



LEAGUE OF
WOMEN VOTERS®
SAN FRANCISCO

San Francisco Ballot Measures

★ Pros & Cons Guide ★

Non-Partisan Information on the Election

Election Day is Tuesday, June 5, 2018

Polls are open from 7:00 am to 8:00 pm

Early voting starts May 7

This Pros & Cons Guide has been prepared by volunteers with the League of Women Voters of San Francisco, a non-partisan political organization. We offer education to help citizens participate in the democratic process and we engage in advocacy to influence public policy that benefits the community. Through their League involvement, our members become more informed and active participants in local, state, and national government.

With your support the League of Women Voters can continue to produce voter education materials such as this Pros & Cons Guide, host Candidate Forums and organize voter registration drives.

Donate online at lwvsf.org

PROPOSITION A – Charter Amendment Authorizing the Public Utilities Commission to Issue Revenue Bonds When Approved by Ordinance

Charter amendment placed on the ballot by a unanimous vote by the Board of Supervisors. Requires a simple majority to pass.

THE QUESTION:

Shall the Charter of the City and County of San Francisco be amended to authorize the Public Utilities Commission

1. to clarify the scope of the Commission's bond authority with regard to the City's water and clean water utilities to include power utilities and
2. to issue revenue bonds for new facilities needed to produce and deliver clean power?

BACKGROUND:

This measure seeks to expand the PUC's scope to include power and power facilities in addition to water and clean water facilities. Since passage of the Raker Act in 1913, the Public Utilities Commission (PUC) has been charged with producing electricity for delivery to San Francisco, largely sourced from the Hetch Hetchy hydroelectric system. The electricity is delivered to many City Departments including SF Fire Department, SF Unified School District, and low-income housing developments.

New facilities will allow expanded provision of this service to new neighborhood developments such as Treasure Island, Hunters Point, Mission Rock, and Pier 70 while continuing to reduce the carbon footprint and improve air quality resulting from these activities.

In addition to supporting achievement of San Francisco's 2030 sustainability goals, these new facilities may not be fossil fuel or nuclear-power based and will integrate new and evolving technologies like solar energy, energy storage and electric vehicle charging stations, while also supporting reliable energy supply solutions like earthquake resilience and grid-to-grid connected technologies.

Currently, the PUC has the authority to issue revenue bonds for some power facilities and require electricity customers to pay the costs of equipment needed to serve them. The PUC must get voter approval to issue those bonds.

THE PROPOSAL:

Proposition A would amend the charter to authorize the PUC to issue revenue bonds to build or improve clean power facilities, with approval by two-thirds of the Board of Supervisors.

This would require the PUC to use revenue bond funds to finance new power facilities that deliver clean energy, enhance reliability and safety, and increase sustainability. The measure would also prohibit the PUC from financing construction of power plants that generate electricity from fossil fuels or nuclear power.

CONTROLLER'S STATEMENT:

http://sfgov.org/elections/sites/default/files/Documents/Prop_A-Controller_Analysis.pdf

A "YES" Vote Means: You want to authorize the PUC to issue revenue bonds to build or improve the City's clean power facilities, subject to approval by two-thirds of the Board of Supervisors, and to prohibit the PUC from financing construction of power plants that generate electricity from fossil fuels or nuclear power.

A "NO" Vote Means: You do not want to make these changes.

ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROP A:

- Prop A's passage would improve public health of residents of San Francisco through deployment of clean energy technologies. It demonstrates San Francisco's leadership on environmental justice at the national level, protecting vulnerable citizens in the developing southeastern part of the City.
- It integrates oversight and development of utilities key to San Francisco's future development. It would allow for improvements to power/electric infrastructure, including movement of existing lines underground, to improve fire and earthquake safety.
- It provides a means for San Francisco to support sustainable development and integration of smart technologies. It supports sustainable housing development in San Francisco without compromising the City's 2030 Sustainability Goals.

ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROP A:

- The PUC's oversight of existing utilities hasn't resulted in any more cost-effectiveness for residents and businesses. Approval of this measure will only result in more debt for the City.
- Inclusion of power facilities potentially increases debt for the City, without direct voter approval. This is a power grab of the SF political establishment.
- This increase in scope and oversight by PUC may result in decreased competition for clean power in San Francisco.

