**SUMMARY**

Authorizes $9 billion in general obligation bonds for new construction and modernization of K–12 public school facilities; charter schools and vocational education facilities; and California Community Colleges facilities. Fiscal Impact: State costs of about $17.6 billion to pay off both the principal ($9 billion) and interest ($8.6 billion) on the bonds. Payments of about $500 million per year for 35 years.

**WHAT YOUR VOTE MEANS**

**YES** A YES vote on this measure means: The state would not have the authority to sell new general obligation bonds for K–12 public school and community college facilities.

**NO** A NO vote on this measure means: The state could sell $9 billion in general obligation bonds for education facilities ($7 billion for K–12 public school facilities and $2 billion for community college facilities).

**ARGUMENTS**

**PRO** Our children deserve safe schools where they can learn, but many schools and community colleges need repairs to meet health and safety standards. Prop. 51 will fix deteriorating schools, upgrade classrooms, and provide job-training facilities for veterans and vocational education. All projects are accountable to local taxpayers.

**CON** Prop. 51 was created for greedy developers to exploit taxpayers for profit. Prop. 51 stops legislators from providing fair school funding. Disadvantaged schools are left behind. There’s no improvement in taxpayer accountability. It does nothing to fight waste, fraud and abuse. Governor Brown opposes Prop. 51. Vote NO on 51.

**ARGUMENTS**

**FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION**

**FOR** Yes on Proposition 51—Californians for Quality Schools info@californiansforqualityschools.com www.californiansforqualityschools.com

**AGAINST** G. Rick Marshall, Chief Financial Officer California Taxpayers Action Network 621 Del Mar Avenue Chula Vista, CA 91910 (310) 346-7425 rick@StopProp51.org StopProp51.org

**FOR** Yes on Proposition 52, a coalition of California Association of Hospitals and Health Systems and non-profit health care organizations. info@yesprop52.org www.yesprop52.org

**AGAINST** George M. Yin Californians for Hospital Accountability and Quality Care—No on 52, Sponsored by Service Employees International Union—United Healthcare Workers West 777 S. Figueroa Street, Suite 4050, Los Angeles, CA 90017 (213) 452-6565 gyin@kaufmanlegalgroup.com www.noon52.com
SUMMARY
Requires statewide voter approval before any revenue bonds can be issued or sold by the state for certain projects if the bond amount exceeds $2 billion. Fiscal Impact: State and local fiscal effects are unknown and would depend on which projects are affected by the measure and what actions government agencies and voters take in response to the measure’s voting requirement.

ARGUMENTS


CON  A NO vote on this measure means: State revenue bonds totaling more than $2 billion for a project that is funded, owned, or managed by the state would require statewide voter approval.

FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

FOR  Yes on 53—Stop Blank Checks 925 University Ave. Sacramento, CA 95825 (916) 500-7040 Info@StopBlankChecks.com www.YESon53.com

AGAINST  No on Prop. 53—Californians to Protect Local Control info@NoProp53.com NoProp53.com

ARGUMENTS

PRO  Prop. 54 stops special-interest, surprise legislation from passing either legislative house without 72 hours for review. Prop. 54 posts all the Legislature's public meetings online, so voters can review legislators' public actions. A bipartisan coalition of good-government, taxpayer, minority, business, and environmental groups backs Prop. 54. Requires no new tax money.

CON  A NO vote on this measure means: Rules and duties of the Legislature would not change.

FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

FOR  Yes on 54—Voters First, Not Special Interests, Sponsored by Hold Politicians Accountable 1215 K Street, Suite 2260 Sacramento, CA 95814 (916) 325-0056 info@YesProp54.org www.YesProp54.org

AGAINST  Steven Maviglio Californians for an Effective Legislature 1005 12th St., Suite A Sacramento, CA 95814 (916) 607-8340 steven.maviglio@gmail.com www.NoOnProposition54.com
**SUMMARY**

Extends by twelve years the temporary personal income tax increases enacted in 2012 on earnings over $250,000, with revenues allocated to K–12 schools, California Community Colleges, and, in certain years, healthcare. Fiscal Impact: Increased state revenues—$4 billion to $9 billion annually from 2019–2030—depending on economy and stock market. Increased funding for schools, community colleges, health care for low-income people, budget reserves, and debt payments.

**WHAT YOUR VOTE MEANS**

**YES**

A YES vote on this measure means: Income tax increases on high-income taxpayers, which are scheduled to end after 2018, would instead be extended through 2030.

