

Yolo — California General Election Ballot Guide (November 3, 2026)

Adopted by the Yolo County DSA General Membership on October 28th 2026

[Yolo — California General Election Ballot Guide \(November 3, 2026\)](#)

[Definitions](#)

[Federal](#)

[U.S. House California District 4 - No Recommendation](#)

[U.S. House California District 6 - Anti-Recommend Kevin Kiley](#)

[U.S. House California District 8 - No Recommendation](#)

[State](#)

[Governor - No Recommendation](#)

[Lieutenant Governor - No Recommendation](#)

[Secretary of State - No Recommendation](#)

[Controller - No Recommendation](#)

[Treasurer - No Recommendation](#)

[Attorney General - No Recommendation](#)

[Insurance Commissioner - Recommend Jane Kim](#)

[Superintendent of Public Instruction - Anti-Recommend Sonja Shaw](#)

[Member of the State Assembly, District 4 - No Recommendation](#)

[Member, State Board of Equalization, District 1 - No Recommendation](#)

[County](#)

[County Supervisor, District 3 - Anti-Recommend Dotty Pritchard](#)

[Municipal / City](#)

[City of Davis, City Council, District 1 - No Recommendation](#)

[City of Davis, City Council, District 4 - No Recommendation](#)

[City of West Sacramento, Member, City Council, District 3 - Anti-Recommend Dave Jans](#)

[City of West Sacramento, Member, City Council, District 4 - Anti-Recommend Kathy Bailey](#)

[City of Winters, Member, City Council, At-Large](#)

[City of Woodland, Member, City Council, District 1 - No Recommendation](#)

[City of Woodland, Member, City Council, District 3 - No Recommendation](#)

[School Districts](#)

[Davis Joint Unified School District, Governing Board Member, Trustee Area 1 - Recommend Colleen Zern](#)

[Davis Joint Unified School District, Governing Board Member, Trustee Area 3 - Recommend Kurt W](#)

[Davis Joint Unified School District, Governing Board Member, Trustee Area 4 - Recommend Elizabeth Moon](#)

[Washington Unified School District, Governing Board Member, Trustee Area 1 - No Recommendation](#)

[Statewide Ballot Measures \(Propositions\)](#)

[Proposition 1: Yes](#)

[Proposition 2: Yes](#)

[Proposition 3: Yes - Endorsed](#)

[Proposition 4: Yes](#)

[Proposition 5: Yes](#)

[Proposition 37: No Recommendation](#)

[Proposition 38: No](#)

[Proposition 39: No](#)

[Proposition 40: Yes - Endorsed](#)

[Proposition 41: No](#)

[Proposition 42: No](#)

[Proposition 43: No](#)

[Proposition 44: No](#)

[Proposition 45: No](#)

[Local Measures](#)

[Measure X — Yolo County Unincorporated Area Hotel Tax \(TOT\) - Yes](#)

[Measure W — City of Davis \(Willowgrove General Plan Amendment\) - Yes](#)

[Measure Y — City of Woodland \(1¢ Transactions and Use Tax\) - No](#)

[Measure Z — City of Woodland \(Urban Limit Line / Utility Extension Policy\) - No](#)

[Measure B — Winters Joint Unified School District Bond \(\\$29.9 million\) - Yes](#)

[Measure H — Los Rios Community College District, SFID No. 1 Bond \(\\$1.1 billion\) - Yes](#)

Definitions

Endorsement - An **Endorsement** by Yolo County CA DSA means our chapter believes that the endorsed candidate or measure position represents the values of democratic socialism and will help build a working class movement to put people and planet before profit and will advance our Workers Deserve More policy platform. Yolo County CA DSA does not endorse candidates who have not publicly aligned with the Workers Deserve More Platform nor openly describe their policy agenda as “socialist”.

Recommendation - A **Recommendation** by Yolo County CA DSA represents our chapter's belief that the recommended candidate or measure position will help arrest the spread of fascism, advance the interest of the working class of Yolo County, or may be an ally in the fight to achieve parts of our policy agenda. We will recommend candidates and measure positions tactically, even if the candidate does not fully follow our principles. A recommendation does not imply any coordination or any direct or indirect support from Yolo County CA DSA.

No Recommendation - Yolo County CA DSA will offer **no recommendation** in races where we feel neither candidate or measure position will advance the interest of the working class of Yolo County.

Anti-Recommendation - Yolo County CA DSA will offer **anti-recommendations** in races where neither candidates or measure position will advance the interests of the working class but a candidate or side will actively harm workers, the environment, or our society more broadly and we cannot in good conscience take no position in the race.

Federal

U.S. House California District 4 - No Recommendation

Eric Jones (D) v. Mike Thompson (D)

The incumbent Democratic Representative, Mike Thompson, is a fairly middle-of-the-road Democrat who has been in the House since the last century (1999, but still). While he has co-sponsored Medicare for All and the Block the Bombs Act, he also [votes](#) for things like [the Trump-backed funding bill that increased funding for the military, included \\$3.3B for Israel, and defunded USAID and UNRWA](#).

Eric Jones is endorsed by progressive group Our Revolution and is running on a progressive platform that focuses on affordability through universal healthcare and lowering drug prices, taking on PG&E, and [ending forever wars](#). For PG&E specifically, he has called for tighter fire regulations on utility companies and called for funding local municipal alternatives by using congress's antitrust powers. He also has a policy page that [calls for regulations on data centers and AI](#), including investments in worker transition training and green energy.

However, there are really reasons to be skeptical of Jones's commitment to getting money out of politics. Not only is he a venture capitalist, his campaign has been boosted by [over a million dollars of SuperPAC spending](#) by his former coworkers and boss at Dragoneer Investment Group.

