

**Tulare County Stonewall Democrats
Agenda**

Monday September 9, 2024

6:00 pm No-Host Dinner -:- 7:00 pm Hybrid Meeting*

Porterville Me-n-Ed's – 1331 W. Henderson – Porterville CA

VIA ZOOM 7:00 pm Meeting ID: 833 0029 9172 - Passcode: 3JeeJR

1. Call to Order Neeley
2. Pledge of Allegiance TBD
3. Self-Introductions All
Candidates Requesting Endorsement (5 min. + questions)
4. Approval of Minutes La Vonne
5. Treasurer's Report A. Smith
6. Old Business:
 - a. **Membership (Recruitment)** Neeley
 - b. **Fundraising Ideas** Neeley
7. New Business:
 - a. Cool Hand Lukes Fundraiser Tickets Neeley
 - b. Porterville Chamber Business Showcase La Vonne
 - c. Prop 3 Outreach Neeley
 - d. NWPC Dinner Coffee
 - e. Ballot Prop Endorsements Neeley
8. Reports
 - a. Regional Director's Report Dr Gomez
 - b. Sub Committees
 - Scholarship La Vonne
 - Membership** *open*
 - Fundraising** *open*
 - Ad-Hoc Budget Committee* *Coffee*
 - c. Central Committee *All who attend TCDCC*
9. Good of the Order All
10. Adjournment Neeley

Remember the next month's meeting will be, Monday October 14, 2024

6:00 pm No-Host Dinner -:- Hybrid Meeting 7:00 pm – 7:40 pm

***Zoom limited to 40 minutes**

Tulare County Stonewall Democrats is a chartered organization of the Tulare County Democratic Central Committee and affiliated with the CADem LGBT Caucus and the CDC (California Democratic Council).

The purpose of the Tulare County Stonewall Democrats is to work within the Tulare County Democratic Party, providing a strong voice and representation within the party structure; securing full equal rights of LGBT+ citizens through affecting legislation and policies; and encouraging LGBT+ community to participate fully as Democrats at all levels of policymaking and public service.



Tulare County Stonewall Democrats

Unapproved Minutes

Hybrid Meeting

Monday August 12, 2024

1. Call to order by Brock Neeley, Chair at 7:08PM

Roll call of members present: Brock Neeley, Chair; John Coffee, Member-at-large; Andy Smith, Treasurer; Cynthia Smith, Vice-Chair; Edith La Vonne, Secretary; Zander Smith, Member.

2. Pledge of Allegiance :

3. Self Introductions: N/A

4. Approval of minutes: John Coffee moved to approve minutes, Andy Smith seconded. Motion passed.

5. Treasurer's Report by Andy Smith

- The beginning balance as of May 31,2024 \$1451.17
- Deposits \$52.50
- Expenses \$0.00
- Ending Balance as of June 28, 2024 \$1503.67
- Edith La Vonne moved to receive and file. John Coffee seconded Motion passed.

6. Old Business:

- a. Membership-N/A
- b. Fundraising-N/A

6. New Business:

- a. Edith La Vonne moved to sell Cool Hand Lukes tickets for \$27each, John Coffee seconded. Motion passed.
- b. September 13th is the Chamber Business Showcase. Edith La Vonne moved to have a booth there, John Coffee seconded. Motion passed.
- c. We need to do outreach for Prop 3. Different methods discussed. Brock Neeley made info available.

8. Reports

- a. Regional Directors-N/A
- b. Sub committees
 - Scholarship-N/A
 - Membership-n/a
 - Fundraising
 - AD HOC-N/A
- a. Central Committee-The meeting went smoothly.

9. Good of the Order

Andy Smith moved to adjourn, John Coffee seconded.

Meeting adjourned 7:33pm.

