



LEAGUE OF
WOMEN VOTERS®
SAN FRANCISCO

San Francisco Ballot Measures

★ Pros & Cons Guide ★

Non-Partisan Information on the Election

Polls are open from 7:00 am to 8:00 pm on Election Day
Early voting starts October 11

This Pros & Cons Guide has been prepared by the League of Women Voters of San Francisco, a non-partisan political organization. We offer education to help citizens participate in the democratic process and we engage in advocacy to influence public policy that benefits the community. Through their League involvement, our members become more informed and active participants in local, state, and national government. **Join the League to make a difference: lwvsf.org.**

PROPOSITION C – Loans to Finance Acquisition and Rehabilitation of Affordable Housing

Ordinance. Placed on the ballot by the Board of Supervisors. Requires a 2/3rds vote for passage.

THE QUESTION:

Shall the City expand the use of the 1992 general obligation bond to allow up to \$260,700,000 in remaining funds as loans that finance the acquisition, improvement and rehabilitation of at-risk multi-unit residential buildings that would convert such structures such structures to permanent affordable housing?

BACKGROUND:

In November 1992, San Francisco voters approved an ordinance authorizing the City to issue up to \$350 million in general obligation bonds to seismically upgrade unreinforced masonry buildings that are at risk from strong earthquakes. The City was required to use the money from these bonds for:

- \$150 million to provide loans to pay for seismic upgrades to unreinforced masonry buildings for affordable housing (Affordable Housing Loan Program); and
- \$200 million to provide loans to pay for seismic upgrades to market-rate residential, commercial and institutional unreinforced masonry buildings (Market Rate Loan Program).

The City has issued approximately \$45 million in loans under the Affordable Housing Loan Program and approximately \$50 million in loans under the Market Rate Loan Program. Approximately \$261 million can still be issued under the 1992 ordinance.

THE PROPOSAL:

This ordinance would change the way the City is allowed to use the remaining \$261 million in general obligation bonds. In addition to the purposes specified in the 1992 ordinance, Proposition C would allow funds to be used for loans to acquire, improve and rehabilitate at-risk multi-unit residential buildings in need of seismic, fire, health or safety upgrades or other major rehabilitation; and to convert those buildings to permanent affordable housing. A multi-unit residential building is a building with three or more units.

A “YES” Vote Means: You want to allow the City to spend the unused \$261 million from the 1992 general obligation bond ordinance to provide loans to acquire, improve and rehabilitate at-risk multi-unit residential buildings in need of seismic, fire, health or safety upgrades or other major rehabilitation; and to convert those buildings to permanent affordable housing.

A “NO” Vote Means: You do not want to make these changes.

ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROP C:

- Proposition C would create new, permanently affordable housing.
- This measure could stabilize housing costs for families living in at-risk housing purchased through Prop C funds.

ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROP C:

- Proposition C would increase the cost of government.
- The bonds could fund the displacement of residents by private landlords.

PROPOSITION D – Filling Vacancies in Local Elective Office

Charter Amendment placed on the ballot by the Board of Supervisors. Requires a simple majority to pass.

THE QUESTION:

Should the Charter be amended to require the Mayor to fill any vacancy in any local elected office within 28 days of the date the office becomes vacant, and, additionally, establish new procedures for filling a vacancy on the Board of Supervisors, including requiring under certain conditions that a Special Election be held in that district, usually within 180 days. Additionally, should the temporary Supervisor appointee not be able to run in that election?

BACKGROUND:

Currently, when a vacancy occurs in a local elected office, the Mayor must appoint a qualified person to fill the vacant office until the next election. The Mayor does not have a deadline for making these temporary appointments nor is there any additional approval process by any other person or body.

The City fills the vacancy for the remainder of the term of office by holding an election, which generally occurs on the date of the next scheduled City election. This election could happen very quickly or, under the new election laws, take up to two years after the appointment. The person appointed by the Mayor to temporarily fill a vacancy may run in the next election.

Currently, this process also applies to members of the Board of Supervisors. Currently, this process also applies to members of the Board of Supervisors. This legislation results from concerns that the unilateral appointment by the Mayor of a member of the Board of Supervisors leads to a loss of separation of powers between the executive and legislative branch. In addition, because the mayoral appointee serves until the next election, that appointee gains the power of incumbency over a new candidate.

Passage of this proposition would require the City to hold a special election for a vacant Board of Supervisors position, usually within 180 days after the vacancy, if no regular election is already scheduled. The temporary Supervisor appointee would not be able to run in that election.

THE PROPOSAL:

This legislation results from concerns that the unilateral appointment by the Mayor of a member of the Board of Supervisors leads to a loss of separation of powers between the executive and legislative branch. In addition, because the mayoral appointee serves until the next election, that appointee gains the power of incumbency over a new candidate.

Passage of Proposition D would require the City to hold a special election for a vacant Board of Supervisors position, usually within 180 days after the vacancy, if no regular election is already scheduled. The temporary Supervisor appointee would not be able to run in that election.

A “YES” Vote Means: If you vote “yes,” you want to amend the Charter to:

- Require the Mayor to make a temporary appointment to fill a vacancy in a local elected office within 28 days of the date of the vacancy;
- Provide that the person who temporarily fills a vacancy on the Board of Supervisors cannot run in the election held to fill that vacancy for the remainder of the term; and
- Require the City to hold an election to fill a vacancy on the Board of Supervisors within 126 to 154 days if there is no City election scheduled, within 180 days if another election is already scheduled within that period, or more than 180 days later if requested by the Director of Elections and approved by the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors.

A “NO” Vote Means: If you vote “no, you do not want to make these changes.

ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROP D:

For all appointed offices, Proposition D would:

- Ensure that all elected-official vacancies are filled promptly, promoting continuation of City government in that position;

For the Board of Supervisors vacancies, Proposition D would also:

- Strengthen the separation between the executive and the legislative branches of City government by allowing the people in a district to select their representative sooner than is now the case;
- Bring SF City and County into best practices, as recommended in the 2013 SF LAFco report and as is done with positions in the US Senate, the US House or Representatives, the State Assembly and State Senate;
- Promote democracy by supporting open and competitive elections, while helping to control the power of incumbency and the resultant financial advantage given to incumbents;
- Cost a small part of the City budget -- as estimated by the Controller the cost over four years would be \$340,000 or \$85,000 a year - .0009% of San Francisco's 2106-2107 \$9.6 billion budget.
- Reduce the temptation of the office of the mayor to appoint termed-out supervisors to other positions before their term expires.
- Allow the appointee to run in other elections, accept other future appointments, or run in a future election for the same position.

ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROP D:

There are no arguments against requiring the Mayor to fill all vacant elected positions within 28 days.

For the Board of Supervisor vacancies, Proposition D would:

- Waste voters' time, because currently the Mayor fills that vacancy until the next election;
- Waste voters' time because only that position can be on the ballot for a special election (if the special election is not combined with a regular election);
- Waste 'millions of taxpayer dollars';
- Reduce the power of the Mayor;
- Appoint a person for the short-term interim appointment, who would be unaccountable to their constituents, because they would not be allowed to run in the special election for that position;
- Appoint a person to the short-term appointment, who might be less qualified or motivated, as the appointee is not permitted to run in the special election for that specific position;
- Result in a special election that might have a low voter turnout;
- Result in an election that would give more power to special interests.

PROPOSITION E – Responsibility for the Maintenance of Street Trees

Charter amendment placed on the ballot by the Board of Supervisors. Requires a 2/3rds vote for passage.

THE QUESTION:

Should the city of San Francisco set aside \$19 million from the General Fund and transfer responsibility from property owners to the City for the maintenance of trees and sidewalks damaged by the trees?

BACKGROUND:

Since 2011, City law has generally required property owners to maintain trees in the public sidewalk area next to their property, and maintain the sidewalk around those trees. The property owner can be liable for injuries and property damage others suffer from the owner's failure to maintain those trees and the sidewalks damaged by those trees. The San Francisco Unified School District (School District) is also responsible for maintaining trees on its property.

THE PROPOSAL:

Proposition E is a charter amendment that would transfer responsibility from property owners to the City for maintaining trees and sidewalks damaged by the trees. The City would then be liable for injuries and property damage resulting from failure to maintain the trees and to repair sidewalks damaged by the trees.

Specifically, under this newly-proposed parcel tax, those duties would be transferred back to the city beginning July 2017. The measure would raise \$19 million per year through a budget set-aside and a progressive parcel tax (\$36.75 per year for a typical single-family home), and would require The City to use those funds to properly maintain all of the City's street trees and public sidewalks, as well as assuming liability for trip-and-fall lawsuits, and supporting the care of trees in public schoolyards.

A "YES" Vote Means: If you vote "yes," you want to amend the Charter to transfer responsibility from property owners to the City for maintaining trees on sidewalks around their property as well as sidewalks damaged by the trees. The City would pay for this by setting aside \$19 million per year from its General Fund, adjusted annually, based on City revenues.

A "NO" Vote Means: If you vote "no," you do not want the City to take on responsibility for maintaining the trees along the sidewalks and any sidewalks damaged by the trees.

ARGUMENTS FOR PROP E:

- The current system unfairly places responsibility on property owners to take care of the trees and fix the sidewalks, many of whom do not have the resources to do so.
- Transferring care and maintenance to the City ensures they will be cared for on a regular basis, by professional arborists.
- This measure includes funding to maintain 50,000 new trees, in addition to maintenance for current street trees.

ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROP E:

- This measure would reassign all responsibility for trees and sidewalks without identifying a dedicated funding source for maintenance.
- Proposition E would significantly increase the cost of government.
- Funding for the measure could fluctuate year-to-year, depending on the change in the City's overall discretionary revenue.

PROPOSITION F – Youth Voting in Local Elections

Charter amendment placed on the ballot by the Board of Supervisors. Requires a simple majority for passage.

THE QUESTION:

Should the city of San Francisco amend the Charter to authorize 16- and 17-year olds to vote in municipal elections?

BACKGROUND:

The campaign for lowering the voting age for local elections began in 2014, and is run by young future voters. The San Francisco Youth Commission passed a resolution in January 2015 that urged the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors to lower the voting age to 16 years old. In March 2015, members of the Board of Supervisors proposed amending the City Charter to lower the voting age. The Board of Supervisors voted 9-2 to put the amendment on the ballot this November.

Currently, California state law allows people to pre-register to vote starting at age 16. Additionally, those who will be 18 at the time of the next election are eligible to register and vote in the next election.

THE PROPOSAL:

Proposition F would amend the City Charter to allow sixteen year olds who meet all other state law voter registration qualifications to register to vote with the San Francisco Department of Elections and vote in San Francisco municipal elections. If passed, these voters would be eligible to vote for local ballot measures and local officials, including the Board of Supervisors and the Governing Board of the Community College District. Voters under the age of eighteen would not be able to vote for state or federal officials or measures. The change would take effect in 2018.

A “YES” Vote Means: You want to amend the Charter to allow San Francisco residents who are 16 years old to be eligible to vote on local candidates and local ballot measures in municipal elections if they are also U.S. citizens, at least 16 years old and registered to vote.

