



# PROS & CONS GUIDE

## SAN FRANCISCO BALLOT MEASURES

### **PROPOSITION A – SAN FRANCISCO TRANSPORTATION AND ROAD IMPORVEMENT BOND**

General Obligation Bond  
Placed on the ballot by the Board of Supervisors  
Requires a 2/3 vote for passage

#### **THE QUESTION:**

Should the City of San Francisco issue \$500 million in general obligation bonds to finance improvements to streets, sidewalks, bike lanes and infrastructure repairs that increase MUNI service reliability?

#### **BACKGROUND:**

San Francisco’s Transportation Task Force identified \$10 billion in projects that the City should focus on to improve MUNI reliability and make roads safer for pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists.

The City’s 10-year Capital Plan adopted in 2006 cites the repair and investment in transportation infrastructure as a high priority. Funding for repairs is accomplished through the sale of general obligation bonds. Property tax revenues are used to repay the principal and interest and property tax rates would not increase above the 2006 level.

#### **ONLINE ELECTION INFO** [www.sfvotes.org](http://www.sfvotes.org)

#### **ELECTION DAY IS TUESDAY, NOV 4**

Polls open from 7 am to 8 pm

Early voting starts Oct 6

Oct 20 last day to register to vote

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

## THE PROPOSAL:

Proposition A is a general obligation bond measure that would authorize the sale of up to \$500 million bonds – subject to citizen oversight and audits – to finance specific transportation improvements including construction, acquisition and funding for the SFMTA’s Transit Effectiveness Project.

The bond proceeds could be used to:

- Improve safety and accessibility at transit stops;
- Improve pedestrian safety through focused engineering efforts at high-injury locations;
- Install modern traffic signals to improve safety and mobility;
- Build streets that enable safe travel for all users and improve bike lanes;
- Invest in development of critical capital projects along key transit corridors; and
- Upgrade MUNI facilities to improve vehicle maintenance efficiency

Proposition A would allow an increase in the property tax and landlords would be permitted to pass through 50% of the cost increase to tenants.

An independent Citizen Oversight Committee would review spending of bond funds. One-tenth of one percent (0.1%) of the bond would pay for the committee’s audit and oversight.

**A “YES” Vote Means:** you authorize the City to sell up to \$500 million in general obligation bonds to finance improvements to streets, sidewalks, bike lanes and infrastructure repairs that increase MUNI service reliability.

**A “NO” Vote Means:** you do not authorize the City to sell up to \$500 million in general obligation bonds to finance improvements to streets, sidewalks, bike lanes and infrastructure repairs that increase MUNI service reliability.

## ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROP A:

- It is a smart investment that will create a safer environment for pedestrians and people with disabilities, make MUNI more reliable, improve traffic flow, and decrease travel times for everyone.
- It will not raise taxes because bonds only would be issued as previous bond debt is retired.
- Transit and pedestrian safety advocates across San Francisco urge you to vote YES.

## ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROP A:

- The Ordinance makes no commitment to any specific work. It does not guarantee money will be used for MUNI.
- Billions of transportation dollars have already been wasted. MUNI continues to receive more money through taxes yet it cuts back on service lines. Prop A will compound the existing problems by shifting buses to ‘high use’ corridors rather than deal with market street subway or population growth.
- We should address transportation problems with comprehensive planning for a citywide integrated MUNI system for everyone rather than an expensive bond measure that raises property taxes and rents without safeguards.

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](http://www.lwvsf.org) or at the Dept. of Elections

**PROPOSITION B – POPULATION-BASED ADJUSTMENT TO GENERAL FUND APPROPRIATION TO TRANSPORTATION FUND**

Charter Amendment  
Placed on the ballot by the Board of Supervisors  
Requires a 2/3 vote for passage

**THE QUESTION:**

Should the City of San Francisco amend the City Charter to adjust the annual appropriation from the General Fund to the Transportation Fund to reflect the growth in population?

**BACKGROUND:**

The City’s Transportation Fund is separate from the General Fund. The Transportation Fund is used exclusively for capital improvements, management, supervision, maintenance, extension, and day-to-day operations of the MTA. Currently, adjustments are made each year by the City Controller based on increases in transportation services or changes to the City’s discretionary revenue.

Since 2003, the population of San Francisco has grown more than 85,000 people and is estimated to grow another 150,000 by 2040.

