



League of Women Voters of San Francisco

PROS & CONS GUIDE

San Francisco Ballot Measures

Special Election: Tuesday, November 8, 2005

MUNICIPAL BALLOT MEASURES

Bond Measures

- A** Community College District General Obligation Bond
- B** Street and Sidewalk Improvement Bond

Charter Amendments

- C** Ethics Commission Budget and Outside Counsel
- D** Appointment of Municipal Transportation Agency Board of Directors
- E** Election Date of the Assessor-Recorder and Public Defender

Ordinances

- F** Neighborhood Firehouses
- G** Access to Underground Parking at Golden Gate Park
- H** Firearm Ban
- Declaration of Policy**
- I** No Military Recruiters in Public Schools, Scholarships for Education and Job Training

REGISTER TO VOTE BY OCTOBER 24

Download the mail-in registration card at www.ss.ca.gov/elections/elections_vr.htm, or pick one up at public libraries, city and county offices, and the Department of Motor Vehicles. To have the registration card sent to you, call the Department of Elections at (415) 554-4375.

VOTING EARLY OR BY ABSENTEE BALLOT

Early voting begins on October 11, 2005. To vote in person, go to the ground floor of City Hall from 8 a.m. to 5 p.m. Monday through Friday, or during the last two weekends before the election from 10 a.m. to 4 p.m.

ANY voter may vote early by absentee ballot. Absentee ballot requests for the November 8 election must be received by the SF Department of Elections by 5 p.m. on Tuesday, November 1. Call (415) 554-4375, visit www.sfgov.org/elections, or follow the instructions on the back of your Official San Francisco County Voter Information Pamphlet. Completed

absentee ballots must be received by the Department of Elections or delivered to any polling place by 8 p.m. on Tuesday, November 8. The Department of Elections is located at City Hall, Room 48, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place (near Polk and Grove Street intersection).

POLL LOCATIONS

Your polling place may have changed since the last election. The location of your polling place is shown on the label on the back cover of the Voter Information Pamphlet that registered voters receive by mail. If you have questions about your polling location, call the Department of Elections at (415) 554-4375. You may also visit the League of Women Voters' SmartVoter website at www.smartvoter.org. Type in your home address to find your polling location and an interactive personalized ballot. Polls are open from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m. on Election Day, Tuesday, November 8.

CALIFORNIA BALLOT MEASURES

The League of Women Voters of California publishes a *Pros & Cons Guide* for state ballot measures. Comprehensive non-partisan information can be found at www.smartvoter.org. To request a printed California *Pros & Cons Guide*, call (916) 442-7215 or visit www.ca.lwv.org. Guides are available in English, Spanish, and Chinese.

CANDIDATE ELECTIONS

For information about San Francisco candidate races, visit www.sfgov.org/elections, call the SF Department of Elections at (415) 554-4375, or visit www.smartvoter.org.

MISSION OF THE LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF SAN FRANCISCO

The League of Women Voters of San Francisco Education Fund which conducts our voter service and citizen education activities is a 501 (c)(3) corporation, a non-profit educational organization. Our mission is to encourage the informed and active participation of all citizens in government. For more information visit www.lwvsf.org.

Membership to the League is open to all. By becoming a member of the League, you support non-partisan educational programs and have exclusive opportunities to enhance your leadership, research, communication, presentation and organizing skills. When you join the San Francisco League, you automatically become a member of the Bay Area, state, and national Leagues.

The *Pros & Cons Guide* has been researched by the League of Women Voters of San Francisco, and has been compiled to ensure maximum accuracy. The arguments for and against each measure represent the opinions of individuals or groups. The League cannot guarantee the truth of these arguments.

Estimates of the cost to taxpayers are verbatim statements of the Controller submitted to the SF Department of Elections. The League of Women Voters of San Francisco is not responsible for errors in information furnished to the League. This guide was published with the support of the League of Women Voters of San Francisco Education Fund, The San Francisco Foundation, The Gwin R. Follis Foundation, Mary Jane Brinton and by the generous support of our members.

Are you looking for more information about this election?

In addition to producing this non-partisan *Pros & Cons Guide*, the League of Women Voters of San Francisco sponsors candidate and issue forums, sends out speakers trained to discuss the ballot measures and maintains an election web site. Visit the League of Women Voters of San Francisco's web site at www.lwvsf.org for more information or call us at (415) 989-VOTE.

League of Women Voters of San Francisco

The League of Women Voters of San Francisco, a national, nonpartisan, multi-issue organization, encourages the informed and active participation of all citizens in their government, works to increase understanding of major public policy issues, and influences public policy through education and advocacy. The League does not support or oppose any political party or candidate. The League publishes and distributes objective information about elections and issues to assist citizens in casting an informed vote.

To join the League of Women Voters of San Francisco (LWVSF) visit our website at www.lwvsf.org

RANKED-CHOICE VOTING

(ALSO KNOWN AS INSTANT RUN-OFF VOTING)

San Francisco voters now use a new voting method for most local contests called “ranked-choice voting.” This new voting method was first used in last November’s general election. The League of Women Voters of San Francisco is dedicated to informing the public about how this new voting method works.

