



BOARD OF EDUCATION

Susan Wittrup, President
Valerie F. Davis, Clerk
Claudia Cazares
Genoveva Islas
Andy Levine
Elizabeth Jonasson Rosas
Keshia Thomas

INTERIM SUPERINTENDENT

Mao Misty Her

BOARD COMMUNICATIONS – NOVEMBER 01, 2024

TO: Members of the Board of Education
FROM: Interim Superintendent, Mao Misty Her

OFFICE OF THE SUPERINTENDENT – Mao Misty Her, Interim Superintendent

S-1 Mao Misty Her Interim Superintendent Calendar Highlights

CHIEF OF STAFF – Ambra O'Connor

COS-1 Amy Idsvoog Agreement with Fresno County Probation Department

BUSINESS & FINANCIAL SERVICES – Patrick Jensen, Chief Financial Officer

BFS-1 Kim Kelstrom School Services Weekly Update Reports for October 24, 2024

Fresno Unified School District
Board Communication

BC Number S-1

From the Office of the Superintendent
To the Members of the Board of Education
Prepared by: Mao Misty Her, Interim Superintendent
Cabinet Approval:

Date: November 01, 2024

Phone Number: 457-3884

Regarding: Interim Superintendent Calendar Highlights

The purpose of this communication is to inform the Board of notable calendar items:

- Site visits at Ayer, Design Science, Farber, Gaston, Manchester GATE, and Sunnyside
- Walked 21 classrooms during site visits
- Department visits at African American Academic Acceleration, English Learner Services, Special Education, Foundation for Fresno Unified Students and the Professional Learning construction site
- Spoke at Principal's Meeting
- Held virtual Measure H informational session for staff
- Held Interim Superintendent Quarterly Update Meeting with district office leaders
- Met with the Latino Educational Roundtable
- Attended the Valley Made Manufacturing Summit
- Attended the Focus Forward Magazine Party
- Met with ACSA Leadership
- Met with ACSA Principals
- Gave interview with Hmongusa TV providing information on Measure H
- Attended the Latin Expo event


Approved by Interim Superintendent

Mao Misty Her _____


Date: 11/01/24

Fresno Unified School District
Board Communication

BC Number COS-1

From the Office of the Superintendent
To the Members of the Board of Education
Prepared by: Amy Idsvoog
Cabinet Approval: 


Date: November 1, 2024

Phone: 457-3498

Regarding: Agreement with Fresno County Probation Department

The purpose of this board communication is to provide the Board with an update on a contract with the Fresno County Probation Department that will be on the November 6, 2024 board agenda. The Safety Office has been in negotiations with Fresno County Probation since last spring regarding its contract renewal and just recently finalized a contract to present to the Board of Education. Contract negotiations that started last school year were delayed due to other Fresno County priorities, coupled with personnel changes impacting both the County Probation Office and the District's Safety Office. As a result, this contract will be coming for approval as a ratify. To ensure support and safety protocols were in place for students on probation at nine of our high schools, the Probation Office ensured sites had officers in place for the start of the school year, while our two organizations finalized a contract.



If you have questions pertaining to this communication or require additional information, please contact Amy Idsvoog at 457-3498.

Approved by Interim Superintendent
Mao Misty Her 

Date: 11/01/24

Fresno Unified School District
Board Communication

BC Number BFS-1

From the Office of the Superintendent
To the Members of the Board of Education
Prepared by: Kim Kelstrom, Chief Executive 
Cabinet Approval: 

Date: November 01, 2024


Phone Number: 457-3907

Regarding: School Services Weekly Update Reports for October 24, 2024

The purpose of this communication is to provide the Board a copy of School Services of California's (SSC) Weekly Updates. Each week SSC provides an update and commentary on different educational fiscal issues. In addition, they include different articles related to education issues. The SSC Weekly Updates for October 24, 2024 are attached and include the following articles:

- Assembly Kicks Off Discussion of LCFF Modifications – October 23, 2024
- Proposition 2 Is Essential for California's Students and Run-Down Schools – October 23, 2024
- CA Propositions: Everything to Know About Measures on Minimum Wage, Marriage Equality and More – October 17, 2024

If you have any questions pertaining to the information in this communication, or require additional information, please contact Kim Kelstrom at 457-3907.

