Sample Ballot

Ballot Type 1

SAMPLE BALLOT

A

NOVEMBER 3, 2026, GENERAL ELECTION

COUNTY OF SANTA BARBARA

Instructions for Voting

- To vote for a candidate, use a black or blue ballpoint pen to completely fill in the oval ◯ next to the candidate's name or the word "Yes" or "No" like this: ●
- To vote for a qualified write-in candidate, write the name in the blank space provided and fill in the oval.
- If you make a mistake: contact the elections official for instructions or to obtain another ballot. A mistake in one contest does not affect the rest of the ballot.
- Do not select more candidates than the number to be elected. You may vote in as many or as few contests as you want.

Voter-Nominated and Nonpartisan Offices

Candidates display a party preference (or None) for the information of voters. This is not a party endorsement or approval.

VOTER-NOMINATED OFFICES

STATE

Governor

Vote for One

- **STEVE HILTON** ◯
  Party Preference: Republican
  Small Business Owner
- **XAVIER BECERRA** ⊗
  Party Preference: Democratic
  Voting Rights Attorney

Lieutenant Governor

Vote for One

- **GLORIA ROMERO** ◯
  Party Preference: Republican
  Educator/Businesswoman
- **FIONA MA** ⊗
  Party Preference: Democratic
  State Treasurer/CPA

Secretary of State

Vote for One

- **DONALD P. (DON) WAGNER** ◯
  Party Preference: Republican
  Orange County Supervisor
- **SHIRLEY N. WEBER** ⊗
  Party Preference: Democratic
  California Secretary of State

Controller

Vote for One

- **MALIA M. COHEN** ⊗
  Party Preference: Democratic
  State Controller/Mother
- **HERB W MORGAN** ◯
  Party Preference: Republican
  Chief Investment Officer

Treasurer

Vote for One

- **JENNIFER HAWKS** ◯
  Party Preference: Republican
  Retired Business Executive
- **ELENI KOUNALAKIS** ⊗
  Party Preference: Democratic
  Lieutenant Governor of California

Attorney General

Vote for One

- **ROB BONTA** ⊗
  Party Preference: Democratic
  California Attorney General
- **MICHAEL E. GATES** ◯
  Party Preference: Republican
  Deputy United States Attorney

Insurance Commissioner

Vote for One

- **JANE KIM** ◯
  Party Preference: Democratic
  Attorney/Consumer Advocate
- **BEN ALLEN** ⊗
  Party Preference: Democratic
  California State Senator

Member, State Board of Equalization, District 2

Vote for One

- **SALLY J. LIEBER** ⊗
  Party Preference: Democratic
  Incumbent
- **JOHN PIMENTEL** ◯
  Party Preference: Democratic
  Member, Board of Trustees, San Mateo County Community College District

UNITED STATES REPRESENTATIVE

United States Representative District 24

Vote for One

- **BOB SMITH** ◯
  Party Preference: Republican
  Defense Systems Engineer
- **SALUD CARBAJAL** ⊗
  Party Preference: Democratic
  Member of Congress

MEMBER OF THE STATE ASSEMBLY

Member of the State Assembly District 37

Vote for One

- **SARI DOMINGUES** ◯
  Party Preference: Republican
  Retired Business Analyst
- **GREGG HART** ⊗
  Party Preference: Democratic
  State Assemblymember

NONPARTISAN OFFICES

JUDICIAL

Vote YES or NO for each office

FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT

Shall Associate Justice of the Supreme Court **JOSHUA GROBAN** be elected to the office for the term provided by law?

YES ⊗ NO ◯

FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT

Shall Associate Justice of the Supreme Court **KELLI M. EVANS** be elected to the office for the term provided by law?

YES ⊗ NO ◯

FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE, COURT OF APPEAL, 2ND DISTRICT, DIVISION 1

Shall Associate Justice **MICHELLE C. KIM** be elected to the office for the term provided by law?

YES ⊗ NO ◯

FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE, COURT OF APPEAL, 2ND DISTRICT, DIVISION 1

Shall Associate Justice **GREGORY J. WEINGART** be elected to the office for the term provided by law?

YES ⊗ NO ◯

FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE, COURT OF APPEAL, 2ND DISTRICT, DIVISION 2

Shall Associate Justice **ANNE RICHARDSON** be elected to the office for the term provided by law?

YES ⊗ NO ◯

FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE, COURT OF APPEAL, 2ND DISTRICT, DIVISION 2

Shall Associate Justice **STEVE GOORVITCH** be elected to the office for the term provided by law?

