November 2026
Key Ballot Propositions
with Impacts to Contra Costa County

PROP 1

The Veterans and Affordable Housing Bond Act (SB 417, Limon)

Authorizes $11.25 billion in state general obligation bonds for housing affordability programs, including for California veterans, and to finance housing development projects seeking federal tax credits.

Allocates funds:

- $5.1 billion to build and rehabilitate multifamily rental housing.
- $2.1 billion to acquire, rehabilitate, or preserve affordable housing units, and provide supportive housing for those experiencing homelessness.
- $1.25 billion for state-funded mortgages for California veterans.
- $1.1 billion for homeownership and downpayment assistance.
- $1 billion for farmworker, tribal, and student housing.
- $500 million for housing infrastructure.
- $200 million to support local housing programs.

This funding would provide subsidies for up to 40,000 multifamily rental units, as well as about 2,500 units for farmers and about 1,200 beds for university students. The bond proceeds will also help up to 40,000 households, including 2,100 veterans, with homeownership assistance and supporting the production and repair of homes.

Arguments in Support	Arguments in Opposition
A "yes" vote means the state could borrow $11.25 billion to support veterans and income-qualified housing programs, such as the Multifamily Housing Program, the CalHome Program, and the Joe Serna, Jr. Farmworker Housing Grant Program, at a time when the state's general fund cannot afford to pay for these directly. **Support:** Habitat for Humanity, California Alliance for Retired Americans, Housing California, California Housing Consortium, California Alliance of Child and Family Services, among others.	This bond would increase state costs by $500-600 million annually for about 25 years. Some opponents question the effectiveness of the specific funding streams in this bond for resolving the state housing crisis. **Opposition:** No opposition has been filed with the Secretary of State at this time.

Potential Impacts to Contra Costa County

If passed, Contra Costa County is likely to apply for funding in the various allocations to support affordable housing production, supportive housing services for multi-family housing, and related infrastructure or local housing programs.

PROP 2

Save for California's Future Act (ACA 20)

Increases State's Rainy Day Fund to address revenue volatility.

Also known as the Budget Stabilization Account Cap Increase and Gann Limit Changes Amendment, this measure would:

- Increase the Budget Stabilization Account (BSA) cap from 10% of general fund revenues to 20%;
- Increase the amount of general fund revenue growth that must be deposited into the BSA when growth is above 8%; and
- Subject withdrawals from the BSA to the state spending limit (Gann Limit) and exclude deposits into the BSA from the limit.

This measure is intended to allow the state to set aside more money when times are good, increasing the amount that can be saved during years when revenues from these tax sources reach high levels, so that the state has more savings when economic downturns hit.

Arguments in Support	Arguments in Opposition
A "yes" vote means the state could set aside more money during surplus years to use to balance the budget during deficit years. State law currently has a spending limit that forces the state to return funds to taxpayers when surpluses exceed a certain percentage of the budget. **Support:** Gov. Newsom, California Professional Firefighters, California Hospital Association, California Primary Care Association, SEIU, among others.	Opponents argue that surplus money should be returned to taxpayers, as required under the existing Gann spending limit, rather than saved for future spending. **Opposition:** No opposition has been filed with the Secretary of State at this time.

Potential Impacts to Contra Costa County

California's revenue structure is progressive, and driven by three major components: personal income tax, sales & use tax, and corporation tax. Personal income tax is heavily-dependent upon capital gains, which are subject to large fluctuations. This measure is intended to smooth some of the state's general fund volatility to ensure more stable, predictable funding for state-funded programs.

PROP 3

Provides Permanent Funding for Schools and Health Care by Extending Existing Tax on High Incomes. (Initiative #25-0016)

Proposition 3 would make permanent the existing 2012 voter-approved tax rates for high-income Californians, currently set to expire on January 1, 2031. This initiative would affect the top 2 percent of California taxpayers with the highest incomes. The tax rate was first adopted in 2012 with the approval of Prop 30, and renewed in 2016 with the approval of Prop 55.

The initiative would continue the higher marginal income tax rates on income above $361,000 for single filers and $721,000 for joint filers.

The initiative would maintain that the revenue generated from the increased marginal tax rate would be divided, with 89% going to K-12 schools and 11% to state community colleges.

