

SUMMARY DESCRIPTION OF STATE PROPOSITIONS FOR THE NOVEMBER 5, 2024, GENERAL ELECTION

The following abstracts of State Propositions on the November 5, 2024, California ballot are taken primarily from the Ballotpedia-California website. For more detailed information click, or copy and paste to your browser, the following link: (https://ballotpedia.org/California_2024_ballot_propositions).

Additional information is from the Secretary of State's office. Click, or copy and paste to your browser, the following link: <https://voterguide.sos.ca.gov/propositions>

PROPOSITION 2 – PUBLIC EDUCATION FACILITIES BOND MEASURE

Type of Initiative – Legislature Referred Bond Measure

Summary – Authorizes \$10 Billion in bonds for repair, upgrade, and construction of elementary and secondary public and charter school education facilities (K-12) and \$1.5 Billion for community college facilities. The measure provides a formula determining the amount each school district must contribute to qualify for receiving state bond funding. The measure requires the State government to fund between 50% to 55% of the construction costs and between 60% and 65% of modernization costs.

Effects on California Debt – The Legislative Analyst's Office reports that California is now repaying about \$80 Billion in bonded debt and is authorized to sell an additional \$35 Billion in bonds. The State's current General Fund debt service obligation is about \$6 Billion, or 3% of total General Fund revenues. If approved, this bond issue would require an estimated additional \$500 Million General fund debt service over a 35-year period.

Who Supports This Proposition – California Federation of Teachers; Association of California School Administrators; California Builders Alliance; California Chamber of Commerce; California Retired Teachers Association; Community League of California; League of Women Voters; Los Angeles Unified School District.

Who Opposes This Proposition – Ballotpedia reports they have not identified any campaign opposition to the Measure.

California Democratic Party Recommendation – Support

PROPOSITION 3 – RIGHT TO MARRY AND REPEAL OF PROPOSITION 8 AMENDMENT

Type of Initiative – Legislature Referred State Constitutional Amendment

Summary – If approved, this proposition would repeal Proposition 8 that was approved by California voters as a citizen's referendum constitutional amendment in 2008. Proposition 8 defined 'marriage' in the State Constitution as between one man and one woman. Proposition 8 reversed a California judicial ruling that legalized same-sex marriage.

In 2010 Proposition 8 was ruled invalid in a federal district court because it violated the U.S. Constitutional guarantees under the Due Process and Equal Protection clauses of the 14th Amendment to the U.S. Constitution. Notwithstanding the federal court ruling, Proposition 8 remains in the California Constitution.

In addition to repealing Proposition 8, this amendment would add language to the State Constitution establishing the right to marry as being in furtherance of the rights to life, liberty, the pursuit of happiness, and privacy, along with the Due Process and Equal Protection clauses of the state constitution.

Other States Actions – In 2020, Nevada became the first state to repeal its same-sex marriage ban. Along with California, Colorado and Hawaii voters will consider constitutional amendments to remove same-sex marriage bans.

Fiscal Impacts – No change in revenues or costs to state and local governments.

Who Supports This Proposition – Gov. Gavin Newsom (D); State Senator Scott Weiner(D); Assembly person Evan Low (D); California Democratic Party; California Labor Council; ACLU of No. Calif; California Chamber of Commerce; Equality California; Human Rights Campaign; League of Women Voters; Planned Parenthood of California; Trans Latina Coalition.

Who Opposes This Proposition – Ballotpedia has not identified any campaign opposition. Opponents include California Capitol Connection; California Family Council; Concerned Women for America Legislative Action Committee; Freedom in Action; Real Impact.

California Democratic Party Recommendation – Support

PROPOSITION 4 – PARKS, ENVIRONMENT, ENERGY, AND WATER BOND MEASURE

Type of Initiative – Legislature Referred Bond Measure

Summary – This Proposition would authorize the state to issue \$10 Billion in bonds to fund various environmental, energy, and water projects. See Table below for bond allocations.