A “NO” Vote Means: You do not want to make these amend the charter to allow 16 year old residents to be eligible to vote on local candidates and local ballot measures in municipal elections.

ARGUMENTS FOR PROP F

- Lowering the voting age for local elections encourages voter participation and civic engagement, increasing investment in civic participation from a young age and leading to a lifetime of voting. This in turn is critical to improving alarmingly low voter turnout.
- Youth voters would be able to vote on measures and officials affecting their lives and education, increasing community investment and connection.
- People under the age of 18 are allowed to drive and also may be tried as adults in the criminal justice system. If you can be treated as an adult before the age of 18, you should also be able to vote.

ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROP F:

- Lowering the voting age for local elections could cause some administrative challenges in creating special ballots and monitoring eligibility for state and federal elections.
- The age restrictions for various rights and privileges—voting, enlisting, driving, purchasing tobacco—are inconsistent, and this proposition would create yet another inconsistency.
- Voting should remain a privilege for adult citizens.

PROPOSITION G – Department of Police Oversight

Charter amendment placed on the ballot by the Board of Supervisors. Requires a simple majority for passage.

THE QUESTION:

Shall the City amend the Charter to rename the Office of Citizen Complaints (OCC) department as the Department of Police Accountability (DPA), give DPA direct authority over its proposed budget and require DPA to conduct a performance analysis every two years to show how the Police Department has handled claims of officer misconduct and use of force?

BACKGROUND:

In June 2016, voters passed Proposition D requiring that the Office of Citizen Complaints (OCC) investigate all officer related shootings. The OCC is a separate department under the Police Commission that investigates complaints of misconduct and neglect of duty by police officers, and may, in certain circumstances, file disciplinary charges against the officers.

Currently under the City Charter, individual departments propose budgets, which are then submitted to the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors. The OCC's budget is part of the budget for the Police Department as a whole and is reviewed and approved by the Police Commission.

THE PROPOSAL:

Proposition G would rename the OCC the Department of Police Accountability (DPA) and allow it to submit an independent budget for shooting related investigations. Passage of Proposition G would provide that the DPA budget would be prepared and submitted separately from the SFPD budget, and would not need Police Commission approval. The Mayor and Board of Supervisors could change the budget before adoption.

This measure would also require the DPA to conduct a performance analysis every two years of the Police Department in order to determine how they are handling claims of officer misconduct and use of force. All City departments, officers and employees would be required to provide the following types of records to the DPA for this analysis:

- Records regarding SFPD policies or practices;
- Personnel and disciplinary records;
- Criminal investigative and prosecution files; and
- Other records to which the Police Commission has access.

A “YES” Vote Means: If you vote “yes,” you want to amend the Charter to rename the Office of Citizen Complaints as the Department of Police Accountability (DPA), allow the DPA to submit a budget independent from the SF Police Department, and require the DPA to review the San Francisco Police Department's use-of-force policies and its handling of claims of police misconduct every two years.

A “NO” Vote Means: If you vote “no,” you do not want to make these changes to the OCC.

ARGUMENTS FOR PROP G:

- Removes a conflict of interest by allowing DPA to submit its budget directly to the Mayor without approval from the SFPD.
- Gives DPA independent authority to perform regular and discretionary auditing of SFPD's use-of-force, officer misconduct, policies and procedures and creates greater transparency by allowing the public to track claims of misconduct and complaints.

ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROP G:

- Proposition G adds another layer of expense and bureaucracy.
- This measure would create additional of levels of reporting.

PROPOSITION H – Public Advocate

Charter amendment placed on the ballot by the Board of Supervisors. Requires a simple majority for passage.

THE QUESTION:

Shall the City amend the Charter to create the position of Public Advocate, responsible for investigating and attempting to resolve public complaints concerning City services and programs; and shall it be City policy to provide the Public Advocate with sufficient funding and a support staff of at least 25 people?

BACKGROUND:

The offices of the Mayor, the City Controller, the District Supervisors, the District Attorney, the City Attorney, the Office of Citizen Complaints, and the Ethics Commission exercise the powers of the proposed Public Advocate.

The Mayor appoints the Director of the Office of Citizen Complaints (OCC). Both the Mayor's Office and the City Controller review the administration, performance, and effectiveness of City programs and services.

In addition, the City Controller oversees the Whistleblower program, with the power to review and investigate all whistleblower complaints regarding City services and programs. The Controller is supported by the investigations of the District Attorney, the City Attorney and the Ethics Commission.

THE PROPOSAL:

This measure would amend the City Charter to create the position of Public Advocate, who would be publicly elected every four years, for up to two consecutive terms. Passage of this proposal would shift some powers from the Mayor and City Controller to the Public Advocate.

Proposition H authorizes the Public Advocate to:

- Appoint the Director of the Office of Citizen Complaints,
- Review the administration and performance of City programs and services,
- Receive and investigate some confidential whistleblower complaints about City programs and services, and
- Investigate and attempt to resolve complaints about City programs and services including introducing new legislation.

Proposition H also creates new City policy to:

- Provide the Office of Public Advocate with sufficient funding and administrative support,
- Develop a Public Advocate office in City Hall with at least 25 support staff, and
- Allow the Public Advocate to hire independent experts who are exempt from some City contracting rules.

A “YES” Vote Means: If you vote “yes,” you want to amend the Charter to create the position of Public Advocate, responsible for investigating and attempting to resolve public complaints concerning City services and programs. You also want to make it City policy to provide the Public Advocate with sufficient funding and a support staff of at least 25 people.

A “NO” Vote Means: If you vote “no,” you do not want to make these changes to amend the Charter to create the position of Public Advocate.