YES ⊗ NO ◯

FOR PRESIDING JUSTICE, COURT OF APPEAL, 2ND DISTRICT, DIVISION 3

Shall Presiding Justice **RASHIDA A. ADAMS** be elected to the office for the term provided by law?

YES ⊗ NO ◯

FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE, COURT OF APPEAL, 2ND DISTRICT, DIVISION 3

Shall Associate Justice **MARK HANASONO** be elected to the office for the term provided by law?

YES ⊗ NO ◯

FOR PRESIDING JUSTICE, COURT OF APPEAL, 2ND DISTRICT, DIVISION 4

Shall Presiding Justice **HELEN ZUKIN** be elected to the office for the term provided by law?

YES ⊗ NO ◯

FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE, COURT OF APPEAL, 2ND DISTRICT, DIVISION 4

Shall Associate Justice **NICHOLAS DAUM** be elected to the office for the term provided by law?

YES ⊗ NO ◯

FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE, COURT OF APPEAL, 2ND DISTRICT, DIVISION 4

Shall Associate Justice **AUDRA M. MORI** be elected to the office for the term provided by law?

YES ⊗ NO ◯

FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE, COURT OF APPEAL, 2ND DISTRICT, DIVISION 4

Shall Associate Justice **ARMEN TAMZARIAN** be elected to the office for the term provided by law?

YES ⊗ NO ◯

CARD "A" This is ballot card 1 of 2

Sample Ballot

NONPARTISAN OFFICES

JUDICIAL — Vote YES or NO for each office

FOR PRESIDING JUSTICE, COURT OF APPEAL, 2ND DISTRICT, DIVISION 5

Shall Presiding Justice **BRIAN M. HOFFSTADT** be elected to the office for the term provided by law?

- **YES** ⓧ
- **NO** ◯

FOR PRESIDING JUSTICE, COURT OF APPEAL, 2ND DISTRICT, DIVISION 6

Shall Presiding Justice **TARI L. CODY** be elected to the office for the term provided by law?

- **YES** ⓧ
- **NO** ◯

FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE, COURT OF APPEAL, 2ND DISTRICT, DIVISION 6

Shall Associate Justice **KENNETH R. YEGAN** be elected to the office for the term provided by law?

- **YES** ◯
- **NO** ⓧ

FOR PRESIDING JUSTICE, COURT OF APPEAL, 2ND DISTRICT, DIVISION 7

Shall Presiding Justice **GONZALO C. MARTINEZ** be elected to the office for the term provided by law?

- **YES** ⓧ
- **NO** ◯

FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE, COURT OF APPEAL, 2ND DISTRICT, DIVISION 7

Shall Associate Justice **NATALIE STONE** be elected to the office for the term provided by law?

- **YES** ⓧ
- **NO** ◯

FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE, COURT OF APPEAL, 2ND DISTRICT, DIVISION 8

Shall Associate Justice **JOHN WILEY** be elected to the office for the term provided by law?

- **YES** ⓧ
- **NO** ◯

FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE, COURT OF APPEAL, 2ND DISTRICT, DIVISION 8

Shall Associate Justice **MATTHEW A. SCHERB** be elected to the office for the term provided by law?

- **YES** ⓧ
- **NO** ◯

FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE, COURT OF APPEAL, 2ND DISTRICT, DIVISION 8

Shall Associate Justice **VICTOR G. VIRAMONTES** be elected to the office for the term provided by law?

- **YES** ⓧ
- **NO** ◯

SCHOOL

State Superintendent of Public Instruction

Vote for One

- **SONJA SHAW** — School District President ◯
- **RICHARD BARRERA** — State Superintendent Advisor ⓧ
- ◯

Write-In _____

CARD "A" This is ballot card 1 of 2

Sample Ballot

Ballot Type 1

SAMPLE BALLOT

NOVEMBER 3, 2026, GENERAL ELECTION

COUNTY OF SANTA BARBARA

B

MEASURES SUBMITTED TO THE VOTERS

STATE

PROPOSITION 1
AUTHORIZES BONDS FOR HOUSING AFFORDABILITY PROGRAMS. LEGISLATIVE STATUTE. Authorizes $11.25 billion in state general obligation bonds for housing affordability programs, including multifamily rental housing, mortgages for veterans, supportive housing, preservation of existing affordable housing, and downpayment assistance.
Fiscal Impact: Increased state cost of $500 million to $600 million annually for about 25 years to repay the housing bond.
Supporters: US Vets; CA Federation of Teachers; Self-Help for the Elderly; Habitat for Humanity CA; CA Alliance of Child & Family Services
Opponents: None submitted