U.S. House California District 6 - Anti-Recommend Kevin Kiley

Richard Pan (D) v. Kevin Kiley (NP - prev Republican)

Kevin Kiley is a former Republican, now independent, who is supported by various business groups such as the Chamber of Commerce. His change to independent coincides with the recent redistricting (Prop 50) that increased the competitiveness of the district. We believe this may be a tactic to shy away from his Republican voting record. He voted for the Big Beautiful Bill, a law that cut over 4 trillion dollars in tax revenue, disproportionately benefiting the wealthiest Americans, while increasing funding for ICE and the military by \$325 billion; all while cutting \$1.4 trillion in healthcare, SNAP, and student loans. The bill was a direct attack on the working class and anyone who voted for it should never hold public office again. He voted for the Laken Riley act, a law that cynically weaponized a tragic murder with no regard for the victim's family. The Laken Riley act is what is currently allowing ICE and CBP to act with federal impunity. It is an overtly fascist policy and needs to be rescinded immediately, along with the complete abolishment of ICE.

Richard Pan is a physician and health advocate. While he has used his position to make some progressive strides in healthcare, he has historically been an opponent of single-payer healthcare.

U.S. House California District 8 - No Recommendation

John Garamendi (D) v. Rudy Recile (R)

Rudy Recile is a Republican business owner and consultant. He is an advocate of tax credits for homeschooling and fewer regulations on oil refineries.

John Garamendi is a long-time incumbent and Democrat. He assumed his current office in 2009 and has been a politician since 1974. He is largely an establishment Democrat with some notable progressive views on foreign policy and privacy.

As in other straightforward Democrat-versus-Republican statewide contests, we make no recommendation

State

Governor - No Recommendation

Xavier Becerra (D) v. Steve Hilton (R)

With his deep ties to the Democratic establishment, Becerra is more of the same disappointing corporate Democrat we're used to. His general election campaign has been somehow even less inspired than his primary campaign. Our only hope for him right now is that his campaign

doesn't suppress turnout from progressive voters. He is not likely to be a good governor.

Becerra will win; he does not need or want our recommendation.

Lieutenant Governor - No Recommendation

Fiona Ma (D) v. Gloria Romero (R)

Ma entered the primary with the bulk of endorsements from California's political establishment and much of organized labor. But her politics are largely those of the state's Democratic establishment, and a former staffer has accused her of sexual harassment and racial discrimination.

As in other straightforward Democrat-versus-Republican statewide contests, **we make no recommendation.**

Secretary of State - No Recommendation

Shirley N. Weber (Incumbent) (D) v. Donald P. (Don) Wagner ®

California's ballot-counting process has continued to become slower, which Weber argues is necessary for accuracy, and disability advocates unsuccessfully sued her office over voting accessibility.

Wagner is a conventional Republican opponent, and Weber remains the overwhelming favorite. As in other straightforward Democrat-versus-Republican statewide contests, **we make no recommendation.**

Controller - No Recommendation

Malia M. Cohen (Incumbent) (D) v. Herb W Morgan (R)

Cohen was never seriously threatened in the primary and is strongly favored for re-election. As in other straightforward Democrat-versus-Republican statewide contests, **we make no recommendation.**

Treasurer - No Recommendation

Eleni Kounalakis (D) v. Jennifer Hawks (R)

Lieutenant Governor Eleni Kounalakis advanced to the general election for State Treasurer, where she faces Republican Jennifer Hawks. Kounalakis entered the race after abandoning a gubernatorial campaign that had failed to gain traction. She is extraordinarily well-connected,

comes from a wealthy family, and has the blessing of much of California's Democratic establishment, including Governor Gavin Newsom and both of California's U.S. senators.

As in other straightforward Democrat-versus-Republican statewide contests, **we make no recommendation.**

Attorney General - No Recommendation

Rob Bonta (Incumbent) (D) v. Michael E. Gates (R)

Incumbent Attorney General Rob Bonta advanced easily to the general election, where he faces Republican Michael Gates. Bonta has generally governed from the more progressive side of what we have come to expect from a California attorney general, particularly one originally appointed by Gavin Newsom, but he fumbled the bag pretty spectacularly on the Paramount-Warner Brothers deal, harming Californian workers in the process.

As in other straightforward Democrat-versus-Republican statewide contests, **we make no recommendation.**

Insurance Commissioner - Recommend Jane Kim

Ben Allen (D) v. Jane Kim (D)

California's Insurance Commissioner is one of the state's more obscure elected offices, but it has unusually direct power over one of the most predatory industries in the state. The commissioner licenses, regulates, and investigates insurance companies and enforces consumer protections at a moment when Californians are facing soaring premiums, lost coverage, and a growing climate-driven insurance crisis.

Jane Kim, the former San Francisco supervisor and former executive director of the California Working Families Party, has a long history as a prominent figure on the California left. She won office in San Francisco against the Democratic machine, served as California political director for Bernie Sanders's 2020 presidential campaign, and has spent years organizing around working-class economic issues.

Kim has clearly distinguished herself as the progressive in this race. She is running on aggressively regulating the insurance industry and creating a public Disaster Insurance for All program. She is endorsed by Bernie Sanders and has significant support from organized labor, including major teachers' unions, nurses, and other unions.

Her opponent, State Senator Ben Allen, is a mainstream coastal liberal with deep support from the Democratic Party establishment. Allen is to the left of many California Democrats and has worked on insurance and climate issues in the Legislature, but he does not offer the same

politics of confrontation with the insurance industry or the same broader working-class orientation as Kim.

This is exactly the kind of general-election race where a socialist recommendation matters: voters have a genuine choice between an establishment liberal and a candidate rooted in the progressive and labor left. **We recommend Jane Kim for California Insurance Commissioner.**

Superintendent of Public Instruction - Anti-Recommendation Sonja Shaw

Richard Barrera v. Sonja Shaw

The race for State Superintendent of Public Instruction is formally nonpartisan, but the general election is effectively a contest between two very different political projects. Richard Barrera, longtime president of the San Diego Unified School District board and a senior adviser to outgoing Superintendent Tony Thurmond, is strongly backed by the California Teachers Association. Barrera points to a record of raising educator pay, protecting family health benefits, expanding community schools, investing in school facilities, and defending immigrant and LGBTQ students. Barrera also alienated much of organized labor in San Diego during his time as SDUSD president.

