



CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
DEPARTMENT OF ELECTIONS

John Arntz, Director

NOTE: This version of the Voter Information Pamphlet does not include your sample ballot, because different versions of the sample ballot apply throughout San Francisco.

Your sample ballot can be accessed, along with the location of your polling place, at sfelections.org/pollsite.

Also, the pages in this online version of the pamphlet are arranged in a different order from the printed version. For this reason, we are unable to provide a Table of Contents. To find specific information, please refer to the bookmarks on the left side of this file.

City and County of San Francisco Voter Information Pamphlet & Sample Ballot



Your City. Your Choice.

vote 投票 bumoto 투표 bỏ phiếu
November 6, 2018 Election

Vote by Mail:

Request by October 30

Vote at City Hall:

October 9 – November 6

Vote at your Polling Place:

November 6, Election Day

Las boletas y otros materiales electorales están disponibles en español.
Vea el dorso de la portada para más información.

選務處提供中文版選票和其他選舉資料。詳細資訊請看封面內頁。

Makakukuha ng mga balota at iba pang mga materyales para sa eleksyon sa Filipino.
Tingnan ang loob ng pabalat para sa karagdagang impormasyon.



**SAN FRANCISCO
ELECTIONS**

Published by:
Department of Elections
City and County of San Francisco
selections.org

Important Dates

City Hall Voting Center opens

Tuesday, October 9

Last day to register to vote

Monday, October 22

- Missed the deadline? Visit sfelections.org, "Registration for Special Circumstances"
- New citizens can register and vote at City Hall through Election Day

Weekend voting at the City Hall Voting Center

Saturday and Sunday, October 27–28

Last day to request a vote-by-mail ballot

Tuesday, October 30

Weekend voting at the City Hall Voting Center

Saturday and Sunday, November 3–4

Ballot Drop-off Stations are open at some City Hall entrances

Saturday–Tuesday, November 3–6

Election Day voting hours

(all polling places and City Hall Voting Center)

Tuesday, November 6, from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m.

Asistencia en español

Para solicitar la boleta y este folleto en español, llame al (415) 554-4366. Vea la Tabla de Contenido para más información sobre asistencia en español.

IMPORTANTE: si ya solicitó materiales electorales en español, pronto se le enviará un Folleto de Información para los Electores. El folleto en español no incluye la muestra de la boleta. Guarde este folleto en inglés para revisar la muestra de su boleta.

中文協助

如需索取中文版的資料手冊，請致電 (415) 554-4367。請看目錄中有關中文選民服務的詳細資訊。

重要須知：如果您已經申請中文版的選舉資料，您將會收到選民資料手冊的翻譯本。中文手冊並不包含選票樣本。請保留這份英文手冊以參考您的選票樣本。

Tulong sa Wikang Filipino

Para humiling ng balota o ng kopya ng pamplet na ito sa wikang Filipino, tumawag sa (415) 554-4310. Tingnan ang talaan ng mga nilalaman para sa karagdagang impormasyon tungkol sa tulong sa wikang Filipino.

MAHALAGA: Kung nakahiling na kayo ng mga materyales para sa eleksyon sa wikang Filipino, padadalhan kayo ng isinalin na Pamplet ng Impormasyon para sa Botante sa lalong madaling panahon. Walang kasamang halimbawang balota ang pamplet sa wikang Filipino. Itago ang Ingles na pamplet na ito para matingnan ang inyong halimbawang balota.

Contact the Department of Elections



PHONE

English: (415) 554-4375
Español: (415) 554-4366
中文: (415) 554-4367
Filipino: (415) 554-4310
TTY: (415) 554-4386



MAIL

Department of Elections
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 48
San Francisco, CA 94102-4634



EMAIL

Use the email form at
sfelections.org/sfvote

Office hours are Mondays through Fridays (except holidays) from 8 a.m. until 5 p.m.

Visit sfelections.org to:

- Check your voter registration status
- Register to vote or update your registration
- Learn more about ranked-choice voting
- Request a vote-by-mail ballot
- Check the status of your vote-by-mail ballot
- Look up your polling place location
- View your sample ballot

Return Address:

**Did you sign the other side of
your Vote-by-Mail Application?**



**Place a first-class
stamp here.
Post Office will
not deliver
without one.**



**DIRECTOR OF ELECTIONS
DEPARTMENT OF ELECTIONS
1 DR CARLTON B GOODLETT PLACE ROOM 48
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102-4608**





CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF ELECTIONS

John Arntz, Director

Dear San Francisco Voter,

August 22, 2018

Election Day is November 6, 2018, and **polling places will open at 7 a.m. and close at 8 p.m.**, throughout the City. The Department of Elections is prepared for everyone to vote at the polls, by mail, or in City Hall. We have also created much information for voters regarding this Consolidated General Election, which is available on our website, sfelections.org.

Information on Non-citizen Voting

Associated with this November's election is the Department's implementation of non-citizen voting in Board of Education elections, as approved by voters under "Prop N" in the November 2016 election. To register and vote in Board of Education elections, non-citizens must live in San Francisco and be the parents, legal guardians, or caregivers (as defined in California Family Code Section 6550) of children under the age of 19 who also live in San Francisco. Anyone in prison or on parole for a felony conviction or currently found by a court to be mentally incompetent is not eligible to register and vote.

Non-citizen voters will vote using a one-card ballot that lists only candidates for the Board of Education contest. Non-citizen voters are not eligible to vote on any other contests besides the Board of Education.

Multi-Card Ballots

Most voters, however, will once again vote using a multi-card ballot, which will consist of four cards. Voters living in even-numbered Supervisorial Districts (2, 4, 6, 8, and 10) will see the contest for Board of Supervisors on their ballots.

Ballot Worksheet

As for every election, this Voter Information Pamphlet includes a "Ballot Worksheet," which provides space to write down your selections for each contest and measure before marking your ballot. Using the Worksheet will assist in marking your vote-by-mail ballot correctly. You can also bring the Worksheet to your polling place to reduce the time you need marking your ballot in the voting booth.

Online Voter Information Pamphlet

This Voter Information Pamphlet is also available in digital versions at voterguide.sfelections.org in accessible HTML and open XML formats in English, Chinese, Spanish, and Filipino. The content is formatted for smart devices, which allows voters much-needed flexibility to review the Pamphlet and consider their voting selections.

City Hall Voting Center

All registered voters in San Francisco can visit the Department's City Hall Voting Center starting October 9. Starting October 22, the Voting Center will be open each day, including Election Day, during the hours listed below. People can also update their voter registration information at the Voting Center and receive ballots during the same visit. During the weekends, enter City Hall using the Grove Street entrance.

Those who are eligible to vote but not yet registered can also visit the Voting Center to provide their registration information and obtain a ballot. After the official registration period closes on October 22, people can still register to vote and receive a ballot by visiting the City Hall Voting Center through Election Day.

Voting Center Hours

Saturday–Sunday, October 27–28, 10 a.m.–4 p.m.

Saturday–Sunday, November 3–4, 10 a.m.–4 p.m.

Monday, November 5, 8 a.m.–5 p.m.

Election Day, Tuesday, November 6, 7 a.m.–8 p.m.

Vote-by-Mail Ballot Drop-off Stations

Starting on November 3, the weekend before Election Day, the Department will provide Ballot Drop-Off stations so voters can deliver their ballots to Department personnel. The stations will be located on the sidewalks in front of City Hall on the Goodlett Place (Polk Street) and Grove Street sides of the building, and available through Election Day during the same hours the Voting Center is open, as listed above.

And, remember to review both sides of all ballot cards when voting so no contest or measure is overlooked and left unvoted — which is another hint to use the Ballot Worksheet so that you know you've fully participated in this election!

Respectfully,
John Arntz, Director

English (415) 554-4375

Fax (415) 554-7344

TTY (415) 554-4386

sfelections.org

1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 48, San Francisco, CA 94102

中文 (415) 554-4367

Español (415) 554-4366


Filipino (415) 554-4310



Purpose of the Voter Information Pamphlet and Voter Information Guide

You will receive **two** voter information guides for this election:

1 San Francisco Voter Information Pamphlet (*this guide*)



This pamphlet includes your sample ballot and information about voting in San Francisco, candidates running for local and certain state and federal offices, and local ballot measures. For details, see the Table of Contents or Index.


The San Francisco Department of Elections prepares the Voter Information Pamphlet before each election and mails it to every registered voter as required by law.

This pamphlet is available in various formats:

- On sfelections.org in PDF, HTML, XML, and MP3 formats
- Large print (English, Chinese, Spanish, Filipino)
- Audio on USB flash drive, cassette, compact disc (CD), or National Library Service (NLS) cartridge.

To request a different format, contact the Department of Elections.

2 California State Voter Information Guide



The California Secretary of State produces the state Voter Information Guide, with information on candidates for certain state and federal offices and state ballot measures. You may access it at sos.ca.gov.



You may bring these guides with you to your polling place. Every polling place also has copies. Ask a poll worker if you would like to see one.



Next time, save paper and read this pamphlet online instead: visit sfelections.org/viponline.

Ballot Simplification Committee

The Ballot Simplification Committee works in public meetings to prepare an impartial summary of each local ballot measure in simple language. The Committee also writes or reviews other information in this pamphlet, including the glossary of “Words You Need to Know” and the “Frequently Asked Questions” (FAQs).

The Committee members have backgrounds in journalism, education, and written communication. They volunteer their time to prepare these materials for voters.

The Committee members are:

Betty Packard, Chair
Nominated by:
the National Academy of Television Arts and Sciences

Scott Patterson
Nominated by:
the National Academy of Television Arts and Sciences

Ashley Raveche
Nominated by:
the League of Women Voters

Michele Anderson
Nominated by:
Pacific Media Workers Guild

Neha Gupta, *ex officio**
Deputy City Attorney

Leila Mongan, *ex officio**
Deputy City Attorney

**By law, the City Attorney, or his or her representative, serves on the Ballot Simplification Committee and can speak at the Committee's meetings but cannot vote.*



Check the Back Cover for Your Polling Place Location

Your polling place may have changed for this election!

On the back cover of this pamphlet, you will find:

1 Your polling place address.

2 An indication of whether your polling place is **accessible for people with disabilities**. To find more information about accessible voting, see the Table of Contents.

DEPARTMENT OF ELECTIONS, City and County of San Francisco
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, City Hall, Room 48
San Francisco, CA 94102-4608
Telephone: (415) 554-4375 TTY: (415) 554-4386
sfelections.org

NONPROFIT ORG.
U.S. POSTAGE
PAID
SAN FRANCISCO, CA
PERMIT NO. 2768

OFFICIAL
ELECTION MAIL
Authorized by the U.S. Postal Service

ELECTRONIC SERVICE REQUESTED

Notice: If the person below is not at this address, please help keep the voter rolls current and save taxpayer dollars by returning this pamphlet to your mail carrier.

Your polling place address:
La dirección de su lugar de votación: / 您的投票站地址: /
Address ng inyong lugar ng botohan:

Mailing Address:

Are the entryway and the voting area accessible? ¿Son accesibles la entrada y el área de votación? /
入口和投票區是否方便出入? / Madali bang makarating at makapasok sa pasukan at sa lugar ng botohan?

Vote-by-Mail Application for the November 6, 2018, Consolidated General Election
Must reach the Department of Elections office by October 30 at 5 p.m.

Name:

If "PERM" is printed above, DO NOT send in this application. You are a Permanent Vote-by-Mail Voter. A ballot will be sent to you automatically.
If "PERM" is printed above, "PERM" means you are a Permanent Voter. Do not send in this application. A ballot will be sent to you automatically.
If "PERM" is not printed above, you must send in this application. If you do not send in this application, you will not be able to vote by mail.
If you are a Permanent Voter, you must send in this application. If you do not send in this application, you will not be able to vote by mail.
Check here if you wish to become a Permanent Vote-by-Mail Voter.

Your polling place address is also available at
sfelections.org/pollsite

Why Do Polling Places Change?

The Department of Elections does not own any of the sites that are used as polling places; it relies on the community to provide locations that are accessible for all voters. If you own a space that might be suitable as a polling place for future elections, please contact the Department of Elections at (415) 554-4375.

Late Polling Place Changes

If a polling place becomes unavailable after the Voter Information Pamphlet is mailed, the Department of Elections notifies affected voters with:

- **"Change of Polling Place" Notification Cards** mailed to all registered voters in the precinct.
- **"Change of Polling Place" Signs** posted at the previous location.

Non-Citizen Voting in the Board of Education Election

In the November 2016 election, San Francisco voters approved Proposition N, amending the City Charter to allow any non-citizen resident of San Francisco of legal voting age, not in prison or on parole for a felony conviction, who is the parent, legal guardian, or caregiver (as defined under California Family Code Section 6550) of a child under the age of 19 living in San Francisco, to vote for members of the Board of Education. Information on non-citizen registration and voting is available on sfelections.org/noncitizen or by calling (415) 554-4375.




Where and When to Vote



Vote at the City Hall Voting Center

Beginning October 9 through Election Day, any San Francisco voter may vote at the City Hall Voting Center, outside Room 48:

- **Monday through Friday**, October 9–November 5, from 8 a.m. to 5 p.m.
- **Saturday and Sunday**, October 27–28 and November 3–4, from 10 a.m. to 4 p.m. (enter on Grove Street)
- ★ **Election Day**, Tuesday, November 6, from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m.



Vote by Mail

Any voter may request a vote-by-mail ballot, for this election only or for all elections.

- If you always vote by mail, your ballot will be mailed in early October. If you have not received your ballot by October 12, please call.
- **New service for voters with disabilities:** The accessible vote-by-mail system is a ballot delivery option that allows voters with disabilities to access their ballot using any computer with internet access (see page 9).
- When you receive your ballot, carefully read and follow the instructions enclosed with it.
- There are **three ways to return your ballot**:
 - Mail it to the Department of Elections. The return envelope must be postmarked by the U.S. postal service or date stamped by a delivery company before or on Election Day, Tuesday, November 6, AND received by the Department of Elections no later than Friday, November 9.
 - Drop it off at a City Hall Drop-off Station.
 - Drop it off at any California polling place on Election Day.

Find details in the instructions enclosed with your ballot, or go to sfelections.org/vbm.

- To check the status of your vote-by-mail ballot at any time from when it is mailed until after it has been counted, go to sfelections.org/vbmstatus or call (866) 325-9163 toll free. If your ballot **cannot** be counted, this tool will tell you how to correct the issue before Election Day so that we can count your ballot.

- Starting October 23, you can watch the opening and processing of vote-by-mail ballots at the Department of Elections at sfelections.org/observe.

Avoid these issues to ensure that your ballot can be counted!

The most common reasons that vote-by-mail ballots cannot be counted are signature issues or late returns:


- The voter did not sign the return envelope.
- The voter's signature on the return envelope does not compare to the voter's signature in the Department of Elections records.
- The voter's ballot was postmarked after Election Day or received later than three days after Election Day.

How to Request to Vote by Mail

If you want to vote by mail for the November 6 election, the Department of Elections must receive your request by October 30. There are several ways to request to vote by mail:

- Fill out and return the application on the back cover of this pamphlet.
- Go to sfelections.org/vbm.
- Call (415) 554-4375, or visit the Department of Elections in City Hall, Room 48.
- Mail, fax, or email a scanned request to the Department of Elections with your name, birth date, home address, the address where you want your ballot to be mailed, and your signature.

If you want to vote by mail for all elections, indicate that you wish to become a permanent vote-by-mail voter.



Vote at Your Polling Place on Election Day

- Where you live determines which contests and candidates appear on your ballot. To receive the ballot with the correct contests and candidates, vote at your assigned polling place.
- Check the address of your polling place on the back cover of this pamphlet, or go to sfelections.org/pollsite.
- Polling places are open on Election Day, Tuesday, November 6, from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m.



How to Vote

Choose Your Preferred Language

Three versions of the ballot are available, each with English and one other language:

- English and Chinese
- English and Spanish
- English and Filipino

If you vote by mail:

If you let the Department of Elections know that you prefer a ballot with Chinese, Spanish, or Filipino, you will receive a ballot in English and that language. To make sure that you receive your preferred version of the ballot, check or update your language preference at sfelections.org/language. Otherwise, if you do not provide your language preference before your ballot is mailed, the instructions included with the ballot will say how to exchange it for a ballot with your preferred language.

If you vote at a polling place:

Ballots in English and all certified languages (Chinese, Spanish, and Filipino) will be available at the City Hall Voting Center and at all polling places. Each polling place will also have facsimile ballots in Vietnamese and Korean; these are exact copies of the official ballot with translated content, for voters to use as a reference.

If you let the Department of Elections know before Election Day that you prefer a ballot with Chinese, Spanish, or Filipino, the poll worker will give you a ballot with English and that language. Provide your language preference to the Department of Elections at sfelections.org/language. Otherwise, you can ask a poll worker for the language that you prefer on Election Day.

Choose Your Ballot Format

- You will receive a paper ballot unless you request to use an accessible voting machine (see page 10).
- If you use the accessible voting machine, the machine will provide instructions.
- **New service for voters with disabilities:** The accessible vote-by-mail system is a ballot delivery option that allows voters with


disabilities to access their ballot using any computer with internet access (see page 9).

Mark Your Paper Ballot

- Read the instructions printed on each ballot card.
- Review both sides of each card for contests.
- For each contest, the number of candidates you may select is printed above the list of names. If you mark more candidates than allowed, or both "YES" and "NO" in a measure contest, your vote for that contest or choice cannot be counted.
- Use a pen with black or dark blue ink or a #2 pencil.
- Complete the arrow pointing to your choice for the contest or measure, as shown in picture ①
- If you do not want to vote on a certain contest or measure, leave that contest or measure blank. Your votes for the other contests and measures will still count.

①

How to mark your choice:





Ranked-Choice Voting

For this election, all San Francisco voters will use ranked-choice voting to elect the Assessor-Recorder and Public Defender. Voters who live in Supervisorial Districts 2, 4, 6, 8, and 10 will also elect their member of the Board of Supervisors using ranked-choice voting.

How Ranked-Choice Voting Works

- First, everyone's first-choice vote is counted.
- If a candidate has the majority of these first-choice votes—more than half—that candidate wins.
- If no candidate has the majority of first-choice votes, the candidate in last place is eliminated.
- Votes for the eliminated candidate transfer to the next-choice candidates marked on those ballots.
- If one candidate has the majority after these votes are transferred, that candidate wins.

- If there is still no candidate with the majority of votes, the process of eliminating candidates and transferring votes continues until one candidate has the majority.

How to Mark a Contest that Uses Ranked-Choice Voting

- For ranked-choice voting, the names of all the candidates are listed in three repeating columns on the ballot. This allows you to rank up to three candidates for the same office: one favorite, and two others.
- Select only **one choice** per column, as shown in picture (2)
- To rank fewer than three candidates, leave any remaining columns blank.
- To vote for a qualified write-in candidate, see next page.

(2)

How to mark a ranked-choice voting contest

1 FIRST CHOICE 第一選擇	2 SECOND CHOICE 第二選擇	3 THIRD CHOICE 第三選擇
Vote for One 選一名	Vote for One: Must be different than your first choice 選一名：必須與第一個選擇不同	Vote for One: Must be different than your first and second choices 選一名：必須與第一個和第二個選擇不同
OCEAN 海洋	OCEAN 海洋	OCEAN 海洋
MOUNTAIN 山嶺	MOUNTAIN 山嶺	MOUNTAIN 山嶺
LAKE 湖	LAKE 湖	LAKE 湖
FOREST 森林	FOREST 森林	FOREST 森林
BEACH 海灘	BEACH 海灘	BEACH 海灘



How do I mark my ballot if there are fewer than three candidates for a ranked-choice contest?

If there are fewer than three candidates for an office, mark your choice(s) and leave any remaining columns blank.


For any contest that uses ranked-choice voting, San Francisco's Charter requires that a voter be allowed to rank no fewer than three choices. Sometimes, however, fewer than three candidates file paperwork to run for an office.

There may be other people who file to be write-in candidates. For more information, see below.

How to Vote for a Qualified Write-In Candidate

- In addition to the candidates listed on the ballot, there may be qualified write-in candidates. "Qualified" means candidates who have submitted the documentation that is required to run for an office.
- The only write-in votes that can be counted are votes for qualified candidates.
- For a list of qualified write-in candidates, visit sfelections.org/writein on or after October 26, or ask a poll worker.
- Before casting a write-in vote, make sure:
 - The candidate is **not listed on the ballot**.
 - The candidate is **on the qualified write-in list**.
 - To write the candidate's name in the space at the end of the candidate list and **complete the arrow** that points to the space, as shown in picture ③

How to vote for a qualified write-in candidate:



How to Get a New Ballot if You Made a Mistake

- **If you vote by mail:** follow the instructions that were enclosed with your ballot, or call (415) 554-4375.
- **If you vote in person:** ask a poll worker for a replacement ballot.



Accessible Vote-by-Mail System

New Service for Voters with Disabilities

If you have a disability, you may use the accessible vote-by-mail system, a new ballot delivery option that allows you to access and mark your ballot using any computer with internet access. You also must have access to a printer to print your marked ballot.



Your ballot will be presented onscreen in an accessible format that is compatible with screen readers. You can use an assistive device to mark your votes. After marking your ballot, you must print and return it to the Department of Elections by mail or in person.

This service provides an opportunity for accessible voting without having to go to a polling place.



To use this service, you must request to vote by mail by October 30.

See page 5 for details on how to apply. If you already vote by mail, you do not need to submit a new request.

Accessing Your Ballot

You will receive a paper ballot, a postage-paid return envelope, and voting instructions in the mail. If you wish to access and mark your ballot through the accessible vote-by-mail system, you can use the postage-paid return envelope to send your printed ballot to the Department of Elections. You may also use your own envelope or return your ballot in person.

You may access your ballot anytime during the early voting period, Monday, October 8, through Election Day, Tuesday, November 6, at sfelections.org/access.

Votes Remain Private

The accessible vote-by-mail system does not store voters' selections or transmit them over the internet.

When the Department of Elections receives your ballot, your selections will be transferred (duplicated) onto a paper

ballot for tabulation by the voting equipment, as required by state election law. During this process, to preserve the secrecy of the votes, the Department of Elections will remove and separate the ballot from the return envelope that has your name, address, and signature.

The Department of Elections follows the duplication process authorized by state election law. This process is open to public observation and is live-streamed on sfelections.org.

Questions?

For more information, contact the Department of Elections.



Accessible Voting and Services for Voters with Disabilities

Accessible voter information

The Voter Information Pamphlet is available in accessible formats:

- On *sfelections.org* in PDF, HTML, XML, and MP3 formats
- Large print (English, Chinese, Spanish, Filipino)
- Audio on USB flash drive, cassette, compact disc (CD), or National Library Service (NLS) cartridge

To request, call (415) 554-4375.

Audio copies are also available from:

San Francisco Library for the Blind and Print Disabled
Main Library, 100 Larkin Street
(415) 557-4253

Accessible voting

NEW! If you have a disability, you may use our accessible vote-by-mail system to access and mark your ballot using any computer with internet access (see page 9).

All voters have the following options:

Vote by Mail: See page 5.

Vote at the City Hall Voting Center: City Hall is accessible from any of its four entrances. The Voting Center has all of the assistance tools listed below. For more information, see page 5.

Vote at Your Polling Place: See back cover for address and accessibility information:

- If your polling place entrance and voting area are functionally accessible, “YES” is printed below the accessibility symbol on the back cover
- If your polling place is not accessible, go to *sfelections.org/pollsite* or call (415) 554-4375 for the location of the nearest accessible polling place within your voting district
- An **accessible voting machine** is available at every polling place, including the City Hall Voting Center
 - Allows voters with sight or mobility impairments or other specific needs to vote independently and privately
 - You can select the ballot language: English, Chinese (Cantonese or Mandarin audio), Spanish, or Filipino



- If you wish to use the accessible voting machine, tell a poll worker which format you prefer:

Touchscreen ballot

- Instructions are provided on screen
- Large-print text is provided on the screen, and you can make the text larger
- Make your ballot selections by touching the screen
- Review your selections on a paper record before casting your vote

Audio ballot

- Audio instructions guide you through the ballot
 - Headphones are provided
 - You can connect a personal assistive device such as a sip/puff device
 - Make your ballot selections using a Braille-embossed handheld keypad; keys are coded by color and shape
 - Listen to review your selections before casting your vote; there is also a paper record of your votes
- The Department of Elections can provide multi-user sip/puff switches or headpointers. To request, call (415) 554-4375. If possible, provide 72 hours' notice to ensure availability
 - Following California Secretary of State requirements, votes from the accessible voting machine are transferred onto paper ballots, which are counted at City Hall after Election Day
- Other forms of assistance are available:
 - **Personal assistance:** you may bring up to two people, including poll workers, into the voting booth for assistance
 - **Curbside voting:** If you are unable to enter your polling place, poll workers can bring voting materials to you outside the polling place
 - **Reading tools:** Every polling place has large-print instructions on how to mark a ballot and optical sheets to magnify the print on the paper ballot
 - **Seated voting:** Every polling place has a booth that allows voting while seated
 - **Voting tools:** Every polling place has easy-grip pens for signing the roster and marking the ballot
 - **American Sign Language interpretation** by video is available at the Department of Elections office



Multilingual Voter Services

In compliance with state and federal language access laws, the Department of Elections provides materials and assistance in Chinese, Spanish, and Filipino, as well as in English. The Department continues to prioritize its multilingual program and to improve upon its services to all voters, including those with limited proficiency in English.

Multilingual voter services include:

- Voter information in English, Chinese, Spanish, and Filipino at sfelections.org.
- Election materials in Chinese, Spanish, and Filipino: ballots, voter registration forms, voter notices, instructional signs at all polling places, vote-by-mail ballot applications and instructions, and Voter Information Pamphlets.
- Bilingual poll worker assistance at designated polling places on Election Day.
- Telephone assistance in many languages at (415) 554-4375.

Each polling place and the City Hall Voting Center will also have facsimile ballots in Vietnamese and Korean; these are exact copies of the official ballot with translated content, for voters to use as a reference. Copies are also available at sfelections.org/pollsite.

我們可以協助您!

如果您想收到中文版的選舉資料，請在選務處網站 sfelections.org/language 更新您的語言偏好或致電 (415) 554-4367。

中文服務包括：

- 網上提供的中文選舉資料: sfelections.org。
- 翻譯的選舉資料：選票、「選民登記表」、選民通告、「郵寄投票申請表」和指南以及《選民資料手冊》。
- 於選舉日在每個投票站提供中文的說明標牌。
- 於選舉日在指定的投票站有雙語工作人員提供中文語言協助。
- 中文電話支援服務，請致電：(415) 554-4367。

¡Le podemos ayudar!

Si quiere materiales en español además de inglés, actualice su preferencia de idioma electoral en sfelections.org/language o llame al (415) 554-4366.

Los servicios en español incluyen:

- Información electoral en español en sfelections.org.
- Materiales electorales traducidos al español: la boleta electoral, la solicitud de inscripción para votar, avisos a los electores, solicitudes e instrucciones para votar por correo y el Folleto de Información para los Electores.
- Rótulos con instrucciones en español en los lugares de votación el Día de las Elecciones.
- Trabajadores electorales bilingües en ciertos lugares de votación el Día de las Elecciones.
- Ayuda telefónica en español llamando al (415) 554-4366.

Matutulungan namin kayo!

Kung gusto ninyo ng mga materyales sa wikang Filipino, bukod sa Ingles, i-update ang inyong higit na nagugustuhang wika sa sfelections.org/language o tumawag sa (415) 554-4310.

Kabilang sa mga serbisyo sa wikang Filipino para sa mga botante ang:

- Impormasyon para sa botante sa wikang Filipino sa sfelections.org.
- Isinaling mga materyales para sa eleksyon: mga balota, mga form para sa pagpaparehistro ng botante, mga paunawa sa botante, mga aplikasyon at instruksiyon para sa vote-by-mail na balota at mga Pamphlet ng Impormasyon para sa Botante.
- Mga karatulang nagbibigay ng instruksiyon sa lahat ng mga lugar ng botohan sa Araw ng Eleksyon.
- Tulong ng bilingual na manggagawa sa botohan sa mga itinalagang lugar ng botohan sa Araw ng Eleksyon.
- Tulong sa telepono sa wikang Filipino. Para sa tulong, tumawag sa (415) 554-4310.

Chúng tôi có thể trợ giúp quý vị!

Cơ quan Bầu cử có thể cung cấp các lá phiếu tham chiếu, hay còn gọi là lá phiếu mẫu, bằng tiếng Việt. Lá phiếu tham chiếu là những bản sao y của lá phiếu chính thức mà được dịch qua tiếng Việt. Cẩm nang Hướng dẫn Cử tri của California cũng có bản dịch tiếng Việt.

Có vài cách khác nhau để xem hay yêu cầu bản sao lá phiếu tham chiếu hay Cẩm nang Hướng dẫn Cử tri của California:

- **Xem trên mạng:** Các cuộc tranh cử cụ thể mà quý vị được phép bỏ phiếu được xác định căn cứ vào nơi quý vị cư trú và ghi danh bỏ phiếu. Để xem lá phiếu tham chiếu dành cho quý vị, hãy truy cập trang mạng sfelections.org/pollsite. Để xem Cẩm nang Hướng dẫn Cử tri của California bằng tiếng Việt, hãy truy cập trang mạng sos.ca.gov.
- **Nhận qua thư hay email:** Truy cập trang mạng sfelections.org/language để nộp yêu cầu. Quý vị cũng sẽ nhận được một bản Cẩm nang Hướng dẫn Cử tri của California bằng tiếng Việt cũng như tiếng Anh trước mỗi cuộc bầu cử.
- **Yêu cầu tại Trung tâm Bầu cử của Tòa Thị chính:** Trung tâm Bầu cử thuộc Tòa Thị chính mở cửa 29 ngày trước mỗi cuộc bầu cử và tất cả cử tri của San Francisco đều có thể bỏ phiếu tại trung tâm này.
- **Yêu cầu tại địa điểm bỏ phiếu:** Mọi địa điểm bỏ phiếu của San Francisco đều sẽ có các lá phiếu tham chiếu và Cẩm nang Hướng dẫn Cử tri của California bằng tiếng Việt. Hãy hỏi một nhân viên phòng phiếu để lấy bản sao. Để biết vị trí địa điểm bỏ phiếu của quý vị hoặc để xem danh sách tất cả các địa điểm bỏ phiếu ở San Francisco, hãy truy cập trang mạng sfelections.org/pollsite.

Các dịch vụ trợ giúp khác bằng tiếng Việt:

- **Trợ giúp qua Điện thoại:** Chúng tôi cung cấp trợ giúp từ thứ Hai đến thứ Sáu, 8 giờ sáng đến 5 giờ chiều, và vào Ngày Bầu cử từ 7 giờ sáng đến 8 giờ tối. Xin gọi số (415) 554-4375.
- **Người trợ giúp Riêng:** Quý vị có thể dẫn theo tới đa hai người vào phòng bỏ phiếu để hỗ trợ mình đánh dấu lên phiếu bầu.
- **Nhân viên Phòng phiếu Biết Hai Thứ tiếng:** Cơ quan Bầu cử huấn luyện nhân viên phòng phiếu để hỗ trợ cho những cử tri yêu cầu được trợ giúp trong lúc bỏ phiếu. Thẻ tên của nhân viên phòng phiếu có ghi rõ những ngôn ngữ họ có thể nói ngoài tiếng Anh. Nhân viên phòng phiếu có thể giúp đọc lá phiếu hoặc đánh dấu sự lựa chọn của cử tri trên lá phiếu bằng giấy hay lá phiếu trên màn hình cảm ứng.

Chúng tôi hiện đang tuyển dụng nhân viên phòng phiếu để phục vụ người đi bỏ phiếu tại các địa điểm bầu cử

trong toàn San Francisco vào Ngày Bầu cử. Nếu quý vị muốn phục vụ cộng đồng của mình đồng thời nhận được một khoản thù lao lên đến \$195, hãy truy cập trang mạng sfelections.org/pw.

Đowa 드리겠습니다!

저희 선거부에서는 참조용 투표용지(팩스 투표용지)를 한국어로 번역해 제공합니다. 참조용 투표용지는 정식 투표용지와 정확히 동일한 내용을 한국어로 번역한 것입니다. 캘리포니아 유권자 정보 안내서는 한국어로도 마련되어 있습니다.

참조용 투표용지나 캘리포니아 유권자 정보 안내서는 다음과 같이 여러 방법으로 보거나 요청하실 수 있습니다.

- **온라인으로 보기:** 유권자의 주소 및 유권자 등록지가 어디인지에 따라 투표할 수 있는 공직 명단이 정해집니다. 참조용 투표용지를 보려면 sfelections.org/pollsite를 방문하십시오. 캘리포니아 유권자 정보 안내를 한국어로 보려면 sos.ca.gov를 방문하십시오.
- **우편 또는 이메일로 받기:** sfelections.org/language에서 요청하시기 바랍니다. 영어 및 한국어로 된 캘리포니아 유권자 정보 안내서를 매 선거 전에 보내 드립니다.
- **시청 투표센터에 요청:** 샌프란시스코 유권자라면 누구나 시청 투표센터에서 투표하실 수 있습니다. 투표센터는 매 선거일로부터 29일 전에 개설됩니다.
- **투표소에 요청:** 샌프란시스코 내 모든 투표소에는 한국어로 된 참조용 투표용지와 캘리포니아 유권자 정보 안내서가 비치될 예정입니다. 투표요원에게 사본을 달라고 요청하시기 바랍니다. 지정 투표소 주소를 찾거나 샌프란시스코 투표소 총 목록을 보려면 sfelections.org/pollsite를 방문하십시오.

한국어로 기타 도움 제공:

- **전화로 도움:** 월요일~금요일 오전 8시~오후 5시(선거 당일에는 오전 7시~오후 8시)에 도움을 제공합니다. 번호는 (415) 554-4375입니다.
- **현장에서 도움:** 투표용지에 기표할 때 도움을 줄 사람 최대 2명과 함께 투표 부스에 입장하실 수 있습니다.
- **이중언어 구사 투표요원:** 투표요원들은 투표 시에 도움을 드릴 수 있도록 선거부로부터 교육을 받았습니다. 투표요원이 착용하는 명찰에는 영어 이외에 구사 가능한 언어가 표시됩니다. 투표용지 내용을 읽거나 종이 용지 또는 터치스크린에 기표하실 때 투표요원이 도움을 드릴 수 있습니다.

선거 당일에 샌프란시스코 전역에 위치한 투표소에서 유권자에게 도움을 제공할 투표요원을 모집하고 있습니다. 지역사회를 위해 일하면서 최대 \$195를 받고자 하신다면 sfelections.org/pw를 방문하시기 바랍니다.



Elections in California

In 2010, California voters approved Proposition 14, which created a “top two” or “open” primary election system. The passage of this proposition changed how elections for state constitutional and legislative offices and U.S. congressional offices are conducted in California. These offices are now known as “voter-nominated” offices.

What does this mean for voters in the November 2018 general election?

In the general election for a voter-nominated office:

- Only the two candidates who received the most votes in the primary election—regardless of party preference—move on to the general election.
- Write-in candidates are not permitted, but, if a qualified write-in candidate had been one of the two candidates who received the most votes in the primary election, his or her name would be printed on the general election ballot.
- There is no independent nomination process.

The voter-nominated offices on the November ballot are:

- Governor
- Lieutenant Governor
- Secretary of State
- Controller
- Treasurer
- Attorney General
- Insurance Commissioner
- Board of Equalization Member
- United States Senate
- United States Representative
- State Senator (in some districts, but not in San Francisco)
- State Assembly Member

The Superintendent of Public Instruction contest also appears on the November ballot. This is a nonpartisan office. The contests for local San Francisco offices are also nonpartisan.

What does party preference mean?

Party preference refers to the political party with which the candidate or the voter is registered.

If a candidate for a voter-nominated office has a preference for a qualified political party, the party is printed by the candidate’s name on the ballot, as required by law. If a candidate does not have a preference for a qualified political party, “Party Preference: None” is printed by the candidate’s name.

The candidate’s party preference does not imply that the candidate is endorsed by that party. Political parties may endorse candidates for voter-nominated offices; any party endorsements received by the Department of Elections by the submission deadline are listed on page 30–31 of this pamphlet.

The party preference, if any, of a candidate for a non-partisan office does not appear on the ballot.

How can I find out with which party I am registered?

- Go to sfelections.org/reglookup, or
- Call (415) 554-4375.

How can I change my party preference?

To change your party preference, complete and submit a voter registration card. You have several options:

- Register online at registertovote.ca.gov
- Request that a registration card be mailed to you by contacting the Department of Elections through sfelections.org or calling (415) 554-4375, or
- Fill out a registration card in person at the Department of Elections in City Hall, Room 48.

Where can I find more information about California’s election system?

For more information about California’s election system, refer to the Official Voter Information Guide, produced by the California Secretary of State, or visit sos.ca.gov.



Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs)

Answered by the Ballot Simplification Committee

? Who can vote?

U.S. citizens, 18 years or older, who are registered to vote in San Francisco on or before the registration deadline.

? What is the deadline to register to vote or to update my registration information?

The registration deadline is October 22, fifteen days prior to Election Day. (Missed the deadline? Visit sfelections.org, "Registration for Special Circumstances.")

? When and where can I vote on Election Day?

You may vote at your polling place or at the City Hall Voting Center on Election Day from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m. Your polling place address is shown on the back cover of your Voter Information Pamphlet. You can also find it at sfelections.org/pollsite or call (415) 554-4375. The City Hall Voting Center is located outside Room 48.

? Is there any way to vote before Election Day?

Yes. You have the following options:

- **Vote by mail.** Fill out and mail the Vote-by-Mail Application printed on the back cover of this pamphlet, complete one online at sfelections.org/vbm, or call (415) 554-4375 to request to vote by mail. A vote-by-mail ballot will be sent to you. Your request must be **received** by the Department of Elections by October 30, or
- **Vote in person** at the City Hall Voting Center, beginning October 9 (see page 5 for dates and times).

? If I don't use an application or call, can I get a vote-by-mail ballot some other way?

Yes. You can send a written request to the Department of Elections. This request **must** include: your printed home address, the address where you want the ballot mailed, your birth date, your printed name, and your **signature**. Mail your request to the Department of Elections at the address on the back cover of this pamphlet or fax it to (415) 554-4372. Your request must be **received** by October 30.

? If I was convicted of a crime, can I still vote?

Yes, you can. You are eligible to register and vote if you:

- Are convicted of a misdemeanor or detained in county jail serving a misdemeanor sentence.
- Are detained in county jail because jail time is a condition of probation.
- Are on probation.
- Are on mandatory supervision.
- Are on post-release community supervision.
- Have completed your parole.

If you are awaiting trial or are currently on trial, but have not been convicted, you may register and vote.

? My 18th birthday is after the registration deadline but on or before Election Day. Can I vote in this election?

Yes. You can register to vote on or before the registration deadline and vote in this election—even though you are not 18 when you register.

? I have just become a U.S. citizen. Can I vote in this election?

Yes.

- If you became a U.S. citizen on or before the registration deadline (October 22), you can vote in this election, but you must register by the deadline;
- If you became a U.S. citizen *after* the registration deadline but on or before Election Day, you may register **and** vote at the City Hall Voting Center before 8 p.m. on Election Day with proof of citizenship.