Parks, Environment, Energy, and Water Bond Measure (2024)	
CATEGORY/PROJECTS	AMOUNT
DROUGHT, FLOOD, AND WATER SUPPLY	\$3.8 billion
Increase quantity and quality of water supply	\$1.9 billion
Flood reduction measures	\$1.1 billion
River and lake restoration	\$800 million
Forest health and wildfire prevention	\$1.5 billion
Sea-level rise and coastal areas	\$1.2 billion
Restore coastal areas	\$890 million

Improve ocean habitats and marine wildlife	\$310 million
LAND CONSERVATION AND HABITAT RESTORATION	\$1.2 billion
ENERGY INFRASTRUCTURE	\$850 million
Wind turbine development	\$475 million
Transmission lines	\$325 million
Battery development	\$50 million
PARKS	\$700 million
Expand recreational activities	\$300 million
Park construction and renovation	\$200 million
State park repairs	\$200 million
EXTREME HEAT	\$450 million
Extreme heat protection	\$200 million
Heatwave and disaster shelters	\$100 million
Local environmental projects	\$150 million
FARMS AND AGRICULTURE	\$300 million
Soil health, reduce air pollution, and water conservation	\$105 million
Community gardens and farmer's markets	\$60 million
Farmland and farmworker support	\$135 million
TOTAL	\$10 billion

Effects on California Debt – Increase state costs by about \$400 million annually for debt service. The Legislative Analyst’s Office reports that California is now repaying about \$80 Billion in bonded debt and is authorized to sell an additional \$35 Billion in bonds. The State’s current General Fund debt service obligation is about \$6 Billion, or 3% of total General Fund revenues. If approved, this bond issue would require an estimated \$400 Million annual debt service over a 40-year period.

Who Supports This Proposition – California Labor Federation; IBEW Local 569; Clean Water Action; Environmental Defense Fund; League of Women Voters of California; Natural Resources Defense Council.

Who Opposes This Proposition - Ballotpedia has not found any campaign organization opposed to this Measure. Opponents include Howard Jarvis Taxpayers Association.

California Democratic Party Recommendation – Support

44e

PROPOSITION 5 – LOWER SUPERMAJORITY VOTE REQUIREMENT TO 55% FOR LOCAL HOUSING & PUBLIC INFRASTRUCTURE BOND MEASURES

Type of Initiative – Legislature Referred Constitutional Amendment

Summary – If approved, this proposition would amend the state constitution to lower the supermajority vote requirement from 66.6% (two-thirds) to 55% for local bonds to finance affordable housing and public infrastructure projects. The initiative also would require local bond issuers to conduct annual audits to ensure that funds are being used according to their intended purpose. The amendment also would include other restrictions, including using bond funds to pay governmental salaries, capping bond sales costs at 5% of bond proceeds; and prohibit governing board members or their entities from bidding on projects funded by the bonds.

Fiscal Impacts – Increased bond issuances by local authorities could increase property taxes and debt service payments for local agencies, depending on the amount of bonds issued.

Who Supports the Proposition – California Democratic Party; State Building and Trades Council of California; AIDS Healthcare Foundation; California State Association of Counties; California YIMBY; League of Women Voters; California Firefighters Association; Sponsor: Assembly Person Aguiar-Curry (D).

Who Opposes the Proposition – California Association of Realtors; California Chamber of Commerce; California Taxpayers Association; Howard Jarvis Taxpayers Association; National Federation of Independent Business; National University.

California Democratic Party Recommendation – Support

PROPOSITION 6 – REMOVE INVOLUNTARY SERVITUDE AS PUNISHMENT FOR CRIME AMENDMENT

Type of Initiative – Legislature Referred Constitutional Amendment.

Summary – This proposition would amend the state constitution by repealing existing provisions that prohibit involuntary servitude *except to punish crime* and replace the provision with a prohibition on slavery and involuntary servitude, *with no exceptions*. The amendment also prohibits the Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation from disciplining any person in custody for refusing to work and authorizes the Department to award time credits to person in custody who voluntarily participate in work assignments.

Fiscal Impacts - Potential increase or decrease in state and local costs, depending on how work for people in state prison and county jail changes. Any effect likely would not exceed the tens of millions of dollars annually.

Other States – Seven other states allow involuntary servitude, but not slavery, as a criminal punishment. Thirty-four other states provide earned-time credits for time served to be awarded for participating in education, vocational training, treatments, and work programs. In 2022, five states considered ballot measures to repeal language permitting enslavement or involuntary servitude as punishments for crimes. All except Louisiana were approved.

Who Supports This Proposition – Anti-Recidivism Coalition; California Legislative Black Caucus; League of Women Voters of California; California Labor Federation; the ACLU of California; the Abolish Slavery National Network; Sponsor – State Assembly person Lori Wilson (D).