PROPOSITION B – Prohibiting Appointed Commissioners from Running for Office

Charter amendment placed on the ballot by the Board of Supervisors. Sponsored by Supervisors Peskin, Kim, Safai, and Yee. Requires a simple majority for passage.

THE QUESTION:

Should appointed members of San Francisco boards and commissions forfeit their offices upon declaring candidacy for state or local elected office?

BACKGROUND:

The Charter of San Francisco establishes boards, commissions, and other administrative bodies. Most members of these bodies are appointed by the Board of Supervisors, the Mayor, or other elected officials. Current law allows appointed members of these boards and commissions to run for elected office while retaining their appointed seats.

THE PROPOSAL:

This charter amendment would require any member of a board, commission, or other body established by the Charter of San Francisco, to forfeit his or her appointed seat upon filing a declaration of candidacy for any local or state elective office.

The proposal would not apply to the following:

- Members serving on citizens advisory committees,
- Members of boards and commissions created by ordinance, and
- Elected members of the Retirement Board, Health Service Board, or Retiree Healthcare Trust Fund Board.

CONTROLLER'S STATEMENT:

http://sfgov.org/elections/sites/default/files/Documents/Prop_B-Controller_Analysis.pdf

A “YES” Vote Means: You want to require appointed members of boards and commissions established by the Charter to forfeit their appointed seat at the time they file to run for state or local elective office.

A “NO” Vote Means: You do not want to make these changes.

ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROP B:

- Appointed board and commission members should not be attempting to get political endorsements while making decisions that affect all residents of the city as a part of their appointed roles.
- The proposal would require appointees to commit to the position they hold and avoid the distraction of an electoral campaign.

ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROP B:

- Elected officials and those serving on boards and commissions are already required to disclose all monetary donations/ contributions to the Fair Political Practices Commission (FFPC) and the information is publicly available.
- This measure could potentially deter qualified candidates from running from office and would introduce an unnecessary restriction on citizens' participation in local government.



PROPOSITION C – Ordinance Setting a Gross Receipts Tax for Child Care and Education

Tax ordinance placed on the ballot by a citizen initiative campaign led by Supervisors Norman Yee and Jane Kim. Requires a simple majority vote for passage.

NOTE: Propositions C and D concern the same tax. If the voters approve both measures, the one with the greater number of votes over the threshold will be enacted.

THE QUESTION:

Shall the City impose a new gross receipts tax of 1% on revenues a business receives from leasing warehouse space in San Francisco, and 3.5% on revenues a business receives from leasing some commercial spaces in San Francisco, to fund quality early care and education for young children and for other public purposes?

BACKGROUND:

The City collects a gross receipts tax from many businesses receiving revenue from the lease of commercial property, such as office buildings, warehouses and other industrial buildings, and retail spaces. The current tax rate ranges from 0.285% to 0.3%.

Businesses with \$1 million or less in total gross revenues within San Francisco are generally exempt from the gross receipts tax. Certain other businesses are also exempt, including some nonprofit organizations, banks and insurance companies.

THE PROPOSAL:

This measure would impose a new and additional gross receipts tax of:

- 1% on the amounts a business receives from the lease of warehouse space in the City and
- 3.5% on the amounts a business receives from the lease of other commercial spaces in the City.

This tax would not apply to:

- Businesses with \$1 million or less in total gross receipts and
- Businesses currently exempt from existing gross receipts tax or to amounts received from leases to non-formula retail sales establishments or industrial or arts spaces

85% of the revenues would fund:

- Child care and education for children birth to 5 years whose parents are very low income to low income,
- Child care and education for children birth to 3 years whose parents are low to middle income and do not currently qualify for assistance,
- Services that support the development of children birth to 5 years, and
- Increased compensation for child care and education providers of children birth to 5 years old.

15% of the revenues would go to the City's General Fund.

CONTROLLER'S STATEMENT:

http://sfgov.org/elections/sites/default/files/Documents/Prop_C-Controller_Analysis.pdf

A "YES" Vote Means: You want to impose a new gross receipts tax of 1% on revenues a business receives from the lease of warehouse space in the City, and 3.5% on revenues a business receives from the lease of some commercial spaces in the City to fund quality early care and education for young children, and for other general purposes.

A "NO" Vote Means: You do not want to approve this tax.