Next meeting set for Monday, Sept 9, 2024

Respectfully Submitted, Edith La Vonne, Secretary



Treasurer's Report
September 2024
 July 31, 2024 - August 30, 2024

Beginning Balance July 31 2024					\$1,503.67
Cash/Check Deposits					\$243.00
8/16/2024				\$135.00	
8/27/2024				\$81.00	
8/30/2024				\$27.00	
Square Deposits					\$104.60
	Collected	Fees	Deposited		
8/5/2024	\$54.00	\$1.90	\$52.10		
8/19/2024	\$54.00	\$1.50	\$52.50		
		\$0.00			
		\$0.00			
		\$0.00			
Totals	\$108.00	\$3.40	\$104.60		
Expenses:					\$125.00
8/16/2024 Ck 1052 Chamber Business Showcase					\$125.00
General Fund Balance					\$914.08
Scholarship Fund Balance					\$812.19
Ending Balance					\$1,726.27

	# Tickets	Sell 4	Sub Total	Minus Cost	Fees	Total
2018 Cool Hand Luke's Tickets	45	\$20.00	\$900.00	\$554.65	\$8.80	\$350.00
2019 Cool Hand Luke's Tickets	43	\$20.00	\$860.00	\$499.66	\$8.25	\$352.09
				2020 Book Order		\$246.81
				2021 Book Order		\$261.63
				Scholarship Donation		\$100.00
				Half 2022 Fundraisr		\$169.26
				Scholarship Donation		\$500.00
			5/15/2024 Reid Lowery Scholarship			\$150.00
				Scholarship Total		\$812.91
2019 Cool Hand Luke's Tickets (FALL)	37	\$20.00	\$740.00	\$440.18	\$4.95	\$294.87
2020 Cool Hand Luke's Tickets	23	\$20.00	\$460.00	\$273.62	\$0.62	\$185.76
2022 Cool Hand Luke's Tickets	32	\$25.00	\$800.00	\$449.92	\$11.55	\$338.53
2023 Cool Hand Luke's Tickets - May	50	\$25.00	\$1,250.00	\$703.00	\$8.43	\$538.57
2023 Cool Hand Luke's Tickets - October	19	\$25.00	\$475.00	\$267.14	\$5.63	\$202.23

Respectfully Submitted

Andy Smith, Treasurer



MARRIAGE EQUALITY IS ON THE BALLOT!

Proposition 3, also known as the Freedom to Marry ballot measure, is a crucial initiative to protect California's values of freedom and equality. Currently, the California Constitution contains discriminatory language that defines marriage as only between a man and a woman.

Proposition 3 seeks to remove this outdated language and replace it with a provision that establishes the right to marry as a fundamental right.

Proposition 3 will ensure that protections for same-sex and interracial couples are enshrined in our constitution.

SCAN TO VOLUNTEER



WHY CALIFORNIA NEEDS TO PASS PROPOSITION 3, THE FREEDOM TO MARRY BALLOT INITIATIVE:

- In today's uncertain legal landscape, especially with the current makeup of the Supreme Court, there's a real risk of rights regression. We've seen recent attacks on reproductive freedoms and threats to the LGBTQ+ community across the country.
- If the Supreme Court can overturn fifty years of precedent, it's not safe to assume it will uphold the more recent decisions protecting marriage equality for same-sex couples. Proposition 3 is our chance to take a proactive step to safeguard these rights in California.
- By voting YES on Proposition 3 this November, you will be affirming California's commitment to civil rights and individual freedom. You will be voting for love and acceptance, ensuring that everyone has the right to marry the person they love, regardless of race, gender, or sexual orientation.



This November, we're asking you to vote YES on Prop 3 to uphold the principles that make California a leader in equality and justice.

¡SU LIBERTAD PARA CASARSE ESTARÁ A VOTO!



La Proposición 3, también conocida como la medida electoral Libertad Para Casarse, es una iniciativa crucial para proteger los valores de libertad e igualdad de California. Actualmente, la Constitución de California contiene un lenguaje discriminatorio que define el matrimonio sólo entre un hombre y una mujer.

La Proposición 3 busca eliminar este lenguaje obsoleto y reemplazarlo con una disposición que establezca el derecho a casarse como un derecho fundamental.

La Proposición 3 garantizará que la protección para las parejas interraciales y del mismo sexo esté consagrada en nuestra constitución.