His opponent, Chino Valley Unified School District board president Sonja Shaw, represents the organized right in California education politics. Shaw has made opposition to protections for transgender students a centerpiece of her politics and is backed by the California Republican Party, Moms for Liberty, and the California Rifle and Pistol Association.

Barrera was not our preferred candidate in the primary, and his coalition also includes charter-school advocates and all sorts of unsavory establishment Democratic figures. **We therefore make no affirmative recommendation, but recommend you not vote for or to vote against Sonja Shaw.**

Member of the State Assembly, District 4 - No Recommendation

Cecilia M. Aguiar-Curry (Incumbent)

Cecilia is running unopposed.

Member, State Board of Equalization, District 1 - No Recommendation

Nelson Esparza (D) v. Shannon Grove (R)

As in other straightforward Democrat-versus-Republican statewide contests, **we make no recommendation.**

County

County Supervisor, District 3 - Anti-Recommend Dotty Pritchard

Dotty Pritchard v. Mayra Vega

Dotty's family has owned businesses in Woodland since the late Gilded Age, 100 years ago. At different times in her early career she has been an accountant and an adjunct English professor at Woodland Community College. More recently Dotty has served as the lead staffer for the last three holders of this office, including the incumbent Mary Sandy, her predecessor & husband Gary Sandy, two centrist Democrats, and Republican campaign operative/lawyer Matt Rexroad. Her website says that she supports 2024's tough-on-crime Prop 36, while deceptively spinning it as a proposition that "prioritizes treatment over incarceration for nonviolent offenders" when it does the opposite. Her website also spends a lot of time talking about making "difficult but necessary budget reductions", "strengthening our general reserve", "avoiding spending increases", and "reducing costs where possible". All of this is coded messaging to right-wing voters that she will make county workers pay the price of any budget shortfall.

Councilmember Vega was elected to the Woodland City Council in 2020 and in that time has not proposed many things of consequence, for or against working people in Woodland. One item of note was her silence during the 2023 recall campaign against transphobic school board member Emily MacDonald. Vega refused Yolo DSA's specific call to action during that campaign as did the rest of the city council. It's also important to note that Councilmember Vega has chosen not to embrace unions and other organizations representing working people despite running against corporately backed conservatives.

Municipal / City

City of Davis, City Council, District 1 - No Recommendation

Judy Ennis

Judy is a member of the Davis Social Services Commission, and has previously served as Chair. She is also the founder and immediate past Executive Director of the Davis Community Action Network. In both roles she used her platform to push for expanding housing and to tackle Davis' housing affordability crisis. It should be noted that she does come from a more liberal or YIMBY mindset on housing, and our chapter will likely still have to push her to achieve the largest expansions of quality-affordable housing.

We are making no recommendation because she is running unopposed

City of Davis, City Council, District 4 - No Recommendation

Gloria Partida (Incumbent)

Gloria is seeking a 3rd term on the Davis City Council, has previously served as Mayor, and was Davis' 1st and so far only Latina Councilmember, as well as Davis' 1st and so far only Latina Mayor. A retired UC Davis neurobiologist, Gloria spent most of her time before council working on various LGBTQ+ and disability inclusion issues, and has focused on much the same as a councilmember. She's made substantial progress in diversifying city commissions, including getting some DSA members and allies appointed to city commissions.

We are making no recommendation because she is running unopposed

City of West Sacramento, Member, City Council, District 3 - Anti-Recommend Dave Jans

Both Jackson and Jans heavily emphasize their small business bonafides and support for law enforcement. Neither are running to promote the specific interest of the working class of West Sacramento and either will most likely serve as a middle of the road unimpressive democrat. Both are endorsed by a spattering of local politicians. Jackson's endorsements pull heavily from

his time as a school board trustee, while Jans' are broader including the police and firefighter unions and the Sacramento Association of REALTORS.

However we have to anti-recommend Dave Jans for his support for bringing armed police officers into our schools. The presence of "School Resource Officers" as they are called, has been proven over and over to have no impact on reducing fights and behavioral issues in schools, and instead have been linked to sharp increases in arrests and violence committed against minors. Children of racially marginalized backgrounds and children with disabilities are more at risk of negative interactions with SROs. The ACLU of Southern California found that black students are 3x more likely to be referred to law enforcement compared to white students. Arrests and referrals to law enforcement, which are often arbitrarily and with no due process, can stain a child's record for the rest of their life and impact future education and employment opportunities. SROs do not make our schools safer, but there are proven methods to reduce violence in schools including investing in after school activities, mental health resources, and food programs. We recommend The ACLU of Southern California's policy paper on School Resource Officers for further study on this topic:

<https://www.aclusocal.org/publications/no-police-in-schools/>

City of West Sacramento, Member, City Council, District 4 - Anti-Recommend Kathy Bailey

Verna is a corporate democrat backed by the Police Union, Firefighters Union, Metro Chamber of Commerce, and Association of Realtors. She has few labor endorsements and her campaign literature largely focuses on what she can do for the business and real-estate industries. With some accomplishments noted for public spaces including funding the construction of more walking and biking paths. She appears socially liberal and supports the rights of our LGBTQ+ neighbors and has earned the endorsement of Yolo Pride Democratic Club and Sacramento Stonewall Democrats.

Kathy on the other hand is a registered Republican and not clearly public on her policy goals. She has used vague broad language to describe why she is running and serves on the board of a large HOA.

Normally we wouldn't make a recommendation in a straight D v R race, but Kathy has been shy about her affiliation with the Republican party and is running as a non-partisan which warrants specific attention.