? I have moved within San Francisco but have not updated my registration prior to the registration deadline. Can I vote in this election?

Yes. You have the following options:

- Come to the City Hall Voting Center, on or before Election Day, complete a new voter registration form **and** vote; or
- Go to your new polling place on Election Day and cast a provisional ballot. You can look up the address of your new polling place by entering your new home address at sfelections.org/pollsite, or call (415) 554-4375.

? I am a U.S. citizen living outside the country. How can I vote?

You can register to vote and be sent a vote-by-mail ballot by completing the Federal Post Card Application. Download the application from fvap.gov or obtain it from embassies, consulates or military voting assistance officers.

? If I don't know what to do when I get to my polling place, is there someone there to help me?

Yes. Poll workers at the polling place will help you, or you may visit sfelections.org or call the Department of Elections at (415) 554-4375 for assistance on or before Election Day.

? Can I take my Sample Ballot or my own list into the voting booth?

Yes. Deciding your votes before you get to the polls is helpful. You may use either a Sample Ballot or the Ballot Worksheet in this pamphlet for this purpose.

? Do I have to vote on every contest and measure on the ballot?

No. The votes you cast will be counted even if you have not voted on every contest and measure.



★ Voter Bill of Rights ★

You have the following rights:

- 1. The right to vote if you are a registered voter.**
You are eligible to vote if you are:
 - a U.S. citizen living in California
 - at least 18 years old
 - registered where you currently live
 - not in prison or on parole for a felony
- 2. The right to vote if you are a registered voter even if your name is not on the list.** You will vote using a provisional ballot. Your vote will be counted if elections officials determine that you are eligible to vote.
- 3. The right to vote if you are still in line when the polls close.**
- 4. The right to cast a secret ballot** without anyone bothering you or telling you how to vote.
- 5. The right to get a new ballot if you have made a mistake,** if you have not already cast your ballot.
You can:
Ask an elections official at a polling place for a new ballot; or
Exchange your vote-by-mail ballot for a new one at an elections office, or at your polling place; or
Vote using a provisional ballot, if you do not have your original vote-by-mail ballot.
- 6. The right to get help casting your ballot** from anyone you choose, except from your employer or union representative.
- 7. The right to drop off your completed vote-by-mail ballot at any polling place** in California.
- 8. The right to get election materials in a language other than English** if enough people in your voting precinct speak that language.
- 9. The right to ask questions to elections officials about election procedures** and watch the election process. If the person you ask cannot answer your questions, they must send you to the right person for an answer. If you are disruptive, they can stop answering you.
- 10. The right to report any illegal or fraudulent election activity** to an elections official or the Secretary of State's office.
 - On the web at www.sos.ca.gov
 - By phone at (800) 345-VOTE (8683)
 - By email at elections@sos.ca.gov



If you believe you have been denied any of these rights, call the Secretary of State's confidential toll-free Voter Hotline at (800) 345-VOTE (8683).

🔒 Confidentiality and Voter Records

Permissible Uses of Voter Registration Information (*California Elections Code section 2157.2*)

Information on your voter registration form is used by election officials to send you official information on the voting process, such as the location of your polling place and the issues and candidates that will appear on the ballot.

Commercial use of voter registration information is prohibited by law and is a misdemeanor. Certain voter information may be provided upon request for election, scholarly, journalistic, political, or governmental purposes, as determined by the Secretary of State. For example, information may be provided to a candidate for office or a ballot measure committee. The following information *cannot* be released for these purposes:

- Your driver's license number
- Your state identification number
- Your Social Security number
- Your signature as shown on your voter registration form.

If you have any questions about the use of voter information or wish to report suspected misuse of such information, please call the Secretary of State's Voter Hotline: (800) 345-VOTE (8683).

🔒 Safe at Home Program

Certain voters facing life-threatening situations may qualify for confidential voter status. For more information, contact the Secretary of State's Safe at Home program toll-free at (877) 322-5227, or visit sos.ca.gov.

Any voter has the right under California Elections Code Sections 9295 and 13314 to seek a writ of mandate or an injunction, prior to the publication of the Voter Information Pamphlet, requiring any or all of the materials submitted for publication in the Pamphlet to be amended or deleted.



Elections Commission

The Elections Commission assumes policy-making authority and oversight of all public, federal, state, district and municipal elections in the City and County of San Francisco. The Commission is charged with setting general policies for the Department of Elections and is responsible for the proper administration of the Department subject to budgetary and fiscal Charter provisions.

Roger Donaldson, President
appointed by the City Attorney

Viva Mogi, Vice President
appointed by the District Attorney

Jill Rowe
appointed by the Public Defender

Charles Jung
appointed by the Mayor

Charlotte Hill
appointed by the Board of Education

Christopher Jerdonek
appointed by the Board of Supervisors

Help Us Maintain an Accurate Voter List: Notice about Residency Confirmation Postcards

In February 2019, the Department of Elections will mail Residency Confirmation Postcards to voters who have not voted in any election in the previous four years and have not updated or confirmed information in their voter registration record during that period.

Voters who receive a postcard and who continue to live in San Francisco must respond within 15 days to confirm their home address and remain on the active voter list.

Voters who do not respond will be placed on the “inactive voter” list. “Inactive” voters are still registered and eligible to vote, but the Department does not mail election materials to them.

For more information, contact the Department of Elections at (415) 554-4375, write to sfvote@sfgov.org, or visit the Department’s office in City Hall, Room 48.



Ballot Worksheet

Fill in your choices — Cut out and take with you to the polls

Not all voters are eligible to vote on all contests. Your sample ballot includes the contests for which you are eligible to vote. For more information, see your sample ballot, page 14.

VOTER-NOMINATED OFFICES

Governor (Vote for one) _____

Lieutenant Governor (Vote for one) _____

Secretary of State (Vote for one) _____

Comptroller (Vote for one) _____

Treasurer (Vote for one) _____

Attorney General (Vote for one) _____

Insurance Commissioner (Vote for one) _____

United States Senate (Vote for one) _____

Board of Equalization Member (Vote for one) _____

United States Representative (Vote for one) _____

State Assembly Member (Vote for one) _____

NONPARTISAN OFFICES

Associate Justice of the Supreme Court, Carol A. Corrigan (Vote "Yes" or "No") _____

Associate Justice of the Supreme Court, Leondra R. Kruger (Vote "Yes" or "No") _____

Presiding Justice, Court of Appeal, District 1, Division 1, James M. Humes (Vote "Yes" or "No") _____

Associate Justice, Court of Appeal, District 1, Division 1, Sandra Margulies (Vote "Yes" or "No") _____

Associate Justice, Court of Appeal, District 1, Division 2, James A. Richman (Vote "Yes" or "No") _____

Associate Justice, Court of Appeal, District 1, Division 2, Marla Miller (Vote "Yes" or "No") _____

Presiding Justice, Court of Appeal, District 1, Division 3, Peter John Siggins (Vote "Yes" or "No") _____

Associate Justice, Court of Appeal, District 1, Division 4, Jon B. Streeter (Vote "Yes" or "No") _____

Associate Justice, Court of Appeal, District 1, Division 4, Alison M. Tucher (Vote "Yes" or "No") _____

Presiding Justice, Court of Appeal, District 1, Division 5, Barbara Jones (Vote "Yes" or "No") _____

State Superintendent of Public Instruction (Vote for one) _____

Member, Board of Education (Vote for no more than three) _____

Member, Community College Board (Vote for no more than three) _____

BART Director (BART District 8 only) (Vote for one) _____

(The ballot worksheet continues on the next page)





Note: Index appears on page 118.

(Ballot worksheet, continued)

Assessor-Recorder
(Rank up to three choices)

First choice

Second choice

Third choice

Public Defender
(Rank up to three choices)

First choice

Second choice

Third choice

Member, Board of Supervisors (even districts only)
(Rank up to three choices)

First choice

Second choice

Third choice

PROPOSITIONS

TITLE:	YES	NO
1: Authorizes bonds to fund specified housing assistance programs.		
2: Authorizes bonds to fund existing housing program for individuals with mental illness.		
3: Authorizes bonds to fund projects for water supply and quality, watershed, fish, wildlife, water conveyance, and groundwater sustainability and storage.		
4: Authorizes bonds funding construction at hospitals providing children's health care.		
5: Changes requirements for certain property owners to transfer their property tax base to replacement property.		
6: Eliminates certain road repair and transportation funding. Requires certain fuel taxes and vehicle fees be approved by the electorate.		
7: Conforms California daylight saving time to federal law. Allows legislature to change daylight saving time period.		
8: Regulates amounts outpatient kidney dialysis clinics charge for dialysis treatment.		
9: Proposition 9 was removed from the ballot by order of the California Supreme Court.		
10: Expands local governments' authority to enact rent control on residential property.		
11: Requires private-sector emergency ambulance employees to remain on-call during work breaks. Eliminates certain employer liability.		
12: Establishes new standards for confinement of specified farm animals; bans sale of noncomplying products.		
A: Embarcadero Seawall Earthquake Safety Bond		
B: City Privacy Guidelines		
C: Additional Business Taxes to Fund Homeless Services		
D: Additional Tax on Cannabis Businesses; Expanding the Businesses Subject to Business Taxes		
E: Partial Allocation of Hotel Tax for Arts and Cultural Purposes		

NOTES:



Volunteer! Be a Poll Worker!

Election Day, Tuesday, November 6

It takes more than 2,500 Poll Workers to conduct an election. Poll Workers operate polling places on Election Day and assist voters in many parts of the voting process. Some Poll Workers have volunteered during every election for decades. Poll Workers include high school students learning on-the-job civic lessons, retirees, and hundreds of people who take a day off from their regular lives to be of service to San Francisco voters.

To be a Poll Worker, you must be:

- A registered California voter, or
- A U.S. legal permanent resident, age 18 or older, or
- A San Francisco high school student at least 16 years old*

If you are bilingual in English and Spanish, Filipino, Vietnamese, Korean, Cantonese, or Mandarin, we encourage you to apply!

Earn a stipend of up to \$195 while helping your community.

How to apply:

Apply at the Poll Worker Recruitment Office (City Hall, Room 48), Monday through Friday, from 10 a.m. to 4 p.m.

* High school students can visit sfelections.org/student for instructions and to download an application.

**We look forward to
having you join our
poll worker team!**

For more information, visit sfelections.org/pw or call the Department of Elections Poll Worker Division at (415) 554-4395.





Candidate Information

Notice about Candidate Statements of Qualifications

Not all candidates submit a statement of qualifications. A complete list of candidates appears on the sample ballot, which begins on page 14 of this pamphlet.

Each candidate's statement of qualifications, if any, is volunteered by the candidate and, for some offices, printed at the expense of the candidate.

You may find candidate information as follows:

- **California Voter Information Guide:** candidates for:
 - United States Senate
 - Governor
 - Lieutenant Governor
 - Secretary of State
 - Controller
 - Treasurer
 - Attorney General
 - Insurance Commissioner

- Board of Equalization, District 2
- Superintendent of Public Instruction
- Justices of the Supreme Court

- **San Francisco Voter Information Pamphlet** (*this guide*): candidates for:

- United States Representative
- State Assembly
- Board of Education
- Community College Board
- BART Director, District 8
- Assessor-Recorder
- Public Defender
- Board of Supervisors, Districts 2, 4, 6, 8, 10



Statements are printed as submitted by the candidates, including any typographical, spelling, or grammatical errors. The statements are not checked for accuracy by the Director of Elections nor any other City agency, official, or employee.

Voluntary Spending Limits and State Legislative Candidates' Campaign Statements

In November 2000, California voters approved Proposition 34, which states that if a candidate for State Senate or State Assembly accepts voluntary campaign spending limits specified in Section 85400 of the California Government Code, that candidate may purchase the space to place a candidate statement in the Voter Information Pamphlet.

The legislative candidates who have accepted the voluntary spending limits and are therefore eligible

to submit a candidate statement for the November 6, 2018, Consolidated General Election are:

Member of the State Assembly, District 17
David Chiu

Member of the State Assembly, District 19
Keith Bogdon
Phil Ting

Party Endorsements

State law allows political parties to endorse candidates for voter-nominated offices. The party endorsements received by the Department of Elections by the submission deadline are as follows:

Governor

American Independent Party: John H. Cox
Democratic Party: Gavin Newsom
Republican Party: John H. Cox

Secretary of State

American Independent Party: Mark P. Meuser
Democratic Party: Alex Padilla
Republican Party: Mark P. Meuser

Controller

American Independent Party: Konstantinos Roditis
Democratic Party: Betty T. Yee
Republican Party: Konstantinos Roditis

Treasurer

American Independent Party: Greg Conlon
Democratic Party: Fiona Ma
Republican Party: Greg Conlon

**Attorney General**

American Independent Party: Steven C Bailey
Democratic Party: Xavier Becerra
Republican Party: Steven C Bailey

Insurance Commissioner

American Independent Party: Steve Poizner
Democratic Party: Ricardo Lara

United States Senate

Democratic Party: Kevin de León

Board of Equalization Member, District 2

American Independent Party: Mark Burns
Democratic Party: Malia Cohen
Republican Party: Mark Burns

United States Representative, District 12

American Independent Party: Lisa Remmer
Democratic Party: Nancy Pelosi
Republican Party: Lisa Remmer

United States Representative, District 14

Democratic Party: Jackie Speier
Republican Party: Cristina Osmeña

State Assembly Member, District 17

Democratic Party: David Chiu

State Assembly Member, District 19

Democratic Party: Phil Ting
Republican Party: Keith Bogdon

City and County of San Francisco Offices To Be Voted on this Election

Assessor-Recorder

The Assessor-Recorder decides what property in the City is subject to property tax, and the value of that property for tax purposes.

The term of office for the Assessor-Recorder is four years. The Assessor-Recorder is currently paid \$209,183 per year.

Public Defender

The Public Defender represents some people who cannot afford to pay their own lawyer. The Public Defender represents: persons accused of crimes, juveniles in legal actions, and persons in mental health hearings.

The term of office for the Public Defender is four years. The Public Defender is currently paid \$255,098 per year.

Member, Board of Supervisors

The Board of Supervisors is the legislative branch of government for the City and County of San Francisco. Its members make laws and establish the annual budget for City departments.

The term of office for members of the Board of Supervisors is four years. Supervisors are currently paid \$125,132 per year.

There are eleven members of the Board of Supervisors. Voters in Districts 2, 4, 6, 8, and 10 will vote for their member of the Board of Supervisors in this election.

Member, Board of Education

The Board of Education is the governing body for the San Francisco Unified School District. It directs kindergarten through grade twelve.

The term of office for members of the Board of Education is four years. They are paid \$6,000 per year.

There are seven members of the Board of Education. Voters will elect three members in this election.

Member, Community College Board

The Community College Board is the governing body for the San Francisco Community College District. It directs City College and other adult learning centers.

The term of office for members of the Community College Board is four years. They are paid \$6,000 per year.

There are seven members of the Community College Board. Voters will elect three members in this election.



Candidates for United States Representative, District 12

NANCY PELOSI

My occupation is Member of Congress.

My qualifications are:

It is my honor to serve as your Representative in Congress, where I lead the most diverse House Democratic Caucus in history. We are united by our values in defending middle class families, union rights, women's rights, veterans, public education, people with disabilities, the dignity of immigrants and safety of our DREAMers, the LGBTQ community, and the planet we will leave to our children.

As your Representative, I have fought to secure critical federal resources for the battle against HIV/AIDS, San Francisco's transportation infrastructure, saving City College, protecting our pristine coastline, and opening new affordable housing in our neighborhoods.

When people ask what my priorities are, I always say: our children, our children, our children — their health and education, economic security of their families, a dignified retirement for their grandparents, a healthy environment in which they can thrive, and a world at peace where they can reach their aspirations. These have been, and always will be, my priorities in Congress.

Together, we continue fighting toward A Better Deal for the people. We keep fighting for debt-free college, immigrant families, gun violence prevention, Americans' pensions, consumers' protections from Wall Street's predatory practices, and making health care affordable for all. And we must stop the Trump Administration's cruel family separation policy, end the detention of children, and reunite families immediately.

Our work toward progress must continue. I humbly ask for your vote for my re-election as your Representative, and hope that together we can fight for a better tomorrow.

Nancy Pelosi

LISA REMMER

My occupation is Educator.

My qualifications are:

For 30 years, I've lived in San Francisco, where I, as a single mother, raised my daughter.

I self-financed my BA and MA by working as a Flight Instructor and substitute teacher.

Teaching United States history and civics to Vietnamese immigrants awakened my respect for our Constitution, which limits federal power. Our federal government was formed to protect our national security and individual liberty, including property rights, not to increase governmental dependency.

Homelessness, drug abuse, failing schools, and neglect of youth all waste human potential. When political correctness prevents leaders from publicly questioning the status quo or acknowledging policy failures, government is shirking its duty to protect us.

As your representative, I pledge to follow the Constitution and the rule of law. I will seek to curtail the unwarranted powers of unelected bureaucrats, including the powers to interfere in and spy on our private lives.

I pledge to balance the budget, and return educational control to the people in the states.

I pledge to encourage small businesses, rather than smothering innovation and prosperity with regulations and administrative paperwork.

Democrats and Republicans must discuss issues. Stubbornly voting only along party lines, with hostility to the other party's solutions – hurts intellectual discourse, closing our minds to ideas and solutions that could resolve many of our local and national problems.

I pledge to be your moderate voice in Washington and work across the aisle, rather than being a partisan who abuses power to enrich my family.

Endorsements:

San Francisco Republican Party
California Republican Party.

Remmer4Congress.com

Lisa Remmer



Candidates for United States Representative, District 14

CRISTINA OSMEÑA

My occupation is Solar Energy Executive.

My qualifications are:

My profile uniquely reflects this diverse district — I come from multiple cultures, lived in several places, and walked an immigrant's path.

I was born in the Philippines, but at the age of six, after several family members were severely injured or imprisoned by the Marcos dictatorship, my family and I fled and sought political asylum in the United States. I embraced my adopted country and its values, attended California schools, and graduated from UC Berkeley with a B.A. in English. Later, I earned the CFA designation.

I believe in democratic capitalism and free markets, the sanctity of human life, and compassionate government.

Unlike career politicians, my experience and training was in the private sector. My career in the investment industry spanned more than two decades. While in the solar industry, I worked to develop off-grid renewable energy systems for underserved communities, among other things.

I married a U.S. Naval Academy graduate and Gulf War veteran. I'm a working mom, and, in my free time, I write.

As your representative, I will

Defend free markets, free trade, and economic freedoms,
Push for continued tax relief and responsible federal budgeting,
Seek common ground across party lines,
Address the affordability crisis forcing people to leave the Bay Area,
Champion California's needs in immigration reform,
Stand for our veterans, and
Fight human trafficking.

I respectfully request your vote on the November ballot.

For more information, please go to my website at OsmenaForCongress.com

Thank you!

Cristina Osmeña

JACKIE SPEIER

My occupation is Congresswoman.

My qualifications are:

I'm truly privileged to represent you and am working harder than ever to fight for you.

I'm fighting to help build more workforce housing, sensible immigration reform, reducing traffic gridlock, and building an economy that works for everyone. I fought for net neutrality and pushed legislation to block robocalls once and for all. I fought for veterans and got them over \$5 million in VA benefits and I helped obtain \$647 million for Caltrain electrification.

As a mother, I know we owe our children a better world. We cannot roll back the reforms gained to address climate change. As a woman, I'll do everything necessary to protect a woman's right to choose. As a gun violence survivor, I know how it ravages life. Under my legislation, all gun buyers would be subject to background checks. I also support banning bump stocks, assault weapons and high capacity magazines.

Sexual harassment in the workplace must end, including in Congress. My legislation forces congressmembers who harass to pay out of their own pockets, not the taxpayers'.

On the House Intelligence Committee, I'm working to thwart Russia's meddling and secure our election system. Our democracy is fragile and I will not allow Russia or people within the US to undermine it.

This session, I held 13 town halls, convened events including a senior conference, girls empowerment programs, gun buybacks, and DACA support programs. I'll always be accessible to you and respectfully ask for your vote.

Jackie Speier



Candidates for Assembly District 17

DAVID CHIU

My occupation is Assemblymember.

My qualifications are:

While running for the Assembly, I committed to delivering results on the challenges facing San Francisco and California. After Trump's shocking election, I vowed to protect our city and state as California leads the Resistance.

During this past legislative session, we have done both:

- As Assembly Housing Committee Chair, successfully championed passage of a historic package to address the housing crisis by creating a permanent source of affordable housing funding, holding cities accountable to build housing, and streamlining the process.
- Provided billions of dollars of new funding for roads, public transit and congestion relief.
- Delivered justice for sexual assault survivors by requiring law enforcement to track untested rape kits.
- Held polluting corporations responsible for cleaning up toxic lead paints in our communities in order to keep our children safe.
- Protected immigrant families with new workplace and tenant protections.
- Allowed data collection so government can better serve LGBTQ Californians.
- Gave all California residents one year of free community college.
- Established transparency requirements to shine light on skyrocketing drug prices.

As a San Franciscan and a parent, there's much work to do to improve our city for future generations. This year, I've been fighting to provide new funding and solutions for homelessness, expand tenant protections, address school bullying, protect domestic violence survivors, increase employment for immigrants, and work towards universal health coverage.

My supporters include:

California League of Conservation Voters
California Nurses Association
California Teachers Association
Equality California
United Farm Workers
US Senator Dianne Feinstein
US Senator Kamala Harris
Mayor London Breed
Lt. Governor Gavin Newsom
Assembly Speaker Anthony Rendon

Our work continues. Join our fight. www.VoteDavidChiu.org

David Chiu



Candidates for Assembly District 19

KEITH BOGDON

My occupation is Biotech Marketing Consultant.

My qualifications are:

As someone who grew up on the Westside, graduated from Lowell High School in 1989, and returned to the City in 1999 to raise a family and begin a career in biotech, I've witnessed along with you the gradual decline of our quality of life.

Our middle-income and working families and long-time residents on fixed-incomes are fleeing the area. They are escaping the skyrocketing costs for housing, goods, and services, rampant homelessness, car break-ins, gridlock, empty storefronts, and a crumbling infrastructure.

The threadbare "solutions" of the past from Sacramento are failing us. Too often they are dictated by special interests vested in the status quo. Indeed, many of the recent proposals are only making matters worse:

- We don't need top-down mandates -- such as SB-827 -- from Sacramento and unelected regional agencies taking away local control while dictating zoning and housing density decisions best left to city planners and our neighborhoods;
- We don't need higher taxes and increased regulations driving local merchants out of business; and
- When we approve taxes to fix our roads or build more reservoirs, let's ensure the monies raised are quickly and efficiently spent on their intended purposes.

It's time for change! As your new Assemblymember, with your help, we'll bring common sense solutions to restore our quality of life.

You can visit my website www.bogdonforassembly.com to learn more about my campaign. Please donate on-line so we can reach more voters.

I'm endorsed by the San Francisco and San Mateo Republican Parties and hope to earn your vote on November 6th.

Keith Bogdon

PHIL TING

My occupation is Assemblymember.

My qualifications are:

California can do so much more to create affordable housing, reduce homelessness, protect our environment, address traffic gridlock and build an economy that works for everyone. And we need to do it while being mindful that tax revenues are not unlimited and we could face a recession at any time.

That's why I am proud to have worked as the Chair of the Assembly Budget Committee to shape balanced budgets that invest in our future while still growing our Rainy Day fund. Budgets are a reflection of our values, and the budgets I have drafted for California have reflected our community's core values, like:

Investing in our future by making community college free for first year students.

Building more affordable housing and protecting tenants from evictions.

Making sure we can protect our quality of life with significant new investments in roads and transit to address our terrible traffic. These new investments make our economy stronger and our lives easier, and they create high-wage jobs.

Growing an economy that is fair to everyone by making sure we increase our support for the number one engine of economic equality -- great public schools.

My wife Susan and I are raising two wonderful daughters. I think about them before every vote -- remembering that we are all working today to create a better future.

I'm proud to have won the support of Firefighters, the Sierra Club and many others. I hope you will join in support of our campaign at www.PhilTing.com.

Phil Ting



Candidates for Community College Board

BRIGITTE DAVILA

My occupation is Professor.

My qualifications are:

Access to higher education made a huge difference in my life and the lives of thousands of other San Franciscans. I am running for re-election to the City College Board of Trustees to ensure that a world-class education is available to all San Franciscans.

As the first in my family to go to college, I benefited from Community College before graduating from UC Berkeley. I've since taught at San Francisco State for 25 years and I understand what it takes for students of all backgrounds to thrive and succeed.

I spent the last fifteen years advocating for quality public education at the local, state and national level. I worked with legislators, faculty, and students to pass legislation and push for budgets that support public education.

Since joining the City College Board, we saved it from closing during the accreditation crisis and made it free for all San Franciscans. I want to keep bringing positive changes to City College, like coordinating our public transit, creating affordable housing for faculty/staff/students, and addressing the achievement gap. I will work tirelessly to keep City College open, and expand its promise of education for all.

For a complete list of endorsements, go to www.brigittedavila.com.

Brigitte Davila

DR. VICTOR OLIVIERI

My occupation is Educator / Nonprofit Director.

My qualifications are:

I am an educator with two decades of experience in higher education and I believe we have a responsibility to help every City College student achieve academic, career, and lifelong success.

Yet, recently, City College has faced one crisis after another: accreditation, financial, administrative, enrollment – and students are the ones who suffer.

When I came to this country at 12 years old, I spoke little English. Community college changed my life. Now, I am a Ph.D., university lecturer, decorated U.S. Army Officer, City Commissioner, and former senior administrator at the University of California.

As a place of opportunity for so many, I know that City College must not only survive, it must thrive. As your Trustee, I'll strengthen City College for the next generation:

- Improve Student Success: help students graduate or advance their career within two years
 - Support Our Community: expand FREE CITY to lower barriers to education and foster lifelong learning
 - Embrace Innovation: provide students the skills and training they need for the jobs of tomorrow
- I'll put my experience to work for our students.

Endorsements:

Lieutenant Governor Gavin Newsom
Congresswoman Nancy Pelosi, House Democratic Leader
Mayor London Breed
State Board of Equalization Vice Chair Fiona Ma, CPA
State Senator Scott Wiener
State Assemblymember David Chiu
Public Defender Jeff Adachi
Assessor-Recorder Carmen Chu
San Francisco Democratic Party Chair David Campos
Community College Board Vice President Alex Randolph
Community College Board Trustee Tom Temprano
Community College Board Trustee Shanell Williams
Supervisor Catherine Stefani
Supervisor Vallie Brown

LiUNA Local 261

www.VictorForSF.com

Dr. Victor Olivieri



Candidates for Community College Board

JOHN RIZZO

My occupation is Incumbent, Community College Board.

My qualifications are:

I successfully fought for City College's accreditation, free tuition for San Franciscans, and for streamlining administration bureaucracy so that City College now educates more students at lower cost than two years ago. I am now working on building City College for the future.

Under Board leadership, we are on track to create affordable housing for 500 students and 200 teachers and staff. I am working to build a Performing Arts Center for students and the community and to expand curriculum to qualify students for the latest career fields. Now I am working with the Board of Supervisors to make Free City College permanent.

I am protective of our students' rights. I co-authored City College's Sanctuary campus policy to protect undocumented students and provide helpful information and resources.

I have also incorporated my work as an environmental activist with the Sierra Club to create sustainability policy for City College procedures and construction programs.

My supporters include:

Former Senator Mark Leno
 Assemblyman Phil Ting
 Senator Scott Weiner
 Former Assemblyman Tom Ammiano
 Supervisor Aaron Peskin
 Supervisor Rafael Mandelman
 Dennis Kelly, former President, United Educators of San Francisco
 Community College Board members Brigitte Davila, Alex Randolph, Shanell Williams, Tom Temprano, Thea Selby

Sierra Club
 National Union of Healthcare Workers

www.johnrizzoformcollegeboard.com

John Rizzo

THEA SELBY

My occupation is Incumbent.

My qualifications are:

I was elected to the Board of Trustees four years ago when CCSF was on the verge of losing accreditation, there was a revolving door of interim Chancellors, and each semester's enrollment was lower than the last.

While I was Board President, we:

- Implemented FREE CITY, making CCSF tuition-free for all San Franciscans.
- Reaffirmed our accreditation for the maximum amount of 7 years.
- Voted in a permanent Chancellor.

We must continue this momentum to return CCSF to a thriving, financially stable institution. I pledge to:

- Put students first by providing more classes and establishing a Rams Transit Pass.
- Expand FREE CITY and ensure we receive the funding that we voted for.
- Fight for fair wages to keep quality of teachers and staff high.
- Update facilities and build a Performing Arts and Education Center.

I humbly ask for your vote for my re-election.

My endorsers include:

Board of Equalization Member Fiona Ma
 State Senator Scott Wiener
 Assemblymembers Phil Ting, David Chiu
 Mayor London Breed
 President, Board of Supervisors Malia Cohen
 Supervisors Aaron Peskin, Norman Yee
 Chair, SF Democratic Party David Campos
 All current CCSF Trustees

Sierra Club

www.theaselby.org

Thea Selby



Candidates for BART Director, District 8

EVA I. CHAO

My occupation is Business Owner / CFO.

My qualifications are:

Let's make BART stand for "Be Accountable to Riders and Taxpayers."

The Politicians at BART have misallocated resources, giving riders the lowest priority. Anxious passengers hope for safe, undelayed trips. Filthy stations are considered normal. Workers lack tools and parts for maintenance. Understaffed police lead to disastrous results.

Politicians pledge "Safe-Reliable-Clean" transit, but no one can deliver unless they differ from the status quo, aren't tethered to the establishment's pocketbooks to pay back special interests or refuse to use BART to reach higher office.

It's time for new leadership.

I will reform BART's priorities for ALL riders, not selective groups, so we can reduce the number of cars. The board's prioritization of housing development at BART stations over police and disabled access does not serve you, the Riders or Taxpayers.

I'm a Taiwanese immigrant who walked 20 blocks to save nickels in bus fares. I'm a graduate of UC Berkeley Haas Business School with 20 years' experience as a San Francisco business owner, CFO and service industry executive.

As a BART rider and San Francisco businesswoman, I will provide fiscally accountable, independent leadership that prioritizes you, Riders and Taxpayers.

I will need your vote for real leadership and change!

Learn more: evaforBART2018.org

Eva I. Chao

BRIAN J. LARKIN

My occupation is Engineer / Transit Consultant.

My qualifications are:

I am Brian J Larkin, a 33 year-resident of the Richmond District. My wife/campaign manager, Debbie Chan-Larkin, and I raised our three daughters here. All of them attended SF public schools and graduated from the UC or CSU systems.

I am a licensed engineer and transit professional. I worked for BART either as a direct employee or consultant for eleven years, helping deliver the Pittsburg-Antioch, Dublin-Pleasanton and Warm Springs Extensions.

I have also been a member of several transit-related Citizens Advisory Committees in San Francisco and am currently on the Citizens General Obligation Bond Oversight Committee, focusing on large capital projects.

My main goal as board member is to bring underground rail transit to the western part of the City. BART has tentative plans to build a second transbay tube with tracks running west on Geary Blvd. and then south to the existing main line. BART and Muni can build that portion of the tunnel together, with Muni using the Geary portion first and BART following when the new tube is ready.

Other goals are to ensure BART better coordinates with local agencies and municipalities, implementing a wayside energy storage system, and better oversight of its disadvantaged business enterprise program.

Brian J. Larkin



Candidates for BART Director, District 8

JANICE LI

My occupation is Director, Transportation Nonprofit.

My qualifications are:

As an Outer Sunset resident, I'm one of many westsiders paying to improve BART who is ashamed that the system is unsafe, unwelcome and dirty.

Let's change that.

As a longtime advocate for smart, sustainable and affordable transportation, I'm ready to bring fiscal oversight to BART to make sure the system serves everyone. With \$3.5 billion of capital infrastructure investment approved by voters in 2016, those dollars must be spent urgently and effectively to fix the system.

I've served on Mayor Ed Lee's Transportation Task Force to develop a plan for our city's transportation investment needs. I've chaired the Port's 33-member working group to develop land use and transportation recommendations for the future of our waterfront. And most importantly, I'm a regular Muni and BART rider who believes that the west side of San Francisco deserves a seat at the table when it comes to transportation.

A vote for Janice Li is a vote for a smart BART.

I am proudly endorsed by:

- Assemblymember Phil Ting
- Supervisor Sandra Lee Fewer
- Supervisor Aaron Peskin
- Supervisor Katy Tang
- Supervisor Jane Kim
- BART Director Nick Josefowitz
- BART Director Bevan Dufty
- Rose Pak Democratic Club
- Sierra Club

Janice Li

www.janice.li

JONATHAN LYENS

My occupation is Budget Analyst.

My qualifications are:

Because they know I'm an independent voice and I have the skills to get things done, I have the support of Fiona Ma, Mark Leno, Sandra Lee Fewer and many local community leaders.

Growing up blind wasn't always easy.

I have spent my life overcoming obstacles and standing for those without a voice.

But now I, and we, face a new challenge – fighting for a safe, accessible and reliable public transportation system.

As a community advocate, I've fought to give marginalized communities a voice in our city government. As a city budget analyst, I worked every day to make City Hall more effective and efficient, and helped balance the city's budget during the great recession while protecting the most vulnerable. I am a proven negotiator – I've helped reach agreements with the city's 26 labor unions and negotiated multi-million dollar contracts to rebuild San Francisco General Hospital.

Now I'm running for the BART Board of Directors to realize the original promise of BART – safe, accessible and reliable transportation.

Whether, like me, you rely on public transportation every day, or not, each of us pay into BART and deserve safety, accessibility and efficiency.

I humbly ask for your vote. www.jonathanlyens.com

Jonathan Lyens



Candidates for BART Director, District 8

MELANIE NUTTER

My occupation is Transportation Policy Advisor.

My qualifications are:

The safety, cleanliness, and reliability of BART are my top priorities. As a transportation and sustainable communities advisor to cities and nonprofits, I have spent my career working to solve our country's most pressing urban challenges including transportation and mobility.

BART is the backbone of regional transit in the Bay Area. Working with the community, I will ensure that everyone feels safe while riding BART and that riders have a comfortable, efficient, and affordable transit system. I will also ensure that our core transit infrastructure keeps pace with the growth of the Bay Area.

I served as the Deputy District Director for House Minority Leader Nancy Pelosi and in leadership roles on many committees devoted to San Francisco. During my tenure as the Director of the San Francisco Department of the Environment, San Francisco was named the Greenest City in North America.

My Priorities include:

- Safety for all BART riders.
- Cleaning up stations & fixing broken infrastructure.
- Modernizing trains and stations.
- Ensuring affordability for all riders.
- Help BART be safe in earthquakes and resilient to climate change.
- Compassionately responding to homelessness and mental illness.
- Making BART sustainable and powered by renewable energy.

Endorsements:

London Breed, Mayor of San Francisco
Nick Josefowitz, BART Director, District 8
Scott Wiener, State Senator
David Chiu, Assemblymember
Mary Jung, Arts Commissioner*

Working for a Safe, Reliable, and Clean BART for All
www.melanieforbart.com

*For Identification Purposes Only

Melanie Nutter



Candidates for Board of Education

MONICA CHINCHILLA

My occupation is Education Advocate.

My qualifications are:

As a mother and an experienced education advocate, I believe every child needs equitable access to a rigorous high-quality education.

My priorities are:

- Teacher Support -- livable wages so educators can live and work in San Francisco;
- Strong Start -- building a solid foundation by prioritizing Pre-K through 3rd grade education;
- Community Schools -- integrating support services for families onsite at each school

As campaign manager for the historic soda tax proposition, my work resulted in an increase of \$15 million annually into our city's budget, money used to improve the health of San Francisco children and families.

As coordinator of the Latino Parity and Equity Coalition, I brought an investment of \$800,000 for new programs and services for the Latino community.

As commissioner for the Southeast Community Facility, I brought education and workforce opportunities for residents in the area.

My supporters include:

Mayor London Breed

President of the Board of Supervisors Malia Cohen
Board of Education Commissioners Shamann Walton and Mark Sanchez

City College Trustees Brigitte Davila, Shanell Williams, and Thea Selby

Public Defender Jeff Adachi

SF Democratic Party Chair David Campos

Former State Superintendent of Public Schools Delaine Eastin

Former Mayor Art Agnos

National Union of Healthcare Workers

SF Firefighters Local 798

SEIU Local 1021

LiUNA Local 261

Sheet Metal Workers Local 104

Carpenters Local 22

Plumbers Local 38

Painters and Drywall Finishers Local 913

Carpet, Linoleum & Soft Tile Workers Local 12

Glaziers, Architectural Metal & Glass Workers Local 718

Vote CHINCHILLA!

www.MonicaChinchilla.com

Monica Chinchilla

ALISON COLLINS

My occupation is Educator and Parent Organizer.

My qualifications are:

I am a former SFUSD teacher with a masters in education from San Francisco State University. I have 20+ years experience increasing teacher effectiveness, improving school safety, and increasing opportunity for underserved youth. I co-founded the San Francisco Families Union, which educates and empowers families to successfully advocate for quality public schools. I am an active member of the African-American Parent Advisory Council. I also serve on the Parent Teacher Organization and School Site Council at my children's school.

My accomplishments include:

- Raised over \$1M for renovations at Dr. George Washington Carver Elementary in the Bayview.
- Worked with Chinese speaking families to secure full-time teaching staff after months of substitutes
- Designed anti-bullying student leadership programs, delivered to hundreds of educators in Northern California schools.

My top priorities will be:

- Safe schools: physically, emotionally, culturally
- Every child is academically challenged and supported
- Improved communication and transparency
- Expand community schools and hold charters accountable

Endorsements include:

United Educators of San Francisco
Service Employees International Union
National Union of Healthcare Workers

SF Board of Supervisors:

Sandra Fewer

Jane Kim

Rafael Mandelman

Aaron Peskin

Hillary Ronen

Norman Yee

SFUSD Board of Education:

Stevon Cook

Matt Haney

Hydra Mendoza

Mark Sanchez

Shamann Walton

Learn more at:

www.alisoncollinssf.com

www.sfpsmom.com

Alison Collins



Candidates for Board of Education

ALIDA FISHER

My occupation is Parent / Education Consultant.

My qualifications are:

I'm the mother of four SFUSD students, including a 2018 Mission High graduate. In the thirteen years my children have attended SFUSD, I have been an active parent and volunteer at seven schools. I am Chair of the Community Advisory Committee for Special Education, an African American Parent Advisory Committee member, and an LCAP Task Force member. As an education advocate, I work with families to ensure that our voices are heard. As a former foster parent and adoptive parent of African American children, I am particularly passionate about the issues of equity and social justice.

I've attended hundreds of district Board of Education meetings. I'm ready to do more than comment at meetings; I want to ensure that we consider our most vulnerable students and families in every decision, resolution, and guideline. I want to be the next member of the Board of Education.

My priorities:

- Make every student feel welcome, included, and valued at school
- Provide supports and interventions so all students are proficient readers by third grade
- Accelerate staff retention incentives such as teacher housing and mentoring programs for new teachers and paras
- Increase budget and decision making accountability and transparency at every level

www.alidafisher.com

Alida Fisher

PHILLIP MARCEL HOUSE

My qualifications are:

The purpose of this statement is to convey to the reader why I want to be on the Board of Education. I got a BS in Business Administration from San Francisco State University got a Job as a Teacher enjoyed it. I have been sing in the Glide Choir for 5 years, playing the Bass at Gratia Community Church, and with the San Francisco Opera.