1. WHAT IS RANKED-CHOICE VOTING?
2. WHO IS ELECTED USING RANKED-CHOICE VOTING?
3. HOW TO MARK THE RANKED CHOICE BALLOT
4. HOW DOES RANKED-CHOICE VOTING WORK?
5. WHEN WILL RESULTS BE REPORTED?
6. HOW TO FIND OUT MORE INFORMATION

1. WHAT IS RANKED-CHOICE VOTING?

Ranked-choice voting allows voters to rank a first-, second-, and third-choice candidate for a single office. This allows a candidate to be elected by a majority of votes without the need for a separate run-off election. Ranked-choice voting was passed by the voters of San Francisco in March 2002 as a Charter Amendment under the name Proposition A, called Instant Run-off Voting at the time.

2. WHO IS ELECTED USING RANKED-CHOICE VOTING?

San Francisco will use ranked-choice voting to elect most local officials. In the November 2005 election, San Francisco voters will use ranked-choice voting to elect the Assessor-Recorder and City Treasurer. (Because the City Attorney is running unopposed, ranked-choice voting will not be necessary.)

Ranked-choice voting does not affect the election of state and federal officials or the adoption of ballot measures. Ranked choice voting will be used to elect members of the Board of Supervisors as well as Mayor, Sheriff, District Attorney, City Attorney, Treasurer, Assessor-Recorder and Public Defender.

Ranked-choice voting does not apply to the contests of School Board or Community College Board.

3. HOW TO MARK THE RANKED-CHOICE BALLOT

For the November 8, 2005 election, voters will continue to mark their choices on paper ballots. The voting equipment used to count the ballots will be the same as in the past elections, which uses optical scan technology to count votes, and is called the “Eagle” voting machine.

Marking the ranked-choice ballot:
In the 1st column (on the left) every voter selects his or her **first choice** candidate by completing the arrow pointing to the choice.

To indicate a **second choice**, voters should select a different candidate in the 2nd column (in the middle) by completing the arrow pointing to the choice. Voters should choose a different candidate in the second column. If a voter selects the same candidate in more than one column, his or her vote for that candidate will count only once.

To indicate a **third choice**, voters should select a different candidate in the 3rd column (on the right) by completing the arrow pointing to the choice. If a voter selects the same candidate in more than one column his or her vote for that candidate will count only once.

If you wish to vote for a qualified write-in candidate for any of your three choices, write the person’s name on the blank line provided at the end of each column and complete the arrow pointing to your choice.

4. HOW DOES RANKED-CHOICE VOTING WORK?

Ranked-choice voting is a little like having an election and several run-offs rolled into one.

- In the first round, every voter’s first choice is tabulated. If one candidate gets over 50 percent of the votes, that candidate is the winner. The second and third choices don’t have any effect on the election outcome.
- If no candidate wins in the first round, the candidate who received the fewest first-choice votes is eliminated from the contest. The votes of people whose first-choice candidate has been eliminated go to their second-choice candidate and another count is taken. That may give one candidate over 50 percent of the vote.
- If it does not give one candidate over 50 percent of the vote, there’s another round and the remaining candidate with the fewest votes is eliminated. Each of those votes goes to that voter’s next-choice candidate and there’s another count. This continues until one candidate has over 50 percent of the votes.

Each round is like a runoff. So long as your first choice candidate is in the running, your vote is cast for that candidate. If your first choice candidate is eliminated, your vote goes to your second choice candidate. If that candidate is eliminated your vote goes to your third-choice candidate.

5. WHEN WILL RESULTS BE REPORTED?

On election night, results of first-choice votes from absentee ballots received by the Department of Elections prior to election day and first-choice votes from the polling places will be made available.

The Department of Elections must process all ballots – ballots cast at polling places, absentee ballots and provisional ballots, before determining final results.

The date when final results are reported cannot be predicted; however, the Department intends to report final election results no later than 28 days after Election Day.

6. HOW TO FIND OUT MORE INFORMATION

For more information about ranked-choice voting, please contact the Department of Elections.

Stop by:
Department of Elections
City Hall, Room 48
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102

Call:
English: (415) 554 4375
Chinese:(415) 554 4367
Spanish:(415) 554 4366

Website: www.sfgov.org/election/rcv

This stub should be removed
BEFORE the ballot is
placed into the voting device
or absentee envelope.

DEMONSTRATION BALLOT / BALOTA DE MUESTRA / 模擬選票

CONSOLIDATED GENERAL ELECTION / ELECCIONES GENERALES CONSOLIDADAS / 聯合普選
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO / CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO / 三藩市市縣
NOVEMBER 2, 2004 / 2 DE NOVIEMBRE DE 2004 / 2004年11月2日

DEMONSTRATION BALLOT / BALOTA DE MUESTRA / 模擬選票

CONSOLIDATED GENERAL ELECTION / ELECCIONES GENERALES CONSOLIDADAS / 聯合普選
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO / CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO / 三藩市市縣
NOVEMBER 2, 2004 / 2 DE NOVIEMBRE DE 2004 / 2004年11月2日

CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT 8, SENATE DISTRICT 8, ASSEMBLY DISTRICT 12, SUPERVISORIAL DISTRICT 00, BART DISTRICT 9

INSTRUCTIONS TO VOTERS: Mark your first choice in the first column by completing the arrow pointing to your choice, as shown in the picture. To indicate a second choice, select a different candidate in the second column. To indicate a third choice, select a different candidate in the third column. To vote for a qualified write-in candidate, write the person's name on the blank line provided and complete the arrow.