Approved by Interim Superintendent
Mao Misty Her 

Date: 11/01/24



1121 L Street

•
Suite 1060

•
Sacramento

•
California 95814

•
TEL: 916 . 446 . 7517

•
FAX: 916 . 446 . 2011

•
www.sscal.com

DATE: October 24, 2024

TO: Misty Her
Interim Superintendent

AT: Fresno Unified School District

FROM: Your SSC Governmental Relations Team

RE: ***SSC's Sacramento Weekly Update***

DOF Releases October Finance Bulletin

On Tuesday, the Department of Finance (DOF) released its monthly [Finance Bulletin](#) (Bulletin), which provides a report of how the economy is faring and an update on how state revenues are coming in compared to the projections of the 2024-25 Enacted Budget.

GDP and Personal Income

The DOF reports that U.S. real gross domestic product (GDP) grew at a 3.0% in the second quarter of 2024, while California real GDP grew by 2.8% in the second quarter. The Bulletin also reports that California's personal income increased by 6.5% in the second quarter of 2024, while growth in the first quarter was revised up from 8.2% in its preliminary estimate to 15.2%. California's share of U.S. personal income was 13.7%, which is comparable with the 2019 average share of 13.8%.

Inflation

The Bulletin reports that U.S. headline inflation slowed to 2.4% year over year in September 2024, down 0.1 percentage points from August 2024 and its lowest level since February 2021. Core inflation, which excludes food and energy, rose up to 3.3% year over year. Shelter inflation fell to 4.9% from 5.2% in September, which is the first time since February 2022 that shelter inflation has fallen below 5.0%.

Unemployment Rate

The U.S. unemployment rate dropped 0.1 percentage point in September to 4.1% as the civilian labor force and household employment increased by 150,000 and 430,000 persons, respectively. The U.S. added 254,000 nonfarm payroll jobs in September, while July's and August's gains were revised upward by a combined 72,000 jobs.

California's unemployment rate remained at 5.3% as the state's labor force and civilian household employment increased by 13,700 and 2,100 persons,

respectively, and unemployment increased by 11,400 persons. California added 14,700 nonfarm payroll jobs in September.

Housing Market

Through August 2024, California permitted 104,000 housing units, which is down 6.8% from a year ago. August year-to-date annualized total permits consisted of 61,000 single-family units and 43,000 multi-family units, up 11.3% and down 24.3% from the previous year, respectively.

The statewide median sale price of existing single-family homes decreased to \$868,150 in September 2024, which is down 2.3% from the previous month, but up 2.9% from \$843,500 in September 2023. Sales of existing single-family homes in California were 253,010 in September 2024, down which is 3.4% from August 2024 but up 5.1% from September 2023.

Monthly Cash Report

Tax revenues from the “Big Three” taxes—personal income, sales and use, and corporation taxes—are exceeding 2024-25 State Budget projections by \$4.1 billion for the fiscal year. Moreover, revenues for the last three months of 2023-24 are also outpacing budget estimates by \$3.2 billion, according to the DOF.

Personal income tax cash receipts were \$1.8 billion, or 20.4%, above forecast in September and \$4 billion, or 6.6%, above forecast cumulatively since April. Corporation tax cash receipts were \$557 million, or 22.0%, above forecast in September. Preliminary sales and use tax receipts were \$60 million, or 2.2%, below forecast in September. Sales tax receipts were \$73 million, or 0.4%, above forecast cumulatively since April.

Proposition 2 Poll

On Thursday, the Public Policy Institute of California (PPIC) released its October survey, which included polling data for Proposition 2 (2024), the measure that would issue \$10 billion in bond funding for K-14 facilities.

