

WEBVTT

123

00:13:48.470 --> 00:13:50.570

Jackson Nutt-Beers / SPUR: Hi, Everybody welcome.

124

00:13:51.550 --> 00:13:57.749

Jackson Nutt-Beers / SPUR: We're letting people join the zoom room. So give us a couple of seconds and then

125

00:13:57.820 --> 00:14:01.380

Jackson Nutt-Beers / SPUR: we will get started happy to have you guys here today.

126

00:14:14.800 --> 00:14:21.859

Jackson Nutt-Beers / SPUR: Okay, uh, now is a good time. Is any um? Because I know you guys are not here to listen to me. Talk.

127

00:14:21.870 --> 00:14:50.819

Jackson Nutt-Beers / SPUR: Um! Hello, everyone! My name is Jackson Nubiers, and I'm. One of Spurs public programming associates. Thank you so much for joining us for this digital discourse today. Many of you here today are spur members. So thank you so much for your support. If you're not a member, I encourage you to join to support spurs, ongoing work and using education, policy, analysis, and advocacy to make our cities and region more prosperous, sustainable, and equitable places to live. Your financial support enables us to continue our work, including the hosting of programs like today's

128

00:14:50.830 --> 00:14:55.020

Jackson Nutt-Beers / SPUR: you'll find more information about membership online at spirit or join

129

00:14:55.640 --> 00:15:16.410

Jackson Nutt-Beers / SPUR: our next to total discourse is scheduled for tomorrow at twelve thirty Pm. It is titled affordable housing on the ballot. Concerning the differences between property and November Eighth San Francisco voters will be asked to choose between two competing charter amendments, Prop d versus Prop. E. To streamline the creation of new affordable and workforce housing,

130

00:15:16.420 --> 00:15:33.139

Jackson Nutt-Beers / SPUR: while the two ballot measures may sound similar. The policy details included in each make a significant difference in the impact each would have on affordable housing production in San Francisco. Um. In the meantime you can read up on a few of the many differences Um, both measures on our website

131

00:15:33.240 --> 00:15:39.179

Jackson Nutt-Beers / SPUR: and get your questions ready. So that's happening tomorrow at twelve thirty Pm.

132

00:15:39.890 --> 00:15:58.290

Jackson Nutt-Beers / SPUR: But today's total discourse, and the reason that you guys are all here, i'm sure many of you know that spare released their voter guide um yesterday morning. So today uh Spurtzberger guide provides an in-depth analysis and recommendations on the complex measures that are coming up um in the next election. So we're being joined by our

133

00:15:58.300 --> 00:16:23.150

Jackson Nutt-Beers / SPUR: um esteemed policy staff today, and I beloved tradition to really tackle the state measures that are on the ballot. Uh. So today we're joined by Anne Kristy, our policy associate for our local impact team, Jessica Payton, our public programming Associate Nick Deafowitz our Chief of policy. Polymer, Sisnara, Slobato, Our Food and Agriculture Senior Policy Associate and myself. Jackson up here, who is also the public programming, says, Yet

134

00:16:23.160 --> 00:16:53.149

Jackson Nutt-Beers / SPUR: Um, so we really want this to be an interactive conversation, and we really plan on spending as much time with you as possible. So I encourage you to use a chat box to share your thoughts with each other and the speakers. And I know this is different than how we usually host our digital discourses, and how it's usually formatted. So after our presentation portion of this forum, I will transition to the Q. A. Portion. So if you have a question about a specific measure, or something that you've heard. Um, we do ask that you use the raise hand function which is located at the bottom of your screen

135

00:16:53.160 --> 00:17:05.969

Jackson Nutt-Beers / SPUR: and wait to be called upon. We also ask that you remain muted for the duration of the Forum, unless you are asking the question. Just so. Folks are not talking over each other, and we don't have this weird, echoing effect that sometimes happens,

136

00:17:06.319 --> 00:17:23.540

Jackson Nutt-Beers / SPUR: and then also within the next few days we'll be sharing a copy of the recording, the transcript and the chat with everybody who's registered. Uh. So that's it for me.

Um! I will turn it over to you to give a brief summary of the Voter guide process and to get us started on proposition. One. So it's all you

137

00:17:23.960 --> 00:17:48.409

Paloma Sisneros-Lobato: thanks so much, Jackson. Hello, everyone. My name is Palomas. This narrow slobato um. As Jackson mentioned, I'm. A senior policy associate with the Food and Agriculture team at Spur, but I'm also the project manager for scoot spurs, voter, guide, and ballot analysis process. So in advance of a big election, i'm pleased to be here with you today uh to share Spurs recommendation on the California State propositions,

138

00:17:48.420 --> 00:17:56.039

Paloma Sisneros-Lobato: and before we dig into that, I want to share a little bit of background on the importance of ballot measures, and more about this for about analysis process.

139

00:17:56.210 --> 00:18:09.760

Paloma Sisneros-Lobato: So first ballot measures are an important part of policy making in the State of California, which isn't necessarily true in all other States, and because of that ballot measure, analysis provides a critical service to California voters.

140

00:18:09.770 --> 00:18:21.860

Paloma Sisneros-Lobato: We know that not everyone has the time to dedicate to do their own independent research. But everyone deserves the opportunity to better understand the history and the nuances behind all ballot measures, so they can be informed of voters

141

00:18:21.870 --> 00:18:32.809

Paloma Sisneros-Lobato: Spur has been doing ballot analysis for more than twenty years, and this for Voter Guide, therefore, has become one of our signature publications, and we take a lot of pride in putting it out for the public

142

00:18:33.530 --> 00:18:41.060

Paloma Sisneros-Lobato: spurn out, analyzes the ballot measures in San Francisco, Oakland, and San Jose, as well as any regional and state measures.

143

00:18:41.130 --> 00:18:47.039

Paloma Sisneros-Lobato: There are seven State belt measures on the November ballot, so we'll be covering all of those together today,

144

00:18:47.790 --> 00:18:54.799

Paloma Sisneros-Lobato: and the ballot analysis process that we run is an exciting one because it involves first staff and board member collaboration.

145

00:18:54.930 --> 00:19:06.899

Paloma Sisneros-Lobato: We organize ballot analysis committees for each jurisdiction that there are measures. The State Committee is comprised of for executive Board members, and each City committee is comprised of members from the relevant City board,

146

00:19:06.970 --> 00:19:19.619

Paloma Sisneros-Lobato: and then the analysis process is as follows: For staff conducts research and outreach on each of the ballot measures and presents them to each ballot Analysis Committee with the background as well as the staff recommendation.

147

00:19:19.630 --> 00:19:27.879

Paloma Sisneros-Lobato: Each measure is then deliberated in committee, and then the committee then presents to the relevant Board of Directors, who make the final vote on this for recommendation for each

148

00:19:28.470 --> 00:19:39.650

Paloma Sisneros-Lobato: staff, then work to write up the analysis, and our communication team brings it to life in the final format which is now out and available on our website for you to take a look at Spur Org.

149

00:19:40.350 --> 00:19:52.899

Paloma Sisneros-Lobato: So, after many months of ballot analysis, i'm pleased to kick off the election season by sharing more with you all, and we'll run through all seven state measures in order today, so I will be kicking us off with proposition one

150

00:19:54.320 --> 00:19:59.360

Paloma Sisneros-Lobato: wonderful, so California proposition, one and shining reproductive freedom.

151

00:20:00.020 --> 00:20:03.710

Paloma Sisneros-Lobato: So I will jump to the next slide and start with what the measure would do.

152

00:20:04.170 --> 00:20:09.969

Paloma Sisneros-Lobato: So this measure would amend the California Constitution to enshrine reproductive freedom.

153

00:20:10.240 --> 00:20:18.360

Paloma Sisneros-Lobato: It would explicitly prohibit the State from interfering with one's right to choose to have an abortion and one's right to choose or refuse contraceptives,

154

00:20:18.560 --> 00:20:31.709

Paloma Sisneros-Lobato: and then it would also eliminate any possible future misinterpretation of the law that would limit reproductive freedom. So i'm going to pause here and provide a little bit of brief background before I jump over to the equity impacts.