Join the League of Women Voters or Donate at lwvsf.org!

ARGUMENTS FOR PROP C:

- The shortage of and high costs of childcare pose a financial burden to working families and can cause families to leave San Francisco. Affordable and accessible childcare helps women stay in the workforce.
- Large property owners have been taking advantage of Proposition 13¹ and should pay their fair share by supporting residents and working families of San Francisco.
- Early education and childcare teachers are among the most underpaid workers in the City. This will provide quality jobs and increased wages for a workforce that is predominately low-income women of color.
- Studies have found that every dollar invested in early childhood education saves seven dollars in reduced costs for remedial education, incarceration and social support.

ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROP C:

- The high prices and shortage of childcare can be attributed to the administrative burdens of opening a childcare business, including zoning laws and high annual licensing fees.
- Commercial rents are already high, and this \$148 million tax increase will force businesses to cut staff, leave the City, or close entirely.
- This proposal would give free childcare to families earning 200% of Area Median Income (AMI), such as a single parent earning \$185,000, a family of three earning \$208,000, or a family of four earning \$230,000.
- In 2012, the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HSS) reported that the benefits of Head Start's preschool disappear by 3rd grade.



¹ **Proposition 13** was an amendment to the California Constitution approved by the voters of California in 1978. It caps the tax amount for all kinds of properties – residential and commercial – at 1% of a property's purchase price, allowing for increases of no more than 2% per year.

PROPOSITION D – Ordinance Setting A Gross Receipts Tax for Housing and Homeless Services

Ordinance placed on the ballot by Supervisors Safai, Sheehy, Tang, Cohen, and Farrell. Requires two-thirds vote for passage.

NOTE: Propositions C and D concern the same tax. If the voters approve both measures, the one with the greater number of votes over its threshold will be enacted.

THE QUESTION:

Should the City impose an additional tax of 1.7% on the gross receipts from the lease of commercial space in the City to fund low and middle-income housing and homelessness services and the General Fund?

BACKGROUND:

The City collects a gross receipts tax from many businesses receiving revenue from the lease of commercial property, such as office buildings, warehouses and other industrial buildings, and retail spaces. The current tax rate ranges from 0.285% to 0.3%.

Businesses with \$1 million or less in total gross revenues within San Francisco are generally exempt from the gross receipts tax. Certain other businesses are also exempt, including some nonprofit organizations, banks and insurance companies.

THE PROPOSAL:

Proposition D would impose an additional gross receipts tax of 1.7% on revenues some businesses receive from the lease of commercial space in the City. This additional tax would generally not apply to businesses exempt from the existing gross receipts tax.

It would also not apply to revenues received from leases to businesses engaged in:

- Production, Distribution or Repair (PDR) uses. PDR uses include a variety of business-related uses such as industrial, automotive, storage and wholesale. They also include uses by small businesses such as furniture makers, recording studios, auto repair shops, plumbing supply stores, art studios and lumberyards;
- The retail sale of goods and services directly to consumers; or
- Arts or entertainment activities.

This additional tax would also not apply to revenues received from certain nonprofit organizations.

The City would be required to first use between \$1.5 million and \$3 million of the total collected tax per fiscal year for any general purpose.

The City would be required to use all remaining revenues collected from this new tax as follows:

- 45% to help homeless adults, families or youth move into temporary shelter or permanent housing;
- 35% to acquire and rehabilitate rent-controlled apartment buildings to protect vulnerable residents from displacement, and to create permanently affordable homes for middle-income households;
- 10% to acquire, rehabilitate or operate single room occupancy (SRO) buildings and to help house people with extremely low and very low incomes, especially seniors, veterans, persons with disabilities, or immigrants; and
- 10% to provide permanent rent subsidies to extremely low-income senior households that are in income-restricted developments.

CONTROLLER'S STATEMENT:

http://sfgov.org/elections/sites/default/files/Documents/Prop_D-Controller_Analysis.pdf

A “YES” Vote Means: You want to impose a new gross receipts tax of 1.7% on revenues a business receives from the lease of some commercial spaces in San Francisco to fund homeless services, extremely low- to middle-income housing and other general purposes.

A “NO” Vote Means: You do not approve this tax.