INSTRUCCIONES PARA LOS ELECTORES: Para marcar su primera opción en la primera columna, complete la flecha que apunta hacia su selección, tal como se indica en la imagen. Para indicar una segunda opción, seleccione un candidato distinto en la segunda columna. Para indicar una tercera opción, seleccione un candidato distinto en la tercera columna. Para votar por un candidato calificado no listado, escriba el nombre de la persona en el espacio en blanco provisto, y complete la flecha.



選民指南：在第一列中標記你的第一個選擇，將指向你的選擇的箭頭畫線連接起來，如圖所示。標記第二個選擇時，在第二列中選擇一位不同的候選人。標記第三個選擇時，在第三列中選擇一位不同的候選人。投選合格寫入候選人時，在提供的空位上填寫此人的姓名，並將箭頭畫線連接起來。



MEMBER, BOARD OF SUPERVISORS / MIEMBRO, CONSEJO DE SUPERVISORES / 市參議員
DISTRICT 00 - DISTRITO 00 - 第00選區

VOTE YOUR FIRST, SECOND AND THIRD CHOICES / VOTE POR SU PRIMERA, SEGUNDA Y TERCERA SELECCIÓN / 投選你的第一、第二和第三選擇

1 FIRST CHOICE PRIMERA SELECCIÓN 第一選擇	2 SECOND CHOICE SEGUNDA SELECCIÓN 第二選擇	3 THIRD CHOICE TERCERA SELECCIÓN 第三選擇
--	---	--

Vote for One Vote por Uno 第一選擇	Vote for One - Must be different than your first choice Vote por Uno - Debera ser diferente de su primera selección 第一選擇 / 必須與第一個選擇不同	Vote for One - Must be different than your first and second choices Vote por Uno - Debera ser diferente de su primera y segunda selección 第一選擇 / 必須與第一個選擇和第二個選擇不同
ELEANOR ROOSEVELT 愛麗諾·羅斯福 Incumbent Titular 現任者	ELEANOR ROOSEVELT 愛麗諾·羅斯福 Incumbent Titular 現任者	ELEANOR ROOSEVELT 愛麗諾·羅斯福 Incumbent Titular 現任者
CESAR CHAVEZ 西薩·舍瓦茲 Labor Organizer Organizador Laboral 勞工組織者	CESAR CHAVEZ 西薩·舍瓦茲 Labor Organizer Organizador Laboral 勞工組織者	CESAR CHAVEZ 西薩·舍瓦茲 Labor Organizer Organizador Laboral 勞工組織者
WALTER LUM 沃爾特·林 Publisher Editor 出版商	WALTER LUM 沃爾特·林 Publisher Editor 出版商	WALTER LUM 沃爾特·林 Publisher Editor 出版商
JOHN HANCOCK 約翰·漢考克 Physician Médico 醫生	JOHN HANCOCK 約翰·漢考克 Physician Médico 醫生	JOHN HANCOCK 約翰·漢考克 Physician Médico 醫生
MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR. 小馬丁·路德·金 Minister Pastor 牧師	MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR. 小馬丁·路德·金 Minister Pastor 牧師	MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR. 小馬丁·路德·金 Minister Pastor 牧師
ANNA MAE PICTOU AQUASH 安娜·梅·皮克投·阿夸施 Indigenous Rights Organizer Organizadora para Derechos Indígenas 土著權益組織者	ANNA MAE PICTOU AQUASH 安娜·梅·皮克投·阿夸施 Indigenous Rights Organizer Organizadora para Derechos Indígenas 土著權益組織者	ANNA MAE PICTOU AQUASH 安娜·梅·皮克投·阿夸施 Indigenous Rights Organizer Organizadora para Derechos Indígenas 土著權益組織者
WRITE-IN / NO LISTADO / 寫入	WRITE-IN / NO LISTADO / 寫入	WRITE-IN / NO LISTADO / 寫入

PROPOSITION A

COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT GENERAL OBLIGATION BOND

Bond Resolution

Placed on the Ballot by City College Board of Trustees

PRINCIPAL PROVISIONS

Proposition A is an ordinance that would allow the Community College District to borrow \$246,300,000 by issuing general obligation bonds. The District would use the money to:

- Construct and equip new facilities or buildings for performing arts, bio/stem cell technology, student services and programs offered jointly with San Francisco State University;
- Complete construction projects at Mission, Chinatown and John Adams campuses;
- Expand intercampus communication systems;
- Improve energy conservation;
- Support training programs in engineering, design/graphics, computer and bio/stem cell technology;
- Support educational programs in music, theatre arts, film, teacher education, health care and child development;
- Improve disability access, seismic safety, and child care facilities; and
- Consolidate student services, such as admissions, registration, financial aid, counseling and career planning, in one location.

