★ Who are the real sponsors and opponents of the measure? Check where the money is coming from on Power Search.
- ★ Is the measure written well? Will it create conflicts in law that may require court resolution or interpretation? Is it “good government,” or will it cause more problems than it will resolve?
- ★ Does the measure create its own revenue source? Does it earmark, restrict, or obligate government revenues? If so, weigh the benefit of securing funding for this measure against the cost of reducing overall flexibility in the budget.
- ★ Does the measure mandate a government program or service without addressing how it will be funded?
- ★ Does the measure deal with one issue that can be easily decided by a YES or NO vote? Or, is it a complex issue that should be thoroughly examined in the legislative arena?
- ★ If the measure amends the Constitution, consider whether it really belongs in the Constitution. Would a statute accomplish the same purpose? All constitutional amendments require voter approval; what we put into the Constitution would have to come back to the ballot to be changed.
- ★ Be wary of distortion tactics and commercials that rely on image but tell nothing of substance about the measure. Beware of half truths.

## AUTHORIZES BONDS FOR PUBLIC SCHOOL AND COMMUNITY COLLEGE FACILITIES

**THE QUESTION:** Should the state authorize \$10 billion in bonds to build new, or renovate existing, public school and community college facilities?

### THE SITUATION:

The Legislature placed Proposition 2 on the ballot.

California has approximately 10,000 public schools and 115 community colleges. Many schools and community colleges have older, outdated facilities. Many need health and safety repairs, renovations, and new classrooms. According to a 2020 publication from the Public Policy Institute of California, 38% of California students attend schools that don't meet minimum facility standards. This includes 25% of students attending schools with damaged floors, walls, or ceilings, and 14% attending schools with malfunctioning electrical systems. 15% of students attend schools with extreme deficiencies, such as gas leaks, power failures, and structural damage. The state and the school districts usually share the cost for renovation and new construction almost equally. The state uses voter-approved bonds for its share of these costs.

### THE PROPOSAL:

If passed, Proposition 2 would authorize \$10 billion in state general obligation funds for repair, upgrade, and construction of facilities at K-12 public schools (including charter schools) and community colleges. Of that amount the bonds would be allocated in the following way:

- \$8.5 billion (or 85% of total bond amount) for public schools, including charter schools. \$1.5 billion (or 15% of total bond amount) for community colleges.
- A small portion of new construction and renovation funds must be set aside for small school districts.

Up to \$115 million to be used to reduce lead levels in water at public school sites. The state would pay a higher share of project costs for school districts with lower assessed property values and have a higher share of students who are low-income, English learners, or foster youth.

### FISCAL EFFECTS:

The state's estimated cost to repay this bond would be about \$500 million each year for 35 years. The effect on local governments would depend on the choices that school districts and community colleges make about building repairs and new buildings.

### SUPPORTERS SAY:

- Provides funding for outdated facilities needing repairs and upgrades to meet basic health safety standards.
- Provides strict taxpayer accountability protections.
- Protects local control. Funding can only be used for projects approved by local school and community college districts, with local community input.

### OPPONENTS SAY:

- California already has over \$109 billion of outstanding and unissued bonds.
- Sacramento politicians overspend, issue bonds, and punish us with tax hikes.
- Tell politicians to prioritize education funding over free healthcare for illegal immigrants in our state budget.

### FOR MORE INFORMATION:

#### Supporters:

Yes on Prop 2 [yesprop2ca.com](http://yesprop2ca.com)

#### Opponents:

Assemblyman Bill Essayli,  
California State Legislature

At press time there is no organized campaign website.

## CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT TO MARRIAGE

**THE QUESTION:** Should the California Constitution be amended to define marriage as a fundamental right for all regardless of sex or race and remove language that states that marriage is only between a man and a woman?

### THE SITUATION:

The California Constitution contains an outdated and unenforceable provision stating “Only marriage between a man and a woman is valid or recognized in California.” The language was inserted as a result of the passage of Proposition 8 in 2008. After federal court decisions holding that the provision was unconstitutional under the 14th Amendment of the U.S. Constitution, California has recognized same-sex marriage. In 2015 the U.S. Supreme Court held that states must allow and recognize same-sex marriage.

### THE PROPOSAL:

Prop 3 would repeal the outdated language and amend the state Constitution to provide that the right to marry is a fundamental right, and this fundamental right is in furtherance of the rights to enjoy life, liberty, safety, happiness and privacy, and the rights to due process and equal protection. These amendments would protect both same-sex and interracial marriages.