Phillip Marcel House



Candidates for Board of Education

DR. PAUL KANGAS, JD, ND.

My occupation is Doctor and Private Investigator.

My qualifications are:

We must pay teachers the same as police, to motivate students & “Dreamers” to go into teaching.
Raise money for teachers salaries, by adding 1,000 solar panels on each school, making solar a major source of funding, earmarked for teachers, -thus reducing taxes.
Require PG&E to pay solar schools \$0.49 kwh, who’s failure to trim trees, burned Napa, Sonoma, Lake Counties, etc.
Solar is the best longterm investment SF can make for our teachers.

“The #1 issue we face is global warming.” —Bernie 2020.
SFUSD must improve the African American graduation rates. Black Lives Matter.

Dr. Paul Kangas, JD, ND, Passed SF Nuclear Free Zone ‘87.

Hastings Law College ‘75, Raised 3 kids in SF schools.
Taught Law & Private Investigations for 7 years. ILWU ‘68.
Today I work as a criminal defense PI & Doctor in SF schools, streets & jails.

Created first Earth Day, SFSU, 4/22/68, (SF Examiner 9/30/2006)

Former SF Drug Commissioner. Found a vitamin C cure for Lyme.

US Navy 60-64: guard for President Kennedy, Cuban invasion, Vietnam.

See me at: Youtube: paul8kangas & “Highwire”. 877-912-7529, 1pm.

Enough sun hits SF in one hour, to power every school for one year.

Endorsed by: Attorney Christina Chen, Teacher Lynn Carberry, Sen. Mark Leno, Dr. Christina Hicks, Chiropractor, Dr. David Latch, DC, & Dr. Richard Kunin, MD, Nutritional Medicine.

Dr. Paul Kangas

PHIL KIM

My occupation is Public School Educator.

My qualifications are:

As a 7th and 8th grade public school science teacher, I have worked to close the achievement gap among our most marginalized communities. I now lead teachers and leaders on curriculum and instructional practices, and oversee teaching and learning for science, technology, and engineering. I am the only candidate running for school board that has experience as a teacher in Bay Area schools, an M.A. in urban education policy and administration, and has worked at the state and national levels in STEM education policy.

I am the son of Korean immigrants and a product of public schools. Many issues that families and residents face today – affordability, access to a high-quality school, housing – are struggles that my parents and I worked to overcome.

I have both the professional and personal experience that uniquely qualifies me to bring much needed reform to our schools. My priorities are:

- Improving teacher retention and sustainability
- Streamlining the student assignment system
- Expanding Science, Technology, Engineering and Math programs
- Deepening family and community partnership

I am committed to ensuring that every student has access to a high-quality, safe, and supportive school. Join State Senator Scott Wiener, City College Trustee Alex Randolph, teachers, and families to put kids first.

www.philkim.org

Phil Kim



Candidates for Board of Education

CONNOR KRONE

My occupation is Financial Literacy Educator.

My qualifications are:

Visit www.ConnorKrone.com to watch and hear why I believe we need real educators representing San Francisco children.

Our public schools remain a realm of inequity, unable to make up for the long-term effects of poverty, racism, and other deeply rooted injustices. Decide for yourself: across our 136 schools, only 50% of students scored proficient or above on the state's CAASPP math and English tests. Half of San Francisco students are not meeting California's own learning standards. Fixing these issues is complicated. I want to be blunt: these are not problems a parent or aspiring politician are equipped to fix. I want you to vote for a candidate with a track record in public education.

That's me; I have ten years of experience breaking barriers in public education. In San Francisco I founded a financial education non-profit to combat the student loan crisis. In my career I have mentored high school students to become entrepreneurs, worked for the College Board to bring STEM coaching to minorities, developed a K-5 robotics curriculum, and run a city-wide youth leadership program. I am proud of my work for San Francisco students. Help me continue with your vote.

Connor Krone

LEX LEIFHEIT

My occupation is Parent / Public Servant.

My qualifications are:

I'm running for School Board because I believe public education is fundamental to building a more equitable city. As a public school parent with young children I've seen the barriers families face to a good education. Not enough is being done to address achievement gaps and build long-term sustainability. SFUSD has one of the highest opt-out rates in the country and this has to change.

As the first Nonprofit Business Development Manager in San Francisco's Office of Economic and Workforce Development* I've used my professional policy and budgeting background to support childcare and after-school programs facing displacement, design policy to activate underutilized property, and administer financial assistance to protect neighborhood services and cultural resources.

I have worked to increase educator wages, make early childcare accessible to all, and support educator housing. But there is more work to do.

My priorities are:

- Closing the achievement gap
- Building enrollment and parent engagement
- Activating underutilized property for community benefit
- Preparing students for good jobs by leveraging arts education and STEM innovation

It's time to have a truly unified SF Unified School District. Join me and let's build a bright future for public schools.

*Organization for identification purposes only

Lex Leifheit



Candidates for Board of Education

GABRIELA LÓPEZ

My occupation is Public School Teacher.

My qualifications are:

My qualifications are:

I am a bilingual classroom teacher in San Francisco public schools. I have worked in education for over ten years, and understand why it's critical to ensure all students have access to a quality education.

Working with administrators, parents and educators as the Arts Coordinator and Union Building Representative, I serve on the School Site Council and help oversee the +\$74 million dollar Public Education Enrichment Fund.

I also organize with Teachers 4 Social Justice and teach at San Quentin State Prison, to help interrupt the school to prison pipeline by promoting literacy and math learning.

My priorities are:

Quality Schools from Childcare to College

- Ensuring access to the arts and updated technology in every school
- Increasing academic and language supports for Families
- Investing in the recruitment and retention of quality educators

Directing More Resources to Classrooms and Special Education

- Addressing mental health and wellness by providing nurses and counselors at every school
- Providing Smaller Class Size

Increasing Services for students and families:

- Improving Student Assignment- implementing online and real-time enrollment
- Expanding Affordability & Housing options for families and educators

I will bring a knowledgeable voice, with integrity and experience to the San Francisco Board of Education.

Endorsements:

San Francisco Board of Education Members:

- Mark Sanchez
- Hydra Mendoza, President

San Francisco Board of Supervisors:

- Sandra Lee Fewer- District 1
- Jane Kim- District 6
- Hillary Ronen- District 9

David Campos, Chair- San Francisco Democratic Party

Karen Zapata & Jeremiah Jeffries, Teachers 4 Social Justice

And many more!

www.gabrielalopez.org

Gabriela López

LI MIAO LOVETT

My occupation is Academic Counselor.

My qualifications are:

I have worked in public education for two decades after earning degrees from Stanford University and California Institute of Integral Studies. In the nineties, I started a mentoring program in the Bayview, did crisis counseling with teens at Huckleberry House, and worked with immigrant students in the Mission. As a teachers' union leader and activist, I worked on the front lines to keep City College of San Francisco from closure during the 4 ½-year accreditation crisis, keeping the doors of access open for immigrants, high school grads, veterans, ESL learners—all who benefit from a college education. With the passage of Free City College, I did outreach with a coalition of community groups so that San Franciscans can achieve their goals without the burden of college debt. As an academic counselor, I've supported thousands of students on their college paths, including SFUSD high school seniors enrolled in Early College.

As a School Board member, I'd build on initiatives that foster academic success, equity, and social-emotional learning. I plan to enhance college and career guidance for students, advocate for families in need and communities with access barriers, support and retain our teachers coping with the affordability crisis.

For endorsements, visit www.lilovett.com.

Li Miao Lovett



Candidates for Board of Education

FAAUUGA MOLIGA

My occupation is School Social Worker / Parent.

My qualifications are:

I'm a parent and mental health professional who grew up in San Francisco's projects and graduated from Balboa High School.

I've developed programs that have created a pathway for young women to gain college admission, decreased truancy, and increased enrollment in San Francisco's public schools. Currently, I provide counseling to public school students suffering from trauma.

My goal as Board Commissioner will be to create a safe and supportive learning environment by establishing wellness centers in every public school, implementing a community-based approach to school sites and supporting our educators with benefits that ensure a high-level of retention.

I'm committed to improving our public schools by implementing holistic policies that focus on the well-being of students and staff. I humbly ask for your vote.

Achievements

Master of Social Work, San Jose State University
McCoy Award, YMCA San Francisco Association
Community Builder Award, The Perlman Foundation

Supporters

United Educators of San Francisco
National Union of Healthcare Workers
Service Employees International Union 1021
London Breed
David Campos
Lateefah Simon
Rafael Mandelman
Sandra Fewer
Jeff Adachi
Hillary Ronen
Ahsha Safai
Aaron Peskin
Bevan Dufty
Matt Haney
Shamann Walton

www.faaugamoliga.com

Faauga Moliga

DARRON A. PADILLA

My occupation is Organization Development Consultant.

My qualifications are:

Born and raised in California with six siblings, my parents and teachers instilled the values of dedication, hard work, and education in us. For this reason, I am passionate about the opportunity to serve SFUSD Board of Education and help SFUSD be known as a world-class educational ecosystem that develops the highest quality of students who are prepared to enter universities and colleges as well-rounded, diverse, global citizens.

My qualifications to serve SFUSD is from my vast education and experience both in my volunteer work and professional career. In addition to being a volunteer building essential family homes with Habitat for Humanity, since 1999, I have been a volunteer educator/teacher for grade levels 2–12 in the Junior Achievement of Northern California 6-week curriculum, ranging from civics to mathematics. I'm a firm believer in education and family. I put myself through college at California State University, East Bay and earned my Masters in Organization Development at Pepperdine University.

I'm an experienced and highly intuitive organization effectiveness consultant known for helping leaders and communities reach their strategic goals. As a Board of Education member, my mission is to support SFUSD's Vision 2025 roadmap, specifically access and equity, student achievement, and accountability.

Darron A. Padilla



Candidates for Board of Education

MICHELLE PARKER

My occupation is Nonprofit Grantwriter / Parent.

My qualifications are:

I'm a parent of three San Francisco public school students. I've been an effective advocate and voice for parents and students for over a decade, because investing in public education is the key to improving opportunities for economic mobility and strengthening our communities.

I served as President of the San Francisco PTA, supporting parents in over 60 schools; co-founded the San Francisco Parent PAC to elevate parent voices to ensure San Francisco is a place where families can thrive; and served as Co-chair of the Quality Teacher Education Act Oversight Committee, making sure taxpayer funds are used to support quality teaching. I served on state-level education committees, giving me critical experience to serve San Francisco students. I am president of an arts education nonprofit, prioritizing racial justice and helping students learn critical thinking through the arts.

My priorities are:

- Universal Preschool
 - Neighborhood Schools to ensure families can attend elementary schools near their home
 - Returning Algebra and all accelerated math to middle school
 - Expanding Career Technical Education
 - Attracting and supporting excellent teachers
- Please vote Michelle Parker for School Board!

www.michelleparker.org

Endorsers:

- Mayor London Breed
- Senator Scott Wiener
- Equalization Member Fiona Ma
- Assessor Carmen Chu
- Assemblymember David Chiu
- Supervisors: Catherine Stefani, Katy Tang, Vallie Brown, Ahsha Safai
- School Board: Shamann Walton, Rachel Norton, Emily Murase
- City College: Alex Randolph, Thea Selby

Michelle Parker

MARTIN RAWLINGS-FEIN

My occupation is Educator / Parent.

My qualifications are:

I am uniquely qualified to run for the Board of Education because I have twenty years of leadership experience in professional and volunteer settings. As a bi trans father of two public school students, I have served as a member of the School Site Council (SSC) and PTA and was the lead teacher and interim director of the Beit Sefer Phyllis Mintzer school at Sha'ar Zahav. I am an EdTech specialist at UCSF who knows the importance of a state of the art educational setting for our children.

Additionally, I have over two decades of activist experience fighting for trans youth and elders, patients in the Department of Corrections (CDCR), Native American communities and LGBTQ families. I've served in multiple public service positions and advocated for single-payer healthcare, marriage equality, and housing as a human right.

As a School Board Commissioner, I'll bring my whole self to the challenges and opportunities around the assignment process, affordable housing, and supporting healthy school communities for all students.

Please join City College Trustee John Rizzo, BART Board Member Bevan Dufty, and Pedestrian Safety Advisory Committee Chair Becky Hogue in supporting my campaign for the Board of Education at www.martinrawlings-fein.com.

Martin Rawlings-Fein



Candidates for Board of Education

MIA SATYA

My occupation is Case Manager / Author.

My qualifications are:

I've spent my career championing under-resourced youth. Now I'm running for School Board to end barriers to education and empower all youth to succeed.

I've served as Youth Commissioner, Transitional Age Youth Advisory Board Member, and Vice Chair of the Department of Children Youth and Their Families Oversight and Advisory Committee. My work has been honored by our Board of Supervisors and State Senate.

I have:

- Helped reauthorize the Children's Fund and Public Enrichment Education Fund which brings \$150+ million annually to public schools and afterschool programs.
- Co-created landmark LGBTQ diversity training for 9,000 city employees.
- Worked as a leader with community groups securing Free MUNI for 40,000 low-income youth.

I will:

- Reduce illiteracy and dropout rates for our students.
- Guarantee all students access to mental health treatment to end bullying and suicide in our schools.
- Achieve pay equity and housing for all teachers and students.
- Foster financial and political literacy for students.

My supporters include the Harvey Milk LGBTQ Democratic Club, former President of the Board of Supervisors Harry Britt, former Supervisor John Avalos, School Board Member Matt Haney, City College Trustee Thea Selby, and City College Trustee Shanell Williams.

Let's ensure all students and educators thrive!

www.MiaSatya.com

Mia Satya

ROGER SINASOHN

My occupation is Software Developer.

My qualifications are:

There are very few aspects of the SFUSD where I don't have personal experience and a vested interest. I have been involved with the SFUSD and public schools for most of my life in many capacities, including:

- Product of SFUSD schools
- Have three children attending SFUSD schools
- Served on school site council, on PTSA, and as classroom volunteer
- 19 years married to a 25-year public school teacher
- Developed software for public school districts for 14 years

We must address the achievement gap affecting so many of our most vulnerable students by ensuring equity across all schools and increasing exposure to STEAM subjects – technology and the arts – in the daily curriculum and as extra-curricular activities. All children deserve the opportunity to explore art and science every day. For some, sports are a strong motivator; we need to ensure that the artistically and scientifically minded students have as much encouragement and support as the athletically gifted students.

Our district serves families and children of all backgrounds, races, sexual orientations and gender identities. As the son of an immigrant refugee, I am committed to setting a standard for diversity that goes beyond tolerance, beyond acceptance, to celebration.

Roger Sinasohn



Candidates for Board of Education

LENETTE THOMPSON

My occupation is Firefighter.

My qualifications are:

I am a mother of four kids and a fourth generation San Franciscan.

I was a student in the SFUSD for my K-12 journey and while some things have improved some things have not.

I have been a San Francisco Firefighter for 25 yrs. I love this city, and I love serving this city. I would like the opportunity to help in another way.

I became passionate about educating out youth and supporting our teachers when I was the PTA President for three years at West Portal Elementary.

My qualifications are that I care deeply. I am passionate about asking questions and taking on the significant issues that face us today and have eluded our school district for the past five decades.

Priorities:

- Closing the Achievement Gap.
- Teacher retention.
- Stick with smaller class sizes and raise teacher's wages.
- Address parents desire to send their kids to their neighborhood school.
- Mindfulness and meditation for all grade levels.

Endorsements:

San Francisco Firefighters, Keith Baraka, 2nd Vice Chair
SF DCCC

(Other endorsements were pending when this went to print.)

I respectfully ask for your vote.

www.lenettethompson.com/ Fired up about our Future!

Lenette Thompson

JOHN TRASVIÑA

My occupation is Law School Dean.

My qualifications are:

I'm grateful to my immigrant parents and the public school teachers at Commodore Sloat, Aptos, and Lowell who prepared me for Harvard University, Stanford Law, and a career dedicated to civil rights advocacy, public service, and education. Today, we still have many good schools but they are not enough and not everywhere.

I seek your vote to strengthen excellence, expectations and equal opportunity in our schools.

Using the experience I gained as a teacher, USF Law School Dean, President Obama's Assistant Secretary for Fair Housing, President of the Mexican American Legal Defense & Educational Fund, and President of the Lowell Alumni Association, I will be an independent voice putting our kids first for equal access to quality educational opportunities.

It is wrong to put barriers to block students who want math instruction or to have an enrollment process that frustrates and confuses parents. To close achievement gaps, we need a Latino Education Initiative to parallel the African American Achievement & Leadership Initiative.

I am honored to be endorsed by educators and public officials who have known me for decades:

US Senator Dianne Feinstein
Leader Nancy Pelosi
SF Democratic Party Chair David Campos
Assembly Members David Chiu and Phil Ting
Board of Equalization Member Fiona Ma
District Attorney George Gascon
Community College Trustee Shanell Williams
Supervisor Katy Tang
Former School Board Member Jill Wynns
USF Dean of Education Shabnam Koirala Azad
USF Law Professor Bill Ong Hing
Retired Lowell Principal Paul Cheng
Retired Potrero Hill and Luther Burbank Jr. High Principal Ron Cabral
Past SF Democratic Party Chairs Linda Post and Jane Morrison

John Trasviña



Candidates for Board of Education

JOSEPHINE ZHAO

My occupation is San Francisco Unified School District Paraeducator / Mom.

My qualifications are:

I am running for School Board to help students compete in the 21st century. San Francisco has abundant opportunities, but our future workforce must be prepared to meet the challenges of a global economy. I believe that all of our students, in every school, must excel so they can have access to all of our city's opportunities.

I am a public school mom of two daughters, a longtime parent advocate, and an experienced Paraeducator/Family Liaison in SFUSD. I served in Mayor Breed's Education Transition Policy Team. And, I am a recognized leader for finding solutions for students who were delayed access to advanced math in 8th grade.

I will:

- push for options on advanced math and technical education;
- advocate for individualized learning to improve student achievement. No two students are the same, we should support students to learn in their own way;
- treat parents as partners and support their needs;
- listen to educators and ensure they are motivated.

I'm endorsed by:

- State Senator Scott Wiener
 - Board of Equalization Member Fiona Ma
 - Mayor London Breed
 - San Francisco Sheriff Vicki Hennessy
 - Assessor Carmen Chu
 - Supervisor Katy Tang
 - Supervisor Catherine Stefani
 - Board of Education Commissioner Emily Murase
- I am grateful for your vote to ensure all children have the opportunity to succeed in our City.

Please visit: <http://JosephineZhao.com>.

Josephine Zhao



Candidates for Assessor-Recorder

PAUL BELLAR

My occupation is Teacher / Real-Estate Appraiser.

My qualifications are:

San Francisco is in a major housing crisis, the likes of which have not been seen in generations. Elected officials, like Assessor/Recorder, have a duty to step up during times of crisis to innovate and work to solve the problems their constituents are facing. This is what I plan to do and is why I am running for County Assessor/Recorder.

When I arrived 15 years ago, San Francisco welcomed me with open arms, even with my meager salary as a public school teacher. As a result, I was able to meet my wife, start a family and make San Francisco our home. If we, along with many long-term residents, were to arrive today, we would not be as fortunate.

Now, with my own company that specializes in San Francisco housing, I have seen how this office can help ease San Francisco's housing crisis. I will leverage my 8 years of housing experience as a real estate appraiser, in addition to my 18 years as a public school educator, to take the role of Assessor/Recorder in a new direction and focus it on housing solutions.

Paul Bellar

CARMEN CHU

My occupation is Assessor Recorder.

My qualifications are:

I've focused on transforming the Assessor's office to deliver nearly \$3 billion in annual revenue for vital city services including public education, housing, public safety, senior services, and street cleaning.

Raising Bar on Accountability

- Eliminating backlogs and resolving appeals; generated over half a billion dollars above expectations to fund our most pressing challenges like affordable housing, safety, street maintenance, homeless navigation centers.
- Closed loopholes to hold the largest corporations responsible for paying their fair share – \$38 million in underreported transfer taxes identified.
- Implemented performance tools and streamlined processes to remove barriers to building more housing.

Office Modernization

- Launched online filing and recording; redesigned website for better customer service.
- 2.6 million historical records transitioned from paper to searchable digital files; data safeguarded for disaster recovery.
- Overhauling dated tax system for greater transparency and efficiency.

Serving Community

- Helped over 800, mostly monolingual families, access free counseling from financial and legal professionals.
- Connected low and middle-income families to foreclosure prevention services.
- Introduced legislation extending tax benefits for locally registered domestic partners who previously didn't have the opportunity to marry.

Proud to be endorsed by Mayor London Breed, Senator Scott Wiener, Supervisor Aaron Peskin, Sheriff Vicki Hennessy.

I respectfully ask for your vote.

www.CarmenChu.org

Carmen Chu



Candidates for Public Defender

JEFF ADACHI

My occupation is Incumbent Public Defender.

My qualifications are:

I have been honored to serve as your Public Defender for the past sixteen years. Each year, our dedicated staff provides zealous, effective and compassionate legal representation to over 20,000 San Franciscans, and upholds our nation's Bill of Rights and Constitution.

I am proud that our office is one of the best and most innovative in the country. Our recent achievements include:

- Establishing a bail unit to reform the money bail system
 - Providing legal assistance to detained immigrants facing deportation
 - 24/7 legal advice lifeline for children
 - Eliminating unfair criminal fines and fees
- I have also worked to improve the quality of life for all San Franciscans through social justice programs that help prevent crime. Our Clean Slate and prisoner reentry programs have helped thousands of people turn their lives around. Our award winning juvenile justice programs, including MAGIC and Legal Education Advocacy Program (LEAP), keep kids in school.

We have received national, statewide and local awards from the American Bar Association, the National Legal Aid and Defender Association, the California Public Defenders Association, the SF Lawyers' Committee, and the Mayor's Fiscal Advisory Committee's Managerial Excellence Awards.

I greatly appreciate your vote and support.

For more information, visit www.jeffadachi2018.com.

Thank you.

Jeff Adachi



Candidates for Board of Supervisors, District 2

JOHN DENNIS

My occupation is Independent Businessman.

My qualifications are:

When I moved into District 2 27 years ago it was a place of dreams.

And while the district is still amazing, we can all see how it has changed in recent years, sadly not for the better.

All of us have either experienced or known someone who has had a car break-in, a package stolen, or even a home break-in. My wife, 12 year old daughter and I have experienced all of the above.

Homeless numbers are unlike anything we have seen.

The city's approach to homelessness and to crime is not working.

Here's what I promise:

1. Sleeping on the streets will no longer be acceptable.
2. End property crime through relentless, vigilant policing.

I was born in a public housing project. My mother worked in city hall. I've had successful businesses in a number of industries, been a candidate for Congress and serve on a number of boards.

I will use my unique skills, experience and approach to politics and management to improve your quality of life.

Careerist politicians have not solved the critical problems of our District. It's time to try something different.

I would be honored to have your vote.

John Dennis

SCHUYLER HUDAK

My occupation is Businesswoman / CEO.

My qualifications are:

The decisions we make today will shape San Francisco for the next century.

We're inventing the future of the world in San Francisco, but our politicians neglect the challenges that have plagued us for a generation.

With an \$11 billion budget – larger than 100 countries – we still face:

- A property crime epidemic with 30,000 car break-ins per year – and we're short 400 sworn officers.
- A monumental housing crisis.
- Inhumane conditions on our streets.

City Hall doesn't lack resources. It lacks ideas, will, and leadership.

We deserve better. It's time for a new era of innovation, transparency, and accountability in San Francisco.

I'm a lifelong Bay Area resident. I worked for Governor Jerry Brown and Mayor Gavin Newsom, built a small business, and raised millions to strengthen San Francisco General Hospital and our City.

As your Supervisor, I'll fight for you to:

- Keep our neighborhoods safe.
- Create a smart growth plan that addresses neighborhood concerns and honors our City's character.
- Significantly reduce homelessness by removing tent cities, addressing severe mental illness, and eradicating street drug use.

Join me at regular community office hours.

I'd be honored to have your vote. No one will work harder – or get more done – for you.

10 ideas for San Francisco: www.schuylerhudak.com.

Schuyler Hudak



Candidates for Board of Supervisors, District 2

NICK JOSEFOWITZ

My occupation is Clean Energy Entrepreneur & Elected Member of the BART Board.

My qualifications are:

Nick's running for Supervisor to Change City Hall.

Our city faces huge challenges, from record street homelessness to soaring housing costs. We can't expect different results if we continue electing the same City Hall insiders. We need new leaders.

If elected, Nick will bring unique business experience to City Hall. He founded and ran a successful clean energy company. He understands that good execution matters more than good ideas.

As a BART Director, Nick took on tough challenges and made real progress: dramatically reducing train breakdowns and raising \$4bn to modernize aging infrastructure and increase rider capacity.

As your Supervisor, Nick will bring new data-driven accountability to city government and will deploy modern technology into an out-of-touch bureaucracy. He will work to:

- build 3000 shelter beds & track every dollar spent on homelessness
- deploy bait cars to cut break-ins, like other big cities
- draw on other cities' best practices and create a performance-driven culture at City Hall

Join our State Legislators Scott Wiener, David Chiu & Phil Ting, MacArthur Genius Award Winner Lateefah Simon, and so many others, and Pick Nick.

Read Nick's detailed Change Agenda, and meet him, his wife, and twin toddlers at www.NickJosefowitz.com

Nick Josefowitz

CATHERINE STEFANI

My occupation is Appointed Supervisor / Attorney.

My qualifications are:

If you believe San Francisco needs strong, experienced leaders who will fight for our neighborhoods at City Hall, vote for me. As your Supervisor, you can count on me to make our streets cleaner and safer. I'm committed to attracting new businesses to our merchant corridors. And I'm dedicated to helping seniors and families thrive here.

I've spent my career making this city an even better place to raise my two kids. I have served as a prosecutor, as an aide to Supervisors Mark Farrell and Michela Alioto-Pier, as your County Clerk, and as your Supervisor. As your Supervisor, I have fought to decrease property crime, reduce street homelessness, eliminate gun violence, ease the tax burden on small businesses, and improve our parks and open space.

My priorities are straightforward:

- Make our city safer by supporting law enforcement;
- Put families, children, and seniors first in our policies;
- Find creative ways to make housing more affordable;
- Bring businesses back into our neighborhoods, and
- Ensure that your tax dollars are spent wisely.

I'm endorsed by:

Senator Dianne Feinstein

Congresswoman Nancy Pelosi

Mayor Mark Farrell

Board of Supervisors President London Breed

Former Supervisor Michela-Alioto Pier

San Francisco Police Officers Association

San Francisco Firefighters Local 798

Full list at www.SupervisorStefani.com

Catherine Stefani



Candidates for Board of Supervisors, District 4

LOU ANN BASSAN

My occupation is Attorney /Teacher.

My qualifications are:

Moved to San Francisco in 1960. Raised in Haight-Ashbury. Resident of Sunset District and homeowner since 1993 (25 years). Married to Larry (retired union electrician and SFSU engineering lecturer) since 1990. Enjoy reading, politics, policy analysis, gardening, dancing, animals.

Graduated San Francisco State University (B.A. Liberal Arts, Kindergarten-12 teaching credential, M.A. English - TESOL), and Hastings College of the Law.

Attorney for 21 years, representing both injured workers and insurance companies; volunteer pro tem judge. Small business owner (my law firm). ESL teacher. Waitress during high school and college. Worked for federal government during and after law school.

Member of Toastmasters International, Museo ItaloAmericano Board of Directors, SFSU Friends of the Library, Taraval Police Station Police Community Relations Forum. NERT certified.

As Supervisor, I will:

Put your interests first!

Bring a mature, rational, considered point of view to issues.

Encourage balanced discussion of issues concerning residents (public health and safety, crime, jobs, congestion, development, housing, education, environment, homeless, mental health, substance abuse, drugs, needles, traffic, parking, MUNI, trash dumping).

Engage with residents and community leaders to find practical and fair solutions to problems.

Tackle tough issues.

Stop repeating failed strategies and expecting different results.

Stop wasting tax dollars!

Lou Ann Bassan

JESSICA HO

My occupation is Legislative Aide.

My qualifications are:

I'm a daughter of immigrants. My grandparents immigrated to the Sunset District seeking opportunity for future generations of our family. Because of their sacrifices, I developed a strong work ethic and desire to give back.

I work in our community every day as a legislative aide to Sunset Supervisor Katy Tang and experience first-hand the challenges we all face as neighbors.

As Supervisor, my priorities will include:

Improving quality of life for all residents

Safe, clean streets and thriving merchant corridors are key to ensuring that residents feel proud to be part of the Sunset community.

Creating housing that is affordable

Too many families and working people are being pushed out of San Francisco. As Supervisor, I will fight for housing that we can afford while respecting the neighborhood.

Reducing homelessness

We must treat the root causes of homelessness and address mental illness, while providing housing and a path to stability to our homeless neighbors.

I am proud to be endorsed by Assessor-Recorder Carmen Chu, Board of Supervisors President London Breed, Supervisor Katy Tang, and the Edwin M. Lee Asian Pacific Democratic Club. I would appreciate your vote!

www.jessicaho.org

Jessica Ho



Candidates for Board of Supervisors, District 4

ADAM KIM

My occupation is Project Manager.

My qualifications are:

I love San Francisco. I moved here from Chicago ten years ago and discovered a city of love, culture, diversity, and arts. The city's wealth comes not from business deals, but from communities of talented people from all backgrounds forming the city's soul.

Big corporations came promising technological innovations, economic growth, and high-paying jobs. Unfortunately, they also contributed to skyrocketing housing costs, increased homelessness, and displaced communities. San Francisco's soul was sold to the highest bidders.

My mission is to fix the issues felt by the most vulnerable members of our society: service workers, educators, small businesses, minorities, and the homeless.

As your next Supervisor, I will:

- Keep housing affordable by incentivizing BMR housing; discouraging speculation, vacancies, and flipping
- Increase resources for educators in our public schools so our children can excel regionally as well as globally
- Expand public transportation to meet demand, holding TNC "rideshare" companies fiscally responsible for added congestion
- Incentivize locally-owned restaurants and retail spaces, stop giving free rides to large corporations
- Enable shelters to provide care and training to homeless, not just "get them off the streets"

With your support, I will work so San Francisco sets the example for the future.

www.adamkimsf.com

Adam Kim

GORDON MAR

My occupation is Nonprofit Director / Parent.

My qualifications are:

Building on my history of achievements to improve the quality of life for San Francisco's working families, I am running for District 4 Supervisor to serve the residents of the Sunset Parkside, and ensure that we have a strong and independent voice at City Hall.

My family has lived in the Sunset Parkside for 13 years, and I've lived in San Francisco for more than 25 years. As a homeowner with a child in 8th grade at Hoover, I have a personal stake in the long-term health and vitality of our neighborhoods.

As the Executive Director of Jobs with Justice, I have developed innovative public policies and led successful organizing efforts to expand access to good jobs, quality public education, affordable housing, and healthcare for working families and seniors.

As your Supervisor, I will strengthen the voice of Sunset Parkside residents in City Hall decisions that affect our neighborhoods by asking for your opinions, listening to your input, and uniting our District's communities in efforts to:

- Increase public safety
- Support small businesses and create new jobs
- Enhance pedestrian safety and reduce traffic congestion
- Improve public transit
- Green our neighborhoods

To learn more, visit www.gordonmar.com

Gordon Mar



Candidates for Board of Supervisors, District 4

TREVOR MCNEIL

My occupation is Public School Teacher.

My qualifications are:

Qualifications:

- Public school teacher
- Former board member of Inner Sunset Neighborhood Association
- Former District 4 representative of the San Francisco Pedestrian Safety Advisory Committee and current member of the San Francisco Parks, Recreation, and Open Space Advisory Committee

I love San Francisco. I loved growing up in The City, and I've made sure all three of my children have been born and raised here. I want to make sure our city is safe, affordable, and vibrant for all our children.

I've seen our neighborhood issues ignored as politicians debate more flashy topics. I've struggled to find housing, and I've had my car broken into countless times. I've faced the same issues as many Sunset residents, and I can lead change in this City.

My Goals:

Family housing - we must create more multi-bedroom units and ensure that housing is affordable to all.

Traffic and Pedestrian Safety - customer-driven approach to improving pedestrian safety, relieving traffic congestion, and enhancing our merchant corridors.

Public Safety - the Westside must no longer be an afterthought. We must respond to property crime.

Fiscal Responsibility - The city budget is now more than \$11 billion, but it takes over an hour on the N-Judah to get downtown. We must cut waste in City Hall.

I respectfully ask for your vote this November.

Trevor McNeil

MIKE MURPHY

My occupation is Educator.

My qualifications are:

As your Supervisor, I'll bring a lifetime of work experience--as a civil servant, educator, husband, and father of a son in our public school system—to the job. Being your representative in city government will be my only job. I will work for you and your family, NOT SPECIAL INTERESTS.

I will Prioritize ACCOUNTABILITY:

- Create formal District-wide councils with monthly meetings.
- Keep my office open, transparent, and RESPONSIVE.

Help Maintain our Neighborhoods (Housing and Businesses):

- Stop City Hall's sell-out of our neighborhood. In the past 6 years, 1/3 of our neighbors have left town and neighborhood businesses have shut down. Shuttered storefronts, homes sold/rented/sold again. This destabilization should end.
- Legislate a vacancy tax, a tax on out-of-town ownership, true disclosures on real estate transactions
- Do everything I can to preserve local businesses and keep neighborhoods intact.

Work to Fix our broken Transportation system:

- Put back our stolen train stops and buses.
- Protect public roads and sidewalks from overuse by ride-shares, luxury buses, electric bikes and scooters, wasteful city projects

Protect our Neighborhood

- Oppose wasteful, massive, ugly development projects that feed developer greed and wreck Neighborhood aesthetics.
- Oppose corporate marijuana dispensaries.
- Protect our Coastal Zone

Mike Murphy



Candidates for Board of Supervisors, District 4

TUAN NGUYEN

My occupation is Consultant.

My qualifications are:

My name is Tuan Nguyen, a Sunset native, and I am running for District 4 Supervisor. I look forward to meeting you throughout the campaign. I have built lasting relationships with Sunset families, small businesses, and ethnic communities the last 37 years. I am a graduate of Holy Name, SI, and SFSU.

As co-chairperson for Friends of the San Francisco Public Library Campaign, we fundraised monies to build the LEED certified Ortega Branch Library. I was elected to serve as president of local and neighborhood clubs. I have consulted and managed multiple non-profit and political campaigns.

Changes to San Francisco have threatened to impact our middle-class families. Renters can no longer afford to live in SF. We must keep our district uniquely diverse. With over 20 years of leadership, activism and community engagement experience, I pledge to lead District 4 independently devoid of the moderate v. progressive division at City Hall.

Affordable housing, public education and ensuring our district gets the resources it needs are my priorities. I am proud to be Vietnamese American and speaking up for you, the everyday people, in the Westside. I am SF. We are the Sunset. We are SF! Thank you.

www.TuanforSunset.com

Tuan Nguyen

ARTHUR TOM

My occupation is City Auditor.

My qualifications are:

As a San Francisco native, homeowner, and parent of two daughters, I am vested in keeping working families in San Francisco. It breaks my heart to see the familiar exodus of young families who face the mounting challenges of housing costs, schools, public safety and quality of life.

That is why over the years as a community leader I have worked with neighborhood groups, the police, City departments, schools, merchants, faith based organizations, businesses, and politicians to build community and improve neighborhood safety and quality of life issues.

I founded the Friends of West Sunset Playground that rebuilt an unsafe and underutilized playground into a shining beacon. As founder of a SAFE neighborhood watch group, I closed down neighborhood brothels suspected of human trafficking. As a PTA officer of my daughters' school I worked to improve San Francisco's public education.

On a citywide scale, I have served on the Taxi Commission, Immigrant Rights Commission, and Assessment Appeals Board. Serving in all these capacities was not my job; I volunteered my efforts because I feel a higher sense of purpose in public service.

I would consider it an honor and privilege to represent you and would greatly appreciate your vote!

Arthur Tom



Candidates for Board of Supervisors, District 6

MATT HANEY

My occupation is School Board Member / Attorney.

My qualifications are:

I was raised in Bay Area public schools, attended UC Berkeley, and received a Law degree from Stanford University. I've dedicated my life to serving the residents of San Francisco.

As School Board President, I've fought for housing for students and teachers, and a new school in Mission Bay. As an eviction defense attorney, I've fought to keep families in the city. As a criminal justice leader, I've fought for community policing and safe streets.

As Supervisor, I'll bring people together to make the bold changes our city desperately needs:

- Homelessness is out of control. I'll make sure our first priority is getting people off the streets, and into services and housing.
- Our housing crisis is unacceptable. I'll get past the grandstanding to build thousands of units of affordable housing.
- Our district is used as a containment zone. I'll get cops walking beats, and ensure compassionate, effective consequences for crime.
- Our sidewalks are filthy. I'll deliver daily deep cleaning and clean public restrooms.

Supporters:

United Educators of San Francisco
San Francisco Fire Fighters Local 798
California Nurses Association
San Francisco Tenants Union
Sierra Club
Tenderloin Chinese Rights Association
Tenderloin Filipino-American Community Association
South Beach District 6 Democratic Club
Harvey Milk LGBTQ Democratic Club
San Francisco Latino Democratic Club

United States Senator Kamala D. Harris
State Controller Betty Yee
Lieutenant Governor Gavin Newsom
Former State Senator Mark Leno
Board of Equalization Member Fiona Ma
State Assemblymember Phil Ting
Former State Assemblymember Tom Ammiano
CNN Commentator Van Jones
Supervisors: Malia Cohen, Sandra Lee Fewer, Jane Kim,
Hillary Ronen, Aaron Peskin, Norman Yee
San Francisco Democratic Party Chair David Campos
BART Board Directors Bevan Dufty, Lateefah Simon

www.matthaney.com

Matt Haney

CHRISTINE JOHNSON

My occupation is Housing Policy Educator.

My qualifications are:

My mom worked two nursing jobs to support the family yet we still moved every couple of years to stay ahead of rising rents. That's why I'm running for the Board of Supervisors, to make San Francisco a place where everyone can build a life.

I've spent the last fourteen years building strong communities and expanding social services in San Francisco. As a redevelopment and Planning Commissioner, I've worked – and voted – to create new diverse neighborhoods, protect small businesses and build more child-care facilities. My experience in public finance gives me a deep understanding of how to use the City budget to improve quality of life for all residents.

As a policy professional and mom of a two-year-old, I will work to make our city a place where residents can thrive from birth to old age.

As your next Supervisor, I will fight to:

- Create more affordable and accessible housing;
- Bring the homeless, those suffering from mental illness and addiction off the streets;
- Create facilities for seniors and families; and
- Help small businesses succeed.

Join Firefighters Local 798, Assemblymember David Chiu and other leaders supporting me to make San Francisco a safe, affordable place for everyone.

www.christineforsupervisor.com

Christine Johnson



Candidates for Board of Supervisors, District 6

SONJA TRAUSS

My occupation is Housing Community Organizer.

My qualifications are:

I'm Executive Director of California Renters Legal Advocacy & Education Fund, and live with my husband and son in SOMA.