The poll found that 52% of likely voters said that they would vote yes on the measure, which is a two-percentage point drop from the PPIC’s September survey (54% of likely voters said that they would vote yes). There was also a two-percentage point increase in the number of likely voters who said that they will vote no on the measure (44% in the September survey to 46% in the October survey).

The survey shows that seven in ten Democratic likely voters support the bond, while only 21% of likely Republican voters say they support the measure. Half of the likely independent voters said they will vote yes.

Support for Proposition 2 is eight points lower than the other statewide bond proposal on the ballot, Proposition 4 (2024). Proposition 4 would authorize the state to issue \$10 billion in bonds to fund various environmental, energy, and water projects. The survey finds that six in ten likely voters support Proposition 4 with strong majorities of likely Democratic voters (81%) and independent voters (58%) saying they will vote yes on the measure. Only 27% of likely Republican voters support Proposition 4.

The last time a statewide education facilities bond was placed before voters was the March 3, 2020, primary election ballot. That measure, unfortunately named Proposition 13 (2020), failed passage with 47% voting for the proposition and 53% voting against it.

It is important to note that the month before the March 2020 primary election, PPIC polling showed that 51% of likely voters supported Proposition 13, just one percentage point lower than the 52% of likely voters indicating their support for Proposition 2.

There is a good chance that this is the final polling data we will have on Proposition 2 prior to the November 5, 2024, General Election.

Leilani Aguinaldo

Assembly Kicks Off Discussion of LCFF Modifications

By Michelle McKay Underwood
School Services of California Inc.'s *Fiscal Report*
October 23, 2024

The Assembly Budget Subcommittee on Education Finance and the Assembly Education Committee held a joint oversight hearing last week on the fiscal design and outcomes of the Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF). While there have been hearings related to accountability and achievement, the purpose of this hearing was to focus on the components that make up the funding formula, mainly the combination of base funding and the weights of the supplemental and concentration grants.

Underlying the hearing was the concept that the combination of current and the near-term future of declining enrollment and a growing Proposition 98 guarantee (under Test 1) would result in increasing per-pupil funds. Co-chairs David Alvarez (D-San Diego) and Al Muratsuchi (D-Torrance) appeared to be seeking recommendations for what could be tinkered with inside the formula in light of the possibility of infusing additional funds into education. Like the original implementation of the LCFF, an updated formula would be phased in, avoiding a “winners and losers” scenario.

More than twenty panelists spoke at the hearing, including researchers, practitioners, and statewide advocacy voices that were part of the initial discussions that shaped the formula over ten years ago. Researchers have had a decade to study the formula’s impact and analyze academic outcomes of students, with a focus on one of the original purposes of the LCFF: to create equity among students with different circumstances.

Researchers suggested various changes to the formula:

- Using a duplicated count (compared to today’s unduplicated count) for supplemental and concentration grant purposes
- Increasing the weight of the supplemental grant either overall or for certain groups, like students experiencing homelessness
- Smoothing out the “kink” created by the concentration grant with a more gradual increase of concentration grant funding (compared to today’s on-off switch at 55% unduplicated pupil percentage [UPP] threshold)
- Adding a regional cost of living factor
- Determining concentration grant eligibility at the school-site level rather than at the district level

For the most part, practitioners focused on the need for additional revenues to address the complex needs of today’s students as compared to ten years ago. There was also an emphasis on the desire to maintain programs that were created and sustained—temporarily—through one-time COVID-19 stimulus funds.