Who Opposes the Proposition – Ballotpedia has found no campaign organization in opposition.

California Democratic Party Recommendation – Support

PROPOSITION 32 - \$18 MINIMUM WAGE INITIATIVE

Type of Initiative – Citizens Initiative State Statute.

Summary – In 2016, SB 3 was enacted into state law. SB 3 initially increased the state’s minimum wage law to \$15/hour. SB 3 also required annual increases in the minimum wage based on changes in the Consumer Price index (CPI-W). The following table shows how the minimum wage would be annually adjusted if this Proposition is approved.

Increases to minimum wage under Initiative 21-0043		
Year	Employers of 26 or more workers	Employers of 25 or less workers
2023	\$16.00	\$15.00
2024	\$17.00	\$16.00
2025	\$18.00	\$17.00
2026	\$18.00	\$18.00
2027	\$18.00 + CPI-W adjustment	\$18.00 + CPI-W adjustment

Fiscal Impacts – Fiscal impacts to state and local governments are uncertain. The cost to state and local agencies will depend upon the number currently at or below minimum wage, partially offset by the increases in state income and payroll taxes. Estimates range from net cost increases of \$1 or \$2 Billion to net revenues of a few hundred \$ Million.

Who Supports This Proposition – California Democratic Party; California Labor Council; California Teachers Association; League of Women Voters.

Who Opposes the Proposition – California Chamber of Commerce.

California Democratic Party Recommendation – Support.

PROPOSITION 33 – REPEAL STATE LIMITATIONS ON LOCAL RENT CONTROL INITIATIVE

Type of Initiative – Citizens Initiative State Statute.

Summary – This Proposition would repeal current law known as the *Costa-Hawkins Rental Housing Act* enacted in 1995. The act prohibits rent control on single-family homes and prohibits rent control laws that mandate what a landlord can charge a tenant for initial rent. If approved, the initiative would allow cities and counties to limit rent on any housing (within their jurisdiction) and rent for a first-time tenant. The proposition would also prohibit the state from limiting “the right of any city or county to maintain, enact or expand residential rent control.

Fiscal Impacts – Potentially, approval of this Proposition could reduce state and local revenues by tens of millions of dollars, depending on actions by local agencies.

Who Supports This Proposition – Justice For Renters, an organization sponsored by the AIDS Healthcare Foundation, is leading the campaign to support this Proposition. Senator Bernie Sanders; Huntington Beach City Council member Tony Strickland; California Democratic Party; California Nurses Association; Americans For Democratic Action – Southern California; Coalition for Humane Immigration Rights; Housing is a Human Right; Pomona United Stable Housing Coalition; Social Security Works – California; Veterans’ Voices.

Who Opposes the Proposition – No on 33 campaign organization; Californians for Responsible Housing sponsored by California Apartment Association; State Senator Toni Atkins; State Assembly member Buffy Wicks; Republican Party of California; Norcal Carpenters Union; United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America; Apartment Association of Greater Los Angeles; California Apartment Association; California Business Roundtable; California Chamber of Commerce; California YIMBY

California Democratic Party Recommendation – Support.

PROPOSITION 34 – REQUIRE CERTAIN PARTICIPANTS IN MEDI-CAL Rx PROGRAM TO SPEND 98% OF REVENUES ON PATIENT CARE

Type of Initiative – Citizens Initiative State Statute.

Summary – If approved, this Proposition would establish the criteria of *prescription drug price manipulator*. Any entity classified as a *prescription drug price manipulator* would have to meet certain requirements each year to maintain its tax-exempt status and license to operate. The requirements include: (i) the entity must spend at least 98% of revenues received from federal Medic-Aid on direct patient care; and (ii) the entity must not engage in unprofessional conduct, or conduct contrary to public health, safety and welfare.

The Medi-Cal program, California’s federal Medic-Aid implementation program, was established by the Governor through an executive order. Future governors could repeal the executive order. If approved, this Proposition would authorize the State to implement Medi-Cal Rx Program by state law.

Fiscal Impacts – Increased costs to the state, potentially millions of dollars annually, to review entities’ compliance with the measure and enforce its provisions.

Who Supports This Proposition – Yes on 34, Protect Patients Now, sponsored by the California Apartment Owners Association, is leading the campaign in support; State Assembly member Evan Low;

Republican Party of California; ALS Association; California Chamber of Commerce; San Francisco Women's Cancer Network.