City of Winters, Member, City Council, At-Large

Richard Casavecchia (Incumbent) - Anti-Recommend

Carol Scianna (Incumbent)

Albert Vallecillo (Incumbent)

Dave Callison

Kelli Villanueva

Winters city council members have four-year terms and are elected 'at-large' to represent the entire city. This contrasts with other Yolo county cities (Davis, Woodland, West Sacramento), where council members are elected to represent districts within each city.

Incumbents Carol Scianna and Albert Vallecillo can be characterized as middle of the road Democrats.

Kelli Villanueva (Business Owner/Parent) is endorsed by Yolo County Democratic Party, Yolo County Pride Democrats and some current and former electeds from around the county.

Dave Callison (Retired Truck Driver) served as a volunteer firefighter and shop steward for Teamsters Local 315.

Pick 3 of those 4. We recommend against incumbent Richard Casavecchia due to past domestic violence suspicions and assault weapons charges.

City of Woodland, Member, City Council, District 1 - No Recommendation

George Washington v. Jesse Ortiz

Jesse Ortiz is a retired educator with more of a record in elected positions in Yolo County and is endorsed by Yolo Pride Democratic Club. He has made some criticisms of recent ICE activity in Woodland, but his long support for former district attorney Jeff Reisig and aggressive policing gives us cause for concern and doubt about his seriousness on resisting ICE if elected.

Attached is his speech at the ICE out of Woodland protest on October 27th.

 Jesse Ortiz at ICE out of Woodland (Oct 27).mp4

George Washington's campaign website says he supports "Strengthening public safety through prevention", "Creating real opportunities for our youth", and "Expanding access to mental health support", all things we can get behind. However, there is not a lot of information about him or his positions and the Yolo County Republican Party recommends voting for him which gives us serious cause for concern.

City of Woodland, Member, City Council, District 3 - No Recommendation

Tania Garcia-Cadena (Incumbent)

Tania appears to be a middle of the road corporate Democrat.

We are making no recommendation because she is running unopposed

School Districts

Davis Joint Unified School District, Governing Board Member, Trustee Area 1 - Recommend Colleen Zern

Colleen Zern v. Dorte Jensen

Colleen is an attorney and teaches at UC Davis Graduate School of Management. She also has a long history of volunteer service in Davis schools, including a number of PTA & Site Council (a locally elected body guiding decisions at a school) leadership roles and coaching many youth sports her children were involved in. Her candidacy is focused on transparency, accountability, & collaboration. Transparency with the public on the matters of the district's governance, accountability on achieving educational outcomes, and collaboration with all the relevant stakeholders in the community. At an October 9th candidate forum she included the local realtors association as an endorser amongst other groups.

Dorte is a longtime Davis resident and graduate of Davis Senior High School as well as Yale University, even though she campaigns against many of the dynamics that allowed her to succeed in DJUSD and later at Yale. Despite running a campaign that may seem to be on similar themes with her opponent, more scrutiny reveals a different picture. Dorte is most known as the most committed ally of Beth Bourne, and it should be seen as no coincidence that they are running at the same time. In a [Davis Enterprise article](#) covering her candidacy, she claimed that housing will be much more available now given the Trump Administration's crackdown on international students. Dorte brags about her regular attendance at school board meetings and participation in public comment. Many of these comments are in opposition to full inclusion of transgender youth, ethnic studies, and mental health support for K-12 students. In an October 9th candidate forum she argued to discontinue the contract between the district and a local healthcare provider to give mental health services to children middle school age & older. Her premise being that this healthcare was causing more harm than good by not always/immediately informing parents of gender identity issues their child may be experiencing. Altogether her candidacy is one of bigotry.

Davis Joint Unified School District, Governing Board Member, Trustee Area 3 - Recommend Kurt W

Joe DiNunzio (Incumbent) v. Kurt Wendlenner

Trustee DiNunzio is seeking a 3rd term on the DJUSD school board. Like many other school board candidates Trustee DiNunzio has a history of volunteer service in Davis schools prior to his time on the board, this includes PTA, Site Council, and the Davis Schools Foundation. His candidacy for re-election mostly points to his understanding of DJUSD as an institution after nearly 8 years on the board. He's not really identifying something different he wants to do if granted a 3rd term.

Like many other school board candidates Kurt has experience as a volunteer in his kid's classroom, as well as service on a Site Council. His candidacy mostly focuses on transparency & making district decisions based on data rather than the subjective whims of board members and administrators. One example includes getting more information about why a number of Davis families send their kids to non DJUSD schools. This is a critical thing to know, as the school district is having conversations of school closures due to declining admissions. Kurt's principles for governance also includes ensuring that technology acts as an aid to faculty rather than a replacement, as well as closing the wage gap between faculty and administrators.

Davis Joint Unified School District, Governing Board Member, Trustee Area 4 - Recommend Elizabeth Moon

Elizabeth Moon (Incumbent) v. Beth Bourne

Trustee Moon is seeking a 2nd term on the Davis school board. She is perhaps the only candidate for Davis school board that has experience as a K-12 teacher. Trustee Moon is campaigning on maintaining fiscal stability, recruiting new teachers, and expanding mental health resources to students. She is focused on the effect the housing crisis has on the operations of the district, pushing for the development of workforce housing options for DJUSD faculty or staff in her current tenure.

Ms. Bourne is running for school board as a "parental rights advocate", which largely involves engaging in public spectacles arguing against the existence of trans people, particularly trans youth. [Ms. Bourne has undressed at board meetings](#) in an attempt to advance her argument. She's used her increased local platform during this campaign to amplify transphobic attacks on the community, particularly DJUSD faculty & staff that are inclusive to queer students. Just

weeks before Election Day [Ms. Bourne was arrested](#) for disrupting a student protest at Sonoma Valley High School, where it's alleged that she assaulted several student protesters who were protesting a decision of their school board to remove Pride flags from their school.