155

00:20:32.020 --> 00:20:39.339

Paloma Sisneros-Lobato: So Proposition Eleven was passed in California in one thousand nine hundred and seventy-two, and this was the first instance in which um

156

00:20:39.440 --> 00:20:52.320

Paloma Sisneros-Lobato: abortion rights in California was recognized in the California Constitution, and this proposition created what is known as the Reproductive Privacy Act. So what this does is, it provides the right to privacy

157

00:20:52.330 --> 00:21:01.269

Paloma Sisneros-Lobato: to access an abortion or contraceptives Um, which in California has most often been interpreted as the overall right to that reproductive freedom.

158

00:21:01.930 --> 00:21:14.310

Paloma Sisneros-Lobato: So the goal of this measure is to ensure the right itself, not just the privacy to it um, which ultimately, with the hope of which was that it would eliminate any potential future misinterpretation of the law

159

00:21:15.200 --> 00:21:23.620

Paloma Sisneros-Lobato: and the Reproductive Privacy Act happens to have come out about one year before the Royal Way decision at the Federal level,

160

00:21:23.890 --> 00:21:38.059

Paloma Sisneros-Lobato: and as many of you know, there was the Dobbs versus Jackson Women's Health Organization Decision made on June twenty fourth, two thousand and Twenty-

two which overturned the Robie Weight decision, and this proposition one was introduced in reaction to that.

161

00:21:38.220 --> 00:21:41.699

Paloma Sisneros-Lobato: So now I will move us next to the equity impacts here.

162

00:21:42.890 --> 00:21:49.429

Paloma Sisneros-Lobato: So abortion and contraceptive restrictions disproportionately impact low-income women and women of color.

163

00:21:49.550 --> 00:22:01.330

Paloma Sisneros-Lobato: Women who are denied access to abortion, face hardship, and in security; and those who carry an unwanted pregnancy to term are four times as likely to live with their child under the Federal poverty line,

164

00:22:02.120 --> 00:22:13.179

Paloma Sisneros-Lobato: and people who are unable to receive the abortion care that they seek are much more likely to struggle to afford the basic needs. Um that they have such as food and housing.

165

00:22:13.910 --> 00:22:17.200

Paloma Sisneros-Lobato: So i'll jump us right over to our pros and cons here.

166

00:22:17.650 --> 00:22:31.729

Paloma Sisneros-Lobato: So the big pro for this uh proposition here is that this amendment leaves no room for interpretation of the law that could ever limit the reproductive rights for women in the State, and for could not identify any cons for this measure

167

00:22:33.310 --> 00:22:36.509

Paloma Sisneros-Lobato: which takes us to our kind of recommendation,

168

00:22:36.900 --> 00:22:58.110

Paloma Sisneros-Lobato: which is to vote. Yes, um! So reproductive rights currently provided under the State, do provide some significant freedom for Californians, but guaranteeing those rights, not just the privacy to them, and reducing the potential for misinterpretation of the law goes one that one step further, that we think is really important in the law

169

00:22:58.140 --> 00:23:14.390

Paloma Sisneros-Lobato: and in the wake of the Supreme court decision to overturn Roe versus Wade. It is important that the State ensures the strength and clarity of reproductive freedom long. So with that, that is a Yes. Recommendation for prop one. Thank you.

170

00:23:16.500 --> 00:23:26.719

Jackson Nutt-Beers / SPUR: Awesome. Thank you so much, Paloma, and then um! I will get us started for prop twenty, six, so sherry, if we can go to the next slide. Awesome. Thank you so much.

171

00:23:26.730 --> 00:23:36.499

Jackson Nutt-Beers / SPUR: Um. So I will be presenting on both. Prop twenty, six, and prop twenty-seven, which is no small feat for myself, and doing this work and the spur team in general,

172

00:23:36.620 --> 00:24:05.740

Jackson Nutt-Beers / SPUR: and so prop twenty-six is the California sports wagering regulation and a novel Gambling Enforcement Act. It would be both a California, our constitutional amendment, and a State statute very generally. What legalize the operations of certain games, smallest in person sports beddings at American Indian gaming casinos, and also privately owned license horse racing tracks and certain counties in California, and it would also impose a ten percent tax on sports

173

00:24:05.970 --> 00:24:12.629

Jackson Nutt-Beers / SPUR: that's made out license horse racing tracks that uh would be deposited into the California sports wagering fund

174

00:24:12.740 --> 00:24:14.579

Jackson Nutt-Beers / SPUR: uh So next slide, please

175

00:24:16.460 --> 00:24:30.280

Jackson Nutt-Beers / SPUR: um. So prop twenty-six would essentially do three things. It would um legalize several new types of games, such as roulette dice, games, sports wagering on tribal lands that would be subjected to various rates of income tax.

176

00:24:31.330 --> 00:24:43.759

Jackson Nutt-Beers / SPUR: Um. It would also allow on-site sports, wagering at certain privately owned horse racing tracks and four counties, those counties being Alameda, Los Angeles, Orange, and San Diego counties

177

00:24:44.150 --> 00:24:58.880

Jackson Nutt-Beers / SPUR: um for anyone over the age of twenty-one it would also impose a ten percent tax on sports bets at horse racing tracks and creates the California sports racing front, where each of those funds would be deposited, so it'd be split up

178

00:24:58.940 --> 00:25:23.249

Jackson Nutt-Beers / SPUR: through three different departments. Um. Fifteen would go to the California Department of Health to um address problem, gambling issues and um support problem, Gambling prevention, fifteen to the Bureau of Gambling control to implement and enforce laws regarding sports, wagering, and all other types of gambling that has been legalized in California,

179

00:25:23.260 --> 00:25:29.149

Jackson Nutt-Beers / SPUR: and lastly, seventy would go to the general fund to the State budget for a general use.

180

00:25:29.570 --> 00:25:31.209

Jackson Nutt-Beers / SPUR: Um, next slide, please,

181

00:25:33.120 --> 00:25:41.410

Jackson Nutt-Beers / SPUR: And then for the equity impacts. Um! Nearly a third of residents living in tribal areas currently live under

182

00:25:41.820 --> 00:25:50.149

Jackson Nutt-Beers / SPUR: the poverty line, both gaming and on giving tribes, and to benefit financially from this game are from gaming in California,

183

00:25:50.500 --> 00:26:08.770

Jackson Nutt-Beers / SPUR: and there are some implications of increased gambling addiction that can disproportionately impact original minority communities due to increased access um to gambling. So the legalization of online sports betting could actually uh increase the likelihood of developing a gambling addiction

184

00:26:09.290 --> 00:26:19.819

Jackson Nutt-Beers / SPUR: Um, which, like I just mentioned, disproportionately impactful income communities um compared to white wider populations in the area, and then next slide, please.

185

00:26:21.820 --> 00:26:37.529

Jackson Nutt-Beers / SPUR: So some of the pros for this measure. Um! This measure would actually build on California's existing approach to gambling. You know gambling. California is not something that is new. It's been around for decades. Um! It would restrict most of the um

186

00:26:37.540 --> 00:26:45.400

Jackson Nutt-Beers / SPUR: practice the gambling services to jurisdictions that already. Um use gambling, so there wouldn't be a lot of added work there.

187

00:26:45.860 --> 00:27:12.410

Jackson Nutt-Beers / SPUR: Um! The gaming operations would provide um additional resources to California's Indian and native American communities, and which uh improve their health outcomes. It would um give more money to the tribes, give them better access to resources, and they currently have um, And then this measure also earmarks money to address problem gambling. Um that could come out of this Uh, if this measure passes

188

00:27:12.440 --> 00:27:14.790

Jackson Nutt-Beers / SPUR: um, and then next slide, please.

189

00:27:15.480 --> 00:27:19.070

Jackson Nutt-Beers / SPUR: And then there were some cons for this measure.