ARGUMENTS FOR PROP H:

- Proposition H would put an independent, unbiased director in charge of Police oversight. Having a publicly elected Public Advocate, rather than a Mayor, appointed the Director of the City’s Office of Citizen Complaints (OCC), will increase government accountability.
- Many large cities, such as New York, Seattle, and Portland, have public advocates. In New York, this saved 0.02 of their annual budget, which would be 20 million in San Francisco.

ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROP H:

- Proposition H would erode the Mayor’s powers, while creating the position of “junior mayor”, an employment opportunity for a “termed-out” supervisor. Also, the Public Advocate could intervene in the Whistleblower Program, which operates under our independent City Controller.
- Proposition H would add one more elected officer to our present 18 elected officers and multiple independent officials, the majority of whom currently perform the duties and wield the powers proposed for the Public Advocate, and who also collect up to \$200,000 a year for their services to the City and affiliated agencies.

PROPOSITION J – Funding for Homelessness and Transportation

Charter amendment placed on the ballot by the Board of Supervisors. Requires a simple majority for passage.

THE QUESTION:

Should the City set aside funds for Homeless Housing and Services and Transportation Improvement in the fiscal year 2016 – 2017 and for following 24 fiscal years?

BACKGROUND:

The City provides a range of services to homeless people including street outreach, shelters, navigation centers, housing, and health and job services. In July 2016, the City created a Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing to consolidate the City’s efforts to assist homeless people. However, the City currently does not have a special fund or mandatory level of funding for homeless housing and services for the budget.

The City has a Municipal Transportation Fund for the operation of the Municipal Transportation Agency (MTA), but does not have a special fund for street resurfacing.

THE PROPOSAL:

This charter amendment would establish two new funds in the City’s Charter, the Homeless Housing and Services Fund and the Transportation Improvement Fund.

The Homeless Housing and services Fund would be used to provide services to the homeless, including programs to prevent homelessness and enable homeless people to transition out of homelessness and into more stable situations.

The City would appropriate \$12.5 million to the Fund in the fiscal year 2016 – 2017 and \$50 million to the Fund each year through fiscal year 2040-2041. This annual amount can be adjusted based on City revenue from year to year. Based on the review of the City’s financial condition, the Mayor will have a one-time chance to cancel this section by January 1, 2017 based on review of the City’s financial condition.

The Transportation Improvement Fund would be used as follows:

- 12.4% to improve service and affordability for low-income communities, seniors, and people with disabilities
- 8.8% for infrastructure repair, including fleet maintenance, stations, and rails
- 9.4% would go to the County Transportation Authority (CTA) for transit optimization and expansion
- 14.1% would go to the CTA for improvements in regional transit including BART and Caltrain and long range regional network planning
- 12.4% would be used to fund safe streets, safety education, outreach and evaluation, and to upgrade traffic infrastructure
- 32.9% would be used for street resurfacing

The City would appropriate \$25.4 million to the Fund in fiscal year 2016 – 2017 and \$101.6 million to the Fund each year through fiscal year 2040 – 2041. This annual amount can be adjusted based on City revenue from year to year. Funds would be allocated to the MTA, CTA, and Department of Public Works to carry out these improvements. This amendment would allow reallocation of funds to other uses if a vehicle license fee or other new revenue becomes available for street resurfacing.

In order to carry out purposes of the Transportation Improvement Fund, the Board of Supervisors may authorize issuance of lease revenue bonds or lease financing arrangements.

This section of the Charter will be active until July 1, 2041, at which point it expires. The Mayor will have a one-time chance to cancel this section by January 1, 2017 based on review of the City’s financial condition.

A “YES” Vote Means: You want the City to create two new funds for Homeless Housing and Services and for Transportation Improvement through fiscal year 2040 - 2041.

A “NO” Vote Means: You do not want the City to set aside funds for these purposes.

ARGUMENTS FOR PROP J:

- Proposition J will only make funding commitments if the city raises new money; it will not take away from other spending.
- This measure is supported by a large coalition of homelessness, transportation, environmental, and housing advocates.
- Proposition J would create a “lockbox” that guarantees funding for vital homelessness and transportation needs.

ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROP J:

- According to the City Controller, Proposition J would significantly increase the cost of government.
- Despite billions of dollars in expenditures, homelessness is worsening in San Francisco.
- Proposition J would take \$152 million annually from the General Fund to spend on homelessness and transportation instead of Police, Fire, and Public Works.

PROPOSITION K – General Sales Tax

Ordinance placed on the ballot by the Board of Supervisors. Requires a simple majority for passage.

THE QUESTION:

Should the City impose a sales and use tax at a rate of 0.75% for 25 years, increasing the combined state and local sales tax to 9.25%?

BACKGROUND:

The sales tax rate in San Francisco is 8.75% with 0.25% of the state component of the tax will expire on December 31, 2016 per the California Constitution, reducing the combined rate to 8.5%.

- 7.5% of this is State tax, of which the City receives 1.25%.
- 1.25% is local taxes used to fund Bay Area Rapid Transit, San Francisco County Transportation Authority, and the San Francisco Public Finance Authority.

THE PROPOSAL:

This ordinance would increase sales tax in San Francisco to 9.25% with the added tax going into the General Fund. If approved, the increase would take effect on April 1, 2017. The increase would expire after 25 years.

If approved, this ordinance would also adjust the spending limits imposed on the City by State law. Following voter approval, it would increase the limit by the amount of additional revenue generated from this tax, for four years.

A “YES” Vote Means: You support increasing the City’s sales tax to 9.25%

A “NO” Vote Means: You do not support increasing the City’s sales tax to 9.25%.