District 6 is home to the core of our thriving economy, and a diverse population of residents, many of whom were born here and many who've come recently.

But over the past eight years our City Hall leadership has failed us, resulting in our neighborhoods becoming the epicenter of the most challenging issues impacting our city: homelessness, dirty and unsafe streets, and rising housing costs.

As your supervisor I'll:

- Fight to build housing citywide, not just in District 6, to house our homeless neighbors and prevent displacement.
- Establish homeless shelters where people can stay as long as needed, with access to showers and lockers for their belongings.
- Rid our sidewalks of dangerous needles by opening safe injection sites.
- Prioritize human life, not cars, by adding cross walks at every intersection, wider sidewalks, bike lanes, and bus lanes.
- Improve services and infrastructure; open schools and hire police.
- Create more parks and open space, especially for families and seniors.

I'm proud to be endorsed by Senator Scott Wiener, Assemblymember David Chiu, Board of Equalization Member Fiona Ma and Yimby Action.

www.sonja2018.org

Sonja Trauss



Candidates for Board of Supervisors, District 8

LAWRENCE "STARK" DAGESSE

My occupation is Theatrical Stage Technician.

My qualifications are:

My name is Lawrence "Stark" Dagesse, a 23-year resident of San Francisco. I work and rent in this city. I use public transit, walk or bike to get around.

I am college educated and part of the LGBTQ community

District 8 is a great community and I will work hard to keep it a safe and beautiful place that welcomes all. We must work to provide opportunities for resident's particularly affordable housing.

Education and access to public resources should be available to everybody. Art, music film, food, culture and beautiful and unique architecture are hallmarks of San Francisco and I will work to promote this vital culture within our city.

I will engage the community to find solutions to homelessness, drug addiction and crime. The heroin and methamphetamine epidemic, car break ins, bike thefts and other crimes are unacceptable.

I have the Strength, Courage and Integrity to work and fight for District 8 and San Francisco.

I will bring new blood, ideas and creative solutions to City Hall and will work hard to create a positive and progressive future.

We are District 8. We are San Francisco.
We're in this together.

I am honored to be your candidate.

Lawrence "Stark" Dagesse

RAFAEL MANDELMAN

My occupation is Member, San Francisco Board of Supervisors, District 8.

My qualifications are:

Thank you for supporting me in June. I am asking for your vote again in November.

As President of the City College Board of Trustees I steered the school through the accreditation crisis to become one of the country's first free colleges. I made common sense cuts to save the college, and I'll do the same on the Board.

As an urban development attorney I've built thousands of affordable homes throughout the Bay Area. I bring that experience to the Board and will ensure we build affordable housing to meet demand.

I'll work tirelessly to solve the homeless crisis. For me, it's personal. Mental illness led my mother into homelessness, and in my experience it takes both compassion and firmness to get sick people off the streets. As Supervisor I'll clear encampments and get mentally ill people into care-- we can't continue spending this much without better results.

I'm proud to have as supporters:

United Educators of San Francisco (San Francisco Teachers)
San Francisco Firefighters Local 798
California Nurses Association
Sierra Club
Harvey Milk LGBTQ Club
Affordable Housing Alliance

Former District 8 Supervisors:

Mark Leno
Bevan Dufty
Scott Wiener

Members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors:

Sandra Lee Fewer
Catherine Stefani
Aaron Peskin
Katy Tang
Jane Kim
Norman Yee
Hillary Ronen
Malia Cohen
Ahsha Safaí

Other Elected Officials:

Nancy Pelosi
Tom Ammiano
David Chiu
Phil Ting
Jeff Adachi
George Gascon
Vicki Hennessy

Rafael Mandelman



Candidates for Board of Supervisors, District 10

GLORIA BERRY

My occupation is United States Veteran.

My qualifications are:

United States Veteran, Thirteen years. Native, born and raised. I went to Public School, Private School and Community College San Francisco. I've been a home owner for eleven years, was homeless nine months and I am now a renter. An Activist all my life. I speak out against domestic violence, racism, sexism, criminal injustice, homelessness, police brutality, environmental issues, big banks, mistreatment of Veterans, and not hiring local contracts. I've attended countless hearings, Board meetings, protests, think tanks, police Commission, reentry council and town hall meetings.

- I want to partner with the School District and get our District 10 schools at a level competitive with the best in the nation.
- Expand existing homeless programs in the district that are doing the work and stop funding programs that are just profiting off homeless
- Build poverty level and no income housing
- More drug treatment programs
- Accountability for Police Officers that use excessive force
- Waive application fees for veterans applying to rentals
- Unity events
- Legislation for an Office of Neighborhood Safety, Richmond, CA model
- Free Health screening for Bayview residents effected by toxins from the Naval shipyard
- Sea rise protection
- Partner with Tech companies and Golden State Warriors to invest in District 10
- Serve the Community and be held accountable
- Promote and Support small businesses

WWW.BerrySmart2018.com

Gloria Berry

ASALE CHANDLER

My occupation is Mother / Grandmother.

My qualifications are:

My name is Asale Chandler and I am running for the Board of Supervisor of District 10 of San Francisco, Ca. I have served in the field of social justice and humanitarian work for 29 yrs of San Francisco, 16 yrs in Bayview hunter point and district 10 I am a mother of 2 and a grandmother of 2 3 - 6 yrs of age.

I am very aware of the issues that plague us as a whole. San Francisco is a beautiful city yet we all know something is amiss. We are all aware of the housing crisis, education failures in the disenfranchised communitas, mass in carceration, lack of a descent living, police accoubl racist profile, wage jobs for San Francisco, heath care, enviromental issues, and neighborhood blight, over-population and parkg concerns. Burglarizg, car theif, homicides unsolved homicides, domestic violence, single parents homes, drug usage and overdosing, depression and mental illness, etc. I have seen it all it and overcame them all. I rased two children one boy 1 girl as a single mother in San Francisco, Ca There is nothing new under the sun!!!!

My platform is simple

Two words

Common Grond.

Asale Chandler
4 Supervisor Dist 10
San Francisco, CA
Asale@Asale4Supervisor

Asale Chandler



Candidates for Board of Supervisors, District 10

THEO ELLINGTON

My occupation is Human Rights Commissioner.

My qualifications are:

As our city grows, too many people in our hometown are getting left behind.

I'm running for Supervisor to make sure every family—not just the wealthy—can afford to live in our city.

For the past decade, I've served and advocated for you.

As the Director of Public Affairs for the Golden State Warriors, I held arena developers accountable to the neighborhood. Because of us, residents will enjoy better transit, good-paying jobs, and increased tax revenue for city services. It's about more than basketball—we are laying the foundation for a better neighborhood.

While Commissioner for the City's Office of Community Investment & Infrastructure I focused on funding affordable housing and overseeing neighborhood development projects.

As Human Rights Commissioner, I fight against injustice and defend anti-discrimination policies for the most vulnerable in our community.

As a volunteer, I help neighbors in need. I serve on the boards of the Chinatown Development Center, the Bayview Opera House, and Economic Development on Third.

Together, we will fight for:

- Affordable housing
- Solving homelessness
- Clean and safe streets

I am proud to be endorsed by:

State Board of Equalization member Fiona Ma
Board of Supervisors: London Breed, Malia Cohen
San Francisco Firefighters Local 798
Operating Engineers Local 3
Keith Goldstein, Potrero Hill Boosters*
Bruce Huie, Dogpatch Neighborhood Association*
April Spears, Bayview Merchants of Butchertown*
Jenny Mai, Visitacion Valley Neighborhood Association*

*names for identification purposes

For a full list: Theo2018.com.

I would be honored to earn your vote.

Theo Ellington

TONY KELLY

My occupation is Artist / Art Director.

My qualifications are:

For fifteen years I've been a neighborhood advocate for saving schools, preserving and creating affordable housing, cleaning up toxic dirt and pollution, and turning vacant lots into parks.

In District 10, too many of our neighbors are on the streets, evicted, unemployed, working multiple jobs, or feeling unsafe in our neighborhoods. We all know friends who have been forced out of San Francisco. If we don't change City Hall's policies that have failed residents for the last 10 years, a lot of us – families, workers, artists, tenants, immigrants – will be forced out too.

I will work at City Hall to keep you and your family here in San Francisco – to listen, to be accountable, to help, to make sure that City Hall works for you. And I'll have Neighborhood Office Hours in District 10 every single day of the year, so you'll always be able to reach me.

A better San Francisco is possible. Let's work to heal, preserve, and grow our community.

Endorsers:

Supervisor Jane Kim

Sierra Club

California Nurses Association (#1)

San Francisco Berniecrats

DSA-SF

Marie Harrison, Bayview environmental justice advocate

Michelle Pierce, Bayview Hunters Point Community Advocates*

*Title for identification purposes only

More at www.tonykellysupervisor.com

I humbly ask for your vote.

Tony Kelly



Candidates for Board of Supervisors, District 10

UZURI PEASE-GREENE

My occupation is Community Builder.

My qualifications are:

I live in Potrero Hill public housing. As a community leader, I advocate for people who often get left out and work to improve my neighborhood every day. We need new resources and opportunities for people in the community. Building real relationships between neighbors, businesses, and City Hall is what is needed to make this happen together.

I know the struggles that many face.

I was homeless for years, sleeping on the sidewalk in a cardboard box, in doorways, and cars. I struggled with addiction. Public housing gave me a chance to change my life and rebuild my future.

I have been clean and sober for nine years.

I got my GED, graduated college, and now I am finishing up a Master's program in Public Administration. I work full-time as a Community Builder for an affordable housing developer and am active in community policing efforts. I helped start a nonprofit in Potrero Hill public housing to strengthen the community and let people flower.

Public housing gave me a chance to rebuild my life. I have worked hard to become a leader in my community and create pathways and opportunities for others. I can be the leader that District 10 needs.

Uzuri Pease-Greene

SHAMANN WALTON

My occupation is San Francisco Board of Education Commissioner / Non-Profit Executive Director.

My qualifications are:

I'm a San Francisco native; our City is changing dramatically. I grew up in public housing, knowing how difficult it is to face eviction because you can't afford rent or what it's like to lose a childhood friend to gun violence. In our rapidly growing City, we must not give up the fight for those who need our help most.

I've dedicated my life to bringing jobs to our community, addressing homelessness, and making our streets safer.

As a San Francisco Board of Education member, I've fought to close the achievement gap, increase teacher pay, and build housing for educators. As Executive Director of Young Community Developers, I placed thousands of district residents into living-wage jobs, built 100% affordable housing units, helped create new community-policing practices, and will be staffing the new Navigation Center in our district for our homeless community.

As Supervisor, I will continue to combat homelessness and housing affordability, improve our public schools, and keep our neighborhoods safe.

My supporters include:

- United Educators of San Francisco
- California Nurses Association (#2)
- SEIU Local 1021
- San Francisco Firefighters Local 798
- Lieutenant Governor Gavin Newsom
- Assemblymembers: David Chiu, Phil Ting
- Democratic County Central Committee Chair David Campos
- Public Defender Jeff Adachi
- Assessor/Recorder Carmen Chu
- San Francisco Supervisors: Sandra Lee Fewer, Aaron Peskin, London Breed, Norman Yee, Hillary Ronen, Malia Cohen, Ahsha Safai
- Former Supervisor Sophie Maxwell
- San Francisco Board of Education: Hydra Mendoza-McDonnell, Mark Sanchez, Stevon Cook, Matt Haney, Emily Murase, Rachel Norton
- City College Trustees: Thea Shelby, Brigitte Davila, Alex Randolph, Rafael Mandelman, Shanell Williams

www.shamannwalton.com

Shamann Walton



Local Ballot Measure and Argument Information

Digest and Argument Pages, Legal Text

This pamphlet includes the following information for each local ballot measure:

- An impartial summary, or digest, prepared by the Ballot Simplification Committee
- A statement by the City Controller about the fiscal impact or cost of each measure
- A statement of how the measure qualified to be on the ballot
- Arguments in favor of and against each measure
- The legal text for all local ballot measures begins on page 104.

Proponent's and Opponent's Arguments

For each measure, one argument in favor of the measure (proponent's argument) and one argument against the measure (opponent's argument) are printed in the Voter Information Pamphlet free of charge.

The designations "proponent's argument" and "opponent's argument" indicate only that the arguments were selected according to the criteria below (*San Francisco Municipal Elections Code, Section 545*) and printed free of charge.

Selection of Proponent's and Opponent's Arguments

The proponent's argument and the opponent's argument are selected according to the following priorities:

Proponent's Argument	Opponent's Argument
1 The official proponent of an initiative petition; or the Mayor, the Board of Supervisors, or four or more members of the Board, if the measure was submitted by same.	1 In the case of a referendum, the person who files the referendum petition with the Board of Supervisors.
2 The Board of Supervisors, or any member or members designated by the Board.	2 The Board of Supervisors, or any member or members designated by the Board.
3 The Mayor.	3 The Mayor.
4 Any association of citizens, combination of voters and association of citizens, or any individual voter.	4 Any association of citizens, combination of voters and association of citizens, or any individual voter.

Rebuttal Arguments

The author of a proponent's argument or an opponent's argument may also prepare and submit a rebuttal argument, or response, to be printed free of charge. Rebuttal arguments are printed below the corresponding proponent's argument and opponent's argument.



All arguments are strictly the opinions of their authors. Arguments are printed as submitted, including any typographical, spelling, or grammatical errors. They are not checked for accuracy by the Director of Elections nor any other City agency, official, or employee.

Paid Arguments

In addition to the proponents' arguments, opponents' arguments, and rebuttals, which are printed without charge, any eligible voter, group of voters, or association may submit paid arguments.

Paid arguments are printed on the pages following the proponent's and opponent's arguments and rebuttals. All of the paid arguments in favor of a measure are printed together, followed by the paid arguments opposed to that measure. Paid arguments for each measure are printed in order of submission.



An Overview of San Francisco's Debt

What Is Bond Financing?

Bond financing is a type of long-term borrowing used to raise money for projects [to be paid for upfront and paid back to investors over a longer period of time]. The City receives money by selling bonds to investors. The City must pay back the amount borrowed plus interest to those investors. The money raised from bond sales is used to pay for large capital projects such as fire and police stations, affordable housing programs, hospitals, libraries, parks, and other city facilities. The City uses bond financing because these capital projects will last many years, and should be paid for over time by the residents of San Francisco who will also benefit over time from the improvements associated with these projects. Additionally, the large dollar costs of these projects are difficult to pay for all at once.

Types of Bonds. There are two major types of bonds — General Obligation and Revenue.

General Obligation Bonds are used to pay for projects that benefit citizens but do not raise revenue (for example, police stations or parks are not set up to pay for themselves). When general obligation bonds are approved and sold, they are repaid by property taxes. General obligation bonds to be issued by the City must be approved by two-thirds of the voters.

Revenue Bonds are used to pay for projects such as major improvements to an airport, water system, garage or other large facilities which generate revenue. When revenue bonds are approved and sold, they are generally repaid from revenues generated by the bond-financed projects, for example usage fees or parking fees. The City's revenue bonds must be approved by a majority vote. There is no revenue bond on this ballot.

What Does It Cost to Borrow?

The City's cost to borrow money depends on the total dollar amount borrowed, the interest rate on the borrowed amount, and the number of years over which the debt will be repaid. City borrowings are typically repaid over a period of 20 to 30 years.

Assuming an average interest rate of 6%, the cost of paying off debt over 20 years is about \$1.74 for each dollar borrowed — \$1 for the amount borrowed and 74 cents for the interest. These payments, however, are spread over the 20-year period. Therefore inflation reduces the effective cost of borrowing because the future payments are made with cheaper dollars. Assuming a 4% annual inflation rate, the cost of paying off debt in today's dollars would be about \$1.18 for every \$1 borrowed.

The City's Current Debt Situation

Debt Payments. During fiscal year 2018–2019 property tax payers in the City will pay approximately \$459 million of principal and interest on outstanding bonds of the City and the other issuers of general obligation bond debt (these are the San Francisco Community College District, San Francisco Unified School District and Bay Area Rapid Transit District). The net property tax rate for the year to provide for debt and special funds debt requirements, pending Board of Supervisors approval, is estimated to be 16.30 cents per \$100 of assessed valuation, or \$967 on a home assessed at \$600,000, reflecting a \$7,000 homeowner's exemption.

Legal Debt Limit. The City Charter imposes a limit on the amount of general obligation bonds the City can have outstanding at any given time. That limit is 3% of the assessed value of taxable property in the City — or currently about \$7.78 billion. Voters give the City *authorization* to issue bonds. Those bonds that have been issued and not yet repaid are considered to be *outstanding*. As of August 1, 2018, there was \$2.48 billion in outstanding general obligation bonds, which is equal to 0.96% of the assessed value of taxable property. There is an additional \$742 million in bonds that are *authorized but unissued*. If these bonds were issued and outstanding, the total debt burden would be 1.24% of the assessed value of taxable property. Bonds issued by the San Francisco Community College District, San Francisco Unified School District, and Bay Area Rapid Transit District (BART) do not increase the City's debt burden for the purposes of the Charter limit, however they are repaid by property taxes



(see Prudent Debt Management below). Part of the City's current debt management policy is to keep the property tax rate from City general obligation bonds below the 2006 rate by issuing new bonds as older ones are retired and the tax base grows, though the overall property tax rate may vary based on other factors. This policy applies to the bonds of the City and County, but not those of other governments, such as the San Francisco Unified School District, San Francisco City College District, or BART.

Prudent Debt Management. Even though the City is well within its legal debt limit in issuing general obligation bonds, there are other debt comparisons used by bond rating agencies when they view the City's financial health. These agencies look at many types of local and regional debt that are dependent on the City's tax base including our general obligation bonds, lease revenue bonds, certificates of participation, special assessment bonds, BART, and school and community college district bonds. The "direct debt ratio" which includes direct debt and other long-term obligations and excludes special assessment bonds, BART, and school and community college district bonds, is equal to 1.49% of the assessed value of taxable property. This direct debt ratio is considered by the bond rating agencies to be a "moderate" debt burden relative to the size of San Francisco's property tax base. **While this ratio is within the comparable benchmarks, the City needs to continue to set priorities for future debt issuances to maintain good credit ratings, which are a sign of good financial health.**

Citizen Oversight of General Obligation Bonds

Voters must approve the purpose and amount of the money to be borrowed through bonds. Bond money may be spent only for the purposes approved by the voters.

For general obligation bonds issued by the City and County of San Francisco, the Citizens' General Obligation Bond Oversight Committee reviews and reports on how bond money is spent. The nine members of the Committee are appointed by the Mayor, Board of Supervisors, Controller, and Civil Grand Jury. If the Committee finds that bond money has been spent for purposes not approved

by the voters, the Committee can require corrective action and prohibit the sale of any authorized but unissued bonds until such action is taken. The Board of Supervisors can reverse the decisions of the committee by a two-thirds vote. The Controller may audit any of the City's bond expenditures.

Prepared by *Ben Rosenfield*, Controller



Words You Need to Know

by the Ballot Simplification Committee

Advisory committee (Proposition C): A group of appointed individuals who generally make recommendations to City boards, commissions and departments.

Amend (Proposition B): To change.

Base tax (Proposition E): The tax at the rate of 8 percent on the rental of hotel rooms in San Francisco.

Bond (Proposition A): A bond is a promise by The City to pay back money borrowed, plus interest, by a specific date. If The City needs to raise a large amount of money to pay for a library, sewer line, school, hospital or other project or program, it may borrow the money by selling bonds. (See also "General Obligation Bond.")

Cannabis business activities (Proposition D): Any business activities directly related to Cannabis or Cannabis Products, including but not limited to the cultivation, possession, manufacture, processing, storing, labeling, distribution, or sale of Cannabis or Cannabis Products for consideration. "Cannabis Business Activities" does not include: (a) business activities indirectly related to Cannabis or Cannabis Products, including the sale of items that do not themselves contain Cannabis or Cannabis Products; (b) laboratory testing; and (c) transportation of Cannabis or Cannabis Products where the person transporting Cannabis or Cannabis Products never takes title to or sells Cannabis or Cannabis Products.

Cannabis, medicinal (Proposition D): Cannabis or a Cannabis Product, respectively, for use under the Compassionate Use Act of 1996 (Proposition 215) by a medicinal cannabis patient in California who possesses a physician's recommendation.

Cannabis, adult use (Proposition D): Any Cannabis or Cannabis Product other than medicinal cannabis.

Capital project (Proposition A): A project initiated by one-time funding to improve The City's infrastructure.

Charter (Proposition B): The City's Constitution.

Charter amendment (Proposition B): A change to The City's Charter. The Charter is The City's Constitution. The Charter can only be changed by a majority of the votes cast.

Citizens' General Obligation Bond Oversight Committee (Proposition A): A nine-member body that monitors The City's use of funds generated by issuing general obligation bonds. Members of this committee are appointed by the Mayor, the Board of Supervisors, the Controller and the Civil Grand Jury.

Cultural Equity Endowment (Proposition E): A City fund dedicated to achieving cultural equity through arts programs that are deeply rooted in, and able to express the experiences of, historically underserved communities, to be distributed through a public process.

Cultural services allocation plan (Proposition E): A plan enacted by the Arts Commission and the City Administrator every five years to determine use of funds in the Arts Impact Endowment, according to a community needs assessment.

Early voting: Voting in person at City Hall before Election Day or mailing a vote-by-mail ballot before Election Day.

Fiscal year (Propositions C, E): The City's 12-month budget period, starting July 1 and ending June 30 of the following calendar year.

General Fund (Propositions D, E): That part of The City's annual budget that can be used for any City purpose. Each year, the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors decide how the General Fund will be used. Money for the General Fund comes from property, business, sales, and other taxes and fees.

General obligation bond (Proposition A): A promise issued by a government body to pay back money borrowed, plus interest, by a certain date. The government body repays the money, plus interest, with property taxes. General obligation bond measures must be approved by the voters in San Francisco.

Gross receipts tax (Propositions C, D): A tax generally based on the total gross revenues a business receives in San Francisco.

Tax surcharge (Proposition E): The additional tax at the rate of 6 percent on the rental of hotel rooms in San Francisco.



Housing, permanent (Proposition C): Housing that is not subject to limits on the duration of occupancy, including (1) private housing funded by rental subsidies, (2) supportive housing funded by rental subsidies and (3) single-room occupancy buildings and units.

Housing, short-term (Proposition C): Housing that is subject to limits on the duration of occupancy.

Initiative (Proposition C): A proposition placed on the ballot by voters. Any voter may place an initiative on the ballot by gathering the required number of signatures of registered voters on a petition.

Interest (Proposition A): The cost of borrowing money.

Ordinance (Propositions C–E): A local law passed by the Board of Supervisors or by the voters.

Oversight (Proposition A): Monitoring activities to ensure that the purposes of a program are followed.

Pass through (Proposition A): To recover an increase in property taxes by passing on a portion of the cost to tenants.

Personal information (Proposition B): Any information that relates to a particular individual, including medical information, information about the individual's background and employment, financial information, demographic information and information that could be used to identify the individual or reveal the individual's location.

Principal (Proposition A): The amount of borrowed money. Principal does not include interest charges.

Property tax (Proposition A): A tax assessed by The City on buildings and land.

Proposition (Propositions A–E): Any measure that is submitted to the voters for approval or disapproval.

Provisional ballot (Frequently asked questions): A ballot cast at a polling place that will not be counted until the Department of Elections verifies the voter's eligibility to cast that ballot.

Qualified write-in candidate: A person who has completed the required paperwork and signatures for inclusion as a write-in candidate. Although the name of this person will not appear on the ballot, voters can vote for this person by writing the name of the person in the space on the ballot provided for write-in votes

and following specific ballot instructions. The Department of Elections counts write-in votes only for qualified write-in candidates.

Revenue (Propositions A, C–E): Income.

Unique cultural heritage (Proposition E): The distinct aspects of a neighborhood or community that contribute to its significance. Qualities that contribute to a neighborhood's or community's unique cultural heritage include its enterprises, arts, services and businesses.

Vote-by-mail ballots: Ballots mailed to voters or given to voters in person at the Department of Elections. Vote-by-mail ballots can be mailed to the Department of Elections, turned in at the Department of Elections office in City Hall, or turned in at any California polling place on Election Day. Also known as absentee ballots.



A

Embarcadero Seawall Earthquake Safety Bond

SAN FRANCISCO SEAWALL EARTHQUAKE SAFETY BOND, 2018. To protect the waterfront, BART and Muni, buildings, historic piers, and roads from earthquakes, flooding and rising seas by: repairing the 100 year old Embarcadero Seawall; strengthening the Embarcadero; and fortifying transit infrastructure and utilities serving residents and businesses; shall the city issue \$425,000,000 in bonds, with a duration up to 30 years from the time of issuance, an estimated tax rate of \$0.013/\$100 of assessed property value, and estimated annual revenues of up to \$40,000,000, with citizen oversight and regular audits? The City's current debt management policy is to keep the property tax rate from City general obligation bonds below the 2006 rate by issuing new bonds as older ones are retired and the tax base grows, though the overall property tax rate may vary based on other factors.

YES ← 
NO ← 

Digest by the Ballot Simplification Committee

The Way It Is Now: The 100-year-old Embarcadero seawall is the foundation of approximately 3 miles of San Francisco's northeastern waterfront. The seawall supports Muni, BART, and power and water utilities. The seawall no longer adequately protects The City from tides, floods and rising sea levels. The seawall is also not protected from earthquake damage.

Through the Port of San Francisco, The City is responsible for maintaining the seawall. The City plans to modernize, upgrade and repair the seawall over the next 30 years. The Port's recommended plan is estimated to cost up to \$5 billion, and The City seeks to finance the first phase.

To pay for large capital projects, The City relies on several funding sources, including borrowing money by selling general obligation bonds. The City uses property tax revenues to pay the principal and interest on these bonds.

The Proposal: Proposition A would authorize The City to borrow up to \$425 million by issuing general obligation bonds to modernize, repair and upgrade the Embarcadero seawall. The Citizens' General Obligation Bond Oversight Committee would review the spending of general obligation bond revenue proceeds.

The City will conduct a public process to determine the specific projects to modernize, repair and upgrade

the seawall. The bond will fund ongoing design and construction improvements that address the most significant earthquake and flood risks to the seawall.

Proposition A would allow an increase in the property tax to pay for the bonds, if needed. It is City policy to limit the amount of money it borrows by issuing new bonds only as prior bonds are paid off. Landlords would be permitted to pass through up to 50 percent of any resulting property tax increase to tenants.

A "YES" Vote Means: If you vote "yes," you want The City to issue up to \$425 million in bonds to modernize, repair and upgrade the Embarcadero seawall.

A "NO" Vote Means: If you vote "no," you do not want The City to issue these bonds.

Controller's Statement on "A"

City Controller Ben Rosenfield has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition A:

Should the proposed \$425 million in bonds be authorized and sold under current assumptions, the approximate costs will be as follows:

- a) In fiscal year (FY) 2019–2020, following issuance of the first series of bonds, and the year with the lowest tax rate, the best estimate of the tax required to fund this bond issue would result in a property tax rate of \$0.00181 per \$100 (\$1.81 per \$100,000) of assessed valuation.

This measure requires 66⅔%+1 affirmative votes to pass.

The above statement is an impartial analysis of this measure. Arguments for and against this measure immediately follow. The full text begins on page 104. Some of the words used in the ballot digest are explained starting on page 58.



- b) In FY 2024–2025, following issuance of the last series of bonds, and the year with the highest tax rate, the best estimate of the tax required to fund this bond issue would result in a property tax rate of \$0.0117 per \$100 (\$11.70 per \$100,000) of assessed valuation.
- c) The best estimate of the average tax rate for these bonds from FY 2019–2020 through FY 2042–2043 is \$0.00767 per \$100 (\$7.67 per \$100,000) of assessed valuation.
- d) Based on these estimates, the highest estimated annual property tax cost for these bonds for the owner of a home with an assessed value of \$600,000 would be approximately \$69.39.

These estimates are based on projections only, which are not binding upon the City. Projections and estimates may vary due to the timing of bond sales, the amount of bonds sold at each sale, and actual assessed valuation over the term of repayment of the bonds. Hence, the actual tax rate and the years in which such rates are applicable may vary from those estimated above. The City's current debt management policy is to issue new general obligation bonds only as old ones are retired, keeping the property tax impact from general obligation bonds approximately the same over time.

How "A" Got on the Ballot

On June 26, 2018, the Board of Supervisors voted 11 to 0 to place Proposition A on the ballot. The Supervisors voted as follows:

Yes: Breed, Cohen, Fewer, Kim, Peskin, Ronen, Safai, Sheehy, Stefani, Tang, Yee.

No: None.

This measure requires 66⅔%+1 affirmative votes to pass.

The above statement is an impartial analysis of this measure. Arguments for and against this measure immediately follow. The full text begins on page 104. Some of the words used in the ballot digest are explained starting on page 58.



Proponent's Argument in Favor of Proposition A

A Stronger Seawall for a Safer San Francisco. Please Vote YES on A.

San Francisco's 100-year-old Seawall is the foundation of our waterfront. Constructed before engineers built infrastructure to survive earthquakes, it stretches three miles under the Embarcadero from Fisherman's Wharf to AT&T Park.

Over the years, it has settled, cracked and eroded. Today, the Seawall is at-risk to earthquakes, disasters and increased flooding due to sea level rise.

Proposition A is the first step to strengthen the Seawall:

- **Protect against earthquakes and disasters.** There is a 72% chance that a major earthquake will strike San Francisco in the next 30 years. When it hits, our current Seawall is likely to fail unless we take action.
- **Prevent flooding of downtown and MUNI/BART tunnels.** A major storm event (a 500 year storm) could flood the BART and MUNI tunnels today, paralyzing regional transit.
- **Safeguard emergency water supply and evacuation routes.** We need the Embarcadero in a disaster to allow evacuation of hundreds of thousands of people and land critical emergency supplies.

- **Prepare for sea level rise due to climate change.** Climate change is predicted to increase water levels as much as 6 feet by the end of this century. Without action, daily high tides will overtop the Seawall and coastal flood risk will extend into most of Downtown before century's end.

The City carefully manages its bond program so that Proposition A will NOT increase property tax rates. There will be independent citizen oversight of spending and regular financial audits.

To keep San Francisco safe, please join us and vote YES on A.

*Mayor London Breed
Supervisor Aaron Peskin
Assessor-Recorder Carmen Chu
Port Commissioner Doreen Woo Ho*
Fire Chief Joanne Hayes-White*
Fire Commission President Ken Cleaveland*
San Francisco Firefighters Union Local 798
San Francisco Police Chief William Scott*
Sheriff Vicki L. Hennessy*

*For identification purposes only; author is signing as an individual and not on behalf of an organization.

Rebuttal to Proponent's Argument in Favor of Proposition A

If the Embarcadero baywall has been settling, cracking and eroding for decades as Prop. A proponents claim, **the Port Commission should have started budgeting for repairs decades ago.**

But no – **they 'd rather spend taxpayers' money on 6-figure salaries and benefits for Port officials, and stick the public with the bill** for a revamped "Wall on the Waterfront".

Estimates of sea level rise advanced by Prop. A proponents are likely inflated. They predict an increase of "as much as 6 feet" by the year 2100. But a **study published by the U.S. Geological Survey** in 2006 (<https://pubs.er.usgs.gov/publication/70157139>) **contained a more sober estimate:** "Relative to sea levels in 2000, by the 2070–2099 period, sea level rise projections range from 11–54 centimeters" at the low end, to "17–72 centimeters for the highest" amount of increase – i.e. **just over 2 feet of increase at most by 2100.**

If some bay water were to spill over the wall and into BART/Muni tunnels, as proponents claim "could" happen in a once-every-500-years storm, **it would be far cheaper to simply pump the water out if and when that does happen, than spend billions on a wall** which could make little difference and which could be much cheaper to repair in a few years with new construction technology.

Incurring massive debt on the basis of dubious predictions will hurt San Francisco residents now, with higher rents and higher property taxes.

It's a bad idea. Vote NO on Proposition A.

*Libertarian Party of San Francisco
www.LPSF.org*



Opponent's Argument Against Proposition A

Proposition A attempts to make San Francisco property owners and renters pay for the Port Commission's failure to maintain bayshore infrastructure.

"Seawall" is misleading – it's actually a wall along the bay. The ballot description falsely implies that this waterfront promenade and the rocks and earth underlying it somehow protect **the entire city** from high tides and flooding. That is nonsense. Only properties along that section of the waterfront would be affected, **not** the whole downtown area let alone all of San Francisco.

If businesses leasing waterfront property from the Port Commission want those properties to be better protected against baywater spillover, they can pay for it themselves.

Perhaps officials like the Port Director, **who received over \$340,000 in salary and benefits in 2015**, could contribute some of their compensation.

But politicians prefer to soak taxpayers (a few hundred million dollars now, lest we reject a higher demand) for a project they say will ultimately cost **up to \$5 billion – a number which probably lowballs what they**

really want to spend, as a former mayor admitted in a July 2013 Chronicle column:

"News that the Transbay Terminal is something like \$300 million over budget should not come as a shock to anyone. We always knew the initial estimate was way under the real cost. Just like we never had a real cost for the Central Subway or the Bay Bridge... In the world of civic projects, the first budget is really just a down payment. If people knew the real cost from the start, nothing would ever be approved. The idea is to get going. Start digging a hole and make it so big, there's no alternative to coming up with the money to fill it in."

Don't reward deception and waste. Vote No on Proposition A.

Libertarian Party of San Francisco

www.LPSForg

Rebuttal to Opponent's Argument Against Proposition A

San Francisco's Seawall is a critical safeguard for our entire city. Keep us safe by voting Yes on A.

- **Yes on A protects us against earthquakes and disasters.** A major earthquake could cause our 100-year-old Seawall to fail, impacting hundreds of thousands of residents and causing billions of dollars in damage.
- **Yes on A prevents flooding of downtown and MUNI/BART tunnels.** Even today, a major storm event could flood the BART and MUNI tunnels, endangering lives and paralyzing regional transit.
- **Yes on A safeguards emergency supply and evacuation routes.** We need the Embarcadero in a disaster to allow evacuation of hundreds of thousands of people and land critical emergency supplies.
- **Yes on A prepares San Francisco for sea level rise due to climate change.** Fixing our Seawall is a critical step that must be taken to prepare for water levels to increase as much as 6 feet by the end of the century.

- **Yes on A does NOT raise property tax rates.** The City carefully manages its bond program so that Proposition A will NOT increase property tax rates. There will be independent citizen oversight of spending and regular financial audits.

To keep San Francisco safe, please join us and vote YES on A.

*Mayor London Breed
Supervisor Aaron Peskin
Assessor-Recorder Carmen Chu
Port Commissioner Doreen Woo Ho*
Fire Chief Joanne Hayes-White*
Fire Commission President Ken Cleaveland*
San Francisco Firefighters Union Local 798
San Francisco Police Chief William Scott**

*For identification purposes only; author is signing as an individual and not on behalf of an organization.



Paid Argument IN FAVOR of Proposition A

City Leaders All Agree, Vote Yes On Proposition A

As members of State and local government, we often disagree on issues. But we ALL AGREE that Proposition A is the critical first step in the plan to strengthen our Seawall and make our city safer.

Our Seawall was built over 100 years ago, and is in dire need of strengthening to modern seismic standards that can withstand what geologists predict will be a massive earthquake within the next 30 years. It is extremely important that we begin the work to strengthen our seawall now.

- **The Seawall is critical to the City's network of emergency response.** In the event of a major earthquake the Embarcadero and waterfront must be safe and available for emergency response and evacuation.
- **The Seawall is key to our regional transportation network,** with BART, Muni, ships and ferries all dependent on a strong, seismically safe Seawall.
- **The Seawall supports and protects key utility infrastructure and water supplies.**
- More than **\$24 billion in economic activity is at risk** from failure of the Seawall due to an earthquake and sea level rise.

Proposition A funds the essential infrastructure work needed to protect our city without raising our taxes.

Please join us in voting YES on A. A Stronger Seawall for a Safer San Francisco.

State Senator Scott Wiener
Assemblymember David Chiu
Assemblymember Phil Ting
Board of Supervisors President Malia Cohen
Supervisor Sandra Fewer
Supervisor Catherine Stefani
Supervisor Aaron Peskin
Supervisor Katy Tang
Supervisor Vallie Brown
Supervisor Jane Kim
Supervisor Norman Yee
Supervisor Rafael Mandelman
Supervisor Hillary Ronen
Supervisor Ahsha Safai
State Senator (ret.) Mark Leno
Former State Assemblymember Tom Ammiano
Former Mayor Art Agnos

The true source(s) of funds for the printing fee of this argument: Kilroy Realty, L.P., Airbnb, Inc. Facebook, Inc.

Paid Argument IN FAVOR of Proposition A

Waterfront leaders urge you to vote YES on A

Delancey Street and the San Francisco Giants have been on the waterfront for decades. We have been proud to contribute to the renaissance of this beautiful area and to work with the Port as it works to restore, protect and improve it.

We both strongly support Proposition A because it is critical to the future of our waterfront and our city. It safeguards San Francisco against earthquakes, flooding and sea level rise. It is a thoughtful, carefully crafted measure that will dedicate resources effectively and not raise property tax rates.

We know firsthand that the Port of San Francisco has a demonstrated ability to manage large projects effectively. We ask you to join with us as we support Prop A, one of the most critical waterfront projects in the history of San Francisco.

Larry Baer, CEO, San Francisco Giants, Campaign Co-Chair, Proposition A
Mimi Silbert, Chief Executive Officer, Delancey Street

The true source(s) of funds for the printing fee of this argument: Kilroy Realty L.P., Airbnb, Inc. Facebook, Inc.

Paid Argument IN FAVOR of Proposition A

Strengthen our Seawall for earthquakes and disasters. Yes on A.

Our 100-year-old Seawall has a critical role to play in safeguarding San Francisco from earthquakes and disasters. If it is not strengthened, it could collapse in an earthquake. This would cause irreparable harm to the immediate area, and could lead to flooding of vast parts of downtown, including the flooding of BART and MUNI tunnels which would paralyze regional transit. It would also make it impossible for the city to receive emergency supplies on the Embarcadero, or to conduct necessary evacuations from the Embarcadero.

As leaders charged with keeping San Franciscans safe, we urge you to vote Yes on Prop A – a vital safeguard to prepare our city for disaster.

San Francisco Firefighters Union Local 798
*San Francisco Police Chief William Scott**
*Doreen Woo Ho, Port Commissioner**
Vicki L Hennessy, Sheriff

*For identification purposes only; author is signing as an individual and not on behalf of an organization.



The true source(s) of funds for the printing fee of this argument: Kilroy Realty, L.P., Airbnb, Inc. Facebook, Inc.

Paid Argument IN FAVOR of Proposition A

Prop A Is The Fiscally Responsible Solution to Strengthen Our Seawall

Our Seawall is the foundation of our northeastern waterfront, but is over 100 years old. Now is the time to invest in its rebuilding before disaster strikes when the next large earthquake occurs.

Proposition A is the fiscally responsible way to rebuild our crumbling infrastructure. It is City policy to limit the amount of money it borrows by issuing new bonds only as prior bonds are paid off. That means no new taxes for residents while making a critical investment in protecting lives, safeguarding emergency evacuation routes, and protecting \$24 billion in economic activity that is at risk from failure of the seawall due to an earthquake and sea level rise.

