



BRAIN TRUST LIVE PRESENTS

WWW.BRAINTRUSTLIVE.COM

**A GUIDE TO THE
CALIFORNIA
PROPS
NOV. 2022**

FEATURING THE UNSOLICITED OPINIONS OF:

LILA NORDSTROM / BRENT THORNBURG



BRAIN TRUST LIVE'S

California Proposition Cheat Sheet

General Election, November 2022

PROP	DESCRIPTION	VOTE	WHY?
1	Establishes a state constitutional right to reproductive freedom, including the right to an abortion.	YES, w/ gusto	<p>This is a pretty easy yes if you're a person who enjoys having a modicum of control over your body, finances, and general liberty. Also, if you're a person who cares about other people. Also, if you want to ensure that future federal Roe-bashing laws have at least a fighting chance of being challenged in the great state of California. Though the CA props are known for sneaky language, this one is pretty straightforward and similar to amendments being considered in Vermont, Kentucky, and Kansas (where it's already passed). It states: "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." Cool, sounds great.</p> <p>Obviously, Republicans and some Catholics are against it. They are claiming abortions are an extension of "throw-away culture" which is an amazing rhetorical framing for an issue that is about healthcare, so honestly...a pat on the back for whoever came up with that branding. They also say it'll allow late-term abortions to which we say: um, good. People deserve access to those too. That's healthcare, sorry 'bout it.</p>
26	Legalizes sports betting at American Indian gaming casinos and licensed racetracks in California.	YES	<p>Prop 26 is approaching the spending record set by Prop 22, and it's not even close to the most expensive race on the ballot (see Prop 27). The measure would allow federally recognized Native American tribes to operate roulette, dice games, and sports betting on their tribal lands for those over 21. It would also impose a 10% tax on racetrack winnings, which would go partially to the General Fund, partially towards a trust that goes to both gaming and non-gaming tribes, and partially into a fund to combat gambling addiction (lol).</p> <p>We've all been inundated for months now with ads related to 26 and 27, and the advertising makes it seem like tribes are working both sides of the aisle on this one. When you dig into the fundraising numbers, however, it's clear that most tribal gambling entities are in favor and it's primarily the GOP, anti-gambling groups, and non-tribal gambling entities - i.e. the competition - that are funding "No on 26." In-person betting is a lot easier to regulate than online betting, and this measure would generate tens of millions of dollars for the state, so that feels like a yes, right? Let's do it.</p> <p>Now, with that said, and sorry to report, Props 26 and 27 are those annoying kinds of measures where we're not really sure what happens if they both pass. Do they cancel each other out? Do they augment each other's powers? Who can say? Perhaps this is why we hire legislators - so idiots like us don't have to vote on incredibly specific policy issues.</p>

Like this? Congratulate: Lila Nordstrom / Brent Thornburg

Hate this? Send Us Your Hate Mail: braintrustapproved@gmail.com

Looking for Free Thoughts on Other Matters? Listen To Our Podcast: www.BrainTrustLive.com