**THE PROPOSAL:**

Proposition B is a charter amendment that would increase the amount of money transferred from the General Fund to the Transportation Fund as the population of San Francisco increases. This population growth adjustment would continue until voters enacted a new general tax on San Francisco’s registered vehicles.

The money raised from Proposition B would be used exclusively as follows:

- 75% would be used for transit system improvements and upgrades to MUNI railways for increased system reliability, frequency of service, capacity and state of good repair.
- 25% would be transportation capital expenditures used to improve street safety.

**A “YES” Vote Means:** You want to amend the City Charter to allow the Controller to increase the funds for transportation based on increased population of the City.

**A “NO” Vote Means:** You do not want funds increased for transportation based on increased City population.

**ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROP B:**

- MUNI has over \$2 Billion in deferred maintenance that will continue to grow if we don’t make investments.
- Prop B is a commitment to public transportation and it will raise funds for better transportation, safer streets, and a cleaner environment.

- This Charter amendment will benefit mass transit users regardless of whether they live in the city or commute.

**ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROP B:**

- An increase in the population-based appropriation of money to the Transportation Fund will mean a decrease in other services that would otherwise be receiving these funds.
- At present, there is no proposal for a general tax on registered vehicles to offset the cost of improvements and therefore no way of discontinuing the increased appropriations.
- The Board of Supervisors should be given the duty to make complex political choices, however, this proposed amendment allows political decisions to be made at the discretion of the Controller.

**PROPOSITION C – CHILDREN AND YOUTH FUND; PUBLIC EDUCATION FUND; OUR CHILDREN, OUR FAMILIES COUNCIL; RAINY DAY RESERVES**

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

**THE QUESTION:**

Should the Charter be changed to amend the way the City funds and administers services to children, youth and their families?

**BACKGROUND:**

Currently the City funds services for children, youth and their families through various ways including:

- The Children’s Fund, voter created in 1991 to provide childcare, health services, job training, social services and delinquency prevention services for youth under 18 years of age. Funding for this program was gathered from property taxes and is set to expire on June 30, 2016;
- Public Education Enrichment Fund (PEEF), voter created in 2004 to fund arts, music, sports and library programs for SF Unified School District. Additionally, the fund supported preschool programs for children under 4 years of age and other general education purposes. This fund is set to expire on June 30, 2015;
- Rainy Day Reserve fund is collected when the City’s revenue exceeds 5% of the previous year. Half of the excess revenue is placed into the Rainy Day Reserves for use by the SF School District when it collects less money per student than in the previous year and plans significant layoffs. The City may give up to 25% of the money in the Reserve to the School District.

**THE PROPOSAL:**

Proposition C would re-authorize the Children’s Fund for another 25 years and re-authorize the Public Education Enrichment Fund for 26 more years. Proposition C would take the existing Reserve and create a separate School Rainy Day Reserve.

An advisory council would be created to recommend and implement a plan for San Francisco Unified School District to address the needs of targeted demographics and set priorities and best practices every 5 years.

There is no change in property tax assessment as a result of this proposition.

**A “YES” Vote Means:** You want voters to extend the current funding of children and youth programs set to expire and create a separate School Rainy Day Reserve from the existing reserve.

**A “NO” Vote Means:** You do not want to extend the current funds set to expire nor create a separate School Rainy Day Reserve from the existing reserve.

**ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROP C:**

- A vote for Prop C would maximize our city’s resources to continue and deepen investment in our children and young people without any tax increase. This fund provides critical funding for preschool, sports, libraries, art, music and school health centers.
- Between 2009 and 2014 the state cut \$77 million from San Francisco School District funding. If Prop C is not passed \$125 million will be removed from children’s services in San Francisco.

**ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROP C:**

- This proposition does not provide for sufficient accountability regarding the use of money once it enters the Children’s Fund, PEEF, or the School Rainy Day Reserve Fund. The Board of Education may access

the funding for any number of objectives that do not include education of our children.

- Families move into San Francisco for the education they may receive from the school district and not the specific services that Proposition C promises to offer. The funding should be directed towards improving education and expanding services.

**PROPOSITION D – RETIREE HEALTH BENEFITS FOR FORMER REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY AND SUCCESSOR AGENCY EMPLOYEE**

Charter Amendment

Placed on the ballot by the Board of Supervisors

Requires a simple majority of votes for passage

**THE QUESTION:**

Should former employees of the now eliminated San Francisco Redevelopment Agency who have become permanent city employees in other departments be granted healthcare credit for the years they worked for the Redevelopment Agency?