ARGUMENTS FOR PROP K:

- Proposition K is progressive and fair because wealthy, big corporations and visitors to San Francisco who spend more will always pay more.
- San Francisco’s sales tax rate would still be lower than many other Bay Area cities and counties.
- Proposition K will generate \$150 million for San Francisco’s General Fund to invest in housing and transportation.

ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROP K:

- Low and middle-income residents will be disproportionately impacted and spending in San Francisco could drop by \$150 - \$150 million a year.
- San Francisco’s sales tax already has an existing fixed transportation allocation.
- Proposition K is bundled with Proposition J, and it is an effort to avoid the 2/3 approval requirement for a dedicated tax.

PROPOSITION N – Non-Citizen Voting in School Board Elections

Charter amendment placed on the ballot by the Board of Supervisors. Requires a simple majority for passage.

THE QUESTION:

Shall the City allow a non-citizen resident of San Francisco who is of legal voting age and the parent, legal guardian or legally recognized caregiver of a child living in the San Francisco Unified School District to vote for members of the Board of Education?

BACKGROUND:

A similar measure was previously on the ballot in 2010 as Proposition D, as well as in 2004, and was defeated both times.

The San Francisco Unified School District operates public schools in San Francisco for students from pre-kindergarten through grade 12.

The San Francisco Board of Education oversees the School District, including:

- Establishing educational goals and standards;
- Approving curriculum;
- Setting the district budget;
- Confirming appointment of all personnel; and
- Approving purchases of equipment, supplies, services, leases, renovation, construction, and union contracts.

The Board of Education appoints a superintendent of schools, who is responsible for managing the day-to-day administration of the district.

The Board of Education has seven members who are elected by San Francisco voters to serve four-year terms. Elections for members of the Board of Education are held in November of even-numbered years.

San Francisco residents who are 18 years of age or older, United States citizens, and not in prison or on parole for a felony conviction are eligible to register to vote in San Francisco elections.

THE PROPOSAL:

Proposition N would amend the City Charter to allow parents, legal guardians, or caregivers of children under the age of 19 to vote in San Francisco Unified School District Board of Education elections regardless of U.S. citizenship status, so long as the parent, legal guardian, or caregiver meets the City Charter's minimum age requirements for voting in a municipal election, they are otherwise not disqualified from voting, and the child resides in the San Francisco Unified School District. "Caregiver" is defined in California Family Code section 6550.

This proposal would expire after the third election where non-citizens are permitted to vote for members of the Board of Education. However, afterwards, under the amendment, the Board of Supervisors could pass ordinances permitting non-citizens to vote for members of the Board of Education.

A "YES" Vote Means: If you vote "yes," you want to allow a non-citizen resident of San Francisco who is of legal voting age and the parent, legal guardian or legally recognized caregiver of a child living in the San Francisco Unified School District to vote for members of the Board of Education.

A "NO" Vote Means: If you vote "no," you do not want to make this change.

ARGUMENTS FOR PROP N:

- Allowing non-citizens to vote on school board elections allows parents and others with or caring for children in San Francisco schools to have a voice in their education.
- This would be a pilot program for expanding voting rights to non-citizens so they can be involved in community politics affecting their lives and their families: the proposition sunsets in 2022.

ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROP N:

- Changing voter qualifications for specific elections or issue creates confusion in administering elections.
- This expands voting rights beyond what state law allows, creating questions about its legality.
- Voting rights should remain a privilege of adult citizens.

PROPOSITION O – Hunters Point Shipyard/ Candlestick Point Joint Stimulus

Ordinance placed on the ballot by initiative petition. Requires a simple majority for passage.

THE QUESTION:

Through Proposition M (1986), the City can approve up to 950,000 square-foot of office developments annually. No office development may be approved beyond such limit. Shall the City amend the Planning Code to exempt new office space in the Candlestick Point and Hunters Point project area from the City's annual 950,000 square-foot limit? And shall the City also amend the Planning Code to permanently exempt any new office space in the project area from counting toward the annual limit?

BACKGROUND:

In 1986, San Francisco voters approved Proposition M that amended the City's Planning Code to establish annual limits of 950,000 square feet on new office space construction in the City. The goal at the time was to prevent rapid development in downtown San Francisco.

In 2008, San Francisco voters approved Proposition G, the Bayview Jobs, Park and Housing Initiative, to encourage development of a mixed-use project area on Candlestick Point and most of the former Navy Shipyard at Hunters Point. The City approved redevelopment plans for this project area, including:

- Approximately 330 acres of public parks and open space,
- Up to 10,500 homes,
- Up to 885,000 square feet of retail and entertainment uses, and
- Up to 5.15 million square feet of office space.

The redevelopment plans of Proposition G require the City to place a higher priority on office space to be built in the project area over most other areas of the City. However, the new office space in the project is still subject to Proposition M.

Passage of this proposition would permanently exempt the project area from Proposition M and the City's Planning Code. The passage of this proposition "would also establish a policy that development applications shall be processed and decided quickly, and development expedited."

There would be no Planning Department oversight with respect to getting Project Authorization from the Planning Commission. The measure would allow any Development on the Subject Property (Hunters Point Shipyard and Candlestick Point) to be treated as if they have been granted Project Authorization. Project Authorization is required by the Department of Building Inspection to get a building permit.

THE PROPOSAL:

This measure would amend the Planning Code to exempt new office space in the Candlestick Point and Hunters Point project area from the City's annual 950,000-square-foot limit. This measure would also amend the Planning Code to permanently exempt any new office space in the project area from counting toward the annual limit.

Passage of this proposition would permanently exempt the project area from Proposition M and the City's Planning Code. The passage of this proposition "would also establish a policy that development applications shall be processed and decided quickly, and development expedited."

