



PROS & CONS GUIDE

San Francisco Ballot Measures

Election Day: Tuesday, November 6, 2007

PROPOSITION A

TRANSIT REFORM, PARKING REGULATION AND EMISSIONS REDUCTION ACT CHARTER AMENDMENT

Placed on the ballot by Supervisors Peskin, Ammiano, Daly, Dufty, Elsbernd, Maxwell, and Mirkarimi

The Question

Should the City Charter be amended to expand the Municipal Transit Agency's authority over its operations, provide additional funding, and require the development of a Climate Action Plan?

The Background

A 1999 voter-approved Charter Amendment (Proposition E) created a Municipal Transportation Agency (MTA) with expanded powers and duties to run the Municipal Railway (Muni) and the Department of Parking and Traffic. Proposition E set service and performance standards for Muni operations and required a minimum annual funding contribution from the City's General Fund. These funds were measured as 40% of the parking tax receipts and 50% of new revenues from parking fee increases, taxes or enforcement. Proposition E gave the MTA authority to manage personnel and labor relations subject to wage caps set by the City and approve an annual budget. The Board of Supervisors can reject the MTA budget by a super-majority vote of eight or more members. The MTA does not currently have the authority to issue bonds or incur debt. It handles personnel and labor relations; however, City law caps the wages of Muni transit operators. Presently, the Board of Supervisors approves many parking regulations and the installation of traffic control devices on City streets.

The Proposal

If this proposition passes, the Municipal Transportation Agency's share of City revenues would increase from 40% to 80% of parking tax receipts from the General Fund. The MTA would also receive 100% of any new revenues from future increased parking

revenues. The MTA could issue revenue bonds and other debt upon approval by the Board of Supervisors.

The MTA would be required to use the new General Fund revenue primarily to implement improvements recommended by the City's Transit Effectiveness Project. The MTA would continue to bargain collectively to set wages for transit operators, and it would set a base wage based on comparable transit systems. The number of "at will" employees (those who can be hired and fired at the will of the manager) would be increased.

MTA's powers would be expanded with regard to the adoption of parking regulations and installation of traffic control devices. Actions related to other traffic and parking regulations would still be subject to review by the Board of Supervisors or regulation under the City's Planning Code. Proposition A would fix the maximum number of off street parking places allowed in new private developments in the City's Planning Code as of July 1, 2007.

Finally, the MTA would be required to develop a Climate Action Plan every two years that would seek to reduce greenhouse gas emissions from San Francisco's transportation sources to 80% of 1990 levels by 2012.

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
- For more, 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 on page 2.

PROPOSITION A

Continued from page 1

TRANSIT REFORM, PARKING REGULATIONS AND EMISSIONS REDUCTIONS CHARTER AMENDMENT

Placed on the Ballot by Supervisors Peskin, Ammiano, Daly, Dufty, Elsbernd, Maxwell, and Mirkarimi

Fiscal Effect

The Controller states the following:

Should the proposed charter amendment be approved by the voters, in my opinion, it would affect the cost of government beginning in fiscal year 2008-2009 in that it would direct approximately \$26 million from the General Fund to the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (MTA). This amount is the equivalent of 40% of the revenue generated by the City's parking tax, and would be added to an equal amount that the MTA already receives. The Charter amendment would not change the City's current policy of using the equivalent of the remaining 20% of parking tax for services for seniors and the disabled.

The amendment also provides that all future revenue growth generated by changes in parking policies and parking fine amounts will be dedicated to the MTA. All of the changes in parking policies and fines that were enacted over the last five years currently generate approximately \$17 million in revenue annually to the General Fund.

To the extent that these funds are shifted to the MTA, other City spending would have to be reduced or new revenues identified.

The amendment provides the MTA with broad additional authority in several areas – approving contracts, hiring, setting employee pay, proposing revenue measures and issuing debt. In general these changes do affect policy and management but do not in and of themselves increase or decrease the cost of government. The amendment requires that the MTA establish a two-year budget. The amendment retains the budget approval process where the Mayor may not change the budget submitted by the MTA Board, but reduces to seven the number of votes by which the Board of Supervisors may accept or reject the budget. The amendment also authorizes the MTA to issue debt financed by revenues under their jurisdiction.