The legislature placed this measure on the ballot to bring the California Constitution in line with existing law that gives same-sex couples the right to marry, as set forth by the U.S. Supreme Court in *Obergefell v Hodges* and the federal Respect for Marriage Act. By placing the freedom to marry in the California Constitution, the state would provide protections in the event that there is a rollback on protections currently afforded at the federal level.

### FISCAL EFFECTS:

No changes in revenues or costs are estimated for state or local governments.

### SUPPORTERS SAY:

- Prop 3 proactively protects against future attempts to restrict marriage rights for same-sex or interracial couples.
- The amendment aligns the state Constitution with the law as it is today and reaffirms the freedom to marry as a fundamental right.
- The amendment does not change any laws regarding age requirements, the number of people in a marriage, or existing rights of clergy to refuse to perform a marriage.

### OPPONENTS SAY:

- Because same-sex marriage is already legal, the amendment fixes a problem that does not exist.
- The amendment’s language is unclear and eliminates all rules for marriage.
- Without safeguards such as age, genetic relationship and the number of participants, the amendment opens the door to child marriage, incest and polygamy.

### FOR MORE INFORMATION:

#### Supporters:

Freedom to Marry  
[yesonprop3ca.com](http://yesonprop3ca.com)

#### Opponents:

California Family Council

## AUTHORIZES BONDS FOR SAFE DRINKING WATER, WILDFIRE PREVENTION, AND PROTECTING COMMUNITIES AND NATURAL LANDS FROM CLIMATE RISKS

**THE QUESTION:** Should voters let the state sell \$10 billion in bonds for various projects to reduce [californiafamily.org/proposition3](https://californiafamily.org/proposition3) climate risks and impacts?

### THE SITUATION:

Destructive forest fires, droughts and floods are becoming more common in California. Climate change is impacting farming, water quality, and wildlife. Many people don't have access to safe drinking water. At the same time, a recent budget deficit led to \$9 billion in cuts from programs meant to reduce pollution and greenhouse gas. According to California's 4th Climate Assessment (Table 6) the cost of climate change for California could be more than \$113 billion annually by 2050 (mostly from human mortality). Climate change affects all Californians, with most impacts hitting those least able to afford countermeasures.

### THE PROPOSAL:

Prop 4 would let the state issue \$10 billion in general obligation bonds. The proceeds of the sale of bonds would be allocated as follows:

- **\$3.8 Billion for Water.** To protect and increase state water supply and water quality, reduce flood risk and improve stormwater management, and protect and restore rivers, lakes and streams.
- **\$1.5 Billion for Wildfires and Forests.** To improve local fire prevention capacity, improve forest health and resilience, and reduce the risk of wildfire spread.
- **\$1.2 Billion for Coastal Resilience.** For coastal and flood management primarily associated with sea-level rise.
- **\$1.2 Billion for Biodiversity Protection.** For grant programs for fish and wildlife, including tribal nature-based climate solutions.
- **\$850 Million for Clean Air.** For offshore wind and expansion of port infrastructure, and projects to support clean energy transmission. \$700 Million for Parks. For state and neighborhood park creation, expansion, renovation, and maintenance.
- **\$450 Million for Extreme Heat Mitigation.** For grants for urban greening and community resilience centers for cooling and benefits during a disaster.
- **\$300 Million for Agricultural Lands.** To improve the climate resilience and sustainability of agricultural lands, including a series of programs benefiting low-income and historically marginalized groups.

Some funding would be used to offset budget cuts. Most funding would create loans and grants for:

- Local governments
- Native American tribes
- Non-profit groups
- Businesses
- State-run agencies

Forty percent of funding must go to activities that will help lower-income communities or communities hit the hardest by environmental changes and disasters.

### FISCAL EFFECTS:

The Legislative Analysts' Office estimates paying back the bond loan would cost the state \$400 million a year for 40 years. However, the bonds would fund projects that reduce future risk and the costs of damage from disasters.

### SUPPORTERS SAY:

- California faces growing threats from wildfires, water pollution, extreme heat, and other disasters. The right investments now could help prevent future damage and costs.
- California is already paying a price for failing to prepare for drought and climate change.
- Prop 4 helps us shift from disaster response to disaster prevention.
- Prop 4 makes efficient, sensible investments in proven solutions

### OPPONENTS SAY:

- The goals identified in Prop 4 should be funded within our current state budget.
- Taxpayers should not be asked for \$10 billion more in the form of a bond that will cost nearly double to repay.
- Prop 4 provides funding for unproven technologies with no real evidence of success.
- Prop 4 lacks fiscal accountability and specific standards for measuring success.