ARGUMENTS FOR PROP D:

- Proposition D would create new, permanently affordable housing for low and middle-class residents without increasing residential rents or tax burden on homeowners.
- Would reduce of homelessness through housing and treatment for mental illness and substance abuse.
- Could reduce displacement of teachers, nurses, firefighters, and other vital professionals from San Francisco.
- Would protect vulnerable residents from eviction and keep communities diverse and intact.

ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROP D:

- Proposition D would increase cost of commercial rents, potentially costing jobs in San Francisco.
- Proposition D does nothing to address the effectiveness of the City’s current approach to homelessness.
- Would contribute millions of dollars annually to the General Fund and may not be used to assist the homeless.
- Temporary navigation centers funded by measure offer no long-term solution for homelessness.

PROPOSITION E – Prohibiting Tobacco Retailers From Selling Flavored Tobacco Products

Ordinance placed on the ballot by initiative petition. Requires a simple majority vote for passage.

THE QUESTION:

Shall the City ordinance prohibiting the sale of flavored tobacco products in San Francisco take effect?

BACKGROUND:

Passage of this proposition would prohibit tobacco retailers from selling flavored tobacco products, including menthol cigarettes. The current age to purchase tobacco products is 21 in the state of California. In 2017, the Board of Supervisors adopted an ordinance prohibiting the sale in San Francisco of flavored tobacco products, including menthol cigarettes and candy-flavored tobacco products. A referendum was filed requiring that the Ordinance be submitted to the voters. The ordinance will not go into effect unless a majority of voters approve.

THE PROPOSAL:

Proposition E is a Referendum to approve the Ordinance passed by the Board of Supervisors prohibiting the sale of flavored tobacco products in San Francisco. The Ordinance will not go into effect unless a majority of voters approve.

CONTROLLER’S STATEMENT:

http://sfgov.org/elections/sites/default/files/Documents/Prop_E-Controller_Analysis.pdf

A “YES” Vote Means: You want to prohibit the sale of flavored tobacco products in San Francisco.

A “NO” Vote Means: You want to allow the sale of flavored tobacco products in San Francisco.

Join the League of Women Voters or Donate at lwvsf.org!

ARGUMENTS FOR PROP E:

- Flavored tobacco masks its true taste, making it easier for people to start using tobacco products and harder for current users to quit.
- Over 80% of children who report having used tobacco claim to have started with a flavored product.
- Proposition E would thwart tobacco companies' attempt to appeal to children and hook them into addiction at young ages.

ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROP E:

- Banning the sale of flavored tobacco products could result in the development of underground markets, thereby increasing the likelihood that children will gain access to the products.
- It is currently illegal for retailers to sell flavored tobacco to anyone under the age of 21, therefore, prohibition of the sale of flavored tobacco products only prohibits purchase by adults.
- The measure is misleadingly written and doesn't explain the wide variety of products that the passing of the measure would affect.

PROPOSITION F – City-Funded Legal Representation for Residential Tenants in Eviction Lawsuits

Ordinance put on the ballot by citizen initiative. Requires a simple majority for passage.

THE QUESTION:

Shall the City provide legal representation to all residential San Francisco tenants facing eviction?

BACKGROUND:

Currently, the City contracts with non-profit organizations to provide no-cost or low-cost basic legal services to some tenants facing eviction at an estimated cost to the City of \$4.4 million and no-cost full legal representation at a cost of approximately \$2 million. These services are based on income, age, and health status.

THE PROPOSAL:

The City would provide legal representation for all residential San Franciscans facing eviction without criteria restrictions and would be required to establish, run and fully fund a program to administer this service.

Exceptions are made for tenants who reside in the same dwelling unit with the landlord. Tenants who are non-residential (i.e. subletting or living elsewhere) would not be eligible.

This proposal would be funded by allocations from the City's General Fund and would vary annually based on budget allowances determined by the Mayor and Board of Supervisors. This measure does not bind future Mayors and Boards of Supervisors to provide funding.

CONTROLLER'S STATEMENT:

http://sfgov.org/elections/sites/default/files/Documents/Prop_F-Controller_Analysis.pdf

A "YES" Vote Means: You want San Francisco to establish and run a program to provide legal representation to all residential tenants facing eviction, funded by allocations from the City budget determined annually by the Mayor and Board of Supervisors.

A "NO" Vote Means: You do not want to make these changes.