Finally, the amendment specifies that transit operator wages will be at least the average of the highest paid comparable transit systems nationwide. Currently, this average is used as a cap, setting the salary limit for transit operator wages.

Arguments in Favor of Proposition A

- Much needed additional funding for Muni would be provided without raising fares or causing service cuts.
- By mandating additional standards of performance and methods of measuring and documenting results, management accountability would be improved.
- The requirement that the overall transportation system meet and exceed Kyoto Global Warming Treaty standards would ensure a reduction of air pollution and global warming.

Arguments Against Proposition A

- An additional \$26 million would be diverted from the General Fund in just the first year of the proposition's implementation.
- Oversight of the MTA would be transferred from the Board of Supervisors to the appointed MTA Board of Directors if this measure passes.
- This measure makes it too difficult to increase parking in neighborhoods.

ONLINE ELECTION INFO

www.sfvotes.org

EARLY VOTING AT CITY HALL

Did you know that you can vote before Election Day?

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

Early voting available 8 am to 5 pm, Monday through Friday, outside Room 48 in City Hall. There will also be early voting on the weekends of October 27-28 & November 3-4.

PROPOSITION B**LIMITING HOLD-OVER SERVICE ON CHARTER-CREATED
BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS****CHARTER AMENDMENT**

Placed on the Ballot by Supervisors McGoldrick, Ammiano, Alito-Pier, Daly, Dufty, Elsbernd, Maxwell, Mirkarimi, Peskin, Sandoval

The Question

Should the City Charter be amended to limit the time board and commission members may serve after their term has expired?

The Background

Currently, most board and commission members are appointed to serve for a specific number of years. A member may continue to serve (or “hold over”) until reappointed, or until someone else is appointed. Members are typically appointed by the Mayor, the Board of Supervisors, or other elected officials.

The Proposal

This proposition changes the City Charter so that upon completion of a board or commission member’s term, he or she would be able to serve for no more than 60 days.

Proposition B would be effective immediately. After the election, members who are hold-over members would be allowed a 60-day grace period before having to leave office. During this time, the Mayor or the Board of Supervisors would be expected to reappoint or replace the member, in order to prevent vacancies.

This proposition would not apply to citizen advisory committees, the Fine Arts Museum Board of Trustees, the Arts Commission, the Asian Art Commission, the War Memorial and Performing Arts Center Board, the Retirement Board, or the Health Service Board.

Fiscal Effect

The Controller states the following:

Should the proposed charter amendment be approved by the voters, in my opinion, it would not increase the cost of government. The amendment provides that commissioners may not continue serving longer than 60 days after the expiration of their term without formal reappointment. Note that in the event that this requirement creates or extends commission vacancies, some City processes including the approval of permits, rules, budgets, policies, and other commission business may be delayed.

Arguments in Favor of Proposition B

- This change would help to ensure that boards and commissions be updated with new members in a timely manner.
- Hold-over board and commission members could plan accordingly for their exits; they could focus their attention on their work, knowing exactly when they will be replaced.

Arguments Against Proposition B

- If positions are not filled promptly, certain City processes may be delayed.
- Information has not been provided about what actions would be taken if a qualified candidate is not readily available when a position becomes vacant.

VOTE AT HOME: Register as a Permanent Absentee Voter

Absentee ballots must be requested from the San Francisco Department of Elections by October 30 at 5 pm.

Request a ballot by fax at (415) 554-4372 or call (415) 554-4411. You can also get more information online at www.sfgov.org/election. Completed ballots must be received at the Department of Elections or a polling place by 8 pm on Election Day. Ballots that arrive to the Department of Elections or at a polling place after 8 pm on Election Day will not be counted, even if a postmark on your absentee ballot return envelope is dated before or on Election Day.

To ensure that your ballot is counted:

- Make no identifying marks on your ballot
- Do not sign or initial your ballot
- Sign your name on the absentee voter return envelope

PROPOSITION C**REQUIRING PUBLIC HEARINGS ON
PROPOSED MEASURES****CHARTER AMENDMENT**

Placed on the Ballot by Supervisors Elsbernd, Peskin,
McGoldrick, Alito-Pier, Maxwell

The Question

Should the City Charter be amended to require the Mayor or the Board of Supervisors to submit ballot measures for public hearings before they are placed on the ballot?