**ARGUMENTS**

**PRO**

Prop. 55 helps children thrive! Prop. 55 prevents $4 billion in cuts to California’s public schools, and increases children’s access to healthcare, by maintaining current tax rates on the wealthiest Californians—with strict accountability requirements. We can’t go back to the deep cuts we faced during the last recession. [www.YesOn55.com](http://www.YesOn55.com)

**CON**

VOTE NO ON 55—TEMPORARY SHOULD MEAN TEMPORARY. Voters supported higher taxes in 2012 because Governor Brown said they would be TEMPORARY. State budget estimates show higher taxes are not needed to balance the budget, but the special interests want to extend them to grow government bigger. TELL THEM NO.

**FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION**

**FOR**

Jordan Curley
Yes on 55—Californians for Budget Stability
1510 J Street, Suite 210
Sacramento, CA 95814
(916) 443-7817
info@protectingcalifornia.com
www.YesOn55.com

**AGAINST**

Howard Jarvis Taxpayers Association
[www.hjta.org](http://www.hjta.org)

**ARGUMENTS**

**PRO**

Prop. 56 increases cigarette tax by $2.00 per pack, with equivalent increase on other tobacco products and electronic cigarettes containing nicotine. Fiscal Impact: Additional net state revenue of $1 billion to $1.4 billion in 2017–18, with potentially lower revenues in future years. Revenues would be used primarily to augment spending on health care for low-income Californians.

**WHAT YOUR VOTE MEANS**

**YES**

A YES vote on this measure means:

State excise tax on cigarettes would increase by $2 per pack—from 87 cents to $2.87. State excise tax on other tobacco products would increase by a similar amount. State excise tax also would be applied to electronic cigarettes. Revenue from these higher taxes would be used for many purposes, but primarily to augment spending on health care for low-income Californians.

**ARGUMENTS**

**PRO**

Tobacco-related healthcare costs California taxpayers $3.5 billion annually, even if you don’t smoke. Prop. 56 works like a user fee, taxing tobacco to help pay for smoking prevention and healthcare—so smokers pay their fair share for their costs. American Cancer Society Cancer Action Network sponsored Prop. 56 to prevent kids from smoking and save lives.

**CON**

Follow the 56 money: This $1.6 billion tax increase gives $1 billion to health insurance companies and special interests. 56 cheats schools out of $600 million a year by circumventing our minimum school funding guarantee. Only 13% of the money helps smokers or prevents kids from starting. No on 56.

**FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION**

**FOR**

Yes on 56—Save Lives California
1020 12th Street, Suite 303
Sacramento, CA 95814
(916) 706-2487
info@YesOn56.org
YesOn56.org

**AGAINST**

No on 56—Stop the Special Interest Tax Grab
925 University Ave.
Sacramento, CA 95825
(916) 409-7500
Info@NoOnProposition56.com
www.NoOnProposition56.com
**SUMMARY**

Prop 57: CRIMINAL SENTENCES. PAROLE. JUVENILE CRIMINAL PROCEEDINGS AND SENTENCING. INITIATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT AND STATUTE.

Allows parole consideration for nonviolent felons. Authorizes sentence credits for rehabilitation, good behavior, and education. Provides juvenile court judge decides whether juvenile will be prosecuted as adult. Fiscal Impact: Net state savings likely in the tens of millions of dollars annually, depending on implementation. Net county costs of likely a few million dollars annually.

**WHAT YOUR VOTE MEANS**

**YES**
A YES vote on this measure means:
- Certain state prison inmates convicted of nonviolent felony offenses would be considered for release earlier than otherwise. The state prison system could award additional sentencing credits to inmates for good behavior and approved rehabilitative or educational achievements.
- Youths must have a hearing in juvenile court before they could be transferred to adult court.

**NO**
A NO vote on this measure means:
- There would be no change to the inmate release process. The state’s prison system could not award additional sentencing credits to inmates. Certain youths could continue to be tried in adult court without a hearing in juvenile court.

**ARGUMENTS**

**PRO**
California public safety leaders and victims of crime support Proposition 57—the Public Safety and Rehabilitation Act of 2016—because Prop. 57 focuses resources on keeping dangerous criminals behind bars, while rehabilitating juvenile and adult inmates and saving tens of millions of taxpayer dollars. YES on Prop. 57.