ARGUMENTS FOR PROP F:

- Legal representation would be directly accessible for those unable to procure their own lawyer.
- Expenditures on homelessness due to unfair evictions would be reduced.
- This proposal slows gentrification and loss of cultural diversity. It would give non-English speakers a better chance to be represented.
- Landlords would be put on alert that they will have to defend unfair evictions in court.

ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROP F:

- This measure increases bureaucracy and uses taxpayers' money for legal defense of those who could afford to retain their own lawyer.
- Some services are already provided by charitable organizations.
- The cost to tax payers would be \$4.2 – \$5.6 million annually, and the Board of Supervisors would be allowed to increase funding without voter approval.
- Diverts taxpayer money from the General Fund, which is needed for other services.

PROPOSITION G – Parcel Tax for San Francisco Unified School District

Ordinance placed on the ballot by initiative petition. Requires a simple majority to pass.

THE QUESTION:

Shall the City collect an annual tax of \$298 per parcel for investment in education, subject to certain exemptions including those for senior citizens?

BACKGROUND:

The San Francisco Unified School District educates approximately 57,000 students annually and receives state, federal and city funding. Previous parcel taxes that have been approved and are still in force are \$198 per parcel expiring in 2038 and \$32.20 per parcel expiring in 2030.

THE PROPOSAL:

Proposition G would authorize the City to collect an annual parcel tax of \$298 per parcel of taxable real property, adjusted annually for inflation, from July 1, 2018 to June 30, 2038.

The proceeds would be transferred to San Francisco Unified School District for use for the following only:

- Increase salaries of teachers and para-educators, and compensation and benefits of other School District employees,
- Increase funding and staffing at high-needs schools and community schools,
- Increase professional development for teachers and para-educators,
- Invest in technology supporting educators, students and families,
- Fund charter schools, and
- Provide oversight monitoring of the School District's spending of these proceeds.

Exemptions from the tax are provided for seniors of 65 or older who own and live at a property parcel and for any parcel used as a parking space that is adjacent to an exempt property.

CONTROLLER'S STATEMENT:

http://sfgov.org/elections/sites/default/files/Documents/Prop_G-Controller_Analysis.pdf

A "YES" Vote Means: You want to authorize the City to collect an annual tax of \$298 per parcel for investment in education, subject to certain exemptions including those for senior citizens.

A "NO" Vote Means: You do not approve of this parcel tax and do not want it collected.

ARGUMENTS FOR PROP G:

- Prop G would allow San Francisco to attract, support, and retain high-quality teachers by paying fair wages.
- This would relieve the teacher shortage with new hires of high-quality teachers so all San Francisco students have the best teachers.
- The measure would strengthen computer science, technology, and digital learning to better prepare students for college and the global economy.
- Funds would be spent in San Francisco to benefit the City's students and teachers.
- There would be a citizen oversight committee and annual audits.

ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROP G:

- Parcel taxes avoid the Proposition 13 restrictions that apply to traditional property taxes, and are the most regressive form of taxation.
- This measure results from teachers' union salary negotiations, which provided solid increases over three years; this tax would provide an additional 2% increase.
- Voter referendums are not the best way to resolve contractual issues.
- Funding would also be provided for "serving students including those who have been expelled from other schools or are on probation or parole."
- SFUSD already receives \$53 million in sales tax, \$40 million from two parcel taxes, and \$130 million from other special taxes.

PROPOSITION H – Use of Tasers by San Francisco Police Officers

Ordinance placed on the ballot by voter petition, sponsored by the San Francisco Police Association. Requires a simple majority for passage.

THE QUESTION:

Shall the City set a policy for when police officers may use tasers and authorize the Police Department to purchase tasers for all officers, subject to specific conditions?

BACKGROUND:

The San Francisco Police Association has been advocating for the use of tasers for years, and is now asking voters to decide the question after the Police Commission has been deadlocked for years on the issue.

However, in March 2018, the Police Commission approved the use of tasers. This ballot measure nevertheless appears before voters because it is impossible to remove a measure from the ballot after enough signatures have been gathered and submitted.

THE PROPOSAL:

The measure would approve the purchase and use of conductive energy devices (CEDs) -- more commonly known by the brand name of Tasers -- by the San Francisco Police Department (SFPD). Tasers discharge an electrical shock intended to temporarily incapacitate a person.