ESCANEA PARA VOLUNTARIAR



POR QUÉ CALIFORNIA TIENE QUE PASAR LA PROPOSICIÓN 3, LIBERTAD PARA CASARSE, EN LA BOLETA ELECTORAL:

- En el incierto panorama legal actual, especialmente con la composición actual de la Corte Suprema, existe un riesgo real de regresión de derechos civiles. Hemos visto ataques recientes a las libertades reproductivas y amenazas a la comunidad LGBTQ+ en todo el país.
- Si la Corte Suprema puede revocar cincuenta años de precedentes, no es seguro asumir que mantendrá las decisiones más recientes que protegen el matrimonio igualitario para parejas del mismo sexo. La Proposición 3 es nuestra oportunidad de dar un paso proactivo para proteger estos derechos en California.
- Al votar Sí a la Proposición 3 este noviembre, estará afirmando el compromiso de California a proteger los derechos civiles y la libertad individual. Votarás por el amor y la aceptación, asegurando que todos tengan derecho a casarse con la persona que aman, sin importar raza, género u orientación sexual.



Este noviembre, vote SÍ a la Proposición 3 para defender los principios que hacen de California un líder en igualdad y justicia.

QUICK REFERENCE GUIDE

PROP 2 AUTHORIZES BONDS FOR PUBLIC SCHOOL AND COMMUNITY COLLEGE FACILITIES. LEGISLATIVE STATUTE.

SUMMARY *Put on the Ballot by the Legislature*

Authorizes \$10 billion in general obligation bonds for repair, upgrade, and construction of facilities at K–12 public schools (including charter schools), community colleges, and career technical education programs, including for improvement of health and safety conditions and classroom upgrades. Requires annual audits. **Fiscal Impact:** Increased state costs of about \$500 million annually for 35 years to repay the bond. **Supporters:** California Teachers Association; California School Nurses Organization; Community College League of California **Opponents:** Howard Jarvis Taxpayers Association

WHAT YOUR VOTE MEANS

YES A YES vote on this measure means: The state could borrow \$10 billion to build new or renovate existing public school and community college facilities.

NO A NO vote on this measure means: The state could not borrow \$10 billion to build new or renovate existing public school and community college facilities.

ARGUMENTS

PRO Many schools and community colleges are outdated and need basic health and safety repairs and upgrades to prepare students for college and careers and to retain and attract quality teachers. Prop. 2 meets those needs and requires strict taxpayer accountability so funds are spent as promised with local control.

CON Proposition 2 will increase our bond obligations by \$10 billion, which will cost taxpayers an estimated \$18 billion when repaid with interest. A bond works like a government credit card—paying off that credit card requires the government to spend more of your tax dollars! *Vote NO on Prop. 2.*

FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

FOR

Yes on Proposition 2—
Californians for Quality
Schools
info@californiansforqualityschools2024.com
www.californiansforqualityschools2024.com

AGAINST

Assemblyman Bill Essayli
California State Legislature
State Capitol
P.O. Box 942849
Sacramento, CA 94249-0063
(916) 319-2063
Assemblymember.Essayli@assembly.ca.gov
<https://ad63.asmr.org/>

PROP 3 CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT TO MARRIAGE. LEGISLATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT.

SUMMARY *Put on the Ballot by the Legislature*

Amends California Constitution to recognize fundamental right to marry, regardless of sex or race. Removes language in California Constitution stating that marriage is only between a man and a woman. **Fiscal Impact:** No change in revenues or costs for state and local governments. **Supporters:** Sierra Pacific Synod of The Evangelical Lutheran Church in America; Dolores Huerta Foundation; Equality California **Opponents:** Jonathan Keller, California Family Council; Rev. Tanner DiBella

WHAT YOUR VOTE MEANS

YES A YES vote on this measure means: Language in the California Constitution would be updated to match who currently can marry. There would be no change in who can marry.

NO A NO vote on this measure means: Language in the California Constitution would not be changed. There would be no change in who can marry.

