

Marsh Creek Democratic Club

Issues Committee's Analysis of 2022 Ballot Propositions

Prop 1 – Would amend the California Constitution to guarantee reproductive rights

Although reproductive rights are already protected by California State law, Prop 1 would amend the California Constitution to provide more powerful protection of those rights. The State Legislature placed it on the ballot.

Supporters of Prop 1: the Board Chair of the California Medical Association; the president of Planned Parenthood; and the president of the League of Women Voters.

In opposition to Prop 1: several individual gynecologists; California Assembly member Jim Patterson; and the president of the International Faith Based Coalition.

This is one that Issues Committee members believe is a “no-brainer.” Democrats are committed to protecting reproductive freedom, and this measure guarantees those protections constitutionally. **We recommend a YES vote on Prop 1.**

Prop 26 – Would allow in-person roulette, dice games and sports betting on tribal lands and some horse racing tracks.

Prop 26 would allow in-person sports betting at racetracks and tribal casinos. It requires that racetracks and casinos that offer sports betting make certain payments to the state, for example to support state regulatory costs. The proposition also allows additional gambling, such as roulette, at tribal casinos. Finally, it adds a new way to enforce certain state gambling laws.

Supporters of Prop 26: Indian tribes; the American Indian Chamber of Commerce; the NAACP of California; the California District Attorneys Association; and the Baptist Ministers Council of LA.

In opposition to Prop 26: the President of the California Black Chamber of Commerce; the President of the National Veterans Foundation; and the president of the California Senior Advocates League.

Although Prop 26 supporters express concern about increased underage gambling, anyone who wants to place a bet now can merely search for sports betting on Google in order to access a list of unregulated sites that will accept their bets. Prop 26 promises new ways to prevent illegal gambling by strengthening enforcement of California gaming laws.

The Issues Committee had a lively debate about Prop 26, with some members believing that there is enough gambling in California right now, and more should not be encouraged. Other members felt that there would be little harm if Prop 26 were adopted. **On balance, the majority of Committee members recommended a NO vote on Prop 26.**

Prop 27 – Would legalize online and mobile sports wagering outside tribal lands, directs some of the income to homelessness programs and to non-participating tribes. Prop 27 would both amend the California Constitution and adopt statutory changes.

Approval of Prop 27 would result in a huge expansion of sports betting via the internet and mobile devices, and it would create a new state administrative unit to regulate online sports betting. Although

Prop 27's supporters claim that it would send needed funding to mental health services and services for the homeless, those opposing the proposition believe such funding would be meager.

Supporters of Prop 27: The measure is sponsored by five out-of-state gambling companies.

In Opposition to Prop 27: Over 50 California tribes; the Chair of the Tribal Alliance of Sovereign Indian Nations; and the Administrator of the Salvation Army of San Bernardino.

The over 50 tribes that oppose Prop 27 claim that 90% of profits would go to out-of-state operators. The promise that Prop 27 would provide funds for mental health and housing is very questionable, especially given that only 10% of profits from its implementation would remain in the state. **The Issues Committee unanimously recommends a NO vote on Prop 27.**

Prop 28 – Would provide additional funding for arts and music education in public schools.

Prop 28 provides badly needed additional funding for art and music education and does not take those funds from other programs. Passage of Prop 28 would result in an increase in state costs by about \$1 billion annually, which is less than one-half of 1 percent of the state's General Fund budget.

Supporters of Prop 28: The president of the California Teachers Association; the president of the California State PTA; and the chair of Californians for Arts and Music in Public Schools.

In Opposition to Prop 28: There is no organized opposition to Prop 28.

The Issues Committee unanimously recommends a YES Vote on Prop 28.

Prop 29 – Would require every state-licensed dialysis center to have an on-site medical professional.

This is virtually an exact copy of a ballot measure that voters defeated in 2018 and again in 2020. It is supported by unions who want to represent the additional employees it would require. Estimates of the cost to taxpayers is in the tens of millions for monitoring. Opponents say the additional costs of compliance will cause clinics to close and make dialysis unavailable to 80,000 patients who need it.

Supporters of Prop 29: a dialysis patient care technician; the president of the Baptist Ministers of LA; and dialysis patient advocates.

In opposition to Prop 29: the American Nurses Association; the California Medical Association; emergency room doctors; and major dialysis center operators who oppose it because they would have to employ many additional medical professionals and there are scant studies showing that safety is a problem under the current system.

The Issues Committee unanimously recommends a NO vote on Prop 29.

Prop 30 – Increases tax on personal income over \$2 million to fund increases in electric vehicle and charging station incentives and programs regarding wildfire response.

Prop 30 would require that every state resident with annual income over \$2 million pay an additional 1.75% state income tax. The funds would be used to fund incentives for purchases of electric vehicles, charging stations and wildfire prevention and response.

Supporters of Prop 30: the California Democratic Party; the president of CalFire state firefighters; the president of the American Lung Association; and the vice chair of the Coalition for Clean Air. Prop 30 is supported by firefighters, environmental groups and energy experts. LYFT has spent \$15 million in support, believing the new tax could be used to pay for the transition to zero emission vehicles (ZEVs) that services like Lyft will be required to make under a ruling by the California Air Resources Board.

In opposition to Prop 30: Governor Gavin Newsom, the president of the California Teachers Association; the former Superintendent of Public Instruction; the Howard Jarvis Taxpayers Association; and the president of United Latinos Action.

Prop 30 would also reduce the use of gasoline and thus gasoline taxes that are used to fund transportation projects. Additionally, all of the new tax money would be earmarked to fund ZEV (zero emission vehicle) programs and programs aimed at preventing and responding to more frequent wildfires; however, they would not be available for schools, healthcare or public safety.

This was another proposition that generated lively debate within the Issues Committee, and while all Committee members support increased funding for ZEVs and wildfire prevention, many expressed concern about the self-serving nature of Lyft's support of the measure. **Although the vote was not unanimous, the majority of Committee members recommend a NO vote on Prop 30.**

Prop 31 – A referendum on the 2020 law which prohibits sale of certain flavored tobacco products.

A Yes vote on Prop 31 approves, and a No vote rejects a 2020 law prohibiting the sale of certain flavored tobacco products.

Supporters of Prop 31: the executive director of the American Academy of Pediatrics; the vice president of the American Heart Association; a board member of the American Cancer Society.

In opposition to Prop 31: the former director of the California Department of Finance; the president of the California Hispanic Chamber of Commerce; and the president of the CalAsian Chamber of Commerce.

While Yes supporters state it will protect kids who would be prohibited from buying the flavored products, the NO supporters point out it is already illegal to sell those products to kids. Prop 31 will make it illegal to sell flavored tobacco products to adults as well. Prop 31's passage would cost the state tax revenues somewhere from ten to hundreds of millions of dollars annually, exceeding \$1 billion over the next four years.

Committee member's were split on Prop 31, with some who oppose its approval believing that the Prop 31 prohibitions would be unworkable, and others who oppose it feeling that it is an unwise effort to further restrict personal autonomy. **The Committee's vote on its recommendation regarding Prop 31 was close; however, the majority of members recommend a Yes vote on Prop 31.**