The Background

The City Charter allows either the Mayor or four or more members of the Board of Supervisors to submit initiatives, ordinances, or policy statements for the ballot. No public notice or hearings, or notice to other Supervisors is required prior to submission to the Department of Elections. Often, these measures are submitted to the Department of Elections very near the deadline for submission of such measures.

The Proposal

Under Proposition C, if four or more members of the Board, or the Mayor, want to place a measure on the ballot, they would be required to submit the proposed initiative to the Board of Supervisors and the Department of Elections at least 45 days before the deadline for submitting such initiatives to the Department of Elections. The President of the Board would then assign the measure to a committee of the Board, and the committee would hold a hearing on the measure in the next 30 days.

If the committee does not hold a public hearing on the measure prior to the election, the measure would still be placed on the ballot, but the Department of Elections would include a note in the voters' information pamphlet explaining that the measure had not been the subject of a public hearing.

The person(s) who submitted a measure could withdraw the proposed measure at any time prior to the Department of Elections' deadline for the submission of such measures.

Fiscal Effect

The Controller states the following:

Should the proposed charter amendment be approved by the voters, in my opinion, it would have a minimal impact on the cost of government. The amendment creates a procedure whereby members of Board of Supervisors who want to place an ordinance on the ballot for voter approval must submit the measure for a public hearing by the Board. If no public hearing is held, the measure may still go on the ballot with a notice to voters that no public hearing was held. Currently, members may place a measure on the ballot with the signatures of four members of the Board.

Arguments In Favor of Proposition C

- The new requirements would result in greater awareness and examination of proposed ballot measures so the public can provide input.
- This change could lead to fewer measures being submitted to the voters because issues could be handled through the traditional legislative process.

Arguments Against Proposition C

- The Mayor and the Board of Supervisors are elected officials and should be able to use their judgment to bring measures to voters.

WHEN DO YOU REGISTER TO VOTE?

When you move...

When you change your name...

When you change your political party affiliation...

PROPOSITION D

RENEWING LIBRARY PRESERVATION FUND CHARTER AMENDMENT

Placed on the Ballot by Supervisors Peskin, Maxwell, Elsbernd, Alito-Pier, Mirkarimi, McGoldrick, Dufty, Ammiano and Sandoval

The Question

Should the City Charter be amended to renew the Library Preservation Fund, with additional authorities to take on debt obligation?

The Background

The Library Preservation Fund was originally approved by voters in 1994 for a period of fifteen years. It has been funded by a set-aside from the annual property tax levy. The annual set-aside is an amount equivalent to an annual tax of two and a half cents for each one hundred dollars of assessed valuation. The Fund set dedicated funding levels for materials, staffing, and establishing library hours.

The Proposal

Proposition D would renew the Library Preservation Fund for 15 years, with monies for the Fund coming from the same annual property tax set-aside. It would allow the City to issue revenue bonds to construct and improve library facilities. Money from the Library Preservation Fund could be used to repay this debt, but only up to the amount of growth in the Fund above the 2006-2007 baseline amount. It would require the Library to continue to provide at least 1,211 permanent system-wide service hours and existing permanent branch hours until 2013. After that, the Library Commission may modify these hours, but must first conduct public hearings in each Supervisorial district.

Fiscal Effects

The Controller states the following:

Should the proposed charter amendment be approved by the voters, in my opinion, it would not increase the cost of government in that it would primarily renew existing uses of property tax funds and other city revenues for the Library.

The amendment renews a voter-approved Charter requirement that property tax funds in the amount of 2.5 cents out of the one dollar base property tax collected on every \$100 of assessed valuation be budgeted for the Library. The amendment renews the period of the property tax set-aside for fifteen years beginning with fiscal year 2008-2009. The amendment also requires the City to maintain and increase its other funding of the Library consistent with general revenue growth—the “baseline”. Currently, property tax revenues provide the Library with approximately \$33.4 million annually, and the baseline amount is approximately \$42.2 million annually.

