



PROS & CONS GUIDE

San Francisco Ballot Measures
Election Day: Tuesday, June 5, 2012

PROPOSITION A – GARBAGE COLLECTION AND DISPOSAL Initiative Petition

Placed on the ballot by Voter Initiative Petition

The Question

Shall the City use a competitive bidding process to award five separate agreements for trash and recycling services; require that garbage processing and transfer facilities be owned by the City and located in San Francisco; require the Board of Supervisors to approve maximum rates for garbage services; and allow the Board of Supervisors to make future amendments without further voter approval?

The Background

Currently, permits are required for any company that collects, disposes of or transports garbage in San Francisco. A single company currently holds all the permits and is required to implement the City's zero-waste goals for recycling and composting. Rates for collection are set by the City's Rate Board for residential properties and are set by the provider for commercial properties, generally based on rate tables established by the Rate Board. The City does not own or lease the processing and transfer facilities which are located in San Francisco.

The Proposal

This Proposition would require the City to replace its permit system for trash and recycling services with a competitive bidding process for five separate agreements:

- Residential collection of trash, recyclables and compostables;
- Commercial collection of trash, recyclables and compostables;
- Recovery and processing of recyclables and compostables;
- Transportation to disposal sites outside the City; and
- Disposal of remaining waste.

The measure would also:

- Require each agreement to be Citywide and for a 10-year term;
- Require that the City own the processing and transfer facilities used under these agreements and that they would be located in San Francisco;
- Prohibit a single company from providing both recycling recovery services and garbage disposal services;
- Require the competitive bidding process for garbage and recycling services to give priority to the following factors: zero-waste goals that maximize recycling, competitive rates, welfare of workers in the industry, and recovery of the City's costs for bidding and administering the program;

ONLINE ELECTION INFO

www.sfvotes.org

**ELECTION DAY IS
TUESDAY, JUNE 5**

- Polls open from 7 am to 8 pm
- Early voting starts May 7
- May 21 is the last day to register to vote
- For more information, visit the SF Department of Elections at www.sfgov.org/election

TO VOTE IN THE JUNE 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.

Join or donate on line! www.SFvotes.org

(Proposition A Continued)

- Give preference to bidders that use small businesses and hire City residents;
- Require the Board of Supervisors to approve the maximum rates for trash and recycling services; and,
- Allow the Board of Supervisors to make future amendments that advance the purposes of this ordinance without further voter approval.

Fiscal Effect

The Controller states:

Should the proposed initiative ordinance be adopted, in my opinion, there could be costs and benefits to the City. The impacts would vary depending on how the City implements the ordinance and on the outcome of contracting and rate-setting processes for garbage collection and disposal.

The ordinance makes changes to how the City contracts for and regulates rates for garbage collection, recycling, waste reduction and disposal. These changes include requiring separate competitively bid contracts or franchises for five specified areas of waste services, administering new rate-setting and complaint processes and conducting analysis. These new requirements would significantly increase the City's costs to administer garbage collection, waste reduction and disposal processes. However, the ordinance also generally provides that the City's costs may be recovered through residential and commercial garbage rates and through franchise

fees charged to garbage companies. The proposal's intent is that competitive bidding processes will reduce the costs and rates for garbage services. The City currently pays Recology approximately \$5.6 million annually for waste and recycling services in City - owned buildings, parks and public spaces. To the degree that the proposal achieves rate reduction, the City's costs for these services would be lowered.

The proposal's most significant costs would occur under a requirement for publicly-owned garbage collection, processing and transfer facilities within the City limits by December 2018. The initiative specifies that these facilities must be publicly owned and privately operated under public-private partnerships. Until plans are developed, the financing methods, costs or revenues for such facilities cannot be estimated, however, the range would be in the tens of millions of dollars.

Specific costs or savings cannot be determined at this time for other objectives under the ordinance such as increasing competition for garbage services, creating jobs and minimizing environmental impacts. This statement does not address the potential impact of this proposal on the local economy or businesses.

EARLY VOTING AT CITY HALL



Did you know that you can vote before Election Day?

May 7 is the First Day for Early Voting at City Hall

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

There will also be weekend voting on:

Saturday, May 26 and Sunday May 27 and
Saturday, June 2 and Sunday, June 3 from 10am to 4pm

Enter on Grove Street only

Join or donate on line! www.SFvotes.org

(Proposition A Continued)

Arguments In Favor Of Proposition A

- This proposition does not take the City's trash and recycling services away from its current vendor. Instead, it prevents the creation of a monopoly that controls both recycling and trash disposal and ensures the selection of the most cost effective and environmentally sound vendor.
- San Francisco should follow the model of many other Bay Area cities that have competitive bidding processes or franchise agreements for waste disposal responsibilities.
- A competitive bidding process may facilitate the relocation of the City's transfer station to public land at the Port rather than its current location near a residential area.