Voting Yes on Prop A is the responsible fiscal choice.

SPUR

San Francisco Chamber of Commerce and our 2,500 local businesses.

The true source(s) of funds for the printing fee of this argument: Kilroy Realty, L.P., Airbnb, Inc. Facebook, Inc.

Paid Argument IN FAVOR of Proposition A

Help San Francisco prepare for sea level rise by voting Yes on A

Adapting to sea level rise is no longer something that might happen in the future. Sea level rise is happening NOW, and we expect between 12" and 66" of sea level rise before the year 2100. The next King Tide on December 22nd and 23rd of this year will flood the Embarcadero and force it to close. BART and Muni also would be inundated now from an extreme rain-storm at high tide. Proposition A will allow the City to address sea level rise NOW.

We need Proposition A to defend our city from sea level rise today. Please vote YES on A!

Save the Bay

Sierra Club

San Francisco League of Conservation Voters

The true source(s) of funds for the printing fee of this argument: Kilroy Realty, L.P. Airbnb, Inc. Facebook, Inc.

Paid Argument IN FAVOR of Proposition A

Asian American leaders support a stronger Seawall to protect San Francisco from Earthquakes and Disasters. Yes on A.

San Francisco is in dire need of upgrading our Seawall. This Bond will make the necessary investments to protect our communities from the real possibility of a large earthquake. We need to strengthen the Embarcadero and protect the waterfront from the expected 12" to 66" of expected sea level rise in the next several decades.

San Franciscans who live far away from the Embarcadero will also benefit from Prop A. Prop A protects MUNI and BART tunnels from flooding that would paralyze local transit. If you wait until disaster strikes, it is estimated that the post-disaster costs of repairing the Embarcadero, MUNI and BART tunnels, and the loss of economic activity would be four times as expensive as fixing it now.

Please Vote Yes on Proposition A.

Assembly Member David Chiu

Assembly Member Phil Ting

Assessor-Recorder Carmen Chu

Supervisor Sandra Lee Fewer

Supervisor Katy Tang

Supervisor Jane Kim

Supervisor Norman Yee

*Mary Jung, Former Chair San Francisco Democratic Party**

*For identification purposes only; author is signing as an individual and not on behalf of an organization.

The true source(s) of funds for the printing fee of this argument: Kilroy Realty, L.P. Airbnb, Inc. Facebook, Inc.

Paid Argument IN FAVOR of Proposition A

Tenant and Affordable Housing Advocates endorse Yes on A

If an earthquake hits San Francisco, none of us will be immune. That's why all of us must be prepared – and why we strongly support Proposition A. By strengthening our Seawall, Prop A will prevent disastrous flooding from both a Seawall failure and sea level rise that would impact both commercial and residential areas, impacting many renters. And, it protects every San Franciscan who uses BART or MUNI, both of which are liable to being flooded if the Seawall is not strengthened. Prop A will not raise property tax rates for property owners OR renters.



Please join us and vote YES on A.

*Affordable Housing Alliance
Gail Gillman, Chief Executive Officer Community
Housing Partnership**

*For identification purposes only; author is signing as an individual and not on behalf of an organization.

The true source(s) of funds for the printing fee of this argument: Kilroy Realty, L.P. Airbnb, Inc, Facebook, Inc.

Paid Argument IN FAVOR of Proposition A

Working San Franciscans Urge a Yes Vote on Prop A

As members of labor, we know that nothing is more important than the foundation of a structure. That's why we are wholeheartedly supporting Proposition A.

Our Embarcadero seawall is the foundation of three miles of our northeastern waterfront from Fisherman's Wharf to AT&T Park. Our seawall was built over 100 years ago, before modern construction standards were in place. The Seawall could fail in the next earthquake, flooding our transit systems and endangering our city's emergency evacuation routes.

We urge you to vote YES on A.

San Francisco Firefighters local 798

*Tim Paulson, Secretary-Treasurer San Francisco
Building and Construction Trades Council*

Laborers Local 261

International Longshore & Warehouse Union

The true source(s) of funds for the printing fee of this argument: Kilroy Realty L.P. Airbnb Inc. Facebook Inc.

Paid Argument IN FAVOR of Proposition A

Westside leaders support Proposition A

The strength of our seawall is critical to the safety of residents citywide. The time to act is now, and Prop A is the first step we can take to rebuild our 100 year old seawall and protect ALL of our city.

Rebuilding the seawall will safeguard residents who work downtown and near the Embarcadero when the next earthquake hits, and will ensure that emergency responders are able to address the emergency needs of residents on the Westside and in every corner of the city.

As Westside residents, we support Prop A to strengthen our Seawall for earthquakes and disasters. And Prop A does NOT raise taxes!

*Assembly Member Phil Ting
Assessor-Recorder Carmen Chu
Supervisor Sandra Lee Fewer
Supervisor Katy Tang
Supervisor Norman Yee
Supervisor Ahsha Safai
Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods*

The true source(s) of funds for the printing fee of this argument: Kilroy Realty, L.P. Airbnb, Inc., Facebook, Inc.

Paid Argument IN FAVOR of Proposition A

Waterfront neighbors and businesses support Yes on A

As businesses and communities along the waterfront, we know the urgency of strengthening our Seawall. Every day we are concerned that when the next big earthquake hits, it will damage or destroy the wharves and piers that support our economy, and that our streets are likely to flood. The time to act is now.

All of us stand together. Vote Yes on A.

*Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods
South Beach District 6 Democratic Club
Barbary Coast Neighborhood Association
Potrero Boosters Neighborhood Association
Lou Giraudo, Boudin Bakeries
Bruce Agid, President, Eastern Neighborhoods
Democratic Club*
Alice Rogers, Neighborhood advocate
Angeles Roy, Mission Bay resident*

*For identification purposes only; author is signing as an individual and not on behalf of an organization.

The true source(s) of funds for the printing fee of this argument: Kilroy Realty, L.P. Airbnb, Inc. Facebook, Inc.

Paid Argument IN FAVOR of Proposition A

Jobs and Social Justice for San Francisco. Yes on A.

Strengthening our Seawall will create 4,000 good paying jobs in San Francisco, helping to ensure working men and women can afford to live in the City. The Port will work with the Office of Economic and Workforce Development and City Build as it bids contracts for Seawall construction work to make sure that these contracts encourage opportunities for Local Business Enterprises and employment for San Francisco residents including First Source Hiring and Local Hiring. This project will create entrepreneurial opportunities, new businesses and economic activity particularly in working-class neighborhoods throughout the City.



Furthermore, residents who depend most on public transit such as the T-Third Line to get to work and to school would be the most adversely impacted by a disaster that would devastate our transit network.

As leaders in our community, we urge you to vote Yes on A

*Malia Cohen, Board of Supervisor President
Hillary Ronen, Supervisor
David Campos, Chair San Francisco Democratic Party*
Sophie Maxwell, Former Supervisor
San Francisco Latino Democratic Club*

*For identification purposes only; author is signing as an individual and not on behalf of an organization.

The true source(s) of funds for the printing fee of this argument: Kilroy Realty, L.P. Airbnb, Inc., Facebook, Inc.

Paid Argument IN FAVOR of Proposition A

LGBTQ community is united for Proposition A

When disaster strikes, communities must come together as one. That's why the LGBTQ community is united for Proposition A. Prop A is essential to keep every San Franciscan safe.

We stand together and ask you to join us in voting Yes on A.

*State Senator Scott Wiener
Supervisor Rafael Mandelman
David Campos, Chair San Francisco Democratic Party*
Bevan Dufty, BART Director*
Mark Leno, State Senator (Ret.)
Tom Ammiano, Former State Assembly Member
Debra Walker, Building Inspection Commissioner*
Alice B. Toklas Democratic Club*

*For identification purposes only; author is signing as an individual and not on behalf of an organization.

The true source(s) of funds for the printing fee of this argument: Kilroy Realty, L.P. Airbnb, Inc., Facebook, Inc.

Paid Argument IN FAVOR of Proposition A

Protect public transit, BART and MUNI. Vote Yes on Prop A

We must strengthen our Seawall. Every day, over a million people use MUNI or BART transit routes that

end downtown or along the waterfront. Over 440,000 people arrive daily by ferry or by the transbay BART tube. All of these lines of transit would completely stop working in the event of a major earthquake and resulting collapse of the Seawall.

Even more urgently, a powerful storm **today** like the one Houston saw last year would cause sea levels to rise over Pier 14 and flow down the Howard Street tunnel. Saltwater would flood the Embarcadero MUNI / BART station and incapacitate regional transit. We would see service delays, and even lines rendered inoperable, all across the city.

Proposition A makes the vital investment we need to protect our transit infrastructure from earthquakes and rising sea levels.

Vote Yes with us on Proposition A.

BART Director Bevan Dufty
BART Director Nick Josefowitz*
Cheryl Brinkman, Chair, SFMTA*
Lee Hsu, Director, SFMTA*
Thea Selby, Chair, SF Transit Riders*

*For identification purposes only; author is signing as an individual and not on behalf of an organization.

The true source(s) of funds for the printing fee of this argument: Kilroy Realty, L.P. Airbnb, Inc. Facebook, Inc.

Paid Argument IN FAVOR of Proposition A

Protect public safety without raising taxes, vote YES on A

Investing in strengthening our seawall is a matter of urgent public safety that makes economic sense. The value of assets at risk in the event of a disaster is ten to forty times greater than the investment needed to strengthen the seawall. Due to our thoughtfully-planned capital investment program, Proposition A will not raise tax rates. We have the opportunity to invest in our city in a smart, effective way.

Conservatives agree, vote yes on A.

San Francisco Republican Party

The true source(s) of funds for the printing fee of this argument: Kilroy Realty, L.P. Airbnb, Inc. Facebook, Inc.

End of Paid Arguments IN FAVOR of Proposition A

No Paid Arguments AGAINST Proposition A Were Submitted



B

City Privacy Guidelines

Shall the City amend the Charter to include privacy guidelines and require the City Administrator to propose a privacy ordinance consistent with the guidelines to the Board of Supervisors?

YES  
NO  

Digest by the Ballot Simplification Committee

The Way It Is Now: The City has laws that provide some privacy protections in the collection, storage, sharing or use of personal information by The City and its contractors. The City does not have a comprehensive policy regarding the protection of personal information.

The Proposal: Proposition B is a Charter amendment that would provide guidelines to City agencies and officials when they consider proposed laws, regulations, policies and practices protecting privacy. These guidelines focus on ensuring that the collection, storage, sharing or use of personal information is transparent, accessible, unbiased, consensual, secure and limited to accomplish a lawful purpose.

Proposition B would require the City Administrator, by May 29, 2019, to propose an ordinance to the Board of Supervisors addressing the collection, storage, sharing and use of personal information. The ordinance must contain rules for:

- The City;
- Third parties who hold contracts or leases with The City;
- Third parties with permits, grants or licenses issued by The City.

A "YES" Vote Means: If you vote "yes," you want to amend the City Charter to include privacy guidelines and require the City Administrator to propose a privacy ordinance consistent with these guidelines to the Board of Supervisors.

A "NO" Vote Means: If you vote "no," you do not want to make these changes.

Controller's Statement on "B"

City Controller Ben Rosenfield has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition B:

Should the proposed charter amendment be approved by the voters, in my opinion, it would have a minimal to moderate impact on the cost of government, depending on the practices used to implement aspects of the privacy policies described in the amendment.

The proposed amendment establishes a Privacy First Policy to provide guidance to the City when considering the adoption of privacy-protective laws, regulations, policies, and practices, including 11 principles which constitute the policy. The amendment may not be implemented in a manner that is inconsistent with voter-approved ordinances regarding privacy, open meetings, or public records.

By May 31, 2019, the City Administrator would propose an ordinance establishing criteria and rules for the collection, storage, sharing, and use of personal information for City practices, including when entering into contracts with third parties and when issuing permits, licenses, and other entitlements. The cost to implement the proposed charter amendment is dependent on decisions that the Board of Supervisors make through the legislative process to enact a Privacy First Policy ordinance.

How "B" Got on the Ballot

On July 24, 2018, the Board of Supervisors voted 9 to 0 to place Proposition B on the ballot. The Supervisors voted as follows:

Yes: Brown, Cohen, Kim, Mandelman, Peskin, Ronen, Safai, Stefani, Yee.

No: None.

Excused: Fewer, Tang.

This measure requires 50%+1 affirmative votes to pass.

The above statement is an impartial analysis of this measure. Arguments for and against this measure immediately follow. The full text begins on page 106. Some of the words used in the ballot digest are explained starting on page 58.



Proponent's Argument in Favor of Proposition B

The case for Proposition B, the Privacy First Policy, is simple: all San Francisco residents and visitors have a fundamental right to privacy.

The Privacy First Policy would set a new precedent for cities across the country seeking to protect the privacy rights of their citizens. Whether regulating artificial intelligence or overseeing rapid developments in surveillance technology, local democracies have a vital role to play in the evolving field of data privacy regulation.

As a hub of tech innovation, San Francisco should be at the forefront of data privacy protections. This means:

- Ensuring that your personal information, including your sexual orientation, race, national origin, or religious affiliation, is protected from unwarranted collection and disclosure.
- Regulating how information that is collected about you is being shared with law enforcement, third party advertisers, or other private special interests.
- Giving you an opportunity to deny consent to the collection and use of your personal information.

- Allowing you to move around the city, meet with friends, and organize groups without being tracked in real time.
- Securing your personal information from unauthorized access or accidental destruction.

The Privacy First Policy was submitted to the ballot by a unanimous vote of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors and is specifically endorsed by:

- Supervisor Malia Cohen, President
- Supervisor Sandra Lee Fewer
- Supervisor Jane Kim
- Supervisor Rafael Mandelman
- Supervisor Aaron Peskin
- Supervisor Hillary Ronen
- Supervisor Norman Yee

Vote YES on Proposition B - it's time to put your Privacy First!

Supervisors Malia Cohen, Sandra Lee Fewer, Jane Kim, Rafael Mandelman, Aaron Peskin, Hillary Ronen, Norman Yee

Rebuttal to Proponent's Argument in Favor of Proposition B

The case for Proposition B is not as simple as the proponents say. Prop. B is a hollow effort to protect privacy. It would, however, hand our elected officials the power to tamper with San Francisco's voter-enacted Sunshine Ordinance.

We agree that privacy should be protected. But far from being a catch-all privacy shield, Prop. B wouldn't give our elected officials the authority to do much, if anything, to protect privacy that they can't do already. Instead, it would set a vague privacy agenda for our elected officials to implement in the future, without any direct input from you, the voter. There is no telling what the result would be.

We oppose authorizing our elected officials to unilaterally tamper with the Sunshine Ordinance, San Francisco's voter-enacted open government law. As James Madison, one of the founding fathers of our nation, once said: "Knowledge will forever govern ignorance; and a people who mean to be their own governors must arm themselves with the power which knowledge gives." We need a strong Sunshine Ordinance to ensure that we, not our elected officials, have the final say over how San Francisco is run.

Prop. B threatens San Francisco's Sunshine Ordinance — the very policy that ensures the public can hold elected officials and civil servants accountable. We urge you to vote NO.

Society of Professional Journalists, Northern California Chapter



Opponent's Argument Against Proposition B

Proposition B threatens San Francisco's landmark Sunshine Ordinance by giving elected officials unilateral authority to gut it. We urge you to vote no.

Maintaining public access to government information keeps public officials and civil servants accountable for their actions. In addition to providing citizens access to government records and open meetings, the voter-approved Sunshine Ordinance created an independent body, the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force, to ensure that city officials actually follow transparency laws.

Prop. B would empower city officials to amend the Sunshine Ordinance, so long as the change is "not inconsistent" with the "purpose or intent" of the law. This wording is vague, and could enable officials to limit access to government records or change the composition of the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force to be more friendly to politicians or the very business interests they say they are trying to rein in.

Although it's aimed to address a real problem, Prop. B is largely a statement of abstract guidelines that could have harmful unintended consequences. Officials say

they would not use the amendment to impede access, and that we should trust them to use their newfound powers judiciously. But that contradicts the basis of our transparency laws, which ensure the public's ability to hold government officials accountable.

Politicians shouldn't be handed the ability to block the public's right to know what happens at City Hall — our right to know how the city runs and how it spends our tax dollars. We urge you to vote NO on Prop. B.

Society of Professional Journalists, Northern California Chapter

Rebuttal to Opponent's Argument Against Proposition B

Any notion that public records laws may be weakened is not only legally impossible, it is a distraction from the important privacy rights that Proposition B would advance.

We agree that public access to government information helps keep public officials accountable for their actions. That is why Proposition B explicitly states that it may not be implemented to undermine the Sunshine Ordinance or any other public records law.

Public records advocates also agree that the Sunshine Ordinance, passed by the voters in 1999, is out of date. From defunct appointing authorities that may only be fixed by going back to the voters, to issues accessing digital records as technology continues to evolve, the Sunshine Ordinance must be fixed to increase transparency and access to public records.

This is why Proposition B actually *restricts* the Board of Supervisors to amending public records laws in order to strengthen them and to hold public officials - including the Board of Supervisors - accountable.

In spite of this peculiar opposition, we look forward to advancing your privacy rights - *and* your access to public records.

Vote **Yes on Prop B**, and put your Privacy First.

Aaron Peskin, Supervisor, District 3



No Paid Arguments IN FAVOR of Proposition B Were Submitted

Paid Argument AGAINST Proposition B

Vote NO on Prop B. Privacy is very important. Transparency is too. Prop B would not boost privacy, but would harm transparency. Existing state and federal laws protect our private data. Hidden in Prop B are provisions that prevent San Franciscans from holding our government accountable. Access to arrest records, police body cameras, sex offender registrations, voter databases, candidate donor records, and public meetings could be restricted by Prop B. Protect transparency and vote NO on Prop B.

The San Francisco Republican Party

The true source(s) of funds for the printing fee of this argument: San Francisco Republican Party.

The three largest contributors to the true source recipient committee: 1. Retain Our San Francisco Superior Court Judges 2018, 2. Committee For An Affordable San Francisco, 3. Stop The Prohibition Proposition.



C

Additional Business Taxes to Fund Homeless Services

Shall the City impose additional business taxes to create a dedicated fund to support services for homeless people and prevent homelessness, including one tax of 0.175% to 0.69% on gross receipts over \$50 million that a business receives in San Francisco, and another tax of 1.5% on certain administrative offices' payroll expense in San Francisco, raising an estimated \$250–300 million in combined tax revenues annually, and with no expiration date for these taxes?

YES  
NO  

Digest by the Ballot Simplification Committee

The Way It Is Now: The City collects a tax on gross receipts from many businesses operating in San Francisco. The current maximum tax rates on gross receipts range from 0.16 percent to 0.65 percent.

Certain businesses with more than \$1 billion in gross receipts, 1,000 employees nationwide, and administrative offices in San Francisco pay an administrative office tax based on their payroll instead of gross receipts. For those businesses, the tax rate is 1.4 percent of their payroll expense.

Some businesses, including certain nonprofit organizations, banks and insurance companies, are exempt from these taxes.

Increasing tax revenue spending limits requires San Francisco voter approval.

The Proposal: Proposition C would impose additional business taxes:

- For businesses that pay a gross receipts tax, an additional tax of 0.175 percent to 0.690 percent on those gross revenues in San Francisco over \$50 million;
- For businesses that pay the administrative office tax, an additional tax of 1.5 percent of their payroll expense in San Francisco.

These additional taxes would not apply to:

- Certain nonprofit organizations and businesses exempt from local taxation, such as banks and insurance companies;
- Revenues that are exempt from the gross receipts tax; and

- Revenues from commercial rents that are subject to The City's Early Care and Education Commercial Rents Tax.

Proposition C would deposit this additional tax revenue into a dedicated fund serving homeless people and preventing homelessness. The Board of Supervisors would determine each fiscal year how to distribute the additional funds from these new taxes, within these limits:

- At least 50 percent to secure permanent housing for homeless people;
- At least 25 percent for mental health services specifically designed for homeless people with severe behavioral health issues;
- Up to 15 percent for services for people who have recently become homeless or are at risk of becoming homeless; and
- Up to 10 percent to secure short-term shelter and access to hygiene programs for homeless people.

The fund would be administered by the Mayor and Board of Supervisors. An advisory committee would monitor the fund.

Proposition C would increase The City's annual tax revenue spending limit for four years.

A "YES" Vote Means: If you vote "yes," you want to impose additional business taxes to create a dedicated fund to support services for homeless people and prevent homelessness.

A "NO" Vote Means: If you vote "no," you do not approve these additional business taxes.

This measure requires 50%+1 affirmative votes to pass.

The above statement is an impartial analysis of this measure. Arguments for and against this measure immediately follow. The full text begins on page 107. Some of the words used in the ballot digest are explained starting on page 58.



Controller's Statement on "C"

City Controller Ben Rosenfield has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition C:

Should the proposed ordinance be approved by the voters, in my opinion, it would generate new tax revenue of approximately \$250 million to \$300 million annually beginning in 2019. The proposed tax is dedicated for defined homeless services, including housing, shelter, prevention, and mental service services.

The City currently assesses a business tax on approximately 13,000 companies in the city, the majority of which is based upon a given company's gross receipts. This current tax is expected to generate approximately \$880 million in fiscal year (FY) 2018–19 for the City's General Fund. The proposed ordinance would establish an additional dedicated tax on gross receipts for approximately 300 to 400 of these businesses, at a rate between 0.175 percent and 0.69 percent of gross receipts above \$50 million, depending on business type. Businesses subject to the proposed tax currently comprise approximately 15 to 20 percent of the city's job base and pay approximately 40 percent of the city's business taxes.

The revenues generated would be deposited into the Our City, Our Home Fund to be used for specific homeless services. Housing programs, including short-term rent subsidies, permanent supportive housing, and permanent rent subsidies would be allocated at least 50 percent of expenditures, or \$125–150 million annually. Short-term residential shelters and hygiene programs would receive up to 10 percent, or \$25–30 million annually. Prevention programs for those at-risk of becoming homeless or who have recently become homeless would receive up to 15 percent, or \$38–45 million annually. Lastly, mental health services for homeless individuals would be allocated at least 25 percent, or \$63–75 million annually. In FY 2017–18, the City allocated approximately \$380 million for similar services.

The measure also creates the Our City, Our Home Oversight Committee to monitor the administration of the special fund and to make recommendations to the Board of Supervisors and Mayor's Office to ensure the fund is administered in accordance with the proposed ordinance.

How "C" Got on the Ballot

On July 16, 2018, the Department of Elections certified that the initiative petition calling for Proposition C to be placed on the ballot had a sufficient number of valid signatures to qualify the measure for the ballot.

9,485 signatures were required to place an initiative ordinance on the ballot. This number is equal to 5% of the total number of people who voted for Mayor in 2015. A random check of the signatures submitted by the proponents of the initiative petition prior to the July 9, 2018, submission deadline showed that the total number of valid signatures was greater than the number required.

This measure requires 50%+1 affirmative votes to pass.

The above statement is an impartial analysis of this measure. Arguments for and against this measure immediately follow. The full text begins on page 107. Some of the words used in the ballot digest are explained starting on page 58.



Proponent's Argument in Favor of Proposition C

Proposition C is the key to solving homelessness in San Francisco now.

This bold plan was created by the people on the front lines of the homeless and affordable housing crisis every day. It's a real solution – not more City Hall window dressing.

Prop C will give us back the San Francisco we love: where homeless people, including those who are disabled, elderly, families and mentally ill, are taken care of – and where we can *all* walk safely and securely in a clean and dignified city.

It starts by asking the city's very largest corporations – *not regular San Franciscans* – to pay additional revenue to fund these services. These top 1% of companies, paying on income above \$50 million per year, many of whom just received a huge tax break from Donald Trump, can afford to do more.

It then dedicates the funding directly to building permanently affordable homes, preventing evictions, mental health and substance use treatment, hygiene programs, and shelters. This money CANNOT be used by City Hall politicians for any other purpose.

Proposition C would:

- Protect **7,000** San Franciscans from losing their homes

- Move more than **4,000** households off the streets and into affordable homes
- Provide intensive mental health care and substance use street-based care for over **4,000** severely impaired individuals
- Fund bathrooms and sanitation centers across the city
- Give the **1,000** people on our wait list for shelter each night a place to sleep off the street
- Bring back the clean, safe, beautiful streets San Franciscans deserve

Proposition C is our last, best chance to tackle homelessness, address the housing affordability crisis and protect the city we love.

The homeless crisis hurts all of us.

Please join us and vote Yes on C.

Affordable Housing Alliance

Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods

Mental Health Association of San Francisco

United Educators of San Francisco

Chinatown Community Development Center

GLIDE Foundation

San Francisco Tenants Union

SEIU 1021

Coalition on Homelessness

Rebuttal to Proponent's Argument in Favor of Proposition C

Everyone agrees that homelessness in San Francisco is a crisis, and everyone believes we need new ideas, a better plan and fundamental reforms to how we deliver services.

Sadly, Prop C contains none of these things.

San Francisco already spends \$382 million a year on homelessness programs — even before we count the portion of San Francisco's police, fire and health budgets dedicated to treating the impacts of homelessness. Prop C would spend another \$300 million per year.

That's a guaranteed set-aside of \$682 million per year.

By comparison:

- The Department of Children Youth and Families receives \$46 million annually
- Parks: \$77 million
- Libraries: \$84 million
- Muni: \$387 million

If you vote Yes on Prop C, you lock in \$682 million — nearly as much as the City's annual police and fire budgets combined or the entire cost of our city's public health system — with no detailed plan, no reforms and no performance requirements.

The proponents say not to worry because “big corporations” will pick up the tab. But the city's own analyses say the tax will hit businesses that comprise 40 percent of the city's tax base and cost middle-class jobs.

Prop C was drafted by the Coalition on Homelessness and other agencies that will receive millions in funding from the measure.

Many of these agencies provide valuable services, but any proposition without fundamental reforms, a detailed plan and strong accountability measures is just a financial windfall for them, not a solution to the crisis.

Vote NO on Prop C.

Gwendolyn Kaplan, Small Business Leader

Henry Karnilowicz, President of the San Francisco

*Council of District Merchants Associations**

Hotel Council of San Francisco

Hispanic Chambers of Commerce of San Francisco

Chinatown Merchants Association

*For identification purposes only; author is signing as an individual and not on behalf of an organization.



Opponent's Argument Against Proposition C

Vote NO on Proposition C. San Francisco already spends more than \$382 million a year on homelessness with little accountability and poor results.

San Francisco city government already spends more per capita – \$12,551 per person – and more addressing homelessness than any big city in America. But it's hard to argue San Franciscans are getting good value or acceptable results for the money spent.

That's why Prop C is such a bad idea. It proposes the largest tax increase in San Francisco history – \$300 million per year – with no plan for spending the money nor any accountability measures for the dozens of agencies that will receive the funding.

The City's own homelessness czar has said that, while they do "God's work," there is a duplication of services and a lack of accountability among the more than 70 agencies currently providing homeless services under contract to the city. If, as Einstein said, "the definition of insanity is doing the same thing and expecting a different result," voters would be ill-advised to vote for Prop C expecting change.

Even worse, the City's own analysis of Prop C by the San Francisco Office of Economic and Workforce Development says it is likely to cost many middle-class jobs in retail and manufacturing across the city.

Homelessness is the biggest problem facing San Francisco, but we'll never fix it without an innovative plan and reform of the current system – and Prop C contains none of these.

Our newly elected Mayor London Breed has a unique opportunity to bring the city together to pursue a consensus-based plan and put it before voters if it requires more money. Until then, join President of the San Francisco Council of District Merchants Henry Karnilowicz*, Small Business Leader Gwen Kaplan, Former San Francisco Democratic Party Chair Mary Jung, the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce, the San Francisco Committee on Jobs, the Building Owners and Managers Association of San Francisco and Supervisor Katy Tang and vote NO on Prop C.

*Title for identification purposes only

John Bozeman, Building Owners and Managers Association of San Francisco

Rebuttal to Opponent's Argument Against Proposition C

Prop C is a bold plan to tackle our homeless crisis, funded by a small tax on San Francisco's largest corporations.

Those same corporations – many of whom received billions in tax breaks from Donald Trump – are now leading the opposition to Prop C. **Don't be fooled.**

Our homeless crisis is hurting all of us. Every San Franciscan has experienced the real-life impact on our streets of the housing crisis, mental illness, and the opioid epidemic.

San Francisco's poorest communities hit walls whenever they seek help. There are over 1,000 people on our shelter waitlist, and over 7,000 homeless households on the housing waitlist, while thousands of San Franciscans needlessly become homeless each year.

But San Francisco's largest corporations tell us to keep suffering, because they don't want to pay a small, one-half of one percent tax on *revenue over 50 million dollars*.

Here are the facts:

- Prop C was carefully crafted by people on the front lines of the homeless crisis – not City Hall. It focuses on proven results.

- Prop C is a pragmatic, concrete measure that will shelter **1,000** people, help over **7,000** households avoid homelessness, and create **4,000** new homes with supportive care.
- Prop C will transform our mental health and drug treatment system to provide the care that is missing today.
- Prop C will provide restrooms across the city to keep our streets sanitary and clean.

San Francisco can't wait any longer. We need action now. Please join us in tackling this citywide crisis and vote YES on C.

*Affordable Housing Alliance
Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods
National Alliance on Mental Illness, San Francisco
Sierra Club
United Educators of San Francisco
SEIU 1021
GLIDE Foundation
San Francisco Tenants Union
Coalition on Homelessness, San Francisco*



Paid Argument IN FAVOR of Proposition C

Democrats Say Prop C Works for ALL of Us!

We all know the Trump administration just gave big business one of the largest tax breaks in history, while regular San Franciscans are struggling to pay rent. This is a bold opportunity to recapture a portion of the revenue to make our city a healthy place for everyone to live a dignified life. Let's make San Francisco work for all of us!

*David Campos, San Francisco Democratic Party Chair**

*Sandra Lee Fewer, District 1 Supervisor**

Jane Kim, District 6 Supervisor

Norman Yee, District 7 Supervisor

*Rafael Mandelman, District 8 Supervisor**

*Hillary Ronen, District 9 Supervisor**

*Jeff Adachi, San Francisco Public Defender**

*Mark Leno, Former California State Senator**

Tom Ammiano, Former California State

*Assemblymember**

*John Burton, Former California Democratic Party Chair**

John Avalos, Former District 11 Supervisor

*Sophenia Maxwell, Former District 7 Supervisor**

*Petra De Jesus, Police Commissioner**

Keith Baraka, 2nd Vice Chair, San Francisco

Democratic Party

Jen Low, Elected member to the San Francisco

*Democratic Party**

Frances Hsieh, Elected member to the San Francisco

*Democratic Party**

Peter Gallotta, Elected member to the San Francisco

*Democratic Party**

Kelly Groth, Elected member to the San Francisco

*Democratic Party**

*For identification purposes only; author is signing as an individual and not on behalf of an organization.

The true source(s) of funds for the printing fee of this argument: Our City Our Home, A Committee in Support Proposition C.

The three largest contributors to the true source recipient committee: 1. Coalition on Homelessness, San Francisco, 2. Evan Owski, 3. Dean Preston.

Paid Argument IN FAVOR of Proposition C

Students Deserve a Home

1 in 25 children in SFUSD sleep every night without a home. Teachers are working with students traumatized every day by the instability of homelessness.

Educating and learning are severely impacted by the crisis occurring in San Francisco and we need Prop C

to give students the housing and support they deserve.

United Educators of San Francisco

AFT 2121

*Hydra Mendoza-McDonnell, President, San Francisco Board of Education**

Stevon Cook, Vice President, San Francisco Board of Education

Matt Haney, San Francisco Board of Education

*Commissioner**

Mark Sanchez, San Francisco Board of Education

Commissioner

Shamann Walton, San Francisco Board of Education

Commissioner

Shanell Williams, San Francisco Community College Board Trustee

*Thomas Temprano, San Francisco Community College Board Trustee**

*John Rizzo, San Francisco Community College Board Trustee**

*For identification purposes only; author is signing as an individual and not on behalf of an organization.

The true source(s) of funds for the printing fee of this argument: Our City Our Home, A Committee in Support of Proposition C.

The three largest contributors to the true source recipient committee: 1. Coalition on Homelessness, San Francisco, 2. Evan Owski, 3. Dean Preston.

Paid Argument IN FAVOR of Proposition C

Asian American Leaders Support Prop C!

Asian Americans make up 42% of the low-income families in San Francisco. This measure will keep our community housed and move our families living in unhealthy and overcrowded conditions into decent housing. Vote yes on Prop C!

Sandra Lee Fewer, Supervisor, District 1

*Jane Kim, Supervisor, District 6**

Norman Yee, Supervisor, District 7

Jeff Adachi, San Francisco Public Defender

Norman Fong, Executive Director, Chinatown

Community Development Center

Gordon Chin, Founder, Chinatown Community Development Center

Chinese Progressive Association

*For identification purposes only; author is signing as an individual and not on behalf of an organization.

The true source(s) of funds for the printing fee of this argument: Chinatown Community Development Center.



Paid Argument IN FAVOR of Proposition C

Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods Say YES on C!

We all know that the homelessness crisis hurts all of us. Our city is cleaner, safer, and healthier when we are able to get our homeless neighbors inside. It's time to finally make a real impact and create thriving San Francisco neighborhoods that we all deserve. We urge you to vote YES on C.

Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods

The true source(s) of funds for the printing fee of this argument: Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods.

Paid Argument IN FAVOR of Proposition C

The Council of Community Housing Organizations – the coalition of San Francisco's nonprofit developers and affordability advocates – urges a YES vote on Proposition C. Our City Our Home will finally provide the funding needed to make a dramatically visible difference with the only solution for homelessness that works: permanent housing for both those experiencing chronic homelessness and homeless families with children, while providing the mental health and other services needed for long-term stability.

*AND Architecture + Community Design
Bernal Heights Neighborhood Center
Bill Sorro Housing Program
Chinatown Community Development Center
Community Design Center
Conard House
Episcopal Community Services
HomeownershipSF
Mercy Housing
Mission Economic Development Agency
Mission Housing Development Corporation
PODER
San Francisco Community Land Trust
SF Housing Development Corporation
San Francisco Information Clearinghouse
Swords to Plowshares
Tenderloin Neighborhood Development Corporation
TODCO Group*

The true source(s) of funds for the printing fee of this argument: The Council of Community Housing Organizations.

Paid Argument IN FAVOR of Proposition C

Mental Health Service Providers for Yes on C!

We know that it is almost impossible to get off the streets when you are living with a mental health con-

dition and are unhoused. We have seen firsthand the exacerbating effects of homelessness on those with mental health issues and substance use disorders. Prop C provides the mental health and addiction services that homeless people need to transition off the streets.

Healthright 360

Mental Health Association of San Francisco

National Alliance on Mental Illness SF

Progress Foundation

The true source(s) of funds for the printing fee of this argument: Mental Health Association of San Francisco, HealthRight 360.

Paid Argument IN FAVOR of Proposition C

Health Service Providers Say YES to C

Working in healthcare has been a constant reminder that no one deserves to live on the street. Homeless people, including the elderly and disabled, are at a higher risk for health problems and end up in the hospital over and over, unable to get the stability they need to end the cycle of homelessness. This is an expensive and heartless way to treat San Franciscans. We urge you to vote YES on C!

*Margaret Stafford MD, Director, Family Medicine
Inpatient Service Zuckerberg San Francisco General
Hospital**

*Barry Zevin, Medical Director of Street Medicine and
Shelter Health, SF Dept. of Public Health**

*William B. Shore, UCSF Emeritus Professor, Family
and Community Medicine**

*Lydia Leung, UCSF Associate Clinical Professor, Dept.
of Family and Community Medicine**

*Juliana Morris, UCSF Clinical Instructor, Department of
Family and Community Medicine**

*Colette Auerswald, UC Berkeley Associate Professor,
School of Public Health**

*Allen Cooper, Professor of Medicine, Chief
Gastroenterology (Emeritus), Stanford University**

Kellene Eagen, MD

Michaela Lambert, RN

*For identification purposes only; author is signing as an individual and not on behalf of an organization.

The true source(s) of funds for the printing fee of this argument: Barry Zevin.

Paid Argument IN FAVOR of Proposition C

LGBTQ Leaders Say Yes to Prop C

We San Franciscans consider ourselves to be one of the most progressive cities in the world with a deep



focus on equal rights. But in San Francisco, nearly one-third of the homeless population identifies as LGBTQ and over 13% of newly diagnosed HIV positive community members are homeless. Building housing can keep our community safe and greatly assist our efforts to get to zero new HIV infections. Vote YES on C!

Rafael Mandelman, District 8 Supervisor

Mark Leno, Former California State Senator

Tom Ammiano, Former California State

*Assemblymember**

Brian Basinger, Executive Director, Q Foundation

*Rebecca Rolfe, Executive Director, SF LGBT Center**

San Francisco AIDS Foundation

Cleve Jones, Author, When We Rise

Alice B. Toklas LGBT Democratic Club

Alpha Honey Mahogany Mulugeta, Harvey Milk

*Democratic Club Co-President**

Thomas Temprano, City College of San Francisco

*Trustee**

Roma Guy, San Francisco Health Commissioner

Debra Walker, Department of Building Inspection

*Commissioner**

*For identification purposes only; author is signing as an individual and not on behalf of an organization.

The true source(s) of funds for the printing fee of this argument: Q Foundation.

Paid Argument IN FAVOR of Proposition C

Eviction can mean homelessness!

When you're evicted from your rent controlled apartment and you don't have a strong safety network, it can mean that you are forced out of the city or onto the streets. For tenants, whether we live on a fixed-income, or are middle income, *losing our home can mean disaster*. Prop C ensures our city will have robust eviction prevention services and that if the unthinkable happens to you or someone you love, you can fight to keep your home.

San Francisco Tenants Union

Housing Rights Committee of San Francisco

*Jordan Davis, Evicted Community Leader**

*Anakh Sul Rama, Evicted Community Leader**

Causa Justa/Just Cause

Mission Economic Development Agency

*For identification purposes only; author is signing as an individual and not on behalf of an organization.

The true source(s) of funds for the printing fee of this argument: San Francisco Tenants Union.

Paid Argument IN FAVOR of Proposition C

Dignity for Seniors and People with Disabilities

The affordability and eviction crisis has pushed many seniors and disabled people with low incomes onto the streets. Not one more should enter the cycle of homelessness. We are better than that as a society. Vote Yes on Prop C!

Senior and Disability Action

California Alliance for Retired Americans

*Bill Hirsch, Executive Director, AIDS Legal Referral Panel**

Gray Panthers

*For identification purposes only; author is signing as an individual and not on behalf of an organization.

The true source(s) of funds for the printing fee of this argument: Senior and Disability Action.

Paid Argument IN FAVOR of Proposition C

Business Suffers When Homelessness is Out of Control

San Francisco business owners deserve to be part of a thriving, dignified community. Without clean streets and healthy neighbors, our business community and economy will suffer. Prop C reflects our city's values, striving to make our commercial corridors vibrant, welcoming spaces for all.

Haight Ashbury Merchants Association

STUD Collective

Roxie Theater

The Booksmith

The true source(s) of funds for the printing fee of this argument: Christin Evans.

