



PROS & CONS GUIDE

SAN FRANCISCO BALLOT MEASURES

ELECTION DAY: TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 6, 2012

PROPOSITION A – CITY COLLEGE PARCEL TAX

District Measure

Placed on the ballot by CCSF

Require 2/3 of votes cast for passage

THE QUESTION:

Shall the San Francisco Community College District levy a parcel tax of \$79 annually for eight years and require independent audits and citizen oversight?

BACKGROUND:

City College of San Francisco (CCSF) has nine campuses in the City and serves approximately 100,000 students each year. The state has reduced funding to CCSF by more than \$53 million over the past three years. As a result, CCSF's annual revenues are now more than \$25 million less than they were a few years ago. The Community College Board, which oversees CCSF, has determined that City College's current revenues are inadequate to fund community college education in San Francisco.

THE PROPOSAL:

Proposition A would authorize a parcel tax to provide funding for City College of San Francisco. The tax would be \$79 per parcel annually, and it would last for eight years.

City College would use the tax funds to:

- maintain core academic courses, including English, math, and science;

- provide workforce training, including nursing, engineering, business, and technology;
- provide an education that prepares students for four-year universities;
- keep City College libraries and student support services open;
- keep technology and instructional support up to date, and
- offset State budget cuts.

The use of the funds would be subject to annual review by a Citizen's Oversight Committee appointed by the Community College Board.

A "YES" Vote Means: If you vote "yes," you want to authorize a parcel tax of \$79 annually for eight years to provide funding for City College of San Francisco.

A "NO" Vote Means: If you vote "no," you do not want to authorize this tax all groups affected by the projects funded by this bond measure.

FISCAL EFFECTS:

The Controller states:

Should the proposed parcel tax be approved by the voters, in my opinion, it would not affect the cost of government for the City and County of San Francisco. The proposed tax of \$79 per parcel would be collected each year for eight years from property owners of each separately taxed parcel in San Francisco. Property that would otherwise be exempt from

ONLINE ELECTION INFO

www.sfvotes.org

ELECTION DAY IS TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 6

- Polls open from 7 am to 8 pm
- Early voting starts October 9
- October 22 is the last day to register to vote
- For more information, visit the SF Department of Elections at: www.sfgov.org/election

TO VOTE IN THE NOVEMBER 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 requires 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.

Join or donate on line! www.SFvotes.org

property taxes will also be exempt from the parcel tax. The tax is projected to generate approximately \$16 million annually. The revenues would benefit the San Francisco Community College District and their use would be subject to the budgetary and fiscal procedures of the Community College District.

ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

- For over 75 years, City College of San Francisco has offered affordable learning experiences to all populations, with a particular commitment to those who encounter barriers to education.
- The State has cut billions of dollars in support for community colleges. This measure would provide money for CCSF that the State cannot take away.
- CCSF helps to support our local economy by serving as San Francisco's largest provider of workforce training, including nursing, engineering, business and technology.
- This measure would establish a Citizen's Oversight Committee to ensure the appropriate use of funds by CCSF.

ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION A

- CCSF's problems are not a result of lack of funding but rather a lack of planning and failure to live within its means.
- Reports in 2006 and again in 2012 show that CCSF faces structural failures and has ignored its fiscal challenges. It needs to remove barriers to effective decision-making before receiving more funding.
- Rather than simply directing more funds to CCSF, efficiency should be demanded of it and all public education institutions.
- More money needs to be spent on maintenance, laboratories, and technology rather than salaries and benefits, which currently account for 92% of the school's budget.



PROPOSITION B - CLEAN AND SAFE NEIGHBORHOOD PARKS BOND

General Obligation Bond

Placed on the ballot by Mayor Edwin Lee and the Board of Supervisors

Requires 2/3 of votes cast for passage

THE QUESTION:

Shall the City and County of San Francisco issue \$195 million dollars in General Obligation bonds, subject to independent oversight and regular audits?

BACKGROUND:

The City operates and maintains more than 200 parks, playgrounds, recreation facilities, public open spaces and other properties throughout San Francisco. In 2007, an independent review revealed that many parks and facilities were outdated and posed seismic and safety risks. As a result, the City's 10-year Capital Plan proposed a series of general obligation bonds to address these needs in parks.

The City uses property tax revenues to pay principal and interest on general obligation bonds. The City's policy is to issue new bonds as prior bond debt is retired.

THE PROPOSAL:

Proposition B is a bond measure that would authorize the City to borrow up to \$195 million by issuing general obligation bonds to fund repairs and improvements of the City's parks and public open spaces.

