October 11, 2022

Honorable Board of Supervisors
Marin County Civic Center
San Rafael, CA 94903

Re: Consider “Support” Resolutions Regarding Propositions 1, 28, and 31; “Oppose” Resolutions Regarding Propositions 26-27; and provide direction regarding Propositions 29-30 appearing on the November 8, 2022 Statewide Ballot

Dear Supervisors:

RECOMMENDATION: Consider adopting “Support” resolutions relating to Propositions 1, 28, and 31; “Oppose” resolutions regarding Propositions 26-27; and provide direction regarding Propositions 29-30 appearing on the November 8, 2022 Statewide Ballot.

BACKGROUND: There are seven measures on the November 8, 2022 statewide ballot. Absentee ballots are being mailed by the Registrar of Voters beginning October 10. We are bringing forward a high-level overview regarding these measures with recommended “Support” positions on three and “Oppose” positions on two. Based on prior Board policy, and consultation with your Board’s Legislative Subcommittee of Supervisors Moulton-Peters and Arnold, we are not recommending positions regarding the remaining two but welcome any direction from your Board. To better assist your Board, we are framing the seven measures into two broad categories:

A. Recommended position: “Support” or “Oppose” based on past Board policy action or consistency with the Legislative Plan; or
B. “No position recommended”: Because the measure does not directly comport with County government or policy, or based upon the recommendation of your Board’s Legislative Subcommittee.

In summary, we are proposing the following recommended positions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposition</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prop 1: Reproductive freedoms</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prop 26: In-person gambling on tribal lands and sports betting</td>
<td>Oppose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prop 27: Online sports betting</td>
<td>Oppose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prop 28: Arts and music education funding</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prop 29: Kidney dialysis clinics</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prop 30: New tax on incomes &gt;$2m for zero-emission vehicles</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prop 31: Ban on retail sale of flavored tobacco products</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary background information can be found in Attachment A, a Quick-Reference Guide prepared by the California Secretary of State. The full Official Voter
Information Guide (112 pages) is available from the Secretary of State's website at: https://vig.cdn.sos.ca.gov/2022/general/pdf/complete-vig.pdf. Specific ballot language is also available from the Secretary of State's website at: https://www.sos.ca.gov/elections/ballot-measures/qualified-ballot-measures.

Statewide ballot propositions require a simple majority of voters to pass. For informational purposes, the nonpartisan Public Policy Institute of California (PPIC) conducted polling on Propositions 1, 27 and 30 in September; please see below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposition</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prop 1</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prop 27</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prop 30</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Public Policy Institute of California (PPIC). The poll surveyed 1,060 likely voters from September 2-11.

A. RECOMMENDED POSITION (SUPPORT OR OPPOSE)

PROPOSITION 1 would codify reproductive freedoms in the California State Constitution, approving a constitutional amendment which states the fundamental right to an abortion and use of contraceptives in California.

The impetus for Proposition 1 was the May 2022 leak of the draft US Supreme Court opinion on the Dobbs case, which ultimately precipitated the Court’s final decision in June to overturn Roe vs. Wade - removing the federal right to an abortion and allowing individual states to set their own laws on reproductive rights and abortion access. Of note, on September 13 U.S. Senator Lindsey Graham of South Carolina proposed a federal bill that would ban abortions nationwide after 15 weeks of pregnancy, with exceptions for rape, incest and pregnancies that threaten maternal health. This follows on a number of states now considering or having enacted new restrictions since the Dobbs decision.

The California Constitution currently provides a “right to privacy” regarding reproductive care, and state law has since been passed to allow individuals the choice to have an abortion or use contraceptives. However, Proposition 1 would further codify these rights by adding the following section directly to Article I of the State Constitution:

“The state shall not deny or interfere with an individual's reproductive freedom in their most intimate decisions, which includes their fundamental right to choose to have an abortion and their fundamental right to choose or refuse contraceptives.”

Supporters include California Senate pro tempore Toni Atkins and Assembly Speaker Anthony Rendon who co-authored the proposed constitutional amendment. Other officials supporting the proposition include Governor Gavin Newsom, and US Senators Dianne Feinstein and Alex Padilla. Groups supporting the measure include Planned Parenthood Affiliates of California, the California Nurses Association, the California Teachers Association, and the California Medical Association.
Opponents include Republican State Senator Brian Dahle and Assemblymembers Megan Dahle and Jim Patterson, who co-wrote the official argument against Proposition 1. The Republican Party of California, the California Conference of Catholic Bishops, and Democrats for Life of America have all issued statements in opposition of Proposition 1. Opponents generally argue that the amendment to the State Constitution is unnecessary as California law already guarantees the right to access abortion, and the proposed change would allow taxpayer funds (through Medi-Cal recipients) to be used for late-term abortions.