**BACKGROUND:**

As part of the 2011 Budget Act, and in order to protect funding for core public services at the local level, the Legislature approved the dissolution of San Francisco’s Redevelopment Agency created to promote economic revitalization and affordable housing in the City. Some San Francisco Redevelopment projects were Mission

Bay, the Transbay Terminal, Hunters Point Shipyard and Candlestick Point. 50 City employees lost credit for their retiree healthcare benefits from this dissolution. 8 employees have transferred to other City agencies and another 42 may become City employees by March 2015.

As a result of the elimination of the RDAs, property tax revenues are now being used to pay required payments on existing bonds, other obligations, and pass-through payments to local governments. The remaining property tax revenues that exceed the enforceable obligations are now being allocated to cities, counties, special districts, and school and community college districts, thereby providing critical resources to preserve core public services.

### **THE PROPOSAL:**

Proposition D would give former employees of the now eliminated Redevelopment Agency credit for the same healthcare benefits as City employees hired during the same period.

**A “YES” Vote Means:** You want voters to approve giving credit for healthcare benefits to permanent city employees who formerly worked for the Redevelopment Agency.

**A “NO” Vote Means:** You do not want voters to approve giving those employees credit for the time they worked for the Redevelopment Agency.

### **ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROP D:**

- Proposition D would resolve the unintended consequence of the State’s elimination of

Redevelopment Agencies. Due to technical issues, these former employees of the Redevelopment Agency who became permanent City employees will lose health care credit for their years of service to San Francisco.

- It is also possible that some or all of the costs of this measure could be reimbursed from the tax increment generated by the approved projects, pending State approval.
- Prop. D would prevent double dipping. It also clarifies that employees may register domestic partnership under San Francisco law or in the city or county where they reside.

### **ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROP D:**

- The Redevelopment Agency has done a lot of harm and little good in San Francisco and no successor agency should be inflicted on San Francisco.
- The SF Redevelopment Agency wrecked the Fillmore District and damaged many neighborhoods while making money for greedy and politically connected developers.
- Redevelopment destroyed historic buildings and drove many poor people from their homes.



**PROPOSITION E – BUSINESS AND TAX REGULATIONS CODE – TAX ON SUGAR-SWEETENED BEVERAGES TO FUND FOOD AND HEALTH PROGRAM**

Ordinance

Placed on the ballot by the Board of Supervisors

Requires a 2/3 vote for passage

**THE QUESTION:**

Should the voters impose a tax on the distribution of some sugar-sweetened beverages? Monies collected would be distributed to City-operated programs and City grants for active recreation and to improve food access, health, and nutrition. Funds also would go to San Francisco Unified School District physical education, after-school physical activity, health, or nutrition programs, and school lunch and other school nutrition programs.

**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 E would amend the Business and Tax Regulations Code to impose a tax of two cents per ounce on beverages sweetened by sugar that also contain more than 25 calories per serving. Beverages such as medical food, nutritional supplements, and infant

formulas are excluded from the proposed tax. The tax will fund City-operated programs and City grants for:

- San Francisco Unified School District’s physical education, after-school physical activity, health and nutrition programs;
- School lunch and other school nutrition programs; and
- Programs for active recreation and improving food access, health, and nutrition.

**A “YES” Vote Means:** You want to impose a tax of two cents per ounce on the distribution of sugar-sweetened beverages, where such funds would contribute to City grants and City-operated or San Francisco Unified School District-operated programs for health, fitness, improving food access, and nutrition.

**A “NO” Vote Means:** You do not want to impose a tax of two cents per ounce on the distribution of sugar-sweetened beverages.

**ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPE:**

- 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 this year and consumption has dropped 5-7%; San Francisco’s consumption is estimated to drop as much as 31% with a similar tax, providing up to \$54 million in funds for health, nutrition and active recreation programs.

- 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 PROPE:**

- 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.

**PROPOSITION F – PIER 70 DEVELOPMENT SITE HEIGHT LIMIT**

Ordinance

Placed on the ballot by initiative petition  
Requires a simple majority of votes for passage

**THE QUESTION:**

Should San Francisco voters approve raising the maximum height limit for buildings on the Pier 70 waterfront development site from 40 feet to 90 feet and adopt a City policy to encourage affordable housing and access to the Bay?