The City plans to use the bond funds for the following purposes:

- neighborhood park repairs and renovations at Angelo J. Rossi Playground, Balboa Park, Garfield Square, George Christopher Playground, Gilman Playground, Glen Canyon Park, Hyde/Turk Mini Park, Joe DiMaggio Playground, Margaret S. Hayward Playground, Moscone Recreation Center, Mountain Lake Park, Potrero Hill Recreation Center, South Park, West Sunset Playground, and Willie "Woo Woo" Wong Playground (\$98.8 million)
- waterfront park and public open space repairs and renovations, which may include Islais Creek, Warm Water Cove, Northeast Wharf Plaza at Pier 27, Agua Vista Park, Pier 43 Plaza and Pier 70 Parks (\$34.5 million)
- playground repair and replacement (\$15.5 million)

Join or donate on line! www.SFvotes.org

- improvements to John McLaren Park (\$10 million), Golden Gate Park (\$9 million), and Lake Merced Park (\$2 million)
- Community Opportunity Fund to pay for community-nominated recreation and park projects (\$12 million)
- improvements that conserve water in parks (\$5 million)
- trail reconstruction in Golden Gate Park and John McLaren Park (\$4 million), and
- park forestry programs (\$4 million).

Proposition B would allow an increase in the property tax to pay for these bonds. It would permit landlords to pass through 50% of any resulting property tax increase to their tenants.

Proposition B would require the Citizen's General Obligation Bond Oversight Committee to provide independent oversight of the spending of bond funds. One-tenth of one percent (0.1%) of the bond funds (\$195,000) would pay for the committee's audit and oversight functions.

A "YES" Vote Means: If you vote "yes," you want the City to issue up to \$195 million in general obligation bonds to fund repairs and improvements to the City's parks and public open spaces.

A "NO" Vote Means: If you vote "no," you do not want the City to issue these bonds.

FISCAL EFFECTS:

The Controller states:

Should the proposed \$195 million in bonds be authorized and sold under current assumptions, the approximate costs would be as follows:

- *In fiscal year 2013-2014, following issuance of the first series of bonds, and the year with the lowest tax rate, the estimated annual costs of debt service would be \$3.7 million and result in a property tax rate of...\$2.24 per \$100,000 of assessed valuation.*
- *In fiscal year 2018-2019, following issuance of the last series of bonds, the estimated annual costs of debt service would be \$16.9 million and result in a property tax rate of...\$8.38 per \$100,000 of assessed valuation.*
- *The best estimate of the average tax rate for these bonds from fiscal year 2013-2014 through 2037-2038 is...\$5.28 per \$100,000 of assessed value.*
- *Based on these estimates, the highest estimated annual property tax cost for these bonds for the*

owner of a home with an assessed value of \$500,000 would be approximately \$43.36.

These estimates are based on projections only, which are not binding upon the City.

ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

- Much of San Francisco's park infrastructure is 60-70 years old. This money would provide for safety, seismic, and facility upgrades for many of our City parks.
- Proposition B would also provide for cleanup of environmental contamination at the waterfront and improvement of water quality along the San Francisco Bay.
- Proposition B would address issues that are currently driving up ongoing maintenance costs. Money spent on park improvements would be subject to independent oversight and regular audits.

ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION B

- All of the money from the 2008 parks bond has not been spent yet. We need to know where all the 2008 money went before we give the San Francisco Recreation and Parks Department additional funds.
- There is no guarantee as to which parks will get these funds as the bond report is not legally binding.
- Improvements to City parks should be funded by the City's General Fund, not by issuing expensive bonds.

PROPOSITION C - HOUSING TRUST FUND

Charter Amendment

Placed on the ballot by Mayor Edwin Lee and the Board of Supervisors

Requires simple majority of votes cast for passage

THE QUESTION

Shall the City amend its Charter to: create a Housing Trust Fund that supports affordable housing for low-income and moderate-income households; and change the affordable housing requirements imposed on some private residential developments?

THE BACKGROUND

The City currently uses federal, State and local funds to support affordable housing programs for both low-income and moderate-income households. These include programs to:

- create and improve affordable housing,
- provide loans to assist with down payments, and
- help eligible homeowners and renters stay in their homes.

In addition, the City requires private residential developers to:

- pay a fee to support low-income housing, or
- make 12-15% of their on-site housing units affordable, or
- create new affordable units off-site, equal to 17-20% of their project's units.