190

00:27:19.430 --> 00:27:22.559

Jackson Nutt-Beers / SPUR: Um! We thought that, uh

191

00:27:23.030 --> 00:27:32.349

Jackson Nutt-Beers / SPUR: measure our laws regarding um gambling should really be made legislatively. Um. It would require future changes to be made by voters

192

00:27:32.630 --> 00:27:45.769

Jackson Nutt-Beers / SPUR: by expanding to racetracks and expanding the types of betting possible. Um. The measure increases access to gambling, but associated with higher likelihood of gambling addiction, and it would also increase state regulatory costs.

193

00:27:46.500 --> 00:27:51.279

Jackson Nutt-Beers / SPUR: And so, um all of those things. Consider the next slide, please.

194

00:27:51.490 --> 00:28:00.769

Jackson Nutt-Beers / SPUR: Um. Gambling operations are in California, and the revenue generated benefited uh benefits. California tribes, however, deciding

195

00:28:00.780 --> 00:28:25.359

Jackson Nutt-Beers / SPUR: who gets to participate in a particular industry, should be done by the State legislature, so that it can be adapt, so that it can adapt how and by whom services are offered as conditions change over time. Uh. So these questions should not really be decided on the ballot, where nuances are lost and administrative flexibility is compromised, and so, for that reason spurs recommending, I know on prop twenty-six.

196

00:28:26.500 --> 00:28:56.310

Jackson Nutt-Beers / SPUR: Um. So that is it for prop twenty-six. If we can go to the next slide I will get a start on prop twenty-seven, which is related to prop twenty-six. So prop twenty-seven is the California solutions to Homelessness and Mental Health Act. It would be both a constitutional amendment and a State statue. Um. This measure would legalize online sports betting in California and with direct tax revenue earned to the California solutions to homelessness and mental health support account and the tribal economic development account.

197

00:28:57.920 --> 00:29:00.230

Jackson Nutt-Beers / SPUR: Yeah, next slide, please, sharing. Thank you.

198

00:29:01.030 --> 00:29:10.860

Jackson Nutt-Beers / SPUR: Um. So essentially this measure would legalize online sports settings for three different entities one would be gaming tribes.

199

00:29:11.090 --> 00:29:21.509

Jackson Nutt-Beers / SPUR: Um, where gaming already exists. It would allow online sports, betting platforms, um through organizations. Um: in other parts of the country

200

00:29:21.820 --> 00:29:28.439

Jackson Nutt-Beers / SPUR: to allow online sports betting in California, and then also additional gaming entities.

201

00:29:28.940 --> 00:29:41.659

Jackson Nutt-Beers / SPUR: Um, It would also place a fifteen percent tax on Bets place. So the funds that would be raised through these taxes would be reserved as a set aside, and would have to be used in a couple of different ways, the first being

202

00:29:41.680 --> 00:30:07.629

Jackson Nutt-Beers / SPUR: uh, it would have to cover the administrative costs, and then eighty five to state housing and mental health programs. Um, with no more than forty percent spent on interim housing, and then fifteen would go to federally recognized tribes in California that do not offer sports, betting so part of a revenue sharing agreement that still provides resources to um. Those tribes that do not directly benefit from

203

00:30:07.640 --> 00:30:08.520

Jackson Nutt-Beers / SPUR: um

204

00:30:08.880 --> 00:30:11.349

Jackson Nutt-Beers / SPUR: benefit from the passing of this measure.

205

00:30:11.750 --> 00:30:14.420

Jackson Nutt-Beers / SPUR: So we can go to the next slide. Please share it. Thank you.

206

00:30:14.920 --> 00:30:41.400

Jackson Nutt-Beers / SPUR: Um. So there are some equity impacts. A lot of the equity impacts in prop twenty-six Our prop. Twenty-seven are similar to prop twenty-six. Nearly one-third of residents and tribal areas are currently living under the poverty line um There is this long term um potential dilution of the power that gaming tribes currently have, and regulating um and providing gaming services that would kind of go away if Um,

207

00:30:41.590 --> 00:30:45.639

Jackson Nutt-Beers / SPUR: there are new players introduced into California

208

00:30:46.370 --> 00:31:01.339

Jackson Nutt-Beers / SPUR: um online sports spending could increase the likelihood of developing a gambling addiction uh which you know typically to uh disproportionately impacts low income communities and uh, the tax revenues that are gained from online sports. Betting stands to benefit uh

209

00:31:01.350 --> 00:31:20.249

Jackson Nutt-Beers / SPUR: communities that are disproportionately impacted by um housing and security, such as uh communities color or communities of color with a black, a Api and American Indian residents. Um, who are disproportionately represented and unsheltered, and or housing secure communities.

210

00:31:20.480 --> 00:31:23.139

Jackson Nutt-Beers / SPUR: And so with that we'll go to the pros

211

00:31:23.850 --> 00:31:36.010

Jackson Nutt-Beers / SPUR: so prop twenty-seven would provide additional funding to support on house populations, in California it would also provide financial support to non-gaming tribal governments,

212

00:31:36.290 --> 00:31:46.920

Jackson Nutt-Beers / SPUR: but also enable tribes to expand their gaming operations which could increase economic activity and additional resources. Um, that Don't already exist in those areas.

213

00:31:47.060 --> 00:31:50.439

Jackson Nutt-Beers / SPUR: There were several cons that we found in our research.

214

00:31:51.000 --> 00:32:07.739

Jackson Nutt-Beers / SPUR: Um, it would I won't go through all of them. But um! It sets for it specific rules for how sports raging will operate in the State. Um. With little to No. Input from the State legislature, and with no ability for the Legislature to amend any of the rules legislatively.

215

00:32:07.750 --> 00:32:24.030

Jackson Nutt-Beers / SPUR: Um. It would also create. Set aside that dictate how tax revenue should be spent rather than allowing the State expenditure priorities to evolve over time. Um! It would also reduce competition among market participants by limiting the pool to well established existing operators.

216

00:32:24.060 --> 00:32:26.009

Jackson Nutt-Beers / SPUR: Then we'll go to the next slide

217

00:32:26.820 --> 00:32:40.440

Jackson Nutt-Beers / SPUR: um, and then it also could potentially impact negative negatively impact um tribal economic well-being by shifting gambling activity from ending casino into online sports betting where um

218

00:32:41.090 --> 00:32:57.170

Jackson Nutt-Beers / SPUR: this measure would not allow. Um, you couldn't with this measure of passing. You couldn't do online sports, betting on um, and it would also require specific naming protocols for gaming, tribal sovereignty and market competitiveness.

219

00:32:57.500 --> 00:33:10.180

Jackson Nutt-Beers / SPUR: And so with that, if you can go to the next slide sharing Thank you. Um. Sports. Betting is a lucrative industry, and California has really yet to lay down the rules on how to regulate it. Um! So it's no surprise that

220

00:33:10.260 --> 00:33:37.899

Jackson Nutt-Beers / SPUR: interested parties are taking measures directly to the voters. Um. Given the complexity of this field, the competing interests among potential participants, and the intended or unintended consequences on tribal well being the only reasonable approach. Um really is for the State of California to legislate the rules surrounding who can operate these services? Um! What the relationships, what the relationship is with existing gaming rules and tribal state compacts,

221

00:33:37.910 --> 00:33:42.220

Jackson Nutt-Beers / SPUR: and whether or not uh sports, betting should be made legal in California at all,

222

00:33:42.810 --> 00:33:54.430

Jackson Nutt-Beers / SPUR: given its potential risk to individual gamblers. Um, so the say really should be the one who decides how any um new revenue from the service will be spent. Um given.

223

00:33:54.440 --> 00:34:11.979

Jackson Nutt-Beers / SPUR: How California is priorities change over time. So all of those things considered, spur is recommending a no vote on prop twenty-seven um so that is it for prop twenty-seven and prompt twenty-eight. All right. I'm sorry. Prop twenty-six and prop twenty-seven um,

224

00:34:11.989 --> 00:34:16.549

Jackson Nutt-Beers / SPUR: and then and Kristy, I will turn it over to you to get started on prompt twenty-eight.

225

00:34:18.050 --> 00:34:39.660

Anne Christie: Okay, Thank you, Jackson. So much. So, Hi! Everyone. My name is Anne and I'm going to be presenting on California prop twenty, eight, the K. Twelve arts and music, Education, Um, Ballot Initiative. This is a voter initiative that would allocate continuous State funding for arts and music education in all K. Twelve public schools next slide, please.

