



PROS & CONS GUIDE

San Francisco Ballot Measures

Election Day: Tuesday, November 3, 2009

PROPOSITION A

Budget Process Charter Amendment

Placed on the ballot by Mayor Newsom and Supervisors Avalos, Campos, Chiu, Dufty, Mar, Maxwell, and Mirkarimi

The Question:

Should the City Charter be amended to require the City to develop binding long-range financial policies, to adopt a two-year budget cycle, and to create a five-year financial plan to forecast expenditures and revenues?

The Background:

Currently, the City adopts an annual budget by July 1. The City is not required to engage in any long-term financial planning or to adopt financial policies that guide the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor in creating the City's annual budgets.

The Proposal:

Under Proposition A, the City would move from a one-year budget cycle to a two-year budget cycle. Annually, the Mayor would submit to the Board of Supervisors a proposed rolling two-year budget, balanced for each fiscal year, and the Board would adopt a two-year budget every year. The Mayor and the Board would also have the power to establish a fixed two-year budget cycle for certain departments. Under the fixed two-year cycle, the Mayor would submit a two-year budget for affected departments, and, if approved, that budget would remain in place for two fiscal years unless the Controller reported that the revenue or expenditure projections on which that budget was based had significantly changed. Under Proposition A, the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors would retain the power to introduce amendments to the budget at any time during the budget cycle.

This proposition would also institute several financial planning measures. Pursuant to Proposition A, the Controller would propose a set of long-range financial policies for the City. These policies would address, at a minimum,

the creation and maintenance of adequate City reserves, the City's use of volatile or fluctuating revenues, the City's issuance of debt, and any extraordinary budget or financial measures that might be needed to deal with natural disasters. The Controller's proposed financial policies would have to be approved by the Mayor and two-thirds of the members of the Board of Supervisors. Once adopted, the policies would be binding; the City would not be allowed to adopt any budget that the Controller deemed inconsistent with any of the financial policies. However, the Board of Supervisors would have the power, by a two-thirds vote, to suspend the policies for a single fiscal year. Additionally, every three years, the Mayor would propose a five-year financial plan that addresses expenditures, revenues, and strategic goals for most City departments. The five-year plan would be adopted by the Board of Supervisors, and this plan would be used to guide the budget process for those departments in future years.

Proposition A would require labor agreements for all City workers to be submitted to the Board of Supervisors no later than May 15 to be adopted for the upcoming fiscal year beginning July 1. A new labor agreement submitted after the deadline would not be effective until July 1 of the following fiscal year (more than a year in the future), unless it was cost neutral or resulted in a cost savings to the City.

This proposition would also give the Board of Supervisors the power to decide how to notify the public of certain Board proposals and actions, removing the requirement that these notices be published annually in an official City newspaper.

(Proposition A continued on Page 2)

ONLINE ELECTION INFO
www.sfvotes.org

ELECTION DAY IS
TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 3

- Polls open from 7 am to 8 pm
- Early voting starts October 5
- October 19 is the last day to register
- 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 card) or the last 4 digits of your Social Security number on your registration card.

PROPOSITION A

(continued)

Fiscal Effect:

The Controller states the following:

Should the proposed charter amendment be approved by the voters, in my opinion, it would not in and of itself affect the cost of government. The charter amendment makes changes to the City's budget and financial processes which are likely to stabilize spending through requiring multi-year budgeting and financial planning.

The amendment makes four significant changes to the City's financial processes and policies:

- *Specifies a two-year (biennial) budget, replacing the current annual budget;*
- *Requires a five-year financial plan which forecasts revenues and expenses and summarizes expected public service levels and funding requirements for that period;*
- *Charges the Controller's Office with proposing to the Mayor and Board of Supervisors financial policies addressing reserves, use of volatile revenues, debt, and financial measures in the case of disaster recovery. The City would be required to adopt budgets consistent with these policies once approved;*
- *Standardizes the processes and deadlines for the City to submit labor agreements for all public employee unions at May 15.*

Overall, the proposed changes would cause the City to budget less in some years, and to fund the budget with reserved funds or new revenues in other years, but the total amount of City revenue or expenditure would not be directly affected.

Arguments In Favor of Proposition A

- Proposition A would improve the City's financial planning and budgeting by requiring the City to look ahead to future revenues and expenditures when adopting budgets.
- This measure would improve the stability of social services and public health and safety by encouraging the City to plan for anticipated revenue declines so that abrupt cuts are not required to maintain a balanced budget.
- Proposition A would bring the City in line with standard financial planning practices.
- Having all labor contracts finalized at least 45 days before the fiscal year begins would allow for a more transparent and efficient budget process.