### FOR MORE INFORMATION:

#### Supporters:

Californians for Safe Drinking Water and Wildfire Prevention  
[yesonprop4ca.com](https://yesonprop4ca.com)

#### Opponents:

Howard Jarvis Taxpayers Association  
[hjta.org/hjta-ballot-measurerecommendations](https://hjta.org/hjta-ballot-measurerecommendations)

**ALLOWS LOCAL BONDS FOR AFFORDABLE HOUSING AND PUBLIC INFRASTRUCTURE WITH 55% VOTER APPROVAL**

**THE QUESTION:** Shall local bond measures to fund housing bonds for low- and middle-income Californians and public infrastructure projects be allowed to pass with 55% voter approval instead of the 66.7% approval currently required?

**THE SITUATION:**

Bonds are a form of long-term borrowing used by cities, counties and special districts. Bond holders are repaid with interest and the repayment funds come from increased property taxes. Local bond measures currently require approval of two-thirds of voters. The state of California is in critical need of more affordable housing. A typical house here costs around twice the national average and rents are about 50% higher than in other states. Upgrades to outdated local infrastructure like roads, hospitals, fire stations and water treatment facilities are also needed.

**THE PROPOSAL:**

Prop 5 would:

- Lower the voting requirement so that some types of local bond measures could pass with 55% of the vote instead of two-thirds of the vote. This lower voting requirement applies to housing program bonds for low income families, seniors, people with disabilities, veterans, and other groups. It could also be used to improve infrastructure for police, flood and fire protection, libraries, public health, and public transit.
- Require those bonds to adhere to specific accountability provisions such as citizen oversight committees and annual independent audits.
- Apply to any qualifying local bond measure passed in the November 2024 election.

**FISCAL EFFECTS:**

The Legislative Analyst believes that if Prop 5 were to pass it would likely mean that more local bond measures would pass, resulting in increased funding for housing assistance and public infrastructure. The amount of increase could be at least a couple billion dollars over the life of the bonds and would vary across local governments. If more bonds were approved then local governments would have more costs, which would be paid with higher property taxes. The impact on California’s state budget is uncertain. There are possible long term state savings if local governments take greater responsibility for affordable housing.

**SUPPORTERS SAY:**

- Prop 5 gives local voters more autonomy to address the unique housing and infrastructure needs in their own communities.
- Prop 5 does not raise taxes. Qualifying bond measures would have strict accountability provisions, ensuring the funds are appropriately spent in the jurisdiction that approved them.

**OPPONENTS SAY:**

- Prop 5 was written by politicians to push the cost of infrastructure onto local governments which increases debt.
- Californians already struggle with the highest cost of living in the nation and Prop 5 would make everything more expensive.
- Prop 5 removes protections that California Constitution has provided taxpayers for many years.

**FOR MORE INFORMATION:**

**Supporters:**

YES on Prop 5  
[yesonprop5.org](http://yesonprop5.org)

**Opponents:**

Protect Local Taxpayers  
[VoteNoProp5.com](http://VoteNoProp5.com)



## ELIMINATES CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISION ALLOWING INVOLUNTARY SERVITUDE FOR INCARCERATED PERSONS

**THE QUESTION:** Should the California Constitution be amended to: (1) remove the provision that allows involuntary servitude to be used as punishment for a crime; (2) prohibit incarcerated people from being punished for refusing a work assignment; and (3) allow incarcerated people to voluntarily accept work assignments in exchange for credit to reduce their sentences?

### THE SITUATION:

California's Constitution mirrors the 13th Amendment of the U.S. Constitution, which allows for involuntary servitude as punishment for crimes.

Although no courts explicitly order forced labor as a part of criminal sentencing, it is standard practice to force incarcerated people to perform labor. California is among 16 states with an exception clause for involuntary servitude in its state constitution. Most recently, voters in Alabama, Oregon, Tennessee, and Vermont removed involuntary servitude language from their state constitutions.

More than 94,000 Californians are currently in state prison. Black people are disproportionately represented in the prison population - accounting for 28% despite making up less than 6% of California's overall population.