226

00:34:41.310 --> 00:34:58.530

Anne Christie: So this measure would guarantee annual State funding for arts and music education in California public schools, including charter schools. This funding is an amount equal to one percent of State education funding from the previous year. It would be, in addition to Normal school funding amounts.

227

00:34:58.540 --> 00:35:15.289

Anne Christie: Funding would be sourced from the general fund, and is expected to cost eight hundred eight hundred million to one billion dollars annually. It would not raise taxes, but it would reduce available funding for other government services and infrastructure. Next slide, please,

228

00:35:16.230 --> 00:35:24.370

Anne Christie: for schools with more than five hundred students. Eighty percent of these funds must be used to employ arts. Education

229

00:35:25.800 --> 00:35:42.250

Anne Christie: with the rest spent on training and supplies. No more than one percent of funds may be used for administrative expenses, and every year a local education agency must certify and publicly report that funds were used properly. Next slide, please.

230

00:35:43.700 --> 00:36:11.339

Anne Christie: So equity impacts this measure provides additional arts, education, funding for schools with high proportions of low income students. Seventy percent of funds are given to schools based on regular enrollment numbers, with the remaining thirty percent distributed as additional resources to schools based on their share of economically disadvantaged students. The ballot text defines economically to Spanish students as those who are eligible for the National School lunch program

231

00:36:11.640 --> 00:36:13.089

Anne Christie: next slide, please.

232

00:36:13.800 --> 00:36:29.339

Anne Christie: So there are a lot of pros and cons of this measure. Pros include that. Schools can hire more instructors and offer additional courses. Allowing more students through the benefits of arts education. This measure provides strict accountability. Standards to make sure funds are used properly.

233

00:36:29.350 --> 00:36:46.750

Anne Christie: It provides additional funding to schools with higher rates of low income students, and it protects arch education from being cut by school districts. On the other hand, cons include that it doesn't create a new revenue source, and instead draws from the general fund which takes funding away from new or existing state priorities.

234

00:36:46.760 --> 00:36:59.270

Anne Christie: It doesn't have a time limit for a sunset clause, which means it will remain active, even if it doesn't work as intended, or it changes are needed in times of budget constraints. It would need another vote of the electorate for chain.

235

00:36:59.760 --> 00:37:13.480

Anne Christie: There are no specific guidelines to measure success. It's unclear. If the funding amount is appropriate, the measure tax doesn't establish a baseline funding need, and it also restricts local school district decision making uh, next slide, please.

236

00:37:14.090 --> 00:37:28.890

Anne Christie: So at the end Spur recommends a no vote on this measure we believe the arts education should be prioritized, so that all students can access its benefits. However, we're disappointed to say that this measure fails to include

237

00:37:28.900 --> 00:37:35.110

Anne Christie: um provisions that make a good budget set aside um, which is disappointing, considering it's good intentions.

238

00:37:35.120 --> 00:37:57.490

Anne Christie: This measure limits um. The state's ability to adapt to changing priorities by requiring the State to spend up to one billion dollars annually on a set issue. Um! We also get um cautious of this measure because it lacks a sunset clause, specific measures for success, and it's unclear. If to this, if the designated funding amount is appropriate.

239

00:37:57.500 --> 00:38:00.240

Anne Christie: So yeah, that's top twenty eight. Thank you, everyone.

240

00:38:01.920 --> 00:38:11.500

Jackson Nutt-Beers / SPUR: So thank you so much, Anne. And then we will jump over to prop twenty-nine, which is going to be Jessica Payton.

241

00:38:11.510 --> 00:38:26.229

Jessica Peyton / SPUR Public Programs: Our public programming associate.

242

00:38:27.050 --> 00:38:49.969

Jessica Peyton / SPUR Public Programs: Okay. So proposition twenty-nine establishes set of regulations for dialysis clinics. Um A version of This measure has actually been on the ballot for three elections in a row. This is the third election uh, where a measure will um measure related will be on the ballot. Uh this is the most recent proposition. Uh it's almost the same as proposition. Twenty-three that was on the ballot in two thousand and twenty

243

00:38:49.980 --> 00:39:02.630

Jessica Peyton / SPUR Public Programs: um, and the provisions are largely the same as proposition. Twenty, three um. So the measure requires clinics to report dialysis related infections to the California Department of Public Health. The Cdph

244

00:39:02.640 --> 00:39:16.400

Jessica Peyton / SPUR Public Programs: clinics would also be required to provide patients with a list of physicians with an ownership interest to five percent or more in the clinic and clinics would be required to obtain the Cd. Ph's written consent before closing, or substantially reducing services to patients

245

00:39:16.410 --> 00:39:38.000

Jessica Peyton / SPUR Public Programs: uh proposition. Twenty-nine, also introduces an expansion on one of the regulations from proposition twenty-three so instead of a physician being required to be on site at every dialysis clinic in the State proposition. Twenty-nine expands that list of medical staff that are eligible to fill the role. To also include nurse practitioners or physician assistants in addition to a license nephrologist

246

00:39:38.010 --> 00:39:39.569

Jessica Peyton / SPUR Public Programs: right next slide, please.

247

00:39:40.540 --> 00:39:52.229

Jessica Peyton / SPUR Public Programs: So, moving on to the equity impacts of this measure. So the elderly black people and Latinx people are more likely than a non black non-hispanic white person to have chronic kidney disease and need dialysis treatments

248

00:39:52.240 --> 00:40:12.040

Jessica Peyton / SPUR Public Programs: Uh, the proposition could positively impact these groups. If clinics were able to fully staff train nephrologist without incurring additional costs. However, that's not the case, and the increased cost of implementing these requirements could create hurdles to dialysis, clinic operations uh which could then reduce access, care, or increase. The cost of treatment for these patients

249

00:40:12.050 --> 00:40:13.649

Jessica Peyton / SPUR Public Programs: next slide, please.

250

00:40:14.420 --> 00:40:39.250

Jessica Peyton / SPUR Public Programs: So moving on to the pros and cons um to the pros. If clinics are able to meet all the requirements set forth by proposition twenty-nine. It could increase the quality of care for dialysis patients, a fully trained to follow nephrologist present at all times could provide constant oversight and ensure that someone is present during an emergency. Um. Additionally, the transparency requirements could also help patients make more informed decisions about their health care and their dialysis treatments

251

00:40:39.280 --> 00:40:55.800

Jessica Peyton / SPUR Public Programs: moving on to the cons. Uh. There is a health care worker shortage, so it's likely that clinics Aren't going to be able to meet the staffing requirements set forth by proposition twenty-nine, which, instead, just increase the clinics operating costs, and put them at risk for closure or for increasing patient cost, of care,

252

00:40:56.200 --> 00:41:19.129

Jessica Peyton / SPUR Public Programs: and even with a fully staffed clinic staff, wouldn't really be able to assist in the case of an emergency in this, in those situations uh the clinic usually just calls nine one one. So if clinics close, or have to reduce their operations as a result of not being able to comply with the regulations set forth by proposition, twenty-nine people could lose access to their treatments which are necessary and required for patient survival.

253

00:41:19.360 --> 00:41:20.919

Jessica Peyton / SPUR Public Programs: Next slide, please.

254

00:41:21.520 --> 00:41:38.649

Jessica Peyton / SPUR Public Programs: So, because of the cons for recommends you vote. No voters have rejected this measure two times before, once in two thousand and eighteen, and the other time in twenty twenty. It's still not clear that California's dialysis, clinics are in need of reform, and there are no recent studies that confirm that these added measures would improve patient care,

255

00:41:38.660 --> 00:41:44.579

Jessica Peyton / SPUR Public Programs: um, and instead tasking clinics with extra regulations, could prevent people from getting access to their life saving health care.

256

00:41:44.610 --> 00:41:58.359

Jessica Peyton / SPUR Public Programs: Uh, Finally, if changes are needed in the industry. Lawmakers should hear from experts in the field, and thoroughly that any new laws, and also be open to alterations dictated by sound medical advice. Um, and they should not rely on the average voter for these decisions.