No bond money would be used for teacher or administrator salaries or any other school operating expenses.

The principal and interest on general obligation bonds are paid with property tax revenues. Proposition A would require an increase in property taxes to pay for the bonds. Approval by fifty-five percent (55%) of the votes cast is required for passage.

TAX COST

The Controller states: “Based on the best estimates of the Community College District, should the proposed \$246.3 million in bonds be authorized and sold, I estimate the approximate costs to be as follows:

- In fiscal year 2006-07, following issuance of the first series of bonds, the estimated annual costs of debt service would be \$6.5 million and result in a property tax rate of 0.057¢ per \$100 of assessed valuation (or \$5.66 per \$100,000 of assessed valuation).

- In fiscal year 2009-10, following issuance of the last series of bonds, and the year with the highest tax rate, the estimated annual costs of debt service would be \$19.5 million and result in a property tax rate of .15¢ per \$100 of assessed valuation (or \$15.44 per \$100,000 of assessed valuation).
- The best estimate of the average tax rate from fiscal year 2006-07 through 2032-33 is .11¢ per \$100 of assessed valuation (or \$10.71 per \$100,000 of assessed valuation)
- Based on these estimates, the highest estimated increase in annual property taxes for the owner of a home with an assessed value of \$400,000 would be approximately \$60.68.

These estimates are based upon projections and estimates only, which are not binding upon the City or the Community College District. Such projections and estimates may vary due to variations in timing of bond sales, the amount of bonds sold at each bond sale, market interest rates at the time of each bond sale, and actual assessed valuation over the term of repayment of the bonds. Hence, the actual tax rates and the years in which such rates are applicable may vary from those estimated above.”

ARGUMENTS FOR

1. Current facilities no longer accommodate demand and recent state budget cuts have reduced City College funding.
2. Bonds are a practical, affordable tool for financing the kinds of capital improvements outlined in Proposition A.
3. Proposition A would provide the necessary funding to modernize and expand the District’s computer technology network, renovate aging buildings, improve access for disabled students and faculty, and upgrade childcare facilities.

ARGUMENTS AGAINST

1. The projects listed in the proposal are not guaranteed to be funded. The College’s Board of Trustees has the authority to reallocate the funds.
2. Taxpayers are being asked to again pay for bonds for projects that were never properly reviewed by the Board of Trustees or the public.
3. This proposition was placed on the ballot prematurely due to concerns about the number of bond initiatives that are expected to be on next year’s ballot.

PROPOSITION B

STREET AND SIDEWALK IMPROVEMENT BOND

Bond Resolution

Placed on the Ballot by the Board of Supervisors (9-2)

PRINCIPAL PROVISIONS

This measure would allow the City to issue \$208,000,000 of general obligation bonds to be used to repair or resurface public streets; repair or replace pavement; build curb ramps and other features to improve access for disabled persons; improve public streets and public sidewalks for pedestrian safety; and improve public streets for the safety of bicyclists.

The principal and interest on general obligation bonds are paid with property tax revenues. Proposition B would require an increase in property taxes to pay for the bonds. Approval by two-thirds of the votes cast is required for passage.

TAX COST

The Controller states: “Should the proposed bonds be authorized and issued, in my opinion, the costs would be:

Bond Redemption	\$208,000,000
Bond Interest	\$151,942,984
Debt Service Requirement	\$359,942,984

Based on a single bond sale and level redemption schedules, the average annual debt requirement for twenty (20) years at the current 6.00 percent interest rate would be approximately \$17,997,100 which is equivalent to one and seventy-one hundredths cents (\$0.0171) per \$100 of assessed valuation in the

current tax rate. The increase in annual property taxes for the owner of a home with an assessed value of \$300,000 would amount to approximately \$50.15 if all bonds were sold at the same time. It should be noted, however, that the City does not plan to issue all authorized bonds at one time; if these bonds are issued over several years, the actual effect on the tax rate would be less than the maximum amount shown above.”

ARGUMENTS FOR

1. The City is at risk of being sued for not complying with the Americans with Disabilities Act because not all sidewalks are wheelchair accessible.
2. Poorly maintained sidewalks are a life-and-death issue for pedestrians, and the City must repair them.
3. Fixing potholes saves motorists on car repairs.
4. Currently, no general funds from the city budget are used for street repair and this bond makes up for the shortfall.
5. A Citizens Committee would oversee bond spending to ensure that funds are spent practically and effectively.

ARGUMENTS AGAINST

1. San Francisco has a budget of over \$5.3 billion and voters should demand that enough of that be set aside for these types of repairs rather than issuing bonds.
2. \$36 million of the bond money will be used to impede vehicular traffic and to build more bike lanes.
3. There is no guarantee that all of the items on the list will actually be funded.
4. San Franciscans who are renters will pay nothing for these bonds.