**BACKGROUND:**

The City of San Francisco, through its Port Commission, administers 69 acres

of waterfront property known as Pier 70. The site was formerly an industrial area used as a shipyard with no public access to the Bay. The National Register of Historic Places lists Pier 70 as the Union Iron Works Historic District and the area includes many historical buildings over the current height limits for waterfront property.

The City of San Francisco’s zoning laws regulate development on waterfront property including the height limit, requirement for public input, approval by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors, and voter approval when height increases are requested. The existing height limit for new developments on waterfront property is 40 feet.

After a 3-year community planning process, the Port Commission drafted a plan to develop 28 acres of Pier 70 as a mixed-use project to include residential units, office buildings, retail, art spaces, and open recreation areas for the public.

**THE PROPOSAL:**

Proposition F would allow an increase to the height limits for new buildings on the Pier 70 development site from 40 feet to 90 feet. The proposed height increase could be used for future developments on Pier 70 by other developers. All aspects of the development would be subject to public approval and environmental review under the California Environmental Quality Act.

The proposition would make it City policy for the development of Pier 70 to encourage local jobs, cultural activities, and preservation of the artist community



living there. The development would include the following features:

- 2,000 residential units with at least 30% below-market-rate housing;
- Nine acres of waterfront parks and public access to the Bay;
- Restoration of historic buildings;
- Improvements to parking and transportation; and
- Ground-level manufacturing, retail and other commercial services

**A “YES” Vote Means:** You want voters to approve a height increase for the Pier 70 development site to 90 feet and to adopt a City policy for the development goals.

**A “NO” Vote Means:** You do not want voters to approve a height increase for the Pier 70 development site nor adopt a City policy for this development.

**ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROP F:**

- The development of Pier 70 is planned to add up to 600 affordable homes, rehabilitate historic buildings, provide \$200 million in transit funds, and generate up to 10,000 permanent jobs.
- The Pier 70 redevelopment plan is a responsible way to open up the waterfront where no building will exceed the tallest historic building in the area, or 90 feet. The re-zoning of Pier 70 to allow the height increase would not occur until the Port Commission approves a development plan and the site undergoes a thorough review and public approval process.



**ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROP F:**

- The guidelines for developing Pier 70 into mixed-use homes, retail, and open space are non-binding. Therefore there are no guarantees that the developer will provide any of this to the community.
- Passing proposition F will increase San Francisco’s growing overpopulation difficulties and the City already has more people per square mile than any other county in California.

**PROPOSITION G – ADDITIONAL TRANSFER TAX ON RESIDENTIAL PROPERTY SOLD WITHIN FIVE YEARS OF PURCHASE**

Ordinance  
Placed on the ballot by initiative petition  
Requires a simple majority of votes for passage

**THE QUESTION:**

Should the Business and Tax Regulations Code be amended to impose a surtax on the transfer of certain residential real property within five years of the prior transfer of the property?

**BACKGROUND:**

The City collects a transfer tax on sales of most real property in San Francisco. The tax rate depends on the sale price of the property. The lowest tax rate is 0.5% for property sold for \$250,000 or less. The highest tax rate is 2.5% for property sold for \$10,000,000 or more. The tax rate is not affected by how long a property is owned.

**THE PROPOSAL:**

Proposition G would impose an additional tax on the sales price of multi-unit property sold within five years of purchase. The tax rate would apply to sales or transfers made on or after January 1, 2015. The tax rate would be highest on property sold within one year and decrease with each additional year of ownership.

24%	less than one year
22%	one to two years
20%	two to three years
18%	three to four years
14%	four to five years

The tax would not apply to owner-occupied buildings or buildings with 30 or more units. Other exemptions for the tax would include property owned by the U.S. Government, property where the seller has installed a solar system or made seismic upgrades, or property

where the sale occurred within one year of the owner’s death.

The ordinance would permit the Board of Supervisors to create additional exemptions from the tax for the sale or transfer of property subject to certain affordability-based restrictions.

**A “YES” Vote Means:** you want voters to approve a surtax on the sale of certain properties if they are held for less than five years.

**A “NO” Vote Means:** you do not want to impose an additional tax on the sale of those properties.

**ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROP G:**

- Home prices and rents in San Francisco are among the highest in the nation and flipping property is contributing to the shortage of affordable housing. Prop G would discourage short-term speculation.
- Proposition G will encourage long-term ownership of apartment buildings and neighborhood stability.
- The measure will generate revenue for the City’s general fund.

**ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROP G:**

- This proposition allows the Board of Supervisors to favor wealthy property owners by creating exempt categories. Prop G is unfair because it penalizes small property owners, while exempting owners of property with over 30 units.
- Prop G also deters owners who wish to improve and renovate property.
- The increase in tax may encourage wealthy speculators to sit on a property for more than five years and increase rents to off-set their loss.

**Propositions H and Proposition I concern the same subject matter. If both measures shall pass, then the proposition with the most votes will be the one to go into effect and the measure with the least votes will not.**

**PROPOSITION H – REQUIRING CERTAIN GOLDEN GATE PARK ATHLETIC FIELDS TO BE KEPT AS GRASS WITH NO ARTIFICIAL LIGHTING**

Ordinance

Placed on the ballot by initiative petition  
Requires a simple majority of votes for passage

**THE QUESTION:**

Should the City and County of San Francisco require all athletic fields be maintained as natural grass and should nighttime sports field lighting be prohibited in the area west of Crossover Drive of Golden Gate Park?

**BACKGROUND:**

This initiative and the competing Proposition I stem from a city council plan for renovations to the athletic/soccer fields in the area by Beach Chalet in Golden Gate Park. The soccer fields at Beach Chalet are well used and in need of repairs. At any one time, no more than three of the four natural grass fields are open for use and the soccer fields are closed at least one day a week. Weather additionally impacts the availability of the soccer fields for public use.

The City Recreation & Parks Department (RPD) adopted the Golden

Gate Park Master Plan (GGP Master Plan) in 1998, which calls for the western edge of the park to be for recreational and parkland use, yet remain in a natural and pastoral state. This Master Plan was part of the City’s 1984 Local Coastal Plan, which called for emphasis of naturalistic landscape qualities in the western end of the Park. In 2010 the City’s Recreation & Parks Commission approved the Beach Chalet Athletic Fields renovation project, which would replace the four soccer fields in the western edge part of Golden Gate Park with artificial turf. In addition to replacing and expanding the soccer fields, the Beach Chalet soccer field renovation project would expand the recreational area (60-foot tall lighting, benches for players, bleachers for 1000 spectators, barbeque area and construction of a community room), add parking and renovate the bathrooms. The renovation project is to be funded in part by a 2008 bond measure for improving city parks and in part by a private firm.

The renovations approved in 2010 have not been enacted due to legal challenges, however, a recent court decision now allows for the RPD to proceed with the renovations to the soccer fields.

**THE PROPOSAL:**

Proposition H is an initiative that would require the athletic fields in the western edge of Golden Gate Park to be maintained as natural grass and would ban nighttime lighting. This initiative effectively nullifies the Beach Chalet Athletic Fields renovation plan approved by the RPD in 2010 since the renovations include the use of non-natural grass (artificial turf) and

installation of lighting that would run until 10 p.m.

**A “YES” Vote Means:** you do not authorize the City to renovate the athletic fields in the western edge of Golden Gate Park with non-natural grass (artificial turf) nor install lighting for nighttime sports activities.

**A “NO” Vote Means:** you authorize the City to use non-natural grass for maintaining the athletic fields in the western edge of Golden Gate Park and/or install nighttime lighting.

#### **ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROP H:**

- Proposition H would prevent loss of over 7 acres of grass and topsoil, about 60 trees and shrubs and wildlife habitat
- Preserve the historic design and the City’s long-standing support and vision of naturalistic parkland at the western edge of Golden Gate Park
  - Maintain pastoral and sylvan landscape for area of Park
  - Preserve local wild life and existing bird migration patterns
  - Keep night skies free from light pollution
- Prevent the potential harmful impact from the gravel base, plastic grass and tire infill components of artificial turf and toxic impact from groundwater contamination
- Prevent implementation of a renovation plan which is not the least environmentally damaging feasible alternative available

#### **ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROP H:**

- Proposition H discounts that the renovation plan for Beach Chalet Athletic Fields includes reforestation and planting of shrubs adjacent to new fields to preserve naturalistic design of area
- Ignores separation of water from fields and groundwater by installation of underdrain system to keep the water from the artificial turf separate from the groundwater; tests to be conducted to determine whether to water from the renovated fields can be introduced to groundwater
- Ignores impact of (1) increased recreational activity of the western edge of the park due to expanding the space and trails for use by the public, (2) increase of use all four athletic fields to 14,000 hours per year from its current 4700+ hours, and (3) increase in disability access to restrooms
- Save an estimated 5.7 million gallons of water during these current drought conditions due to artificial turf rather than natural grass
- Ignores undesirable uses of western area of park (camping, homeless, sexual activity)

---

**Smart Voter**®

---



**BACKGROUND:**

This initiative and the competing Proposition H stem from a plan for renovations to the athletic/soccer fields in the area by Beach Chalet in Golden Gate Park which include installation of artificial turf fields and nighttime (stadium) lighting. The four athletic fields at Beach Chalet are well used and in need of repairs and have varying availability due to rotation, repairs and impact from weather conditions.