Recommended Position
Consistent with Board policy and the Legislative Plan to support efforts to expand health coverage and access including an individual’s right to personal choice in their reproductive care, we recommend a SUPPORT position on Proposition 1.

PROPOSITION 26 would allow in-person sports betting at tribal casinos and privately operated horse racetracks, as well additional types of in-person gambling at tribal casinos for persons over 21.

While current state law does not allow for sports betting or gambling, Native American tribes have federal rights to govern themselves on their lands including the right to offer gambling – and the state is required to negotiate compacts with tribes seeking to do so. In California there are currently 79 negotiated compacts with federally recognized tribes that allow for in-person slot machines and other gambling activities on tribal lands. None currently exist in Marin County.

Sports betting was illegal under federal law until the U.S. Supreme Court overturned a federal ban in 2018. Since then, more than half of states have legalized sports betting. Proposition 26 would make California the next to do so. Specifically, the measure would allow the state’s four privately operated racetracks, as well as tribal casinos, to offer in-person sports betting. One of these privately operated racetracks is Golden Gate Fields in Berkeley.

The measure would also allow additional types of gambling at tribal casinos, including roulette and games played with dice. Any expanded gambling authorized under Proposition 26 on tribal lands in California would be required to create or amend negotiated compacts with the state before any authorized new gaming could take place. For many years, the County’s Legislative Plan has advocated that any such compacts should balance tribal, local, state and federal concerns while protecting or enhancing state and local government authority to mitigate the off-reservation impacts of gaming, which can be substantial.

The measure would also allow a new civil enforcement method against illegal gambling, which would allow people or entities that believe someone is breaking existing or new gambling and sports betting laws to file a civil lawsuit. It is possible that the new civil enforcement method would adversely affect legal cardrooms in 32 counties, which can be an important source of revenue for some local governments. While Marin has one operating cardroom in San Rafael, the City of San Rafael has indicated that the revenue it receives is not significant such that passage would adversely impact City operations.
The Legislative Analyst’s Office forecasts that passage of Proposition 26 would increase state revenues up to tens of millions of dollars annually, collected as a direct and indirect share of new spending on sports wagering and additional gambling games allowed. The measure would require 10 percent of sports bets made on non-tribal lands each day to be deposited into a newly created California Sports Wagering Fund (CSWF). While the measure does not require a specific share of revenues be deposited into the new CSWF, it does require that tribes pay the state for the cost of regulating sports betting at tribal casinos.

Revenues generated in the new CSWF would be used first towards supporting a higher minimum state spending amount for K-12 and community college education in California. Once the new minimum education amount is met, funds can then be used to support state regulatory costs. Any remaining funds would then be used for: gambling addiction and mental health programs (15 percent); sports betting and gambling enforcement costs (15 percent); and deposited into the state General Fund (70 percent). The new civil enforcement method approved with the measure, in addition to new state enforcement and regulation required with legalized sports wagering, would result in increased costs to the state of tens of millions of dollars annually. These costs may be offset by new state revenues described above.

It is anticipated the measure would bring minimal, if any, positive economic benefit to Marin County to offset any adverse off-reservation impacts of expanded gaming in nearby Alameda and Sonoma Counties. It is also worth noting that Proposition 26 would result in new sports wagering opportunities at the nearby Golden Gate Fields horse racetrack in Berkeley – a private, non-tribal establishment.

Supporters include California’s casino-owning tribes, who generally argue that the measure builds on the legacy of allowing California’s tribes to operate safe, well-regulated gaming that provides critical resources and jobs to tribal communities. They also argue that the measure would bring new revenues not only to tribes but statewide through the creation of the CSWF.

Opponents include the California Republican Party and American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees (AFSCME) and generally argue that the measure’s new civil enforcement mechanism would significantly impact local revenues and jobs from legal cardrooms due to the increase in civil suits filed. Additionally, opponents argue that the negative public health impacts of added gambling opportunities, including gambling addiction, could outweigh the benefit from new statewide revenues.