257

00:41:58.420 --> 00:42:04.439

Jessica Peyton / SPUR Public Programs: Um. And so because of that spur recommends a vote of no on proposition twenty-nine. Thank you.

258

00:42:06.810 --> 00:42:15.349

Jackson Nutt-Beers / SPUR: Awesome. Thank you so much, Jessica. We really appreciate it. Um, Then we'll transition over to prop thirty.

259

00:42:15.430 --> 00:42:18.309

Jackson Nutt-Beers / SPUR: Um, it should be.

260

00:42:18.930 --> 00:42:21.840

Jackson Nutt-Beers / SPUR: Let's see, share it. This might not be the right side.

261

00:42:29.570 --> 00:42:31.729

Jackson Nutt-Beers / SPUR: Yeah,

262

00:42:34.630 --> 00:42:40.210

Jackson Nutt-Beers / SPUR: there we go, right, and then we'll have Nick yourself with our chief of policy presenting on this one. Nick.

263

00:42:40.320 --> 00:42:52.199

Nick Josefowitz: Hello, everybody! My name is Nick, just suffered from the chief policy here at Spur. Thank you so much for joining us. Um, prop thirty is the clean cars and clean air act and um for full disclosure, but actually helped

264

00:42:52.210 --> 00:43:03.210

Nick Josefowitz: put this one together. And um, we've been working on this for about three years Um! And and helped convene a bunch of the coalition partners. Um! Who uh! Who Who wrote the measure and got it on the ballot.

265

00:43:03.270 --> 00:43:12.499

Nick Josefowitz: Um! So the the background to this measure is, is not going to be any surprise to anybody. Um! Is that even with the passage of the Inflation Reduction Act

266

00:43:12.630 --> 00:43:31.400

Nick Josefowitz: federally at the United States is not on track to reduce greenhouse gas emissions to a level that will avoid the worst impact of global warming. Um And California is also not on track to meet its climate. Goals and some estimates have us meeting our goals one hundred years late.

267

00:43:31.520 --> 00:43:40.669

Nick Josefowitz: Um! At the same time. California also has the worst worst air quality in the country, and both of those things missing. Our our uh,

268

00:43:40.680 --> 00:43:55.530

Nick Josefowitz: our climate goals, and and having the worst air quality in the country are driven primarily by pollution from vehicles. Um and pollution from wildfires, and that's really what prop thirty is trying to address next slide, please.

269

00:43:57.750 --> 00:44:00.439

Nick Josefowitz: So prop thirty would um

270

00:44:00.790 --> 00:44:13.969

Nick Josefowitz: raise about one hundred billion dollars over the next twenty years to invest in um eliminating tailpipe emissions from vehicles um and fighting and preventing catastrophic wildfires.

271

00:44:14.530 --> 00:44:39.109

Nick Josefowitz: The measure would raise this money with a very small um increase on uh a income tax increase on personal income over two million dollars. So if you earn three million dollars, for instance, you would only be taxed on the increment between two and three million dollars. Um! And so you would pay an extra seventeen thousand dollars of tax if you earn three million dollars of taxable income.

272

00:44:39.230 --> 00:44:40.669

Nick Josefowitz: Um

273

00:44:40.850 --> 00:44:42.530

Nick Josefowitz: out of the um.

274

00:44:42.570 --> 00:44:48.939

Nick Josefowitz: What? What? This measure spends? My Um! What What are the invest specific investments coming out of the measure?

275

00:44:48.950 --> 00:45:08.130

Nick Josefowitz: Forty-five billion dollars would go um to support Californians purchasing zero emission vehicles? Um and to support California businesses, transitioning their fleets to zero emission vehicles to That's everything from cars to trucks that move goods to transit buses

276

00:45:08.140 --> 00:45:23.759

Nick Josefowitz: to school buses, to agricultural equipment to construction, equipment to ambulances. I mean, you can go on There's a lots and lots of different types of vehicles, and each one of them um needs needs help in transitioning to a zero emission vehicle.

277

00:45:23.770 --> 00:45:35.289

Nick Josefowitz: The measure would also invest thirty-five billion dollars in building out the charging and fueling infrastructure that are needed for these vehicles,

278

00:45:35.710 --> 00:45:51.990

Nick Josefowitz: and the goal ultimately would be to make zero Mission vehicles um affordable to every Californian and and to every California small business um, and to make it as easy to charge your fuel, your zero emission vehicle as it is now, to go down to the pump

279

00:45:52.520 --> 00:46:11.319

Nick Josefowitz: and just to kind of give you one sort of two examples that I think kind of a a very relevant for for the Bay area. One is that Um, the Metropolitan Transportation Commission estimates that we have a multi billion dollar need just to transition our transit buses to zero mission

280

00:46:11.330 --> 00:46:20.809

Nick Josefowitz: across the Bay area. Um. And right Now, there really isn't enough money to be able to do that. And secondly, just to take an example of a of a car,

281

00:46:20.960 --> 00:46:32.100

Nick Josefowitz: you know a a chevy bolt costs about eleven thousand dollars more than a uh than a toyota camry um, and so um, you know, even there's

282

00:46:32.240 --> 00:46:50.359

Nick Josefowitz: there's still a significant gap um between the cost of of electric vehicles and fossil fuel powered equivalents, especially for sort of non luxury cars. And that's why, at the beginning of the year we still have ninety-seven percent of vehicles in California that are powered with fossil fuels.

283

00:46:52.250 --> 00:46:53.339

Nick Josefowitz: Um

284

00:46:53.750 --> 00:47:08.570

Nick Josefowitz: Twenty Twenty billion dollars from the measure will be invested in fighting and preventing wild catastrophic wildfires that includes funding for firefighter training and retention, as well as community and home hardening vegetation management and watershed restoration.

285

00:47:08.580 --> 00:47:20.069

Nick Josefowitz: A recent study by the wildfire Conservancy found that Prop thirty would prevent over three hundred thousand acres a year being burned, which would result in an economic benefit to California of over ten billion dollars

286

00:47:20.280 --> 00:47:21.839

next slide, please.

287

00:47:23.500 --> 00:47:24.520

Nick Josefowitz: Um!

288

00:47:25.060 --> 00:47:28.760

Nick Josefowitz: The equity impacts of prop thirty are pretty pretty. Um

289

00:47:28.860 --> 00:47:36.799

Nick Josefowitz: pretty intense. Um, We know very clearly that um that that that polluted there,

290

00:47:36.810 --> 00:47:52.680

Nick Josefowitz: and and climate change have far greater impact. Um in low-income communities and communities of color um, especially communities that are vulnerable to sea level rise around the bay area. Um in places like um

291

00:47:52.690 --> 00:47:57.710

Nick Josefowitz: uh Hunters point um, or in um in West Oakland,

292

00:47:58.080 --> 00:47:59.970

Nick Josefowitz: and there's many, many more

293

00:48:00.000 --> 00:48:16.320

Nick Josefowitz: um to name, especially in communities. Um that are near ports or inland ports that have some of the worst air quality in the country. Um, and uh, And so the uh, the These investments would have really profound impact on those communities

294

00:48:16.330 --> 00:48:32.069

Nick Josefowitz: over and above that, fifty percent of the investments in reducing emissions from uh vehicles would have to be uh benefit, low-income communities and communities of color as part of the measure and that would be audited by the State auditor

295

00:48:32.480 --> 00:48:33.560

Nick Josefowitz: um

296

00:48:34.260 --> 00:48:41.479

Nick Josefowitz: on the revenue side. Increasing taxes on the very wealthiest Californians. Um is very progressive.

297

00:48:41.490 --> 00:49:04.339

Nick Josefowitz: Ninety-nine point eight of Californians will not pay any extra tax um as a result of prop thirty, and the um. The wealthiest Californians are also those who have done best over the last decade. There are now over there now twice as many people who earn over two million dollars a year in California as there were a decade ago. And um! And those those Californians are earning

298

00:49:04.350 --> 00:49:08.560

Nick Josefowitz: three times more taxable income than they were a decade ago.