ARGUMENTS

PRO Proposition 3 protects Californians' freedom to marry, regardless of their race or gender. Proposition 3 removes discriminatory language from the California Constitution stating marriage is only between a man and a woman. Proposition 3 reinforces California's commitment to civil rights and protects personal freedom. *Vote YES!*
YesonProp3CA.com

CON Proposition 3 removes all rules for marriage, opening the door to child marriages, incest, and polygamy. It changes California's constitution even though same-sex marriage is already legal. By making moms and dads optional, it puts children at risk. This careless measure harms families and society. *Vote No on Proposition 3.*

FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

FOR

YES ON PROPOSITION 3,
SPONSORED BY EQUALITY
CALIFORNIA
info@yesonprop3ca.com
YesonProp3CA.com

AGAINST

Jonathan Keller
California Family Council
P.O. Box 7937
Fresno, CA 93747
(866) 866-7993
Proposition3@CaliforniaFamily.org
<https://CaliforniaFamily.org/Proposition3>

QUICK REFERENCE GUIDE

PROP 4 AUTHORIZES BONDS FOR SAFE DRINKING WATER, WILDFIRE PREVENTION, AND PROTECTING COMMUNITIES AND NATURAL LANDS FROM CLIMATE RISKS. LEGISLATIVE STATUTE.

PROP 5 ALLOWS LOCAL BONDS FOR AFFORDABLE HOUSING AND PUBLIC INFRASTRUCTURE WITH 55% VOTER APPROVAL. LEGISLATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT.

SUMMARY *Put on the Ballot by the Legislature*

Authorizes \$10 billion in general obligation bonds for water, wildfire prevention, and protection of communities and lands. Requires annual audits. **Fiscal Impact:** Increased state costs of about \$400 million annually for 40 years to repay the bond. **Supporters:** Clean Water Action; CALFIRE Firefighters; National Wildlife Federation; The Nature Conservancy **Opponents:** Howard Jarvis Taxpayers Association

WHAT YOUR VOTE MEANS

YES A YES vote on this measure means: The state could borrow \$10 billion to fund various activities aimed at conserving natural resources, as well as responding to the causes and effects of climate change.

NO A NO vote on this measure means: The state could not borrow \$10 billion to fund various activities aimed at conserving natural resources, as well as responding to the causes and effects of climate change.

ARGUMENTS

PRO Yes on 4 for safe drinking water, wildfire prevention, clean air, and protection of natural resources. California firefighters, conservation groups, clean water advocates urge YES. Accountable, fiscally responsible, with independent audits, strict transparency. Proactive approach saves money and prevents the worst impacts of devastating wildfires, smoke, droughts, and pollution.

CON Bonds are the most expensive way to fund government spending. *Water and wildfire mitigation are necessities, not luxuries.* They should be *budgeted* for, not *bonded*. Mismanagement led to this crisis. This \$10 billion bond will cost taxpayers almost \$2 to repay for every dollar spent. Vote NO on Prop. 4.

FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

FOR
Californians for Safe Drinking Water and Wildfire Prevention, Sponsored by Environmental Organizations
555 Capitol Mall, Suite 400
Sacramento, CA 95814
Info@CAYeson4.com
CaYeson4.com

AGAINST
hjta.org/hjta-ballot-measure-recommendations

SUMMARY *Put on the Ballot by the Legislature*

Allows approval of local infrastructure and housing bonds for low- and middle-income Californians with 55% vote. Accountability requirements. **Fiscal Impact:** Increased local borrowing to fund affordable housing, supportive housing, and public infrastructure. The amount would depend on decisions by local governments and voters. Borrowing would be repaid with higher property taxes. **Supporters:** California Professional Firefighters; League of Women Voters of California; Habitat for Humanity California **Opponents:** California Taxpayers Association; California Hispanic Chambers of Commerce; Women Veterans Alliance

WHAT YOUR VOTE MEANS

YES A YES vote on this measure means: Certain local bonds and related property taxes could be approved with a 55 percent vote of the local electorate, rather than the current two-thirds approval requirement. These bonds would have to fund affordable housing, supportive housing, or public infrastructure.

NO A NO vote on this measure means: Certain local bonds and related property taxes would continue to need approval by a two-thirds vote of the local electorate.

