Proposition 3: High Income Tax



Summary: The tax, first enacted in 2012, is set to expire in 2031. Under the measure, income taxes for top earners range from 10.3% (for individual income over $360,000) to 12.3% (for individual income over $721,000), with graduated rates in between. Eighty-nine percent of the money goes towards K-12 public schools and 11% goes to community colleges, with any excess going to public healthcare. The tax typically raises $5 billion to $15 billion a year, which is about 3-10% of overall K-12 spending.

Arguments on both sides	
Supporters: The tax has been a vital source of revenue for schools. If it fails, the loss of up to $15 billion a year for schools will likely lead to layoffs, program cuts, and other reductions. Would prevent a tax cut for millionaires and billionaires by maintaining the current tax rates.	**Opponents:** Opponents point out that California already has some of the highest income taxes in the country and say the measure may spur wealthy Californians to leave for lower-tax states, taking jobs and revenue with them. The high-income tax was pitched as 'temporary' leading to some wanting to keep it this way.
Endorsements: • California Teachers Association • California School Employees Association • California State PTA • California Democratic Party • California Medical	**Endorsements:** • California Taxpayers Association • Reform California

Implications: Provides permanent funding towards schools and health care by extending the existing tax on high-income earners. The constitutional amendment would permanently change the voter-approved tax rates for individuals earning over $371,000 (adjusted annually for inflation). Fiscally, it would maintain $5 billion to $15 billion of annual state income tax revenue by making a temporary tax increase on high-income earners permanent instead of letting it expire in 2031.

Proposition 5: Recall Reform



Summary: Recall ballots currently ask two questions: whether to remove an official, and who should replace them. The replacement winner needs only the most votes, not a majority. Prop 5 would remove the second question. Recalled legislators would be replaced by special election, other statewide officers by the Governor's appointment, and a recalled Governor by the Lieutenant Governor.

Arguments on both sides	
Supporters: Recalls should remove corrupt officials, not redo elections for partisan gain. Today a replacement can win with a small fraction of the vote; in 2021, the leading candidate had about 28%. The 2021 recall also cost over $200 million.	**Opponents:** Voters lose the right to choose a replacement. Politicians could appoint their allies, or seats could sit vacant until another costly special election. Opponents say the century-old system isn't broken.
Endorsements: • California Common Cause • California Democratic Party • League of Women Voters • Indivisible CA: StateStrong • The Sacramento Bee	**Endorsements:** • Election Integrity Project California, Inc. • California Republican Party • Reform California • The San Diego Union-Tribune • The Orange County Register

Implications: Recalls would decide only removal, likely making them less frequent and less useful for flipping party control. Vacancies would be filled by appointment, succession, or a later special election, which could leave some seats empty for months. The fiscal impact is unknown as each recall could mean costs or savings in the millions, depending on the office.

Proposition 39: Voter ID



Summary: The initiative would require voters to show government-issued identification at the polls and election officials to verify that all registered voters are US citizens. Voters who cast a mail-in ballot would need to give the last four digits of government ID, such as a driver's license number. California currently requires residents to provide an identification card and Social Security number to register to vote, but does not request it at polling places.

Arguments on both sides	
Supporters: ID requirements at voting sites will strengthen voters' trust in California's election process, and most states require voters to show some form of ID to vote.	**Opponents:** Requiring ID will make it harder for eligible voters who don't have a driver's license or other supporting documents to vote. It will disproportionately affect those with disabilities, who are low-income, or have recently moved. It adds unnecessary barriers to a secure system, where voters' identity is established by voters' signatures
Endorsements: • California Republican Party • Reform California • Uline CEO Richard Uihlein	**Endorsements:** • California Democratic Party • League of Women Voters • American Civil Liberties Union • Common Cause

Implications: It would prohibit citizens from voting unless they present government-issued identification. It would invalidate mail ballots that do not have the last four digits of a designated government-issued identification number written on the envelope. It would prohibit in-person voting without presenting government-issued ID. Fiscal impacts include tens of millions of dollars each year to implement new voting requirements.

Proposition 40: Billionaire Tax



Summary: Around 200 Californians whose net worth exceeds $1 billion at the start of this year would pay a one-time 5% tax. It would raise roughly $100 billion over five years. That money would be earmarked primarily for healthcare, with some reserved for food assistance and education. If Proposition 41 or 42 earn more votes than Proposition 40, this measure would be nullified.

Arguments on both sides	
Supporters: People who would pay the tax are the ones who benefited the most financially from recent federal tax reforms. Congress also cut tens of billions from Medicaid, which provides health insurance to low-income individuals. Those cuts will cause hospitals and clinics to close, which would cost thousands of jobs and worsen access for patients.	**Opponents:** The proposal will backfire, causing billionaires to leave California and decrease tax revenue in the long run. It also contains a loophole exposing all Californians to taxes we cannot afford but does nothing to lower healthcare costs. There would be no safeguards or accountability.
Endorsements: • California Democratic Party • California Labor Federation • Vermont Sen. Bernie Sanders	**Endorsements:** • California Medical Association • California Teachers Association • Planned Parenthood

Implications: It would impose a one-time 5% tax on certain taxpayers with assets over $1 billion. Fiscal implications would lead to a temporary revenue increase of tens of billions of dollars spread over several years from a wealth tax on billionaires. Possible ongoing decrease of less than $1 billion per year in income tax revenue from billionaires.