299

00:49:09.300 --> 00:49:11.209

Nick Josefowitz: Next slide, please.

300

00:49:12.690 --> 00:49:40.369

Nick Josefowitz: So the pros are the California um is not meeting. It's climate and clean air goals, and uh, and this investment will help make that happen. Um! By providing stable long term investment. Um to um address the two most significant drivers of dirty and and climate change in California, which um are tailpipe permissions from vehicles and catastrophic wildfires. Um, and it raises revenue in a very equitable way.

301

00:49:40.570 --> 00:49:46.449

Nick Josefowitz: And so that's why next slide Spur recommends a yes

302

00:49:46.560 --> 00:49:47.890

Nick Josefowitz: on top thirty

303

00:49:51.240 --> 00:50:00.150

Jackson Nutt-Beers / SPUR: awesome. Thank you so much, Nick. Um for that presentation, and then Polymer will bring it back to you. Uh for prop thirty. One

304

00:50:01.570 --> 00:50:08.859

Paloma Sisneros-Lobato: great um, and I will Yes, be closing out our presentation portion, so I will jump right into it.

305

00:50:09.010 --> 00:50:18.169

Paloma Sisneros-Lobato: So I will be talking about California Proposition thirty-one, which is a referendum and challenging the current law which prohibits the sale of certain flavored tobacco

306

00:50:18.440 --> 00:50:21.259

Paloma Sisneros-Lobato: so doing right into what the measure would do,

307

00:50:21.980 --> 00:50:25.200

Paloma Sisneros-Lobato: this measure would uphold um.

308

00:50:25.280 --> 00:50:27.939

Paloma Sisneros-Lobato: We move to the next slide. Thank you.

309

00:50:28.100 --> 00:50:42.960

Paloma Sisneros-Lobato: Um. This measure would uphold Sb: seven hundred and ninety-three, to ban the sale of flavor, tobacco, such as menthol, cigarettes, and fruit, flavored vape liquids, with exceptions for hooka tobacco loosely tobacco, and premium cigars,

310

00:50:42.970 --> 00:50:50.420

Paloma Sisneros-Lobato: and then it would also implement a fine on tobacco retailers of two hundred and fifty dollars for each sale that violates the law.

311

00:50:50.720 --> 00:51:00.999

Paloma Sisneros-Lobato: So sp seven hundred and ninety-three, was passed through the California Legislature in two thousand and twenty, and was set to begin on january one of two thousand and twenty-one,

312

00:51:01.010 --> 00:51:17.299

Paloma Sisneros-Lobato: but has been on hold uh pending the results of a referendum seeking the laws repeal so to reiterate what this particular measure would do is it would uphold the original law that banned these products. Um, and therefore upholding the law that was passed by the Legislature in two thousand and twenty.

313

00:51:17.460 --> 00:51:28.399

Paloma Sisneros-Lobato: So before I dig into the equity impacts. I just wanted to kind of um. Give a little bit of that context and just share a little bit. That tobacco companies design, flavor tobacco products

314

00:51:28.410 --> 00:51:41.409

Paloma Sisneros-Lobato: to soften the kind of like harsh taste of tobacco which ultimately the goal of that is to make it easier for individuals to start using those tobacco products, and then um Ultimately, that often leads to nicotine addiction.

315

00:51:41.420 --> 00:52:05.609

Paloma Sisneros-Lobato: So sb seven hundred and ninety-three was based on um a lot of public health concerns that flavor tobacco in particular, specifically targets youth and communities of color, and is kind of the purpose of kind of adding All those flavors is to get people hooked onto those harmful tobacco products which have corresponding and well known health impacts, such as lung cancer, coronary heart disease, and stroke.

316

00:52:05.890 --> 00:52:25.830

Paloma Sisneros-Lobato: And What's interesting about this is that there's actually um currently about one hundred and twenty cities and counties throughout the State that have adopted local restrictions or bans on different flavored tobacco products, and each of those kind of um restrictions looks a little bit different, but it's all to say that this is kind of you know, showing some momentum for what the State might want to do more broadly.

317

00:52:26.270 --> 00:52:32.420

Paloma Sisneros-Lobato: Um, with this here, so I will transition over to the equity impacts now.

318

00:52:32.770 --> 00:52:44.000

Paloma Sisneros-Lobato: So one of the um kind of positive equity impacts is that this would decrease the disproportionate negative health impacts of tobacco in particular, on black communities,

319

00:52:44.370 --> 00:52:56.389

Paloma Sisneros-Lobato: and in a similar vein. It would also decrease the youth use of tobacco products, and, of course, all of the associated lifelong to tobacco dependency that would kind of stem from starting from that young age.

320

00:52:57.240 --> 00:53:07.680

Paloma Sisneros-Lobato: And another impact. And this is kind of an interesting one. Here. Um is that Sb. Seven hundred and ninety-three does not ban the sale of who could tobacco loosely tobacco or those premium cigars

321

00:53:07.690 --> 00:53:24.009

Paloma Sisneros-Lobato: and premium cigars in particular are most likely to be smoked by what individuals and those with higher incomes, and so ultimately that carve out kind of meet um leads us to believe that those individuals will continue to have um more access to flavor tobacco even with the span.

322

00:53:24.950 --> 00:53:36.609

Paloma Sisneros-Lobato: So I will transition over to the pros and cons, so this measure will likely result in fewer Californians overall, but in particular um black and youth um

323

00:53:36.760 --> 00:53:43.199

Paloma Sisneros-Lobato: throughout the State um. It will result in fewer of those um communities developing tobacco-related diseases

324

00:53:43.630 --> 00:53:51.279

Paloma Sisneros-Lobato: and the legislature, as I mentioned many times. Um had had passed Sb. Seven hundred and ninety-three, with bipartisan, support,

325

00:53:51.290 --> 00:54:07.529

Paloma Sisneros-Lobato: and it went through the traditional legislative process and through various committees, and went through a lot of consideration and deliberation. And ultimately we see that process as a better venue for considering these complex issues. Um, then bringing it to the voters on the ballot. In this way

326

00:54:07.860 --> 00:54:24.220

Paloma Sisneros-Lobato: so we see as implementing seven hundred and ninety-three um with simplified flavor, tobacco regulation by creating a statewide ban rather than relying on the current assortment of local regulations that are currently governing um tobacco sales in cities and counties throughout the State,

327

00:54:25.630 --> 00:54:38.529

Paloma Sisneros-Lobato: and on to the con. So many legal substances. Um, such as cigarettes have negative impact on public health. So it is kind of debatable whether or not it is the role of the government to restrict consumers access to them,

328

00:54:38.890 --> 00:54:48.370

Paloma Sisneros-Lobato: however. Um experience with alcohol as as experience with alcohol prohibition, as shown um a ban isn't always an effective way to address the problem,

329

00:54:49.400 --> 00:55:02.049

Paloma Sisneros-Lobato: and another kind of con is the small businesses, and particularly corner stores. Will will that will face a revenue loss. Um. In the face of this ban and by extension there will be a loss of tax revenue in the State.

330

00:55:02.060 --> 00:55:10.060

Paloma Sisneros-Lobato: Um. That the legislative analysts office estimates that anywhere from tens of million dollars to um upwards of one hundred million dollars annually.

331

00:55:11.180 --> 00:55:25.799

Paloma Sisneros-Lobato: So this will lead us to kind of our final recommendation which is to vote. Yes, on proposition thirty-one. So California has a long standing history of trying to reduce tobacco consumption because of its negative impact on public health.

332

00:55:25.810 --> 00:55:45.269

Paloma Sisneros-Lobato: And um, as we've identified here, flavor, tobacco products are particularly harmful because they're designed to encourage greater consumption, and are specifically marketed to um black communities and youth, and in light of this the California Legislature made a bipartisan decision to ban the sale,

333

00:55:45.540 --> 00:55:53.750

Paloma Sisneros-Lobato: and we think that that should be upheld. So um. We write our recommending that. Yes, vote um! That concludes my presentation. Thank you very much.

