CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
# DEPARTMENT OF ELECTIONS

John Arntz, Director

## Ballot Argument Control Sheet A

Control Sheet A must be submitted for every ballot argument, with required signatures and author information. If your argument has more than one author, you must also submit Control Sheet B with required signatures and information for all additional authors.

For an argument submitted on behalf of an organization, the "Individual" section must also be completed by a principal officer of the organization who must be a registered San Francisco voter.

If an argument states that an individual or organization other than the author supports or opposes the ballot measure, or agrees with or endorses the argument, a completed and signed Consent Form is required.

SAN FRANCISCO FILED

Office Use Only

2022 MAR 21 AM 11:17

Time/Date Stamp DEPARTMENT OF ELECTIONS

**Rebuttal to Proponent Argument** F

Facilitate typesetting, and reduce the possibility of transcription error by sending an electronic copy of your ballot argument text within 24 hours after submission to the Department at publications@sfgov.org.

## Section 1: Argument Information

**Proposition** F

Proponent Argument ☐ Rebuttal to Proponent Argument ☑ Paid Argument in Favor ☐

Opponent Argument ☐ Rebuttal to Opponent Argument ☐ Paid Argument Against ☐

## Section 2: Author Information

**Declaration Related to Proponent and Opponent Arguments**

I attest under the penalty of perjury that I am an Author of the **Proponent Argument** for Proposition ____ being submitted and that I am not a Non-supporter of this measure. A Non-supporter is defined as a person who, with respect to a measure:

- Is a treasurer, officer, or member of a committee that has made or plans to make expenditures in opposition to the measure;
- Has received or been promised any compensation or thing of value from such a committee to perform consulting services for that committee; or
- Has authorized their name or likeness to appear on campaign literature or in advertising that advocates for the defeat of the measure.

I attest under the penalty of perjury that I am an Author of the **Opponent Argument** for Proposition F being submitted and that I am not a Supporter of this measure. A Supporter is defined as a person who with respect to a measure:

- Is a treasurer, officer, or member of a committee that has made or plans to make expenditures in support of the measure;
- Has received or been promised any compensation or thing of value from such a committee to perform consulting services for that committee; or
- Has authorized their name or likeness to appear on campaign literature or in advertising that advocates for the adoption of the measure.

**Complete the following to indicate whether the Author is an individual or an organization:**

**Individual (or principal officer of Organization)** ☑

Full Name (Print) David Pilpel Title (If Applicable)

San Francisco Address (Where you are Registered) [redacted]

**Signature** [redacted] Email

**Organization (Entity)** ☐ (If selected, complete both the Individual Author section and the Organization Section)

Name of Organization (Print)

Who should be listed as an Author for your Organization?

Only the Organization ☐ Both the Officer and the Organization ☐

* Check if the title or identifying information is for identification purposes only, if you are signing as an individual and not of behalf of an organization. ☐

**Signature** Email

## Section 3: Submitter Information

The submitter is the person who delivers the argument and supporting materials to the Department. If there is a question or issue with a submission, the Department will contact the submitter.

Full Name (Print) David Pilpel Phone

Mailing Address [redacted]

**Signature** [redacted] Email

## Section 4: Information for Paid Arguments

Paid arguments must include information about the true source of funds for the publication of the argument. It is also required to indicate whether the true source of funds is a recipient committee. This information will be printed below the argument and the author information in the Voter Information Pamphlet.

The true source of funds for the printing fee of this argument:

Is the true source of funds a recipient committee, as defined by CA Gov. Code §82013?

Yes ☐ No ☐

If the true source(s) of funds is a recipient committee, list the three largest contributors below:

1.
2.
3.

## Section 5: Argument Text

The text of your argument will be printed exactly as submitted. Ensure that your argument meets the legal word limit. You may request that specific argument text be printed in bold, italic, or bold italic type. Type your argument with the desired formatting, or underline the argument text to be formatted and in the left column, mark "B" for bold, "I" for italics, or "BI" for bold italics. Other special formatting is not permitted. **Include author information in argument text.**

| Format B, *I*, *BI* | ← Keep Text Within the Vertical Lines → | # of words per line |
|---|---|---|
| | Please vote NO on Proposition F.<br><br>The proponents argue that garbage bills may be too high. Actually, San Francisco garbage rates are about the same as elsewhere in the Bay Area, and we have a more comprehensive set of services with more processing than most other places.<br><br>Ratepayer advocacy, regular audits, and anti-corruption safeguards already exist. Recycling and zero waste advocates participate in rate hearings. Waste characterization studies and financial audits occur regularly. Tough anti-corruption safeguards are in place both by law and court order.<br><br>The garbage rate-setting system approved by the voters in 1932 still works fine. Proposition F is not a solution we need at this time.<br><br>No one has linked the recent scandal involving the former Director of Public Works and a recent rate miscalculation. Recology admitted the error and gave refunds to customers.<br><br>What's lost here is the great progress San Francisco has made, especially in the last 35 years, to reduce garbage going to landfills. Others envy our comprehensive system of education, sorting, and processing, with modern equipment and local jobs, that reduces environmental impacts at reasonable cost. Coordinating closely with Recology, San Francisco has truly transformed garbage collection into waste reduction and useful resources.<br><br>All of that is threatened here. Proposition F would create more bureaucracy with no meaningful public benefit.<br><br>Existing oversight mechanisms already serve us well and keep both residential and commercial garbage rates low. No change is needed at this time.<br><br>Please vote NO on Proposition F. Thank you.<br><br>David Pilpel | |
| | *If handwritten information or a revision is unclear, Department staff will interpret the handwritten information to the best of their abilities; this interpretation is final.* | |
| | **Total Word Count** | 241 |

**Office Use Only**

| **Total # of words=** 241 **X $2/word =** 482 **+ $200 publication fee =** 682 | | | | **Staff Initials** |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| # of signatures submitted in lieu of publication fee | | Receipt # | | |
| X $0.50/signature | | Check # | | |
| Adjusted Fee Total | | Amount Paid | | |