

From: [Starchild](#)
To: [Carr, Barbara \(REG\)](#)
Cc: [Starchild](#)
Subject: Re: Appeal of ballot wording on "Educator Housing" ordinance
Date: Wednesday, August 7, 2019 9:56:02 PM

I notice the end of the final sentence in the first paragraph below somehow got cut off – if that error appears in the version forwarded to the committee members, it was supposed to read,

People are of course entitled to use such prejudicial wording in titling or describing their measures, but the Ballot Simplification Committee's job is to be impartial.

Love & Liberty,

(((starchild)))

On Aug 7, 2019, at 2:22 PM, Carr, Barbara (REG) wrote:

Thank you. We have shared your request with the members of the Ballot Simplification Committee for consideration at their meeting on Friday.

From: Starchild <RealReform@earthlink.net>
Sent: Tuesday, August 6, 2019 3:55:05 AM
To: Carr, Barbara (REG) <barbara.carr@sfgov.org>
Cc: Starchild <RealReform@earthlink.net>
Subject: Appeal of ballot wording on "Educator Housing" ordinance

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

As the text of the proposed measure makes clear, this housing would *not* be reserved just for "educators", but also for non-teaching government employees. The focus on "educators" is an obvious attempt to sell the measure by taking advantage of the widespread public appreciation of teachers. People are of course entitled to use such prejudicial wording in titling or describing their measures, but the Ballot

While the committee can't change a misleadingly titled measure, it can avoid simply regurgitating the same terminology in its description, when the language of the measure itself reveals that language to be a less than fully accurate description. Where the term "educator housing" appears, it would be more accurate and neutral to replace it with more accurate wording such as "housing for government employees", or put the term in quotes so that voters can recognize it as simply repeating the language used by the ballot measure, and not necessarily an independent, neutral description of what the measure would do.

Even the representative from proponent Aaron Peskin's office, speaking to the committee on Monday, advised use of quotes around the term "Educator Housing" in a proposed chart showing income tiers which Peskin's office recommended including.

The committee's proposed description of the measure also refers to commercial uses that would "support" affordable housing. This term is misleading, because it suggests that these commercial tenants would be paying for the cost of the housing. My understanding is there are no such payments planned, and all that is meant is that the city government would discriminate in favor of commercial uses likely to be used by lower income residents over uses more likely to appeal to residents of greater means. If that's true, the term "support" is inappropriate in this context and should be replaced with language that more accurately describes the proposed discrimination.

Sincerely,

Starchild
Outreach Director, Libertarian Party of San Francisco
www.LPSF.org
(415) 625-FREE