Recent federal cutbacks and reductions in State funding have decreased the funding available for affordable housing programs.

THE PROPOSAL

Proposition C would amend the Charter to establish a Housing Trust Fund (the Fund). The City would contribute \$20 million to the Fund in 2013. Each year, the City contribution would increase by \$2.8 million, up to \$50.8 million in 2024. After 2024, the City would contribute an annual amount based on the \$50.8 million but adjusted for changes in the City's General Fund revenues.

The City would use the Fund to:

- Build, purchase, and improve affordable housing;
- Provide \$15 million for a loan program for down-payment assistance for moderate-income homebuyers and emergency first responders, such as a police officers and firefighters; and
- Provide up to \$15 million for a program that would help eligible households avoid foreclosure or eviction, or improve the safety, accessibility, or efficiency of their homes.

The City could use money from the Fund for neighborhood improvements such as streetscapes, childcare facilities and pedestrian safety projects.

Proposition C would change the affordable housing requirements for private residential developments in two ways:

- Reduce the on-site affordable housing requirement to approximately 12% for most projects.
- Prohibit the City from increasing affordable housing requirements beyond those in place on January 1, 2013. This prohibition would apply only to certain projects.

Proposition C would authorize the development of up to 30,000 low-income rental units in the City. The State Constitution requires local voter approval before using public funds to develop, construct, or acquire low-income rental units.

Proposition C would expire automatically after 30 years. However, the Mayor could cancel the amendment at any time before January 1, 2013, after considering the City's financial situation.

A "YES" Vote Means: If you vote "yes," you want to amend the Charter to create a Housing Trust Fund that supports affordable housing for low-income and moderate-income households and to change the affordable housing requirements imposed on some private residential developments.

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

FISCAL EFFECTS

The Controller states:

Should the proposed charter amendment be approved by the voters, in my opinion, it would affect the cost of government for a thirty-year period beginning in fiscal year 2013-2014 in that it would set aside funds for affordable housing which would otherwise be available for any public purpose. [...]

Under recent and current City policies and budgets a portion of the proposed funds would already have been allocated to affordable housing programs. However the amendment does not identify or create new revenue sources for this set-aside and to the extent that the funds do not fully cover the cost of the housing programs, other City spending would have to be reduced or new sources identified.

This proposed ordinance is not in compliance with a non-binding, voter-adopted city policy regarding set-asides. The proposed allocation to affordable housing would otherwise have been part of the City's General Fund discretionary revenue. Discretionary revenues are available for the Mayor and Board of Supervisors' to allocate in the annual budget and also result in increases to existing baseline-funded programs.

The proposed fund would be used for affordable housing programs with eligibility determined by income level and other criteria. Programs could include land purchases for construction of affordable housing, down payment assistance and loans for occupants to continue to live in their homes. The fund could also be used for community investment in public infrastructure including street and landscape improvements.

ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

- Proposition C is projected to create thousands of good paying jobs over the next 30 years.
- This measure would expand moderate-income home ownership opportunities to support professionals such as teachers and nurses, police and firefighters, and would provide rental options for lower-income individuals.
- This proposition restores money previously designated for housing construction through the now defunct Redevelopment Agency without raising sales or property taxes.

ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION C

- The proposition would reduce the on-site affordability requirements for new residential developments.
- Proposition C would commit the City to increasing payouts for years to come, potentially resulting in a shift of taxpayer dollars that will not be available for other priorities, such as schools, parks or healthcare.
- This measure relies on an additional \$13 million in new revenue from an increase in business license fees which are part of a separate proposed ballot measure that would replace the City's business payroll tax with a gross receipts tax.

PROPOSITION D - CONSOLIDATING ODD-YEAR MUNICIPAL ELECTIONS

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

THE QUESTION

Shall the City amend its Charter to change the election cycle for City Attorney and Treasurer so that these officers would be elected at the same times as the Mayor, Sheriff and District Attorney?

THE BACKGROUND

The Mayor, Sheriff, District Attorney, City Attorney and Treasurer are elected to four-year terms. The Mayor, Sheriff and District Attorney are elected in November of the same year. The City Attorney and Treasurer are elected in November of a different year. The next election for City Attorney and Treasurer will be in 2013. The next election for Mayor, Sheriff and District Attorney will be in 2015.

THE PROPOSAL

Proposition D is a Charter Amendment that would change the election cycle for City Attorney and Treasurer so that these officers would be elected at the same time as the Mayor, Sheriff and District Attorney, beginning in 2015.