Washington Unified School District, Governing Board Member, Trustee Area 1 - No Recommendation

Virginia Coffey (Incumbent) v. Maria Grijalva

Trustee Coffey has served as a substitute and later full-time teacher in West Sacramento schools prior to her service on the board. In running for re-election she touts facilities upgrades at Westfield Village and Elkhorn Village Elementary as well as bringing back the West Sacramento Bears football and cheer teams.

Maria is a longtime civil rights advocate in West Sacramento, having spent a career in state government she champions local causes she cares about like starting the Dia de los Muertos festivities in West Sacramento and the institution of district elections. In running for this seat Maria touts her decades of history as a determined advocate for vulnerable people.

Statewide Ballot Measures (Propositions)

Proposition 1: Yes

Prop 1 authorizes \$11.25 billion in state bonds, mainly for multifamily affordable housing, preservation/supportive housing, veterans' housing, homeownership assistance, and farmworker/tribal/student housing.

California's housing crisis is fundamentally a result of housing being treated as a commodity; working-class tenants bear the consequences through enormous rents, displacement, and homelessness. Prop 1 is a flawed solution, but the positives outweigh the negatives. These bonds create a real public subsidy for housing that the private market will not produce at affordable rents. The proposition includes billions for affordable rental construction/preservation and supportive housing. However, as socialists we must note that bonds are a bad way to finance public investment compared with progressive taxation: the state ultimately pays hundreds of millions annually in debt service to bondholders. This is fundamentally a band-aid; we need to tax the rich and build state capacity to build social housing at scale, on the road to decommodifying housing.

Prop 1 is supported by some developer and real estate interests, but also by most affordable housing advocates and organized labor. Socialists should fight for permanently funded social

housing, funded by taxing the rich, but we should not reject billions of dollars for affordable housing because just California's financing system is inadequate. **We recommend a Yes vote.**

Proposition 2: Yes

Prop 2 raises the state reserve cap from 10% to 20%, requires more saving when revenues surge, and importantly excludes deposits into those reserves from California's Gann spending limit.

Recessions routinely become excuses for austerity. Capitalists use economic precarity to justify cuts to schools, health care, public workers, and social programs precisely when working people need them most. Larger reserves give the state greater ability to maintain services during downturns, rather than balancing budgets on workers and service recipients. Excluding reserve deposits from the Gann Limit also slightly weakens one of California's artificial constitutional constraints on public spending.

The California Labor Federation has endorsed Prop 2, as have most progressive institutional endorsers. Opposition comes primarily from Republicans and fiscal conservatives who are hostile to redistributive politics.

Saving money rather than spending it immediately is not intrinsically progressive; socialists generally don't fetishize balanced budgets or reserves for their own sake. However, this proposal leaves workers better off in the long run by providing more security at the state level. A larger cushion against austerity is better than mandated tax rebates/cuts triggered by California's fiscal constitution. **We recommend a Yes vote.**

Proposition 3: Yes - Endorsed

Prop 3 makes permanent a wealth tax on the top 2% of income earners in the state in order to fund public education and healthcare (as of 2026, those making over \$350,000). This wealth tax increases individual state income tax rates by 1% for those making over \$370k and up to 3% for those making over \$740k. This state income tax on high earners was initially passed in 2012 (as Prop 30) and extended in 2016 (as Prop 55).

If Prop 3 does not pass, the higher tax rates on the wealthy will sunset in 2031, and the state will see a loss of between \$5-\$15B in annual funding for public education. With the associated loss of funding for public education, 1 in 6 public school teachers will be facing layoffs. This is an important measure to maintain funding for public goods and a strong demonstration that taxing the wealthy works to advance the interests of the working class. **Yolo County CA DSA has endorsed a Yes vote.**

Proposition 4: Yes

Prop 4 repeals California's ban on state/local public campaign-finance systems and allows governments to establish programs for qualifying candidates who accept spending limits. It doesn't itself create a statewide public-financing program.

Electoral politics systematically privileges people who can raise money from wealthy donors, corporations, and professional political networks. In cities and states across the country, public

financing of elections has allowed socialists and working people to compete on something at least marginally closer to a level playing field. Many socialist wins across the country, like Zohran Mamdani in New York City, would not have been possible without public financing. This is a clear positive step for working people, and can reduce candidates' dependence on wealthy private donors and allow working class mass membership organizations like our own to participate in larger and more expensive elections.

Prop 4 isn't a silver bullet: it's only enabling legislation, not the final reform. Winning Prop 4 creates space for socialists and reformers to fight locally/statewide over what strong public-finance systems actually look like. Public financing also does not eliminate capitalist political power, independent expenditures, lobbying, or wealthy ownership of media, or even come close to leveling the playing field. It is, however, an important and necessary step forward for working class political power. **We recommend voting yes**

Proposition 5: Yes

Prop 5 ends the simultaneous successor contest when a statewide officer is recalled. If the governor is removed, the lieutenant governor succeeds; other vacancies are filled under normal law rather than by a second question on the recall ballot.

This is not a sexy reform, nor is it a socialist one, but it is basic good government housekeeping. California's recall system creates a bizarre democratic loophole in which a majority can elect someone normally, then a smaller and differently composed electorate can remove them and potentially install a replacement with only a small plurality. Previous gubernatorial recalls have had dozens or even hundreds of candidates on the ballot, and often only recall supporters will even vote in the simultaneous successor contest, meaning a tiny plurality of voters can choose the governor.