Only officers who successfully complete a training would be authorized to use tasers issued by the SFPD and each time an officer used a taser an investigation would be opened into the circumstances. Officers would be required to carry their tasers in holsters on the opposite side of their body from their firearm. Police vehicles would be required to carry defibrillators to revive someone.

CONTROLLER'S STATEMENT:

http://sfgov.org/elections/sites/default/files/Documents/Prop_H-Controller_Analysis.pdf

A “YES” Vote Means: You want to set a policy for the use of tasers and authorize the purchase of tasers for each police officer by the Police Department, subject to specific conditions.

A “NO” Vote Means: You do not want to adopt this measure.

ARGUMENTS FOR PROP H:

- Proposition H would provide police officers with a non-lethal alternative to fire arms in dealing with people actively resisting, assaulting or acting in a way likely to result in serious bodily harm to themselves or others.
- The proposition would lower the number of deaths and injuries from police shootings by providing a less-lethal alternative.
- The proposition would reduce injuries sustained by police officers and community members.

ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROP H:

- The current San Francisco Police Chief Bill Scott, who supports tasers generally, opposes the ballot measure because it removes control over future decision-making around taser policy from the Police Department and Police Commission. Any future changes to the policy around the training and use of tasers would require approval by voters or four-fifths majority of the Board of Supervisors.
- The proposition would not reduce police violence because tasers can cause serious injury, or even death when used on vulnerable populations (ie pregnant women, people with heart arrhythmia, the elderly, etc). Officers who would carry both a firearm and a taser also may reach for the wrong weapon in the heat of the moment.
- Tasers would not improve and may worsen relations with communities of color and vulnerable groups such as the homeless and mentally ill, upon whom tasers may be disproportionately used.

PROPOSITION I – Relocation of Professional Sports Teams

Charter amendment placed on the ballot by citizen initiative led by the Good Neighbor Coalition. Requires a simple majority to pass.

THE QUESTION:

Shall the City adopt a policy not to encourage professional sports teams from other cities to move to San Francisco and to oppose any sports team ownership group attempting to avoid payment of an outstanding public debt?

BACKGROUND:

The Golden State Warriors are moving from their current home of more than forty years, Oracle Arena in Oakland, to San Francisco. They faced opposition from a neighborhood group who argued that the new arena’s location would negatively effect the surrounding neighborhood.

In January 2017, the California Supreme Court rejected lawsuits to halt the construction of a new stadium for the Warriors. The new stadium is expected to be complete before the 2019 NBA season.

THE PROPOSAL:

San Francisco would have an official policy discouraging owners of professional sports teams from relocating to the city.

If a professional sports team has established itself as profitable and supported by fans for at least 20 years, San Francisco would no longer invite or encourage the team to relocate to the city.

This measure would declare that the City would stand against any sports team ownership group that moves in order to avoid payment of an outstanding debt. It would also declare that the City will not endorse or condone the relocation of any team with an extensive history in another location.

CONTROLLER'S STATEMENT:

http://sfgov.org/elections/sites/default/files/Documents/Prop_I-Controller_Analysis.pdf

A "YES" Vote Means: You want to make it City policy not to encourage professional sports teams from other cities to move to San Francisco and to take a stand against any sports team ownership group attempting to avoid payment of an outstanding public debt.

A "NO" Vote Means: You do not want to adopt these City policies.

ARGUMENTS FOR PROP I:

- Poaching the Warriors from Oakland is not in keeping with the values of San Francisco.
- The move of the Golden State Warriors to San Francisco shows no respect for the team's legacy in Oakland; this proposition would show the City's support of Oakland's community and Warriors fans.

ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROP I:

- Proposition I would establish a sweeping policy to discourage professional sports teams from moving to San Francisco, a policy that would weaken the City.
- This would not affect the Warriors who are already slated to move or directly encourage the 49ers to return to the City and this is an emotional measure that lacks merit.

REGIONAL MEASURE 3 – Bay Area Traffic Relief Plan

Region-wide majority vote required for approval.

This summary was provided by the League of Women Voters of the Bay Area.

THE QUESTION:

Shall voters authorize a plan to reduce auto and truck traffic, relieve crowding on BART, unplug freeway bottlenecks, and improve bus, ferry, BART and commuter rail service as specified in the plan in this ballot measure, with a \$1 toll increase effective in 2019, a \$1 increase in 2022, and a \$1 increase in 2025, on all Bay Area toll bridges except the Golden Gate Bridge, with independent oversight of all funds?