In 2010 the City’s Recreation & Parks Commission approved the Beach Chalet Athletic Fields renovation project, which would replace the four soccer fields in the western edge part of Golden Gate Park with artificial turf. In addition to replacing and expanding the soccer fields, the Beach Chalet soccer field renovation project would expand the recreational area (60-foot tall lighting, benches for players, bleachers for 1000 spectators, barbeque area and construction of a community room), add parking and renovate the bathrooms.

There have been petitions and legal challenges to the Beach Chalet Athletic Fields renovation project. The Results from a report of the California Coastal Commission the EIR have certified the renovation project. Recently, the City prevailed in the legal challenges, allowing the renovation project to move forward.

The renovation project is to be funded in part by a 2008 bond measure for improving city parks and in part by a private firm as a one-time donation of \$6 million.

**PROPOSITION I – RENOVATION OF PLAYGROUNDS, WALKING TRAILS, AND ATHLETIC FIELDS**

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

**THE QUESTION:**

Should the City Park Code be amended to authorize renovation to the children’s playgrounds, walking trails and athletic fields, including but not limited to installation of artificial turf and/or nighttime lighting on athletic fields if (1) the Recreation and Parks Department (RPD) and an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) determine the renovations to an area double the usage in a calendar year and (2) the EIR or report from another regulatory agency has been certified?

## THE PROPOSAL:

Proposition I is an initiative that would allow for renovations to any children's playgrounds, walking trails and/or athletic fields, including but not limited to installation of artificial turf and/or nighttime lighting on athletic fields to go forward without delay if approved by an EIR, the California Coastal Commission and any additional regulatory entity.

It would nullify Proposition H since RPD and state-mandated review agencies have approved the renovation plans for the Beach Chalet Athletic Fields.

**A "YES" Vote Means:** you authorize the City amend the Parks Code to amend the Parks Code to allow renovations to children's playgrounds, walking trails and athletic fields if the renovations double usage in a calendar year and if an EIR has been certified. Renovations to areas could include installing artificial turf or nighttime lighting on athletic fields.

**A "NO" Vote Means:** you do not authorize the City to amend its Parks Code to allow it to proceed with renovations to children's playgrounds, walking trails and athletic fields if the renovations double usage of area in a calendar year and if an EIR has been certified.

## ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROP I:

- Beach Chalet Athletic Fields renovation plan has met both the increased usage and regulatory/environmental certification requirements

- Prop I increase access to athletic fields available for use by children and the general public. The renovation would produce 4 fields open year round and extended hours due to nighttime lighting.
- No cost to taxpayers

## ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROP I:

- Proposition I would allow for artificial turf and/or nighttime lighting in renovations to the western edge of Golden Gate Park and Beach Chalet Athletic Field. This would be a disruption to the neighborhood.
- Prop I would cause unknown environmental impact on humans, wildlife and groundwater due to components of artificial turf for some area playgrounds, parks and trails
- Prop I would cause concern over renovations to future playgrounds, parks and trails due to the City's RPD increased focus on revenue and partnerships with private corporations

## PROPOSITION J – MINIMUM WAGE

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

## THE QUESTION:

Should the City of San Francisco increase the minimum wage for employees in San Francisco from \$10.74

to \$12.25 per hour on May 1, 2015, with annual increases reaching \$15.00 per hour by 2018?

### **BACKGROUND:**

In 2003, San Francisco passed a minimum wage ordinance that established a wage increase tied to the regional consumer price index. Only voters can amend this ordinance. Currently, San Francisco employers are required to pay employees a minimum wage of \$10.74 per hour. The Office of Economic Analysis estimates that about 60,000 people in San Francisco earned the minimum wage in 2013.

### **THE PROPOSAL:**

Proposition J would amend the Administrative Code to increase the minimum wage for employees to \$12.25 per hour on May 1, 2015, with annual increases that would reach \$15.00 per hour by 2018.