Over the course of the five-hour hearing, committee members and panelists discussed topics affecting the success of implementing the LCFF, including:

- The impact on the LCFF of inadequate special education funding

- Digitization of Local Control and Accountability Plans, both for research purposes as well as sharing best practices
- Incentives to identify students to generate additional revenues, in both current factors (English learner status and eligibility for free or reduced-price meals [FRPM]) or potential factors (Individualized Education Program eligibility)
- Local decision-making regarding distribution of funds within a district, especially comparing school sites with a higher concentration of unduplicated pupils versus a lower UPP
- Difficulty in gathering data to report FRPM eligibility
- Disconnect between the current cost-of-living adjustment (COLA) metric and actual costs
- COLAs that are inadequate to keep up with fixed costs, such as step and column increases, retirement system increases, and other immutable expenses

As an oversight hearing, no bills were voted on nor decisions made. However, this hearing may serve as a preview to upcoming State Budget and policy discussions should additional ongoing revenues be forecast in the 2025-26 Governor's Budget.

Note: This opinion piece in support of Proposition 2 (2024) was authored by current California State Superintendent of Public Instruction and 2026 gubernatorial candidate Tony Thurmond.

Proposition 2 Is Essential for California's Students and Run-Down Schools

By Tony Thurmond
EdSource
October 23, 2024

After decades of disinvestment and neglect, it's clear that California's schools are in desperate need of repair. Many school districts across the state are struggling with dilapidated buildings, old classrooms and unsafe conditions for their students.

According to a recent report from the Public Policy Institute of California, 38% of K-12 students in California are enrolled in schools that don't meet our state's minimum safety standards. This is obviously dangerous and completely unacceptable. Unsurprisingly, countless studies have shown that bad environmental conditions — including dirty air, lack of light and lack of safe building facilities — significantly decrease students' academic achievement.

Unfortunately, with no dedicated resource pool and no new state school bond measures in almost a decade, California is almost out of money for school repairs. Unlike many other states, California does not have a dedicated funding stream for investments in school facilities, which makes districts across the state entirely reliant on raising money from state or local bonds for facility upgrades.

As a result, California's school repair fund is expected to be depleted by this upcoming January, which would leave countless schools across the state without any ability to repair or upgrade their resources, sans a well-

resourced PTA or local bond measure providing the funding. Wealthier districts might be able to skate by, but districts in low-income communities would be devastated.

As state superintendent of public instruction, I've overseen the administration of billions of dollars for K-12 school construction and modernization that came from the last state bond, but these funds were only a drop in the bucket that just scratched the surface of California's immense needs and were depleted quickly.

That's why Proposition 2, a bond measure this November that would provide \$8.5 billion in facility renovations for TK-12 schools and \$1.5 billion for community colleges, couldn't come at a more urgent time. It's a vitally necessary, common-sense step forward to provide critically needed upgrades to California's schools.

To receive state bond money, districts must attempt to raise a local bond of their own and then apply to the State Facilities Program for a funding match — though districts that are unable to raise more than \$15 million from a local bond can receive up to a 100% match.

The measure, along with the accompanying local bonds, would help upgrade facilities at public elementary, middle and high schools and community colleges across California to build more classrooms, modernize science labs, enhance gymnasiums, build performing arts centers, and replace aging buildings.

But most critically, Proposition 2 would help ensure basic 21st-century facility standards in every school across the state — helping low-income districts receive desperately needed funding to repair heating and air conditioning systems, repair leaky roofs, and remediate hazardous black mold. Some of the money is also earmarked for removing lead from water, creating transitional kindergarten classrooms and building career and technical education facilities.

Significantly, this proposal also includes significant equity-focused improvements to existing policy that would ensure this funding goes to the districts that most need it. Proposition 2 improves how state funds are distributed to school districts across the state, making it more equitable for less-affluent districts and those with higher numbers of English learners and foster youth.

Ten percent of the funds would be dedicated to small school districts that currently struggle to amass the funding for facility upgrades, and the formula for allocating state funding establishes a higher match to low-wealth districts that cannot afford to generate much local funding, as well as those with a high percentage of disadvantaged students.

