

The November 2024 ballot includes 10 California Propositions. The recommendations from the Public Policy Committee, shown below, are marked as YES, NO or ? (Undecided). Summaries are provided by Cal Matters <https://calmatters.org/about/>, and Ballotpedia <https://ballotpedia.org/Ballotpedia:About>

| CALIFORNIA BALLOT MEASURES SUMMARIES | | Y E S | N O | ? |
|--------------------------------------|---|-------------|--------|---|
| PROP 2 | <p>This measure asks voters to approve a \$10 billion loan for public school construction and repairs:</p> <p>The funds will build and repair elementary, secondary and Community Colleges. \$8.5 B would go to elementary and secondary schools and \$1.5 B to Community Colleges. CA State University and University of California systems will receive no funds.</p> <p>Proponents: California Federation of Teachers, California Labor Federation, Association of California, School Administrators, California Builders Alliance, California Chamber of Commerce, California Retired Teachers Association, Community College League of California.</p> <p>Opponents: Some low-wealth districts and advocacy groups that say the proposal does not go far enough in addressing the equity gap that benefits affluent school districts.</p> | 13 | | |
| PROP 3 | <p>Constitutional amendment to remove the CA constitutional ban on same sex marriage:</p> <p>In 2008, voters passed an amendment prohibiting same sex marriage. In 2013, SCOTUS legalized same sex marriage and the CA ban became unenforceable. This amendment would remove the CA ban and replace it with language saying that the “right to marry is a fundamental right.”</p> <p>Proponents: CA Democratic Party, California Labor Federation, ACLU of Northern California, etc.</p> <p>Opponents: California Capitol Connection (an alliance of independent Baptist ministers and churches) and other conservative groups.</p> | 13 | | |
| PROP 4 | <p>This measure asks the voters to approve a loan of \$10 billion for climate programs:</p> <p>The funds will be allocated to various climate programs including improvements to water systems, drought prevention, wildfire preparation, combating sea level rise, parks and recreation programs, extreme heat preparation programs, clean air initiatives, biodiversity protection and farm and ranch sustainability.</p> <p>Proponents: Environmental groups, labor unions, social justice organizations, water agencies, renewable energy companies and the water recycling industry.</p> <p>Opponents: The Howard Jarvis Taxpayers Association.</p> | 13 | | |
| PROP 5 | <p>Constitutional amendment to make it easier for local governments to borrow money:</p> <p>This permission would be contingent on governments using the funds to build affordable housing or public infrastructure. Currently local governments, excluding school districts, may only borrow money if two thirds of the voters approve. This measure lowers the percentage to 55% for affordable housing and public infrastructure projects. Public infrastructure projects include water and sewer systems, public transportation, libraries, broadband internet and hospitals.</p> <p>Proponents: California Democratic Party, State Building and Construction Trades Council of California, AIDS Healthcare Foundation, and California State Association of Counties.</p> <p>Opponents: California Association of Realtors, California Chamber of Commerce, California Taxpayer Association, Howard Jarvis Taxpayers Association, and National Federation of Independent Businesses.</p> | 9 | 1 | 3 |