The amendment changes the existing Charter by making debt repayment an authorized use of the Library’s property tax funding. Subject to approval by the Library Commission, Mayor, and Board of Supervisors, the City would be able to issue bonds for construction, acquisition and renovation of libraries or to purchase equipment, and then to repay those

bonds using the Library’s set-aside property tax funds. The amount authorized for use as debt repayment would be limited to the growth in the baseline and property tax revenue amounts from fiscal year 2006-2007 forward – that amount is \$4.7 million as of the fiscal year 2007-2008 budget.

Arguments in Favor of Proposition D

- Proposition D would renew the Library Preservation Fund which would allow the Library to continue to expand collections and services.
- Proposition D would enable the Library to continue its Branch Library Improvement Program. When this program is complete, 27 branch libraries will have been renovated and made fully accessible.
- Libraries are essential to support access to information for San Franciscans of all ages, ethnic backgrounds, and economic levels. Proposition D would enable the City to continue supporting this vital institution.

Arguments Against Proposition D

- Proposition D would freeze library operations at the 2007 level for the next 15 years and would divert property tax revenues to debt payment for unspecified construction projects.
- Taxpayers approved a library bond in 2000 for renovation and new construction, but the program is behind schedule. Proposition D would allow these projects to be finished without having a general obligation bond approved. A general obligation bond requires a 2/3 vote to be adopted, but Proposition D (a Charter Amendment) requires only a majority vote.
- Proposition D would allow the Library Commission to issue revenue bonds or other debt obligations with the recommendation of the Mayor and approval by the Board of Supervisors. Voter approval would not be necessary.

PROPOSITION E**REQUIRING MAYOR TO APPEAR MONTHLY AT A BOARD OF SUPERVISORS MEETING****CHARTER AMENDMENT**

Placed on the Ballot by Supervisors Daly, Ammiano,
McGoldrick, Mirkarimi, Peskin, Sandoval

The Question

Should the Mayor be required to appear monthly at a Board of Supervisors meeting?

The Background

Currently, the City Charter permits, but does not require, the Mayor to speak and be heard on any matter, at any meeting of the Board of Supervisors or any of its committees. In November 2006, the voters passed a Declaration of Policy, Proposition I, a non-binding measure that advised the Mayor to make a monthly appearance before the Board to engage in formal policy discussions.

The Proposal

Proposition E would require the Mayor to appear personally at one Board of Supervisors meeting each month to engage in formal policy discussions. It would also authorize the Board, in consultation with the Mayor, to adopt rules and guidelines for the appearance of the Mayor.

Fiscal Effect

The Controller states the following:

Should the proposed charter amendment be approved by voters, in my opinion, it would not increase the cost of government.

Arguments for Proposition E

- Proposition E would increase communication between the Mayor and the Board, improving how government works.
- Interaction between the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors should be consistent regardless of the individuals in office.

Arguments against Proposition E

- Forcing a Mayor to appear at Board of Supervisors meetings would merely create a forum for personal attacks and “political theater” and would not result in constructive dialogue.
- How the Mayor and Board members communicate should be resolved by the parties involved rather than making it part of the City Charter.



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

www.smartvoter.org

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 Access SF, SFGTV, and EATV for their tremendous support. In October, you will find on TV and online:

- Discussions of local ballot measures
- Candidate Forums

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

PROPOSITION F**AUTHORIZING BOARD OF SUPERVISORS TO AMEND
CONTRACT FOR RETIREMENT BENEFITS FOR
POLICE DEPARTMENT EMPLOYEES WHO WERE
AIRPORT POLICE OFFICERS****ORDINANCE**

Placed on the Ballot by Supervisors McGoldrick, Alito-Pier, Ammiano, Dufty, Elsbernd, Jew, Maxwell, McGoldrick, Mirkarimi, Peskin, Sandoval

The Question

Should the Board of Supervisors be granted the authority to amend the City's contract with the California Public Employees' Retirement System (CalPERS) to allow police department employees who served as airport officers before December 27, 1997 to end their participation in CalPERS and move their service credit to the San Francisco Employees' Retirement System (SFERS)?

The Background

In January 1997, the Airport Police Department merged with the San Francisco Police Department (SFPD). As a result of this merger, SFPD officers who initially served the International Airport Police are under two retirement systems.