### THE PROPOSAL:

Proposition 6 would amend the California Constitution to end mandatory work assignments for state prisoners. It would make employment voluntary for incarcerated people and would protect them from being disciplined for refusing a work assignment. It would authorize credits for incarcerated people who voluntarily participate in work assignments.

### FISCAL EFFECTS:

Fiscal effects are uncertain. Proposition 6 doesn't mandate wages and a related law, that will go into effect if Prop 6 passes, explicitly exempts California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (CDCR) from minimum wage laws. It also specifies that the compensation for work assignments will be set through regulations. The costs will also depend on whether courts require prisoners to be paid minimum wage for their work. Any potential increase or decrease in state and local criminal justice costs likely would not exceed the tens of millions of dollars each year (annually).

### SUPPORTERS SAY:

- Involuntary servitude is an extension of slavery. There's no room for slavery in our constitution, which should reflect our values in 2024.
- Proposition 6 prioritizes rehabilitation for incarcerated people by allowing them to choose work assignments that enable participation in programs that facilitate personal growth and transformation.
- Proposition 6 was placed on the ballot by California state lawmakers with bipartisan support.

### OPPONENTS SAY:

There are no official opponents

### FOR MORE INFORMATION:

#### Supporters:

Yes on Prop 6  
[voteyesoncaprop6.com](http://voteyesoncaprop6.com)

#### Opponents:

There are no official opponents



## RAISES MINIMUM WAGE

**THE QUESTION:** Should California raise its statewide minimum wage to \$18 an hour by January 1, 2026, and then each year based on inflation?

**THE SITUATION:**

California's statewide minimum wage is now \$16 an hour, with yearly increases based on inflation. Yearly increases range from \$0 if the inflation rate is zero or less, to 3.5% if inflation is 3.5% or more.

Some California workers already have minimum wages higher than \$16 an hour and higher than the proposed rate (\$18 per hour) in Prop 32. These include fast-food workers, healthcare workers, and workers in California cities with their own minimum wage laws.

**THE PROPOSAL:**

Prop 32 would increase California's current statewide \$16 an hour minimum wage each year until it reaches \$18 an hour by January 1, 2026. Minimum wage for employers with 26 or more employees would increase to \$18 an hour in 2025. Employers with 25 or fewer employees would move to \$17 an hour in 2025, and \$18 an hour in 2026. Prop 32 would not change industry specific or local minimum wages.

Inflation adjustments would pause temporarily while the minimum wage is increased in 2025 and 2026. In 2027, yearly increases to minimum wage would resume based on inflation.

**FISCAL EFFECTS:**

Proposition 32 could have a wide range of economic effects:

- A higher minimum wage would likely increase business costs and decrease profits. Businesses may set higher prices for their products and services to offset decreased profits. The overall price increase from Proposition 32 likely would be smaller than one-half of 1 percent.
- Reduced profits for business means they will pay less tax. The decrease in tax revenue will not be more than a few hundred million dollars each year, out of an overall revenue collection of about \$200 billion each year. The number of jobs in the state could go up or down. The change in the number of jobs would likely be less than one quarter of a percent.
- State and local government costs could go up or down, because Prop 32 will increase costs in some way and decrease them in others. State and local

governments will have to pay higher wages, which will increase costs. At the same time, Prop 32 will reduce the number of people enrolled in health and human services programs, such as Medi-Cal. The enrollment changes would likely reduce state and local government costs. With these factors combined, state and local government costs could go up or down and the change would not likely exceed the high hundreds of millions of dollars annually. Total state and local government spending in California is greater than \$500 billion annually.

- Higher wages. A higher minimum wage tends to push up wages for other workers. Employees making a bit more than \$18 an hour would also likely see a pay increase.

**SUPPORTERS SAY:**

- Prop 32 will improve the standard of living for millions of workers in California. Today, many full-time workers can't afford the cost of living in California.
- Prop 32 will improve the economy by making it so that people can increase spending on rent, groceries, and other basic necessities. Increased spending will create more jobs and boost local economies.
- Prop 32 will alleviate taxpayer burden. Taxpayers should not have to subsidize some corporations paying extremely low wages, enabling them to keep record level profit for owners.

**OPPONENTS SAY:**

- Prop 32 will hurt businesses, especially small businesses that are more vulnerable to the impact of higher operating costs.
- Prop 32 will result in higher prices and cause job loss.
- Prop 32 will increase government expenses and deficits. This may result in fewer government services or increased taxes.