Who Opposes the Proposition – The AIDS Healthcare Foundation; Housing is a Human Right; League of Women Voters of California; Mercury News & East Bay Times Editorial Board; San Francisco Chronical Editorial Board.

California Democratic Party Recommendation – Neutral.

PROPOSITION 35 – MANAGED CARE ORGANIZATION TAX AUTHORIZATION INITIATIVE

Type of Initiative – Citizens Initiative State Statute.

Summary - If approved, this Proposition would make permanent an existing state tax, due to expire in 2026, on managed care organizations (MCOs). MCOs offer health insurance coverage to consumers at fixed monthly costs. The current tax was imposed for a limited term in 2009 and has been renewed and changed over the years. Every renewal is subject to federal review and approval.

The current tax on each MCO is \$182.50 per year on each private MCO entity, plus an additional \$1.75 on the MCO for each enrollee. If approved, the Proposition would prohibit the state from charging more than \$2.50 on the MCO for each enrollee and limit the total annual revenue from the MCOs to \$36 Million, adjusted annually for inflation.

Proceeds received by the state from the tax would be allocated to pay for tax collection and administration. Beginning in 2027, any remaining proceeds after tax collection and administrative costs coverage would be allocated to the Medi-Cal Program, health workforce initiative, and subsidies for drug prices.

Fiscal Impacts – The overall impact on state revenues and spending is uncertain. The extent of the impacts depends upon how the Legislature would have changed the MCO tax rates and allocations in the absence of the Proposition.

Who Supports This Proposition – The Coalition to Protect Access to Care is leading the Initiative; California Democratic Party; Republican Party of California; California Dental Association; California Hospital Association; California Medical Association; California Primary Care Association; Planned Parenthood Affiliates of California.

Who Opposes the Proposition – California Pan-Ethnic Health Network; League of Women Voters; San Francisco Chronicle Editorial Board.

California Democratic Party Recommendation – Support.

PROPOSITION 36 – DRUG AND THEFT CRIME PENALTIES AND TREATMENT-MANDATED FELONIES

Type of Initiative – Citizens Initiative State Statute.

Summary – This initiative would increase penalties for certain drug crimes by increasing sentence lengths and the level of crime up to four years’ incarceration. The current sentencing length is one year. The initiative would also add fentanyl to the list of drugs that warrant a felony charge for individual possession. Sentencing lengths would be increased depending on the quantity of drugs sold. Those sentenced would have to certain their entire term in state prison regardless of their criminal history.

The initiative also increases sentences for certain theft crimes. For money or property thefts of \$950 or less, the penalty would be a felony offense for the second and subsequent theft offenses. The initiative would raise the maximum sentence from six months currently to three years in jail or prison. Sentencing would also increase depending on the value of the property stolen.

Fiscal Impacts – State criminal justice system costs (jail and prison expenses) are expected to increase by hundreds of millions of dollars annually. Some of these costs could be offset by reductions in mental health and substance abuse services, truancy and dropout prevention, and victim services due to current requirements. Criminal justice system costs potentially would increase by tens of millions of dollars annually, primarily due to increased court-related workload and net increase in the number of people incarcerated or under supervision.

Who Supports This Proposition – Yes on Prop 36 – Californians for Safer Communities is leading the campaign in support. The campaign is endorsed by the San Francisco mayor; the Republican Party of California; California District Attorneys Association; and California State Sheriff’s Association. Also by various congressional representatives and state senators of both parties; by several large city mayors; Sacramento County District Attorney; the Republican Party of California; California Retailers Association; American Petroleum and Convenience Store Association; California Business Roundtable; California Chamber of Commerce; California Correctional Peace Officers Association and the California Grocers Association.

Who Opposes the Proposition – Committee to Protect Public Safety, No on Prop 36 and the Californians United to Oppose Proposition 36 are leading the campaign effort in opposition to this Proposition. The Proposition is also opposed by the California Democratic Party; ACLU of Northern California; Anti-Recidivism Coalition; Vera Institute of Justice; and League of Women Voters of California. Also opposed by several Democratic State Representatives and Assembly Speaker Robert Rivas; Action for Safety and Justice; ACLU of Northern California; Anti-Recidivism Coalition; Civil Rights Corps; Disability rights California; and League of Women voters of California.

California Democratic Party Recommendation – Oppose.