<p>27</p>	<p>Legalizes mobile sports betting and dedicates revenue to the California Solutions to Homelessness and Mental Health Support Account and the Tribal Economic Development Account.</p>	<p>NO</p>	<p>Prop 27 is officially the most expensive prop in California history, with almost \$400 MILLION in expenditures going to the campaign just as of October 1st. (Prop 26 could never.) For reference, 2020's evil empire strikes back Prop 22 broke records at \$224,271,800 in expenditures overall and, at the time, we thought that was INSANE.</p> <p>Unlike Prop 26, Prop 27 is being promoted and supported by big, non-local, non-tribal casinos. Since the house always wins, they basically have unlimited funds to spend on this measure, which would make online and mobile sports betting legal and was basically written by casinos, for casinos. It would be a windfall for out-of-state entities, though it's currently masquerading as an anti-homelessness measure. LOL to the gall of whoever engineered that. In reality, only 8.5% of the revenue would be earmarked to address homelessness, and we don't actually know what that means since this prop includes no plan for how the money should be used. Additionally, the tax rate on casinos specified here (10%) is WAY lower than what other states charge betting operators. Like, WAY lower. Like in New York they pay 51%.</p> <p>In the wise words of one BTL co-host Brent Thornburg: "I just don't get how letting people ruin their lives gambling online fixes homelessness. It's a real arsonist cosplaying as a firefighter situation."</p>
<p>28</p>	<p>Requires funding for K-12 art and music education.</p>	<p>YES</p>	<p>Arts education in the public schools: It's a good thing. Stop overthinking everything (lol).</p>
<p>29</p>	<p>Enacts staffing requirements, reporting requirements, ownership disclosure, and closing requirements for chronic dialysis clinics.</p>	<p>UGH, YES</p>	<p>ANOTHER FUCKING DIALYSIS PROP. Listen, first off and sorry to yell, but STOP SIGNING PETITIONS FOR DIALYSIS PROPS. If a nice person at a farmer's market approaches and asks you to sign one million papers, you are likely signing petitions for props. Ask what's in the props. You can still help that out-of-work actor meet their signature quota if you refuse to sign for specific props that are dumb. To whoever did this: HOW DARE YOU.</p> <p>Now look, after the last election we said we would be voting no on all future dialysis props because our own (made up) political party is very serious about its anti-dialysis prop platform. We would never begrudge a no vote on this prop. That said, we're also two kids from labor families and we know that ultimately these ridiculous dialysis props are being used as a wedge in a larger labor battle that is really about creating oversight and protecting workers in a very profitable, wildly unregulated industry that receives a HUGE amount of public funding via Medicare and Medicaid payments. (WHY DO WE KNOW SO MUCH ABOUT THE DIALYSIS INDUSTRY?) We're going to hold our nose and vote yes AND HATE IT. As for the opposition's claims that dialysis centers will close, this is a basic anti-labor scare tactic. Seriously, we promise you that Angie, the sad lady on TV and in your text messages who's claiming she'll never be able to receive dialysis treatment ever again if this passes, is lying to you. Do not listen to Angie. And additionally, if a vital medical procedure cannot be fairly and appropriately provided by the market, it should not be privatized. NATIONALIZE DAVITA. Okaythankyougoodnight.</p>

<p>30</p>	<p>Increases the tax on personal income above \$2 million by 1.75% and dedicates revenue to zero-emission vehicle projects and wildfire prevention programs.</p>	<p>NO, you sneaky sneaks</p>	<p>YOU. GUYS. This is so sneaky. It sounds like such a good idea, right? Tax millionaires (yes, please) and put the money towards the environment? Sign us up!</p> <p>Or...wait. Not so fast.</p> <p>We were a little curious about why so many millions are being spent on the "Yes on 30" campaign. It seems like an easy win in a state that has historically led the nation in setting progressive environmental policy. Easy peasy. And yet, for some reason, nearly \$40 million has gone towards promoting 30 and, generally speaking, the pro-environment caucus just doesn't have that kind of cash to spend unless a billionaire or corporation is involved.</p> <p>ENTER: Lyft, those sneaky fucks. You might remember them from having mucho cash to burn on Prop 22. They've spent over \$25 million promoting Prop 30 because the prop is...actually a corporate cash-grab. UGH. See, Lyft is being required by the state to transition their fleet to 90% zero-emissions vehicles by 2030. They currently reimburse drivers of electric vehicles for their charging costs, but if Prop 30 passes, charging stations subsidized by the state (i.e. us) will offset those costs mightily, saving them tons of money. While there are some public health and environmental groups supporting Prop 30, there are notable opponents, most specifically Governor Newsom, who has launched an aggressive "No on Prop 30" campaign. If we're going to enact millionaires taxes, let's make sure the policy is written in a way that's designed to benefit us, not tech giants like Lyft.</p>
<p>31</p>	<p>Upholds a ban on flavored tobacco sales.</p>	<p>YES</p>	<p>Flavored tobacco is how the kiddies get addicted to cigarettes and then they blow smoke in your face while you're, for once in your life, waiting in line for something cool and then you realize you're asthmatic so you can't stay there and then you don't get to do cool things anymore and it's all because of big tobacco. Protect your access to cool things and vote yes!</p>