Both the California State Association of Counties (CSAC) and the League of California Cities have taken a neutral position on Proposition 26.

Recommended Position
Consistent with Board policy and the Legislative Plan to prioritize the mental health and wellbeing of Marin residents, and the potential negative public health impacts associated with expanding gambling opportunities in nearby Sonoma and Alameda counties, we recommend an **OPPOSE** position on Proposition 26.
**PROPOSITION 27** would allow tribes and/or gambling companies to offer online sports betting and gambling to persons over 21 in California.

Tribes with negotiated compacts with the state for gambling operations, as well as certain licensed gambling companies partnering with tribes who have a negotiated compact, would be allowed to apply for a five-year license to offer online sports betting. Only larger gambling companies with operations in more than 10 states would be allowed to apply for a license.

Like Proposition 26, the passage of Proposition 27 would not result in an automatic allowance for all casino-owning tribes to begin offering online sports betting. Tribes would first need to amend or create their existing negotiated compacts with the state accordingly. The measure would require that 10 percent of sports bets made go to the state in a newly created fund: the California Online Sports Betting Trust Fund (COSBTF). The revenues in the new fund would first be used to cover new state regulatory costs associated with the legalization of online gaming. Remaining funds in the new COSBTF would be used as follows:

- Homelessness and gambling addiction programs (85 percent)
- Financial support for governance, health, economic development and other issues for tribes not involved in online sports betting (15 percent)

The measure would mandate the creation of a new online sports betting regulatory unit within the state Department of Justice. Additionally, new fines and penalties would be imposed with the intent of reducing illegal online sports betting. All revenue from fines and penalties would be deposited into the COSBTF.

The Legislative Analyst’s Office (LAO) has determined that the measure would result in increased state revenues, but the size remains uncertain as it would depend on the outcome of the amended negotiated compacts between casino-owning tribes, and state and local governments. The LAO estimates that state revenues could be increased by hundreds of millions of dollars annually, and though some of that revenue would be new revenue from individuals that were not previously engaging in gambling activities – some of that revenue would result from individuals simply shifting from other legal gambling.

**Supporters** include large, online and out-of-state gambling companies, including FanDuel (New York) and Draft Kings (Boston), as well as Major League Baseball and three of California’s 110 federally recognized tribes. They generally argue that the proposition would generate significant revenues that could make a meaningful impact on solving the state’s homelessness crisis.

**Opponents** include most of California’s casino-owning Native American tribes, the California Democratic Party, the California Republican Party, the California State Association of Counties (CSAC), and the League of California Cities. They generally argue that the proposition would undermine the economic gains from expanded gambling on tribal lands of the last two decades; reopen the 79 compacts negotiated to mitigate the off-reservation impacts of gaming in local communities; and that large online non-tribal owned gaming corporations based out of state will reap most profits generated under Proposition 27. Therefore, any new revenues generated under Proposition 27 are likely to have minimal positive impact on California’s economy.
Public Health experts have also noted that increased access to addictive activities (which includes gambling and wagering) increases the number of people addicted, and the online option to participate in gambling activities that Proposition 27 would enable would certainly increase access. Additionally, gambling addiction and related debt disproportionally impacts lower-income individuals.

**Recommended Position**
Consistent with Board policy and the Legislative Plan to prioritize the mental health and wellbeing of Marin residents, and acknowledging the negative public health impacts associated with additional gambling opportunities online, we recommend an **OPPOSE** position on Proposition 27.

**PROPOSITION 28** would require a new annual set-aside of state funding for arts and music education for California’s K-12 public schools. Beginning in 2023, that set-aside for arts education would be equal to 1 percent of the total constitutionally required funding that public schools received the prior year. Therefore, Proposition 28 would increase the overall level of state and local funding for K-12 schools since it would require a maintenance of the existing level of funding, and require an additional 1 percent of that level reserved for arts education.

The total set-aside for arts education under Proposition 28 is expected to be $1 billion annually. The measure allows the state Legislature to reduce this new arts education funding during years when less than the total constitutionally required funding for schools is approved, however this reduction cannot be more (in percentage terms) than the reduction made for total school funding.

Proposition 28 requires 70 percent of the new arts education funds to be distributed to schools based on their enrollment, and 30 percent to schools based on their share of low-income students.

