



November 5, 2024 General Election Voter Guide

Local Offices	Preference
Tuolumne County Supervisor, District 1 – Mark Plummer has withdrawn from the race and endorsed Mike Holland, please make Mark’s sacrifice meaningful by voting for Mike Holland.	Mike Holland
Columbia Elem School Board Member (Vote for 2)	Cody Opie Erik Segerstrom
Soulsbyville Elem School Board Member (Vote for 2)	Joshua Milbourn Marc Christie
Twain Harte CSD Board Member (Vote for 3)	Mary Dearborn Edward Proctor Dennis Mitchell

Local Ballot Measures		Vote
Measure Z	<p>To support essential Tuolumne County services including law enforcement, fire services, and road maintenance, shall the measure increasing the Sales Tax (Transactions and Use Tax) rate from 7.25% to 8.25% in the unincorporated areas of Tuolumne County, providing approximately \$6,200,000 in annual revenue that cannot be taken by the State, subject to an annual audit, and expiring in 20 years, be adopted?</p> <p><i>Measure Z will cost each resident about \$124/yr in additional taxes, or approximately \$500/yr for a family of 4 (reduced somewhat by taxes paid by tourists).</i></p>	No
Measure A	<p>Measure A is not a tax. It is an advisory measure telling current and future Tuolumne County leadership how voters wish Measure Z funds to be spent, if approved. Do you support Measure Z funds being prioritized to maintain competitive deputy sheriff compensation, sustain new and existing fire stations, and increase rural, residential road maintenance?”</p> <p><i>Should Measure Z pass, informs the county government that the additional tax revenue should be spent on law enforcement, fire and roads. This is only an advisory measure and does not hold legal weight.</i></p>	Yes
Measure B	<p>To improve the quality of local high schools; make health, safety, and security improvements; modernize/construct classrooms, restrooms, school, and sports facilities; improve technology infrastructure; and replace aging portables with permanent classrooms; shall Summerville Union High School District’s measure authorizing \$13,000,000 of bonds at legal rates be adopted, generating approximately \$753,000 annually, while bonds are outstanding, at average rates of \$17 per \$100,000 assessed value, with annual audits, citizens’ oversight, NO money for salaries and all money staying local?</p> <p><i>Will add another line item to property tax bills in order to repay to bond. California spends about \$93B on education (44% of its \$211.1B budget).[1] Local schools receive 64% of your property tax dollars. [2]</i></p>	No

[1] <https://www.budgetchallenge.org/pages/overview>

[2] Tuolumne County Financial Trend & Forecasts, pg. 16, July 18, 2024.

National/State Offices	Preference
President of the United States	Donald Trump (R)
United States Senator Full Term	Steve Garvey (R)
United States Senator Partial/Unexpired Term	Steve Garvey (R)
United States Representative District 5	Tom McClintock (R)
State Assembly District 8	George Radanovich (R)

Statewide Ballot Measures		Vote
Proposition 2	<p>Borrow \$10 billion to build schools. Legislative Democrats put on the ballot a bond issue to give \$8.5 billion to K-12 schools and \$1.5 billion to community colleges for construction and modernization.</p> <p><i>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. [3]</i></p>	No
Proposition 3	<p>Reaffirm the right of same-sex couples to marry. This constitutional amendment from the Legislature would remove outdated language from Proposition 8, passed by voters in 2008, that characterizes marriage as being between a man and a woman.</p> <p><i>Permanently overrides the will of the people expressed by the passage of Proposition 8 in 2008. Caters to the far-left agenda by undermining family values.</i></p>	No
Proposition 4	<p>Borrow \$10 billion for climate programs. Legislative Democrats also placed a bond issue on the ballot that includes \$3.8 billion for drinking water and groundwater, \$1.5 billion for wildfire and forest programs and \$1.2 billion for sea level rise. In part, the money would offset some budget cuts.</p> <p><i>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. [3]</i></p>	No

<p>Proposition 5</p>	<p>Lower voter approval requirements for local housing and infrastructure bonds. This constitutional amendment from the Legislature would make it easier for local governments to borrow money for affordable housing and other infrastructure. To avoid opposition from the influential real estate industry, supporters agreed to block bond money from being used to buy single-family homes.</p> <p><i>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. [3]</i></p>	<p>No</p>
<p>Proposition 6</p>	<p>Limit forced labor in state prisons. Lawmakers added this one late - a constitutional amendment to end indentured servitude in state prisons, considered one of the last remnants of slavery. The California Black Legislative Caucus included the amendment in its reparations bill package.</p> <p><i>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. [3]</i></p> <p><i>In 2022 a similar measure was proposed, but failed, after it was projected by the California Department of Finance that it would cost approximately \$1.5 billion annually to pay the prisoner's minimum wage. [4]</i></p>	<p>No</p>
<p>Proposition 32</p>	<p>Raise the state minimum wage to \$18 an hour. This initiative seemed a much bigger deal when it was first proposed in 2021. But under existing law, the overall minimum wage has risen to \$16 an hour. And lower-paid workers in two huge industries are getting more: Fast food workers received a \$20 an hour minimum on April 1 and health care workers will eventually get \$25, though the start date has been pushed back to at least Oct. 15.</p> <p><i>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. [3]</i></p>	<p>No</p>

<p>Proposition 33</p>	<p>Allow local governments to impose rent controls. This is the latest attempt to roll back a state law that generally prevents cities and counties from limiting rents in properties first occupied after Feb. 1, 1995.</p> <p><i>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. [3]</i></p>	<p>No</p>
<p>Proposition 34</p>	<p>Require certain health providers to use nearly all revenue from a federal prescription drug program on patient care. Sponsored by the trade group for California's landlords, this measure is squarely aimed at knee-capping the AIDS Healthcare Foundation, which has been active in funding ballot measures (see Prop. 33).</p> <p><i>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. [3]</i></p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>Proposition 35</p>	<p>Make permanent a tax on managed health care insurance plans. This initiative is sponsored by California's health care industry to raise more money for Medi-Cal and block lawmakers from using the cash to avoid cuts to other programs. The measure would hold Newsom to a promise to permanently secure that tax money for health care for low-income patients.</p> <p><i>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. [3]</i></p>	<p>No</p>
<p>Proposition 36</p>	<p>Increase penalties for theft and drug trafficking. This initiative may be the most contentious on the ballot. It would partly roll back Proposition 47, approved by voters in 2014.</p> <p><i>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. [3]</i></p>	<p>Yes</p>

[3] <https://www.hjta.org/hjta-ballot-measure-recommendations/>

[4] <https://calmatters.org/newsletters/whatmatters/2022/06/will-california-ban-involuntary-servitude/>