Under Proposition D, the persons elected as City Attorney and Treasurer in 2013 would serve a two-year term. In November 2015 and every fourth year after that, the City would elect a City Attorney and Treasurer for a four-year term, in addition to a Mayor, Sheriff, and District Attorney. There would be no regularly scheduled election in 2017 and every fourth year after that.

A "YES" Vote Means: If you vote "yes," you want to amend the Charter to change the election cycle for City Attorney and Treasurer so that these officers would be elected at the same time as the Mayor, Sheriff and District Attorney.

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

FISCAL EFFECT

The Controller states:

Should the proposed charter amendment be approved by the voters, in my opinion, it would decrease the cost of government. Savings would begin in fiscal year 2017-2018 and, spread over the four year election cycle, result in approximately \$1.0 million on an annual basis.

Under the proposed amendment there would be an estimated savings of approximately \$4.2 million every four years achieved by eliminating the local municipal election for the offices of City attorney and Treasurer. The City would consolidate these offices with the election for Mayor, Sheriff and District Attorney beginning in 2015 and not conduct a separate municipal election beginning in 2017.

ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

- By combining elections, the City Attorney and Treasurer would be elected during higher turnout elections.
- Combining these elections would save the City's general fund approximately \$4.2 million every four years.

ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION D

- Combining elections will result in longer ballots.
- Less attention would be paid to the individual offices being elected when more positions are on the ballot.

PROPOSITION E - GROSS RECEIPTS TAX

Charter Amendment

Placed on the ballot by Mayor Edwin Lee and Board of Supervisors

Requires simple majority of votes cast for passage

THE QUESTION

Shall the City: create a gross receipts tax designed to eliminate or reduce the tax on payroll costs; and increase business registration fees?

THE BACKGROUND

The City requires businesses to pay a flat 1.5% tax on payroll costs for work performed in the City. Small businesses with less than \$250,000 in payroll costs are exempt from the tax.

The City also requires businesses to pay an annual registration fee ranging from \$25 to \$500.

THE PROPOSAL

Proposition E would create a new City business tax based on gross receipts rather than payroll costs. Under the new system, the tax on payroll costs would be eliminated or reduced.

Businesses with gross receipts of less than \$1 million annually would be exempt from the gross receipts tax. The \$1 million threshold would be adjusted each year to account for inflation.

The gross receipts tax rates would vary depending on the type of business and its annual gross receipts from its activity in the City. Generally, businesses with higher gross receipts would pay higher rates. The rates would range from 0.075% to 0.650%.

Certain businesses that have their headquarters or administrative offices in San Francisco, but operate primarily in other locations, would pay the gross receipts tax based on payroll costs. The tax rate for these businesses would be 1.4% of payroll costs.

Proposition E would require the City to phase in the gross receipts tax, and phase out the tax on payroll costs, over a five-year period beginning in 2014. Each year, the Controller would increase the gross receipts tax and decrease the tax on payroll costs according to a formula that would maintain business tax revenue. The final rates would depend on the revenue the City receives from the gross receipts tax.

If the gross receipts tax revenue exceeds the revenue the City would have received under the tax on payroll costs, then the tax on payroll costs will be phased out and the final gross receipts rates will be lower than the maximum submitted in this measure.

If the gross receipts tax revenue never equals the revenue the City would have received under the tax on payroll costs, then the tax on payroll costs will be reduced but not phased out. In that event, businesses would pay taxes based on both payroll costs and gross receipts.

Proposition E would increase annual business registration fees. These fees would range from \$75 for small businesses to \$35,000 for businesses with more than \$200 million a year in gross receipts. The fees also would be adjusted each year to account for inflation.

Proposition E would establish penalties for failure to properly register a business.

A "YES" Vote Means: If you vote "yes," you want the City to create a gross receipts tax designed to eliminate or reduce the tax on payroll costs. You also want the City to increase business registration fees.

A "NO" Vote Means: If you vote "no," you do not want the City to create a gross receipts tax designed to eliminate or reduce the tax on payroll costs. You also do not want the City to increase business registration fees.

FISCAL EFFECTS:

The Controller states:

Should this ordinance be approved by the voters, in my opinion, it would generate additional net annual revenue from business taxes and registration fees to the City of approximately \$28.5 million beginning in fiscal year 2013-2014, and growing at approximately the rate of inflation in subsequent years. Revenues from the business tax and registration fees can be spent for any public purpose.

