November Election Timeline:

- June 25th: Deadline for placing or removing measures from the November 3rd ballot
- October 5th: No later than this date, county elections officials shall begin mailing each registered voter a vote-by-mail ballot
- November 3rd: General Election Day
- November 10th: Vote-By-Mail Ballots returned by mail, in order to be counted, must be postmarked on or before Election Day and received by county elections office.
- December 3rd: Last day for county elections officials to certify election results
- December 7th: Convening of the 2027-28 Legislative Session; newly elected State Senators and Assemblymembers take the oath of office
- December 11th: General Election Result Certification Due Date

Background:

The deadline for measures to qualify on the ballot was last Thursday, June 25th. On November 3rd, Californians will vote on **14 statewide ballot measures** on environmental, taxation, election, housing and healthcare issues. Five measures were placed by the Legislature and nine placed by voters.

Deals:

There was drama up until the last literal minute when tax groups agreed to withdraw the controversial Local Taxpayer Protection Act to Save Proposition 13 (Initiative 25-0006A1) from the November ballot and instead advance a legislative negotiated compromise measure, ACA 22. ACA 22's most significant difference from the Howard Jarvis Taxpayer Association (HJTA) initiative is that the compromise measure does not restrict charter cities' authority to impose property transfer taxes, as the initiative would have. In a social media post, ACA 22 author Asm Buffy Wicks said "just because ACA 22 got the more dangerous measure off the ballot *doesn't* mean ACA 22 should pass on the ballot. You should vote No on ACA 22." However, Democrats and labor unions believed this was a better deal than the original HJTA proposal.

In a separate highly charged agreement, Uber and the Consumer Attorneys of California resolved competing ballot initiatives related to ride hailing liability. Uber wanted to limit attorney contingency fees in medical recoveries for all California crashes; the attorney group wanted to increase Uber's liability for sexual misconduct. Governor Newsom signed SB 623 reflecting the negotiated deal, removing both initiatives from the November ballot. The new law will allow Uber to reduce its liability in crashes while subjecting the company to new rules regarding background checks for its drivers.

No Deal:
The most prominent ballot measure conflict was over whether California should impose a 5% wealth tax on billionaires. The measure, sponsored by the SEIU healthcare workers union, will be Proposition 40 and will compete with two countermeasures sponsored by Google billionaire Sergey Brin and other opponents, Proposition 41 and Proposition 42. Under the California Constitution, if two or more measures conflict, the measure receiving the greatest number of affirmative votes supersedes the other, effectively determining which approach becomes law.

November 3, 2026, Statewide Ballot Measures:

Proposition 1

SB 417 (Limón) The Veterans and Affordable Housing Bond Act of 2026 (Ch. 16, 2026) (PDF)

- Supporters: Newsom, Democratic state lawmakers, the California Apartment Association and AFL-CIO California
- Opponents: Republican state lawmakers

This would allow the state to borrow $11.25 billion for affordable housing, with $10 billion to buy, build, rehabilitate and preserve affordable homes and $1.25 billion to help veterans buy homes.

Proposition 2

ACA 20 (Gabriel) Save for California's Future Act. (Res. Ch. 130, 2026) (PDF)

- Supporters: Newsom and legislative Democrats
- Opponents: Legislative Republicans

This would allow the state to deposit up to 20% of its general fund tax revenue into its rainy day fund each year, instead of the current 10%. The state could also spend some tax revenue to pay down its $20 billion federal unemployment insurance debt.

Proposition 3

PROVIDES PERMANENT FUNDING FOR SCHOOLS AND HEALTHCARE BY EXTENDING EXISTING TAX ON HIGH INCOMES. INITIATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT.

- Supporters: Reform California, Californians for Voter ID and Republican U.S. Rep. Ken Calvert
- Opponents: League of Women Voters of California, ACLU California Action and California Donor Table

Makes permanent the existing 2012 voter-approved tax rates for high-income Californians, currently set to expire in 2031. Rates apply to personal income over about $360,000 for single filers, $721,000 for joint filers, and $490,000 for heads of household (2024 levels; adjusted annually for inflation). Allocates tax revenues 89% to K-12 schools, 11% to community colleges. Allows local school boards to decide how revenues are spent; bars use for administrative costs. Increases General Fund revenues available for education, healthcare, budget reserves, and other programs. Summary of estimate by Legislative Analyst and Director of Finance of fiscal impact on state and local governments: **Maintains $5 billion to $15 billion of annual state income taxes (in today's dollars) by making a tax on high income earners permanent instead of letting it expire in 2031.** (25-0016.)

Proposition 4

SB 42 (Umberg) Political Reform Act of 1974: public campaign financing: California Fair Elections Act of 2026. (Ch. 245, 2025) (PDF)

- Supporters: California Common Cause, California Clean Money Campaign, League of Women Voters and ACLU California Action
- Opponents: California Taxpayers Association

This measure would give California governments the authority to set up public financing systems for state and local political candidates. Public campaign financing has been banned in California since 1988. State lawmakers approved the measure last year to send it to voters this November.