School districts would be required to spend at least 80 percent of the new funding to hire new staff, and the remaining funds could be used for training, supplies and materials, and partnership programs. Schools would have up to three years to spend the funding, and any funds unspent after three years would be subject to reversion by the California Department of Education and redistributed throughout the state.

Many public schools in Marin County have been able to offer more robust arts and music education programming with financial support from local school district foundations, which privately fundraise. Because Proposition 28 requires that 30 percent revenues go to schools based on their share of low-income students, Proposition 28 is likely to result in a more equitable formula for funding arts and music education statewide.

Of note, Proposition 28 requires a net increase in state General Fund support for public schools without the creation of a new revenue source. Therefore, should the measure pass, Marin would closely watch the development of the new state General Fund allocation process to ensure the State does not attempt to shift local property tax funding for state benefit, which would negatively impact funding for critical local public services.
Supporters include the proposition’s sponsor, former Los Angeles Unified School District superintendent Austin Beutner, as well as California State Assembly Speaker Anthony Rendon and a number of arts, music and education labor organizations.

Currently no opponents or arguments against Proposition 28 have been submitted to the Secretary of State.

Recommended Position
Consistent with Board policy and the Legislative Plan to improve arts and cultural programming in public education in a more equitable manner, we recommend a SUPPORT position on Proposition 28.

PROPPOSITION 31 would ban the sale of flavored tobacco from all in-person stores and vending machines in California (consistent with Senate Bill 793 signed by the Governor in 2020). This includes flavored tobacco in cigarettes (such as menthol), as well as in battery-operated devices such as e-cigarettes and vapes. The ban under Proposition 31 would not apply to so-called shisha (hookah) tobacco, cigars, and loose-leaf tobacco.

Senate Bill 793 did not go into effect in 2020 because at the time of its passage a referendum on the bill qualified for the November 2022 ballot; Proposition 31 is that referendum. Under California state law, when a new law qualifies for as an upcoming statewide ballot measure, the law will not go into effect until voters decide the outcome of the referendum in the upcoming election.

In addition to banning the sale of flavored tobacco products, Proposition 31 would impose a $250 per incidence penalty against stores and vending machine owners who violate the ban.

Jurisdictions in California have the authority to regulate the sale of tobacco within their localities, and many are already ahead of Proposition 31. In November 2018, your Board approved a ban on flavored tobacco and vaping products in tobacco stores in unincorporated Marin. Other local municipalities have similarly banned the sale of flavored tobacco products as of July 2022, including Corte Madera, Larkspur, Mill Valley, Novato, Ross, San Anselmo, San Rafael, Sausalito and Tiburon. Therefore, it is anticipated that the greatest impact of this measure to Marin County residents would be to also ban the sale of these products in nearby jurisdictions that do not currently have bans in place, such as Petaluma and Santa Rosa.

Since the ban on flavored tobacco products is intended to result in lower overall public consumption of tobacco products, it is anticipated that approval would also reduce state tobacco tax revenues. However, the magnitude of this reduction depends on how consumer behavior changes in response to the ban: e.g., whether individual consumers switch to non-flavored tobacco products, or they reduce their total consumption of tobacco products. Should the latter be more common, the immediate revenue loss due to reduced tobacco product consumption could be up to $100 million annually. While there would be immediate revenue reduction associated with lower tobacco product consumption, there would also be long-term savings for state and local governments resulting from a reduction in the adverse health impacts associated with tobacco use.
Supporters include Kaiser Health, the American Heart Association, the American Lung Association, the Cancer Action Network and the California Teachers Association.

Opponents include several large tobacco companies, which secured the two-year delay of Senate Bill 793 going into effect by qualifying the law for this referendum.

Recommended Position
Consistent with Board policy and the Legislative Plan to support restrictions on the sale of flavored tobacco products, which disproportionately impact youth and communities of color, we recommend a SUPPORT position on Proposition 31.

B. NO POSITION RECOMMENDED (NEUTRAL)

Based on prior Board policy, and/or based upon the recommendation of the Legislative Subcommittee, we are not recommending a formal Board position on the following measures, but we welcome any Board direction. We are prepared to return the following week with a formal position should your Board so direct.