The minimum wage increases would be:

- Beginning May 1, 2015, the minimum wage would be \$12.25 per hour
- Beginning July 1, 2016, the minimum wage would be \$13.00 per hour
- Beginning July 1, 2017, the minimum wage would be \$14.00 per hour
- Beginning July 1, 2018, the minimum wage would be \$15.00 per hour

After 2018 there would be annual cost-of-living increases to the minimum wage. The minimum wage increase would apply to employees who perform at least two hours of work and for those

who qualify under California's minimum wage law. Employees under the age of 18 in specialized mentorships and employees over 55 working at non-profits with government-subsidized services would receive annual increases based on inflation.

**A "YES" Vote Means:** you authorize the City to require employers to raise the minimum wage to \$12.25 per hour, with annual increases reaching \$15.00 per hour by 2018.

**A "NO" Vote Means:** you do not authorize the City to raise the minimum wage. The minimum wage would continue to be \$10.74 per hour with annual increases based on inflation.

### **ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROP J:**

- This ordinance will increase incomes, encourage consumer spending and stimulate the local economy.
- Proposition J would boost the pay of 23 per cent of San Francisco workers by an estimated \$2,800 a year.
- Pay increases would especially benefit women, working families, and workers of color. Increasing the minimum wage could reduce reliance on federal and state welfare programs.

### **ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROP J:**

- Raising the minimum wage could raise labor costs for small businesses and non-profit organizations.
- Increasing the minimum wage could increase consumer prices as struggling businesses pass increased costs onto consumers.

- Raising the minimum wage could limit future job growth and lead to a reduction in employment

**PROPOSITION K – AFFORDABLE HOUSING GOALS**

Declaration of Policy  
Placed on the ballot by the Board of Supervisors  
Requires a simple majority vote for passage

**THE QUESTION:**

Should San Francisco commit to increasing the availability of affordable housing for lower and middle income residents?

**BACKGROUND:**

San Francisco has experienced a rapid increase in rent and property values, making housing unaffordable to lower and middle income residents, and leading to the displacement of the City’s families and seniors.

While San Francisco’s median income has grown over time, the City’s middle class population has declined by almost 10% since 1990 and their ability to obtain affordable housing has decreased.

In January 2014, Mayor Lee set forth a proposal to construct or rehabilitate 30,000 homes throughout the city by 2020, with at least one third of those permanently affordable to low and moderate income households and over 50% within financial reach of working middle class San Franciscans.

Due to the poor physical condition of many public housing projects, combined with a sharp decrease in federal funding for public housing, the City has developed a plan for their rehabilitation.

**THE PROPOSAL:**

Passage of this proposition would affirm the City’s commitment to address the current housing affordability crisis. It would enable the following actions:

- Supporting production of 30,000 units of new housing in San Francisco by 2020, with at least 33% permanently affordable to low and moderate income households, and over 50% affordable to working middle class San Franciscans
- Creating a Housing Action and Stabilization Plan to realize the 30,000 unit goal. The Plan would implement:
  - A funding strategy sufficient to support rental and homeownership affordable to low, moderate, and middle income households
  - Funding for Neighborhood Stabilization Trust to preserve affordability of existing rental units and stabilizing neighborhoods with historically high levels of evictions
  - Land acquisition strategy to purchase sites appropriate for public housing
  - Funding for housing rehabilitation
- Achieving 33% of residential units affordable to low and moderate income households in new Area Plans or Special Use Districts with



significantly increased development potential.

- Introduction of legislation requiring the City to review the ratio of affordable to market rate housing through an annual housing production calculation.
- Holding an annual hearing by the Board of Supervisors on progress towards housing goals stated above. If the goals are not progressing, the Mayor shall propose a strategy to achieve those goals and the Board of Supervisors should review the strategy.

**A “YES” Vote Means:** You support policies to increase the availability of affordable housing in San Francisco.

**A “NO” Vote Means:** You do not support policies to increase the availability of affordable housing in San Francisco.

#### **ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROP K:**

- In San Francisco, rents are three times higher than the national average. Average rent for a 2 bedroom apartment is \$3,989 a month.
- Housing affordability is presently one of the greatest challenges the City faces. In response, the City is committing to take immediate action to generate revenue and execute strategies to build housing for residents at all income levels.
- This measure would hold the City accountable to building 30,000 new residential units, protect existing tenants and curb rapidly rising rents, generate new revenue to build affordable housing, and establish 33%

affordable housing in areas where new housing is added.