Arguments in Support	Arguments in Opposition
Without this permanent extension of the tax, education could lose between $5-15 billion each year, requiring school funding to be paid for by other sources. Allowing the tax to lapse would be the equivalent of a tax cut for high-income earners. **Support:** AFSCME, California Federation of Teachers, California Professional Firefighters, California State PTA, SEIU, among others.	Opponents argue that taxing the highest earners continues to create an imbalanced tax system, subject to major fluctuations in revenues depending on the stock market, and can also result in high earners leaving the state. Additionally, guaranteeing 100% of these revenues to schools does not provide flexibility to the state when needed. **Opposition:** California Taxpayers Association, Family Business Association, California Hispanic Chamber of Commerce, Reform California.

Potential Impacts to Contra Costa County

If this existing tax were allowed to lapse by the voters, schools in California would lose between $5-15 billion per year. A large amount of this loss would likely be offset with general fund dollars, taking away state funding for core county services.

PROP 43

Limits Voters' Ability to Raise Revenues for Local Government Services (ACA 22)

Creates a 2/3 Vote Requirement for Local Special Tax Initiatives and a Property Tax Initiative Amendment.

Beginning January 1, 2027, Proposition 43 would require that all local special taxes receive approval from two-thirds of voters, regardless of whether the tax is placed on the ballot by a local government or by voters through the initiative process. This provision would effectively reverse the legal interpretation created by recent court decisions that allow voter-initiated special taxes to pass with a simple majority vote.

Proposition 43 also prohibits local governments, including voters through the initiative process, from imposing ad valorem taxes on real property, except as otherwise allowed by the constitution.

Arguments in Support	Arguments in Opposition
"Prop 43 makes it harder for local politicians to raise your taxes by restoring the two-thirds vote requirement on any local tax measures. It also closes loopholes the politicians have created in Prop 13 to violate the property tax caps that voters originally imposed." – Reform California **Support:** California Hispanic Chambers of Commerce, California Taxpayers Association, Howard Jarvis Taxpayers Association, Reform California, among others.	"This measure would require 2/3 voter approval to raise any new local revenue. If this measure passes, it will make California the hardest place in the country to raise local revenue." – Evolve California **Opposition:** California Federation of Teachers, California Professional Firefighters, Californians Against Waste, Evolve California, League of California cities, State Assemblymember Buffy Wicks (AD-14), among others.

Potential Impacts to Contra Costa County

Proposition 43 does not have an immediate fiscal impact on counties, but it could result in a potential future reduction in what local governments would otherwise collect in revenues due to a higher vote threshold for certain taxes. If a group of citizens wants to organize a to pass a new special local tax in the future, they will be subject to the higher vote threshold (2/3 requirement), the same as a measure placed by the Board of Supervisors.

PROP 45

Modifies Environmental Review for Certain Projects

Amends CEQA to expedite environmental review of specified project categories (including most housing, transportation, water, health, and clean energy projects). For these types of projects, this measure:

- Sets deadlines for public agencies to complete environmental review and take required actions for project;
- Allows expedited review of project's environmental impacts, limiting public agencies' current obligation to consider a range of feasible project alternatives to reduce environmental impacts; and
- Limits court review of project approvals by establishing deadlines for filing and resolving lawsuits and limiting evidence court may consider and relief it can order.

Arguments in Support	Arguments in Opposition
Supporters argue that CEQA has been abused to environmentalists and NIMBYs to increase cost and create massive delays in the construction of critical housing, transportation, and water projects across California. This will limit the scope of lawsuits and expedite processing of application without changing the environmental projections and regulations that underly CEQA. **Support:** California Chamber of Commerce, California Building Industry Association California Business Roundtable, among others.	Opponents argue that Prop 45 won't lower living costs and instead benefits corporate polluters by weakening environmental and public review. It risks public health, increases pollution near communities, and shifts power away from residents by limiting public input. **Opposition:** Center for Environmental Health, NRDC Action Fund, State Building and Construction Trades Council of CA, Surfrider Foundation, Western Center on Law and Poverty, among others.

Potential Impacts to Contra Costa County

Proposition 45 would impose strict new timelines and requirements on local agencies to complete environmental review. It would also limit community input and the ability to propose alternatives. Mandated approval actions for missed deadlines could force counties to make premature or legally vulnerable decisions; increasing litigation risk rather than streamlining approvals.