ARGUMENTS

PRO Prop. 5 shifts local spending priorities away from state government, giving local voters and taxpayers the choice and the tools to address the challenges facing their communities. Whether it's housing affordability, safer streets, more fire stations, or other community-driven projects, Prop. 5 empowers local voters to solve local problems. Vote YES.

CON Prop. 5 changes the constitution to make it easier to increase bond debt, leading to higher property taxes. Prop. 5 shifts the financial burden from the state to local communities, increasing costs for homeowners, renters, and consumers. Politicians wrote loopholes in Prop. 5 so "infrastructure" can mean just about anything.

FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

FOR
Yes on Prop. 5
www.YesOnProp5.org

AGAINST
Protect Local Taxpayers
info@VoteNoProp5.com
VoteNoProp5.com

QUICK REFERENCE GUIDE

PROP 6 ELIMINATES CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISION ALLOWING INVOLUNTARY SERVITUDE FOR INCARCERATED PERSONS. LEGISLATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT.

PROP 32 RAISES MINIMUM WAGE. INITIATIVE STATUTE.

SUMMARY *Put on the Ballot by the Legislature*

Amends the California Constitution to remove current provision that allows jails and prisons to impose involuntary servitude to punish crime (*i.e.*, forcing incarcerated persons to work). **Fiscal Impact:** 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. **Supporters:** Assemblymember Lori Wilson **Opponents:** None submitted

WHAT YOUR VOTE MEANS

YES A YES vote on this measure means: Involuntary servitude would not be allowed as punishment for crime. State prisons would not be allowed to discipline people in prison who refuse to work.

NO A NO vote on this measure means: Involuntary servitude would continue to be allowed as punishment for crime.

ARGUMENTS

PRO Proposition 6 ends slavery in California and upholds human rights and dignity for everyone. It replaces carceral involuntary servitude with voluntary work programs, has bipartisan support, and aligns with national efforts to reform the 13th Amendment. It will prioritize rehabilitation, lower recidivism, and improve public safety, resulting in taxpayer savings.

CON No argument against Proposition 6 was submitted.

FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

FOR
Esteban Nunez
Anti-Recidivism Coalition
1320 E. 7th Street, Suite 260
Los Angeles, CA 90021
(323) 830-0177
enunez@antirecidivism.org
antirecidivism.org

AGAINST

SUMMARY *Put on the Ballot by Petition Signatures*

Raises minimum wage as follows: For employers with 26 or more employees, to \$17 immediately, \$18 on January 1, 2025. For employers with 25 or fewer employees, to \$17 on January 1, 2025, \$18 on January 1, 2026. **Fiscal Impact:** State and local government costs could increase or decrease by up to hundreds of millions of dollars annually. State and local revenues likely would decrease by no more than a few hundred million dollars annually. **Supporters:** None submitted **Opponents:** California Chamber of Commerce; California Restaurant Association; California Grocers Association

WHAT YOUR VOTE MEANS

YES A YES vote on this measure means: The state minimum wage would be \$18 per hour in 2026. After that, it would go up each year based on how fast prices are going up.

NO A NO vote on this measure means: The state minimum wage likely would be about \$17 per hour in 2026. After that, it would go up each year based on how fast prices are going up.

ARGUMENTS

PRO YES on Proposition 32 raises the minimum wage to \$18 so more SERVICE, ESSENTIAL, AND OTHER WORKERS, and SINGLE MOMS can AFFORD the state's COST OF LIVING. CORPORATE PROFIT MARGINS INCREASED 100% since 2000 because CORPORATIONS SPIKED the PRICES OF GOODS. YES on PROP. 32 so workers can afford life's basic needs.

CON Prop. 32 was written by one multimillionaire alone, and he wrote a horribly flawed measure. Prop. 32 increases the cost of living, eliminates jobs, makes our state and local government budget deficits worse, and makes California's complex minimum wage laws even harder for businesses and workers to understand. No on 32!

FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

FOR
livingwageact.com

AGAINST
Californians Against Job Losses and Higher Prices,
No on Prop. 32
info@stopprop32.com
StopProp32.com

QUICK REFERENCE GUIDE

PROP 33 EXPANDS LOCAL GOVERNMENTS' AUTHORITY TO ENACT RENT CONTROL ON RESIDENTIAL PROPERTY. INITIATIVE STATUTE.

PROP 34 RESTRICTS SPENDING OF PRESCRIPTION DRUG REVENUES BY CERTAIN HEALTH CARE PROVIDERS. INITIATIVE STATUTE.

SUMMARY *Put on the Ballot by Petition Signatures*

Repeals Costa-Hawkins Rental Housing Act of 1995, which currently prohibits local ordinances limiting initial residential rental rates for new tenants or rent increases for existing tenants in certain residential properties. **Fiscal Impact:** Reduction in local property tax revenues of at least tens of millions of dollars annually due to likely expansion of rent control in some communities. **Supporters:** CA Nurses Assoc.; CA Alliance for Retired Americans; Mental Health Advocacy; Coalition for Economic Survival; TenantsTogether **Opponents:** California Council for Affordable Housing; Women Veterans Alliance; California Chamber of Commerce

WHAT YOUR VOTE MEANS

YES A YES vote on this measure means: State law *would not* limit the kinds of rent control laws cities and counties could have.

NO A NO vote on this measure means: State law *would continue to* limit the kinds of rent control laws cities and counties could have.

ARGUMENTS

PRO The rent is too damn high. One million people have left California. Rent control in America has worked to keep people in their homes since 1919. California's 17 million renters need relief. Homeowners and taxpayers benefit from stable communities. The California dream is dying. You can help save it.

CON Don't be fooled by the latest corporate landlord anti-housing scheme. California voters have rejected this radical proposal twice before, because it would freeze the construction of new housing and could effectively reverse dozens of new state housing laws. Vote No on 33 to protect new affordable housing and California homeowners.

FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

FOR

Susie Shannon
Renters and Homeowners for Rent Control Yes on 33,
Sponsored by AIDS
Healthcare Foundation
1250 6th Street, Suite 205
Santa Monica, CA 90401
(310) 576-1233
info@prop33.org
www.yeson33.org

AGAINST

No on Prop. 33, Californians for Responsible Housing
2350 Kerner Blvd. #250
San Rafael, CA 94901
(916) 292-8100
info@californiansforresponsiblehousing.org
NoOnProp33.com

SUMMARY *Put on the Ballot by Petition Signatures*

Requires certain providers to spend 98% of revenues from federal discount prescription drug program on direct patient care. Authorizes statewide negotiation of Medi-Cal drug prices. **Fiscal Impact:** Increased state costs, likely in the millions of dollars annually, to enforce new rules on certain health care entities. Affected entities would pay fees to cover these costs. **Supporters:** The ALS Association; California Chronic Care Coalition; Latino Heritage Los Angeles **Opponents:** National Org. for Women; Consumer Watchdog; Coalition for Economic Survival; AIDS Healthcare Foundation; Dolores Huerta

WHAT YOUR VOTE MEANS

YES A YES vote on this measure means: Certain health care entities would have to follow new rules about how they spend revenue they earn from a federal drug discount program. Breaking these rules would result in penalties (such as not being able to operate as a health care entity), generally for a ten-year period.

NO A NO vote on this measure means: These new rules would not go into effect.

ARGUMENTS

PRO Proposition 34 will protect patients and ensure public healthcare dollars actually go to patients who need it. Prop. 34 will close a loophole that allows corporations to spend this money on things like buying stadium naming rights and multi-million dollar CEO salaries. Protect Patients Now. Vote Yes on Proposition 34.

CON Prop. 34—The Revenge Initiative. California Apartment Association, representing billionaire corporate landlords, doesn't care about patients. Their sole purpose is silencing AIDS Healthcare Foundation, the sponsor of the rent control initiative. 34 weaponizes the ballot, is a threat to democracy, and opens the door to attacks on any non-profit.

FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

FOR

YES on 34, Protect Patients
Now: A Coalition of Women, Veterans, LGBTQ+ Advocates, and Patient Groups
2350 Kerner Blvd. #250
San Rafael, CA 94901
(916) 447-7881
info@protectcapatientsnow.com
YesOnProp34.com

AGAINST

Susie Shannon
Stop the Revenge Initiative—
No on 34, sponsored by AIDS Healthcare Foundation
1250 6th Street, Suite 205
Santa Monica, CA 90405
(310) 576-1233
info@voteno34.org
www.voteno34.org

QUICK REFERENCE GUIDE

PROP 35 PROVIDES PERMANENT FUNDING FOR MEDI-CAL HEALTH CARE SERVICES. INITIATIVE STATUTE.

SUMMARY *Put on the Ballot by Petition Signatures*

Makes permanent the existing tax on managed health care insurance plans, which, if approved by the federal government, provides revenues to pay for Medi-Cal health care services. **Fiscal Impact:** Short-term state costs between roughly \$1 billion and \$2 billion annually to increase funding for certain health programs. Total funding increase between roughly \$2 billion to \$5 billion annually. Unknown long-term fiscal effects. **Supporters:** Planned Parenthood Affiliates of CA; American College of Obstetricians & Gynecologists; American Academy of Pediatrics, CA **Opponents:** None submitted

WHAT YOUR VOTE MEANS

YES A YES vote on this measure means: An existing state tax on health plans that provides funding for certain health programs would become permanent. New rules would direct how the state must use the revenue.

NO A NO vote on this measure means: An existing state tax on health plans would end in 2027, unless the Legislature continues it. The new rules would not become law.

ARGUMENTS

PRO Yes on 35 addresses our urgent healthcare crisis by securing dedicated funding—*without raising taxes*—to protect access to primary and specialty care, community clinics, hospitals, ERs, family planning, and mental health providers. Prop. 35 prevents the state from redirecting funds for non-healthcare purposes. Supported by Planned Parenthood, pediatricians, California Medical Association. www.VoteYes35.com

CON No argument against Proposition 35 was submitted.

FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

FOR

Yes on 35—Protect Our Health Care
2350 Kerner Blvd. #250
San Rafael, CA 94901
(916) 238-8310
info@VoteYes35.com
VoteYes35.com

AGAINST

PROP 36 ALLOWS FELONY CHARGES AND INCREASES SENTENCES FOR CERTAIN DRUG AND THEFT CRIMES. INITIATIVE STATUTE.

SUMMARY *Put on the Ballot by Petition Signatures*

Allows felony charges for possessing certain drugs and for thefts under \$950, if defendant has two prior drug or theft convictions. **Fiscal Impact:** State criminal justice costs likely ranging from several tens of millions of dollars to the low hundreds of millions of dollars annually. Local criminal justice costs likely in the tens of millions of dollars annually. **Supporters:** Crime Victims United of California; California District Attorneys Association; Family Business Association of California **Opponents:** Diana Becton, District Attorney Contra Costa County; Crime Survivors for Safety and Justice

WHAT YOUR VOTE MEANS

YES A YES vote on this measure means: People convicted of certain drug or theft crimes could receive increased punishment, such as longer prison sentences. In certain cases, people who possess illegal drugs would be required to complete treatment or serve up to three years in prison.

NO A NO vote on this measure means: Punishment for drug and theft crimes would remain the same.

ARGUMENTS

PRO Prop. 36 makes California communities safer by addressing rampant theft and drug trafficking. It toughens penalties for fentanyl and drug traffickers and “smash-and-grabs” while holding repeat offenders accountable. It targets serial thieves and encourages treatment for those addicted to drugs, using a balanced approach to fix loopholes in current laws.

CON Don't be fooled. Proposition 36 will lead to more crime, not less. It reignites the failed war on drugs, makes simple drug possession a felony, and wastes billions on prisons, while slashing crucial funding for victims, crime prevention, treatment, and rehabilitation. This puts prisons first and guts treatment. Vote No.

FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

FOR

Californians for Safer Communities
info@VoteYesProp36.com
VoteYesProp36.com

AGAINST

Info@StopProp36.com
StopProp36.com