Arguments Against Proposition A

- Proposition A is not needed because the law already requires certain agencies, including the Controller, to issue a three-year budget report every year.
- Budget projections on which multi-year budgets are based often turn out to be incorrect.
- Proposition A reduces accountability because it gives the Controller, an appointed official, power over the budget at the expense of elected officials; it also reduces public hearings regarding agency budgets on fixed two-year budget cycles from every year to every two years.
- Failure to finalize labor contract negotiations before May 15 means that these employees would be without a new contract for over a year.



JOIN OR GIVE TO THE LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF SAN FRANCISCO!

All are invited to become members of the League. By becoming a member, you support our efforts to educate and inform voters about their election choices. You also will become a member of the National, State and Bay Area Leagues.

Join or Donate online:

www.sfvotes.org



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

www.smartvoter.org

PROPOSITION B

Board of Supervisors Aides Charter Amendment

Placed on the ballot by Supervisors Alioto-Pier, Ammiano, Daly, Dufty, Maxwell, Mirkarimi, McGoldrick, Peskin, and Sandoval

The Question

Should the City Charter be amended to allow members of the Board of Supervisors an unspecified number of aides?

The Background

The current Charter allows each of the eleven members of the Board of Supervisors to have two aides.

The Proposal

This measure would amend the City Charter to remove the stipulation that each member of the Board Supervisors have two aides.

Fiscal Effect

The Controller states the following:

Should the proposed Charter Amendment be approved by the voters, in my opinion, it would not in and of itself affect the cost of government. The proposal would remove the current reference in the Charter limiting each member of the Board of Supervisors to two staff aides. In effect, the number of staff for the members of the Board of Supervisors would become subject to the normal budgetary and fiscal provisions of the Charter through which annual budgets are proposed by the Mayor and revised and approved by the Board of Supervisors.

Currently each of the eleven members of the Board of Supervisors is authorized to have two staff members. The legislative aide job classification currently in use for these staff pays from \$69,500 to \$93,100 annually and the total cost of the 22 positions is approximately 2.3 million annually including salary and benefits.

Arguments In Favor of Proposition B

- Staffing levels should be arranged according to what is needed, not dictated by the City Charter.
- The realities of the City's budget will act as a constraint on the number of people hired and their salaries.
- This measure would benefit constituents by giving Supervisors more flexibility in their staffing needs, which would result in increased responsiveness to the needs of citizens. Additional resources would also improve the quality of research done on issues going before the Board.
- San Francisco has relatively few aides per elected official, compared with other large California cities.

Arguments Against Proposition B

- It is unreasonable for Supervisors to ask for increased staffing when the City's budget is in such crisis.
- This measure seeks to ignore the wishes of the voters; in 2000 (Proposition B) and 2004 (Proposition D) there were similar measures that were not passed by voters.
- The City should be trimming staff; not adding new positions that could be costly to the City.
- The Supervisors' aides do not need to do in-depth research on issues, since there are already City offices that provide research and data.

EARLY VOTING AT CITY HALL



Did you know that you can vote before Election Day?
October 5 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 31 and Sunday, November 1, 10am to 4pm
(enter on Grove St. only)

Join or donate on line! www.Sfvotes.org

PROPOSITION C

Candlestick Park Naming Rights Ordinance

Placed on the ballot by Board of Supervisors Alioto-Pier, Campos, Chiu, Chu, Dufty, Elsbernd, Maxwell, and Mirkarimi

The Question

Should the City be allowed to enter into naming contracts for the stadium at Candlestick Point?

The Background

The 49ers football team entered into a stadium naming contract with the City in 2004. The team signed a 4-year naming contract with Monstercable that expired in 2008. The City collected \$700,000 annually during that contract period. The 49ers may continue to negotiate a new contract with a new naming partner through the end of their stadium lease, as long as the following stipulations are met: the sponsor is one of 5 pre-approved sponsors named in the original contract; the City's anticipated revenue from the sale is at least \$3 million; and the sale complies with the City's advertising policies. The 49ers' lease expires in 2013 and could be renewed at 5-year intervals through 2023. After the 49ers vacate the stadium at Candlestick Point at the conclusion of their lease, City administrative code requires that the property be known as Candlestick Park. Proposition C would repeal Proposition H, passed by voters in 2004, which requires the stadium to be named Candlestick Park.

The Proposal

This proposition would allow the Recreation and Park Department to enter into agreements for the naming of the City-owned sports stadium located at Candlestick Point. This proposition would also broaden the pool of prospective naming partners and could designate at least 50% of the collected revenue be used to fund recreation and parks center directors. However, any funds generated for the City from naming rights contracts would be General Fund revenues.

Any new contract would be subject to the approval by the Board of Supervisors.

Fiscal Effect

The Controller states the following:

Should this ordinance be approved, in my opinion, it would not in and of itself affect the cost of government and could result in additional revenue for the City.

The proposed ordinance amends the Administrative Code to allow the Recreation and Park Department to approve

or enter into an agreement for the naming rights of the City-owned sports stadium located at Candlestick Point. The San Francisco 49ers currently have exclusive rights to sell and enter into agreements with five named entities listed in their 2004 naming agreement with the City. The proposed ordinance would permit the 49ers to enter into agreements with any other naming rights sponsor with prior approval from the Recreation and Park Department and Board of Supervisors.