YES ⓧ
NO ◯

PROPOSITION 2
INCREASES STATE'S RAINY DAY FUND. LEGISLATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Increases California's Rainy Day Fund, approved by voters in 2014, to provide funding for education, health care, public safety, and other essential services during economic downturns.
Fiscal Impact: State budget reserves would be higher.
Supporters: CA Professional Firefighters; LA Chamber of Commerce; Gavin Newsom; Xavier Becerra; Assemblymember Jesse Gabriel
Opponents: None submitted

YES ⓧ
NO ◯

PROPOSITION 3
PROVIDES PERMANENT FUNDING FOR SCHOOLS AND HEALTH CARE BY EXTENDING EXISTING TAX ON HIGH INCOMES. INITIATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Makes permanent existing voter-approved tax rates for individuals earning over $371,000 (adjusted annually for inflation). Allocates tax revenues to public education.
Fiscal Impact: Maintains $5 billion to $15 billion of annual state income tax revenue by making a temporary tax increase on high-income earners permanent instead of letting it expire in 2031.
Supporters: California Teachers Association; CA School Nurses Organization; California State PTA; Planned Parenthood Affiliates of CA
Opponents: California Taxpayers Association; Family Business Association of California; California Hispanic Chambers of Commerce

YES ⓧ
NO ◯

PROPOSITION 4
REPEALS PROHIBITION AGAINST PUBLIC FUNDING OF ELECTION CAMPAIGNS. LEGISLATIVE STATUTE. Repeals prohibition on state and local governments offering public funding of candidate election campaigns. Public funding programs may not use funds earmarked for education, transportation, or public safety.
Fiscal Impact: Ongoing costs to the state of a few hundred thousand dollars each year for the Fair Political Practices Commission to answer questions from state and local governments about public campaign finance programs.
Supporters: League of Women Voters of CA; California Nurses Association; Mental Health Advocacy; Social Security Works; Consumer Watchdog
Opponents: California Taxpayers Assn; Howard Jarvis Taxpayers Assn; Family Business Assn of California; United Latinos Action

YES ⓧ
NO ◯

PROPOSITION 5
CHANGES RECALL ELECTION PROCESS FOR STATEWIDE OFFICERS. LEGISLATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Under current law, voters elect replacement candidates at the same time as the recall election. This measure instead fills recall vacancies by subsequent special election or appointment.
Fiscal Impact: Net fiscal effect unknown. In the event of a recall, savings or costs of millions of dollars to administer the election depending on the office recalled.
Supporters: None submitted
Opponents: None submitted

YES ⓧ
NO ◯

PROPOSITION 37
CREATES LOAN PROGRAM FOR MIDDLE-INCOME BUYERS OF QUALIFIED NEW HOMES. INITIATIVE STATUTE. Authorizes $25 billion in bonds to offer eligible buyers fixed-rate mortgages for up to 17% of purchase price of a newly constructed home priced below about $1.5 million. Borrowers must be California residents, occupy the home, meet income limits, and pay at least 3% down. Bonds repaid by mortgage payments, not State.
Fiscal Impact: No direct state or local costs.
Supporters: United Nurses Associations of California; California Conference of Carpenters; California State Treasurer Fiona Ma
Opponents: None submitted

YES ⓧ
NO ◯

PROPOSITION 38
AUTHORIZES BONDS FOR IMMUNOLOGY MEDICAL RESEARCH. INITIATIVE STATUTE. Authorizes $8.4 billion in general obligation bonds for immunology and immunotherapy research, half to a single University of California-affiliated nonprofit medical research institute, half to research grants.
Fiscal Impact: Increased state cost of $500 million to $600 million annually for about 20 years to repay the research bond, with some or all of the cost offset if the funded research generates revenue.
Supporters: Michael J. Fox Foundation; Alzheimer's Los Angeles; Kidney Cancer Assoc; American Nurses Assoc\CA
Opponents: Robert M Kaplan Ph.D.

