

# November 2022 Ballot Measure Voter Guide



**LUTHERAN OFFICE  
of PUBLIC POLICY  
-CALIFORNIA**

\*These recommendations by the Policy Council of the Lutheran Office of Public Policy-California are made within the framework of the principals, values, and commitments of ELCA Social Statements and Social Messages. More information: [ELCA.org](http://ELCA.org)

Proposition	Position	What it does and our position
<b>1</b> <b>[Amendment]</b> <b>Reproductive Freedom</b>	YES Strong Support	Enshrines a fundamental right to reproductive freedom in the California Constitution. This includes the right to choose to have an abortion and the right to choose or refuse contraceptives. We support because: (1) As the <a href="#">ELCA Social Statement on Abortion</a> , pg. 9, states, this church has a conviction that both the life of the pregnant person and the life in the womb must be respected by law (2) Prop. 1 is unlikely to have any fiscal impact on California (3) We have a duty to support “health-promoting public health measures that can be taken only at community, state, and national levels” – <a href="#">ELCA Social Statement on Caring for Health: Our Shared Endeavor</a> , pg. 8.
<b>Result Prop. 1</b>	<b>YES, passes</b>	Margin: 33.8%  Next steps? Reproductive freedom enshrined into the Cal. constitution
<b>26</b> <b>[Amendment &amp; Statute]</b> <b>Legalize sports betting on American Indian lands and at licensed racetracks</b>	NO Oppose	Allows tribal casinos and the state’s four horse racetracks to offer in-person sports betting, with revenue generated from taxes on bets placed at the horse tracks. It would also allow tribal casinos to begin offering roulette and dice games, including craps. Additionally, anyone would be able to bring a lawsuit if they feel gaming laws are being violated with penalty and settlement money going to the state. We oppose because: (1) The actual revenue projected to be brought in from these taxes and tribal reimbursements to the state are difficult to know, partly because there may be new tribal-state compacts resulting from negotiations on sports betting age restrictions and also, it’s unclear how much money private lawsuits will bring in (2) While we recognize legal gaming by American Indian and Alaska Native Tribes for the purpose of self-determination and sovereignty, ELCA social documents express serious concerns about all forms of gambling and call for opposition to lotteries and other state-sponsored gambling. – ELCA social policy resolution on <a href="#">The Sponsorship of Legal Gambling by American Indian Tribes</a> , pg. 1
<b>Result Prop. 26</b>	<b>NO, fails</b>	Margin: 34%  Next steps? Similar path options as Prop. 27 (see below). Nothing concrete laid out yet.

<p>27 [Amendment &amp; Statute] Allows online &amp; mobile sports betting off American Indian lands</p>	<p>NO Strong Oppose</p>	<p>Allows licensed tribes and gaming companies to offer mobile and online sports betting for adults 21 and older outside Native American tribal lands. Gaming companies could only offer betting if they made a deal with a tribe. We oppose because: (1) This would make it nearly impossible for smaller gaming companies to compete due to the high thresholds for companies to do business in California (2) State revenues are uncertain because of the allowance for gaming companies to deduct certain expenses to reduce their tax bill. As seen in the <a href="#">ELCA Social Statement on Economic Life: Sufficient, Sustainable Livelihood for All</a>, pg. 13-14, we recognize the “inordinate potential to influence political decisions, local and regional economies, and democratic processes in society” that large corporations possess and are therefore calling for “scrutiny of tax breaks, subsidies, and incentives” companies receive to “assure that they serve the common good” (3) ELCA social documents express serious concerns about all forms of gambling and call for opposition to lotteries and other state-sponsored gambling. – ELCA social policy resolution on <a href="#">The Sponsorship of Legal Gambling by American Indian Tribes</a>, pg. 1</p>
<p>Result Prop. 27</p>	<p>NO, fails</p>	<p>Margin: 64.6%</p> <p>Next steps? Campaign supporting this Prop. said they remain committed to California and legalizing online betting there. No concrete next steps laid out yet by the proponents of this prop. nor Native American tribes.</p>
<p>28 [Statute] Funding of arts and music education</p>	<p>No position</p>	<p>Would require the state to allocate at least 1% of Prop. 98 funding – money guaranteed for public schools and community colleges in the state budget – for music and arts education. This is estimated to be \$1 billion annually. We have no position at this time because: LOPP is deeply committed to the legislative deliberative process and therefore, we feel that a ballot proposition that is budgetary in nature is harmful to the long-term success of the state budgetary system. However, we do acknowledge that arts and music education is a goal worth striving for. <a href="#">The ELCA Social Statement on Our Calling in Education</a> states on pg. 2 that “the ELCA affirms and advocates for the equitable, sufficient, and effective funding of public schools.” Should this idea come before the state legislature in the form of a bill, LOPP would gladly look to support its passage.</p>
<p>Result Prop. 28</p>	<p>YES, passes</p>	<p>Margin: 28.8%</p> <p>Next steps? Extra funding for arts and music education will take effect</p>