Paid Argument IN FAVOR of Proposition C

Faith Leaders Support Prop C!

As faith leaders, we care for the spiritual wellbeing of our communities and our city. Yet we know that ensuring a basic degree of material wellbeing for each of us is vital to the spiritual health of us all. And in a city with such extraordinary means, creative and technological prowess, and sheer abundance, we can do far better than the widening inequality we see around us.

So many of our brothers and sisters are consigned to the most deplorable conditions—unsheltered, traumatized and un-regarded in our very midst. Meanwhile, many thousands of others live fearfully on the brink of succumbing to the appalling situation of losing their homes and stability themselves. These are grave injus-



tices which people of all faiths are bound to oppose. Let's take a great step forward in ensuring the wellbeing of our communities.

*Archbishop Franzo Wayne King**
Father Richard Smith
GLIDE Foundation
*Lorena Melgarejo, Executive Director, Faith in Action**
*Rabbi Michael Lezak, GLIDE**
*Rabbi Noa Kushner, The Kitchen**
*Rev. Deacon Bidwell-Waite, Faith in Action**
Rev. Dr. Timothy Svoboda, Youth With A Mission
Rev. Margret Henderson, Old First Presbyterian Church
Rev. Nancy Pennekemp, San Francisco Night Ministries
Rev. Victor H. Floyd, Calvary Presbyterian Church

*For identification purposes only; author is signing as an individual and not on behalf of an organization.

The true source(s) of funds for the printing fee of this argument: GLIDE Foundation.

Paid Argument IN FAVOR of Proposition C

San Francisco's Latinx Community Needs Prop C!

With aggressive gentrification on the rise in our Latinx neighborhoods, we have seen the disproportionate rise of Latinx becoming homeless. And in the Era of Trump, where immigrants are already under attack, we should be fighting to preserve the cultural diversity that makes San Francisco the vibrant, diverse city we love, not thrusting our neighbors into the cycle of homelessness. Vota Sí en Prop C!

San Francisco Latino Democratic Club
Dolores Street Community Services
*David Campos, San Francisco Democratic Party Chair**
John Avalos, former District 11 Supervisor

*For identification purposes only; author is signing as an individual and not on behalf of an organization.

The true source(s) of funds for the printing fee of this argument: Our City Our Home, A Committee in Support of Proposition C.

The three largest contributors to the true source recipient committee: 1. Coalition on Homelessness, San Francisco, 2. Evan Owski, 3. Dean Preston.

Paid Argument IN FAVOR of Proposition C

Join African American Leaders in Support of Prop C.

It's no secret that San Francisco's African American population has been among the hardest hit during the housing and homelessness crisis. We ask you to join us in supporting Prop C to greatly reduce the dispro-

portionate number of African Americans living on the streets in San Francisco.

Danny Glover, Actor and Director
*Shanell Williams, San Francisco Community College Board Trustee**
*Shamann Walton, San Francisco Board of Education Commissioner**

*For identification purposes only; author is signing as an individual and not on behalf of an organization.

The true source(s) of funds for the printing fee of this argument: Our City Our Home, A Committee in Support of Proposition C.

The three largest contributors to the true source recipient committee: 1. Coalition on Homelessness, 2. Evan Owski, 3. Dean Preston.

Paid Argument IN FAVOR of Proposition C

Small Landlords for Prop C

People come from around the world to live in San Francisco, yet we greet them with a human rights catastrophe. Let's start the real work of solving this issue by funding the programs that homeless service providers have been demanding for years. NO MORE STREET HOMELESSNESS! YES ON C!

Buck Bagot
Nato Green
Alex Lantsberg

The true source(s) of funds for the printing fee of this argument: Alex Lantsberg.

Paid Argument IN FAVOR of Proposition C

GLIDE says YES on C!

San Francisco is a compassionate city. But it takes work to live up to our better instincts.

We know that misfortune, illness, accidents and missteps can befall any of us at any time. In a compassionate community these events don't need to be causes for despair or for living in fear. We all benefit from a world that is just and decent, sociable and kind. We rest easier in such an environment. We feel less divided from one another. We create space for opportunity and creativity and cooperation; for harnessing our full potential as individuals and as a people. Currently we face a human catastrophe in the homelessness and despair among us, and a moral challenge to do right by our neighbor. In "Our City, Our Home," we have a historic opportunity to set a better course for ourselves. GLIDE has emphasized love and inclusion for over 50 years. We believe Proposition C sets



us on the path to a greater, more capacious city in which love and inclusion represent not just widely held values but create a cherished environment, in which everyone shares the glow, security and dignity of home.

GLIDE Foundation

The true source(s) of funds for the printing fee of this argument: GLIDE Foundation.

Paid Argument IN FAVOR of Proposition C

San Francisco Democratic Socialists of America Say YES on C

Every day in our city, people are forced to live in tents under the shadows of gleaming skyscrapers and luxury condos. In one of the wealthiest cities in the world, we have the means to provide for people's basic needs and respond to an urgent public health crisis impacting almost 7,500 homeless San Franciscans. All we have to do is tax a handful of massively profitable multinational corporations. These companies just received a trillion dollar corporate tax break from the GOP, and they can easily afford this tiny tax, a fraction of one percent of their annual revenue. We can transform San Francisco by passing Prop C and providing housing, emergency shelter, and mental health services for thousands of our homeless neighbors. Housing is a human right. No one should have to wonder where they'll lay their head tonight. Vote yes on Prop C.

Democratic Socialists of America San Francisco

The true source(s) of funds for the printing fee of this argument: Democratic Socialists of America, San Francisco Chapter (Electoral Fund).

Paid Argument IN FAVOR of Proposition C

Nearly 1/3 of the City's homeless population is in Bayview, but we get less than 10% of the City's budget for homelessness. We see first-hand the alarming need for homelessness and mental health services in our District 10 neighborhoods. We stand with our community, supporting Gwendolyn Westbrook and Mother Brown's, demanding Beds for Bayview, and voting YES on Prop C!

*Tony Kelly, Beds for Bayview Coalition**

*For identification purposes only; author is signing as an individual and not on behalf of an organization.

The true source(s) of funds for the printing fee of this argument: Tony Kelly.

Paid Argument IN FAVOR of Proposition C

Vote YES on Proposition C - Our City, Our Home. The Right Priorities. The Right Approach. The Right Time.

Each year, thousands of San Franciscans experience homelessness, including more than 3,000 children. Every night, 1,000 San Franciscans are denied emergency shelter. Nearly every treatment program in the City is full. Despite significant resources devoted to battling homelessness, more is needed to give individuals and families a chance for a better future.

Proposition C, Our City, Our Home combines bold vision with bold investments for the City's future. Prop C doubles investments in permanent housing, increases mental health services, expands our shelter capacity, and prioritizes prevention. Proposition C gives thousands of individuals and families real opportunity to exit homelessness, for good. And Prop C ensures accountability and transparency for public expenditures.

Hospitality House enthusiastically supports Proposition C.

We're calling on our champions of local industry to join thousands of San Franciscans in saying YES to Real Solutions, and YES to San Francisco's future.

Vote YES on Proposition C - Our City, Our Home.

Daniel Hlad, Central City Hospitality House

The true source(s) of funds for the printing fee of this argument: Central City Hospitality House.

Paid Argument IN FAVOR of Proposition C

Did you know there are no consequences for lying in ballot arguments? The opponents are straight up lying when they say Prop C has "no plan." The ballot digest clearly describes Prop C's plan to invest \$300 million/year in housing and services to address homelessness. Shame on these large corporations for lying to protect their Trump tax cuts!

Vote HELL YES on Prop C!

See our full analysis in our voter guide:
www.theLeagueSF.org/PropC

San Francisco League of Pissed Off Voters

The true source(s) of funds for the printing fee of this argument: Alexander Cotton, Allyson Eddy Bravmann, Cynthia Crews, Gabriel Markoff, Jeremy Pollock, John Blue, Kelly



Lawson, Lee Hepner, Nathaniel Owen, Peter Gallotta, Sam Heft-Luthy, Sondra Angulo.

End of Paid Arguments IN FAVOR of Proposition C

Paid Argument AGAINST Proposition C

NO ON C

According to the Office of Economic and Workforce Development, this misguided initiative could cause middle-income job loss at some large companies. The job losses will affect people in mid-level jobs such as administrative, retail, or grocery store workers.

San Francisco will spend nearly \$280 million on the homeless this fiscal year that equals \$38,000 per individual. San Francisco does not need more money, it needs better management.

The San Francisco Republican Party

The true source(s) of funds for the printing fee of this argument: San Francisco Republican Party.

The three largest contributors to the true source recipient committee: 1. Retain Our San Francisco Superior Court Judges 2018, 2. Committee For An Affordable San Francisco, 3. Stop The Prohibition Proposition.

Paid Argument AGAINST Proposition C

Prop C despicably blames yet another of The City's problems on the thriving industry that has made our economy flourish. **Bureaucrats consider it a "privilege" to operate a business in The City; we consider it none of their business!**

Even the proponents admit that the \$382 million we spend on homelessness now is not utilized effectively and the problem continues to get worse. **Why should we believe that another \$300 million will magically turn things around?**

Another patchwork attempt which creates more government programs will yield the same poor results we have seen time and time again. **We must hold our government accountable to the people so that over time we can work to *reduce* the need for all this spending, not double it.**

Vote NO on C.

Libertarian Party of San Francisco

www.LPSF.org

The true source(s) of funds for the printing fee of this argument: Libertarian Party of San Francisco.

The three largest contributors to the true source recipient committee: 1. Scott Banister, 2. Libertarian Party of San Francisco, 3. Tim Carrico.

Paid Argument AGAINST Proposition C

Homelessness in San Francisco is a humanitarian crisis, but throwing more money at the problem is not enough. If we are serious about tackling the root causes of homelessness, we need better ideas and stronger reforms to ensure the agencies receiving money are actually helping get people off the streets.

If Prop C passes, the City will be required to spend nearly \$682 million a year on homelessness. This is almost as much as we currently spend on the San Francisco Police and Fire Departments **combined**, but with less accountability for results.

I cannot support spending \$682 million a year on homelessness with no guarantee of success. **Vote No on C**

San Francisco Supervisor Katy Tang

The true source(s) of funds for the printing fee of this argument: SF Forward.

The three largest contributors to the true source recipient committee: 1. Committee on Jobs Government Reform Fund, 2. Hathaway Dinwiddie Construction Company, 3. SF Association of Realtors Legal Action Fund.

Paid Argument AGAINST Proposition C

San Francisco Democrats Urge You to Vote NO on Prop C

President Trump, the Drudge Report and other conservatives mock San Francisco every day for San Francisco's inability to address our homelessness crisis despite hundreds of millions we throw at the problem.

Unfortunately, Prop C won't solve the problem and plays right into the hands of our city's Right Wing critics.

We can't solve homelessness with a divisive measure that proposes a tax increase the city's own analysis admits will cost middle-class jobs.

We can't solve homelessness with a divisive ballot measure that proposes \$300 million a year in new spending with no plan or accountability.

Mayor Breed and San Francisco have an opportunity to implement her well-thought homelessness plan and demonstrate that progressives can manage effectively



and reduce homelessness without abandoning our compassion.

*Mary Jung, Former San Francisco Democratic Party Chair**

*Tom Hsieh, Democratic Party Leader**

*Kat Anderson, Democratic Party Leader**

*For identification purposes only; author is signing as an individual and not on behalf of an organization.

The true source(s) of funds for the printing fee of this argument: SF Forward.

The three largest contributors to the true source recipient committee: 1. Committee on Jobs Government Reform Fund, 2. Hathaway Dinwiddie Construction Company, 3. SF Association of Realtors Legal Action Fund.

Paid Argument AGAINST Proposition C

Chinatown Leaders Urge You to Learn the Facts About Prop C

- Biggest tax increase in San Francisco history
- Doubles funding to the same flawed delivery system and programs
- Contains no reforms, no plan, and no performance requirements
- Locks in more than \$680 million funding through budget set asides — more than the police and fire departments put together
- Spends \$375,000 — a total of \$1.5 billion — over five years on each homeless person it purports to help — with no guarantee of housing or an exit from homelessness
- City's own analysis says it will devastate middle class jobs and incentivize companies to move employees out of San Francisco
- Written before the election of our new Mayor without her involvement

Prop C is well-intentioned but seriously flawed. Let's get behind a real sustainable plan for reducing homelessness.

Vote No on Prop C

Chinatown Merchants Association

The true source(s) of funds for the printing fee of this argument: SF Forward.

The three largest contributors to the true source recipient committee: 1. Committee on Jobs Government Reform

Funds, 2. Hathaway Dinwiddie Construction Company, 3. San Francisco Association of Realtors Legal Action Fund.

Paid Argument AGAINST Proposition C

Latino Leaders Urge you to Vote NO on Prop C

We need real solutions to homelessness, not a tax increase that the city's own analysis says will cost middle-class jobs.

You can't solve homelessness with a measure that threatens people's jobs, income and their ability to afford their homes.

Let's go back to the drawing board with our Mayor and implement the well-thought-out plan she put forward in her campaign.

In the meantime, vote NO on Prop C.

Hispanic Chambers of Commerce of San Francisco

The true source(s) of funds for the printing fee of this argument: SF Forward.

The three largest contributors to the true source recipient committee: 1. Committee on Jobs Government Reform Funds, 2. Hathaway Dinwiddie Construction Company, 3. San Francisco Association of Realtors Legal Action Fund.

Paid Argument AGAINST Proposition C

If Prop C passes, it would be the largest tax increase in San Francisco history—doubling spending on homelessness services to a total of \$682 million a year. This additional funding would be locked in forever, with no plan or accountability measures to make sure the agencies receiving the money are actually having an impact

As a small business owner with a storefront at the frontlines of the homelessness crisis, I couldn't agree more that we need better ideas to address the problem. But Prop C has no chance of succeeding if there is no plan and no accountability.

I urge you to vote No on Prop C

Gwen Kaplan, Small Business Leader

The true source(s) of funds for the printing fee of this argument: SF Forward.

The three largest contributors to the true source recipient committee: 1. Committee on Jobs Government Reform Funds, 2. Hathaway Dinwiddie Construction Company, 3. SF Association of Realtors Legal Action Fund.



Paid Argument AGAINST Proposition C

Here are a few things to consider before you cast your vote on Prop C:

San Francisco city government already spends more per capita than any other city in America.

San Francisco city government already spends more on homelessness per capita than any other city in America.

At \$300 million per year, Prop C is the largest tax increase ever proposed by San Francisco.

San Franciscans just passed a \$141 million tax increase on the June ballot that the city hasn't even begun collecting yet.

Prop C would nearly double funding for the existing agencies that contract with San Francisco to provide homeless services, but the measure contains no plan, no performance benchmarks and no accountability measures for how the money is spent.

San Francisco Small Business leaders urge you to vote NO on Prop C

Henry Karnilowicz

*President, San Francisco Council of District Merchants Association**

*For identification purposes only; author is signing as an individual and not on behalf of an organization.

The true source(s) of funds for the printing fee of this argument: SF Forward.

The three largest contributors to the true source recipient committee: 1. Committee on Jobs Government Reform Funds, 2. Hathaway Dinwiddie Construction Company, 3. San Francisco Association of Realtors Legal Action Fund.

Paid Argument AGAINST Proposition C

Proposition C will not solve our homelessness problem.

Proposition C proposes the biggest tax increase in city history, doubles spending on homelessness services with no plan or additional accountability measures for the agencies receiving the money and locks in the funding as a budget set aside.

Proposition C spends a total of \$1.5 billion over five years with no guarantee of housing or an exit from homelessness. It contains no reforms, no plan, and no performance requirements.

We all know that we need to do more to address homelessness in our streets, but Prop C is not the answer.

Vote No on Prop C.

Hotel Council of San Francisco

The true source(s) of funds for the printing fee of this argument: SF Forward.

The three largest contributors to the true source recipient committee: 1. Committee on Jobs Government Reform Fund, 2. Hathaway Dinwiddie Construction Company, 3. SF Association of Realtors Legal Action Fund.

Paid Argument AGAINST Proposition C

Prop C is a nonstarter if there is no real plan to solve our homelessness crisis.

Prop C proposes spending an additional \$300 million a year on homelessness services with no accountability measures to ensure agencies receiving the money are actually delivering results.

As a small business leader already operating in one of the most expensive cities in America, I'm particularly concerned about Prop C's impact on our middle-class communities. The City's own analysis says the tax will cost middle-class jobs, driving away customers from many of San Francisco's merchant corridors. This is unacceptable.

I urge you to vote No on Prop C.

*David Heller**

President, Greater Geary Blvd Merchants Association

*For identification purposes only; author is signing as an individual and not on behalf of an organization.

The true source(s) of funds for the printing fee of this argument: SF Forward.

The three largest contributors to the true source recipient committee: 1. Committee on Jobs Government Reform Fund, 2. Hathaway Dinwiddie Construction Company, 3. SF Association of Realtors Legal Action Fund.

Paid Argument AGAINST Proposition C

Proposition C proposes the biggest tax increase in city history, doubles spending on homelessness services with no plan or additional accountability measures for the agencies receiving the money and locks in the funding as a budget set aside.

To put things in perspective, San Francisco will now lock in \$682 million a year in funding — almost double



the current amount — for the same homeless service system that produced the current result without a plan or performance benchmarks for how the money is spent. This is almost as much as we currently spend on the San Francisco Police and Fire Departments combined with less accountability for results.

San Francisco Police urge you to vote No on Prop C.

San Francisco Police Officers Association

The true source(s) of funds for the printing fee of this argument: SF Forward.

The three largest contributors to the true source recipient committee: 1. Committee on Jobs Government Reform Fund, 2. Hathaway Dinwiddie Construction Company, 3. SF Association of Realtors Legal Action Fund.

Paid Argument AGAINST Proposition C

At \$300 million per year, Proposition C is the biggest proposed tax increase in San Francisco history, and could cost the city a large numbers of middle class jobs.

Prop C nearly doubles San Francisco's payroll and gross receipts taxes on businesses headquartered here. No other major city in California even charges a business payroll tax because it is such a strong incentive for companies to leave or grow elsewhere.

That's why the City's own analysis of Prop C from the Office of Workforce and Economic Development says Prop C will cause the city to lose middle-class jobs in offices and retail throughout the city.

"We need to be conscious of who our revenue generating measures are affecting. In this case, it seems the potential to impact middle income jobs should cause concerns," the report concludes.

We should go back to the drawing board and work with our new Mayor London Breed to come up with a solution that fights homelessness without costing more San Franciscans their jobs, livelihoods and, possibly, their homes. **We urge you to Vote NO on Prop C.**

San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

The true source(s) of funds for the printing fee of this argument: SF Forward.

The three largest contributors to the true source recipient committee: 1. Committee on Jobs Government Reform Fund, 2. Hathaway Dinwiddie Construction Company, 3. SF Association of Realtors Legal Action Fund.

Paid Argument AGAINST Proposition C

San Franciscans willingly spend more to address homelessness per capita than any other city in the country.

Supporters of this measure offer no solutions, no accountability and no thought in solving homelessness beyond guilt.

If Prop C passes, the city will be spending \$90 million more on homelessness than Muni, Children Youth and Families, Libraries, and Rec and Park combined.

San Franciscans should reject this expensive proposition of guilt and demand that our elected officials produce results from our existing \$11 billion dollar budget.

That is why I am urging San Franciscans to vote NO on Prop C.

Ron Dudum, Sunset Neighborhood Leader

The true source(s) of funds for the printing fee of this argument: SF Forward.

The three largest contributors to the true source recipient committee: 1. Committee on Jobs Government Reform Fund, 2. Hathaway Dinwiddie Construction Company, 3. SF Association of Realtors Legal Action Fund.

Paid Argument AGAINST Proposition C

At \$300 million annually, Proposition C is the largest proposed tax increase in San Francisco history. While the measure addresses the right issue of our time — homelessness — it is too costly and fails to include appropriate benchmarks on spending. In short, this measure is an effort to spend significantly more money on a serious problem yet lacks discernment on how and why that money is spent, and whether the spending is making a difference.

Innovation is a fundamental component to the success of the technology industry here in San Francisco. At the core of innovation is the idea that we can and should improve things by looking at issues with a different approach. Proposition C is the antithesis to innovation; instead of reevaluating how our current homelessness budget is spent, and whether that spending is making a sufficient impact, this measure suggests we should simply spend more money in the exact same manner and hope the problem is fixed.

Here at sf.citi, we suggest, instead, that as a community we should go back to the drawing board and work with City and community leaders to come up with a



solution that fights homelessness effectively with real results. Let's consider, first, policy reforms that address mental health and shelter services and other sorely needed changes to the status quo of homelessness services. We simply cannot continue to throw more and more money at a problem with no results when the lives of San Franciscans are at stake. Vote NO on Proposition C.

sf.citi

The true source(s) of funds for the printing fee of this argument: SF Forward.

The three largest contributors to the true source recipient committee: 1. Committee on Jobs Government Reform Fund, 2. Hathaway Dinwiddie Construction Company, 3. SF Association of Realtors Legal Action Fund.



D

Additional Tax on Cannabis Businesses; Expanding the Businesses Subject to Business Taxes

Shall the City impose new cannabis business taxes beginning in 2021, at rates ranging from 1% to 5% on gross receipts of cannabis businesses in San Francisco, where the Board of Supervisors could decrease those rates, or increase them up to 7%; and shall the City apply many of its business taxes to businesses with over \$500,000 in gross receipts in San Francisco that do not have a physical presence here; raising an estimated \$2–4 million annually in combined tax revenues in 2019 and 2020, and an estimated \$7–16 million annually beginning in 2021, and with no expiration date on these newly imposed and applied taxes?

YES  
NO  

Digest by the Ballot Simplification Committee

The Way It Is Now: The City collects a tax on gross receipts from many businesses operating in San Francisco. The current tax rates on gross receipts range from 0.075 percent to 0.65 percent. Cannabis businesses are subject to the tax on gross receipts.

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

The City collects gross receipts and other taxes on businesses that meet specified conditions relating to activities within San Francisco.

Increasing tax revenue spending limits requires San Francisco voter approval.

The Proposal: Beginning January 1, 2021, Proposition D would impose a new gross receipts cannabis business tax of:

- 2.5 percent on the first \$1 million of gross revenues from the retail sale of cannabis products;
- 5 percent on gross revenues over \$1 million from the retail sale of cannabis products;
- 1 percent on the first \$1 million of gross revenues from cannabis business activities other than the retail sale of cannabis products; and

- 1.5 percent on gross revenues over \$1 million from cannabis business activities other than the retail sale of cannabis products.

These additional taxes would not apply to:

- Revenues from the retail sale of medicinal cannabis;
- The first \$500,000 of gross revenues;
- Revenues from certain activities indirectly related to cannabis businesses; or
- Some businesses exempt from The City's gross receipts tax, such as certain nonprofit organizations.

The Board of Supervisors could decrease or increase the tax rate, up to a maximum rate of 7 percent in each category. By a two-thirds vote of the Board, the tax in any category may be increased up to 1 percent each year.

Revenues from this additional tax would go into the General Fund, which The City may use for any public purpose.

Proposition D would increase The City's annual tax revenue spending limit for four years.

In addition, beginning January 1, 2019, Proposition D would modify The City's tax code to apply many of The City's business taxes to some businesses that receive more than \$500,000 in gross revenue in San Francisco and do not have a physical presence in The City.

This measure requires 50%+1 affirmative votes to pass.

The above statement is an impartial analysis of this measure. Arguments for and against this measure immediately follow. The full text begins on page 112. Some of the words used in the ballot digest are explained starting on page 58.



A "YES" Vote Means: If you vote "yes," you want to:

- Impose new cannabis business taxes; and
- Apply many of The City's business taxes to some businesses that do not have a physical presence in The City.

A "NO" Vote Means: If you vote "no," you do not approve these taxes and modifications.

Controller's Statement on "D"

City Controller Ben Rosenfield has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition D:

Should this ordinance be approved, in my opinion, it would result in a tax revenue increase to the City of an estimated \$2–4 million in 2019, growing to \$7–16 million annually beginning in 2021. The tax is a general tax and proceeds would be deposited into the General Fund.

The measure would amend the City's Business Tax and Regulations Code to impose a cannabis business tax rate of between one percent and five percent depending on the type of cannabis business activity and amount of a business's gross receipts, beginning on January 1, 2021. In addition, the measure would exempt the first \$500,000 of gross receipts and exempt retail sales of medicinal cannabis. The tax rate may be adjusted between zero percent and seven percent at any time by a two-thirds vote of the Board of Supervisors, but the rate cannot be increased by more than 1 percent annually. This portion of the ordinance is estimated to generate \$5–12 million annually beginning in 2021.

Additionally, the ordinance would permit the City to tax businesses that do not have a physical presence here, provided those businesses' sales exceed \$500,000 annually. The revenue implications of this provision depend on the extent to which local wholesalers, retailers, and consumers directly receive shipments from these non-local businesses, as opposed to shipping through other distributors already subject to business tax. Currently, this is largely unknown to the City. We estimate shorter-term revenues of \$2 to 4 million annually as a result of this change, with the potential for significant additional tax revenue depending on the total sales from new required business tax payers. For each additional \$1 billion from such sales, City revenues would increase by approximately \$1.5 million.

How "D" Got on the Ballot

On July 31, 2018, the Board of Supervisors voted 8 to 3 to place Proposition D on the ballot. The Supervisors voted as follows:

Yes: Brown, Cohen, Fewer, Peskin, Safai, Stefani, Tang, Yee.

No: Kim, Mandelman, Ronen.

This measure requires 50%+1 affirmative votes to pass.

The above statement is an impartial analysis of this measure. Arguments for and against this measure immediately follow. The full text begins on page 112. Some of the words used in the ballot digest are explained starting on page 58.



Proponent's Argument in Favor of Proposition D

Prop D is a fair and data-driven tax on high-earning cannabis businesses to ensure they pay their fair share to build a responsible, inclusive industry.

In 2016, California voted to legalize cannabis and allow cities like San Francisco to tax the associated businesses.

San Francisco is the last major city in California to pass a tax on cannabis.

Learning from the experiences of other cities, San Francisco worked with a broad range of community and industry stakeholders to design a fair tax structure.

The end result is something that the entire community can be proud of. Prop D is structured to keep medicinal cannabis affordable, incentivize local manufacturing businesses, support startup businesses entering the market, provide data-driven analysis of the industry, and put Equity businesses on equal footing.

Prop D, which is expected to generate ~ \$10 Million per year, will allow the highest-earning cannabis businesses to contribute to:

- Education about the effects of cannabis
- Compassion programs for low-income patients
- Equity programs for business owners harmed by over-policing
- Training and education for the new cannabis workforce
- Enforcement of city cannabis permitting laws

We cannot leave millions of dollars on the table that could fund key resources in our community.

Prop D is specifically endorsed by:

Supervisor Malia Cohen
 Supervisor Norman Yee
 Supervisor Katy Tang
 Supervisor Catherine Stefani
 Supervisor Vallie Brown

Vote Yes on Proposition D – Cannabis Education, Access, and Equity

Supervisor Malia Cohen
Supervisor Norman Yee
Supervisor Katy Tang
Supervisor Catherine Stefani
Supervisor Vallie Brown

Rebuttal to Proponent's Argument in Favor of Proposition D

A long uphill battle was fought to legalize marijuana. Consumers were excited when San Francisco dispensaries finally opened for legal, recreational products which are safe, tested and quality controlled. But the Board of Supervisors, which submitted Proposition D, may ruin this before it even has a chance.

The Board of Supervisors incorrectly assumes cannabis businesses are highly successful, and we're learning many across California are actually struggling with narrow profit margins. As a result, many cities are actually lowering cannabis taxes.

The Board of Supervisors says cannabis businesses need to pay their fair share, yet they already pay a business tax, and they pay the required payroll taxes and income taxes- that's their fair share. Adding more proposed taxes on top of taxes is actually unfair and simply abusive!

If this tax passes, consumers will face even higher cannabis prices than now; San Francisco risks losing legal, safe recreational marijuana, fueling the growth of an illegal cannabis market instead. We certainly would not be proud of that.

The Proposition D ordinance wording requires that tax revenue goes into the city's General Fund, with no specific contribution to education, to training, nor enforcement. But the Board of Supervisors misleads us, tells us differently. Don't you wish San Francisco bureaucrats would just give us voters correct information? Let's hold them accountable and vote NO on Prop D. We deserve honest guidance so we can feel good about our decision come Election Day.

Learn more at www.richiegreenberg.com.

Richie Greenberg



Opponent's Argument Against Proposition D

By all measures, Proposition D is shortsighted and will harm cannabis-related businesses with higher costs, putting them out of business, and driving consumers back to purchasing marijuana on the illegal market with reduced product testing and quality. If approved, this additional tax serves no useful public purpose. It's simply a City Hall greedy money-grab. Tax revenues will go, not to fund education or rehabilitation programs, but to the General Fund, the City's ever expanding and unaccountable bureaucracy. Say no to Proposition D. Keep consumption safe and legal.

Richie Greenberg

Rebuttal to Opponent's Argument Against Proposition D

Proposition D was crafted with the input of educators, business owners, patients, and regulators. The tax is a fair way to keep cannabis businesses accountable, while supporting small businesses, equity operators, and low income patients across the City.

This revenue will allow San Francisco to use a data-driven approach in developing a responsible, fair, and safe cannabis industry. By directing money to the general fund, the City can be responsive to the changing needs over time.

Prop D helps pay for legal assistance, financial access, and worker training. It will help create a well-trained, socially responsible, unionized workforce to ensure that the benefits of the new industry are accessible to everyone.

Prop D helps support for a streamlined, safety-driven permitting process that will prioritize public safety and limit the illegal market.

San Francisco has one chance to build a fair, safe, and responsible industry.

Prop D is endorsed by the San Francisco Equity Group

Vote Yes on Proposition D – Cannabis Education, Access, and Equity

Malia Cohen, President, Board of Supervisors

San Francisco Equity Group



Paid Argument IN FAVOR of Proposition D

LGBTQ Leaders Urge You to Vote Yes on D

We are proud to support a progressive tax that allows LGBTQ San Franciscans to continue to use medical cannabis tax-free as an HIV/AIDS treatment.

Prop D would also fund much-needed cannabis education initiatives and programming to support entrepreneurs unjustly targeted by the War on Drugs.

Vote Yes on D

*Alice B. Toklas Democratic Club
Compton's Trans Cultural District*

The true source(s) of funds for the printing fee of this argument: Sophia Kitler.

End of Paid Arguments IN FAVOR of Proposition D

Paid Argument AGAINST Proposition D

By all measures, Proposition D is shortsighted and will harm cannabis-related businesses with higher costs, driving consumers back to purchasing marijuana on the illegal market with reduced product testing and quality. If approved, this additional tax serves no benevolent purpose. Tax revenues will go, not to education or rehabilitation programs, but to the general fund, likely to city employee payroll and pensions. Say no to Prop D.

San Francisco Republican Party

The true source(s) of funds for the printing fee of this argument: San Francisco Republican Party.

The three largest contributors to the true source recipient committee: 1. Retain Our San Francisco Superior Court Judges 2018, 2. Committee For An Affordable San Francisco, 3. Stop The Prohibition Proposition.

Paid Argument AGAINST Proposition D

Finally, recreational marijuana can be purchased openly and legally, but **Prop D would send pot purchasers back to the black market with onerous taxes that would make the price of legal cannabis prohibitively high.**

Wasn't the whole point of legalization to eliminate the black market where even children could easily access marijuana, and quality and potency were unpredictable?

Washington and Colorado lowered their initially high taxes to attract buyers back to the legal market, and

even Berkeley lowered its cannabis tax rate. **Cannabis is already taxed in California and San Francisco.**

California imposes a 15% excise tax. San Francisco taxes it at 8.5%, and cannabis businesses with gross receipts of over \$1,000,000 are already taxed from .075% to .65%. Cannabis is already taxed at every step of the supply chain—cultivation, testing, and sales.

Prop D purposely leaves the door open to supervisors to further increase taxes beyond what voters approve. The **starting** rates are 1%, 1.5%, 2.5%, and 5%. Prop D sets 7% as the maximum; it's just a matter of time before tax hungry politicians vote to **raise** rates to 7%.

Vote NO on D.

Libertarian Party of San Francisco

The true source(s) of funds for the printing fee of this argument: Libertarian Party of San Francisco.

The three largest contributors to the true source recipient committee: 1. Scott Banister, 2. Libertarian Party of California, 3. Tim Carrico.



E

Partial Allocation of Hotel Tax for Arts and Cultural Purposes

Shall the City annually distribute up to 1.5% of the current base hotel tax for specific arts and cultural purposes, without increasing the existing hotel tax?

YES  
NO  

Digest by the Ballot Simplification Committee

The Way It Is Now: The City currently imposes a hotel tax on the rental of hotel rooms. The tax is 14 percent (an 8 percent base tax and a 6 percent tax surcharge). The tax goes into the General Fund, and the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor may allocate the money for any public purpose.

The Arts Commission is a City agency that receives money from the General Fund. The Arts Commission:

- Funds arts programs for youth, community and arts education;
- Approves designs of City-owned structures;
- Oversees City-owned cultural centers; and
- Selects art for City buildings and public spaces.

In addition to funding the Arts Commission, The City runs other programs that fund nonprofit organizations to support arts activities and help neighborhoods maintain their unique cultural heritage.

The Proposal: Proposition E would distribute up to 1.5 percent of the money raised from the current 8 percent base hotel tax for specified arts and cultural purposes. It would not change the hotel tax rate of 14 percent.

In each fiscal year, it would require The City to make a distribution of set dollar amounts for these designated arts and cultural uses:

- \$16.3 million to support nonprofit cultural organizations;
- \$6.4 million for programs related to the Cultural Equity Endowment;
- \$3.8 million to support City-owned community cultural centers;

- \$3 million to support communities working to maintain cultural heritage in City neighborhoods; and
- \$2.5 million to address needs in the arts community, as determined by a cultural services allocation plan.

Dollar amounts will change subject to the receipt of tax revenues.

After all of these distributions have been made for a fiscal year, any remaining portion of the funds would go into the General Fund.

A "YES" Vote Means: If you vote "yes," you want The City to distribute up to 1.5 percent of the current base hotel tax for specific arts and cultural purposes.

A "NO" Vote Means: If you vote "no," you do not want The City to make this distribution.

Controller's Statement on "E"

City Controller Ben Rosenfield has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition E:

Should the proposed amendment be approved by the voters, in my opinion, it would have a significant impact on the cost of government. The measure dedicates a portion of the City's hotel tax revenue which is currently available for any public purpose to specific arts and cultural services. As these funds are shifted to these purposes, they would not be available to support other City spending.

The hotel tax currently generates approximately \$370 million that is available for any governmental purpose. The proposed amendment would allocate approximately eight percent of total hotel tax revenue to specified arts and cultural services. The City currently allocates General Fund revenues to many of these same purposes. When compared to these current spending

This measure requires 66⅔%+1 affirmative votes to pass.

The above statement is an impartial analysis of this measure. Arguments for and against this measure immediately follow. The full text begins on page 115. Some of the words used in the ballot digest are explained starting on page 58.



levels, \$22.4 million in fiscal year (FY) 2017–18, funds allocated to the uses specified in the amendment would grow by approximately \$5 million in FY 2018–19, increasing to approximately \$13 million in FY 2021–22.

As these funds are shifted to these purposes, they would not be available to support other City spending. This shift includes approximately \$5 million annually from the City’s general discretionary budget and approximately \$8 million from funding requirements previously adopted by the voters for public transit, youth services, libraries, schools, and other services.

How "E" Got on the Ballot

On July 31, 2018, the Board of Supervisors voted 11 to 0 to place Proposition E on the ballot. The Supervisors voted as follows:

Yes: Brown, Cohen, Fewer, Kim, Mandelman, Peskin, Ronen, Safai, Stefani, Tang, Yee.

No: None.

This measure requires 66⅔%+1 affirmative votes to pass.

The above statement is an impartial analysis of this measure. Arguments for and against this measure immediately follow. The full text begins on page 115. Some of the words used in the ballot digest are explained starting on page 58.



Proponent's Argument in Favor of Proposition E

Protect Arts and Culture without raising taxes. Vote YES on E.

Arts and culture are the heart of San Francisco. Our children benefit every day from hands-on education at places like the Exploratorium; world-renowned performing arts institutions like the San Francisco Symphony, Ballet and Opera bring music, dance and language programs to schools; our diversity and heritage are preserved at places like the Calle 24, SOMA Pilipinas Filipino Cultural Heritage District and the African American Art & Culture Complex; and small grassroots arts and culture organizations and individual artists strengthen the fabric and vitality of every San Francisco community.

But over the years, funding for arts and culture – which was once dedicated from the hotel tax – has diminished. As a result, many artists are struggling, and community arts organizations can no longer pay rent in neighborhoods they've been in for decades, like Bayview, SoMA, Chinatown and the Mission.

Yes on E protects and restores funding for all San Francisco arts, without raising any taxes, by re-dedicating 1.5% of the 14% hotel tax to the arts. This funding will be used to:

- **Bring arts to kids and schools** to encourage their creativity and pay dividends for a lifetime.
- **Support Cultural Districts and community arts** so that arts and culture are available to all San Franciscans.
- **Keep our economy strong**, as San Francisco arts help attract tourists here, contributing one-point-seven billion dollars annually to the City's economy.

Proposition E is spearheaded by the San Francisco Arts & Culture Coalition representing arts and culture organizations united to restore the heart of our city – arts and culture.

Please join us. Vote Yes on E.

Mayor London Breed

Supervisor Katy Tang

Supervisor Aaron Peskin

*Tom DeCaigny, Director of Cultural Affairs, San Francisco Arts Commission**

Hotel Council of San Francisco

United Educators of San Francisco

San Francisco Arts Education Project

San Franciscans for the Arts

*For identification purposes only; author is signing as an individual and not on behalf of an organization.

Rebuttal to Proponent's Argument in Favor of Proposition E

It is disingenuous to claim that Prop E's proposed allocation of 1.5% of the City's hotel tax to arts and culture would not raise tax rates when it would do what amounts to the same thing -- **reduce the City's budget across all other services, creating pressure for near-term tax hikes.**

The hotel room tax, introduced in 1961 at 6%, is now 14%. Its great appeal is that it's paid by people who don't vote here. And is paid on top of taxes of 1.06% to 2.25% in the two tax districts that contain the majority of City hotels (the Moscone Expansion District and the Tourism Improvement District). The revenue it raises has grown exponentially over the years, but is still cyclical and depends on business and tourism trends. **If a hotel tax earmark for the arts attracts visitors, higher hotel rates tend to repel them.** Any claims that a hotel tax allocation for the arts pays for itself are dubious.

The real issues here aren't economic. Taste in art is individual and evolves constantly. Manet's "*dejeuner sur l'herbe*" was once branded pornography, as were Mappleworth's photographs. Christo's installations across the US landscape featured lawsuits as part of the art. Chairman Mao's thoughts are not considered propaganda in China.

Opera or hip hop? **Should the City have the final say through its art commission and subsidies? The vibrant arts scene the City enjoys today depends upon individuals and not public officials making these judgments.**

Vote NO on E.

Libertarian Party of San Francisco

www.LPSForg



Opponent's Argument Against Proposition E

The issue is not support for the arts, but government subsidy.