**CON**
Vote NO on 57 because it:
- Authorizes EARLY RELEASE of violent criminals, including those who RAPE unconscious victims.
- Authorizes immediate release for 16,000 dangerous criminals, even convicted murderers.
- Amends the California Constitution; takes rights away from victims; grants more rights to criminals. Vote NO on 57.

**FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION**

**FOR**
James Harrison
Remcho, Johansen and Purcell, LLP
1901 Harrison Street, Suite 1550
Oakland, CA 94612
(510) 346-6200
Info@SafetyandRehabilitation.com
www.Vote4Prop57.com

**AGAINST**
William Kolkey
Stop Early Release of Violent Criminals Committee
FFPC#1386627
No on 57 Committee
921 11th Street, #300
Sacramento, CA 95814
(916) 409-7401
will@stopEarlyRelease.com
www.StopEarlyRelease.com

**PROP 58: ENGLISH PROFICIENCY. MULTILINGUAL EDUCATION. INITIATIVE STATUTE.**

Preserves requirement that public schools ensure students obtain English language proficiency. Requires school districts to solicit parent/community input in developing language acquisition programs. Requires instruction to ensure English acquisition as rapidly and effectively as possible. Authorizes school districts to establish dual-language immersion programs for both native and non-native English speakers. Fiscal Impact: No notable fiscal effect on school districts or state government.

**WHAT YOUR VOTE MEANS**

**YES**
A YES vote on this measure means:
- Public schools could more easily choose how to teach English learners, whether in English-only, bilingual, or other types of programs.

**NO**
A NO vote on this measure means:
- Public schools would still be required to teach most English learners in English-only programs.

**ARGUMENTS**

**PRO**
Teachers, parents, school principals, local school board members, and Governor Jerry Brown support Proposition 58 to help students learn English as quickly as possible and expand opportunities for English speakers to master a second language. Proposition 58 gives school districts local control to choose the most effective instruction methods for their students.

**CON**
Prop. 58 is not about modernizing the way we teach English. It’s about eliminating parental rights to an English-language education for their children. English-language success has been spectacular. Immigrant children are learning English faster than ever before and record numbers of immigrant students are gaining admission to our universities.

**FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION**

**FOR**
Lisa Gasperoni
Yes on 58—Californians for English Proficiency sponsored by the California State Council of Service Employees
1510 J Street, Suite 210
Sacramento, CA 95814
(916) 668-9103
 info@SupportProp58.com
www.SupportProp58.com

**AGAINST**
www.KeepEnglish.org
**SUMMARY**

Asks whether California’s elected officials should use their authority to propose and ratify an amendment to the federal Constitution overturning the United States Supreme Court decision in Citizens United v. Federal Election Commission. Citizens United ruled that laws placing certain limits on political spending by corporations and unions are unconstitutional. Fiscal Impact: No direct fiscal effect on state or local governments.

Shall California’s elected officials use all of their constitutional authority, including, but not limited to, proposing and ratifying one or more amendments to the United States Constitution, to overturn Citizens United v. Federal Election Commission (2010) 558 U.S. 310, and other applicable judicial precedents, to allow the full regulation or limitation of campaign contributions and spending, to ensure that all citizens, regardless of wealth, may express their views to one another, and to make clear that corporations should not have the same constitutional rights as human beings?

**WHAT YOUR VOTE MEANS**

**YES**  A YES vote on this measure means: Voters would be asking their elected officials to use their constitutional authority to seek increased regulation of campaign spending and contributions. As an advisory measure, Proposition 59 does not require any particular action by the Congress or California Legislature.

**NO**  A NO vote on this measure means: Voters would not be asking their elected officials to seek certain changes in the regulation of campaign spending and contributions.

**ARGUMENTS**

**PRO**  Vote YES on Prop. 59 to tell Congress we want big money out of politics and overturn misguided Supreme Court rulings saying unlimited campaign spending is free speech and that corporations have the same constitutional rights as real people. Send a message to Congress that we’ll hold them accountable.

**CON**  The Legislature should stop wasting taxpayer dollars by putting do-nothing measures on the ballot that ask Congress to overturn the Supreme Court. Instead of wasting time and money on do-nothing ballot measures, politicians in Sacramento should focus on transparency and bringing jobs to California. Proposition 59 DOES NOTHING. Vote NO!

**FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION**

**FOR**  Derek Cressman  California Common Cause  (323) 536-1459  vote@yesonCAProp59.com  www.yesonCAProp59.com

**AGAINST**  Dave Gilliard  Gilliard Blanning & Associates  5701 Lonetree Blvd., Suite 301  Rocklin, CA 95765  (916) 626-6804  info@gbacampaigns.com

**FOR**  Rick Taylor  Yes on Prop. 60, For Adult Industry Responsibility (FAIR)  22815 Ventura Blvd., #405  Los Angeles, CA 91364  (310) 815-8444  rick@dakcomm.com  www.FAIR4CA.org

**AGAINST**  Eric Paul Leue  Californians Against Worker Harassment  PO Box 10480  Canoga Park, CA 91309  (818) 650-1973  press@freespeechcoalition.com  www.DontHarassCA.com
### QUICK-REFERENCE GUIDE

#### PROP 61
**STATE PRESCRIPTION DRUG PURCHASES. PRICING STANDARDS. INITIATIVE STATUTE.**

**SUMMARY**
Prohibits state from buying any prescription drug from a drug manufacturer at price over lowest price paid for the drug by United States Department of Veterans Affairs. Exempts managed care programs funded through Medi-Cal. Fiscal Impact: Potential for state savings of an unknown amount depending on (1) how the measure’s implementation challenges are addressed and (2) the responses of drug manufacturers regarding the provision and pricing of their drugs.

**WHAT YOUR VOTE MEANS**

| **YES** | A YES vote on this measure means: State agencies would generally be prohibited from paying more for any prescription drug than the lowest price paid by the U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs for the same drug. |
| **NO** | A NO vote on this measure means: State agencies would continue to be able to negotiate the prices of, and pay for, prescription drugs without reference to the prices paid by the U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs. |

**ARGUMENTS**

| **PRO** | Prop. 61, The California Drug Price Relief Act, would require all prescription drugs purchased by the State of California to be priced at or below the price paid for the same drug by the U.S. Dept. of Veterans Affairs, which pays by far the lowest price of any federal agency. |
| **CON** | Experts say Prop. 61 would: increase prescription prices, reduce patient access to needed medicines, produce more bureaucracy and lawsuits that cost taxpayers millions, and hurt veterans by increasing their prescription costs. Strongly opposed by California Medical Association, California NAACP, California Taxpayers Association, Ovarian Cancer Coalition of Greater California, Veterans of Foreign Wars (VFW), Department of California. www.NoProp61.com |

**FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION**

| **FOR** | Aref Aziz  
Yes on Prop. 61, Californians for Lower Drug Prices  
22815 Ventura Blvd., #405  
Los Angeles, CA 91364  
(323) 601-8139  
Yes@StopPharmaGreed.com  
www.StopPharmaGreed.com |
| **AGAINST** | No on Prop. 61—Californians Against the Deceptive Rx Proposition  
(888) 279-8108  
info@noprop61.com  
www.Noprop61.com |

#### PROP 62
**DEATH PENALTY. INITIATIVE STATUTE.**

**SUMMARY**
Repeals death penalty and replaces it with life imprisonment without possibility of parole. Applies retroactively to existing death sentences. Increases the portion of life inmates’ wages that may be applied to victim restitution. Fiscal Impact: Net ongoing reduction in state and county criminal justice costs of around $150 million annually within a few years, although the impact could vary by tens of millions of dollars depending on various factors.

**WHAT YOUR VOTE MEANS**

| **YES** | A YES vote on this measure means: No offenders could be sentenced to death by the state for first degree murder. The most serious penalty available would be a prison term of life without the possibility of parole. Offenders who are currently under a sentence of death would be resentenced to life without the possibility of parole. |
| **NO** | A NO vote on this measure means: Certain offenders convicted for first degree murder could continue to be sentenced to death. There would be no change for offenders currently under a sentence of death. |

**ARGUMENTS**

| **PRO** | Prop. 62 replaces the FAILED DEATH PENALTY SYSTEM with a strict life sentence without possibility of parole. Prisoners must work and pay restitution, instead of sitting on death row. Guarantees no innocent person is executed. TAXPAYERS SAVE $150 MILLION/year. Victims’ family members and former death penalty advocates: YES on 62. |
| **CON** | Prop. 62 repeals the death penalty for brutal killers, including child killers, mass murderers, serial killers, and rape/torture murderers. Prop. 62 means these murderers will live the rest of their lives at taxpayers’ expense, with free healthcare, long after their victims are gone. Law enforcement, victims’ families, and DAs oppose Prop. 62. |

**FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION**

| **FOR** | Quintin Mecke  
Yes on Prop. 62, Replace the Costly, Failed Death Penalty System  
5 Third Street, Suite 724  
San Francisco, CA 94103  
(415) 243-0143  
info@justicethatworks.org  
www.YesOn62.com |
| **AGAINST** | Mike Ramos  
Californians for Death Penalty Reform and Savings  
520 Capitol Mall, Ste. 630  
Sacramento, CA 95814  
(800) 372-6417  
info@noprop62yesprop66.com  
www.noprop62yesprop66.com |
**QUICK-REFERENCE GUIDE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROP 63</th>
<th>FIREARMS. AMMUNITION SALES. INITIATIVE STATUTE.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUMMARY</strong></td>
<td>Requires background check and Department of Justice authorization to purchase ammunition. Prohibits possession of large-capacity ammunition magazines. Establishes procedures for enforcing laws prohibiting firearm possession by specified persons. Requires Department of Justice’s participation in federal National Instant Criminal Background Check System. Fiscal Impact: Increased state and local court and law enforcement costs, potentially in the tens of millions of dollars annually, related to a new court process for removing firearms from prohibited persons after they are convicted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WHAT YOUR VOTE MEANS</strong></td>
<td>YES A YES vote on this measure means: A new court process would be created for the removal of firearms from individuals upon conviction of certain crimes. New requirements related to the selling or purchasing of ammunition would be implemented. NO A NO vote on this measure means: No new firearm- or ammunition-related requirements would be implemented.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ARGUMENTS</strong></td>
<td><strong>PRO</strong> Proposition 63 will improve public safety by keeping guns and ammunition out of the wrong hands. Law enforcement and public safety leaders support Prop. 63 because it will reduce gun violence by preventing violent felons, domestic abusers, and the dangerously mentally ill from obtaining and using deadly weapons and ammo. <strong>CON</strong> Law enforcement, anti-terrorism experts, and civil liberties groups overwhelmingly oppose Prop. 63. It was written by a politician seeking to make a name for himself, not the public safety community. It imposes costly burdens on law enforcement and the taxpayer and only affects the law-abiding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION</strong></td>
<td><strong>FOR</strong> Lindsey Cobia Safety for All 268 Bush Street #222 San Francisco, CA 94104 (415) 735-5192 <a href="mailto:safetyforall@safetyforall.com">safetyforall@safetyforall.com</a> <a href="http://www.safetyforall.com">www.safetyforall.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROP 64</th>
<th>MARIJUANA LEGALIZATION. INITIATIVE STATUTE.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUMMARY</strong></td>
<td>Legalizes marijuana under state law, for use by adults 21 or older. Imposes state taxes on sales and cultivation. Provides for industry licensing and establishes standards for marijuana products. Allows local regulation and taxation. Fiscal Impact: Additional tax revenues ranging from high hundreds of millions of dollars to over $1 billion annually, mostly dedicated to specific purposes. Reduced criminal justice costs of tens of millions of dollars annually.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WHAT YOUR VOTE MEANS</strong></td>
<td>YES A YES vote on this measure means: Adults 21 years of age or older could legally grow, possess, and use marijuana for nonmedical purposes, with certain restrictions. The state would regulate nonmedical marijuana businesses and tax the growing and selling of medical and nonmedical marijuana. Most of the revenue from such taxes would support youth programs, environmental protection, and law enforcement. NO A NO vote on this measure means: Growing, possessing, or using marijuana for nonmedical purposes would remain illegal. It would still be legal to grow, possess, or use marijuana for medical purposes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ARGUMENTS</strong></td>
<td><strong>PRO</strong> Prop. 64 creates a safe, legal system for adult use of marijuana. It controls, regulates and taxes marijuana use, and has the nation's strictest protections for children. It provides billions for afterschool programs, job training, drug treatment, and cracking down on impaired driving. Fix our approach to marijuana. Visit YesOn64.org! <strong>CON</strong> Proposition 64 purposely omits DUI standard to keep marijuana-impaired drivers off our highways. California Association of Highway Patrolmen and Senator Dianne Feinstein strenuously oppose. Legalizes ads promoting smoking marijuana, Gummy candy and brownies on shows watched by millions of children and teens. Shows reckless disregard for child health and safety. Opposed by California Hospital Association. Vote “No”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION</strong></td>
<td><strong>FOR</strong> Dustin Moore Yes on 64, Californians to Control, Regulate and Tax Adult Use of Marijuana While Protecting Children 1029 H St., Suite 301 Sacramento, CA 95814 (916) 382-2952 <a href="mailto:info@yeson64.org">info@yeson64.org</a> <a href="http://www.yeson64.org">www.yeson64.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUMMARY</td>
<td>SUMMARY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redirects money collected by grocery and certain other retail stores through mandated sale of carryout bags. Requires stores to deposit bag sale proceeds into a special fund to support specified environmental projects. Fiscal Impact: Potential state revenue of several tens of millions of dollars annually under certain circumstances, with the monies used to support certain environmental programs.</td>
<td>Changes procedures governing state court challenges to death sentences. Designates superior court for initial petitions and limits successive petitions. Requires appointed attorneys who take noncapital appeals to accept death penalty appeals. Exempts prison officials from existing regulation process for developing execution methods. Fiscal Impact: Unknown ongoing impact on state court costs for processing legal challenges to death sentences. Potential prison savings in the tens of millions of dollars annually.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### WHAT YOUR VOTE MEANS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A YES vote on this measure means: If state law (1) prohibits giving customers certain carryout bags for free and (2) requires a charge for other types of carryout bags, the resulting revenue would be deposited in a new state fund to support certain environmental programs.</td>
<td>A NO vote on this measure means: If charges on carryout bags are required by a state law, that law could direct the use of the resulting revenue toward any purpose.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ARGUMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRO</th>
<th>CON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES ON 65—PROTECT THE ENVIRONMENT. In a deal brokered by special interest lobbyists, the Legislature REQUIRED grocery stores to CHARGE and KEEP fees on certain bags at checkout. Grocers get $300 million richer, while shoppers lose $300 million. Prop. 65 redirects those fees to environmental projects, not grocer profits.</td>
<td>Prop. 65 is sponsored by out-of-state plastic companies from South Carolina and Texas. They don’t care about California’s environment, they just want to confuse voters and distract from the real issue: the need to phase out plastic grocery bags. 65 is deceptive and doesn’t deserve your vote.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FOR</th>
<th>AGAINST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes on 65 2350 Kerner Blvd., Suite 250 San Rafael, CA 94901 <a href="mailto:info@SayYesOn65.com">info@SayYesOn65.com</a> <a href="http://www.SayYesOn65.com">www.SayYesOn65.com</a></td>
<td>Mark Murray Californians Against Waste 921 11th Street, Ste. 420 Sacramento, CA 95814 (916) 443-5422 <a href="mailto:murray@cawrecycles.org">murray@cawrecycles.org</a> cawrecycles.org</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### AGAINST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FOR</th>
<th>AGAINST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
SUMMARY
A “Yes” vote approves, and a “No” vote rejects, a statute that prohibits grocery and other stores from providing customers single-use plastic or paper carryout bags but permits sale of recycled paper bags and reusable bags.