Currently, airport police officers who were employed before December 27, 1997 and who qualify for retirement after that date receive retirement benefits through CalPERS and SFERS. Airport police officers who were employed on or after December 27, 1997 qualify for retirement benefits through SFERS, a City program.

In 1983, the voters of San Francisco passed a proposition allowing the Board of Supervisors to transfer retirement systems from the State to the City for miscellaneous safety employees (thus increasing employee benefits), so long as it did not result in a cost to the City. Employees could trade wages for benefits.

The Proposal

Proposition F is a Charter Amendment that would authorize the Board of Supervisors to amend the contract with CalPERS to allow police department employees who served as airport police officers before December 27, 1997, to end their participation in CalPERS and move their service credit to SFERS. The City and County of San Francisco would transfer funds amounting to no more than \$670,000 over the next twenty years to move these officers into the same benefit class as other officers. If the cost exceeds \$670,000 over twenty years, the excess cost would be paid by the officers themselves.

Fiscal Effect

The Controller states the following:

Should the proposed charter amendment be approved by the voters, in my opinion, it could increase the cost of government by up to \$670,000.

The charter currently limits the Board of Supervisors' authority to enter into contracts with the California Public Employees' Retirement System (CALPERS) to those contracts which are cost-neutral. The proposed amendment would change this authority to allow the Board of Supervisors to enter into a contract between the City and CALPERS at a cost to the City of up to \$670,000.

The specific contract that would be authorized by this amendment would cover employees who were formerly airport police officers—these officers would transfer from retirement coverage under CALPERS to coverage under the San Francisco Employees Retirement System with improved benefits as a result. A majority of the \$670,000 cost would likely be borne by the Airport, and any cost above that limit would have to be paid by the employees themselves.

Arguments In Favor of Proposition F

- Proposition F would assure equal pension benefits and equity for all active San Francisco Police Officers. Police officers work under the same risks and deserve the same benefits.
- Proposition F would result in only a small direct cost to the City.

Arguments Against Proposition F

- If the officers want increased retirement benefits, they should trade wages or some other benefit.
- This measure is unfair because it would treat one group of public safety employees differently than other groups.
- Voters have been asked to adjust City employee retirement benefits countless times and this piecemeal approach is both expensive and confusing.

PROPOSITION G**ESTABLISHING GOLDEN GATE PARK
STABLES MATCHING FUND****ORDINANCE**

Placed on the Ballot by Supervisors McGoldrick, Daly, Mirkarimi and Sandoval

The Question

Should the City establish a Golden Gate Stables Matching Fund that would contribute \$1 of City funds for every \$3 in private donations to pay for the renovation, repair, and maintenance of the Golden Gate Park stables?

Background

Horseback riding has taken place in Golden Gate Park for more than a century. In 2001, the Golden Gate Park stables were closed, due to the inability of the operators to earn the money necessary for the renovations called for in their contract. In 2003, the San Francisco Stables Foundation submitted a proposal to the City to develop a long-term plan for the renovation and maintenance of the stables.

Some believe the City-owned stables could be operated successfully by a private operator as a City-owned concession if funds for renovations and expansion were available. The City is currently preparing a Request for Proposals seeking such an operator.

The Proposal

Passage of this proposition would commit up to \$750,000 in City funds for the renovation, repair, and maintenance of the Golden Gate Park stables. One dollar from the City General Fund would be used to match every \$3 in private donations to rebuild the stables.

Fiscal Effect

The Controller states the following:

Should the proposed ordinance be approved by the voters, in my opinion, it would increase the cost of government by up to \$750,000 in total over the period between April 1, 2008 and March 31, 2009.

The ordinance creates a fund for the City to receive private donations to pay for renovation and maintenance of the Golden Gate Park stables, and provides that matching funds must be provided by the City at the rate of \$1.00 for every \$3.00 donated, up to a limit of \$750,000.

Arguments In Favor of Proposition G

- The horse stables are a historic amenity of Golden Gate Park and could provide important after-school, weekend, and summer activities for San Franciscans.
- City matching funds would encourage private donations.

Arguments Against Proposition G

- The stables are not a priority, and City funds would be better spent for more critical programs.