**FOR MORE INFORMATION:****Supporters:**

Yes on the California Living Wage Act  
[livingwageact.com](http://livingwageact.com)

**Opponents:**

Californians Against Job Losses and Higher Prices  
[stopprop32.com](http://stopprop32.com)

## EXPANDS LOCAL GOVERNMENTS' AUTHORITY TO ENACT RENT CONTROL ON RESIDENTIAL PROPERTY

**THE QUESTION:** Should the Costa-Hawkins Rental Housing Act of 1995 (a state law) be repealed so local governments can regulate rents?

### THE SITUATION:

Housing in California is expensive. Renters here typically pay about 50% more for housing than in other states, and in some areas, rents are more than double the national average. This is because there isn't enough housing for everyone who wants to live in California, so renters have to compete, which drives up the prices.

To help with this, some cities in California have rent control laws that limit how much landlords can increase rent each year. About one-quarter of Californians live in areas with rent control, like Los Angeles, San Francisco, and San Jose.

Additionally, a state law limits most landlords from raising rent by more than 5% plus inflation (up to 10%) each year, and this law is in effect until 2030. However, another state law, called the Costa-Hawkins Rental Housing Act, restricts local rent control in three ways: it doesn't allow rent control on single-family homes, on any housing built after February 1, 1995, and it doesn't let local laws control the rent a landlord can charge a new tenant. Rent control can only limit rent increases for existing tenants.

### THE PROPOSAL:

Prop 33 says the state government cannot limit local governments' power to expand or limit rent control. In essence, it would repeal the Costa Hawkins Rental Act. It would allow cities and counties to regulate rents for any type of housing property they choose. It would not matter when the property was built or what type of building it is. Prop 33 would not change existing rent control laws or create new rent control laws. It would not change a landlord's right to a fair rate of return on their investment.

### FISCAL EFFECTS:

The impact on renters and landlords would depend on how many properties are covered by rent control and how much rent increases are limited. Local governments and voters would decide these factors. On the one hand, expanded rent control would provide some people with more affordable housing. On the other hand, housing scarcity could occur if landlords sell their properties rather than rent them out. And the value of rental properties could decrease because potential buyers might not want to pay as much for these properties.

The impact on local budgets would depend on how many cities and counties pass rent control laws and what landlords do. The measure would likely reduce the amount of money cities, counties, special districts, and schools receive from property taxes. This decrease could be in the tens of millions of dollars each year. Cities or counties will also need to spend money to enforce rent control laws. These costs will likely be paid by landlords

### SUPPORTERS SAY:

- Prop 33 lets local governments enact rent control to protect renters and allow renters to stay in their homes and apartments while more affordable housing is built.
- Prop 33 allows local governments to decide whether and how much to control rents based on the unique situations in their communities.
- Billionaire corporate landlords are currently calling the shots and profit from the lack of housing supply.

### OPPONENTS SAY:

- Prop 33 could increase housing costs and block new affordable housing from being built. This could worsen the housing crisis. Prop 33 could eliminate homeowner and renter protections that already exist and could lead to overturning other state affordable housing laws.
- Prop 33 could reduce home values.

### FOR MORE INFORMATION:

#### Supporters:

Yes on 33  
Yeson33.org

#### Opponents:

No on Prop 33  
noonprop33.com

## RESTRICTS SPENDING OF PRESCRIPTION DRUG REVENUES BY CERTAIN HEALTH CARE PROVIDERS

**THE QUESTION:** Should certain healthcare providers be required to spend 98% of revenues from a federal discount prescription drug program on direct patient care and should the state be permanently authorized to negotiate Medi-Cal drug prices?

### THE SITUATION:

Medi-Cal is a joint federal-state program that provides health coverage for low-income people. This coverage includes the cost of prescription drugs. In 2019, the state adopted a single approach called “Medi-Cal Rx.” Medi-Cal Rx is not reflected in state law, but it is the approach used to pay for drugs in the Medi-Cal system.

The Federal Drug Discount Program provides discounts on drugs to certain healthcare providers. To qualify for these discounts, providers must meet certain rules. Eligible providers are public or private nonprofits that focus on serving low-income people.

According to the federal government, the federal drug discount program intends to allow eligible providers to increase services and serve more low-income patients. Federal and state law, however, does not directly restrict how providers spend their revenue from federal drug discounts.

### THE PROPOSAL:

If passed, Prop 34 would add Medi-Cal Rx to state law. Restricts How Certain Entities Spend Revenue From Federal Discounts.

