

PROPOSITION 3 – ARGUMENT IN FAVOR

Proposition 3 provides access to healthcare for more than 150,000 Utahns and brings nearly \$800 million in federal funding back to our state every year from Washington D.C. – money that is already set aside for Utah. It's money 33 other states already get, but we've been losing out on for years. Proposition 3 creates nearly 14,000 new jobs and generates \$1.7 billion in new economic activity for our state.

Medicaid expansion is a good deal for Utah and helps provide life-saving healthcare to Utahns who earn less than \$17,000 a year, including parents and people with chronic illnesses who are often forced to choose between putting food on the table and getting treatments for diseases like cancer or diabetes.

Proposition 3 was also crafted to ensure that hard-working Utahns who earn a promotion or take on more hours to get ahead won't have their healthcare taken away. With this initiative, Medicaid covers working Utahns as they pull themselves out of poverty, and it rewards hard work—instead of punishing it by cutting off somebody's healthcare.

The Governor's Office of Management and Budget concluded that this program would be fiscally sound. It enables Utah taxpayers to expand healthcare access while promoting individual responsibility and smart use of public monies. Proposition 3 is accompanied with a sales tax increase on non-food items equivalent to about one cent on the cost of a movie ticket. This investment enables Utah to bring home nine times that amount in federal dollars every year.

AARP supports this measure because "Proposition 3 allows us to be fiscally responsible and significantly improve the lives of our families and neighbors most in need." This measure lets Utahns take control of our healthcare system, expand access to quality, affordable healthcare, and return Utah's federal tax dollars to our state. Vote "YES" on Proposition 3.

Alan Ormsby
AARP Utah State Director
1320 E. Milne Ln., Midvale, UT 84047

Representative Ray Ward
Utah State House of Representatives
954 E. Millbrook Way, Bountiful, UT 84010

Bishop Scott Hayashi
Episcopal Diocese of Utah
2649 E. Chalet Circle, Cottonwood Heights, UT 84043

PROPOSITION 3 – REBUTTAL TO ARGUMENT IN FAVOR

Don't Be Swayed by False Claims and Misguided Analysis
Robert Spendlove

The Utah Legislature already expanded Medicaid to close the coverage gap created by Obamacare. Those who currently have access to health insurance through that law will be able to keep it, while those who make too little to qualify will have access to Medicaid. This solution will be paid for with no sales tax increase and no additional state spending.

To say that those who earn a promotion or work to get ahead will have their healthcare taken away as a result of earning more money is simply not true. Medicaid always ends when the recipient makes a dollar above what is allowed. Proposition #3 does nothing to change that fact, nor would the federal government permit it.

The Governor's Office of Management and Budget (GOMB) also responded to claims made by the proponents of Proposition #3 by stating: "The Argument FOR Proposition #3 blatantly mischaracterizes GOMB's fiscal impact statement and willfully ignores express communication about the limited scope and use of the fiscal impact estimates. GOMB has not concluded that this initiative program is fiscally sound. To the contrary, GOMB explicitly warned in its fiscal estimate that Proposition #3 could be fiscally unsound in future years."

Proposition #3 is not fiscally responsible. It exposes Utah to great risk and uncertainty by taking away state flexibility to innovate and address the underlying problems at the heart of poverty.

Voters should not be swayed by false claims and misguided analysis, and should vote NO on Proposition #3.

PROPOSITION 3 – ARGUMENT AGAINST This Initiative is Bad Policy

Expanding Medicaid eligibility as originally envisioned by the Affordable Care Act (Obamacare), as this initiative does, is bad policy.

Medicaid was designed to help the most needy obtain healthcare, but this initiative incentivizes more spending on able-bodied adults than on the vulnerable. Similar expansions in other states have led to reductions in services for the disabled as state budgets have been squeezed by increases in funding for the expansion population. Many have also experienced budget shortfalls that could ultimately require even greater tax increases, or spending cuts to things like education, other programs for the needy, roads and public safety.

This initiative contains a tax increase on Utah families of \$90 million annually, amounting to nearly \$1 billion over 10 years. Before we raise taxes and spend more on working age, able-bodied adults, we should first clear out the waiting list of 2,900 disabled Utahns who currently don't have access to home and community-based care.

With this full Obamacare expansion, the state loses the ability to change or modify the program, as the federal government has complete control and will force compliance. We would have no ability to limit enrollment or implement cost controls to protect Utah taxpayers, who would be forced to pay an ever-growing bill.

Social, health and human services already represent the largest portion of our state budget. This initiative would leave taxpayers with a program on autopilot, a zombie program that would be financially devastating to our state. If federal officials do not approve all portions of the initiative, Utah will be forced to pay for it in its entirety, which is estimated to cost over \$700 million per year. The state would have no choice but to cut other essential services even further.

Utahns expect and deserve a responsible and compassionate solution to care for the most vulnerable among us. Greater access to healthcare for those in need has already been achieved through careful study and consideration. The state, through legislation, has extended Medicaid to the poor and needy in a responsible way that will help people move from poverty to self-reliance, with no new state money. It also allows us to make adjustments to coverage to keep the program from growing to an unsustainable level.

Those who suggest that opposing this initiative indicates a lack of compassion are simply wrong. Even those who support a broader social safety net should be wary of this deeply flawed, one-size-fits-all model.

We already have a responsible, compassionate Utah solution to care for our most vulnerable. This initiative goes too far.

Please join us as we respectfully vote “no thank you” to the federal government’s offer to create yet another new entitlement program by voting against Proposition 3.

Representatives:	Greene	McCay	Roberts	Wilde	Grover
Barlow	Hughes	McKell	Robertson	Wilson	Hemmert
Chew	Ivory	Jeff Moss	Schultz	Senators:	Henderson
Christofferson	Kennedy	Noel	Seegmiller	Adams	Stephenson
Coleman	Knotwell	Jeremy Peterson	Spendlove	Anderegg	
Daw	Lisonbee	Pulsipher	Thurston	Christensen	
Gibson	Maloy	Ray	Westwood	Fillmore	

Representative Robert Spendlove
350 North State Street
Salt Lake City, UT 84114

PROPOSITION 3 – REBUTTAL TO ARGUMENT AGAINST

Proposition 3 protects hard-working families and returns taxpayer money to Utah, where it belongs.

Medicaid expansion will return taxpayer dollars back to our state every year to benefit Utahns and grow our economy. Proposition 3 will bring home nine federal dollars for every state dollar spent. If someone offered you nine dollars if you gave them one, that’s a deal most of us would take every single time.

Thirty-three states have already expanded Medicaid, resulting in substantial job benefits and economic growth compared to non-expansion states. Independent economists say that Proposition 3 will grow our economy by \$1.7 billion, creating nearly 14,000 jobs and providing workers and small business owners with nearly \$785 million in new income in the next three years. Not one of those 33 states have reversed its decision. Instead, states have determined that expansion has boosted their economies, improved health outcomes and increased healthcare access.

Proposition 3's conservative approach protects taxpayer money and ensures that funds go directly where needed. The 10 percent state match needed to trigger federal funding for Medicaid expansion would come from a sales tax increase on non-food items, equivalent to about one cent on a movie ticket. Those funds will provide healthcare access to 150,000 Utahns, including parents and those with chronic illnesses.

Proposition 3 is a commonsense decision to return tax dollars to our state, grow our economy, protect small businesses, and provide life-saving healthcare to individuals earning less than \$17,000 annually.

Alan Ormsby
AARP Utah State Director

Representative Ray Ward
Utah State House of Representatives