PROPOSITION 29 would mandate that every kidney dialysis clinic in California have a medical professional (a physician, nurse practitioner, or physician assistant) on-site during all patient treatment hours. Additionally, the measure would require clinics to regularly report to the California Department of Public Health (CDPH) infection-related information, as well as information on clinic ownership. Finally, the measure would require CDPH to sign off on any clinic closure and would prohibit clinics from refusing care to a patient based on the method of payment or treatment.

California currently has about 650 licensed chronic dialysis clinics, which serve roughly 80,000 patients per month. The requirement for an on-site medical professional at every clinic would increase clinic operating costs by several hundred thousand dollars per clinic annually on average. These increased operating costs to clinics are anticipated to cause increase rates for dialysis treatment and/or will be absorbed by the clinics causing lower profits and likely some clinic closures.

The increased rates that would result from the measure would be passed on to state and local governments through increased Medi-Cal costs, and insurance plan costs for employees. The additional cost impact to state and local governments in anticipated to be tens of millions of dollars annually.

Recommended Position
Neutral. Proposition 29 is considered very similar to Proposition 23 that appeared on the state ballot in 2020 and failed 48 percent to 52 percent. A similar measure also failed previous to the 2020 effort. We have previously remained Neutral for lack of a direct nexus to County operations, and we recommend doing so again.

PROPOSITION 30 would require a new 1.75 percent tax on personal incomes above $2.0 million annually to fund zero-emission vehicle uptake, and wildfire prevention and response efforts in California. The new tax would begin January 2023 and end by January 2043 (20 years).
The revenues generated through the new tax would be used for zero-emission vehicle programs (80 percent) and wildfire response and prevention (20 percent) efforts. Of the 80 percent of total funds required for zero-emission vehicles, about less than half (44 percent) must be used to install and operate charging and fueling stations, and more than half (56 percent) must be used as direct payment subsidies to help individuals, businesses and government entities purchase electric vehicles.

Proposition 30 is anticipated to generate $3.5 to $5 billion in new revenues annually and would increase over time. Funding for zero-emission vehicles is projected to increase by $2.8 to $4 billion annually, and funding for wildfire activities would increase $700 million to $1 billion annually.

It is important to note that recently state regulators voted to require that all new passenger cars and light trucks sold in California be zero-emission by 2035. As a result of this regulatory action, passage of Proposition 30 is not anticipated to have a significant effect on the total number of zero-emission vehicles driven in California. However, the measure would provide a new source of revenue to help pay for the (soon to be required) zero-emission vehicles. The measure would in effect shift some of the cost of this required transition to zero-emission vehicles from car manufacturers, individuals, businesses and government entities to high-income earners in the state through the new tax and resulting subsidies.

Of note, Proposition 30 could have implications for the State Appropriation’s Limit, also known as the “Gann Limit”. The Gann Limit is a statutory requirement which limits how the Legislature can use revenues exceeding a specific threshold, and once it is reached, the state must either 1) return the excess to taxpayers (through rebates and more spending for schools); or 2) spend more on Limit-excluded expenses (which includes some of Proposition 30’s proposed spending including responding to emergencies and building infrastructure).

The state faces Gann Limit risk absent passage of Proposition 30, so its passage would likely exacerbate this risk and could create unintended reductions to State funding in other areas. The LAO forecasts that $1.5 to $3 billion of the new revenues generated through Proposition 30 could count towards the State Appropriations Limit as new, non-excludable expenses. Because the measure would amend the California constitution to mandate these new expenditures on zero-emission vehicle and wildfire programs, this would mean that - should the state reach the Gann Limit
in the future - then the state must reduce an equal amount of spending from other programs to "make room" for Proposition 30's new mandated spending (which could mean reductions in other high priority areas such as healthcare, housing and education).

Supporters include the California Democratic Party, California Environmental Voters, the State Building and Construction Trades Council of California, the California State Association of Electrical Workers and the rideshare company Lyft. Separately passed state law mandates that ride-hailing companies like Lyft will be required by the state to log 90 percent of their miles in electric vehicles by 2030.

Opponents include the California Teachers Association, Governor Gavin Newsom, the California Chamber of Commerce and the Howard Jarvis Taxpayers Association. They, as well as the Editorial boards of major publications, such as the Sacramento Bee and Los Angeles Times, generally argue the measure is backed and funded by special interests (Lyft) seeking to financially gain from the measure.