- Proposition K is a unified effort to make the City affordable and accessible to all.

#### **ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROP K:**

- San Francisco is already experiencing local overpopulation problems and increased traffic accidents.
- The City has already reached its carrying capacity and has more people per square mile than any of the other Bay Area counties.
- Developers and builders seek to add housing and increase the population to 1 million residents, which will result in traffic problems, auto accidents, Muni transportation limits, and unavailable / overtaxed public services.
- Parkmerced’s management wants to increase the population from 8,000 to 25,000 and other developers want to add 250,000 people to Sunset, Parkside, Richmond, and other neighborhoods regardless of the social and economic impact.

#### **PROPOSITION L – RESTORE TRANSPORTATION BALANCE**

Declaration of Policy  
Placed on the ballot by Restore  
Transportation Balance 2014 Committee  
Requires a simple majority vote for  
passage

## **THE QUESTION:**

Should San Francisco develop a more motorist-friendly transportation policy?

## **BACKGROUND:**

The Board of Supervisors created a “Transit First” policy in 1973 that aimed to facilitate alternative modes of transportation including MUNI, bicycles, and walking. The San Francisco Municipal Transportation Authority, created in 1999, has developed and implemented policies to promote public transit and bicycling while reducing the availability of parking and converting vehicle traffic lanes into bicycle lanes. As a result, motorists face increased travel times and decreasing parking availability. Due to increased metering and ticket fines for parking, motorists are a larger share of SFMTA funding but do not benefit directly from this funding.

## **THE PROPOSAL:**

- Parking meters should not operate outside the hours of 9am to 6pm. Starting January 1, 2015, fees for parking garages, meters, parking tickets, and parking permits should be frozen for 5 years, and thereafter only be adjusted for consumer price index increases.
- Introduction of parking meters to areas where they do not currently exist should require a petition by the majority of affected households and merchants.
- A portion of any motorists’ fees and new bond funds raised for the

SFMTA should go towards construction of parking garages.

- Any proposed re-engineering of traffic flows should achieve safer, smoother-flowing streets.
- Traffic laws should be enforced equally for anyone using San Francisco’s streets and sidewalks.
- The SFMTA board should include motorists and other stakeholders in addition to the 4 regular MUNI riders. The SFMTA should create a Motorist Citizens Advisory Committee in addition to its other committees.
- The Board of Supervisors should make every reasonable effort to implement components of this policy.

**A “YES” Vote Means:** you want voters to reduce the volume and pricing of parking meters, increase parking garage space, and reduce traffic congestion for motorists.

**A “NO” Vote Means:** you support the existing Transit First policy which prioritizes public transit, bicycling, walking, and other alternative modes of transportation.

## **ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSAL:**

- Almost 80% of San Francisco households own motor vehicles, but SFMTA’s policies penalize them by eliminating traffic lanes and parking spaces, increasing cost and hours of parking meters, increasing fines, and imposing demand responsive pricing

for parking where it didn't exist before.

- This has increased traffic congestion, cost, stress, pollution, and travel times. It especially harms families with small children, blue-collar workers, merchants, tradespeople, disabled people, seniors, and faith communities, and threatens San Francisco's diversity.
- This proposition will open a meaningful dialogue with the MTA and city officials about a transportation policy that truly respects all people affected.
- Most people use multiple modes of transportation – motor vehicles, public transit, cycling, and walking. Just as most people aim for balance, appropriateness and reasonableness, so does Restore Transportation Balance.



LEAGUE OF  
WOMEN VOTERS®  
SAN FRANCISCO

#### **ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROP L:**

- Proposition L is a radical effort to turn transportation policies backwards and reverse decades of environmental progress.
- It will make traffic, parking, and pollution worse for all residents, whether they drive, walk, take transit, or bike. It will encourage more people to drive by diverting transportation dollars to parking and will make streets more dangerous by prioritizing traffic flow over safety.
- It will push the City to purchase land to build parking garages instead of affordable housing or improving MUNI. San Francisco does not have the space or funding to build homes for cars instead of homes for people.
- Proposition L does not reflect San Francisco values. We care about creating less pollution and fighting climate change, not making our environment worse. We care about making transit better for everyone, not making it slower. We care about making our streets safer, not more dangerous.

**The statements made in the Pros and Cons Guide are not the opinions of the League of Women Voters of San Francisco nor the Voter Services Committee. The statements are a compilation of publicly filed ballot arguments, news articles, interviews with various advocates and online research.**