PROPOSITION C

**ETHICS COMMISSION BUDGET AND OUTSIDE COUNSEL
Charter Amendment
Placed on the Ballot by the Board of Supervisors (10-1)**

PRINCIPAL PROVISIONS

The Ethics Commission was created by voters in 1993 to enforce San Francisco’s ethics laws. The proposed City Charter Amendment would change how the Ethics Commission budget is formulated and approved. If passed, the Commission and Controller would establish a baseline budget every three years. They would consider the funding of similar agencies in other cities and the workload of the San Francisco Ethics Commission. Each year, the Commission would propose a budget to the Mayor at or above the baseline amount. The Mayor could not revise the proposed budget but could recommend changes to the Board of Supervisors. The Board could increase or decrease the Commission’s budget before approving it. The Mayor could not cut spending added by the Board.

Proposition C would also authorize the Commission to retain outside counsel to advise the Commission on any audit, fine, penalty or complaint involving the City Attorney or an employee of the City Attorney’s office. Consent of the City Attorney or a determination by a retired judge would not be required. If the Commission believed that the City Attorney had a conflict of interest in other matters, consent of the City Attorney or a determination by a retired judge would still be required.

TAX COST

The Controller states: “Should the proposed Charter amendment be approved by the voters, in my opinion, it would not in and of itself increase the cost of government. However, the amendment would mandate a survey process to set the budget for the Ethics Commission which, depending on the survey results, may increase the City’s costs for this function.

The amendment would require that the Ethics Commission, in conjunction with the Controller, survey agencies in comparable jurisdictions every three years to establish and update a minimum baseline budget for the Commission. The resulting budget proposed by the Commission would have to be submitted without change by the Mayor to the Board of Supervisors but would be subject to the Board’s normal budget process.

For fiscal year 2005-2006, the Ethics Commission’s budget is \$1.3 million, with a staff of 12.8 fulltime equivalents. San Francisco’s current budget and staff for this function is slightly above the average of comparable agencies in Los Angeles, San Diego, and Oakland. These agencies have budgets ranging from \$268,000 with a staff of two in Oakland to \$2.4 million with a staff of 25 in Los Angeles.

The amendment would also allow the Ethics Commission to hire outside counsel instead of using the services of the City Attorney if the City Attorney, or any current employee of that office, is the subject of an audit, fine, penalty or investigation by the Ethics Commission. The Commission’s costs for legal services could increase or decrease under this provision depending on the rates for outside counsel and on other factors.”

ARGUMENTS FOR

1. The Ethics Commission is vital to maintaining clean government and has been historically under funded. This measure would ensure that the Commission is adequately supported.
2. Proposition C would insulate the commission from undue political pressure by creating a special budget process and ensure the funding and independence to carry out its mission.
3. The Ethics Commission has relied on one half-time investigator since its inception and thus adequate enforcement has not been possible.
4. The Ethics Commission would generate revenue through fines and fees that currently are uncollected due to limited staff resources. These revenues could be used to offset any future funding increases.

ARGUMENTS AGAINST

1. Proposition C would render the Mayor powerless to revise proposed Ethics Commission budgets, shifting power to the Board of Supervisors and eliminating necessary mayoral oversight.
2. Proposition C would not insulate the Commission from the Board of Supervisors. The Board of Supervisors would be able to cut the Commission’s budget.
3. The current budget process already allows the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors to address any budget shortfalls that the Ethics Commission may be experiencing.

PROPOSITION D

**APPOINTMENT OF MUNICIPAL TRANSPORTATION
AGENCY BOARD OF DIRECTORS
Charter Amendment
Placed on the Ballot by the Board of Supervisors (11-0)**

PRINCIPAL PROVISIONS

The City’s Municipal Transportation Agency (or “MTA”) runs the Municipal Railway and the Department of Parking and Traffic. A seven-member board of directors oversees the MTA. The Mayor appoints all seven members, who are confirmed by the Board of Supervisors after a public hearing. The members are appointed to four-year terms. After a member serves a term, he or she may continue to serve as a “hold-over” until reappointed or replaced.

This proposal would provide new provisions for MTA board of director nominations, tenure and cause for removal. It would reduce the Mayor’s appointments from seven to four; the President of the Board of Supervisors would nominate three. All nominations would be subject to confirmation by the full Board of Supervisors. Two members nominated by the Mayor and by the President of the Board of Supervisors would be regular riders of the Municipal Railway, and at least one director would have a physical disability and be a regular rider of the Municipal Railway. Tenure would be no longer than three terms; seats would remain vacant until they are filled. The Mayor and the President of the Board of Supervisors would have the authority to remove for cause only board members that they nominated.

TAX COST

The Controller states: “Should the proposed charter amendment be approved by the voters, in my opinion, it would not increase the cost of government.”