JOIN US FOR CANDIDATE FORUMS - SUBMIT A QUESTION!**Sheriff & District Attorney****Tuesday, October 9****6 pm Sheriff; 7 pm District Attorney****San Francisco Public Library, Koret Auditorium****100 Larkin Street, San Francisco**

From 6 to 7 pm, candidates for Sheriff for the City and County of San Francisco will answer questions. From 7 to 7:45 pm, unopposed incumbent District Attorney Kamala Harris will participate in a one-on-one interview with Belva Davis of KQED. The League invites community members to email the League your suggested questions. The League will select questions from this pool as well as those submitted via comment card on the evening of the forum. Please email your suggestions to lwwsf@lwwsf.org by 5 pm on October 8.

San Francisco Mayor**Thursday, October 11****6 to 7:45 pm****San Francisco Public Library, Koret Auditorium,****100 Larkin Street, San Francisco**

From 6 to 7:45pm, Incumbent Mayor Gavin Newsom and challengers will respond to questions posed by the public. Scott Shafer, host and reporter with KQED radio's *California Report Magazine*, will moderate. The League invites community members to email the League your suggested questions for the candidates. The League will select questions from this pool as well as those submitted via comment card on the evening of the forum. Please email your suggestions to lwwsf@lwwsf.org by 5 pm on October 10.

PROPOSITION H**REGULATING PARKING SPACES
ORDINANCE**

Placed on the Ballot by Initiative

The Question

Should the City Planning Code regulating how many parking spaces that buildings and developments may have be amended to increase the number of parking spaces allowed and change the zoning and authority to apply the parking codes?

The Background

Currently, the City's Planning Code regulates the amount of parking required or permitted in new developments and buildings. These requirements vary by neighborhood and may be tailored by neighborhood plans. For several decades, San Francisco has emphasized policies that limit parking and promote transit for the City's downtown commercial district. As a result, the City has not built a new parking garage downtown in five years. In the last seven years, the City has lost 10,000 parking spaces because of construction projects like the Bay Bridge retrofit and South of Market development.

The City has the authority to grant development requests for parking spaces and permits for off street parking development to existing residential structures. It also regulates the quantity and use of off street parking.

The Board of Supervisors has the authority to assign zoning districts in the City.

The Proposal

Proposition H is an ordinance that would amend the City Planning Code to allow more spaces in new residential and commercial developments in certain downtown zoning districts. Proposition H would divide the City into four geographic quadrants (northeast, northwest, southeast, southwest) and would prohibit the City from applying certain downtown zoning designations to any property located outside the Northeast Quadrant, which is generally bounded by Van Ness, 11th and Townsend streets and San Francisco Bay.

Key provisions of the initiative are as follows:

- It would increase the minimum number of parking spaces that the City must allow developers to build in new buildings and developments downtown.
- Proposition H would allow owners of certain existing residential buildings to build new off street parking, without regard to potential effects on transit stops, bicycle or pedestrian use, or nearby trees.
- Parking spaces designated for car-share or low-emission vehicles would be exempt from limits on the number of parking spaces. Proposition H also creates a new definition for the term 'low-emission vehicle'.
- The City's authority to grant, deny, or modify development permit requests regarding parking spaces would be reduced.

Fiscal Effects

The Controller states the following:

Should the proposed ordinance be approved by the voters, in my opinion, it would affect the cost of government by an unknown but potentially significant amount.

The ordinance changes the limits and requirements governing permitting and construction of parking spaces and facilities in the City in ways which would allow significant increases in the number of parking spaces. In general, these changes would reduce the density of future housing and office development in San Francisco, decrease the land and square footage devoted to housing and business uses, increase the land and square footage devoted to parking uses and affect transportation in a variety of ways.

In general, the lower density development allowed by the ordinance would likely mean lower future property and other municipal tax revenues. The Municipal Transportation Authority is likely to experience higher costs under the ordinance due to increases in congestion, traffic management needs and construction expense.

This estimate does not address the potential impact of this ordinance on private business or the local economy overall, only the cost to government.

Arguments In Favor of Proposition H

- This measure helps San Francisco respond to the reality that more cars are driving into the City and more parking is needed.
- No public parking garages have been built in the city since 2002. This measure would allow private development of new parking.
- Transit friendly policies should include parking.