<p><b>29</b> [Statute] <b>Dialysis clinic regulation</b></p>	<p>NO Oppose</p>	<p>Requires kidney dialysis clinics to have at least one physician, nurse practitioner, or physician assistant with six months of relevant experience available on site, or in some cases, via telehealth. It would also require clinics to report infection data to the state, as well as physicians who have ownership interest of 5% or more in a clinic. We oppose because: this initiative could affect health care access for others, which we recognize as a need for all. The measure has the potential to raise healthcare costs. The <a href="#">ELCA Social Statement on Caring for Health: Our Shared Endeavor</a>, pg. 1, speaks to keeping costs low in healthcare to ensure equal access to all.</p>
<p><b>Result Prop. 29</b></p>	<p><b>NO, fails</b></p>	<p>Margin: 36.8%</p> <p>Next steps? None at this time</p>
<p><b>30</b> [Statute] <b>Increases some taxes for clean energy &amp; air funding</b></p>	<p>NO Oppose</p>	<p>Would impose a 1.75% personal income tax increase on Californians making more than \$2 million a year to create a fund that would go towards various climate programs, with the goal of improving air quality and meeting greenhouse gas emissions reductions targets. Most of the money raised would go toward rebates for zero-emission cars and building charging stations. We oppose because: (1) \$10 billion over the next five years was allocated to zero-emissions vehicle (ZEV) programs already in this year’s budget. Millions are invested in these programs now. Investing 80% of this new fund toward ZEV rebates would not significantly contribute to reaching the goal of a “sufficient, sustainable livelihood for all”, especially when the infrastructure is still not in place for more reliable ZEV use and rebates are likely not high enough to help low- and middle-income residents despite the statute’s claims (2) Like Prop. 28, this statute aims to budget through a proposition, which LOPP believes is problematic in that it harms the long-term success of the state budgetary system. More information about the ELCA’s mission to seek sufficient, sustainable livelihood for all can be found throughout the <a href="#">ELCA Social Statement on Sufficient, Sustainable Livelihood for All</a>.</p>
<p><b>Result Prop. 30</b></p>	<p><b>NO, fails</b></p>	<p>Margin: 15.4%</p> <p>Next steps? None at this time</p>
<p><b>31</b> [Referendum] <b>Retain ban on retail sale of flavored tobacco products</b></p>	<p>YES Support</p>	<p>Asks voters to retain or overturn a 2020 law that prohibits the sale of some flavored tobacco products. A “yes” vote upholds the current law; a “no” vote would strike down the law and allow the sale of flavored tobacco products. We support a “yes” vote because: (1) Avoiding the use of tobacco and drugs promotes personal health by preventing illness and disease. Being good stewards of our own health is a responsibility we share “out of thankfulness for the gift of life and in order to serve God and the neighbor”, as expressed in the <a href="#">ELCA Social Statement on Caring for Health: Our Shared Endeavor</a>, pg. 7 (2) To live out the calling of living abundantly in relationship with God and in loving service to our neighbor, health must be approached as a shared endeavor. Overturning</p>

		<p>the law banning flavored tobacco products would be a disservice to our neighbors, particularly those most affected by tobacco advertising, including students and those from lower income households. Pg. 2-3 of the <a href="#">ELCA Social Statement on Caring for Health: Our Shared Endeavor</a> discusses our support for health care as a shared endeavor and our responsibilities in working toward health care for all people.</p>
<p><b>Result Prop. 31</b></p>	<p><b>YES, passes</b></p>	<p>Margin: 27%</p> <p>Next steps? 2020 law banning flavored tobacco will take effect</p>