ARGUMENTS FOR

1. Dividing the nominations between the Mayor and Board of Supervisors would ensure that voters are guaranteed that diverse voices contribute to the budget deliberations.
2. Split appointments in other city commissions have resulted in better debates about issues affecting neighborhoods and the commissions they oversee.
3. Proposition D would create a much more diverse MTA Board that would be more responsive to community concerns such as rising fares and deteriorating service.
4. Proposition D would create a truly independent MTA by ensuring that no single person has control of the Municipal Railway and Parking Department.
5. Proposition D would ensure diversity by requiring that at least one MTA member be a person with a physical disability.

ARGUMENTS AGAINST

1. Proposition D would allow the Supervisors to reject mayoral nominees, but not allow the Mayor to reject the Supervisors’ nominees.
2. Proposition D would create an agency with twelve bosses and no direct accountability to anyone.
3. Proposition D would slow progress by making the agency more political and more difficult to run.
4. Should Proposition D pass no single official could be held responsible for keeping Muni safe, clean, on-time and on-budget.
5. Proposition D would not address any current issue facing the agency; it would not reform labor practices or hold management more accountable.

PROPOSITION E

ELECTION DATE OF THE ASSESSOR-RECORDER AND PUBLIC DEFENDER

Charter Amendment

Placed on the Ballot by Board of Supervisors (10-1)

PRINCIPAL PROVISIONS

Under existing law, San Franciscans vote to elect the Assessor-Recorder and Public Defender every four years at the statewide primary election in June. If no candidate receives a majority of the votes in the statewide primary election, a run-off election was held at the municipal election the following November.

San Francisco now uses ranked-choice (or “instant run-off”) voting to elect local officers, including the Assessor-Recorder and Public Defender. As a result, separate run-off elections are no longer necessary.

Proposition E would move the election date of the Public Defender and Assessor-Recorder from the statewide primary election in June to the following general municipal election in November.

TAX COST

The Controller states: “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 would move the election of the Assessor-Recorder and the Public Defender from the statewide primary in June to the general municipal election in November, beginning in 2006. This change would result in a shift of costs from one fiscal year to the next because the ballot and voter information materials for these two offices would be printed and distributed later in the year. The City may also avoid some costs because the offices that are elected through ranked-choice voting would be grouped in November rather than occurring in both June and November. However the total expenditure by the City on elections would not be significantly changed.”

ARGUMENTS FOR

1. Voter turnout is higher in the November general election than in the June primary. It is best to have elections decided by as many voters as possible.
2. It would be cheaper and more efficient for the City Department of Elections to hold the race for these offices during the November primary election.

ARGUMENTS AGAINST

1. The November ballot is typically very long and complicated. This change would add even more decisions, potentially confusing voters and reducing the amount of individual attention the race for these offices would receive.

PROPOSITION F

NEIGHBORHOOD FIREHOUSES

Ordinance

Placed on the Ballot by Initiative Petition

PRINCIPAL PROVISIONS

To reduce costs, the City has recently implemented a program of “brownouts” in firehouses in which, on a rotating basis, some firehouses are temporarily closed and personnel are directed to other stations. If passed, this initiative would require neighborhood firehouses to remain open and staffed at the same levels as existed on January 1, 2004. The City would be required to do all of the following 24 hours a day:

- Provide adequate staff to respond to all fire, medical and other emergencies,
- Operate an arson and investigation unit,
- Maintain no fewer than four ambulances based in the firehouses, and
- Maintain no fewer than four medical supervisors based in the fire houses.

With the approval of the Fire Commission and Board of Supervisors, the City could:

- Close a firehouse that is unsafe, requires renovation or has been replaced by a new firehouse in the same neighborhood;
- Establish new firehouses necessary to meet safety needs of the community; and
- Relocate vehicles and equipment from one firehouse to another if the change is necessary to meet safety needs of the community and would not interfere with the provision of service 24 hours a day.

This measure would take effect on July 1, 2006.

TAX COSTS

The Controller states: “Should the proposed ordinance be approved by the voters, and should the Mayor and Board of Supervisors fund the ordinance in the annual budget, in my opinion, there would be a new added cost of approximately \$4.4 to \$6.6 million annually, and a requirement to operate facilities and vehicles that currently cost the City approximately \$158 million annually. These costs are for firefighter salaries and benefits and would increase or decrease over time based primarily on the changes in the salary rates for firefighters.

Currently, the City can temporarily take fire stations and vehicles out of service and relocate vehicles to provide emergency service coverage. Temporary service changes or relocations typically occur when not enough firefighters are available for work and when fire facilities and vehicles are being repaired. Currently, the City can also

decide to close a fire station or to change the location, size or type of vehicles located at its fire stations.

The proposed ordinance provides instead that the City must not close any of the fire stations that it now has with limited exceptions – such as if the building is structurally unsafe or if the station has been replaced by a new stations in the same neighborhood. The ordinance also requires that the City operate specific vehicles and units in those stations on a continuous basis, including when fire equipment is being maintained and on days when not enough firefighters are available to work and additional personnel must be called in. The ordinance covers all fire stations, all fire engines, all ladder trucks, most specialized units, and four of the 22 ambulances that were in service in the 42 existing stations as of January 1, 2004.