Proposition 5

SCA 1 (Newman) Elections: recall of state officers. (Res. Ch. 204, 2024) (PDF)

- Supporters: League of Women Voters, California Common Cause and Secretary of State Shirley Weber
- Opponents: Election Integrity Project California

After a recall, this constitutional amendment would eliminate the election to pick a successor immediately, such as when Gov. Arnold Schwarzenegger replaced the recalled Gov. Gray Davis, instead leaving the post vacant until it's filled in a separate election. It would also allow the recalled official to run for the office again.

Proposition 37

CREATES LOAN PROGRAM FOR MIDDLE-INCOME BUYERS OF QUALIFIED NEW HOMES. INITIATIVE STATUTE.

- Supporters: Former Senate Majority Leader Bob Hertzberg, Building a Better California, the California Association of Realtors, United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America and Western States Regional Council of Carpenters

Authorizes up to $25 billion in bonds to offer eligible buyers fixed-rate mortgages for up to 17% of the purchase price of a "qualified new home" (new construction or first sale of converted nonresidential property, priced below about $1 million–$1.5 million, depending on county, adjusted annually). Borrowers must be California residents for one year, plan to occupy the home, earn less than 200% of area median income, and pay at least 3% down. Requires that bonds be repaid by homeowners' mortgage payments, not State. Summary of estimate by Legislative Analyst and Director of Finance of fiscal impact on state and local governments: **No direct state or local costs.** (25-0013A1.)

Proposition 38

AUTHORIZES BONDS FOR IMMUNOLOGY RESEARCH. INITIATIVE STATUTE.

- Supporters: Gary Michelson, philanthropist and funder of the California Institute for Immunology and Immunotherapy, Meyer Luskin, philanthropist and institute board member, The ALS Association, The Alzheimer's Association and Blood Cancer United
- Opponents: Robert Kaplan, former associate director of the National Institutes of Health

Authorizes $8.4 billion in state general obligation bonds for immunology and immunotherapy research (technologies that use body's immune system to treat disease), allocated equally

between (1) a University of California-affiliated nonprofit medical research institute selected by the California Department of Public Health based on specified criteria, and (2) a grant program for public or nonprofit universities and institutions. Requires half of research money go to cancer, heart disease, and Alzheimer's disease research. Requires funding recipients to sell technology and drugs derived from research in California for 20% below national average price. Appropriates money from General Fund to repay bonds. Summary of estimate by Legislative Analyst and Director of Finance of fiscal impact on state and local governments: **Increased state costs of about $500 million annually for 25 years to repay the bonds. The state could recoup part or all of this cost in subsequent decades if the funded research leads to discoveries that generate revenue, though this is uncertain.** (25-0026A1.)

Proposition 39

ESTABLISHES ADDITIONAL VOTER IDENTIFICATION AND CITIZENSHIP VERIFICATION REQUIREMENTS. INITIATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT.

- Supporters: Reform California, Californians for Voter ID and Republican U.S. Rep. Ken Calvert
- Opponents: League of Women Voters of California, ACLU California Action and California Donor Table

Under current law, when registering to vote, individuals must state under penalty of perjury that they are United States citizens and provide information to verify their identity (e.g., birthdate, driver's license or Social Security number). This measure would amend the California Constitution to further require that:

- voters present government-issued identification at the polls or the last four digits of a government-issued identification number when voting by mail;
- the State provide voter identification cards on request; and
- elections officials annually report percentage of each county's voters whose citizenship they have verified.

Summary of estimate by Legislative Analyst and Director of Finance of fiscal impact on state and local governments: **One-time state and local government costs in the tens of millions of dollars to prepare for implementation of the measure. Increased annual state and local government costs potentially ranging in the tens of millions of dollars to the low hundreds of millions of dollars to fulfill new requirements related to elections administration.** (25-0007A1.)

Proposition 40

IMPOSES ONE-TIME TAX ON CERTAIN INDIVIDUALS AND TRUSTS. INITIATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT AND STATUTE.

- Supporters: Service Employees International Union–United Healthcare Workers West, independent U.S. Sen. Bernie Sanders, Teamsters California and AFSCME California
- Opponents: Gov. Gavin Newsom, prominent billionaires including Google co-founder Sergey Brin and Ripple Labs co-founder Chris Larsen, the California Teachers Association, California Primary Care Association and California Medical Association

Imposes one-time tax of up to 5% on taxpayers and trusts with covered assets valued over $1 billion; covered assets include businesses, securities, art, collectibles, and intellectual property, but exclude real property and some pensions and retirement accounts. Allocates 90% of these tax revenues for health care, 10% for food assistance or education-related programs; prohibits using revenues to replace existing funding for these purposes. Exempts such tax revenues from constitutional requirements for school funding, budget reserves, and state spending limit. Summary of estimate by Legislative Analyst and Director of Finance of fiscal impact on state and local governments: Temporary increase in state revenues from a new tax on the wealth of billionaires. These wealth tax revenues probably would add up to tens of billions of dollars spread over several years. Likely ongoing decrease in state income tax revenues of hundreds of millions of dollars or more per year. (25-0024A1.)