Arguments Against Proposition H

- Proposition H reverses the City's commitment to transit-friendly policies and would significantly increase traffic, congestion, and pollution.
- Based on how the term "low-emission vehicle" is defined in Proposition H, a loophole exists that would allow low-emission set-aside parking for vehicles such as Hummers, Cadillac Escalades, and Ford Expeditions among that class of vehicle.
- Parking policy should be established by the Planning Department, not made at the ballot box.
- This measure makes it harder for the City to manage traffic and for neighborhoods to determine their own parking needs.

PROPOSITION I

**ESTABLISHING OFFICE OF SMALL BUSINESS AS CITY
DEPARTMENT AND CREATING
SMALL BUSINESS ASSISTANCE CENTER
ORDINANCE**

Placed on the Ballot by Mayor Gavin Newsom

The Question

Should the City establish an Office of Small Business as a City department?

The Background

There are more than 100,000 businesses in San Francisco with fewer than 100 employees, and these businesses employ over 50% of San Francisco's workers. Currently, the City has a Small Business Commission that works together with the Department of Workforce Development to direct the Office of Small Business. The Office of Small Business has two staff members that provide limited technical assistance to small businesses. There are 15 City departments that a small business owner may be required to contact for license and permit processing.

The Proposal

Proposition I would establish the Office of Small Business as a City Department, create a Small Business Assistance Center, and provide \$750,000 for the first year of operations. The Office would be staffed by a Director, Deputy Director/Community Outreach Manager, and three case managers. The Office would assist businesses with 100 or fewer full-time employees by:

- Employing case managers who would coordinate and centralize information from other City departments
- Providing information on business structure and financial resources, permitting and licensing requirements, bidding on government contracts, compliance with applicable laws and regulations, and adopting "green" and sustainable business practices.

The office would report to the Mayor and Board of Supervisors twice per year on key metrics, such as number of businesses served, types of services provided, number of small businesses obtaining city contracts, and dollar amount of the contracts. It would also conduct an annual survey to evaluate effectiveness of its services.

Fiscal Effect

The Controller states the following:

Should the proposed ordinance be approved by voters, in my opinion, it would increase the cost of government by \$750,000 in fiscal year 2007 – 2008 to fund a proposed City Office of Small Business and Small Business Assistance Center beginning in January 2008.

Among other requirements, the proposed ordinance specifies five new staff people and requires semi-annual reporting on small business programs and an annual survey of businesses using the Office of Small Business' services.

The ordinance specifically appropriates the budget amount of \$750,000 for fiscal year 2007-2008 for the first year of operations of the Office of Small Business. The annualized cost of the functions and the new staff required under the ordinance is approximately \$917,000. Currently, the City budgets approximately \$218,000 for the existing Small Business Commission staff.

Arguments In Favor of Proposition I

- Proposition I would help small businesses thrive by helping them sort through challenging permitting and licensing processes and other bureaucracy.
- More than half of San Francisco's workers are employed by small businesses. When these firms do well, their employees benefit with better wages and benefits.

Arguments Against Proposition I

- Proposition I would create an unnecessary and expensive new City agency. Employees of our existing agencies are already available to help small businesses comply with legal and licensing requirements.
- Proposition I would employ at least five people and cost \$750,000 in its first year. It is an expensive "band aid" and does nothing to fix the underlying problem of an overly complicated City bureaucracy.

PROPOSITION J

ADOPTING A POLICY TO OFFER FREE CITY-WIDE WIRELESS HIGH-SPEED INTERNET NETWORK

DECLARATION OF POLICY

Placed on the Ballot by Mayor Gavin Newsom

The Question

Should it be City policy to support the creation of a public-private partnership to establish a wireless Internet network that would provide free and equal service to all parts of San Francisco?

The Background

In 2005, Mayor Newsom proposed the idea of providing free wireless access to the city. Google and Earthlink were selected over five other contractors to create a municipal wireless network. In January 2007, the Mayor introduced an ordinance to the Board to approve the public/private contract. In March 2007, the Board approved a resolution to analyze a municipally-owned wireless network.

Due to business challenges, the anticipated partnership between San Francisco and Earthlink has been dissolved.