Without Proposition 2, schools districts in smaller and lower-income areas would have no other way to pay for these critical improvements, as they struggle tremendously to raise enough local bond money to pay for school repair, making them completely reliant on funding from state bonds for facility repairs.

Additionally, while not the focus of the measure, the investments provided by Proposition 2 will also create tens of thousands of good-paying construction jobs across the state, which will boost local economies.

Ultimately, California's schools have a desperate need to modernize our buildings, facilities and campuses, and the money needed to make the necessary repairs has been exhausted. Proposition 2 will provide an infusion of vitally important investments to our schools that will address the significant backlog of districts hoping to receive funding for repairs, and considerably improve the conditions of students across the state.

Tony Thurmond is California's superintendent of public instruction and a candidate for governor in 2026.

Note: California voters will decide ten statewide measures on the November 5 General Election ballot, including Proposition 2 (2024), which would issue \$10 billion in bond for K-14 facilities, and Proposition 32 (2024), which would raise the minimum wage to \$18 per hour.

CA Propositions: Everything to Know About Measures on Minimum Wage, Marriage Equality and More

ABC7.com
October 17, 2024

Californians are being asked to vote on 10 propositions in the 2024 election, covering issues from minimum wage and marriage equality to increasing penalties for some theft and drug crimes.

We've put together a guide to the 2024 propositions in California. Scroll down to read about each ballot proposition.

The ballot language for each proposition is available from the Secretary of State's office. Continue reading below for our summaries of each measure, the argument for and against it, and a short list of supporters and opponents.

Prop 2: Authorizes bonds for public school and community college facilities

Summary: Authorizes \$10 billion in general obligation bonds for repair, upgrade, and construction of facilities at K-12 public schools (including charter schools), community colleges, and career technical education programs, including for improvement of health and safety conditions and classroom upgrades. Requires annual audits.

Argument for: Many schools and community colleges are outdated and need basic health and safety repairs and upgrades to prepare students for college and careers and to retain and attract quality teachers. Prop. 2 meets those needs and requires strict taxpayer accountability so funds are spent as promised with local control.

Argument against: Proposition 2 will increase our bond obligations by \$10 billion, which will cost taxpayers an estimated \$18 billion when repaid with interest. A bond works like a government credit card—paying of that credit card requires the government to spend more of your tax dollars! Vote NO on Prop. 2.

Supporters: California Teachers Association; California School Nurses Organization; Community College League of California

Opponents: Howard Jarvis Taxpayers Association

More details: [Prop 2 looking to borrow money to repair schools, colleges](#)

Prop 3: Constitutional right to marriage

Summary: Amends California Constitution to recognize fundamental right to marry, regardless of sex or race. Removes language in California Constitution stating that marriage is only between a man and a woman.

Argument for: Proposition 3 protects Californians' freedom to marry, regardless of their race or gender. Proposition 3 removes discriminatory language from the California Constitution stating marriage is only between a man and a woman. Proposition 3 reinforces California's commitment to civil rights and protects personal freedom. Vote YES! YesonProp3CA.com

Argument against: Proposition 3 removes all rules for marriage, opening the door to child marriages, incest, and polygamy. It changes California's constitution even though same-sex marriage is already legal. By making moms and dads optional, it puts children at risk. This careless measure harms families and society. Vote No on Proposition 3.

Supporters: Sierra Pacific Synod of The Evangelical Lutheran Church in America; Dolores Huerta Foundation; Equality California

Opponents: Jonathan Keller, California Family Council; Rev. Tanner DiBella

More details: [Prop 3 aiming to protect marriage rights for all](#)

[Prop 4: Authorizes bonds for safe drinking water, wildfire prevention, and protecting communities and natural lands from climate risks](#)

Summary: Authorizes \$10 billion in general obligation bonds for water, wildfire prevention, and protection of communities and lands. Requires annual audits.