BACKGROUND:

The San Francisco Bay Area's growing economy and population place a large burden on the aging transportation infrastructure. Population and jobs are forecast to continue to grow in the next 20 years along with traffic congestion. This ballot measure intends to improve the quality of life and sustain the economy of the region by improving mobility and enhancing travel options on the bay bridges and corridors by increasing the toll rate on the seven state-owned bridges.

THE PROPOSAL:

Approval of this measure will allow the Bay Area Toll Authority (BATA) to raise the rates by a maximum of \$3 over 6 years on the rate charged by the state-owned toll bridges in the area to be used for specific projects and programs.

FISCAL EFFECT:

The Regional Measure 3 Expenditure Plan identifies projects that would be funded if voters approve a toll increase of \$3 over 6 years. Funds from this increase would be used to finance a \$4.5 billion slate of highway and transit projects, and would provide \$60 million each year to operate new bus and ferry services in congested bridge corridors and improve regional connectivity at the soon-to-open Transbay Transit Center in downtown San Francisco. The Expenditure Plan matches investment in each county to the anticipated toll burden on its residents.

Join the League of Women Voters or Donate at lwvsf.org!

A “YES” Vote Means: The voters of the Bay Area counties approve giving the BATA the go-ahead to raise the toll rates on the state-owned bridges in the Bay Area by a maximum of \$3 over 6 years. Funds will be available for transportation improvements and transit operations.

A “NO” Vote Means: The voters of the Bay Area counties do not approve giving the BATA the go-ahead to raise the toll rates on the state-owned bridges in the Bay Area by a maximum of \$3 over 6 years. Funds for proposed projects and programs will be unavailable, and some projects may be delayed indefinitely.

ARGUMENTS FOR REGIONAL MEASURE 3:

- Reduces truck traffic congestion and improve air quality
- Extends BART to San Jose and Silicon Valley
- Improves Transbay bus service and carpool access to improve times across bridges
- Provides funding to plan and design a second Transbay rail crossing to provide additional rail service and expand BART capacity by 45%
- Upgrades the Clipper transit card system to support universal, seamless public transit fare payment
- Improves bike/pedestrian access to train stations and ferry terminals
- Provides 50% discount on toll increase amount for commuters who cross a second bridge
- Ensures strong taxpayer safeguards, including independent audits, citizen oversight and a BART Transportation Inspector General to hold elected leaders accountable for spending

ARGUMENTS AGAINST REGIONAL MEASURE 3:

- Encourages single-occupant drivers to use the road by converting HOV lanes to variable toll “Hot Lanes”
- Raises bridge tolls, thus discriminating against low-income drivers who cannot afford to live closer to their workplace
- No guarantee against diversion of voter-approved funds by the Bay Area Toll Authority from their specified use
- No guarantee that funds allocated to later projects would still be there when needed
- No clear procedural documents which detail how funds will be received and administered
- No clear policy detailed about how priorities would be chosen for the disbursement and reprogramming of funds for either surpluses or cost overruns
- No clear policy or guidelines on how to measure success
- Oversight committee does not review both financial and programmatic information, nor provide for transparency to report to the public on their findings

Be a voter!

You are eligible to vote in San Francisco if you are:

- ✓ A United States citizen
- ✓ At least 18 years old on Election Day
- ✓ Not in prison or on parole for a felony conviction
- ✓ A resident of San Francisco
- ✓ Registered to vote in San Francisco

Get more information on how to register to vote at registertovote.ca.gov

Already registered? Check your registration status online with the SF Board of Elections

Get even more election resources

This non-partisan Pros & Cons Guide is just one of many resources that the League of Women Voters of San Francisco provides to help you become a more informed and active participant in the election. We also offer:

- Candidate forums
- Statements from candidates
- ...and more!

Join us!

Become a member online at lwvsf.org

Follow us!

Facebook ([@LWVSanFrancisco](https://www.facebook.com/LWVSanFrancisco)) and Twitter ([@LWVSF](https://twitter.com/LWVSF)).

LWVSF volunteers helped to put together this Pros & Cons Guide.
Show your support for our work by donating online at lwvsf.org.