The Proposal

Proposition J would make it City policy that San Francisco should offer free wireless Internet access to all parts of San Francisco through a partnership with a private provider. This policy would state that wireless access be free and serve all San Francisco neighborhoods equally, and that the service be implemented as quickly as possible. The policy also calls for strong privacy safeguards against the unnecessary retention of location information and sharing of personal information with third parties.

Fiscal Effect

The Controller states the following:

Should the proposed policy statement be approved by the voters, in my opinion, it would not increase the cost of government.

Arguments In Favor of Proposition J

- Free and fast Internet access should be available to all San Franciscans, and a public/private partnership is the best way to achieve it.
- A municipal wireless network will increase competition among Internet providers in San Francisco, potentially allowing consumers who already access the Internet to save money.
- Free wireless access will improve San Francisco residents' educational and economic opportunities, as well as awareness of and ability to obtain social services.

- A municipal wireless network in San Francisco would complement the diverse technology sector it has developed.

Arguments Against Proposition J

- The establishment of a municipal wireless network could produce radiation levels that may increase negative health concerns. There are safer and faster alternatives to wireless access, including fiber optic broadband.
- Wireless technology may become obsolete. The City should not bind itself to a potentially transient technology that will require a public infrastructure to be under the control of private corporations.
- The privacy safeguards in Proposition J do not sufficiently protect City residents from the activities of the vendors who provide the services.
- The City should continue to explore creating a municipally-owned wireless network, not a public/private partnership.

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.

This 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.

This guide was made possible by the generous support of our sponsors and members, notably the Lisa & Douglas Goldman Fund.

PROPOSITION K

ADOPTING A POLICY TO RESTRICT ADVERTISING ON STREET FURNITURE AND CITY BUILDINGS

DECLARATION OF POLICY

Put on the Ballot by McGoldrick, Daly, Mirkarimi, and Peskin

The Question

Should it be City policy to limit general advertising on street furniture including transit shelters, kiosks, benches and newspaper racks?

The Background

The City contracts with private companies to provide facilities such as toilets, newspaper racks, and transit shelters in public places and authorizes those companies to sell advertising space on these facilities. The City sometimes earns a share of advertising revenues.

The previous contract for bus shelters and kiosks in exchange for advertising space started 20 years ago and was one of the first of its kinds in the country; it was modeled after existing shelter programs in Europe. The program is now replicated in several major American cities. The original program generated approximately \$250,000 a year to the Municipal Transportation Agency (MTA).

A new contract was approved by the MTA with Clear Channel on September 4, 2007. This expanded contract would allow Clear Channel to sell advertising on bus shelters for 15 years, with one five year extension option. This contract still needs approval from the Board of Supervisors and the Port Commission.

The Proposal

This declaration of policy would allow for no increase in the number of general advertising signs on street furniture including transit shelters, kiosks, benches and newspaper racks over the number authorized by City law and through City contracts as of July 1, 2007. Furthermore, this policy would not allow any increase in general advertising signs visible to the public on the exterior of City-owned buildings over the number in place as of December 1, 2007.

Fiscal Effect

The Controller states the following:

Should the proposed policy statement be approved by the voters, in my opinion, it would not in and of itself impact the cost of government.

However, if the City chose to enact the restrictions on general advertising in the policy statement, it could affect some programs that public agencies use to generate revenue. For example, the Municipal Transportation Agency (MTA) currently allows advertising on a portion of its transit shelters and is developing a new contract that would expand the program. If no new shelters with advertising are allowed, the amount of lost revenue to MTA could be more than one million dollars annually for the 20-year period of the contract.

Arguments in Favor of Proposition K

- Proposition K will continue the fight against visual blight and commercialization of public space.
- This proposition does not limit freedom of speech as it includes limits on general advertising, but not on banners or advocacy appeals.
- The visual beauty of San Francisco should be protected and preserved.

Arguments Against Proposition K

- Allowing advertising on bus shelters and newspaper racks raises needed revenue to support City services without increasing taxes. This measure threatens up to \$1 million in funding annually for the MTA.
- This proposition does not define the type of advertising that would be limited. It could, as written, include special event banners, issue advocacy, political campaigns, and non-profit charitable appeals.

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**