Arguments Against Proposition A

- San Francisco already enjoys average or below average rates for garbage services compared to the Bay Area market. It was recently named the "Greenest City in North America"
- This proposition could replace Recology – our San Francisco born and based, employee-owned garbage, recycling and composting company – with national garbage companies that have no connection or commitment to San Francisco.
- Proposition A would fractionalize an efficient system that provides all phases of the refuse opera-

tion, splitting services over as many as five different uncoordinated companies and resulting in duplication and raised costs.

- This proposition could result in the City needing to spend a significant amount of money to replicate the infrastructure that the existing vendor owns. There is no certainty that it would result in the transfer station being moved to the Port, as it is not required as part of this measure.

PROPOSITION B – COIT TOWER POLICY

Declaration of Policy

Placed on the ballot by voter initiative petition

The Question

Shall it be City policy to strictly limit commercial activities and private events at Coit Tower, and to use funds from Coit Tower concession operations to preserve and maintain the Coit Tower murals, building and Pioneer Park?

The Background

Coit Tower is a San Francisco landmark built in 1933. The tower is located in Pioneer Park at the top of Telegraph Hill. It contains 27 historic Depression era murals painted by 25 artists, many of whom were influenced by Diego Rivera. These murals depict California life and the socio-political issues which were important during the Great Depression.



ABOUT THE LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS

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

ABOUT THE PROS AND CONS GUIDE

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

OUR THANKS

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

The Langendorf Foundation Lisa and Douglas Goldman Fund The David B. Gold Fund
The Walter and Elise Haas Fund League of Women Voters Education Fund

(Proposition B Continued)

The City's Recreation and Park Department manages Coit Tower and Pioneer Park. The City's Arts Commission is responsible for maintaining the murals inside Coit Tower but has no dedicated funds for doing so.

Under a long-standing agreement with the City, a private company runs concession operations at Coit Tower that include a food and beverage stand, gift store, the elevator and the right to operate special events. The City allocates the money from concession operations to the Recreation and Park Department, but is not required to do so.

Recently, the Department committed to making a \$250,000 contribution to the Arts Commission as well as setting aside one percent of all gross revenues from the Tower for mural preservation and restoration.

There is no City policy against renting out Coit Tower for private events.

The Proposal

Proposition B would make it City policy to:

- Strictly limit commercial activities and private events at Coit Tower;
- Restrict the use of funds the City receives from Coit Tower concession operations so that they can be used only for preserving the Coit Tower murals, protecting and maintaining the Coit Tower building, and beautifying Pioneer Park around Coit Tower.

Fiscal Effects

The Controller states that:

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

Arguments In Favor Of Proposition B

- Prop B would protect Coit Tower and its murals by limiting the commercial activities and private parties and prioritizing its maintenance and preservation.
- Coit Tower is a special place that is worth protecting. It is being exploited rather than preserved. The murals in Coit Tower have long been neglected and are now damaged. Water leaks, peeling paint,

and broken lights abound. Pioneer Park is overgrown and in shameful disrepair. Prop B would give much needed funds to Coit Tower, the murals and Pioneer Park.

- The commercialization of Coit Tower is part of a pattern by the Recreation and Parks Department which uses publically-owned open space and facilities indiscriminately for generating funds. Prop B would protect Coit Tower from over-commercialization by the Recreation and Parks Department.

Arguments Against Proposition B

- Prop B would likely take funding away from local neighborhood parks because revenue generated at Coit Tower is now used for beautifying parks across the City.
- The Recreation and Parks Department has already pledged \$250,000 for the restoration of the murals and 1% of the funds generated by Coit Tower annually will be used for their maintenance. The SF Arts Commission, which is responsible for the maintaining the murals, agrees that this amount is sufficient.
- Prop B would set a dangerous precedent, requiring money earned at one park facility to be spent exclusively at that facility. Curtailing concessions and events at Coit Tower could potentially reduce revenues by more than \$500,000. Since that revenue in part pays to support Coit Tower and its murals, reducing revenues would sabotage the stated goals of Prop B.



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

www.smartvoter.org