The recall mechanism should answer the democratic question "should this official be removed?" rather than create an alternative low-turnout route to power for a minority of voters. Despite its abuse in California, socialists shouldn't oppose recall as a democratic mechanism itself. Recall has long been a democratic demand of historical socialist movements. We should, however, eliminate the anti-majoritarian successor-election mechanism. **We recommend a Yes vote.**

Proposition 37: No Recommendation

Prop 37 creates up to a \$25 billion revenue-bond program providing qualifying middle-income buyers a second mortgage worth up to 17% of a newly built home's price. The bonds are repaid from borrowers' mortgage payments rather than the state budget.

Housing unaffordability is a real crisis for workers. The proposition gives households without enough accumulated wealth for a conventional down payment access to homeownership, and this is a real material benefit for some workers. However, it treats the housing crisis principally as a problem of financing individual purchases rather than expanding permanently affordable/public housing or reducing the power of landlords and landowners. Ultimately, promoting homeownership is not a socialist solution, and this proposition will only help a small subset of workers. Socialists do not and should not support homeownership as an end in itself.

Labor supporters include nurses and carpenters, and the California Labor Federation supports a Yes vote. Roughly \$22.6 million has gone to Yes, dominated by the California Association of Realtors and the billionaire front group Building a Better California.

Ultimately, this is, in many ways, a subsidy for finance capital. This proposition could genuinely help individual working families while simultaneously using state machinery to support private real-estate transactions, developers, and asset ownership. Renters and most working class Californians don't get much benefit from Prop 37. Prop 37 can deliver some real material benefit to some working class Californians, but it's not a socialist solution. **We have No Recommendation.**

Proposition 38: No

Prop 38 borrows \$8.4 billion for immunology/immunotherapy research—and directs **half the proceeds to one qualifying UC-affiliated research institute**, run by a billionaire, with the rest distributed through grants.

Public investment in biomedical research is obviously good and something we strongly support. But Prop 38 is not constructed primarily to best facilitate this research. The eligibility language appears effectively tailored to the California Institute for Immunology and Immunotherapy; billionaire Gary Michelson is its co-founder/board chair and the chief financial force behind the initiative. FPPC data show roughly \$36M in top support contributions dominated by Michelson/Michelson Center and Meyer Luskin.

This proposition is pretty naked self-dealing by wealthy individuals. By phrasing it as promoting medical research, something no one opposes, Michelson hopes to smuggle in a popular mandate to deliver state funds to his own institution. Voters should not constitutionally commit billions in public debt through an initiative constructed around a particular private institution. Instead, we should democratically fund actual public institutions that are accountable for their work. California must expand publicly governed research, make discoveries broadly available, and fund it through progressive taxation. **We recommend a No vote.**

Proposition 39: No

Prop 39 is a Republican initiative that requires government-issued ID for in-person voters and identifying information for mail voting, plus new citizenship-verification/reporting requirements.

Voting is a democratic right, not something conditioned on navigating unnecessary administrative barriers. This is a proposal to add as many barriers as possible to voters to stop a non-existent fraud problem. Reactionary anti-democratic forces want to disenfranchise working class Californians in an effort to rig our elections. People with less money, less stable housing, limited transportation, or complicated documentation are least able to absorb new restrictions. This is just one more step in the fascist MAGA movement's quest to disenfranchise the poor and anti-democratically rig our elections for their own benefit.

The Yes campaign has raised more than \$28 million and is heavily financed by conservative billionaire Richard Uihlein and Carl DeMaio's Reform California. Official opposition includes ACLU, Common Cause, the League of Women Voters, civil rights groups, and most of California's labor movement. It also includes us. **We recommend a No vote.**

Proposition 40: Yes - Endorsed

Prop 40 would levy a one-time 5% wealth tax on individuals with over \$1 billion in assets (a little over 220 people in California) in order to offset the loss of almost \$100 billion in federal funding for Medi-Cal due to cuts from HR1 (the "big beautiful bill"). In the absence of alternate funding, hospitals across the state will face closures, healthcare workers will be laid off, our most vulnerable neighbors will face increasing challenges to get the care they need, and mortality rates will rise.

Prop 40 responds to the immediate need for more healthcare funding, provides a corrective to Trump's push for greater wealth consolidation, and offers a pilot wealth tax in order to address expanding inequality. Billionaires like Google founder Sergey Brin are spending hundreds of millions in an effort to fight this necessary redistribution of resources. **Yolo County CA DSA has endorsed a Yes vote**

Proposition 41: No

Prop 41 is one of two measures put on the ballot by billionaires to thwart the Billionaire Tax (Prop 40). Prop 41 supposedly creates audits of new state tax revenues and makes them subject to a cap. The Billionaire Tax will easily earn more than the cap, over which any money is either returned to voters or goes to education. It doesn't mention the Billionaire Tax directly, and contains a standard California poison pill that if it receives more votes than other measures with an overlapping topic (the billionaire tax), it nullifies it.

This measure, like 42, is ultimately about defeating the billionaire tax and more generally, the possibility of expanding the public sphere. One of the primary funders of Prop 41 is Sergey Brin, who recently surpassed Jeff Bezos to become the third richest person in the world. **We recommend a No vote.**

Proposition 42: No

Prop 42 is the second of two measures put on the ballot to thwart the Billionaire Tax (Prop 40). It prohibits new taxes on personal property including retirement accounts, financial assets, or business interests. It deceptively proposes that unnamed "Sacramento politicians" are planning to do this to everyone. The only tax it would apply to, without naming it, is the Billionaire Tax. Like with 41, more votes for 42 than 40 nullifies the Billionaire Tax. This would very directly block

the advancement of the kinds of wealth taxes that can achieve a much needed redistribution of resources and power. **We recommend a No vote.**

Proposition 43: No

Prop 43, backed by the Howard Jarvis Taxpayer Association, aims to make it harder to raise local revenue by changing the threshold on local ballot measures that raise taxes from a simple majority to a $\frac{2}{3}$ supermajority. This would apply to initiatives placed on a local ballot on or after January 1, 2027. This new supermajority vote requirement would apply to measures raising revenue for all types of local governments, including cities, counties, special districts, school and community college districts, and any other local or regional government entity.