Get complete, non-partisan information about this election including your polling place, personalized ballot, candidate profiles, and election results.



www.smartvoter.org

Join or donate on line! www.SFvotes.org

The proposed ordinance would replace the existing tax which is 1.5% of a business' payroll with a tax on a business' gross receipts at rates that vary by the size and type of business. The new tax structure would be phased-in over a five year period and at the end of the period the gross receipts tax rates would remain fixed. The new tax structure is projected to generate annual tax revenues equal to what would have been generated under the existing tax structure plus the amount of the additional administrative cost of the new system.

The existing business registration fee structure would be replaced by a new higher graduated registration fee structure that would generate a new revenue increase to the City of approximately \$28.5 million beginning in fiscal year 2013-2014 and growing at approximately the rate of inflation in subsequent years.

Total business tax and registration fee revenues are estimated to be approximately \$450 million in fiscal year 2012-2013 and are the City's second largest General Fund revenue source.

The proposed gross receipts tax would apply to businesses with \$1 million or more in gross receipts, and the \$1 million threshold would be adjusted by the Consumer Price Index going forward. The ordinance would increase the number and types of businesses in the City that pay business tax and registration fees from approximately 7,500 currently to 15,000 under the new structure. The ordinance would convert most existing payroll tax exclusions into gross receipts tax exclusions of the same size, terms and expiration dates.

ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

- Taxing receipts rather than payroll would encourage hiring in San Francisco.
- Only businesses earning over \$1 million in receipts would pay the gross receipts tax.
- Proposition E would provide a more stable tax base, which is good for fiscal planning, and additional funding for vital public services.

ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION E

- Proposition E would raise taxes through an increase in annual business license fees.
- Proposition E would penalize companies' success by requiring those with higher gross receipts to pay a higher percentage in taxes.
- This Proposition could discourage large companies from coming into San Francisco.

PROPOSITION F - WATER AND ENVIRONMENT PLAN

Ordinance

Placed on the ballot by initiative petition

Requires simple majority of votes cast for passage

THE QUESTION:

Shall the City prepare a two-phase plan that evaluates how to drain the Hetch Hetchy Reservoir so that it can be restored by the National Park Service and identifies replacement water and power sources?

THE BACKGROUND:

San Francisco owns the Hetch Hetchy Regional Water System (Water System), which provides water to about 2.5 million people in San Francisco and neighboring areas. Water System reservoirs collect water from the Tuolumne River and Bay Area watersheds.

The Water System's largest reservoir is in Yosemite National Park's Hetch Hetchy Valley. The reservoir was created in 1923 by damming the Tuolumne River. The Hetch Hetchy Reservoir delivers 85% of the System's water. The water that flows from the reservoir also generates hydroelectric power for City services.

In 2002, the voters of San Francisco authorized the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission to implement a \$4.6 billion project to improve the Water System, including \$334 million to develop additional groundwater, conservation, and recycled water supplies. The project is nearing completion.

THE PROPOSAL:

Proposition F would require the City to prepare a two-phase plan to evaluate how to drain the Hetch Hetchy Reservoir and identify replacement water and power sources. The implementation of this plan would require voter approval.

The first phase would identify:

- new water supply and storage options;
- additional water conservation opportunities;
- expanded water filtration facilities; and
- additional renewable energy sources to replace the reductions in hydroelectric power resulting from draining the Hetch Hetchy Reservoir.

The second phase would evaluate how to:

- drain the Hetch Hetchy Valley and stop using it as a reservoir so that it can be restored by the National Park Service;
- increase flows on the lower Tuolumne River; and
- decrease storm water discharge into the bay and the ocean.

Proposition F would allocate \$8 million to pay for the plan and create a five-member task force to develop it.

Proposition F would require the task force to complete the plan by November 1, 2015, and require the Board of Supervisors to consider placing on the ballot a Charter Amendment to approve the plan.

A "YES" Vote Means: If you vote "yes," you want to require the City to prepare a two-phase plan that would evaluate how to drain the Hetch Hetchy Reservoir and identify replacement water and power sources.

A "NO" Vote Means: If you vote "no," you do not want the City to prepare this plan.

FISCAL EFFECT:

The Controller states:

Should the proposed ordinance be adopted, in my opinion, there would be costs and benefits to the City and County. The costs would vary widely depending on how the City implements the ordinance, and on whether or not voters approve a Charter amendment that is specified in the ordinance. Planning costs over the next several years would be no more than \$8 million. Future infrastructure costs could range from \$3 billion to \$10 billion if the voters approve a future Charter amendment specified in the

ordinance. Benefits cannot be accurately determined at this time for the large-scale resource and environmental objectives in the ordinance. [...]