The City has not earned naming rights revenue from the stadium since 2008. The previous naming rights agreement generated approximately \$700,000 annually for the City. The proposed ordinance could earn revenue for the City by significantly widening the pool of potential naming rights sponsors.

The proposed ordinance also specifies that at least fifty percent of the revenue received by the City from naming agreements shall be used to fund recreation center directors. However, any revenues generated from a naming rights agreement are General Fund revenues and could be used for any legal purposes of the City, subject to Board of Supervisors' appropriation approval.

Arguments in Favor of Proposition C

- Revenue from naming rights could provide the General Fund with much needed income.
- This proposition could help ensure that recreation centers have the necessary staff to remain open.
- Proposition C could encourage the 49ers to stay in San Francisco.

Arguments Against Proposition C

- The sale of naming rights feeds the illusion of fixing budgetary woes; it usually just delays the true structural reforms that are needed to sustain a city.
- Changing stadium names every few years creates confusion and unnecessary expenses.
- Funding for the Recreation and Park Department should not be at the mercy of an unpredictable funding source.

LEAGUE ON TV AND ONLINE!

The League of Women Voters of San Francisco partners with our San Francisco public, educational, and government cable channels to produce election programs for television and video. We are grateful to SFGTV, and EATV for their tremendous support. In October, you will find on TV and online: Discussions of local ballot measures.

Visit www.sfvotes.org for the TV schedule and to watch these programs as video on demand.



Join or donate on line! www.SFvotes.org

PROPOSITION D**Mid-Market Special Sign District
Initiative Ordinance
Initiative Petition**

The Question

Should a special sign district be created which would allow new general advertising signs on and near Market Street between 5th and 7th Streets?

The Background

Outdoor advertising signage has been addressed through several ballot measures in previous years.

In 2002, voters adopted an ordinance prohibiting new general advertising signs anywhere in San Francisco. This proposition, if passed, would exempt the Mid-Market Street area from this ban.

The Mid-Market Street area has historically been a center of San Francisco's arts and entertainment industry. In recent years, this section of Market Street, while still home to many cultural destinations, has fallen on hard times. The City has adopted a Mid-Market Draft Redevelopment Plan to promote cultural and economic vitality in the area.

The Proposal

Proposition D would create a new special sign district on Market Street between 5th and 7th Streets. Allowable new signage could include roof signs, wind signs, video signs, rotating signs, signs with moving parts, and illuminated signs, among others. The existing non-profit Central Market Community Benefit District (CBD) would regulate signs (height, position, movement, and illumination, for example) and select the companies allowed to install signs.

Further, Proposition D would require property owners who have sold advertising space on their buildings to deposit a percentage of revenue earned into a fund managed by CBD and audited by the City Controller. Funds could be used for youth and cultural arts education and a cultural organization ticket booth at Market and Powell Streets, among other things.

Fiscal Effect

The Controller states the following:

Should this ordinance be approved, in my opinion, it would in and of itself have a minimal impact on the cost of government.

The proposed ordinance would create a new special district allowing general advertising signs in the Mid-Market Street area between 5th and 7th Streets, forming an exception to the bans on general advertising currently in place

for those areas. Signs allowed in the area would be subject to various restrictions as to their size and features. A portion of revenues earned from signs would be required to be deposited to a fund for youth and arts education and related purposes in the area. Regulations and processes for signs in the district, and management of the youth arts and education funds resulting from the district would be the responsibility of an existing non-profit organization, the Central Market Community Benefit District, which works on community benefit issues in the Mid-Market area. The Controller's Office would be required to audit the youth arts and education funds annually. City agencies including the Planning Department and the Building Inspection Department would continue to have regulatory and permitting responsibilities and would incur added costs to administer signage allowed in the district, however these costs are typically recovered through fees charged to permit applications.

Arguments In Favor of Proposition D

- Income generated from outdoor advertising sales would provide an important revenue source to support struggling Market Street theatres and cultural institutions. Funding would also support the CBD and other arts and education programs serving the local community.
- New signage and outdoor marquees will create a sense of liveliness, bring needed lighting to the area, and improve safety for residents and visitors.
- Proposition D creates a sensible exception to the City-wide ban on new signage; it is targeted only to a small area where signage has traditionally been located and where it is necessary to attract visitors.

Arguments Against Proposition D

- Outdoor advertising, particularly digital billboards, would create visual blight that could be seen from across San Francisco.
- Outdoor advertising generates large profits, only some of which would benefit the Community Benefit District and other non-profits.
- Leadership and comprehensive planning are needed to revitalize the Mid-Market area; advertising alone will not restore vitality and would detract from the existing quality of life for residents and visitors.