YES ⓧ
NO ◯

PROPOSITION 39
PROHIBITS CITIZENS FROM VOTING UNLESS THEY PRESENT GOVERNMENT-ISSUED IDENTIFICATION. INITIATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Invalidates mail ballots that do not have last four digits of designated government-issued identification number written on envelope. Prohibits in-person voting without presenting government-issued identification.
Fiscal Impact: Costs of between tens of millions of dollars and low hundreds of millions of dollars each year to implement new voting requirements.
Supporters: The Transparency Foundation; Latino American Political Assn; Howard Jarvis Taxpayers Assn; CA Women's Leadership Assn
Opponents: ACLU California Action; Common Cause; League of Women Voters of California

YES ◯
NO ⓧ

PROPOSITION 40
IMPOSES ONE-TIME TAX ON CERTAIN TAXPAYERS. INITIATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT AND STATUTE. Imposes 5% tax on certain taxpayers with assets over $1 billion; revenue primarily for health care. Exempts revenues from constitutional requirements for school funding and spending limit.
Fiscal Impact: Temporary revenue increase of tens of billions of dollars spread over several years from wealth tax on billionaires. Possible ongoing decrease of less than $1 billion per year in income tax revenue from billionaires.
Supporters: US Senator Bernie Sanders; SEIU United Healthcare Workers West
Opponents: California Primary Care Association; California School Boards Association; California Taxpayers Association

YES ◯
NO ⓧ

PROPOSITION 41
PROHIBITS NEW STATE TAXES THAT EXCLUDE REVENUES FROM STATE SPENDING LIMIT. REQUIRES AUDITS FOR NEW STATE SPECIAL TAXES. INITIATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Nullifies state taxes enacted after January 1, 2026 that exempt their revenues from voter-approved state spending limit. Requires pre-election and recurring audits of programs funded by new special taxes.
Fiscal Impact: The net fiscal effect is unknown as it depends on future decisions by voters, the Legislature, and other policymakers.
Supporters: CA Society of Certified Public Accountants (CalCPAs); CalAsian Chamber of Commerce; California Taxpayers Association (CalTax)
Opponents: US Senator Bernie Sanders; SEIU United Healthcare Workers West

YES ◯
NO ⓧ

PROPOSITION 42
PROHIBITS NEW STATE PERSONAL PROPERTY TAXES AND CERTAIN RETROACTIVE STATE TAXES. INITIATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Prohibits any new state tax (1) imposed on the ownership of personal property (all things people own other than real estate), or (2) that applies retroactively based on taxpayer's past activities. Nullifies taxes enacted after January 1, 2026 that conflict with this measure.
Fiscal Impact: Possibility that tax revenues will not go up as much in the future.
Supporters: CA Professional Firefighters; State Building & Construction Trades Council of CA; AMVETS Department of CA
Opponents: US Senator Bernie Sanders; SEIU United Healthcare Workers West

YES ◯
NO ⓧ

PROPOSITION 43
LIMITS VOTERS' ABILITY TO RAISE REVENUES FOR LOCAL GOVERNMENT SERVICES. LEGISLATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Limits voters' ability to pass voter-proposed local special taxes by increasing percentage of votes needed to approve such ballot measures from a majority (over 50%) to two-thirds, beginning January 1, 2027.
Fiscal Impact: Possibility that local government tax revenues will not go up as much in the future due to a higher vote threshold for certain taxes.
Supporters: California Taxpayers Association; Family Business Association of California; California Hispanic Chambers of Commerce
Opponents: California Professional Firefighters; California Federation of Teachers; Nurse Alliance of SEIU CA.

YES ◯
NO ⓧ

CARD "B" This is ballot card 2 of 2

Sample Ballot

MEASURES SUBMITTED TO THE VOTERS

STATE

PROPOSITION 44
REQUIRES COMMUNITY HEALTH CLINICS SPEND 90% OF REVENUE ON PROGRAM SERVICES. INITIATIVE STATUTE. Imposes penalties on nonprofit Federally Qualified Health Centers (community clinics providing primary care to medically underserved areas and populations) that spend less than 90% of revenue on "program services" advancing their charitable purpose, including but not limited to patient services.
Fiscal Impact: Increased state costs in the low tens of millions of dollars per year, covered by fees.
Supporters: None submitted
Opponents: American Academy of Pediatrics CA; CA School Nurses Org; CA Academy of Family Physicians; CA Medical Assoc.

YES ◯

NO ⓧ

PROPOSITION 45
MODIFIES ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW FOR CERTAIN PROJECTS. INITIATIVE STATUTE. Amends California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) to expedite environmental review for certain projects (including most housing, transportation, water, and health projects) by setting deadlines to complete environmental review and resolve lawsuits challenging project approvals.
Fiscal Impact: Initial costs for state and local governments, likely in the high tens of millions of dollars—potentially exceeding $100 million—annually, partly covered by fees. Uncertain, potentially more significant positive or negative longer-term fiscal effects.
Supporters: California Children's Hospital Association; California Water Association; California Council for Affordable Housing
Opponents: Coalition for Clean Air; CA Environmental Voters; Physicians for Social Responsibility, LA; National Wildlife Federation

YES ◯

NO ⓧ

CARD "B" This is ballot card 2 of 2