The costs discussed above could increase or decrease depending on how the City implements the ordinance. Note that an ordinance cannot bind future Mayors and Boards of Supervisors to provide funding for this or any other purpose. Under the City Charter, the ultimate cost of this proposal depends on decisions made in the City’s annual budget process.”

ARGUMENTS FOR

1. Rotating closures of firehouses mean increased response times. Every neighborhood should have a timely response to emergencies, including fire, medical emergencies, disasters such as earthquakes, or terrorist attack.
2. Firefighters and other emergency response workers must have the resources and tools they need to protect our neighborhoods.
3. San Francisco’s Eastern neighborhoods are most affected by the “brownouts.” Buildings are old, very close together, and densely populated. We cannot afford to balance the budget by risking the lives of the many seniors, immigrants, and children who live in these communities.

ARGUMENTS AGAINST

1. This measure is unnecessary because response time has increased by only 11 seconds under the current “brownouts” mandated by the Mayor.
2. A recent City Controller audit determined that the San Francisco Fire Department could save millions of dollars, improve operations and increase public safety by making smart reforms. This proposition is simply an effort to stop these reforms.
3. Proposition F would stop safe, cost-saving measures at the San Francisco Fire Department and preserve perks like \$7 million in overtime pay for firefighters.
4. More money for the Fire Department would mean less money for education, arts funding, youth programs, street maintenance, public transit, libraries and parks.

PROPOSITION G

ACCESS TO UNDERGROUND PARKING AT GOLDEN GATE PARK
Ordinance
Placed on the Ballot by the Board of Supervisors (11-0)

PRINCIPAL PROVISIONS

In 1998, the voters approved Proposition J, an ordinance authorizing construction of an underground public parking garage below the Music Concourse, with entrances and exits outside Golden Gate Park. The garage is currently under construction.

Proposition G would allow the Golden Gate underground parking garage to have an entrance-exit inside the park if there is also a separate entrance-exit outside the park. It would also eliminate dedicated access lanes that start outside the park. Proposition G would also restrict the traffic to just one lane in each direction on both Martin Luther King, Jr. Drive and Ninth Avenue, between Lincoln Way and Concourse Drive.

TAX COSTS

The Controller states: “Should the proposed ordinance be approved by the voters, in my opinion, it would have a minimal impact on the cost of government.”

PROPOSITION H

FIREARM BAN
Ordinance
Placed on the ballot by Supervisors Tom Ammiano, Chris Daly, Bevan Dufty and Matt González

PROVISIONS

Proposition H is an ordinance that would ban the manufacture, distribution, sale and transfer of firearms and ammunition within San Francisco. Proposition H would also prohibit San Francisco residents from possessing handguns within the City. An exception would allow residents to possess handguns if it is required for specific professional purposes (such as if the resident is a security guard or active member of the armed forces). The Board of Supervisors would be required to enact penalties for violation of this ordinance.

Proposition H would take effect January 1, 2006. Until April 1, 2006 residents could surrender their handguns to any district station of the San Francisco Police Department or the San Francisco Sheriff’s Department without penalty.

PROPOSITION I

NO MILITARY RECRUITERS IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS, SCHOLARSHIPS FOR EDUCATION AND JOB TRAINING
Declaration of Policy
Placed on the Ballot by Initiative Petition

PRINCIPAL PROVISIONS

The San Francisco Unified School District operates the City’s public schools, and receives federal money to support their operation (the District estimates it will receive federal funding for 2005-2006 in the amount of \$17.2 million). By accepting federal money, the District must permit U.S. military recruiters access to its schools. Colleges and universities that receive federal funds are subject to similar requirements.

Proposition I is a Declaration of Policy that the people of San Francisco would oppose the federal government’s use of public schools to recruit students for service in the military. It is also a declaration that San Francisco should consider funding scholarships for higher education and job training that could provide an alternative to military service.

Because Proposition I is a Declaration of Policy, it is intended only to provide policy guidance to lawmakers. It would have no binding effect on the policies and procedures of the Unified School District.

ARGUMENTS FOR

1. Proposition G would ensure safer travel by pedestrians and bicyclists.
2. Proposition G would provide fair distribution of traffic going to and from Golden Gate Park and the Concourse Garage. Park visitors would travel equally through the Richmond, the Sunset and the neighborhood around the panhandle.
3. Proposition G would maintain the balance between accessibility and conservation while eliminating unnecessary changes to park roadways.

ARGUMENTS AGAINST

1. Proposition G would add traffic congestion and pollution in the Golden Gate Park.
2. Proposition G would disrupt the free flow of traffic and create major new automobile accident risks.
3. Proposition G would make traffic much worse on an already congested and overcrowded Ninth Avenue.

TAX COST

The Controller states: “Should the proposed ordinance be approved by voters, in my opinion, it would have a minimal impact on the cost of government.”

ARGUMENTS FOR

1. Easy access to handguns can cause violence.
2. Legal owners of handguns contribute to handgun violence through involvement in suicides, domestic disturbances and workplace violence.
3. Criminals often get their guns by robbing legal gun owners.

ARGUMENTS AGAINST

1. Banning handguns has not been proven to reduce crime.
2. Proposition H would limit San Francisco citizens’ ability to protect themselves.
3. Proposition H may be overturned in a costly court battle.