334

00:55:59.430 --> 00:56:17.830

Jackson Nutt-Beers / SPUR: So thank you so much, for that was fantastic. Um. So Now we are going to transition over to the Q. A. Portion of this event, and I did just want to give a quick mention before we get into it that we do have to more about and improve events that are happening next week.

335

00:56:17.840 --> 00:56:29.129

Jackson Nutt-Beers / SPUR: Uh, on Tuesday we are having the uh San Francisco ballot and bruise uh forum. That'll be um from six to eight Pm.

336

00:56:29.140 --> 00:56:38.719

Jackson Nutt-Beers / SPUR: At the urban center. Um! So you can really get to talk to everybody in person. Um. We just found It'd be easier to do that one in person than to um

337

00:56:38.940 --> 00:57:06.170

Jackson Nutt-Beers / SPUR: do it virtually, so we'll be able to get back in person to the urban center. So you can find more information about that online at Spur of Jessica has just dropped it in the chat. Thank you so much, Jessica. So if you're interested in, come to that one, that one will be on Tuesday. Um. That we are having a virtual Oakland forum very similar to this one that will

be happening on Wednesday um Wednesday evenings, so that um can be found online on our website at for dot org events as well.

338

00:57:06.580 --> 00:57:16.970

Jackson Nutt-Beers / SPUR: So if you do have questions, I would employ you to please raise your hand or you to raise your hand function. Then we can get to you. If you don't want to

339

00:57:16.980 --> 00:57:36.489

Jackson Nutt-Beers / SPUR: raise your hand, feel free to submit your question in the chat, and then we can read it out loud. So we have a couple of questions so far in the chat that I will bring up Paloma. I think this one is going to go to you. So Michaela asks What criteria did the committee use to frame these recommendations more than equity?

340

00:57:37.630 --> 00:57:53.729

Jackson Nutt-Beers / SPUR: Okay, Sorry. I was confused. I thought you were referring to one of the propositions that I was covering. But this is the broader um broader question about the process. Is that correct? Yes,

341

00:57:53.740 --> 00:58:23.730

Paloma Sisneros-Lobato: yeah, Great? Yeah. So the committee has various criteria. But really I would kind of boil them down to maybe three or four. So they take into consideration the equity of each of the measures, and that's kind of the, you know impetus for that equity impact section that ends up being in the final product they take into consideration um good government proponents. So whether or not this is written in a way that makes sense. Whether or not this upholds kind of the various principles that um help with the management of

342

00:58:23.740 --> 00:58:26.240

Paloma Sisneros-Lobato: in this case um State government,

343

00:58:26.300 --> 00:58:38.620

Paloma Sisneros-Lobato: and they consider the way in which it was um put onto the ballot right? So in some instances, whether it be a voter initiative, or whether it be placed on um

344

00:58:38.690 --> 00:58:43.219

Paloma Sisneros-Lobato: from various other interests. That's all kind of analyzed throughout that process.

345

00:58:43.250 --> 00:59:01.489

Paloma Sisneros-Lobato: And then ultimately, they just kind of run through the what it would do, what the history is, and take all of that into consideration to try to understand the full scope, and I think the portion of the ballot analysis process that I think is really important to elevate is all of the research and outreach that our dedicated policy staff does

346

00:59:01.500 --> 00:59:28.139

Paloma Sisneros-Lobato: so. This, in many instances, entails reaching out to relevant folks who understand this a lot more than us, right, as you all know, many of these in particular, the State measures are outside of the normal wheelhouse. Of what um for policy focuses on. So it's even ever more important for these issues to reach out to the issue area experts. Um in those fields to really understand the nuance and the complexity to um Have that be an informed decision.

347

00:59:29.850 --> 00:59:46.010

Nick Josefowitz: And I think also it's important to say that as an organization, and our mission is um is sort of balances, equity, sustainability, and prosperity. And we think those are the three values that we do we hold in all of our work, and that um, It's important to kind of balance in, in including in our ballot analysis

348

00:59:48.700 --> 01:00:01.239

Jackson Nutt-Beers / SPUR: awesome. Thank you so much, and it looks like Deborah Miller is asking how to spur. Analyze the governor's opposition to prop thirty, so I think it's a bit of a head scratch uh to be honest. Um,

349

01:00:01.250 --> 01:00:11.699

Nick Josefowitz: because you know, prop that the the governor um has has has done so much on climate. And I, you know, I think we really respect the work that he's been doing on that

350

01:00:11.710 --> 01:00:25.810

Nick Josefowitz: Um and um and prop thirty really fund fully funds. A lot of the programs of the A Resources Board and the Energy Commission um in his administration have put in place um to try and transition

351

01:00:25.820 --> 01:00:34.299

Nick Josefowitz: erez Agmoni, California, away from zero emission vehicles, and to sort of fight and prevent wildfires, and it gives a lot of discretion to the administrative agencies one hundred and fifty

352

01:00:34.580 --> 01:00:44.189

Nick Josefowitz: to sort of frame those investment programs as as appropriate as technology, shift as market shift as um as a as need shift,

353

01:00:44.470 --> 01:00:49.509

Nick Josefowitz: and to just give you one example. For instance, there's there is a a program

354

01:00:50.200 --> 01:01:08.320

Nick Josefowitz: um developed by by the sort of by the new, some administration that supports um small businesses buying zero emission, um trucks. And and that program opens up for new funding request for for for for for business to request funding

355

01:01:08.330 --> 01:01:18.219

Nick Josefowitz: every year, and this year it ran out of money after sixteen days. So um! So there is a real need to sort of fully fund these programs and um,

356

01:01:18.300 --> 01:01:21.760

Nick Josefowitz: and we're a bit, You know we we're sort of scratching our head as to why

357

01:01:21.770 --> 01:01:43.010

Nick Josefowitz: the Governor isn't supporting this especially given that it's supported by the Democratic party. Um all, you know most of the major environmental and environmental justice groups. Um, Every big city, mayor and more or less every big city Mayor in California. Um Public health groups, labor unions, I mean. There's like a really big coalition That's that's yes, on thirty.

358

01:01:45.910 --> 01:02:05.370

Jackson Nutt-Beers / SPUR: Awesome. Thank you so much, Nick. And it looks like there's another prop. Thirty related question from Roger, Roger asked. Is prop thirty help fund, electric rail, such as Cal train and high speed rail, and the Federal Inflation Act specifically does not. And what about electric bikes? Then also, maybe more nuanced question um about

359

01:02:05.380 --> 01:02:15.290

Jackson Nutt-Beers / SPUR: um assuring that hydrogen pumps are electric from charging stations are actually green and not driving age or electric from petroleum slash. Producing Co: Two offsite.

360

01:02:15.890 --> 01:02:34.580

Nick Josefowitz: Yeah, thank you, Roger. Good to see you. Thanks for joining um. So yes, um. All All sort of vehicles are basically eligible for uh, for prop thirty support. So that that does include um that does include trains. Um an electrified rail. Um

361

01:02:34.780 --> 01:02:53.609

Nick Josefowitz: um, and it also includes um uh electric bikes. So also eligible for for support. And, as you know, we're seeing a sort of a huge boom in in in in sort of electric bike adoption. There are actually more electric bikes that were sold last year in the United States than any other than all the other electric vehicles combined.

362

01:02:53.620 --> 01:03:22.479

Nick Josefowitz: Um! And they sort of have a opportunity to profoundly revolutionize urban mobility. But they're still out of reach for for most Californians. Um and uh, And so, you know, prop thirty definitely has the the potential to make electric bikes affordable to many, many more Californians. Um! Who uh, who are looking to purchase those um. And uh, you know, California has set a goal on the electric side. Um to produce all its electricity from uh from uh,

363

01:03:22.620 --> 01:03:52.510

Nick Josefowitz: zero from zero carbon sources, um, and and we're sort of more or less on track to meet that target. Um, And so uh the uh, the over time. All already. California produces well over fifty percent of its electricity from zero carbon sources, Um. And and pretty quickly. We're going to be getting to a hundred, so I don't think that there's a a sort of a particularly big risk, and and the the studies show very clearly that electric vehicles Um, in a place like California are far from

364

01:03:52.520 --> 01:03:54.779

Nick Josefowitz: more environmentally

365

01:03:54.940 --> 01:04:03.499

Nick Josefowitz: uh have a thought, produce far, far fewer co carbon emissions than um than their fossil fuel powered counterparts.