Proposition 41

REQUIRES AUDITS OF PROGRAMS FUNDED BY NEW STATE SPECIAL TAXES. PROHIBITS NEW STATE TAXES THAT ARE EXCLUDED FROM EXISTING VOTER-APPROVED STATE SPENDING LIMIT. INITIATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT.

- Supporters: Building a Better California, primarily funded by Brin and venture capitalists John Doerr and Michael Moritz, Reform California and California Chamber of Commerce
- Opponents: Proponents of the billionaire tax initiative

For statewide special taxes, requires (1) a pre-election audit of programs that would receive funding from a special tax proposed by voter initiative, and (2) recurring audits of programs funded by all special taxes enacted after January 1, 2026. Prohibits any new state taxes, enacted after January 1, 2026, that exclude their revenues from existing voter-approved state spending limit, including any new taxes that appear on the same ballot as this measure. Summary of estimate by Legislative Analyst and Director of Finance of fiscal impact on state and local governments: ***Unknown Fiscal Effect.*** **Net costs or savings resulting from the measure would depend on (1) how many special tax initiatives qualify for a one-time audit but are not approved by voters, (2) the number of pages that are added to the Voter Information Guide each election cycle, and (3) the level of savings that are identified and implemented as a result of the audits.** (25-0040A1.)

Proposition 42

PROHIBITS NEW STATE PERSONAL PROPERTY TAXES AND CERTAIN RETROACTIVE STATE TAXES. INITIATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT.

- Supporters: Building a Better California, Reform California, the State Building and Construction Trades Council of California and California Chamber of Commerce
- Opponents: Proponents of the billionaire tax initiative

Prohibits any new state tax that either (1) taxes the ownership or control of personal property (including retirement accounts, financial assets, investment accounts, business interests, and intellectual property), or (2) applies retroactively based on the taxpayer's conduct, activities, or a status that occurred before the new tax's effective date, with limited exceptions. Applies to taxes that are enacted or take effect on or after January 1, 2026, including taxes that appear on the same ballot as this measure. Summary of estimate by Legislative Analyst and Director of

Finance of fiscal impact on state and local governments: **Possibility that tax revenues will be lower in the future.** (25-0041A1.)

Proposition 43

ACA 22 (Wicks) Local taxes: limitation. (Res. Ch. 132, 2026) (PDF)

- Supporters: Howard Jarvis Taxpayers Association

This would raise the threshold for citizen-driven special tax ballot initiatives to pass from a simple majority to two-thirds, making it harder to impose or increase taxes.

Proposition 44

REQUIRES COMMUNITY HEALTH CLINICS SPEND 90% OF REVENUE ON PROGRAM SERVICES. INITIATIVE STATUTE.

- Supporters: Service Employees International Union-United Healthcare Workers West
- Opponents: The California Primary Care Association, which represents clinics, the California Medical Association, Planned Parenthood Affiliates of California and the California Teachers Association

Requires nonprofit Federally Qualified Health Centers (community clinics that provide primary care to medically underserved areas and populations) to spend at least 90% of their revenue on program services advancing their charitable purpose, including but not limited to patient services, rather than management and overhead. Department of Public Health may waive spending requirement in exceptional circumstances. Authorizes Attorney General to publish guidance defining qualifying expenditures. Imposes monetary penalties for noncompliance, which may be refunded if centers become compliant within five years. Authorizes criminal charges for false reports and schemes to artificially increase spending ratio. Summary of estimate by Legislative Analyst and Director of Finance of fiscal impact on state and local governments: **State cost of up to the low tens of millions of dollars annually to enforce the new requirement that nonprofit safety net health clinics spend at least 90 percent of annual revenue on certain types of expenses, much of which would be covered by fees and penalties charged on the affected entities.** (25-0008A1.)

Proposition 45

MODIFIES ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW FOR CERTAIN PROJECTS. INITIATIVE STATUTE.

- Supporters: California Chamber of Commerce, Building a Better California, the California Building Industry Association, PG&E and Edison
- Opponents: Clean and Healthy California, a coalition of environmental advocates and the California State Building and Construction Trades Council

Amends California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) to expedite environmental review of specified project categories (including most housing, transportation, water, health, and clean energy projects). For these types of projects, this measure:

- sets deadlines for public agencies to complete environmental review and take required actions for project;
- allows expedited review of project's environmental impacts, limiting public agencies' current obligation to consider a range of feasible project alternatives to reduce environmental impacts; and

- limits court review of project approvals by establishing deadlines for filing and resolving lawsuits and limiting evidence court may consider and relief it can order.

Summary of estimate by Legislative Analyst and Director of Finance of fiscal impact on state and local governments: **State and local government implementation costs in the tens of millions of dollars annually for the first several years. Over the long term, the annual net fiscal effects are uncertain, but state and local governments likely would experience net savings due to reduced administrative and legal workload. Net fiscal effects on state trial courts ranging from annual savings of up to the tens of millions of dollars to annual costs of up to the low tens of millions of dollars.** (25-0023A1.)

Note: On June 25, 2026, ACA 13 (Res. Ch. 176, 2023) was removed from the November 3, 2026, General Election ballot pursuant to ACA 21 (Res. Ch. 131, 2026).