TAX COST

The Controller states: “Should the proposed policy statement be approved by the voters, in my opinion, it would not affect the cost of government.”

ARGUMENTS FOR

1. Many members of the armed forces never receive the education and training that military recruiters promise them.
2. Many members of the armed forces have been killed in Iraq, in a war opposed by many Americans.
3. The armed forces discriminate against gays and lesbians, which is contrary to San Francisco city policy.

ARGUMENTS AGAINST

1. Proposition I if accepted and implemented, would cost San Francisco millions of dollars in federal funds, which would have to be replaced by local taxes.
2. Students should be informed of all their employment and educational options.
3. It is unpatriotic to undermine America’s armed forces.

In an effort to provide voters the opportunity to meet and ask questions of the candidates running for local office, the League will sponsor candidate forums open to the public. Candidate forums are free.

CITY TREASURER
Thursday, October 20th
The San Francisco LGBT Community Center
1800 Market Street
7:00 – 8:30 pm

ASSESSOR RECORDER
Thursday, October 27th
Koret Auditorium
The San Francisco Public Library
100 Larkin Street
6:00 -7:30 pm

Forums Moderated by Cheryl Jennings
News Anchor ABC7/KGO

**Access SF, Cable Channel 29 Pro/Con Discussions
& Candidate Forum Television Schedule**

“Tune in to Access SF, Cable Channel 29 and watch the League’s Pro & Con Discussions and Candidate Forums. Our forums provide voters with information about candidates and issues in a neutral context. The Discussions feature a proponent and opponent of the local measures and are moderated by a League member. Each of the four programs will feature two ballot measures.”

	10/24 MONDAY	10/25 TUESDAY	10/26 WEDNESDAY	10/27 THURSDAY	10/28 FRIDAY	10/29 SATURDAY	10/30 SUNDAY
Pro & Con Program 1	10:30am-11:00am	11:30am-12:00pm	4:30pm-5:00pm	5:30pm-6:00pm	9:00pm-9:30pm	6:30pm-7:00pm	5:00pm – 5:30pm
Pro & Con Program 2	11:00am-11:30am	12:00pm-12:30pm	5:00pm-5:30pm	1:00pm-1:30pm	7:30pm-8:00pm	5:00pm-5:30pm 9:30pm-10:00pm	3:00pm – 3:30pm
Pro & Con Program 3	11:30am-12:00pm	12:30pm-1:00pm	7:30pm-8:00pm	1:30pm-2:00pm	1:00pm-1:30pm	5:30pm-6:00pm 10:00pm-10:30pm	3:30pm – 4:00pm
Pro & Con Program 4	12:00pm-12:30pm	1:00pm-1:30pm	9:30pm-10:00pm		1:30pm-2:00pm	7:00pm-7:30pm	6:00pm - 6:30pm
Candidate Forum Assessor-Recorder	1:30pm-3:00pm	7:30pm-9:00pm	10:30am-12:00pm	11:00pm-12:30pm	10:30am-12:00pm	10:00am-11:30am	11:30am-1:00pm
Candidate Forum Treasurer				6:00pm-7:30pm Recorded Live†		7:30pm-9:00pm	7:00pm – 8:30pm
Candidate Interview City Attorney	9:00pm-9:30pm	3:00pm-3:30pm	11:30pm-12:00am	10:30am-11:00am		9:00pm-9:30pm	

† Recorded live at the San Francisco Library - Koret Auditorium. Open to the public.

	10/31 MONDAY	11/1 TUESDAY	11/2 WEDNESDAY	11/3 THURSDAY	11/4 FRIDAY	11/5 SATURDAY	11/6 SUNDAY
Pro & Con Program 1	4:00pm-4:30pm	7:30pm-8:00pm		1:30pm-2:00pm		10:30am-11:00am	TBA
Pro & Con Program 2	4:30pm-5:00pm	10:30pm-11:00pm		4:30pm-5:00pm		11:00am-11:30am	TBA
Pro & Con Program 3		7:00pm-7:30pm	1:30pm-2:00pm		7:30pm-8:00pm		TBA
Pro & Con Program 4	9:00pm-9:30pm	1:00pm-1:30pm	5:00pm-5:30pm			12:30pm-1:00pm	TBA
Candidate Forum Assessor-Recorder	10:00pm-11:30pm		10:30am-12:00pm	12:00pm-1:30pm	10:30am-12:00pm		TBA
Candidate Forum Treasurer	12:30pm-2:00pm	10:30am-12:00pm	12:00pm-1:30pm	10:30am-12:00pm	12:00pm-1:30pm		TBA
Candidate Interview City Attorney	2:00pm-2:30pm	1:30pm-2:00pm			1:30pm-2:00pm		TBA



For more nonpartisan information about the November 8 Consolidated Special Statewide Election, visit:

www.smartvoter.org

Enter your zip code to get a complete personalized ballot with:

- Candidate profiles
- Ballot measures
- Election results

VOTE Tuesday November 8, 2005