366

01:04:06.510 --> 01:04:08.529

Jackson Nutt-Beers / SPUR: Awesome! Um,

367

01:04:08.820 --> 01:04:19.850

Jackson Nutt-Beers / SPUR: Thank you so much, Nick. So Kevin asks. Can you share a document that outlines your analysis? Process. Do you know if that if we have a document that would outline that process?

368

01:04:20.020 --> 01:04:34.739

Paloma Sisneros-Lobato: So we currently um. We have a kind of internal document that we use to um inform that process that we have yet to share externally. So I think that that is something I will take back to the team, and we can work on um something, maybe, to to share out with folks

369

01:04:35.440 --> 01:04:55.319

Jackson Nutt-Beers / SPUR: awesome. Thanks. Lemma um! Mikayla also asks, Is there a history, a history of labor to speeds associated with prop twenty-nine. So, Jessica, I think that one is for you. Yeah. So I can touch on. That So the um proposition was brought onto the ballot by the Labor Union organization.

370

01:04:55.330 --> 01:05:00.500

Jessica Peyton / SPUR Public Programs: Um, And the opposition to this measure uh is

371

01:05:00.610 --> 01:05:02.589

Jessica Peyton / SPUR Public Programs: these are saying that

372

01:05:02.800 --> 01:05:13.970

Jessica Peyton / SPUR Public Programs: Um Sc. I you is using this proposition as an attempt to unionize dialysis workers. However, they say that there isn't substantial evidence that this is actually necessary.

373

01:05:16.950 --> 01:05:34.670

Nick Josefowitz: Great thanks, Cisco um! And then, Nick when this from thirty questions, so I can just take them all if you want Jackson. So I have to go ahead. And this barities in the funding for and against prop thirty. So um the the sort of I don't know the exact latest numbers. But you you have about um

374

01:05:34.680 --> 01:06:04.660

Nick Josefowitz: sort of fifteen million dollars. I think that has been spent uh against prop thirty Um! No! Over ninety percent of that fund. Almost all of that funding has come from some of the wealthiest Californians who would be? It would have to pay an additional um tax on uh who would have to pay the additional tax. Um! And we were actually told to some of the fundraising materials for the No. One. Thirty campaign asks wealthy donors to calculate how much they would have to pay in tax over the next few years if this passes,

375

01:06:04.690 --> 01:06:22.929

Nick Josefowitz: and then t their contribution levels off of that um on the yes, on thirty Um! It's about, I think, just over forty million dollars, which is just a unbelievable amount of money, except in the context of California ballot measures um and um, and it's primarily funded by left.

376

01:06:23.200 --> 01:06:41.020

Nick Josefowitz: Um uh the the the right check company um lyft um has a uh as a really isn't a really interesting position where um it it is. It's required to the most of the most of the vehic. Most of its um rides have to be um

377

01:06:41.070 --> 01:06:58.689

Nick Josefowitz: done on on zero mission vehicles by two thousand and thirty. Um! But it also is sort of very committed to to sort of fighting climate change, and understand that for it to achieve its goals, of of providing zero mission vehicles uh having all its rides on zoom rooms, your mission vehicles.

378

01:06:58.700 --> 01:07:09.710

Nick Josefowitz: You basically need to get all of California on to zero Mission vehicles, and so well, under one of the measures investments, would actually go to benefit, lift, or lift drivers.

379

01:07:09.720 --> 01:07:25.230

Nick Josefowitz: So just to say that again, less than one percent of the measures investments would go to benefit, lift, or lift drivers, and there are no carve outs for lift or lift drivers in the measure. Um, but it's really a kind of a an acknowledgment by a company which I so I think, is

380

01:07:25.240 --> 01:07:38.999

Nick Josefowitz: it's sort of quite impressive that. Um! That rather than that, they're going to help all of California reach its goals, and they're going to help all Californians um, especially low income Californians transition to zero emission transportation.

381

01:07:39.060 --> 01:07:40.229

Nick Josefowitz: Um!

382

01:07:40.920 --> 01:07:49.049

Nick Josefowitz: Why did Spur choose to work on this initiative rather than working in the Legislature to achieve the same goals from Elliot? I think it's a good question. Um,

383

01:07:49.120 --> 01:08:16.739

Nick Josefowitz: you know tax measures are just different than than legislation. Um! And California has a uh The California Constitution makes it almost impossible to pass tax measures um through the Legislature because of the very, very, very high threshold. And I think that was an intentional, that um, when when those constitutional amendments were passed in the seventeenth and eighties, it was really designed to to to sort of prevent the Legislature from increasing taxes.

384

01:08:16.750 --> 01:08:26.410

Nick Josefowitz: Um, and actually um. It sort of gives the power over to the voters much more to kind of sort of manage the physical policy.

385

01:08:26.420 --> 01:08:52.749

Nick Josefowitz: I I think That's I. You know I I don't think that system works super well. Um! And I wish it didn't exist, but that is the system that we have um and uh. And so that's the system that we have to work within. Well for the other other measures. Um! There is no additional threshold that needs to be passed that there there's no sort of constitutional requirement sort of limits that make it very difficult to pass

386

01:08:52.760 --> 01:09:03.609

Nick Josefowitz: these measures. Um through the legislature. And so that's Why, we kind of um took a different perspective on those other measures. Um! And then um

387

01:09:04.460 --> 01:09:22.609

Nick Josefowitz: from thirty feels like throwing from Peter. Prop thirty feels like um throwing a lot of money at a uh to to fight climate change reactively with a more proactive approach. Fun behavior change, such as getting more people out of cars. I assume. Um, Peter, and you know I I think

388

01:09:22.760 --> 01:09:29.139

Nick Josefowitz: we need to. We need to address climate change, and we are not. We need to do both.

389

01:09:29.500 --> 01:09:47.860

Nick Josefowitz: We need to get fewer people driving alone, and spur does an enormous amount of work on that um, and by funding transit, making transit work better, making it easier for people to bike um, uh, and and a whole number building sort of workable communities,

390

01:09:47.870 --> 01:10:07.770

Nick Josefowitz: um, et cetera. Whole lot of things that we need to do, and the huge benefits to that. But that alone is not sufficient to deal with climate change, because we really need to zero out emissions from vehicles. We don't need to reduce it a little bit. We need to zero it out. If we're going to have a chance of reducing greenhouse gas emissions to a level which will prevent

391

01:10:07.780 --> 01:10:21.059

Nick Josefowitz: the most catastrophic impacts of global warming. And so we need to sort of. We need to do these two things at the same time. We need to support all vehicles transitioning to zero mission, and we need to help people

392

01:10:21.070 --> 01:10:30.570

Nick Josefowitz: get out of there. Uh, we need to give people much better options and create the right incentives for people not to drive alone as much. Um. And and I think prop thirty

393

01:10:30.580 --> 01:10:45.350

Nick Josefowitz: does a lot of that. That sort of really focuses more on on the vehicle side, but does, but also makes huge investments in in transit and school buses and and bike and bike infrastructure. That, I think, will also be transformative in that regard. Um!

394

01:10:45.360 --> 01:10:56.139

Nick Josefowitz: So uh, thank you very much for all those great questions about prop thirty. It is a it's a It's a really important one. Um, but it's uh is dealing with a really big issue.

395

01:10:58.280 --> 01:11:27.730

Jackson Nutt-Beers / SPUR: Awesome. Thank you so much for taking all those on Nick. Um, let's look like we are at time. Um, So I just want to thank everybody today for joining us uh for our state measure spotlight, like I had already mentioned. We have two more events coming up next week on Tuesday and Wednesday, so be sure to check those um out on our website as spread dot org. So everybody enjoy the rest of your day and have a great rest of your week.

396

01:11:28.040 --> 01:11:29.110

Jackson Nutt-Beers / SPUR: Bye, guys.