Recommended Position
Neutral. While the environmental goals of Proposition 30 align with Board policy to support greater adoption of zero-emission vehicles, and additional funding for wildfire fighting efforts would certainly be welcome, we highlight the LAO's analysis that passage of the Proposition is not likely to change the number of zero-emission vehicles on the road in California (given recent regulatory actions mandating that all new passenger cars and light trucks sold in California be zero-emission by 2035).

There are also significant new federal and state monies coming to California for zero-emission vehicles – independent of the passage of Proposition 30 – under the recently legislated federal Inflation Reduction Act and last year's Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act.

Additionally, under the measure as written, all the non-wildfire revenues generated under the measure (60 percent) are to be used strictly for zero-emission passenger vehicle programs. The measure would not generate new funds to be used towards other important emission reduction initiatives consistent with the County's Climate Action Plan, such as bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure and public transit.

Finally, the Proposition could adversely impact other state expenditures resulting from the measure's impact to the state Gann Limit. The new expenditures mandated under the measure could mean unintended consequences of forcing decreased state spending in other high priority areas such as healthcare, housing and education.

Please feel free to contact us should you have any questions or concerns regarding any of the above ballot measures.

Submitted by:  
Talia Smith  
Principal Administrative Analyst

Reviewed by:  
Daniel Eilerman  
Assistant County Administrator
Resolutions in Support of Propositions 1, 28, and 31 and in Opposition to Propositions 26-27

Attachment A: Quick-Reference Guide, California Secretary of State

Attachment B: LAO Fiscal Summary and Analysis
RESOLUTION NO. 2022-113
RESOLUTION OF THE MARIN COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
IN SUPPORT OF PROPOSITION 1 ON THE NOVEMBER 8, 2022 STATEWIDE BALLOT
“CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT TO REPRODUCTIVE FREEDOM. LEGISLATIVE
CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT.”

WHEREAS, Proposition 1 would codify reproductive freedoms in the California State Constitution, approving a constitutional amendment which states the fundamental right to an abortion and use of contraceptives in California; and

WHEREAS, supporters of Proposition 1 include California Senate pro tempore Toni Atkins and Assembly Speaker Anthony Rendon, who co-authored the proposed constitutional amendment. Other officials supporting the proposition include Governor Gavin Newsom and U.S. Senators Dianne Feinstein and Alex Padilla. Groups supporting the measure include Planned Parenthood Affiliates of California, the California Nurses Association, the California Teachers Association, and the California Medical Association; and

WHEREAS, Proposition 1 is consistent with the Marin County Legislative Plan to support efforts to expand health coverage and access including an individual’s right to personal choice in their reproductive care.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Supervisors of the County of Marin hereby SUPPORTS Proposition 1 and urges its residents to vote “YES” on Proposition 1 on November 8, 2022.

PASSED AND ADOPTED at a regular meeting of the Board of Supervisors of the County of Marin held on this 11th day of October 2022, by the following vote:

AYES: SUPERVISORS Dennis Rodoni, Judy Arnold, Damon Connolly, Stephanie Moulton-Peters, Katie Rice
NOES: NONE
ABSENT: NONE

ATTEST:

PRESIDENT, BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

CLERK
RESOLUTION NO. 2022-115
RESOLUTION OF THE MARIN COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
IN OPPOSITION TO PROPOSITION 27 ON THE NOVEMBER 8, 2022 STATEWIDE BALLOT
“ALLOWS ONLINE AND MOBILE SPORTS WAGERING OUTSIDE TRIBAL LANDS.
INITIATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT AND STATUTE.”

WHEREAS, Proposition 27 would allow tribes and/or gambling companies to offer online
sports betting and gambling to persons over 21; and

WHEREAS, the measure would allow tribes with negotiated compacts for gambling
operations, as well as large gambling companies with operations in more than 10 states, to offer
online sports betting to Californians; and

WHEREAS, supporters of the measure include predominately large, out-of-state
gambling companies, including Fan Duel (New York) and Draft Kings (Boston), as well as Major
League Baseball and only three of California’s 110 federally recognized tribes; and

WHEREAS, opponents include most of California’s casino-owning Native American
tribes, the California Democratic Party, the California Republican Party, the California State
Association of Counties and the League of California Cities, who generally argue that the
proposition would undermine the economic gains from expanded gambling on tribal lands of the
last two decades, secured by 79 negotiated compacts among tribes, the state, and local
governments, and that large online non-tribal owned gaming corporations based out of state will
reap most profits generated under Proposition 27; and

WHEREAS, opposition to Proposition 27 is consistent with the Marin County Legislative
Plan to prioritize the mental health and wellbeing of Marin residents, acknowledging the negative
public health impacts associated with additional gambling opportunities online.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Supervisors of the County of
Marin hereby OPPOSES Proposition 27 and urges its residents to vote “NO” on Proposition 27
on November 8, 2022.