Argument for: Yes on 4 for safe drinking water, wildfire prevention, clean air, and protection of natural resources. California firefighters, conservation groups, clean water advocates urge YES. Accountable, fiscally responsible, with independent audits, strict transparency. Proactive approach saves money and prevents the worst impacts of devastating wildfires, smoke, droughts, and pollution.

Argument against: Bonds are the most expensive way to fund government spending. Water and wildfire mitigation are necessities, not luxuries. They should be budgeted for, not bonded. Mismanagement led to this crisis. This \$10 billion bond will cost taxpayers almost \$2 to repay for every dollar spent. Vote NO on Prop. 4.

Supporters: Clean Water Action; CALFIRE Firefighters; National Wildlife Federation; The Nature Conservancy

Opponents: Howard Jarvis Taxpayers Association

More details: [What is Prop 4? \\$10 billion bond pays for long list of CA climate change projects](#)

[Prop 5: Allows local bonds for affordable housing and public infrastructure with 55% voter approval](#)

Summary: Allows approval of local infrastructure and housing bonds for low- and middle-income Californians with 55% vote. Accountability requirements.

Argument for: Prop. 5 shifts local spending priorities away from state government, giving local voters and taxpayers the choice and the tools to address the challenges facing their communities. Whether it's housing affordability, safer streets, more fire stations, or other community-driven projects, Prop. 5 empowers local voters to solve local problems. Vote YES.

Argument against: Prop. 5 changes the constitution to make it easier to increase bond debt, leading to higher property taxes. Prop. 5 shifts the financial burden from the state to local communities, increasing costs for homeowners, renters, and consumers. Politicians wrote loopholes in Prop. 5 so "infrastructure" can mean just about anything.

Supporters: California Professional Firefighters; League of Women Voters of California; Habitat for Humanity California.

Opponents: California Taxpayers Association; California Hispanic Chambers of Commerce; Women Veterans Alliance.

More details: [California is in serious need of housing. Is Proposition 5 the solution?](#)

Prop 6: Eliminates constitutional provision allowing involuntary servitude for incarcerated person

Summary: Amends the California Constitution to remove current provision that allows jails and prisons to impose involuntary servitude to punish crime (i.e., forcing incarcerated persons to work).

Argument for: Proposition 6 ends slavery in California and upholds human rights and dignity for everyone. It replaces carceral involuntary servitude with voluntary work programs, has bipartisan support, and aligns with national efforts to reform the 13th Amendment. It will prioritize rehabilitation, lower recidivism, and improve public safety, resulting in taxpayer savings.

Argument against: No argument against Proposition 6 was submitted.

Supporters: Assemblymember Lori Wilson

Opponents: None submitted

Prop 32: Raises minimum wage

Summary: Raises minimum wage as follows: For employers with 26 or more employees, to \$17 immediately, \$18 on January 1, 2025. For employers with 25 or fewer employees, to \$17 on January 1, 2025, \$18 on January 1, 2026.

Argument for: YES on Proposition 32 raises the minimum wage to \$18 so more SERVICE, ESSENTIAL, AND OTHER WORKERS, and SINGLE MOMS can AFFORD the state's COST OF LIVING. CORPORATE PROFIT MARGINS INCREASED 100% since 2000 because CORPORATIONS SPIKED the PRICES OF GOODS. YES on PROP. 32 so workers can afford life's basic needs.

Argument against: Prop. 32 was written by one multimillionaire alone, and he wrote a horribly flawed measure. Prop. 32 increases the cost of living, eliminates jobs, makes our state and local government budget deficits worse, and makes California's complex minimum wage laws even harder for businesses and workers to understand. No on 32!

Supporters: None submitted

Opponents: California Chamber of Commerce; California Restaurant Association; California Grocers Association

More details: [Voters to consider raising minimum wage to \\$18 with Proposition 32](#)

Prop 33: Expands local governments' authority to enact rent control on residential property

Summary: Repeals Costa-Hawkins Rental Housing Act of 1995, which currently prohibits local ordinances limiting initial residential rental rates for new tenants or rent increases for existing tenants in certain residential properties.

