League of Women Voters of San Francisco Education Fund

PROS & CONS GUIDE

SAN FRANCISCO BALLOT MEASURES

PROPOSITION A – PUBLIC HEALTH AND SAFETY BOND

General Obligation Bond
Placed on the ballot by Supervisors Avalos, Breed, Campos, Cohen, Farrell, Kim, Mar, Tang, Wiener, and Yee
Requires a 2/3 vote for passage

THE QUESTION:
Should the city of San Francisco issue a $350 million dollar bond to finance the construction, acquisition, improvement, seismic strengthening, and betterment of critical community and mental health, emergency response and safety, and homeless shelter and service facilities?

BACKGROUND:
The City recognizes the need to safeguard and enhance public health and safety in the event of an earthquake by constructing and improving facilities that provide critical health and safety services to City residents. Under the 10-year Capital Plan adopted in 2006, the City may uses property tax revenues to repair and reconstruct public health and safety infrastructure, including repairs made for seismic upgrades. Funding for repairs is accomplished through the sale of general obligation bonds, and property tax revenues are used to repay the principal and

ONLINE ELECTION INFO
www.sfvotes.org

ELECTION DAY IS TUESDAY, JUNE 7

Polls open from 7 am to 8 pm

Early voting starts May 9

May 23 last day to register to vote

For more information visit the SF Department of Elections at: www.sfgov.org/election

TO VOTE IN THE NOV ELECTION YOU MUST:

Be a U.S. citizen and a resident of California.

Be at least 18 years old by the date of the election.

Be registered to vote.

Not be in prison or on parole for a felony conviction.

Not have been judged mentally incompetent to vote by a court.

Federal and State Law now required that every person who registers or re-registers to vote provide either a California Driver's License (or California ID) number or the last 4 digits of your Social Security number on your registration card.

interest on the bonds. Property tax rates would not increase above the 2006 level and all bond spending is subject to a Citizens Oversight Committee.

The San Francisco General Hospital located on Potrero Avenue does not meet seismic safety standards for hospitals and is not expected to remain functional in the event of a major earthquake. City-owned homeless shelters and service sites are in need of repair. The San Francisco Department of Public Health has 10 health clinics that are unable to meet current needs for families seeking health and mental health care, urgent care, substance abuse services, and social services. City fire stations are in need of repair and modernization.

THE PROPOSAL:
This measure would authorize the City of San Francisco to issue up to $350 million of general obligation bonds for the construction and improvement of critical community health, emergency response and safety, and animal care facilities for earthquake safety as follows:

- $272 million will be used to fund seismic retrofits and fire response system improvements at the San Francisco General Hospital. This will include renovation of the Southeast Health Center and improvement of high demand community health centers with expansion of access to mental health care, urgent care, substance abuse services, and other services.
- $58 million will be used for construction and upgrades of the San Francisco Fire Department Ambulance Deployment Facility, including constructing a seismically safe and modernized paramedic deployment facility.
- $20 million will be used for facilities to better serve homeless individuals and families as part of the Homeless Health and Safety Project.

Bond spending under Proposition A would be subject to a Citizen's Oversight Committee and landlords may pass through 50% of resulting property tax increase to their tenants.

A "YES" Vote Means: You authorize the City to sell up to $350 million in general obligation bonds to finance the construction and improvement of community health, emergency response, and homeless shelter facilities.

A "NO" Vote Means: You <u>do not</u> authorize the City to sell bonds for this purpose

Smart Voter®

Each measure has additional comments provided by the Controller of the City of San Francisco that may be helpful for determining how best to vote on an issue. You may find these statements at www.lwvsf.org or at the Department of Elections.

ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROP A:

- San Francisco General Hospital is City's only acute care and trauma center that all San Franciscans will rely on after an earthquake or other disaster. Proposition A will make Building 5 at San Francisco General Hospital earthquake safe
- The current ambulance deployment facility was never meant to be a permanent home for our City's first responders. Proposition A will create a new, centrally located ambulance deployment center that will dramatically reduce restock times and allow for faster response
- Proposition A will significantly preserve mental health and substance abuse services available for the homeless, and help get people off the streets and into the care they need

ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROP A:

- This measure is too vague and too broad in scope (health and safety, earthquake safety, emergency response)
- A general obligation bond is no different than a tax – a deferred tax that gets paid by taxpayers after the money is spent
- Mark Zuckerberg recently donated money for improvements at San Francisco General Hospital

PROPOSITION B – PARK, RECREATION, AND OPEN SPACE FUND

Charter Amendment
Placed on the ballot by Supervisors Avalos, Breed, Campos, Cohen, Farrell, Kim, Mar, Wiener, and Yee
Requires a simple majority vote for passage

THE QUESTION: Should the Charter be amended to extend the sunset date of the Park, Recreation, and Open Space Fund through the 2045 fiscal year, including funding set-asides; create an additional, annual baseline funding for the Park, Recreation, and Open Space Fund; and require the Recreation and Park Department to include equity analysis in its planning obligations?