PASSED AND ADOPTED at a regular meeting of the Board of Supervisors of the
County of Marin held on this 11th day of October 2022, by the following vote:

AYES: SUPERVISORS Dennis Rodoni, Judy Arnold, Damon Connolly,
Stephanie Moulton-Peters, Katie Rice

NOES: NONE

ABSENT: NONE

ATTEST: ________________

PRESIDENT, BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

CLERK

Resolution No. 2022-115
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RESOLUTION NO. 2022-116
RESOLUTION OF THE MARIN COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
IN SUPPORT OF PROPOSITION 28 ON THE NOVEMBER 8, 2022 STATEWIDE BALLOT
"PROVIDES ADDITIONAL FUNDING FOR ARTS AND MUSIC EDUCATION IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS. INITIATIVE STATUTE."

WHEREAS, Proposition 28 would require a new annual set-aside of roughly $1 billion in state funding for arts and music education for California’s K-12 public schools; and

WHEREAS, supporters of Proposition include the proposition’s sponsor, former Los Angeles Unified School District superintendent Austin Beutner, as well as California State Assembly Speaker Anthony Rendon, and a number of arts, music and education labor organizations. No opponents or arguments against Proposition 28 have been submitted to the Secretary of State; and

WHEREAS, Proposition 28 is consistent with the Marin County Legislative Plan to improve arts and cultural programming in public education in a more equitable manner; and

WHEREAS, overall, 70 percent of the new arts education funds would be distributed to schools based on their enrollment, and 30 percent to schools based on their share of low-income students, ensuring a more equitable delivery of arts and cultural programming to California school children.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Supervisors of the County of Marin hereby SUPPORTS Proposition 28 and urges its residents to vote “YES” on Proposition 28 on November 8, 2022.

PASSED AND ADOPTED at a regular meeting of the Board of Supervisors of the County of Marin held on this 11th day of October 2022, by the following vote:

AYES: SUPERVISORS Dennis Rodoni, Judy Arnold, Damon Connolly, Stephanie Moulton-Peters, Katie Rice

NOES: NONE

ABSENT: NONE

ATTEST:

CLERK

PRESIDENT, BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Resolution No. 2022-116
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RESOLUTION NO. 2022-117
RESOLUTION OF THE MARIN COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
IN SUPPORT OF PROPOSITION 31 ON THE NOVEMBER 8, 2022 STATEWIDE BALLOT
"REFERENDUM ON 2020 LAW THAT WOULD PROHIBIT THE RETAIL SALE OF CERTAIN
FLAVORED TOBACCO PRODUCTS."

WHEREAS, Proposition 31 would ban the sale of flavored tobacco from all in-person
stores and vending machines in California; and

WHEREAS, the ban proposed under Proposition 31 would be a statewide version of the
ban on the sale of flavored tobacco and vaping products in tobacco stores in unincorporated Marin
approved by your Board in November 2018, and which Corte Madera, Larkspur, Mill Valley,
Novato, Ross, San Anselmo, San Rafael, Sausalito and Tiburon have all similarly enacted; and

WHEREAS, supporters of Proposition include Kaiser Health, the American Heart
Association, the American Lung Association, the Cancer Action Network and the California
Teachers Association; and

WHEREAS, Proposition 31 is consistent with the Marin County Legislative Plan to
support restrictions on the sale of flavored tobacco products, which disproportionately impact
youth and communities of color.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Supervisors of the County of
Marin hereby SUPPORTS Proposition 31 and urges its residents to vote “YES” on Proposition 31
on November 8, 2022.

PASSED AND ADOPTED at a regular meeting of the Board of Supervisors of the
County of Marin held on this 11th day of October 2022, by the following vote:

AYES: SUPERVISORS Dennis Rodoni, Judy Arnold, Damon Connolly,
Stephanie Moulton-Peters, Katie Rice

NOES: NONE

ABSENT: NONE

ATTEST: PRESIDENT, BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

PRESIDENT, BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

CLERK