Argument for: The rent is too damn high. One million people have left California. Rent control in America has worked to keep people in their homes since 1919. California's 17 million renters need relief. Homeowners and taxpayers benefit from stable communities. The California dream is dying. You can help save it.

Argument against: Don't be fooled by the latest corporate landlord anti-housing scheme. California voters have rejected this radical proposal twice before, because it would freeze the construction of new housing and could effectively reverse dozens of new state housing laws. Vote No on 33 to protect new affordable housing and California homeowners.

Supporters: CA Nurses Assoc.; CA Alliance for Retired Americans; Mental Health Advocacy; Coalition for Economic Survival; TenantsTogether

Opponents: California Council for Affordable Housing; Women Veterans Alliance; California Chamber of Commerce

More details: [Prop 33 - a ballot measure on expanding rent control](#)

Prop 34: Restricts spending of prescription drug revenues by certain health care providers

Summary: Requires certain providers to spend 98% of revenues from federal discount prescription drug program on direct patient care. Authorizes statewide negotiation of Medi-Cal drug prices.

Argument for: Proposition 34 will protect patients and ensure public healthcare dollars actually go to patients who need it. Prop. 34 will close a loophole that allows corporations to spend this money on things like buying stadium naming rights and multi-million dollar CEO salaries. Protect Patients Now. Vote Yes on Proposition 34.

Argument against: Prop. 34-The Revenge Initiative. California Apartment Association, representing billionaire corporate landlords, doesn't care about patients. Their sole purpose is silencing AIDS Healthcare Foundation, the sponsor of the rent control initiative. 34 weaponizes the ballot, is a threat to democracy, and opens the door to attacks on any non-profit.

Supporters: The ALS Association; California Chronic Care Coalition; Latino Heritage Los Angeles

Opponents: National Org. for Women; Consumer Watchdog; Coalition for Economic Survival; AIDS Healthcare Foundation; Dolores Huerta

More details: [Prop 34 - the prescription drug revenue-spending measure](#)

[Prop 35:](#) Provides permanent funding for Medi-Cal health care services

Summary: Makes permanent the existing tax on managed health care insurance plans, which, if approved by the federal government, provides revenues to pay for Medi-Cal health care services.

Argument for: Yes on 35 addresses our urgent healthcare crisis by securing dedicated funding-without raising taxes-to protect access to primary and specialty care, community clinics, hospitals, ERs, family planning, and mental health providers. Prop. 35 prevents the state from redirecting funds for non-healthcare purposes. Supported by Planned Parenthood, pediatricians, California Medical Association. www.VoteYes35.com

Argument against: No argument against Proposition 35 was submitted.

Supporters: Planned Parenthood Afliates of CA; American College of Obstetricians & Gynecologists; American Academy of Pediatrics

Opponents: None submitted

More details: [Prop 35 - a measure to fund Medi-Cal services](#)

Prop 36: Allows felony charges and increases sentences for certain drug and theft crimes

Summary: Allows felony charges for possessing certain drugs and for thefts under \$950, if defendant has two prior drug or theft convictions.

Argument for: Prop. 36 makes California communities safer by addressing rampant theft and drug trafficking. It toughens penalties for fentanyl and drug traffickers and “smash-and-grabs” while holding repeat offenders accountable. It targets serial thieves and encourages treatment for those addicted to drugs, using a balanced approach to fix loopholes in current laws.

Argument against: Don’t be fooled. Proposition 36 will lead to more crime, not less. It reignites the failed war on drugs, makes simple drug possession a felony, and wastes billions on prisons, while slashing crucial funding for victims, crime prevention, treatment, and rehabilitation. This puts prisons first and guts treatment. Vote No.

Supporters: Crime Victims United of California; California District Attorneys Association; Family Business Association of California

Opponents: Diana Becton, District Attorney Contra Costa County; Crime Survivors for Safety and Justice