BACKGROUND:
In 2000, voters established the Park, Recreation and Open Space Fund ("Fund"). The City sets aside a portion of the property tax, equivalent to 2.5 cents for every $100 of assessed valuation, for the Fund. The Fund will expire at the end of the 2031 fiscal year.

This set-aside funding is in addition to any money normally budgeted to the Recreation and Parks Department. The City is not required to budget any particular amount to the Department, and "normally budgeted" is not defined in the Charter.

THE PROPOSAL:
The proposed measure would extend the life of the property tax set-aside Fund to the end of the 2045 fiscal year. It would also establish a baseline amount for the Department of at least the amount budgeted from the General Fund in the 2015 fiscal year, plus annual adjustments. Annual adjustments to the baseline budget would increase by $3 million from 2017 through 2026. Afterward, the Controller would adjust the Department's budget based on City revenues. The City would not be required to make annual adjustments to the baseline budget if a $200 million or greater deficit is projected. The baseline budget and annual adjustments would be in addition to the set-asides already paid to the Fund.

Proposition B would require the Parks Department to measure and compare services and resources in low-income neighborhoods to those available to the City, subject to Recreation and Parks Commission approval. All of the Department's strategic, expenditure, and operational plans would be required to include this comparison analysis to help eliminate deficiencies. The Department would also be subject to an audit in the fourth year of every strategic plan.

The Board of Supervisors would be required to have hearings on the Department's plans, but the Board would have no power to adopt, reject, or modify the plans. The Board would be allowed to withhold up to 5% of the baseline budget for non-compliance.

A "YES" Vote Means: You want the City to amend the Charter to extend the property tax set-aside for the Park, Recreation, and Open Space Fund until 2045 and for the City to create a minimum baseline budget for the Recreation and Parks Department from the General Fund.

A "NO" Vote Means: You do not want to make these changes to the Charter.

ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROP B:

- The proposal provides for stable funding for City parks, which have suffered from budget cuts even as the City's budget has grown. Proponents claim that over 20 million people visit the park system each year, and as much as $1 billion could be added to the budget for City parks under this proposal.
- The City's parks have a backlog of maintenance and critical improvement needs that this proposal could fund without raising taxes.
- The proposal would ensure equitable funding and resource management of parks in every neighborhood.

ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROP B:

- The proposition does not comply with a voter-approved, non-binding City policy limiting set-asides that reduce General Fund monies that could otherwise be allocated by the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors in the annual budget.
- The proposition diverts the City's General Funds that are otherwise discretionary, although funding can be suspended when the City budget forecasts a $200 million or greater deficit. This could affect funding for other City services. Opponents of the proposal claim that Prop. B would remove $1 billion from the City's general funds over 30 years.
- The Recreation and Parks Commission must approve the Recreation and Parks Department's plans. Although the City requires plans to be submitted to the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor, they have no authority to adopt, reject, or modify the Department's plans.

SMART Voter™
League of Women Voters

PROPOSITION C – AFFORDABLE HOUSING REQUIREMENTS

Charter Amendment
Placed on the ballot by the Board of Supervisors
Requires a simple majority for passage

THE QUESTION:
Should the Board of Supervisors be authorized to update the Charter on inclusionary or affordable housing obligations for new housing development projects and authorize the Board of Supervisors to make changes to affordable housing requirements by ordinance?

BACKGROUND:
Over the past 10 years, San Francisco has built 4,300 units of affordable housing and has lost 3,200 housing units due to Ellis Act evictions and short-term rental speculation. Average rents continue to increase, with median rent for a one bedroom at $3,500 a month.

In response to the housing crisis, San Francisco voters passed The Affordable Housing Goals Declaration of Policy (Prop K) in 2014 and the Affordable Housing Bond (Prop A) in 2015.

Under current inclusionary or affordable housing laws, developers are required to either pay a fee for affordable housing units equal to 20% of the total units developed, create at least 12% of on-site housing for low-income families, or create off-site affordable housing units equal to 20%

of the total units on the main development site. These requirements may be modified only by voter amendment of the Charter.