A "YES" Vote Means: If you vote "yes," you want to permanently exempt new office space on Candlestick Point and most of the former Navy shipyard at Hunters Point from the City's annual 950,000-square-foot limit.

A "NO" Vote Means: you vote "no," you do not want to make these changes. And new office space on Candlestick Point and most of the former Navy shipyard at Hunters Point will remain subject to the City's annual 950,000-square-foot limit.

ARGUMENTS FOR PROP O:

- Proposition O would provide speedy approval of office space construction, which would bring jobs, economic opportunities for residents and guaranteed affordable housing along with new parks and open space.
- Proposition O would provide help in relieving downtown congestion and prevent companies from relocating to Oakland, the East Bay, and the Peninsula.

ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROP O:

- Proposition O would encourage developers throughout the City to seek their own exemptions to Proposition M. This measure would cause all office space in the project area to be exempted from the Planning Code so there will be no Planning Commission hearings on the new office buildings or any mitigation of their housing and transit impacts on the City's General Fund.
- Proposition O would add new workers without additional commitments to housing or transporting them adding to increased evictions in nearby neighborhoods and further displacement of San Francisco's remaining working class communities of color.

PROPOSITION P – Competitive Bidding for Affordable Housing Projects on City-Owned Property

Ordinance placed on the ballot by a petition signed by the City's registered voters. Requires a simple majority for passage.

THE QUESTION:

Shall the City be prohibited from proceeding with an affordable housing project on City-owned property unless the Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development receives at least three proposals; and shall the City incorporate into City law the most current criteria for selecting a developer for affordable housing projects on City-owned property?

BACKGROUND:

According to the City Planning Department, San Francisco is projected to need 70,000 new housing units by 2030. In 2014 approximately 66% of the City's voters passed Proposition K, making it official City policy to build or rehabilitate 30,000 homes by 2020, with at least one-third, or 10,000, being affordable to low and moderate income households.

The City has various programs that provide financing to developers to build new affordable housing and rehabilitate existing affordable housing (affordable housing projects). The Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development (Housing Office) administers most of these programs.

When the Housing Office has funds available for an affordable housing project, it posts a description of the proposed project on its website and invites developers to submit proposals. Under current practice, the posting describes the criteria used to select a proposal and sets a deadline for submissions. The Housing Office may then select a qualified developer to proceed with an affordable housing project even if it receives fewer than three proposals.

THE PROPOSAL:

This initiative would amend the City Administrative Code to require that the Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD) receive at least three bids for any affordable housing project using City funds before proceeding with that project.

Proposition P would also update City law with the most current criteria for selecting a developer for affordable housing projects on City-owned property.

A "YES" Vote Means: If you vote "yes," you want to prohibit the City from proceeding with an affordable housing project on City-owned property unless the Housing Office receives at least three proposals and you want to make most current selection criteria part of City law.

A "NO" Vote Means: If you vote "no," you do not want to make this change.

ARGUMENTS FOR PROP P:

- This Proposition would save City resources. When the City's affordable housing projects do not require three competitive bids, we may not be getting the lowest prices. Market-rate developments go through a competitive bid structure. As a result, the cost of building an affordable housing unit can exceed the cost of a private party building a luxury unit.
- This Proposition would require three competitive bids for all Affordable housing projects, This will help prevent the City from developing favored, crony relationships, instead of those based on merit and cost, as well as prevent the City from being sued.

ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROP P:

- Most Housing Office projects receive three bids. However, Proposition P could result in a long wait for the third bid, which may indefinitely delay the project and the much-needed housing. The Mayor's Office of Housing stated that if Proposition P had been law, over 1000 housing units would have been blocked from being built.
- This legislation incorrectly assumes that developers submit bids with all final costs. Instead, they create cost estimates for a project. The City conditionally approves the project, gives the Developer time-sensitive entitlements to proceed, and each part of the project is competitively bid. Also, this Proposition would require choosing the "best-value" housing bids, which could result in slum housing.

PROPOSITION Q – Prohibiting Tents on Public Sidewalks

Ordinance placed on the ballot by the Board of Supervisors. Requires a simple majority for passage.

THE QUESTION:

Should the City of San Francisco amend the Police Code to prohibit the placement of tent encampments on public sidewalks?

BACKGROUND:

Current San Francisco City law prohibits the willful obstruction of public sidewalks, as well as sitting or lying on public sidewalks from the hours of 7:00 a.m. until 11:00 p.m. The Department of Public Health is authorized to remove public nuisances, which include unsanitary structures. However, City law does not specifically prohibit placing tents on public sidewalks at this time.

THE PROPOSAL:

Proposition Q would prohibit placing tents on public sidewalks without a City permit. The City would not be allowed to remove or order removal of an unauthorized tent unless the City had available shelter for all residents of the tent. Under Proposition Q, shelter includes City-operated shelters, Navigation Centers and other City-operated housing.

Before removing or ordering a person to remove an unauthorized tent on a public sidewalk, the City would be required to: offer shelter to all tent residents; offer to pay the cost to transport all tent residents to live with friends or family outside San Francisco; and provide written notice that the City will remove the tent in 24 hours. The City would have to provide this notice to all tent residents and post the notice near the tent.

If residents do not accept the City's offer of housing or shelter, or do not remove the unauthorized tent within 24 hours of the notice, the City may remove the tent. After removing the tent, the City would be required to post a written notice near the area where the tent was located and store the residents' personal property for up to 90 days.

A "YES" Vote Means: If you vote "yes," you want to prohibit the placement of tents on public sidewalks without a City permit and allow the City to remove unauthorized tents if the City provides 24-hour advance notice, offers shelter for all tent residents and stores the residents' personal property for up to 90 days.