Fiscal Impact: Relatively small fiscal effects on state and local governments, including a minor increase in state administrative costs and possible minor local government savings from reduced litter and waste management costs.

WHAT YOUR VOTE MEANS

YES  A YES vote on this measure means:
Most grocery stores, convenience stores, large pharmacies, and liquor stores would be prohibited from providing single-use plastic carryout bags. Stores generally would be required to charge at least 10 cents for any other carryout bag provided to customers at checkout. Stores would keep the resulting revenue for specified purposes.

NO  A NO vote on this measure means:
Stores could continue to provide single-use plastic carryout bags and other bags free of charge unless a local law restricts the use of such bags.

ARGUMENTS

PRO  YES on 67 protects California’s successful efforts to PHASE OUT PLASTIC GROCERY BAGS. Plastic bags strangle wildlife, litter communities, raise clean-up costs, clog recycling machines. Bans on plastic grocery bags are WORKING IN 150 CALIFORNIA COMMUNITIES. Don’t let out-of-state plastic companies stop California. YES on 67.

CON  DON’T BE FOOLED. Prop. 67 is a $300 million annual HIDDEN TAX on consumers who will be forced to pay $.10 for every grocery bag at checkout. Not one penny goes to the environment. All $300 million goes to grocer profits. Stop the bag tax . . . VOTE NO ON PROP. 67.

FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

FOR
Mark Murray
California vs Big Plastic
921 11th Street, Ste. 420
Sacramento, CA 95814
(916) 443-5422
murray@cawrecycles.org
protectplasticbagban.org

AGAINST
No on 67
2350 Kerner Blvd., Suite 250
San Rafael, CA 94901
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