- Health care providers that participate in Medi-Cal Rx may be restricted if they (a) spend over \$100 million in any 10 years on things besides direct patient care and (b) own and operate multifamily housing units with at least 500 have serious health violations in their properties. Affected healthcare providers would have to spend at least 98 percent of their net revenue earned in California on healthcare services provided directly to patients. They would also have to submit timely and accurate reports detailing the revenue received and the expenditures of that revenue.
- Establishes Penalties for Violating Rules. The four penalties that would apply to violators of these provisions would include loss of state tax-exempt status, loss of license, loss of state contracts or grants, and loss of eligibility to serve in leadership roles in state health plans, pharmacies, or clinics.

### FISCAL EFFECTS:

According to the Legislative Analyst, there would be increased state costs, likely in the millions of dollars annually, to enforce new rules on affected healthcare entities. Affected entities would pay fees to cover these costs.

### SUPPORTERS SAY:

- Prop. 34 will drastically cut the cost of prescription drugs for Medi-Cal patients by permanently authorizing the State of California to negotiate lower Medi-Cal prescription drug costs.
- Prop 34 requires abusers of the new rules to provide healthcare to low-income patients according to their original mission.
- Prop 34 will require the designated healthcare providers to spend 98% of their tax payer generated revenues on direct patient care, which should be their main mission.

### OPPONENTS SAY:

- Prop 34 is an attempt by the California Apartment Association to harm a specific healthcare provider, the AIDS Healthcare Foundation, that supports rent control.
- Prop 34 weaponizes the initiative process so no organization in the future will be safe from retribution by wealthy opponents.
- Prop 34 is not necessary because Medi-Cal already has a discount drug program.

### FOR MORE INFORMATION:

#### Supporters:

California Apartment Association  
caanet.org

#### Opponents:

Vote No on 34  
noon34.org

## PROVIDES PERMANENT FUNDING FOR MEDI-CAL HEALTH CARE SERVICES

**THE QUESTION:** Should California make permanent an existing tax on managed health care plans to provide ongoing funding for Medi-Cal and other health care services?

### THE SITUATION:

California currently imposes a tax on health care plans. The tax is not permanent and needs to be approved every few years by the California Legislature and the federal government. It was last approved in 2023 and will expire at the end of 2026 unless it's approved again. When matched with federal funds, this tax generates revenue that helps pay for health care services for low-income families, seniors, disabled persons, and other Medi-Cal recipients. Medi-Cal is California's Medicaid program, providing health coverage to eligible low-income residents.

The way this tax works has changed over time, but right now, health plans are taxed based on the number of people they cover, including those in Medi-Cal. Some of the tax revenue helps pay for existing Medi-Cal costs, which reduces the amount of money the state has to spend from its General Fund. Some of it is used to increase funding for Medi-Cal and other health programs. For example, the state is using this money to raise payments to doctors and other health care providers in Medi-Cal.

### THE PROPOSAL:

Proposition 35 would make the existing tax on managed health care plans permanent. The revenue generated would fund Medi-Cal services and other specified healthcare programs. Key provisions include: Making the existing tax on managed health care plans permanent, subject to federal approval.

- Requiring that revenues be used only for specified Medi-Cal services, in ways different from the current distribution of funds.
- These services include primary and specialty care, emergency care, family planning, mental health, and prescription drugs.
- Prohibiting the use of these revenues to replace existing Medi-Cal funding.
- Capping administrative expenses and requiring independent audits of programs.

### FISCAL EFFECTS:

According to the Legislative Analyst's estimate:

- In the short term (the next few years) there will be no changes Beginning in 2027:
  - Increased funding for Medi-Cal and other health programs between roughly \$2 billion and \$5 billion annually (including federal matching funds).
  - Increased state costs between roughly \$1 billion to \$2 billion annually to implement funding increases.
- In the long term:
  - Unknown effect on state tax revenue, health program funding, and state costs.

Fiscal effects depend on many factors, such as whether the Legislature would continue to approve the tax on health plans in the future if Proposition 35 is not passed by voters.

### SUPPORTERS SAY:

- Protects and expands access to health care for millions of Californians, including children, low-income families, seniors, and people with disabilities.
- Provides dedicated, ongoing funding for critical health care services without raising taxes on individuals.
- Improves access to primary care, specialty care, emergency services, and mental health treatment.
- Includes strong accountability measures to ensure funds are spent as intended.