A "NO" Vote Means: If you vote "no," you do not want to make these changes.

ARGUMENTS FOR PROP Q:

- Proposition Q is a compassionate way to deal with the City's homeless.
- This measure helps to maintain accessible sidewalks for both residents and emergency personnel.
- Gives safety personnel the authority to deal with inaccessible public sidewalks.

ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROP Q:

- Proposition Q does not offer a long-term solution for providing shelter for the homeless.
- This measure does not specify how long the city has to offer people shelter before removing them from encampments.
- Government costs could increase dramatically with the enactment of this new program.

PROPOSITION S – San Francisco Art and Families Funding Ordinance

Ordinance placed on the ballot by initiative petition. Requires a 2/3rds vote for passage.

THE QUESTION:

Shall the City use the money raised by the current 8% base tax on the rental of hotel rooms to provide specific funding for arts programs and family homeless services?

BACKGROUND:

The City imposes a hotel tax on the rental of hotel rooms. For most of its existence since 1961, the tax has dedicated the money raised to City arts agencies and departments, the City's convention facilities, and low-income housing. However, starting in the early 2000s, the City began amending those allocations as part of the General Fund.

The tax rate is 14% (an 8% base tax and an additional 6% tax surcharge). The following chart is the current allocation of the money raised from the 8% base tax:

Current Allocation of 8% Base Tax	Amount
Moscone Convention Center	50%
Administration	Up to .6%
Refunds of Overpayments	As required
Publicity & Advertising (of SF)	As appropriated by the Board of Supervisors
To General Fund	Remainder

Any remaining money raised from the 8% base tax after taking into account other allocations listed above are deposited into the General Fund. Money raised from the 6% tax surcharge is also deposited into the General Fund. The Board of Supervisors may allocate money in the General Fund for any public purpose. Currently, there are no specific amounts of funding for The Arts Commission, Cultural Equity Endowment Fund, Grants for the Arts Program, and the City's War Memorial and Performing Arts Center (War Memorial complex) consisting of the War Memorial Opera House, Davies Symphony Hall, Herbst Theatre, the Green Room and Zellerbach Rehearsal Hall.

THE PROPOSAL:

This ordinance that would allocate part of the current hotel base tax for two areas: arts programs and family homeless services. It would not change the existing hotel tax rate. The following chart is the proposed allocation of the money raised from the 8% base tax:

Proposed Allocation of 8% Base Tax by Prop S	Amount
Moscone Convention Center	Up to 50%
Administration	Up to .6%
Refunds of Overpayments	As required
Arts Commission	2.9%
Cultural Equity Endowment Fund	7.5% by 2020
Grants for the Arts	7.5% by 2020
War Memorial Complex	5.8%
Neighborhood Arts Program Fund	6% by 2020
Ending Family Homelessness Fund	6.3%
To General Fund	Remainder

The Arts Commission, Cultural Equity Endowment Fund, Grants for the Arts, War Memorial Complex instead of being funded through the General Fund would be funded by the 8% Base Tax of the Hotel Tax. In addition to these programs, two funds would be established and funded by the 8% Base Tax of the Hotel Tax: Neighborhood Arts Program Fund and Ending Family Homelessness Fund.

Proposition S would also establish the Neighborhood Arts Program Fund to provide money and assistance to nonprofit organizations that establish or improve affordable facilities for artists and arts organizations. Money from this Fund would also be provided to artists and nonprofit organizations to create art experiences in San Francisco. The Arts Commission would administer this Fund. Each year it would receive a percentage of the money raised by the hotel base tax, up to 6% by 2020.

Proposition S would also establish the Ending Family Homelessness Fund to provide subsidies and case management programs to house homeless families; provide services to low-income families at risk of becoming homeless; and develop, rehabilitate and acquire new housing for homeless families.

A “YES” Vote Means: If you vote “yes,” you want to use the money raised by the current base tax on the rental of hotel rooms to provide specific funding for two different areas: arts programs and family homeless services.

A “NO” Vote Means: If you vote “no,” you do not want to make these changes.

ARGUMENTS FOR PROP S:

- Proposition S would provide support at risk, low income and homeless families without raising taxes.
- Restores original intent of the Hotel Tax to help support people and arts.
- Supports diverse arts and cultural organizations that provide programming that serves youth, families and arts audiences in the city and makes art experiences more accessible and affordable for all. Prevents displacement of families, artists, art organizations and art leaders

ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROP S:

- Supervisors could fund programs without voter approval.
- San Francisco relies on tourist and convention business for tax revenue and we should not jeopardize this important economic segment.
- This is another attack on the General Fund, further eroding the monies available for streets, public safety and all other obligations, which benefit all citizens.

PROPOSITION U – Affordable Housing Requirements for Market-Rate Development Projects

Ordinance placed on the ballot by a petition by the City’s registered voters. Requires a simple majority to pass.

THE QUESTION:

Shall the City increase the income eligibility limit for on-site rental units for all new and existing affordable housing units to make them affordable for households earning up to 110% of the area median income?

BACKGROUND:

Affordable housing measures have been enacted since the 1970s. Starting with the State Density Bonus Law from 1979, which requires cities and counties to offer a bonus and other incentives to housing developments that make housing units available to low income to middle income households. San Francisco created the Affordable Housing Bonus Program to go beyond the Law by incentivizing building affordable housing and mandating, amongst many things, more housing development, of which 30% shall be affordable housing units.

The City generally requires developers of market-rate housing of 10 units or more to provide affordable housing. A developer can meet this requirement in one of three ways: Pay an affordable housing fee; Construct off-site affordable housing; and construct on-site affordable housing.