Proposition 43: Two-Thirds Vote Requirement for Local Special Tax Initiatives and Property Tax Initiative Prohibition Amendment



Summary: This proposition would amend the California Constitution to require that local ballot measures proposing, extending, or increasing special taxes initiated by citizens receive a two-thirds vote to be enacted. Currently, local tax measures can be enacted in one of two ways: 1. A local governing board sends the tax to voters, and it is approved by a two-thirds vote, or 2. Citizens can petition to place a special tax on local ballots, and it is approved by a majority of voters. The two-thirds threshold already applies to taxes proposed by local governments but not individuals. This would make it more difficult to impose or increase local taxes by raising the threshold for local citizen-driven special tax ballot initiatives to pass from a simple majority to two-thirds.

Arguments on both sides	
Supporters: This protects taxpayers by restoring Proposition 13's two-thirds vote requirement to pass local special taxes. This measure will close the loophole, protecting taxpayers, homeowners, and renters.	**Opponents:** The measure would limit the ability to raise needed revenue for local services and make it easier for moneyed interests to block tax initiatives that the majority of voters support.
Endorsements: • Howard Jarvis Taxpayers Association • Reform California	**Endorsements:** • California Democratic Party • SEIU Local 1000

Implications: Possibility that local government tax revenues will not go up as much in the future due to a higher vote threshold for certain taxes.

Proposition 44: Clinic Funding



Summary: impose penalties on nonprofit Federally Qualified Health Centers (community clinics providing primary care to medically underserved areas and populations) that spend less than 90% of revenue on "program services" advancing charitable purpose, including but not limited to patient services.

Arguments on both sides	
Supporters: Clinics should spend more on direct patient care and less on executive pay and overhead. With federal cuts which may leave many more uninsured, supporters say it is especially critical for clinics to prioritize patient care. It increases transparency, reduces wasteful executive spending, and ensures healthcare dollars are going towards taking care of Californians in need.	**Opponents:** The measure is unnecessary because community clinics are already heavily regulated by the state and federal governments. It would also cost clinics more than $1.7 billion in noncompliance fees in the first year, forcing clinics to significantly reduce services or close.
Endorsements: • Service Employees International Union-Union Healthcare Workers West	**Endorsements:** • California Primary Care Association • California Medical Association • Planned Parenthood Affiliates of California • California Hospital Association California Democratic Party

Implications: There is the possibility that local government tax revenues will not go up as much in the future due to a higher vote threshold for certain taxes. Fiscal implications include increased state costs in the low tens of millions of dollars per year, covered by fees.

Proposition 45: Environmental Review



Summary: This measure aims to help developers advance projects they designate as "essential" more quickly and easily. It would also limit reviews under the state's landmark environmental law, the California Environmental Quality Act. There would be a 365-day limit on environmental reviews for projects, including infrastructure like roads and bridges, housing, schools, broadband and wildfire mitigation. It would also require courts to rule within 270 days on lawsuits related to the environmental review law.

Arguments on both sides	
Supporters: Certain public and private projects would be eligible for new project review and court challenge procedures. Currently, the environmental review law is outdated and creates expensive bureaucracy and frivolous litigation that slows development. This would mean that there could be cutting red tape to build housing, water, schools, hospitals, clean energy, and wildfire prevention faster, while maintaining California's strongest environmental protections.	**Opponents:** This measure would weaken California's environmental review law, which exists to protect people and the environment from potentially harmful developments. This proposition would strip agencies of the tools they have to protect communities, increase costly litigation, and eliminate ability to enforce the law. The long-term costs of poor planning will be passed onto agencies and taxpayers.
Endorsements: • California Chamber of Commerce • California Republican Party • California Hospital Association • California Water Association	**Endorsements:** • California Labor Federation • California Democratic Party • California Nurses Association • Californians Against Waste • National Wildlife Federation

Implications: Fiscal impacts include initial costs for state and local governments, ranging from tens to hundred million dollars annually, partly covered by fees. There may be significant positive or negative longer-term fiscal effects.

District Proposition RTM: Public Transit Revenue Measure



Summary: Proposition RTM would establish a 14-year sales tax across five Bay Area counties, raising approximately $1 billion annually to preserve transit services. The funding would help prevent cuts to BART, Muni, Caltrain, and AC Transit, while supporting regional transit improvements and road maintenance. If the proposition fails, transit agencies may reduce service, affecting commuters and residents who rely on public transportation.

Arguments on both sides	
Supporters: The proposition would prevent service cuts and reduce car traffic and emissions, preventing impacts such as gridlock and protecting climate progress. The measure emphasized financial accountability to further efficiencies and cost controls to align expenses with available resources.	**Opponents:** The measure introduces a new tax, and the Bay Area already has some of the highest sales taxes in California. It would fall hardest on working families and those working paycheck to paycheck.
Endorsements: • Connect Bay Area • San Francisco Democratic Party • California Working Families Party • Salesforce • Sierra Club	**Endorsements:** • Fixes Before Funding • San Francisco Republican Party • Silicon Valley Taxpayers Association

Implications: The proposition would create a dedicated sales tax to fund Bay Area public transportation, imposing a 0.5% tax in Alameda, San Mateo, Santa Clara, and Contra Costa counties and a 1% tax in San Francisco. The tax is expected to generate approximately $1 billion annually through April 1, 2041. The funding would help prevent transit cuts, reduce traffic congestion and commuting costs, and support residents who rely on public transportation, including seniors, lower-income residents, and people with disabilities. However, it shifts the financial burden onto consumers and raises concerns about potentially inefficient spending.