THE PROPOSAL:
This measure would amend the Charter to allow the City to change the minimum or maximum affordable housing obligations by ordinance and adopt definitions for affordable housing programs. Until the Planning Codes are amended by ordinance, Proposition C would set the following obligations for housing developments with more than 25 units as follows:

- Fee increases for affordable housing calculated at 33% of the total units developed,
- On-site affordable housing increased to 25% of the total units, with 15% for low income and 10% for middle income households, or
- Off-site affordable housing increased to 33% of the total units on the principal project, with 20% for low income and 13% for middle-income households.

Under these proposed amendments the City would be able to meet housing needs across a broad range of household incomes, family sizes, and neighborhood conditions. The City would be allowed to set new fee calculations based on building types and set policies on conversion of rental units to ownership units.

A "YES" Vote Means: You authorize the City to update inclusionary and affordable housing requirements for new housing development projects.

A "NO" Vote Means: You do not authorize the City to make changes to the existing law.

ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROP C:

- Proposition C will have an immediate impact on the housing crisis by requiring new housing developments to have a greater supply of low and middle income housing.
- This measure is the first to propose affordable housing for middle-income families.
- Proposition C allows the Board of Supervisors to adjust the affordable housing requirements either higher or lower, based on future economic conditions. This will ensure that the City can produce the maximum number of economically feasible affordable housing units.

ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROP C:

- Proposition C will reduce the overall amount of housing built and increase displacement of residents.
- Creating additional affordable housing will increase the cost of market-rate units.
- San Francisco residents will pay higher rent to off-set the increases in construction fees

and increased obligations by this measure.

PROPOSITION D – OFFICE OF CITIZEN COMPLAINTS INVESTIGATIONS

Initiative Ordinance
Placed on the ballot by the Board of Supervisors
Requires a simple majority vote for passage

THE QUESTION:
Should the Office of Citizens Complaints be required to investigate any incident in the City in which a police officer fires a gun and injures or kills someone?

BACKGROUND:
The Office of Citizen Complaints (OCC) is part of the Police Department and is charged with promptly, fairly, and impartially investigating all complaints of misconduct against members of the Police Department. Currently, there is no requirement for the OCC to investigate shootings by members of the police unless a complaint has been issued.

THE PROPOSAL:
This ordinance would make it a requirement for the Office of Citizen Complaints to investigate any incident in which a police officer fired a gun killing or physically injuring someone, even if no complaint has been filed. The Police Department would be required provide the OCC with full cooperation on this investigation.

A "YES" Vote Means: You want the Office of Citizen Complaints to investigate every incident where a police officer fires a gun resulting in injury or death, even if no complaint has been filed.

A "NO" Vote Means: You do not want the Office of Citizen Complaints to investigate every incident where a police officer fires a gun resulting in injury or death, unless a complaint has been filed.

ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROP D:

- Incidents involving shooting by an officer should be met with a high degree of accountability and transparency.
- In other municipalities where similar accountability was instituted, officer-involved shootings dramatically declined.

ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROP D:

- This measure does not give the Office of Citizen Complaints authority to prosecute police officers if the investigation finds inappropriate use of their guns, and therefore will only create more paperwork for the OCC.
- This might lead to investigations of accidental shootings.

LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS®
SAN FRANCISCO

PROPOSITION E – PAID SICK LEAVE

Initiative Ordinance
Placed on the ballot by the Board of Supervisors
Requires a simple majority vote for passage

THE QUESTION:
Shall the City amend the Paid Sick Leave Ordinance to adopt all state law provisions on sick leave without reducing any coverage, and allow employees to use paid sick leave hours for the broader purposes authorized by state law?

BACKGROUND:
In 2006, San Francisco voters approved the Paid Sick Leave Ordinance requiring one hour of paid sick leave for every 30 hours worked, up to 40 hours of paid leave. For employers with more than 10 employees the paid sick leave is capped at 72 hours. Under this ordinance, paid sick leave begins to accrue 90 days after the first date of employment.

California offers slightly broader protections for employees under a state paid sick leave policy, where leave accrues on the date of hire but cannot be used for the first 90 days.

Employers are required to comply with both Paid Sick Leave Ordinance and state law. The City is only required to offer employees benefits under the City's Paid Sick Leave Ordinance.

LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS®
SAN FRANCISCO

THE PROPOSAL:
Proposition E would amend the City's Paid Sick Leave Ordinance to parallel state law as follows:

- Employees would begin to accrue paid sick leave on the first date of employment,
- Employees who are rehired by the same employer within a year will have their unused paid sick leave reinstated,
- Qualifying paid sick leave would expand to include state law provisions for domestic violence, stalking, or sexual assault, bone marrow or organ donation and,
- Employees could use paid leave to care for a biological, adoptive, or foster parent, step-parent, or guardian of their spouse or registered partner, or employee's guardian when the employee is a minor.