San Francisco's hotel tax revenue is currently available for any government purpose. This provides maximum flexibility in allocating these funds to the City's highest priorities at any time. So why does the City now want to earmark a chunk of these taxpayer funds to the arts for the next few years? **Are the arts a higher priority than public transit, youth services, libraries, schools and other services?** These are the budget items that the City Controller says would be proportionately reduced by the proposed arts allocation.

If it ain't broke, don't fix it. Allowing bureaucrats to pick and choose which artists get funded does not create a flourishing, independent artistic community. All they need is an art-loving public that sustains its favorite artists by buying their works, attending their performances, or becoming patrons of their non-profit arts organizations.

Government subsidies can only harm our large and vibrant art scene. **They would substitute a government committee's choice of which of their pet projects and artists to fund for the choices of many individuals.**

Government earmarks and set-asides are generally inefficient. Funding allocations would become entrenched and create vested interests among the artists having to lobby for them. They involve grant-making committees, whose selection criteria would inevitably favor political bias over aesthetic and popular appeal. A look at the current crop of San Francisco grants is replete with vague virtue-signaling references to "social justice initiatives" and "cultural equity."

Subsidies of the arts can create the same problems of waste and corruption seen in banking, the housing market and other areas, complete with taxpayer bailouts and the weakening of once-strong institutions and communities.

Support the arts! Vote NO on E.

Libertarian Party of San Francisco

www.LPSForg

Rebuttal to Opponent's Argument Against Proposition E

Protect the arts without raising taxes. Vote Yes on Prop E.

There has always been a link between San Francisco's Hotel Tax and the arts community. When the Hotel Tax was first formed in 1961, its intent was to support our local artists and arts organizations.

Over the years, the arts in San Francisco have lost tens of millions of dollars of funding as our economy has soared. As a result, arts organizations have struggled or closed, artists who can't afford San Francisco are leaving and we are missing out on opportunities to expand arts education for our kids.

Proposition E is not a tax increase. This measure simply restores the previous, voter-approved priorities for hotel tax funding, which the City has diverted for other purposes over the years. It re-allocates existing tax dollars to their original purpose- arts and culture- with no increase in taxes.

We must act locally to protect the arts. President Trump has proposed eliminating all federal funding for the arts in his budget. It's time for us to act locally to show our progressive values and invest in our most urgent priorities.

There's a reason that Proposition E has nearly unanimous support from our city's elected leaders, community organizations, affordable housing advocates, good-government organizations and the City's hotels who collect the tax.

It's because Proposition E is a smart, fiscally responsible way to protect our arts in San Francisco without raising any taxes.

Vote Yes on Prop E.

Supervisor Katy Tang

The Hotel Council of San Francisco

United Educators of San Francisco

San Franciscans for the Arts



Paid Argument IN FAVOR of Proposition E

Vote YES on E Because Arts Education is Vital for SF Kids.

The arts have the power to transform young people's lives and help them see and experience the world in different ways. Access to visual and performing arts in schools increases opportunities for self-expression and enjoyment and has a profound positive impact on youth development. This measure will ensure that our kids have more access to the arts, encouraging their creativity and providing life-changing experiences. Vote YES on E to keep arts and culture spaces available to the youth of our city.

*United Educators of San Francisco
San Francisco Arts Education Project
San Francisco Symphony Education Programs
San Francisco Ballet, Education & Training Department
San Francisco Opera Association
Root Division*

The true source(s) of funds for the printing fee of this argument: San Franciscans for the Arts.

The three largest contributors to the true source recipient committee: 1. Yerba Buena Center for the Arts, 2. Asian Pacific Islander Cultural Center, 3. San Francisco Ballet.

Paid Argument IN FAVOR of Proposition E

We stand united for Proposition E.

Proposition E is a broad-based, comprehensive, and fiscally-responsible approach to protecting and expanding arts and culture in San Francisco. We are proud to support Prop E because it not only protects arts and culture for EVERY San Franciscan, but it allows the City to expand its support for the arts city-wide. Proposition E preserves and celebrates our diverse cultures, supports the world-renowned performance arts enjoyed by millions, and expands our ability to make arts a vital part of our schools and education: ALL WITHOUT RAISING TAXES. Please join us and vote **YES ON E** to protect San Francisco arts and culture for years to come.

*State Senator Scott Wiener
Assemblymember David Chiu
Former State Senator Tom Ammiano
Board of Supervisors President Malia Cohen
Supervisor Katy Tang
Supervisor Aaron Peskin
Supervisor Rafael Mandelman
Supervisor Sandra Lee Fewer
Supervisor Vallie Brown
Supervisor Jane Kim*

*Supervisor Norman Yee
Supervisor Catherine Stefani*

The true source(s) of funds for the printing fee of this argument: San Franciscans for the Arts.

The three largest contributors to the true source recipient committee: 1. Yerba Buena Center for the Arts, 2. Asian Pacific Islander Cultural Center, 3. San Francisco Ballet.

Paid Argument IN FAVOR of Proposition E

A broad coalition of artists and arts organizations, representing cultural equity, Cultural Centers, Cultural Districts, and civic institutions, have partnered with the City of San Francisco to vote YES ON E to restore the historical connection of arts and culture funding from the Hotel Tax.

Celebrated arts and culture organizations that will benefit from Prop E include:

*African American Art & Culture Complex
Asian Pacific Islander Cultural Center
Calle 24 Latino Cultural District
Compton's Transgender Cultural District
Exploratorium
San Francisco Ballet
San Francisco Film Society
San Francisco Opera
San Francisco Symphony
SFJAZZ
San Francisco Museum of Modern Art
SOMA Pilipinas
Theatre Bay Area
Yerba Buena Center for the Arts*

This measure has support from a broad coalition including nearly every local elected official, arts and cultural organizations, and the business community. In 1961, San Francisco set the tone for the rest of the country with its original link of arts and tourism through the Hotel Tax. Slowly, this foundation for our greatness has been taken away and the critical loss of funding has had a profound effect on arts and culture in San Francisco. We love this City and want to continue contributing to its beauty and diversity but we need secure funding to do this. Without raising taxes, revenue allocation through the Hotel Tax will increase access to arts education and thriving arts and culture programs, which will help to preserve our wonderful city. Proposition E will also help our local artists and programs, ensuring that our homegrown talent can continue to thrive in San Francisco.

Vote YES ON E to restore funding to arts and culture in San Francisco.



San Franciscans for the Arts

The true source(s) of funds for the printing fee of this argument: San Franciscans for the Arts.

The three largest contributors to the true source recipient committee: 1. Yerba Buena Center for the Arts, 2. Asian Pacific Islander Cultural Center, 3. San Francisco Ballet.

Paid Argument IN FAVOR of Proposition E

Invest in San Francisco. Vote YES on E.

San Francisco's arts community is a major driver of the City's economy. Independent studies have shown that the arts help attract tourists to San Francisco, contributing \$1.7 billion per year to the City's economy. The arts help support thousands of jobs in San Francisco. At its inception in 1961, the Hotel Tax rightfully linked tourism and art and this measure only looks to restore this relationship, WITHOUT RAISING TAXES. San Francisco's arts and cultural organizations serve as a powerful economic force and act as a magnet for tourism, attracting visitors from all over the world to admire the museums, performances, architecture, murals, and so much more. These visitors help bring in revenue for local businesses and boost the local economy. Vote YES on E to invest in ALL San Franciscans.

*Jim Lazarus, Senior Vice President, Public Policy, San Francisco Chamber of Commerce**

*For identification purposes only; author is signing as an individual and not on behalf of an organization.

The true source(s) of funds for the printing fee of this argument: San Franciscans for the Arts.

The three largest contributors to the true source recipient committee: 1. Yerba Buena Center for the Arts, 2. Asian Pacific Islander Cultural Center, 3. San Francisco Ballet.

Paid Argument IN FAVOR of Proposition E

Support our City Cultural Centers, vote YES on E.

Proposition E will RESTORE funding to nonprofit cultural institutions and community cultural centers like Asian Pacific Islander Cultural Center and Mission Cultural Center for Latino Arts, and Cultural Districts such as Calle 24 Latino Cultural District and Japantown Cultural Heritage District. It would also dedicate funding with a focus on enhancing arts and music programs in schools and making the arts more accessible and affordable to local residents. The programs supported by Prop E help enhance cultural diversity in the arts and preserve such a tradition for future generations. Arts and culture are at the heart of what make San Francisco unique and they must be protected. VOTE YES ON E.

Bayview Opera House

Mission Cultural Center for Latino Arts

Asian Pacific Islander Cultural Center

SOMArts Cultural Center

Queer Cultural Center

The true source(s) of funds for the printing fee of this argument: San Franciscans for the Arts.

The three largest contributors to the true source recipient committee: 1. Yerba Buena Center for the Arts, 2. Asian Pacific Islander Cultural Center, 3. San Francisco Ballet.

Paid Argument IN FAVOR of Proposition E

SF Cultural Districts Need You to VOTE YES ON E.

Cultural Districts like Compton's Transgender Cultural District in the Tenderloin and SOMA Pilipinas - Filipino Cultural Heritage District play an integral role in preserving and protecting the rich heritage and culture of San Francisco. Funding from this measure will support Cultural Districts that preserve the heritage of our ethnic communities and neighborhoods, part of San Francisco's unique character as a city. Proposition E has a plan to support the youth of our communities, support local businesses, and preserve places where history, culture, and public spaces connect. Vote YES ON E.

SOMA Pilipinas - Filipino Cultural Heritage District

Compton's Transgender Cultural District

Japantown Task Force

Calle 24 Latino Cultural District

Leather & LGBTQ Cultural District

The true source(s) of funds for the printing fee of this argument: San Franciscans for the Arts.

The three largest contributors to the true source recipient committee: 1. Yerba Buena Center for the Arts, 2. Asian Pacific Islander Cultural Center, 3. San Francisco Ballet.

Paid Argument IN FAVOR of Proposition E

Support the local economy, vote YES on Prop E.

There's a reason why San Francisco's hotel tax was created to support the arts: San Francisco's arts community is a major driver of the City's economy. Prop E is looking to restore the original purpose of the Hotel Tax that linked arts funding to hotel revenue, without raising taxes. Independent studies have shown that the arts help attract visitors to San Francisco, contributing \$1.7 billion per year to the City's economy. Vote YES on Proposition E to ensure arts and culture thrive in San Francisco and continue to invest in the future of this City.



The Hotel Council of San Francisco
*Peter Gamez, Chair, SFTravel**

*For identification purposes only; author is signing as an individual and not on behalf of an organization.

The true source(s) of funds for the printing fee of this argument: San Franciscans for the Arts.

The three largest contributors to the true source recipient committee: 1. Yerba Buena Center for the Arts, 2. Asian Pacific Islander Cultural Center, 3. San Francisco Ballet.

Paid Argument IN FAVOR of Proposition E

Support LGBTQ arts and culture, vote YES on E.

Voting Yes on E will provide support for arts experiences and support to LGBTQ organizations, cultural groups, and artists. Our Cultural Districts and Cultural Centers, including the Compton's Transgender Cultural District and the Leather and LGBTQ Cultural District, provide a necessary public space for open discussion and learning that improves and strengthens the quality of our diverse community. Prop E will ensure that our City invests in the LGBTQ community and includes and empowers ALL members to inspire positive social change.

Alice B. Toklas LGBT Democratic Club
State Senator Scott Wiener
Former Assemblymember Tom Ammiano
Supervisor Rafael Mandelman
*Honey Mahogany, Co-President, Harvey Milk LGBTQ Democratic Club**
Debra Walker, Former President, Harvey Milk LGBTQ Democratic Club, Artist Pamela Peniston, Artistic Director, Queer Cultural Center*
*David Campos, Chair, San Francisco Democratic Party**
*Tom Temprano, Board Trustee at City College of San Francisco**

*For identification purposes only; author is signing as an individual and not on behalf of an organization.

The true source(s) of funds for the printing fee of this argument: San Franciscans for the Arts.

The three largest contributors to the true source recipient committee: 1. Yerba Buena Center for the Arts, 2. Asian Pacific Islander Cultural Center, 3. San Francisco Ballet.

Paid Argument IN FAVOR of Proposition E

Our City's workers agree: Saving the arts is good for workers and good for San Francisco.

Despite the Bay Area's economic boom, our arts and culture organizations are struggling to survive in San Francisco. Proposition E would restore funds that

would go to musicians, writers, choreographers, filmmakers, muralists, machine operators, performers, and thousands of other unseen workers who make San Francisco a global attraction. The arts help support thousands of jobs in San Francisco. Join the working people of this City as we support job growth and financial stability for all San Franciscans while working toward a more creative and sustainable San Francisco. VOTE YES ON E.

American Federation of Teachers Local 2121
Theatrical Stage Employees Local 16
Musicians Union Local 6

The true source(s) of funds for the printing fee of this argument: San Franciscans for the Arts.

The three largest contributors to the true source recipient committee: 1. Yerba Buena Center for the Arts, 2. Asian Pacific Islander Cultural Center, 3. San Francisco Ballet.

Paid Argument IN FAVOR of Proposition E

Help Keep Local Artists in San Francisco. Vote YES on E.

San Francisco residents are facing a severe affordability crisis. Despite the economic boom, local artists and residents cannot afford to stay in the City they helped create. Once known for its creativity, vibrancy, and diversity, San Francisco is becoming more unaffordable for its communities each year. Proposition E will help reinvest in the fabrics of our community - arts and culture - and will make arts more accessible and affordable to local residents, **all without raising taxes.**

Affordable Housing Alliance

The true source(s) of funds for the printing fee of this argument: San Franciscans for the Arts.

The three largest contributors to the true source recipient committee: 1. Yerba Buena Center for the Arts, 2. Asian Pacific Islander Cultural Center, 3. San Francisco Ballet.

Paid Argument IN FAVOR of Proposition E

Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods supports YES on E.

Arts and culture have always been a beacon for San Francisco neighborhoods. They help improve infrastructure, provide jobs, enhance education opportunities for our kids, engage community members, and drive thoughtful conversation. The arts help build bridges between people, places, and ideas and promote understanding, compassion and collaboration. This measure uses some of the money from the economic boom to reinvest in the fabric of our communi-



ties, ensuring that arts and culture are available to all San Franciscans. Please vote Yes on E.

Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods

The true source(s) of funds for the printing fee of this argument: San Franciscans for the Arts.

The three largest contributors to the true source recipient committee: 1. Yerba Buena Center for the Arts, 2. Asian Pacific Islander Cultural Center, 3. San Francisco Ballet.

Paid Argument IN FAVOR of Proposition E

Local artists ask you to vote YES on E.

Prop E will provide increased funding to support local artists and enable us to continue living in, working in, and contributing to the incredibly diverse and wonderful community that is San Francisco. Local artists are part of the fabric of this city but are being displaced. This measure will help support working artists and encourage the next generation of artists through arts education programming. Please vote Yes on E.

*Recording Academy San Francisco Chapter
Chanticleer*

Rhodessa Jones, Artist and Activist

Matt Gonzalez, Artist, Former Supervisor

Yukiya Jerry Waki

The true source(s) of funds for the printing fee of this argument: San Franciscans for the Arts.

The three largest contributors to the true source recipient committee: 1. Yerba Buena Center for the Arts, 2. Asian Pacific Islander Cultural Center, 3. San Francisco Ballet.

Paid Argument IN FAVOR of Proposition E

SAVE ARTS AND CULTURE. VOTE YES ON E.

Proposition E will RESTORE funding for arts and cultural experiences in San Francisco through allocations from the Hotel Tax, without raising any taxes. The displacement of local Black artists, arts and culture organizations, and community programs continues to rise despite the booming economy in San Francisco. Proposition E would ensure funding for cultural programs and communities like the celebrated Bayview District is allocated in a way that is resourceful and sustainable. Vote YES on E to preserve and support African-American arts and culture in San Francisco and continue to celebrate our shared diversity.

African American Art & Culture Complex

Museum of the African Diaspora

African-American Shakespeare Company

Board of Supervisors President Malia Cohen

Shamann Walton, Board of Education Commissioner

Sophie Maxwell, Former Supervisor

The true source(s) of funds for the printing fee of this argument: San Franciscans for the Arts.

The three largest contributors to the true source recipient committee: 1. Yerba Buena Center for the Arts, 2. Asian Pacific Islander Cultural Center, 3. San Francisco Ballet.

Paid Argument IN FAVOR of Proposition E

Chinese American leaders say YES on E.

Now more than ever, we must protect the culture and heritage of San Francisco communities. Local residents are struggling to stay in San Francisco because of the high living costs and Prop E offers realistic solutions to keep San Francisco accessible and affordable for ALL San Franciscans. Proposition E will protect local artists, arts programs, cultural diversity, and heritage in San Francisco without raising taxes.

Chinese Cultural Center

Assemblymember David Chiu

Supervisor Norman Yee

Jon Jang, American Jazz Pianist, Composer, and Bandleader

The true source(s) of funds for the printing fee of this argument: San Franciscans for the Arts.

The three largest contributors to the true source recipient committee: 1. Yerba Buena Center for the Arts, 2. Asian Pacific Islander Cultural Center, 3. San Francisco Ballet.

Paid Argument IN FAVOR of Proposition E

Support Latino cultural arts. Vote Yes on E.

Yes on E helps our community centers provide programming that serves youth, families, and arts audiences in our diverse neighborhoods, and promotes, preserves, and develops Latino cultural arts. Now more than ever before, it's imperative that we celebrate the influence, culture, and experiences of Latinos in our communities and ensure that working artists can remain in San Francisco.

Mission Cultural Center for Latino Arts

Calle 24 Latino Cultural District

*David Campos, Chair, San Francisco Democratic Party**

*For identification purposes only; author is signing as an individual and not on behalf of an organization.

The true source(s) of funds for the printing fee of this argument: San Franciscans for the Arts.

The three largest contributors to the true source recipient committee: 1. Yerba Buena Center for the Arts, 2. Asian Pacific Islander Cultural Center, 3. San Francisco Ballet.



Paid Argument IN FAVOR of Proposition E

Support local theaters, vote YES on E.

The San Francisco theater community unites to support Proposition E that would dedicate funding to support arts and culture in San Francisco. The benefits of the booming economy have not been equally shared. This measure uses some of the money from the economic boom to ensure that arts and culture are available to ALL San Franciscans. Our artists provide so much to the fabric of our communities and we must make sure they can afford to stay in the City. Vote YES on E.

*San Francisco Shakespeare Festival
African-American Shakespeare Company
Brad Erickson, Executive Director, Theatre Bay Area
Custom Made Theatre Company
Eugenie Chan Theater Projects
Golden Thread Productions
Cutting Ball Theater
Z Space*

The true source(s) of funds for the printing fee of this argument: San Franciscans for the Arts.

The three largest contributors to the true source recipient committee: 1. Yerba Buena Center for the Arts, 2. Asian Pacific Islander Cultural Center, 3. San Francisco Ballet.

End of Paid Arguments IN FAVOR of Proposition E

No Paid Arguments AGAINST Proposition E Were Submitted



Proposition A

Ordinance calling and providing for a special election to be held in the City and County of San Francisco on Tuesday, November 6, 2018, for the purpose of submitting to San Francisco voters a proposition to incur the following bonded debt of the City and County: \$425,000,000 to finance the construction, reconstruction, acquisition, improvement, demolition, seismic strengthening and repair of the Embarcadero Seawall and other critical infrastructure, and related costs necessary or convenient for the foregoing purposes; authorizing landlords to pass-through 50% of the resulting property tax increase to residential tenants in accordance with Administrative Code, Chapter 37; finding that the estimated cost of such proposed project is and will be too great to be paid out of the ordinary annual income and revenue of the City and County and will require expenditures greater than the amount allowed therefor by the annual tax levy; reciting the estimated cost of such proposed project; fixing the date of election and the manner of holding such election and the procedure for voting for or against the proposition; fixing the maximum rate of interest on such bonds and providing for the levy and collection of taxes to pay both principal and interest; prescribing notice to be given of such election; affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act, and finding that the proposed bond is in conformity with the eight priority policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1(b), and with the General Plan; consolidating the special election with the general election; establishing the election precincts, voting places and officers for the election; waiving the word limitation on ballot propositions imposed by Municipal Elections Code, Section 510; complying with the restrictions on the use of bond proceeds specified in California Government Code, Section 53410; incorporating the provisions regarding the Citizens' Bond Oversight Committee in Administrative Code, Sections 5.30-5.36; and waiving the time requirements specified in Administrative Code, Section 2.34.

Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. Findings.

a. The Embarcadero Seawall (the "Seawall"), which serves as the foundation of the northern waterfront, is one of San Francisco's oldest pieces of infrastructure.

b. Constructed by the State of California over one hundred years ago, the Seawall supports San Francisco's historic piers, wharves, local businesses, maritime uses, iconic tourist destinations, recreation facilities, and restaurants, which bring an estimated 24 million people to the waterfront annually.

c. The Seawall also supports key lifeline utility networks and infrastructure, including the Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART), Muni Metro, and ferry transportation networks.

d. The Seawall serves as a critical emergency response, evacuation and recovery area and provides flood protection to downtown San Francisco ("City") neighborhoods. All told, the Seawall protects over \$100 billion of assets and economic activity.

e. The Seawall is a contributing resource to the Embarcadero Historic District listed on the National Register of Historic Places.

f. Recent analysis by the City and the Port of San Francisco (the "Port") found that the Seawall will likely suffer significant damage during a major earthquake, causing widespread harm to the

Embarcadero; historic buildings and piers; critical transportation, utility, and emergency response infrastructure; and the residents, workers, and visitors who depend on them. A major earthquake would likely cause the Seawall to move towards the bay, potentially by as much as five feet. This seismic risk is compounded by the accelerating risk of flooding, which occurs today during high tides and larger storm events.

g. The Seawall is named as a critical infrastructure priority in the City's Lifelines Interdependency Study published in 2014, and the Bond (as defined below) is planned for the November 2018 election as part of the General Obligation Bond Program in the City's FY 2018-27 Capital Plan.

h. The Embarcadero Roadway encircles downtown San Francisco. After a major seismic event, up to 250,000 people are expected to exit downtown towards the waterfront. The Embarcadero must provide access to first responders, safe locations for people exiting downtown, and routes for transporting emergency supplies and equipment.

i. To address earthquake and flood risks to the Seawall, the Port is leading the Seawall Earthquake Safety and Disaster Prevention Program ("Seawall Program"), a program that will invest a projected \$2-5 billion over the next three decades to protect the San Francisco waterfront from imminent seismic risk and increasing flood risk due to sea level rise.

j. This Board of Supervisors (this "Board") recognizes the need to improve the earthquake safety and performance of the Seawall and other critical infrastructure, provide near-term flood protection improvements, and plan for long-term resilience and sea level rise adaptation along this important stretch of the City's waterfront.

k. The Seawall Earthquake Safety Bond (the "Bond") will provide funding to the Seawall Program and other critical infrastructure (as described below in Section 3).

l. The Bond sets up a financing mechanism to be used for certain kinds of work, and specific projects at specified locations will not be determined until additional design and budget development, as well as further planning and environmental review processes, are complete.

m. The Port, in consultation with the Board, will work with City transportation planners and conduct public outreach to determine the most financially feasible approaches to construction on the Seawall that minimize disruption along the Embarcadero.

n. At one or more hearings of the Historic Preservation Commission, the Port, in consultation with seismic and structural engineers, will analyze preferred alternatives for Seawall construction that minimize impact to the San Francisco Bay and preserve historic assets to the fullest extent possible.

o. This Board now wishes to describe the terms of a ballot measure seeking approval for the issuance of general obligation bonds to finance all or a portion of the City's Seawall and other critical infrastructure needs as described below.

Section 2. A special election is called and ordered to be held on Tuesday, November 6, 2018, for the purpose of submitting to the electors of the City a proposition to incur bonded indebtedness of the City for the project described in the amount and for the purposes stated:

"SAN FRANCISCO SEAWALL EARTHQUAKE SAFETY BOND, 2018. To protect the waterfront, BART and Muni, buildings, historic piers, and roads from earthquakes, flooding and rising seas by: repairing the 100 year old Embarcadero Seawall; strengthening the Embarcadero; and fortifying transit infrastructure and utilities serving residents and businesses; shall the city issue \$425,000,000 in bonds, with a duration up to 30 years from

the time of issuance, an estimated tax rate of \$0.013/\$100 of assessed property value, and estimated annual revenues of up to \$40,000,000, with citizen oversight and regular audits?

The City's current debt management policy is to keep the property tax rate from City general obligation bonds below the 2006 rate by issuing new bonds as older ones are retired and the tax base grows, though the overall property tax rate may vary based on other factors."

The special election called and ordered shall be referred to in this ordinance as the "Seawall Earthquake Safety Bond Special Election."

Section 3. PROPOSED PROGRAM. All contracts that are funded with the proceeds of bonds authorized hereby shall be subject to the provisions of Chapter 83 of the Administrative Code (the "First Source Hiring Program"), which fosters construction and permanent employment opportunities for qualified economically disadvantaged individuals. In addition, all contracts that are funded with the proceeds of bonds authorized hereby shall be subject to the provisions of Chapter 14B of the Administrative Code (the "Local Business Enterprise and Non-Discrimination in Contracting Ordinance"), which assists small and micro local businesses to increase their ability to compete effectively for the award of City contracts. To the extent permitted by law, eligible costs for the proposed program include all costs associated with Seawall Program development and planning, including planning for future sea level rise adaptation, pre-design, design, engineering and other soft costs; and construction management. The proposed program can be summarized as follows:

a. EARTHQUAKE PROJECTS. Several construction options are available to improve Seawall seismic reliability. All or a portion of these options may be implemented together, individually, or sequenced over time. A portion of the Bond may be allocated to:

- 1) Ground strengthening and liquefaction remediation
- 2) Constructing a new Seawall
- 3) Bulkhead wall, wharf and pier retrofits and replacements
- 4) Bulkhead building retrofits and seismic joints
- 5) Critical facility retrofits and replacements
- 6) Utility replacements, relocations and bypasses
- 7) Matching funds for public and private sources or
- 8) Other life safety improvements.

b. FLOOD PROTECTION PROJECTS. The Port will co-design flood mitigations with seismic improvements and will evaluate the applicability, effectiveness, risks, and costs of the short and mid-term seismic reinforcements and flood mitigations to Seawall reaches. Among the projects a portion of this Bond may be allocated to are the following:

- 1) Flood walls and barriers
- 2) Changes to surface grading
- 3) Flood proofing
- 4) Enhanced foundation for future adaptation or
- 5) Other flood control improvements.

c. MITIGATION AND ENHANCEMENT PROJECTS. The Port will decide whether to include enhancements for both the urban landscape and the bay environment based on the scale and location of the site-specific seismic and near-term flood risk reduction methods and the cost-benefit ratio of these infrastructure investments. A portion of the Bond may be allocated to:

- 1) Public access enhancements
- 2) Transportation/mobility improvements
- 3) Environmental benefits or
- 4) Other public benefits.

d. CITIZENS' OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE. A portion of the Bond shall be used to perform audits of the Bond, as further described in Section 15.

e. ART ENRICHMENT. Consistent with Section 3.19 of the San Francisco Administrative Code and to the extent permitted by law, up to 2% of Bond proceeds may be used to 1) fund educational and interpretative art to inform the public about the Seawall and earthquake and flood risks to the City's waterfront, and 2) fund other art enrichment, in either case on Port property as approved by the Port Commission in consultation with the Arts Commission.

Section 4. BOND ACCOUNTABILITY MEASURES. The Bond shall include the following administrative rules and principles:

a. OVERSIGHT. The proposed bond funds shall be subjected to approval processes and rules described in the Charter and Administrative Code. Pursuant to Administrative Code Section 5.31, the Citizens' General Obligation Bond Oversight Committee shall conduct an annual review of bond spending, and shall provide an annual report of the bond program to the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors.

b. TRANSPARENCY. The City shall create and maintain a Web page outlining and describing the bond program, progress, and activity updates. The City shall also hold an annual public hearing and reviews on the bond program and its implementation before the Board of Supervisors, the Port Commission, the Capital Planning Committee, and the Citizens' General Obligation Bond Oversight Committee.

Section 5. The estimated cost of the bond financed portion of the project described in Section 2 above was fixed by the Board by Resolution No. 183-18, in the amount of \$425,000,000. Said resolution was passed by two-thirds or more of the Board and approved by the Mayor. In such resolution it was recited and found by the Board that the sum of money specified is too great to be paid out of the ordinary annual income and revenue of the City in addition to the other annual expenses or other funds derived from taxes levied for those purposes and will require expenditures greater than the amount allowed by the annual tax levy.

The method and manner of payment of the estimated costs described in this ordinance are by the issuance of bonds of the City not exceeding the principal amount specified.

Such estimate of costs as set forth in such resolution is adopted and determined to be the estimated cost of such bond financed improvements and financing, as designed to date.

Section 6. The Bond Special Election shall be held and conducted and the votes received and canvassed, and the returns made and the results ascertained, determined, and declared as provided in this ordinance and in all particulars not recited in this ordinance such election shall be held according to State law and the Charter and any regulations adopted under State law or the Charter, providing for and governing elections in the City, and the polls for such election shall be and remain open during the time required by such laws and regulations.

Section 7. The Bond Special Election is consolidated with the General Election scheduled to be held in the City on Tuesday, November 6, 2018. The voting precincts, polling places, and officers of election for the November 6, 2018 General Election are hereby adopted, established, designated, and named, respectively, as the voting precincts, polling places, and officers of election for the Bond Special Election called, and reference is made to the notice of election setting forth the voting precincts, polling places, and officers of election for the November 6, 2018 General Election by the Director of Elections to be published in the official newspaper of the City on the date required under State law.



Section 8. The ballots to be used at the Bond Special Election shall be the ballots used at the November 6, 2018 General Election. The word limit for ballot propositions imposed by Municipal Elections Code Section 510 is waived. On the ballots to be used at the Bond Special Election, in addition to any other matter required by law to be printed thereon, shall appear the following as a separate proposition:

“SAN FRANCISCO SEAWALL EARTHQUAKE SAFETY BOND, 2018. “To protect San Francisco’s waterfront, BART and Muni tunnels, buildings, historic piers, and roads from earthquakes, flooding and rising sea levels by: repairing and upgrading the City’s 100 year old Embarcadero Seawall; strengthening the Embarcadero; protecting transit infrastructure and utilities that provide water, wastewater, power and telecommunications to residents and businesses; shall the City of San Francisco issue \$425,000,000 in bonds, subject to independent citizen oversight and regular audits?”

Each voter to vote in favor of the issuance of the foregoing bond proposition shall mark the ballot in the location corresponding to a “YES” vote for the proposition, and each voter to vote against the proposition shall mark the ballot in the location corresponding to a “NO” vote for the proposition.

Section 9. If at the Bond Special Election it shall appear that two-thirds of all the voters voting on the proposition voted in favor of and authorized the incurring of bonded indebtedness for the purposes set forth in such proposition, then such proposition shall have been accepted by the electors, and bonds authorized shall be issued upon the order of the Board. Such bonds shall bear interest at a rate not exceeding applicable legal limits.

Section 10. For the purpose of paying the principal and interest on the bonds, the Board shall, at the time of fixing the general tax levy and in the manner for such general tax levy provided, levy and collect annually each year until such bonds are paid, or until there is a sum in the Treasury of the City, or other account held on behalf of the Treasurer of the City, set apart for that purpose to meet all sums coming due for the principal and interest on the bonds, a tax sufficient to pay the annual interest on such bonds as the same becomes due and also such part of the principal thereof as shall become due before the proceeds of a tax levied at the time for making the next general tax levy can be made available for the payment of such principal.

Section 11. This ordinance shall be published in accordance with any State law requirements, and such publication shall constitute notice of the Bond Special Election and no other notice of the Bond Special Election hereby called need be given.

Section 12. The Board, having reviewed the proposed legislation, makes the following findings in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act, California Public Resources Code Sections 21000 et seq., the CEQA Guidelines, 15 California Administrative Code Sections 15000 et seq., and San Francisco Administrative Code Chapter 31 (collectively, “CEQA”): The Planning Department has determined that The Planning Department has determined that this legislation is not defined as a “project” under CEQA, because it is only the creation of a government funding mechanism and does not involve any commitment to any specific project, as defined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15378(b)(4). The Board affirms this determination.

Section 13. The Board finds and declares that the proposed Bond is in conformity with the priority policies of Section 101.1(b) of the San Francisco Planning Code and consistent with the City’s General Plan, and adopts the findings of the Planning Department, as set forth in the General Plan Referral Report dated May 24, 2018, a copy of which is on file with the Clerk of the Board of

Supervisors in File No. 180454 and incorporates such findings by reference.

Section 14. Under Section 53410 of the California Government Code, the bonds shall be for the specific purposes authorized in this ordinance and the proceeds of such bonds will be applied only for such specific purposes. The City will comply with the requirements of Sections 53410(c) and 53410(d) of the California Government Code.

Section 15. The Bonds are subject to, and incorporate by reference, the applicable provisions of Administrative Code Sections 5.30 – 5.36 (the “Citizens’ General Obligation Bond Oversight Committee”). Under Section 5.31, to the extent permitted by law, one-tenth of one percent (0.1%) of the gross proceeds of the Bonds shall be deposited in a fund established by the Controller’s Office and appropriated by the Board of Supervisors at the direction of the Citizens’ General Obligation Bond Oversight Committee to cover the costs of said committee.

Section 16. The time requirements specified in Section 2.34 of the Administrative Code are waived.

Section 17. The appropriate officers, employees, representatives, and agents of the City are hereby authorized and directed to do everything necessary or desirable to accomplish the calling and holding of the Bond Special Election, and to otherwise carry out the provisions of this ordinance.

Section 18. Documents referenced in this ordinance are on file with the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors in File No. 180454 which is hereby declared to be a part of this ordinance as if set forth fully herein.

Proposition B

Describing and setting forth a proposal to the voters at an election to be held November 6, 2018, to amend the Charter of the City and County of San Francisco to adopt a Privacy First Policy.

NOTE: **Unchanged Charter text and uncodified text** are in plain font.
Additions are single-underline italics Times New Roman font.
Deletions are ~~strike-through italics Times New Roman font~~.
Asterisks (* * * *) indicate the omission of unchanged Charter subsections.

Section 1. The Board of Supervisors hereby submits to the qualified voters of the City and County, at an election to be held on November 6, 2018, a proposal to amend the Charter of the City and County of San Francisco by adding Section 16.130, to read as follows:

SEC. 16.130. PRIVACY FIRST POLICY.

(a) The principles stated in subsection (e) of this Section 16.130 constitute the Privacy First Policy of the City and County of San Francisco (“City”) and are intended to provide guidance to the City when considering the adoption of privacy-protective laws, regulations, policies, and practices for the City; the City’s contractors, lessees, and grantees; third parties receiving permits, licenses, or other entitlements from the City; and persons (including businesses and other entities) within the regulatory authority of the City.

(b) All parts of City government, including but not limited to boards, commissions, departments, other bodies, and officials, are authorized to implement any or all of these principles consistent with other provisions of the Charter, including this Section 16.130, and City law.

(c) Notwithstanding subsection (b), and notwithstanding any other provision of the Charter, the Board of Supervisors shall have authority

by ordinance to implement these principles as it deems appropriate. This authority includes imposing requirements that implement any or all of these principles on any or all City boards, commissions, departments, other entities, and officials, and on any or all contractors, lessees, grantees, third parties receiving permits, licenses, or other entitlements, or others, within the jurisdiction of said boards, commissions, departments, other entities, and officials.

(d) For purposes of the Privacy First Policy, “Personal Information” means any information that identifies, relates to, describes, or is capable of being associated with, a particular individual. Personal Information includes, but is not limited to, an individual’s name, signature, social security number, physical characteristics or description, address, geolocation data, IP address, telephone number, passport number, driver’s license or state identification card number, insurance policy number, education, employment, employment history, bank account number, credit card number, debit card number, or any other financial information, medical information, genetic and biometric data, or health insurance information.

(e) When considering the adoption of privacy-protective laws, regulations, policies, and practices, the City shall:

(1) Engage with and inform individuals and communities likely to be impacted by the collection, storage, sharing, or use of their Personal Information prior to authorizing and prior to any change regarding the collection, storage, sharing, or use of their Personal Information.

(2) Ensure that Personal Information is only collected, stored, shared, or used pursuant to a lawful and authorized purpose.

(3) Allow individuals to access Personal Information about themselves that has been collected, and provide access and tools to correct any inaccurate Personal Information.

(4) Solicit informed consent to the collection, storage, sharing, or use of Personal Information, and provide alternative and equal access to goods and services for those who deny or revoke consent.

(5) Discourage the collection, storage, sharing, or use of Personal Information, including Personal Information that may identify an individual’s race, religion or creed, national origin, gender, sexual orientation, age, physical or mental disability, or other potentially sensitive demographic information, unless necessary to accomplish a lawful and authorized purpose.

(6) De-identify data sets, when collected for research, statistical, or other analytical purposes, thereby removing the ability to connect personal characteristics with specific individuals, and implement technical safeguards to prevent re-identification of information.

(7) Adopt and make public, or cause to be made public, policies and practices for responding to requests or demands for Personal Information from governmental entities.

(8) Allow individuals to move and organize throughout the City without being tracked or located in a manner that subjects them to collection of Personal Information without their consent.

(9) Evaluate and mitigate bias or inaccuracy in the collection, storage, sharing, or use of Personal Information, and anticipate potential bias in secondary uses of and algorithms used in connection with Personal Information.

(10) Retain Personal Information for only as long as necessary to accomplish a lawful and authorized purpose.

(11) Secure Personal Information against unauthorized or unlawful processing or disclosure; unwarranted access, manipulation, or misuse; and accidental loss, destruction, or damage.

(f) In furtherance of the Privacy First Policy, the City Administrator, by May 31, 2019, shall propose for consideration by the Board of Supervisors an ordinance establishing criteria and rules that the City shall adhere to (1) in the City’s own practices for the collection, storage, sharing, and use of Personal Information; (2) when entering

into contracts, grants, or leases with third parties that are, or may in the future be, in a position to collect, store, share, or use Personal Information in connection with or generated by the contract, grant, or lease; and (3) when issuing permits, licenses, or other entitlements that involve, or may in the future involve, collection, storage, sharing, or use of Personal Information in connection with or generated by the permit, license, or other entitlement. The proposed ordinance may also address criteria and rules regarding collection, storage, sharing, and use of Personal Information by persons (including businesses and other entities) within the City’s regulatory authority. This subsection (f) shall not be construed to restrict the authority of the Board of Supervisors at any time to adopt an ordinance concerning the subjects that are or could be addressed by the City Administrator in the proposed ordinance.

(g) No less frequently than every three years following the submission under subsection (f) of the City Administrator’s proposed ordinance, the City Administrator shall provide to the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor a written report describing the City’s implementation of the Privacy First Policy; describing new dimensions of collecting, storing, sharing, and using Personal Information that may present a threat to privacy; and making such recommendations as the City Administrator deems appropriate, including but not limited to recommendations to adopt or amend ordinances regarding the collection, storage, sharing, or use of Personal Information.

(h) The principles in subsection (e) underlying the Privacy First Policy are not binding or self-executing but rather are intended as a guide to City boards, commissions, departments, other bodies, and officials, and to the Board of Supervisors, when considering the adoption of privacy-protective laws, regulations, policies, and practices.