### OPPONENTS SAY:

No arguments against Proposition 35 were submitted

### FOR MORE INFORMATION:

**Supporters:**

Protect Our Healthcare [voteeyes35.com](https://www.voteeyes35.com)

**Opponents:**

There were no arguments submitted in opposition to Prop 35

## ALLOWS FELONY CHARGES AND INCREASES SENTENCES FOR CERTAIN DRUG AND THEFT CRIMES

**THE QUESTION:** Should California allow people to be charged with felonies for possessing certain drugs and for thefts under \$950, if the defendant has two prior drug or theft convictions?

### THE SITUATION:

The law divides crimes into one of two general categories: a felony or a misdemeanor. Felonies are considered by the legal system to be the most severe crimes and can result in state prison or county jail time for more than one year. The sentence for a felony depends on the specific crime and the defendant's history of other criminal convictions. Less severe crimes are called misdemeanors. The sentence for a misdemeanor can be a fine, some sort of supervision, or time in a county jail for no more than one year.

In 2014, voters passed Proposition 47, which changed some crimes from felonies to misdemeanors. For example, it reduced shoplifting (stealing items worth \$950 or less) from a felony charge to a misdemeanor unless the accused person had prior convictions for serious crimes. Drug possession became a misdemeanor as well. Prop 47 also created the Safe Neighborhood and School Fund, which funneled savings from lower incarceration rates to mental health and drug treatment programs, programs to keep kids in school, and for victim services.

One of Prop 47's purposes was to reduce overcrowding in state prisons that had been ruled unconstitutional by the U.S. Supreme Court in 2011. Since 2014, the prison population has decreased and the money saved has been redirected toward the Safe Neighborhood and School Fund.

### THE PROPOSAL:

Proposition 36 would turn some misdemeanors into felonies, make some sentences longer, and require some sentences be served in prison instead of county jail. For example:

- If someone has two past theft convictions, then shoplifting could be charged as a felony with a possible 3-year sentence.

- A person who gives or sells an illegal drug to someone who suffers a major injury from using it could receive a longer prison term instead of a jail sentence. This includes drugs like psychedelic mushrooms and peyote.
- If someone with two or more past drug convictions possesses certain drugs, like fentanyl or cocaine, they could be charged with a felony. If the judge decides that someone is "eligible" or "suitable" they must be sent for drug or mental health treatment. If not, they could be sent straight to jail or prison. If someone finishes treatment, the charges will be dismissed. If not, they could be sent to jail or prison.

Prop 36 also requires that people convicted of selling or providing certain drugs, like fentanyl and cocaine, receive a warning by the court that they could be charged with murder if they do it again and someone dies as a result. This practice could increase the likelihood of a murder conviction for the warned person.

### FISCAL EFFECTS:

Proposition 36 would have financial impacts on both the state and local governments, but the extent of these effects is uncertain and would depend on factors like decisions made by local prosecutors.

The state would experience higher costs, likely in the tens of millions to hundreds of millions of dollars each year, from an increased prison population and the length of time it takes to resolve felonies versus misdemeanors. At the local level, Proposition 36 would likely increase the number of people in county jails and under community supervision. Local courts, prosecutors, and public defenders would also see increased workloads due to the more complex felony cases. Overall, local criminal justice costs could rise by tens of millions of dollars each year.

*Continued on Next Page*



**ALLOWS FELONY CHARGES AND INCREASES SENTENCES FOR CERTAIN DRUG AND THEFT CRIMES**

**THE QUESTION:** Should California allow people to be charged with felonies for possessing certain drugs and for thefts under \$950, if the defendant has two prior drug or theft convictions?

Proposition 36 would reduce the state savings created by Proposition 47, which are currently used for mental health and drug treatment, school programs, and victim services. This reduction could be in the low tens of millions of dollars annually.

**SUPPORTERS SAY:**

- Prop 36’s tougher laws against “smash-and-grab” thefts will protect businesses in every community.
- Prop 36 will allow prosecutors to combine the value of items stolen from multiple thefts to increase accountability for serial thieves.
- Prop 36 will reduce crime and substance abuse by mandating treatment for felony drug offenders.

**OPPONENTS SAY:**

- The law already requires felonies for smash-and-grab robberies, drug trafficking, and repeat theft - the purpose of Prop 36 is to increase prison time for unrelated crimes.
- Prop 36 will make California less safe by reducing funding for crime prevention, treatment, rehabilitation and services for crime victims.
- Prop 36 would cost taxpayers billions to imprison more people without reducing crime.