The Board of Supervisors would be allowed to amend the Paid Sick Leave Ordinance to adopt broader protections offered by state law.

A "YES" Vote Means: You want to amend the Paid Sick Leave Ordinance to include greater state law benefits for employees and use of sick leave hours for broader purposes.

A "NO" Vote Means: You do not want to amend the Paid Sick Leave Ordinance.

ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROP E:

- The proposed amendments combine San Francisco policy with state laws, creating clarity

for both employees and employers.
- Proposition E conforms paid sick leave uses and definition of qualifying uses with state law, without reducing City benefits that are greater than the state law.

ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROP E:
- Expanding uses of sick leave without state caps will increase the cost to employers, especially those with fewer than 10 employees
- An increase to paid sick leave will burden employees not taking leave with greater hours and a larger work load.

There are no public comments on the District measure provided by the Controller of the City of San Francisco.

DISTRICT MEASUER PROPOSITION AA – CLEAN AND HEALTHY BAY PARCEL TAX

Parcel Tax
Placed on the ballot by the San Francisco Bay Restoration Authority
Requires a 2/3 vote among Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, Napa, San Mateo, Santa Clara, Solano, Sonoma, and San Francisco counties for passage

THE QUESTION:
Should the San Francisco Bay Restoration Authority authorize a parcel tax of $12 per year until 2037 throughout Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, Napa, San Mateo, Santa Clara, Solano, Sonoma, and San Francisco for the purpose of restoring 35,000 acres of wetlands that surround the San Francisco Bay?

BACKGROUND:
The San Francisco Bay Restoration Authority is an independent regional governmental entity formed in 2009. The Authority is charged with raising and allocating resources for the restoration, enhancement, protection, and enjoyment of wetlands and wildlife habitat in the San Francisco Bay.

The Bay Area lost about 85 percent of its marshlands for the purpose of urban development during the past 100 years, and currently there are approximately 35,000 acres of wetlands and marshlands that surround the Bay. The Authority has a long-term goal of restoring 100,000 acres of wetlands within 50 years, with an estimated total cost of $1.5 billion.

Proposition AA is the first regional parcel tax proposed, and is meant to provide a reliable funding source that would also leverage potential federal funding sources for the purpose of wetland and marshland restoration and protection of Bay Area cities from the potential impacts of future sea level rise.

THE PROPOSAL:
This parcel tax would authorize the San Francisco Bay Restoration Authority to levy a tax based on units of property of $12 per year throughout the nine counties that surround the San Francisco Bay. The tax would automatically expire in the year 2037, and during its lifetime would generate approximately $25

million per year, for a total of $500 million over 20 years.

The majority of funds raised through the tax would be used to restore tidal marshes on former hay fields in the North Bay, salt ponds in the South Bay, and diked-off areas from the Petaluma River to Santa Clara. The Measure ensures allocation of 50% of the funds to the Bay Area counties in proportion to their populations, and 50% allocated without regard to location.

Under this measure the San Francisco Bay Clean Water, Pollution Prevention and Habitat Restoration Program would protect the Bay by reducing trash, pollution, and harmful toxins, improving water quality, restoring habitat for fish, birds and wildlife, protecting communities from floods, and increasing shoreline public access.

Proposition AA is subject to independent citizen oversight, regular audits, and would require all funds generated by the tax to be spent locally.

A "YES" Vote Means: You authorize a parcel tax of $12 per year throughout the nine counties that surround the San Francisco Bay to finance the construction, development, acquisition, and preservation of affordable housing.

A "NO" Vote Means: You <u>do not</u> authorize a parcel tax of $12 per year throughout the nine counties that surround the San Francisco Bay to finance the construction, development, acquisition, and preservation of affordable housing.

ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF DISTRICT MEASURE AA:

- The tax will generate funding for the restoration of San Francisco Bay wetlands, benefiting the people, wildlife, and economy of Bay Area communities. Funding from this measure will reduce trash, pollution and harmful toxins in the Bay, improve water quality, restore wildlife habitat, protect communities from floods, and increase shoreline habitat for future generations throughout the Bay Area.
- The tax will leverage additional state and federal funding necessary to support the Authority's restoration goal.
- This measure includes accountability protections and citizens' oversight so that all funds must stay in the Bay Area to be used only on local habitat restoration and wildlife protection projects.

ARGUMENTS AGAINST DISTRICT MEASURE AA:

- There is no requirement for a scientific advisory board to evaluate proposed projects or assess project accomplishments.
- It is a blank check because Section 5.A states that the Authority Board can "amend this measure by majority vote."
- The tax is regressive because it does not levy funds in proportion to the value of the property.