Prop 43 would undermine basic principles of democracy by making it easier for big corporate interests like the Realtor's Association, the Chamber of Commerce, the fossil fuel industry, and other likely suspects to kill funding for the things we need by propagandizing a sufficient minority to prevent funding of public goods. **We recommend a No vote.**

Proposition 44: No

Prop 44 would require nonprofit Federally Qualified Health Centers (FQHCs) to spend at least 90% of their revenue on patient care and other qualifying program services, effectively capping administrative and other non-program expenses at 10%. Clinics that fail to meet the requirement would face financial penalties. The measure is sponsored by SEIU-UHW, which argues that too much public healthcare funding is going toward executive compensation and administration instead of patients and healthcare workers.

FQHCs are among the closest institutions we have to a socialized primary healthcare system in the United States. They are nonprofit, receive substantial public funding, operate under community-based governance requirements, and serve patients regardless of their ability to pay. In Yolo County, CommuniCare+OLE is a critical part of that system, particularly for Medi-Cal recipients and patients who face significant barriers to accessing other healthcare providers.

The problem with Prop 44 is that it treats administrative spending as inherently wasteful rather than recognizing that healthcare institutions require facilities, technology, staffing infrastructure, coordination, and long-term investment to function. The 10% threshold also recalls the longstanding nonprofit-sector problem of inadequate overhead funding, which can undermine institutional capacity even when an organization is effectively fulfilling its mission. California's Legislative Analyst reports that community clinics currently spend approximately 80% of revenue on healthcare services on average, and acknowledges that some could close under the proposed requirements.

This creates a serious conflict between healthcare workers and the community institutions serving working-class patients. Better wages, staffing, accountability, and patient care are

legitimate demands. But a spending requirement that risks destabilizing safety-net clinics raises questions about whether those goals can be achieved without compromising access to care. In Yolo County, the consequences could be particularly significant for Medi-Cal recipients and transgender patients who already face limited alternatives for appropriate healthcare.

The central question is whether financial accountability should be pursued through a uniform spending ratio or through stronger, evidence-based standards that protect workers, patients, and the long-term capacity of community healthcare institutions. Prop 44 raises this question without resolving the potential conflict between those goals. **We recommend a No vote**

Proposition 45: No

Prop 45 is an initiative statute backed by the California Chamber of Commerce that makes sweeping changes to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). Prop 45 creates a fast-track version of CEQA for a broad range of “essential” projects, including housing, transportation, energy, water, healthcare, schools, broadband, and public-safety infrastructure.

CEQA can be and is regularly abused to delay housing, transit, clean energy, and other necessary infrastructure at the expense of working class Californians. We don't default to defending all regulatory and permitting processes just because they give the government power over private business. This is a genuinely thorny issue, with many costs and benefits and bad actors on both sides that can be difficult for socialists to disentangle. CEQA does desperately need further reform. Prop 45 sets fast timelines. It also limits agencies' obligation to study feasible alternatives and restricts the evidence and remedies available to courts reviewing approvals for a broad range of housing and infrastructure projects. Beyond this, it gives much of the housing it fast-tracks weaker labor standards than the other “essential” projects it covers.

For socialists, the key question we care about here is who gains power when review is weakened? As certified Bad Guy Alec Baldwin says in *The Departed*, “cui bono?” A good reform would accelerate democratically planned affordable housing, transit, and green infrastructure, while preserving workers' and affected communities' power over pollution and development. Prop 45 instead applies broad deregulation across many kinds of private and public projects, concentrating this power in the hands of developers themselves. There's a reason for this. This reform was written by and for some of the most rapacious capitalists in the state.

The Yes campaign is heavily financed by the Building Industry Association, Chamber of Commerce, Edison, Realtors, developers, and billionaire cutout Building a Better California, a veritable rogues gallery of California politics. The No campaign includes most environmental groups and the state building trades. The latter is notable: the building trades will generally support nearly all construction. The old joke is they would pave over the Pacific Ocean if there was a project labor agreement.

California has already undertaken CEQA reform via AB 130 and SB 131, which broadly exempt urban infill housing from CEQA review. Prop 45's new reforms use the word “essential” to bring

in drastic new changes: covering not only apartments and transit but highways and road expansions, subdivisions, private medical-office buildings, major water systems, power infrastructure, and more. Expanding urban housing and giant infrastructure projects present radically different environmental problems, and need different regulatory regimes. We need more housing and transit; that doesn't mean gutting regulation on highways and data centers. CEQA has been abused by wealthy homeowners, yes, but it has also been a vital tool for working class communities fighting warehouses, freeway expansions, industrial pollution, contaminated sites, and infrastructure that capitalists and more politically powerful actors want to dump in their communities. The answer is to make it harder for wealthy NIMBYs to block socially useful housing and transit, not to strip the ability of under-resourced working class Californians to fight environmental harm.

If passed, this proposition can only be legislatively amended at all by a 2/3rds vote of the legislature. Any defects or unintended consequences would therefore be incredibly difficult to fix through the ordinary democratic process. California history is littered with examples of poorly worded propositions creating seemingly permanent unintended negative consequences.

CEQA needs reform; California needs a faster process to allow our state to build housing at the needed scale. The housing crunch has been incredibly damaging to working class Californians and their ability to live in this state. CEQA needing further reform doesn't mean developers and the Chamber of Commerce should be writing that reform. Socialists should support targeted reform, not less reform. This means by-right approval for affordable/social housing, transit, and clean energy. We should support greater public planning capacity; strong labor standards; and targeted limits on bad-faith litigation from wealthy and well-connected homeowners who want to block affordable housing and public transit. But we still need community and environmental protections, as well as a democratic process for development. Prop 45 is not the solution. **We recommend a No vote.**

Local Measures

Measure X — Yolo County Unincorporated Area Hotel Tax (TOT) - Yes

Measure X would increase Yolo County's transient occupancy tax from 8% to 12% on hotels, vacation rentals, Airbnb-style accommodations, and other short-term lodging in unincorporated areas of the county. The tax is paid by guests staying for 30 days or less, rather than by residents through ordinary property or sales taxes. County officials estimate that the increase would generate approximately \$250,000 annually for the county's general fund.