**FOR MORE INFORMATION:**

**Supporters:**

Californians for Safer Communities [voteyesprop36.com](http://voteyesprop36.com)

**Opponents:**

Stop Prop 36 [stopprisonscam.org](http://stopprisonscam.org)

**Who can vote?**

You may register to vote in California if:

- ★ You are a U.S. citizen and California resident.
- ★ You will be at least 18 years old on election day.
- ★ You are not in prison or on parole for a felony.
- ★ You have not been judged mentally incompetent.

**When must you re-register to vote?**

You need to fill out a new voter registration form if:

- ★ You change your residence address or mailing address.
- ★ You change your name.
- ★ You want to change your political party affiliation.

*If you registered and your name does not appear on the voter list at your polling place, you have a right to cast a provisional ballot at any polling place in your county.*



## What are my voting options?

The L.A. County RR/CC provides various voting options to best fit your needs. These include:



### 1. Vote by Mail.

Skip the lines and save time! Every registered voter in L.A. County will be mailed a ballot for the General Election starting October 3rd. All you have to do is fill it out, sign the Return Envelope, and send it back.



### 2. Drop off at a Ballot Drop Box.

It only takes a few moments to return your ballot at one of over 400 official Ballot Drop Box locations. Find a Ballot Drop Box close to you at [PLAN.LAVOTE.GOV](https://www.plan.lavote.gov).



### 3. Visit any Vote Center beginning October 26th.

L.A. County voters can cast their ballot at any Vote Center. Find a Vote Center near you at [PLAN.LAVOTE.GOV](https://www.plan.lavote.gov) and make your plan to vote before Election Day.

The L.A. County RR/CC is the official source for accurate and unbiased election information and voting resources.

Go to [PLAN.LAVOTE.GOV](https://www.plan.lavote.gov) for more information on the voting process.





This election is a local, county, state, and federal general election. California voters will choose between run-off candidates for county, state and congressional elective offices and choose from among all candidates running for local city, school district and special district races. California voters will also decide on 3 county measures on page 5 and 10 state propositions beginning on page 9 of this guide.

*All Los Angeles County Voters* will choose between the candidates for 5 Los Angeles County Superior Court Judge seats and for District Attorney of Los Angeles County. County Board of Supervisors seats were decided in the March Primary.

Visit [VOTE411.org](http://VOTE411.org) to see everything on your ballot, and your polling place, and get information about your voting choices. Candidates provide information about themselves in their own words. Pro and Con discussion of Ballot Measures is also on site.

Voters registered in Los Angeles County will receive a sample ballot at the address on record October 7. This sample ballot shows the candidates and measures that will be on your ballot.



Go to [www.lavote.gov](http://www.lavote.gov) in Los Angeles County to:

- Check your registration status—including your party choice
- Register to vote if you have moved or changed your name
- Register to vote if you want to change your political party
- Find a VOTE CENTER or Ballot Drop Box
- Track your ballot with BallotTrax

**Making Democracy Work and Contact your local League of Women Voters today!**

#### LIST OF LEAGUES

Los Angeles County	562-947-5818	<a href="https://www.LWVLACounty.org">https://www.LWVLACounty.org</a>
Beach Cities	310-793-0569	<a href="http://www.lwvbeachcities.org">www.lwvbeachcities.org</a>
East San Gabriel Valley	626-967-8055	<a href="https://my.lwv.org/california/east-san-gabriel-valley">https://my.lwv.org/california/east-san-gabriel-valley</a>
Greater Los Angeles Area	213-368-1616	<a href="http://www.lwvlosangeles.org">www.lwvlosangeles.org</a>
Long Beach Area	562-930-0573	<a href="http://www.lwvlongbeach.org">www.lwvlongbeach.org</a>
Palos Verdes Peninsula	320-784-7787	<a href="http://www.lwvpv.clubexpress.com">www.lwvpv.clubexpress.com</a>
Pasadena Area	626-798-0965	<a href="http://www.lwv-pa.org">www.lwv-pa.org</a>
Santa Monica	310-692-1494	<a href="http://www.lwvsantamonica.org">www.lwvsantamonica.org</a>
Torrance Area	310-223-6897	<a href="http://www.lwvtorrancearea.org">www.lwvtorrancearea.org</a>
Whittier	562-947-5818	<a href="https://www.facebook.com/LWVWhittier">https://www.facebook.com/LWVWhittier</a>