| CALIFORNIA BALLOT MEASURES SUMMARIES | | Y E S | N O | ? |
|--------------------------------------|--|-------------|-----------|----------|
| PROP 6 | <p>Constitutional amendment to ban forced labor in any form: Currently the Constitution bans involuntary servitude or forced labor except as a punishment for crime. The proponents of this amendment are concerned that the Department of Corrections regularly puts inmates to work against their will. It is common for incarcerated prisoners to be forced to work against their will for less than a \$1 per hour. The average is 74 cents per hour. This measure is called the Anti-slavery measure since it is a vestige of the chain gangs of prisoners forced to labor after the Civil War. The measure provides for a volunteer work program whereby a prisoner can reduce their sentence. Rehabilitation activists believe that without forced labor, prisoners will be able to choose rehab programs including education, job training, and therapy.</p> <p>Proponents: The ACLU, the Abolish Slavery National Network, and the Anti-Recidivism Coalition.</p> <p>Opponents: None known.</p> | 13 | | |
| PROP 32 | <p>This measure will increase California’s minimum wage to \$18 per hour: It is currently \$16 per hour for most and \$20 per hour for fast food workers. This measure would provide for an increase for health care workers to an eventual minimum wage of \$25 per hours, pursuant to a law signed by Gov. Newsom in 2023.</p> <p>Proponents: The Working Hero Action for Living Wage PAC.</p> <p>Opponents: The Republican Party of CA and business owners.</p> | 12 | 1 | |
| PROP 33 | <p>This initiative aims to repeal a state law prohibiting cities and counties from capping rents on single - family homes, condominiums and apartments built after 1995: It states that: “The state may not limit the right of any city, county, or city and country to maintain, enact or expand residential rent control.” Proponents call it the “Justice for Renters” initiative. The state law, which this initiative would repeal, passed in 2019 approving a 10% cap on rental increases. It exempted new construction and will expire in 2030. Proponents argue that passage will help prevent homelessness. Opponents argue that passage will hurt mom and pop landlords, affect property values and discourage construction of new affordable housing. Similar rent control measures failed in 2018 and 2020.</p> <p>Proponents: Justice for Renters (sponsored by the AIDS Healthcare Foundation), the California Democratic Party, the American Federation of Teachers, the Tenants’ Rights Group, Housing is a Human Right, and the AIDS Healthcare Foundation.</p> <p>Opponents: State Senator Toni Atkins (D), Assembly Appropriations Chair Buffy Wicks (D), Republican Party of California, Norcal Carpenters Union, United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, California Apartment Association, California Business Roundtable, the Rental Housing Association and other landlord, real estate groups.</p> | 2 | 10 | 1 |

| CALIFORNIA BALLOT MEASURES SUMMARIES | | Y E S | N O | ? |
|--------------------------------------|--|-------------|-----------|---|
| PROP 34 | <p>This measure will permanently allow CA's Medicaid program to pay pharmacies directly for prescription drugs: CA has been doing this since 2019 per Gov. Newsom's executive order and this measure will make this a law. This measure will also require some health care providers (the Aids Healthcare Foundation) to spend almost all federal monies received from a federal prescription drug program on patients and not elsewhere.</p> <p>Proponents: California Apartment Association, ALS Association, S.F. Women's Cancer Network, CA Republican Party.</p> <p>Opponents: Aids Health Care Foundation, Consumer Watchdog, Housing is a Human Right Organization, Board of NOW, Coalition Economic Survival.</p> | | 13 | |
| PROP 35 | <p>This measure would require the state to pay more to doctors who provide care for Medicaid patients: Managed care providers contract with the state to provide these health benefits. The state taxes these organizations to help pay for the state Medicaid program. This measure would require the state to use a portion of this tax money to increase the amount the state Medicaid program pays doctors.</p> <p>Proponents: CA Democratic Party, the Republican Party of CA, SEIU CA State Council, the CA Hospital Association and others.</p> <p>Opponents: There is no known opposition.</p> | | 13 | |
| PROP 36 | <p>This measure makes the crime of shoplifting a felony for repeat offenders, and would increase some penalties for drug charges, including those involving fentanyl: It would also allow judges to order multiple drug offenders into treatment. Proponents argue that this measure is needed to prevent retail crime. Opponents argue that this measure will disproportionately result in more poor people, more Black and Brown people and those with drug addictions being swept up into our system of mass incarceration while not impacting criminals who hire large groups to steal for them. They argue that this measure will cut \$850 million in the next decade for mental health services, drug treatment, victim services and re-entry prevention programs.</p> <p>Proponents: District Attorneys, Police and Law Enforcement Organizations, including the CA Correctional Peace Officers Association.</p> <p>Opponents: Democratic State Leaders and social justice activists, ACLU, CA Democratic Party, the Anti-Recidivism Coalition.</p> | | 13 | |