The measure raises revenue primarily from visitors using short-term accommodations, rather than increasing taxes on everyday purchases or residential housing. Vacation rentals are also part of a broader housing economy in which residential properties can generate income through tourism rather than long-term tenancy, although Measure X does not directly regulate that conversion. Because the tax applies to lodging expenditures, its burden depends on who uses the accommodations, including tourists, business travelers, and people requiring temporary housing.

Yolo County faces significant budget pressures, including the need to maintain health and human services, public safety, and emergency preparedness. The additional revenue would provide some fiscal flexibility without imposing a broad-based tax on residents. However, Measure X is a general tax, meaning the revenue is not legally earmarked for particular services. It is a relatively modest source of revenue and does not resolve the county's longer-term structural funding challenges. **We recommend a Yes vote**

Measure W — City of Davis (Willowgrove General Plan Amendment) - Yes

The Yes on W campaign in part is running on the slogan “Designed for Davis”, and while how broadly that slogan applies to this project is debatable, it’s clear that many of the features of this project take into account why past projects have failed. At completion the Willowgrove project will hold 1,250 units of housing on the North-East side of Davis, with 20% of those being deed-restricted affordable homes, and a further 23% being what folks might call “market-rate affordable”. The 250 deed-restricted affordable units will be built in the first phase of the development. 20 of the units at the project are being developed in partnership with Alta Regional Center, the local arm of California’s disabilities services, specifically to address the chronic affordable housing needs for adults with developmental disabilities in Davis. Overall, the project expands the city's available affordable housing, in a larger amount, than required by Davis’ development rules, and a specific effort to address equitable access to affordable housing for Davisites with developmental disabilities. **We recommend a Yes vote**

Measure Y — City of Woodland (1¢ Transactions and Use Tax) - No

Measure Y applies a one cent flat tax to all transactions. It is a regressive tax. Since the cost is the same even for low-income people, lower-income people pay a higher proportion of their income towards this tax. Furthermore, the cost is also the same regardless of purchase type or price, meaning expensive luxury goods are charged the same amount as basic living essentials.

Lastly, proceeds of the tax go to Woodland's general fund, meaning the tax could end up funding aggressive law enforcement policies that have negatively affected minorities in the past. **We recommend a No vote**

Measure Z — City of Woodland (Urban Limit Line / Utility Extension Policy) - No

Measure Z would amend Woodland's voter-approved Urban Limit Line, established in 2006 to protect farmland and limit urban sprawl, to allow municipal water and sewer services to be extended to existing commercial facilities within one mile of the boundary. The measure originated with requests from Bayer Crop Science and Clark Pacific, two large corporations operating outside the city limits. The two companies have funded the Yes campaign. Passing Measure Z would not move the Urban Limit Line or automatically approve development, but would create a permanent exception to the existing restrictions.

Supporters argue that connecting these businesses to municipal utilities would reduce groundwater pumping, improve wastewater management, protect local jobs, and provide additional infrastructure funding. These are legitimate potential benefits. However, the measure also raises questions about the use of public infrastructure to support private corporations, the long-term protection of agricultural land, and whether Woodland residents should weaken a voter-established growth boundary to accommodate two businesses. The environmental analysis addresses the immediate utility impacts, but does not resolve the broader question of how industrial development affects regional resources, including water, farmland, and the ecological costs of construction materials.

Woodland needs good jobs, a healthy environment, and a strong local economy. But economic development should be accountable to the entire community, not simply respond to the infrastructure needs of established corporations. Rather than creating exceptions to voter-approved growth protections one industry at a time, the city could establish clear public-benefit standards that evaluate infrastructure investments according to their contributions to local employment, environmental sustainability, community wealth, and long-term quality of life. Measure Z illustrates the need for that broader approach. **We recommend a No vote**

Measure B — Winters Joint Unified School District Bond (\$29.9 million) - Yes

Measure B allows Winters Joint Unified School District to sell \$29.9m worth of bonds to fund long-needed facilities improvement projects. Projects listed include roof and plumbing repairs, classroom and restroom modernization, health and accessibility improvements, and technology

updates. The district estimates that this will cost property owners \$46 per year per \$100,000 of assessed property value.

These are basic needs for the school district, which is a bedrock social institution. The measure straightforwardly levies a very modest property tax to provide much-needed improvements to the spaces where the vast majority of the community's children spend their time. **We recommend a Yes vote**

Measure H — Los Rios Community College District, SFID

No. 1 Bond (\$1.1 billion) - Yes

Measure H authorizes Los Rios Community College District (LRCCD) to issue bonds of up to \$1.1b to fund facilities improvement projects at American River College, Cosumnes River College, Folsom Lake College, Sacramento City College, and other facilities that support the district. Featured improvement projects include safe drinking water provision, roof repairs, and asbestos removal. The measure is written flexibly to allow for various other facilities construction, improvement, and expansion projects. Homeowners already pay a small fee on their property taxes for older college building loans; this new bond is timed to take the place of those old loans right as they get paid off, so the tax rate stays about the same for the next 25 years instead of dropping off

LRCCD is a staple institution that contributes to the upwards mobility of people in Yolo County. Like other community college districts across the state, LRCCD continues to offer an affordable alternative to CSUs, UCs, and private institutions. It serves as an essential entry point for Yolo County residents - especially those with less means - into four-year institutions, careers, or other stable economic positions. Passing this measure bolsters LRCCD's ability to serve this purpose. **We recommend a Yes vote**