An on-site rental unit counts as affordable for a “low-income household” if it is affordable for households earning up to 55% of the area median income. An on-site rental unit counts as affordable for a “middle-income household” if it is affordable for households earning up to 100% of the area median income.

The City uses Federal income standards to determine the maximum allowable rent levels for the affordable units. The rent is updated each year. For low-income households, the monthly rent for an on-site one-bedroom affordable housing unit is \$1,185 and for a two-bedroom, \$1,333.

THE PROPOSAL:

Prop U proposes that the affordable housing requirements for new development projects be adjusted to serve a higher percentage of the population. Currently, one of the three choices for property developers is to make 12% of their housing available for individuals making 55% or less of the median household income. This proposal would make individuals earning 110% of the median income eligible to receive the below market rate housing.

Income Definition:

	1 Person	2 Person	3 Person	4 Person
55% of median	\$41,450	\$47,400	\$53,300	\$59,250
100% of median	\$75,400	\$86,150	\$96,950	\$107,700
110% of median	\$82,950	\$94,750	\$106,650	\$118,450

A “YES” Vote Means: you vote “yes,” you want to increase the income eligibility limit for on-site rental units for all new and existing affordable housing units to make them affordable for households earning up to 110% of the area median income.

A “NO” Vote Means: If you vote “no,” you do not want to make these changes.

ARGUMENTS FOR PROP U:

- This measure aims to help the middle class, such as teachers, EMTs, nurses and artists by allowing households that make up to 110% of the area median income to qualify for affordable housing.
- Proposition U ensures that affordable housing for low-income residents remains attainable by applying this measure to 2% of the below market-rate units. The rest will remain for low-income.

ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROP U:

- This measure would double the rent that developers and landlords can charge for future and existing affordable housing units.
- Prop C passed in June 2016 and requires new developments to provide 25% affordable housing of which 10% are for middle-income residents. Prop U will repeal this measure, enable landlords to increase rent on existing affordable homes, and pits middle income against low-income renters for affordable housing.

PROPOSITION V – Business and Tax Regulations Code – One Cent Per Ounce Tax on the Distribution of Sugar-Sweetened Beverages

Ordinance placed on the ballot by the Board of Supervisors. Requires a simple majority vote for passage.

THE QUESTION:

Should the voters impose a tax on the distribution of some sugar-sweetened beverages?

BACKGROUND:

To discourage consumption of sugar- sweetened beverages, the White House Task Force on Childhood Obesity recommends that local governments implement a tax for such calorie-dense, nutrient-poor food and beverages. The City of San Francisco does not impose a tax on sugar-sweetened beverages.

THE PROPOSAL:

Proposition V would place a tax of one cent per ounce on the distribution of sugar-sweetened beverages. The distributors of sugar-sweetened beverages in San Francisco would be responsible for paying the tax. The tax would not apply to retail sales of sugar-sweetened beverages.

A sugar-sweetened beverage is a beverage that contains added sugar and 25 or more calories per 12 ounces. These include some soft drinks, sports drinks, iced tea, juice drinks and energy drinks. The tax would also apply to syrups and powders that can be made into sugar-sweetened beverages, for example, fountain drinks from beverage-dispensing machines.

Beverages that are not subject to the tax include:

- Diet sodas;
- Beverages that contain only natural fruit and vegetable juice;
- Infant formula;
- Milk from animal or vegetable sources, including soy, rice and almond milk;
- Nutritional therapy, rehydration and other beverages for medical use; and
- Alcoholic beverages.

A 16-member Advisory Committee would be established to evaluate the impact of the tax on beverage pricing, consumer purchasing behavior, and public health. The Committee would also advise the Mayor and Board of Supervisors about how to reduce the consumption of sugar-sweetened beverages in San Francisco. The City could use the proceeds of the tax for any governmental purpose.

A “YES” Vote Means: If you vote “yes,” you want the City to collect a tax of one cent per ounce from the distributors of sugar-sweetened beverages.

A “NO” Vote Means: You do not want the City to collect a tax of one cent per ounce on the distribution of sugar-sweetened beverages.

ARGUMENTS FOR PROP V:

- Cigarette taxes have significantly reduced smoking, so a soda tax would reduce consumption of sodas and other sugary beverages. The diabetes epidemic reportedly contributes to \$61 million in related health care costs in San Francisco.
- Mexico instituted a soda tax and consumption has dropped 12-17%; San Francisco's consumption is estimated to drop as much as 31% with a similar tax.
- This tax can help address an emerging health crisis, especially in low-income communities and communities of color, where 1 in 3 children today will develop Type II diabetes.

ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROP V:

- A soda tax is a simplistic and ineffective solution to a very real and complex problem. Calories in soda are no more or less fattening than calories in other food.
- A soda tax will hurt small neighborhood stores that rely on soft drinks for much of their revenue. The tax on the distributor will be passed onto the customer.
- This proposed ordinance is paternalistic. Individuals should be able to choose what they eat or drink.



Be a voter!

You are eligible to vote in San Francisco if you are:

- ✓ A United States citizen
- ✓ At least 18 years old on Election Day
- ✓ Not in prison or on parole for a felony conviction
- ✓ A resident of San Francisco
- ✓ Registered to vote in San Francisco

Get more information on how to register to vote at registertovote.ca.gov or call the San Francisco Department of Elections at (415) 554-4375.

Get even more election resources

This non-partisan Pros & Cons Guide is just one of many resources that the League of Women Voters of San Francisco provides to help you become a more informed and active participant in the election. We also offer:

- Candidate forums
- Statements from candidates
- ...and more!

Visit lwvsf.org for all of our election resources and follow us on Facebook (facebook.com/LWVSanFrancisco) and Twitter (twitter.com/LWVSF).

