



Paid for by

PROTECT PROPOSITION 13

A Project of the Howard Jarvis Taxpayers Association

HJTA's Quick Guide to the Statewide Propositions:

NO on 2, 4, 5, 6, 32, 33

YES on 34, 36

HJTA takes no position on 3, 35

Why the gap in the numbers? Propositions 2 through 6 were placed on the ballot by the Legislature and given special numbering. Propositions 32-36 are citizens' initiatives that were given sequential numbering from prior elections, as usual.

Ballot Measure Information & Recommendations

Statewide Propositions

NO on 2

Why we're against it

Proposition 2 is \$10 billion of bonds, new state debt, to pay for school facilities. It is almost certain to result in higher property tax bills, because school districts must provide a "local match" of funds in order to receive money from the Prop. 2 state bonds. That will lead to districts issuing new local school bonds, which are paid for by **adding new charges to property tax bills**. Enrollment is declining in both K-12 district schools and community colleges and the declines are projected to continue. But Proposition 2 commits California to pay an estimated \$18 billion, including interest, for school buildings that may not even be necessary. **VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION 2.**

Proposition 3 – HJTA takes no position on this measure

Proposition 3 removes language from the state Constitution that defines marriage as between a man and woman. It adds the language, "right to marry is a fundamental right." This measure has no effect on the current law, because the U.S. Supreme Court held that the federal Constitution protects the right to marry.

NO on 4

Why we're against it

This is the \$10 billion “climate bond” that state politicians have long planned. California already has too much bond debt, over \$78 billion outstanding as of January 1. Then \$6.38 billion was added with Proposition 1 in March. Proposition 4 would add another \$10 billion in bond debt to pay for climate “programs.” It’s reckless to use borrowed money, an estimated \$18 billion with interest, to pay for “programs,” including salaries for all the groups that receive the money. Bond financing only makes sense for necessary projects that will last more than the 30 years it takes to repay the debt. The governor has already declared a budget emergency because the state spends more than it takes in. Spending even more “on the credit card” is a bad idea. **VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION 4.**

NO on 5

Why we're against it

Proposition 5 is ACA 1, a direct attack on Proposition 13. It makes it easier to raise taxes by eliminating the longstanding two-thirds vote of the electorate required to pass local bonds (borrowed money that must be repaid with interest). All new bond measures for “infrastructure” (nearly everything is “infrastructure”) and for public housing projects would pass with just 55% approval instead of the current 66.7%. Local bonds are paid for with extra charges on property tax bills, adding to the tax burden on homeowners and businesses, leading to higher rents for tenants and higher consumer prices for everyone. **If Proposition 5 is not stopped, property tax bills are likely to go up after every election, forever.** Proposition 5 will raise the cost of living in California, which already has the highest poverty rate in the country when the cost of living is taken into account. **VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION 5.**

NO on 6

Why we're against it

Proposition 6 bans mandatory work requirements for state prison inmates. It doesn’t seem fair to further increase the burden on taxpayers by creating the conditions to negotiate higher wages for inmates who are paying off their debt to society by serving their sentences in state prison. **VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION 6.**

NO on 32

Why we're against it

Proposition 32 would raise California’s hourly minimum wage from \$16 to \$18 and then adjust it annually for inflation. Unfortunately, raising the hourly minimum wage has sometimes reduced weekly wages as businesses cut hours and lay off workers. The best way to raise incomes in California is to stop driving job-creating businesses out of the state or into the ground. Raising the minimum wage is counter-productive. It also increases the state’s expenses by raising government labor costs. **VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION 32.**

NO on 33

Why we're against it

Proposition 33 is a rent control measure that would lead to a reduction in the supply of rental housing. It repeals a sensible 1995 law, the Costa-Hawkins Rental Housing Act, which put limits on rent control laws to ensure that housing providers could make a fair return on their investment and stay in business. Repealing Costa-Hawkins would mean cities could enact radical rent control, even on single-family homes and condos, and prevent property owners from resetting the rent to the market rate after a tenant voluntarily moves out. Proposition 33 would lead to a sharp reduction in new apartment construction as lenders evaluate financial risk due to potential rent control laws. That will worsen the housing shortage in California. Voters have already rejected this proposal twice before, in 2018 and 2020. **VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION 33.**

YES on 34

Why we're for it

Some nonprofit healthcare organizations that receive federal funds to provide health care services have abused the system to spend large amounts of money on political causes. Proposition 34 would end this practice and require that healthcare providers spend most of the money they receive from a federal prescription drug discount program on direct patient care. **VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION 34.**

Proposition 35 – HJTA takes no position on this measure

California currently taxes managed care organizations (MCOs) such as Anthem Blue Cross and others. The MCO tax is set to expire in 2026, and we expect the Legislature to make it permanent. Proposition 35 would also make it permanent but would require the revenue from the tax to fund Medi-Cal, the government health insurance program for low-income residents, instead of being used to close gaps in the state budget. About 14 million California residents rely on the Medi-Cal program for their health care needs.

YES on 36

Why we're for it

Proposition 36 is the “Homelessness, Drug Addiction and Theft Reduction Act,” backed by law enforcement groups and retailers. It makes thoughtful changes to Proposition 47 (2014), which reduced some theft and drug felonies to misdemeanors. Proposition 36 would get tougher on third offenses and also offer drug and mental health treatment as an alternative to incarceration. It would allow judges to sentence some individuals to state prison instead of county jail. The surge of retail theft, vehicle break-ins and open drug use on California’s streets has increased the burden on first responders, and on taxpayers, as well as raising insurance costs throughout the state. **VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION 36.**

Local Measures

In the Bay Area

No on Regional Measure 4 Dropped from the ballot thanks to taxpayer pressure!

A property tax increase in nine counties to pay for borrowing \$20 billion for "affordable housing."

In Los Angeles

No on Measure A

Doubles the temporary sales tax for homelessness programs and makes the tax increase permanent

No on Measure E

Raises property taxes by \$60 per 1,000 square feet of your home for the County Fire Department

No on Measure US

A property tax increase to pay for \$9 billion in borrowing for the Los Angeles Unified School District.

In Folsom

No on Measure G

A sales tax increase of 1%, sponsored by "citizens."

Ad paid for by Protect Prop. 13, a project of the Howard Jarvis Taxpayers Association.