There would be near-term costs under the ordinance of a maximum of \$8 million under a provision requiring that the City appropriate funds for the planning effort. This amount is likely to be insufficient to complete the required work – in 2005, the State of California Resources Agency estimated the cost for a comparable planning and study process at \$65 million.

The ordinance specifies that funds for the planning process and studies be appropriated from any legally available source and that other governmental or private sources could supplement City funding.

Significant long-term costs could occur as a result of the ordinance if a Charter amendment is eventually approved by the voters requiring development of new water and energy storage, transmission, and treatment facilities, removal of the Hetch Hetchy dam and reservoir, and implementation of environmental goals. There are multiple possible methods for approximating these costs and estimates range widely. Under any method, the amounts are certainly substantial – in the billions of dollars. The State's compilation of estimates shows a range, in 2005 dollars, of not less than \$3 billion, and up to \$10 billion for these facilities and programs, depending on which elements of the water, energy and environmental resource issues are included. This estimate does not include increased operations and maintenance costs associated with the new infrastructure. In addition, the Public Utilities Commission estimates that the loss of hydroelectric energy and lost revenue from energy sales would cost the City an additional \$41 million annually.

EARLY VOTING AT CITY HALL



Did you know that you can vote before Election Day?

October 9 is the First Day for Early Voting at City Hall

Early voting is available 8 am to 5 pm, Monday through Friday, outside Room 48 in City Hall.

There will also be weekend voting on:

Saturday, October 27 and Sunday October 28 and
Saturday, November 3 and Sunday, November 4 from 10am to 4pm
Enter on Grove Street only

Join or donate on line! www.SFvotes.org

The ordinance states that funding sources for the water and energy facilities and the environmental programs that are called for could include federal, state and private sources. However, it should be noted that typically, water and energy facilities are funded by issuing 20 to 30 year bonds and the cost of this debt is recovered through charges to ratepayers. If ratepayer bonds were issued to replace Hetch Hetchy and build new water and energy facilities, customers of San Francisco's water and power utilities would experience rate increases. The Public Utilities Commission estimates that for every \$1 billion in project costs, residential water users in San Francisco would pay between \$60 and \$170 more annually depending on how costs were distributed among local and regional users of the Hetch Hetchy system. As noted above, these large-scale costs would result not directly from the ordinance, but from voter approval of a future Charter amendment that is specified in the ordinance.

ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F:

- Proposition F would require San Francisco to be more reliant on renewable, local water supplies, to recycle more of our water and to encourage the use of reclaimed "greywater."
- While San Francisco is an environmental leader in many ways, our City's water use practices are not and Proposition F would start a needed public dialogue about our City's future water strategy.
- San Francisco is the only city in America that owns and operates a dam in a national park, giving the City special responsibility to demonstrate its environmental leadership by way of this measure.

- Future voter approval is required for the implementation of any recommendation resulting from the study funded by this measure.

ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION F:

- This measure proposes a study with a pre-determined outcome of draining Hetch Hetchy Reservoir at a potential cost of \$3 billion to \$10 billion.
- This measure would force the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission to spend millions of dollars on a plan that would dismantle a reservoir which supplies 85% of the system's water and generates clean hydro-electric power.
- Hetch Hetchy reservoir supplies 2.6 million Bay Area residents with pristine water and dismantling it could aggravate California's already severe water crisis.
- Proposition F has the potential to undercut the \$4 billion initiative that San Francisco residents voted for ten years ago to improve our City's water system, which includes \$334 million to develop additional groundwater, conservation and recycled water supplies.



ABOUT THE LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS

The League of Women Voters of San Francisco, a nonpartisan political organization, encourages the informed and active participation of citizens in government. The League also influences public policy through action and advocacy. The League does not support or oppose candidates or political parties.

ABOUT THE PROS AND CONS GUIDE

The Pros and Cons Guide is produced by the League of Women Voters of San Francisco Education Fund, a 501(c)(3) non-profit educational organization. No portion of the Guide may be reprinted without the express permission of the League of Women Voters of San Francisco Education Fund.

OUR THANKS

The League's voter education programs were made possible with the generous support of our members and the following sponsors:

The Stanley S. Langendorf Foundation Lisa and Douglas Goldman Fund
The David B. Gold Fund Walter and Elise Haas Fund van Loben Sels/RembeRock Foundation