(i) The Privacy First Policy may not be implemented in a manner that is inconsistent with voter-approved ordinances regarding privacy, open meetings, or public records. Notwithstanding any other provision of the Charter, the Board of Supervisors is authorized by ordinance to amend voter-approved ordinances regarding privacy, open meetings, or public records, provided that any such amendment is not inconsistent with the purpose or intent of the voter-approved ordinance.

(j) The Privacy First Policy is not intended in any manner to limit the power of the City to protect privacy by adopting laws, regulations, policies, and practices within the City’s power, whether specified or not specified in this Section 16.130.

(k) This Section 16.130 shall not apply to the extent, if any, its application is preempted by federal or state law.

Proposition C

NOTE: **Unchanged Charter text and uncoded text** are in plain font.

Additions are single-underline italics Times New Roman font.

Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. The Business and Tax Regulations Code is hereby amended by adding Article 28 consisting of Sections 2801 through 2814, to read as follows:

ARTICLE 28: HOMELESSNESS GROSS RECEIPTS TAX ORDINANCE

SEC. 2801. SHORT TITLE.

This Article 28 shall be known as the “Homelessness Gross Receipts Tax Ordinance,” and the tax it imposes shall be known as the “Homelessness Gross Receipts Tax.”

SEC. 2802. FINDINGS AND PURPOSES.

(a) San Francisco is experiencing a housing crisis of historic proportions that has led to a major humanitarian and public health



crisis in large-scale homelessness for which the City has insufficient resources to address.

(b) The Homelessness Gross Receipts Tax will fund the “Our City, Our Home Fund.” Consistent with the analysis of the Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing (“HSH”) it is the intentions of the voters in adopting Article 28 to house at least 4,000 homeless people and expand shelter beds by 1,000 within five years, fund legal assistance and rent subsidies to keep San Franciscans housed, and fund intensive mental health and substance abuse services to move the City’s most severely impaired individuals off the streets.

(c) In December, 2017 Donald Trump signed the “Tax Cuts and Jobs Act” into law which reduced the federal corporate tax rate from 35% to 21%, a 14% reduction. By comparison, this measure would be an average of less than a half of a percent tax for the gross receipts of San Francisco businesses over \$50 million.

(d) The San Francisco 2017 Homeless Count & Survey found that over 7,000 people in the City experience homelessness at any one time. According to HSH, as of April, 2018, the City has approximately 2,500 temporary shelter beds for the homeless population and there have been over 1,000 people on the waitlist for shelter each night. The intent of the voters in adopting Article 28 is to eliminate the waiting period for shelter.

(e) For years San Franciscans have witnessed individuals with severe mental illnesses wandering City streets. One purpose of this Article 28 is to fund intensive mental health care and substance abuse treatment facilities linked to housing placement to ensure severely mentally ill and drug addicted people are able to exit homelessness. The intent of the voters in adopting Article 28 is to provide care sufficient to move all those San Franciscans with severe behavioral health issues out of homelessness.

(f) Multiple studies have shown significant cost savings when cities invest in permanently affordable housing, thus reducing needs usage of hospitals, jails, and inpatient treatment facilities. The intent of voters in adopting Article 28 is to reduce overall costs for the City.

(g) According to HSH, one in twenty-five public school students in San Francisco is homeless. This has a devastating effect on their educational outcomes and development. This Article 28 is intended to reduce family homelessness by more than 85%.

(h) Approximately half of homeless people became homeless when they were less than 25 years old, according to the San Francisco 2017 Homeless Count & Survey. The intentions of voters in Article 28 is to ensure young homeless people are able to move into stable housing and avoid becoming chronically homeless adults.

(i) This crisis of homelessness affects both homeless people and their housed neighbors. San Franciscans should not have to step over homeless people or walk out their doors and see tents on sidewalks, and homeless people should not be forced to live in these conditions. The intent of voters in adopting Article 28 is to significantly decrease the visible presence of homeless people and tent encampments on City streets by eliminating chronic homelessness.

(j) HSH recently released a strategic framework describing its five-year goals for reducing street homelessness and ending family homelessness and has instituted a new system to coordinate services. According to HSH, the City needs increased revenue both to achieve these important goals and to address the problem more completely.

(k) The Housing First model creates a foundation of stability for formerly homeless individuals by providing permanent supportive housing as a springboard for resolving and treating issues that may have precipitated a person’s first encounter with homelessness, or which may have come as a result of being forced to survive on the street. The intent of voters in adopting Article 28 is to provide the

resources to implement a Housing First model.

(l) It is the intention of the voters in adopting Article 28 to ensure that (1) homelessness funding for existing and future programs continues at the current base year levels without utilizing monies or resources from the Our City, Our Home Fund, and (2) tax proceeds from the Homelessness Gross Receipts Tax be used to fund the programs set forth in Section 2810.

SEC. 2803. DEFINITIONS.

Unless otherwise defined in this Article 28, the terms used in this Article shall have the meanings given to them in Articles 6 and 12-A-1 of the Business and Tax Regulations Code, as amended from time to time.

SEC. 2804. IMPOSITION OF TAX.

(a) Except as otherwise provided in this Article 28, for the privilege of engaging in business in the City, the City imposes an annual Homelessness Gross Receipts Tax on each person engaged in business in the City that receives or is a member of a combined group that receives, more than \$50,000,000 in total taxable gross receipts.

(b) If, after applying any rules or elections used to assign receipts to a business activity in Section 953.9 of Article 12-A-1, a person or combined group derives gross receipts from business activities described in only one of Sections 953.1 through 953.7 of Article 12-A-1, inclusive, the Homelessness Gross Receipts Tax shall be calculated by applying to the person or combined group’s taxable gross receipts in excess of \$50,000,000 the following percentage that corresponds to the person or combined group’s business activities, as described in Sections 953.1 through 953.7 of Article 12-A-1, inclusive:

<u>Business Activity Set</u>	<u>Tax Rate</u>
<u>Section 953.1</u>	<u>.175%</u>
<u>Section 953.2</u>	<u>.500%</u>
<u>Section 953.3</u>	<u>.425%</u>
<u>Section 953.4</u>	<u>.690%</u>
<u>Section 953.5</u>	<u>.475%</u>
<u>Section 953.6</u>	<u>.600%</u>
<u>Section 953.7</u>	<u>.325%</u>

(c) If, after applying any rules or elections used to assign receipts to a business activity in Section 953.9 of Article 12-A-1, a person or combined group derives gross receipts from business activities described in more than one of Sections 953.1 through 953.7 of Article 12-A-1, inclusive, the taxable gross receipts and rate or rates of tax to be applied to that person or combined group shall be determined as follows:

(1) The taxable gross receipts shall be determined on an aggregate basis in numbered order of Sections 953.1 through 953.7, inclusive, i.e., the taxable gross receipts for business activities described in Section 953.1 of Article 12-A-1 should be determined first, Section 953.2 of Article 12-A-1 second, and so on;

(2) The rates in subsection (b) shall apply to the gross receipts from the corresponding sets of business activities described

in Sections 953.1 through 953.7 of Article 12-A-1, inclusive, except that the rate shall be 0% for the first \$50,000,000 of the person or combined group's total taxable gross receipts from all taxable business activities;

(3) Whether the 0% rate for the first \$50,000,000 of the person or combined group's total taxable gross receipts from all taxable business activities applies to any set of business activities after the first shall be determined by adding to the taxable gross receipts from that set of business activities all of the taxable gross receipts from all previous sets of business activities; and

(4) The Homelessness Gross Receipts Tax for the person or combined group shall be the sum of the liabilities for each set of business activities determined under subsections (1) through (3).

(d) Notwithstanding any other subsection of this Section 2804, every person engaging in business within the City as an administrative office, as defined in Section 953.8 of Article 12-A-1, shall pay an annual homelessness administrative office tax measured by its total payroll expense, as defined in Section 953.8(f) of Article 12-A-1, that is attributable to the City. If a person is a member of a combined group, then its tax shall be measured by the total payroll expense of the combined group attributable to the City. Such combined group shall pay only the homelessness administrative office tax, and not the tax imposed under other subsections of this Section 2804, but a person or combined group may be liable for both the administrative office tax imposed by Section 953.8 of Article 12-A-1 and the homelessness administrative office tax imposed by this subsection (d). The homelessness administrative office tax rate for each tax year is 1.5%. Unless specified otherwise, this homelessness administrative office tax shall be considered part of the Homelessness Gross Receipts Tax for all purposes.

(e) "Taxable gross receipts" means a person or combined group's gross receipts, not excluded under Section 2805, attributable to the City. The person or combined group's gross receipts that are attributable to the City shall be determined in the same manner as in Article 12-A-1, as amended from time to time.

(f) If the voters adopt any measure adding a business activity category in Section 953.7.5 of Article 12-A-1 at the November 6, 2018 consolidated general election, any receipts from business activities described in that Section 953.7.5 shall be assigned, for purposes of this Article 28, to one or more of Sections 953.1 through 953.7 of Article 12-A-1, inclusive, as if Section 953.7.5 were not added to Article 12-A-1.

SEC. 2805. EXEMPTIONS AND EXCLUSIONS.

(a) An organization that is exempt from income taxation by Chapter 4 (commencing with Section 23701) of Part 11 of Division 2 of the California Revenue and Taxation Code or Subchapter F (commencing with Section 501) of Chapter 1 of Subtitle A of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as amended, as qualified by Sections 502, 503, 504, and 508 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as amended, shall be exempt from taxation under this Article 28, only so long as those exemptions continue to exist under state or federal law.

(b) For only so long as and to the extent that the City is prohibited from imposing the Homelessness Gross Receipts Tax, any person upon whom the City is prohibited under the Constitution or laws of the State of California or the Constitution or laws of the United States from imposing the Homelessness Gross Receipts Tax shall be exempt from the Homelessness Gross Receipts Tax.

(c) For purposes of this Article 28, gross receipts shall not include receipts that are excluded from gross receipts for purposes of the gross receipts tax imposed by Article 12-A-1, and also shall not include receipts subject to a gross receipts tax on commercial

rents imposed as a result of a measure adopted by the voters of San Francisco in the June 5, 2018 election.

SEC. 2806. COMBINED RETURNS.

(a) Persons subject to the Homelessness Gross Receipts Tax shall file returns at the same time and in the same manner as returns filed for the gross receipts tax imposed by Article 12-A-1, including the rules for combined returns under Section 956.3, as amended from time to time.

(b) If a person is subject to the Homelessness Gross Receipts Tax but is not required to file a gross receipts tax return under Article 12-A-1, such person or combined group's Homelessness Gross Receipts Tax return shall be filed at the same time and in the same manner as if such person or combined group were required to file a gross receipts tax return under Article 12-A-1.

(c) For purposes of this Article 28, a lessor of residential real estate is treated as a separate person with respect to each individual building in which it leases residential real estate units, notwithstanding Section 6.2-15 of Article 6, as amended from time to time, or subsection (a) of this Section 2806. This subsection (c) applies only to leasing residential real estate units within a building, and not to any business activity related to other space, either within the same building or other buildings, which is not residential real estate. The Tax Collector is authorized to determine what constitutes a separate building and the number of units in a building.

SEC. 2807. TAX COLLECTOR AUTHORIZED TO DETERMINE GROSS RECEIPTS.

The Tax Collector may, in his or her reasonable discretion, independently establish a person or combined group's gross receipts within the City and establish or reallocate gross receipts among related entities so as to fairly reflect the gross receipts within the City of all persons and combined groups.

SEC. 2808. CONSTRUCTION AND SCOPE OF THE HOMELESSNESS GROSS RECEIPTS TAX ORDINANCE.

(a) This Article 28 is intended to authorize application of the Homelessness Gross Receipts Tax in the broadest manner consistent with its provisions and with the California Constitution, the United States Constitution, and any other applicable provision of federal or state law.

(b) The Homelessness Gross Receipts Tax imposed by this Article 28 is in addition to all other City taxes, including the gross receipts tax imposed by Article 12-A-1, as amended from time to time. Accordingly, by way of example and not limitation, persons subject to both the Homelessness Gross Receipts Tax and the gross receipts tax shall pay both taxes. Persons exempt from either the gross receipts tax or the Homelessness Gross Receipts Tax, but not both, shall pay the tax from which they are not exempt.

SEC. 2809. ADMINISTRATION OF THE HOMELESSNESS GROSS RECEIPTS TAX ORDINANCE.

Except as otherwise provided under this Article 28, the Homelessness Gross Receipts Tax Ordinance shall be administered pursuant to Article 6 of the Business and Tax Regulations Code, as amended from time to time, including all penalties and other charges imposed by that Article.

SEC. 2810. DEPOSIT OF PROCEEDS: EXPENDITURE OF PROCEEDS.

(a) All monies collected under the Homelessness Gross Receipts Tax Ordinance shall be deposited to the credit of the Our City, Our Home Fund, established in Administrative Code Section 10.100-164. The Fund shall be maintained separate and apart from all other City funds and shall be subject to appropriation. Any balance remaining in the Fund at the close of any fiscal year shall be deemed to have been provided for a special purpose within the meaning of Charter Section 9.113(a) and shall be carried forward and accumu-



lated in the Fund for the purposes described in subsection (b)(3).

(b) Subject to the budgetary and fiscal provisions of the Charter, monies in the Our City, Our Home Fund shall be appropriated on an annual or supplemental basis and used exclusively for the following purposes:

(1) Up to 3% of the proceeds of the Homelessness Gross Receipts Tax distributed in any proportion to the Tax Collector and other City departments, for administration of the Homelessness Gross Receipts Tax and administration of the Our City, Our Home Fund for the following purposes:

(A) Payment of the administrative expenses of collecting the Homelessness Gross Receipts Tax;

(B) Payment for City oversight of the expenditures described in this subsection (b); and

(C) Payment for City expenses providing support for the Our City, Our Home Oversight Committee, including but not limited to payments for the needs assessments described in Section 2810(e)(2)(B).

(2) Refunds of any overpayments of the Homelessness Gross Receipts Tax, including any related penalties, interests, and fees.

(3) All remaining amounts for the following purposes, in the following percentages, which amounts shall include the costs of administering the programs described.

(A) **Permanent Housing Expenditures.** At least 50% to the Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development ("MOHCD"), or its successor agency, for uses consistent with the Homelessness Gross Receipts Tax Ordinance that help Homeless adults, families, or youth, including but not limited to Homeless persons with mental illness or addiction, permanently exit homelessness and secure permanent housing. Every reasonable effort shall be made to ensure that Homeless persons with barriers to housing, including but not limited to a lack of identification and documentation, are able to access housing made available under this subsection (A). Uses under this subsection (A) shall be limited to:

(i) Short-term rental subsidies, expenditures for which shall be limited to no more than 12% of this subsection (A). For purposes of this subsection (i), "short-term" means a period that is five years or less.

(ii) Construction, acquisition, rehabilitation, lease, preservation, and operation of permanent supportive housing units. For purposes of this subsection (ii), "permanent supportive housing" means housing that provides a rental subsidy and onsite supportive services for formerly Homeless adults, families, and youth.

(iii) Acquisition, rehabilitation, master lease, and operation of SRO Buildings, or portions thereof, newly acquired or master leased on or after January 1, 2019, and the associated protection of extremely low- and very low-income households, especially households with seniors, veterans, persons with disabilities, or immigrants. Existing, higher-income households may retain occupancy in SRO Buildings, under the program's goal of preventing displacement. Any vacant unit in an SRO Building may be used for the purpose of housing Homeless individuals or families. Long-term rental subsidies shall be an eligible use of funds under this subsection (iii). For purposes of this subsection (iii) the following terms shall have the following meanings:

(aa) "Area Median Income" means the area median income for the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development ("HUD") Metro Fair Market Rent Area ("HFMA") that includes San Francisco, as published annually by MOHCD, adjusted for household size. If HFMA data is unavailable, MOHCD shall calculate area median income using other

publicly available and credible data.

(bb) "Extremely low- and very low-income households" means households that earn up to 50% of Area Median Income.

(cc) "Long-term" means a period that is longer than five years.

(dd) "Master lease" means a nonprofit or governmental entity leasing dedicated housing units from a property owner and, in turn, leasing those units to residents.

MOHCD shall enter into an agreement with HSH, or its successor agency, that requires at least 20% of the total amounts appropriated under this subsection (A) be used for the purposes described in this subsection (A) that support Homeless youth aged 18 through 29, and at least 25% of the total amounts appropriated under this subsection (A) be used for the purposes described in this subsection (A) that support Homeless families with children under age 18 at the time of entry into housing.

(B) **Homeless Shelter Expenditures.** Up to 10% to HSH, or its successor agency, for uses consistent with the Homelessness Gross Receipts Tax Ordinance that help Homeless adults, families, or youth, including but not limited to Homeless persons with mental illness or addiction, secure short-term residential shelter, including but not limited to funding navigation centers and shelters, and to fund Hygiene Programs. For purposes of this subsection (B), "Hygiene Programs" means any program that provides bathrooms, handwashing stations, and/or showers intended for use by those who do not have access to those facilities.

(C) **Homelessness Prevention Expenditures.** Up to 15% to MOHCD and/or HSH, or their successor agencies, for the provision of services to those at risk of becoming Homeless or who recently have become Homeless. These services are limited to providing financial, utility, and/or Rental Assistance; flexible funding (e.g., security deposit, expenses necessary to maintain housing); short-term case management; conflict mediation; legal representation in eviction cases; connection to mainstream services (e.g., services from agencies outside of the homelessness assistance system, such as public benefit agencies); housing search assistance; and assistance to newly Homeless families and individuals to identify immediate alternate housing arrangements. Every reasonable effort shall be made to ensure that financial assistance is available in a timely manner to avoid evictions or displacements.

(D) **Mental Health Expenditures for Homeless Individuals.** At least 25% to the Department of Public Health ("DPH") for the creation of a new mental health services program or programs that are specifically designed for Homeless people severely impaired by behavioral health issues. Such uses shall be limited to:

(i) Intensive street-based mental health services and case management;

(ii) Assertive outreach services;

(iii) Mental health and substance abuse treatment, including medications;

(iv) Peer support;

(v) Residential and drop-in services; and

(vi) Specialized temporary and long-term housing Rental Assistance, housing linkage, and referrals into supportive housing with continued intensive case management and mental health services that follow people from homelessness into housing.

Nothing in this subsection (D) shall prevent DPH from using allocations pursuant to this subsection (D) to acquire or lease facilities to provide the mental health services described herein.

(E) **Determination of Appropriations; Remaining Amounts.** The Board of Supervisors shall determine how much to

appropriate to each of Sections 2810(b)(3)(A) through (D), in accordance with those Sections. Any amounts remaining in the Our City, Our Home Fund at the end of any fiscal year shall be held in the Our City, Our Home Fund to be added to amounts available for appropriation under Section 2810(b)(3) in any future year.

(c) Commencing with a report filed no later than February 15, 2020, covering the fiscal year ending on June 30, 2019, the Controller shall file annually with the Board of Supervisors, by February 15 of each year, a report containing the amount of monies collected in and expended from the Our City, Our Home Fund during the prior fiscal year, the status of any project required or authorized to be funded by this Section 2810, and such other information as the Controller, in the Controller's sole discretion, shall deem relevant to the operation of this Article 28.

(d) **Appropriations May Not Supplant Existing Expenditures.** Monies in the Our City, Our Home Fund shall be expended only for Eligible Programs. Monies in the Our City, Our Home Fund shall not be spent to supplant existing programs funded by the City for homeless programs, which shall continue to be funded, at a minimum, at the Base Amount. All funds unexpended from the Our City, Our Home Fund shall be held in the Our City, Our Home Fund and may be expended on Eligible Programs in any future fiscal year in which other expenditures from the Our City, Our Home Fund may be made. For purposes of this subsection (d):

(1) "Base Amount" means the Controller's calculation of the amount of City appropriations (not including appropriations from the Our City, Our Home Fund and exclusive of expenditures funded by private funding or funded or mandated by state or federal law) for Eligible Programs for the fiscal year ending June 30, 2018.

(2) "Eligible Programs" means all programs and expenditures described in Section 2810(b)(3).

(e) **Our City, Our Home Oversight Committee.**

(1) By February 28, 2019, the Board of Supervisors shall establish by ordinance the Our City, Our Home Oversight Committee ("Oversight Committee") to make recommendations to the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors to ensure that the Our City, Our Home Fund is administered in a manner consistent with the provisions of this Section 2810.

(2) The purpose of the Oversight Committee shall be to monitor and make recommendations in the administration of the Our City, Our Home Fund, to take steps to ensure that the fund is administered in a manner accountable to the community and consistent with the law, and to advise the Board of Supervisors on appropriations from the Our City, Our Home Fund. As part of this purpose, the Oversight Committee shall:

(A) Develop recommendations for prioritizing the use of funds appropriated from the Our City, Our Home Fund;

(B) By December 31, 2019, and every three years thereafter, conduct a needs assessment with respect to homelessness and Homeless populations, including but not limited to an assessment of available data on subpopulations with regard to race, family composition, sexual orientation, age, and gender served by the programs and expenditures described in Section 2810(b)(3), and make annual recommendations about appropriations from the Our City, Our Home Fund to the Board of Supervisors consistent with that needs assessment;

(C) Promote and facilitate transparency in the administration of the Our City, Our Home Fund.

(D) Promote implementation of the programs funded by the Our City, Our Home Fund in a culturally sensitive manner.

(3) **Voting Members.**

(A) The Oversight Committee shall have nine voting

members.

(i) Seats one, three, five, and seven shall be appointed by the Mayor under Charter Section 3.100(18).

(ii) Seats two, four, six, and eight shall be appointed by the Board of Supervisors.

(iii) Seat nine shall be appointed by the Controller.

(B) **Eligibility.**

(i) Seat one shall be an individual with experience with Homeless housing development or supportive housing services.

(ii) Seat two shall be an individual representing families with minor children residing in SRO Units or a family member residing in a SRO Unit.

(iii) Seat three shall be an individual with experience providing Homeless services.

(iv) Seat four shall be an individual who has experienced homelessness and also has experience advocating for Homeless people.

(iv) Seat five shall be an individual with mental health service and/or substance abuse expertise.

(v) Seats six and seven shall be individuals who have personally experienced homelessness.

(vi) Seat eight shall be an individual who has experience advocating on Homeless or mental health issues.

(vii) Seat nine shall be an at large seat.

(C) **Term.** The terms of the initial appointees to the Oversight Committee shall commence on the date of the first meeting of the committee, which shall occur when at least six members have been appointed and are present, but no later than February 28, 2019. The initial terms of odd numbered seats shall be three years, and two years following the initial three-year term. Even numbered seats shall have two-year terms.

(4) The City shall provide adequate dedicated staffing to the Oversight Committee.

(5) The Oversight Committee shall meet at least six times during each fiscal year, except for the fiscal year ending June 30, 2019, during which the Oversight Committee shall meet at least twice.

(g) Nothing in this Section 2810 shall limit the authority of the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors to propose, amend, and adopt a budget under Article IX of the Charter.

(h) For purposes of this Section 2810:

(1) "Homeless" means an individual or family that lacks a fixed, regular, and adequate nighttime residence, and whose primary nighttime residence is one or more of the following: a shelter; a sidewalk or street; outdoors; a vehicle; a structure not certified or fit for human residence, such as an abandoned building; a couch used for sleeping in accommodations that are inadequate or overly crowded; a SRO Unit in which one or more family members are under the age of 18; a transitional housing program; or in such other location that is unsafe or unstable.

(2) "Single Room Occupancy (SRO) Unit" or "SRO Unit" means a dwelling unit or group housing room consisting of no more than one occupied room with a maximum gross floor area of 350 square feet and meeting the Housing Code's minimum floor area standards. The unit may have a bathroom in addition to the occupied room. As a dwelling unit, it would have a cooking facility and bathroom. As a group housing room, it would share a kitchen with one or more other single room occupancy unit(s) in the same building and may also share a bathroom. A Single Room Occupancy Building (or "SRO Building") is one in which at least 50% of the units are SRO Units.

(3) "Rental Assistance" means rental subsidies or nonprofit housing operating subsidies that help Homeless people find housing and



stabilize in housing in which they are the leaseholders.

SEC. 2811. AMENDMENT OF ORDINANCE.

The Board of Supervisors may amend this Article 28 by ordinance by a two-thirds vote but only to further the Findings and intent as set for the in Section 2802.

SEC. 2812. EFFECT OF STATE AND FEDERAL AUTHORIZATION.

To the extent that the City's authorization to impose or to collect any tax imposed under this Article 28 is expanded or limited as a result of changes in state or federal statutes, regulations, or other laws, or judicial interpretations of those laws, no amendment or modification of this Article shall be required to conform the taxes to those changes, and the taxes are hereby imposed in conformity with those changes, and the Tax Collector shall collect them to the full extent of the City's authorization up to the full amount and rate of the taxes imposed under this Article.

SEC. 2813. SEVERABILITY.

(a) Except as provided in Section 2813(b), below, if any section, subsection, sentence, clause, phrase, or word of this Article 28, or any application thereof to any person or circumstance, is held to be invalid or unconstitutional by an unappealable decision of a court of competent jurisdiction, such decision shall not affect the validity of the remaining portions or applications of this Article. The People of the City and County of San Francisco hereby declare that, except as provided in Section 2813(b), they would have adopted this Article 28 and each and every section, subsection, sentence, clause, phrase, and word not declared invalid or unconstitutional without regard to whether any other portion of this Article or application thereof would be subsequently declared invalid or unconstitutional.

(b) If the imposition of the Homelessness Gross Receipts Tax in Section 2804 is held in its entirety to be facially invalid or unconstitutional in a final unappealable court determination, the remainder of this Article 28 shall be void and of no force and effect, and the City Attorney shall cause it to be removed from the Business and Tax Regulations Code, and likewise cause Section 10.100-164 to be removed from the Administrative Code.

SEC. 2814. SAVINGS CLAUSE.

No section, clause, part, or provision of this Article 28 shall be construed as requiring the payment of any tax that would be in violation of the Constitution or laws of the United States or of the Constitution or laws of the State of California.

Section 3. The Administrative Code is hereby amended by adding Section 10.100-164, to read as follows:

SEC. 10.100-164. OUR CITY. OUR HOME FUND.

(a) Establishment of Fund. The Our City, Our Home Fund ("Fund") is established as a category four fund as defined in Section 10.100-1 of the Administrative Code, and shall receive all taxes, penalties, interest, and fees collected from the Homelessness Gross Receipts Tax imposed under Article 28 of the Business and Tax Regulations Code.

(b) Use of Fund. Subject to the budgetary and fiscal provisions of the Charter, monies in the Fund shall be used exclusively for the purposes described in Section 2810(b) of Article 28 of the Business and Tax Regulations Code.

(c) Administration of Fund. As stated in Section 2810(c) of Article 28 of the Business and Tax Regulations Code, commencing with a report filed no later than February 15, 2020, covering the fiscal year ending June 30, 2019, the Controller shall file annually with the Board of Supervisors, by February 15 of each year, a report containing the amount of monies collected in and expended from the Fund during the prior fiscal year, the status of any project required or authorized to be funded by Section 2810, and such other information as the Controller, in the Controller's sole discretion, shall deem

relevant to the operation of Article 28.

Section 4. Appropriations Limit Increase. Pursuant to California Constitution Article XIII B and applicable laws, for four years from November 6, 2018, the appropriations limit for the City shall be increased by the aggregate sum collected by the levy of the tax imposed under this ordinance.

Section 5. Effective and Operative Date. The effective date of this ordinance shall be ten days after the date the official vote count is declared by the Board of Supervisors. This ordinance shall become operative on January 1, 2019.

Proposition D

Ordinance amending the Business and Tax Regulations Code to impose an additional gross receipts tax, starting January 1, 2021, on gross receipts from cannabis business activities, but exempting the first \$500,000 of gross receipts and exempting retail sales of medicinal cannabis; said tax to be between 1% and 5% depending on the type of cannabis business activity and amount of gross receipts, but may be adjusted at any time within a range of 0% to 7% by an ordinance adopted by a two-thirds vote of the Board of Supervisors for any increase (which is limited to 1% annually) or an ordinance adopted by a majority vote of the Board of Supervisors for any decrease; and, starting January 1, 2019, to expand the conditions that subject a person to certain business taxes by including persons with more than \$500,000 in annual gross receipts in the City; and increasing the City's appropriations limit by the increase in the amount of those business taxes collected compared to the prior year and by the amount collected under the new Cannabis Business Tax, for four years from November 6, 2018.

NOTE: **Unchanged Code text and uncodified text** are in plain font.

Additions to Codes are in *single-underline italics Times New Roman font*.

Deletions to Codes are in *strikethrough italics Times New Roman font*.

Asterisks (* * * *) indicate the omission of unchanged Code subsections or parts of tables.

Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. Pursuant to Article XIII C of the Constitution of the State of California, this ordinance shall be submitted to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco at the November 6, 2018, consolidated general election.

Section 2. The Business and Tax Regulations Code is hereby amended by revising Section 6.2-12 of Article 6, to read as follows:

SEC. 6.2-12. NEXUS: "ENGAGING IN BUSINESS WITHIN THE CITY."

The taxes imposed by Article 12-A (Payroll Expense Tax Ordinance), ~~and Article 12-A-1 (Gross Receipts Tax Ordinance), Article 21 (Early Care and Education Commercial Rents Tax Ordinance), and Article 30 (Cannabis Business Tax Ordinance)~~, and the registration fee imposed by Article 12 (Business Registration Ordinance) shall apply to any person engaging in business within the City unless exempted therefrom under *such said* Articles. A person is "engaging in business within the City," within the meaning of this Article 6, if that person meets one or more of the following conditions:

(a) The person maintains a fixed place of business within the City; or

(b) An employee, representative, or agent of the person maintains a fixed place of business within the City for the benefit or partial benefit of the person; or

(c) The person or one or more of the person's employees, representatives, or agents owns, rents, leases, or hires real or personal property within the City for business purposes for the benefit or partial benefit of the person; or

(d) The person or one or more of the person's employees, representatives, or agents regularly maintains a stock of tangible personal property within the City, for sale in the ordinary course of the person's business; or

(e) The person or one or more of the person's employees, representatives, or agents employs or loans capital on property within the City for the benefit or partial benefit of the person; or

(f) The person or one or more of the person's employees, representatives, or agents solicits business within the City for all or part of any seven days during a tax year; or

(g) The person or one or more of the person's employees, representatives, or agents performs work or renders services within the City for all or part of any seven days during a tax year; or

(h) The person or one or more of the person's employees, representatives, or agents utilizes the streets within the City in connection with the operation of motor vehicles for business purposes for all or part of any seven days during a tax year; or

(i) The person or one or more of the person's employees, representatives, or agents exercises corporate or franchise powers within the City for the benefit or partial benefit of the person; or

(j) The person or one or more of the person's employees, representatives, or agents liquidates a business when the liquidators thereof hold themselves out to the public as conducting such business; or

(k) The person has more than \$500,000 in total gross receipts, as the term "gross receipts" is used in Article 12-A-1 of the Business and Tax Regulations Code, in the City during the tax year, using the rules for assigning gross receipts under Section 956.1 of Article 12-A-1.

Section 3. The Business and Tax Regulations Code is hereby amended by adding Article 30, consisting of Sections 3001 through 3014, to read as follows:

ARTICLE 30: CANNABIS BUSINESS TAX

SEC. 3001. SHORT TITLE.

This Article 30 shall be known as the "Cannabis Business Tax Ordinance," and the tax it imposes shall be known as the "Cannabis Business Tax."

SEC. 3002. DEFINITIONS.

Unless otherwise defined in this Article 30, the terms used in this Article shall have the meanings given to them in Articles 6 and 12-A-1 of the Business and Tax Regulations Code, as amended from time to time. For purposes of this Article 30, the following definitions shall apply:

"Cannabis" means all parts of the plant *Cannabis sativa* Linnaeus, *Cannabis indica*, or *Cannabis ruderalis*, whether growing or not; the seeds thereof; the resin, whether crude or purified, extracted from any part of the plant; and every compound, manufacture, salt, derivative, mixture, or preparation of the plant, its seeds, or resin. "Cannabis" also means the separated resin, whether crude or purified, obtained from cannabis. "Cannabis" does not include the mature stalks of the plant, fiber produced from the stalks, oil or cake made from the seeds of the plant, any other compound, manufacture, salt, derivative, mixture, or preparation of the mature stalks (except the resin extracted

therefrom), fiber, oil, or cake, or the sterilized seed of the plant which is incapable of germination. For the purpose of this Article 30, "Cannabis" does not mean "Industrial Hemp."

"Cannabis Business Activities" means any business activities directly related to Cannabis or Cannabis Products, including but not limited to the cultivation, possession, manufacture, processing, storing, labeling, distribution, or sale of Cannabis or Cannabis Products for consideration. "Cannabis Business Activities" shall not include: (a) business activities indirectly related to Cannabis or Cannabis Products, including the sale of items that do not themselves contain Cannabis or Cannabis Products; (b) laboratory testing; and (c) transportation of Cannabis or Cannabis Products where the person transporting Cannabis or Cannabis Products never takes title to or sells Cannabis or Cannabis Products.

"Cannabis Products" means Cannabis that has undergone a process whereby the plant material has been transformed into a concentrate, including, but not limited to, concentrated Cannabis, or an edible or topical product containing Cannabis or concentrated Cannabis and other ingredients.

"Industrial Hemp" means a fiber or oilseed crop, or both, that is limited to types of the plant *Cannabis sativa* L. having no more than three tenths of 1% tetrahydrocannabinol (THC) contained in the dried flowering tops, whether growing or not; the seeds of the plant; the resin extracted from any part of the plant; and every compound, manufacture, salt, derivative, mixture, or preparation of the plant, its seeds or resin produced therefrom.

"Medicinal Cannabis" means Cannabis or a Cannabis Product, respectively, sold for use under the Compassionate Use Act of 1996 (Proposition 215) by a medicinal cannabis patient in California who possesses a physician's recommendation.

"Retail Sale" means any transaction whereby, for any consideration, title to Cannabis or Cannabis Products is transferred from one person to another for the latter person's use and not for resale, and includes the delivery of Cannabis or Cannabis Products to a person for such person's own use and not for resale pursuant to an order placed for the purchase of the same and soliciting or receiving an order for the same.

SEC. 3003. IMPOSITION OF TAX.

(a) Except as otherwise provided in this Article 30, for the privilege of engaging in Cannabis Business Activities in the City, the City imposes an annual Cannabis Business Tax on each person engaged in business in the City that receives gross receipts from Cannabis Business Activities attributable to the City.

(b) The Cannabis Business Tax shall be calculated in the following manner:

(1) The person or combined group's first \$500,000 of gross receipts attributable to the City from Cannabis Business Activities shall be exempt from the Cannabis Business Tax.

(2) The person or combined group's gross receipts attributable to the City from the Retail Sale of Cannabis or Cannabis Products, including the amount exempt under Section 3003(b)(1), shall be multiplied as follows:

(A) by 2.5% for gross receipts in excess of the amount exempt under Section 3003(b)(1) and up to and including \$1,000,000; and

(B) by 5% for gross receipts over \$1,000,000.

(3) The person or combined group's gross receipts attributable to the City from all Cannabis Business Activities other than the Retail Sale of Cannabis or Cannabis Products, including the amount exempt under Section 3003(b)(1), shall be multiplied as follows:

(A) by 1% for gross receipts in excess of the amount exempt under Section 3003(b)(1) and up to and including \$1,000,000; and



(B) by 1.5% for gross receipts over \$1,000,000.

(4) The Board of Supervisors may from time to time by an ordinance adopted by at least two-thirds of the members of the Board increase one or more of the rates provided for in Sections 3003(b)(2) and 3003(b)(3), except that no rate may increase more than 1% annually and no rate may exceed 7%. The Board of Supervisors may from time to time by an ordinance adopted by a majority of the members of the Board decrease one or more of the rates provided for in Sections 3003(b)(2) and 3003(b)(3). Any such adjustments in this Section 3003(b)(4) shall be effective no sooner than the tax year following the tax year in which the ordinance adjusting the rate is effective. The Controller shall prepare and submit a market analysis and impact report to the Board before the Board adjusts any tax rate under this Section 3003(b)(4).

(5) If a person or combined group has gross receipts attributable to the City from the Retail Sale of Cannabis or Cannabis Products and from Cannabis Business Activities other than the Retail Sale of Cannabis or Cannabis Products, the person or combined group's Cannabis Business Tax shall be determined as follows:

(A) The person or combined group's taxable gross receipts shall be determined on an aggregate basis first for gross receipts attributable to the City from Cannabis Business Activities other than the Retail Sale of Cannabis or Cannabis Products, and then for gross receipts attributable to the City from the Retail Sale of Cannabis or Cannabis Products;

(B) The \$500,000 exemption in Section 3003(b)(1) shall be applied first to gross receipts attributable to the City from Cannabis Business Activities other than the Retail Sale of Cannabis or Cannabis Products, with any remaining portion of the exemption then applied to gross receipts attributable to the City from the Retail Sale of Cannabis or Cannabis Products;

(C) The rates applicable under Section 3003(b)(2) shall be determined by applying the rate scale commencing with the gross receipts attributable to the City from Cannabis Business Activities other than the Retail Sale of Cannabis or Cannabis Products; and

(D) The Cannabis Business Tax for the person or combined group shall be the sum of the liabilities calculated under Sections 3003(b)(2) and 3002(b)(3), determined in accordance with Sections 3003(b)(5)(A), 3003(b)(5)(B), and 3003(b)(5)(C).

SEC. 3004. ALLOCATION; GROSS RECEIPTS ATTRIBUTABLE TO THE CITY.

(a) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Article 30, any person subject to the Cannabis Business Tax engaging in Cannabis Business Activities in the City and engaging in no Cannabis Business Activities outside the City is subject to the Cannabis Business Tax on all non-exempt gross receipts.

(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Article 30, any person subject to the Cannabis Business Tax engaging in Cannabis Business Activities both in the City and outside the City shall determine their or their combined group's gross receipts attributable to the City from Cannabis Business Activities under Section 956.1 of Article 12-A-1. For purposes of this Section 3004(b), "gross receipts" as used in Section 956.1 of Article 12-A-1 shall mean all of the person or combined group's non-exempt gross receipts from Cannabis Business Activities.

SEC. 3005. EXEMPTIONS AND EXCLUSIONS.

(a) For purposes of this Article 30, gross receipts shall not include receipts from the Retail Sale of Medicinal Cannabis.

(b) An organization that is exempt from income taxation by Chapter 4 (commencing with Section 23701) of Part 11 of Division 2 of the California Revenue and Taxation Code or Subchapter F (commencing with Section 501) of Chapter 1 of Subtitle A of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as amended, as qualified by Sections 502, 503, 504, and 508 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as amended, shall be exempt

from taxation under this Article 30, only so long as those exemptions continue to exist under state or federal law.

(c) For purposes of this Article 30, gross receipts shall not include receipts from business activities if, and only so long as and to the extent that, the City is prohibited from taxing such receipts under the Constitution or laws of the United States or under the Constitution or laws of the State of California.

(d) For only so long as and to the extent that the City is prohibited from imposing the Cannabis Business Tax, any person upon whom the City is prohibited under the Constitution or laws of the State of California or the Constitution or laws of the United States from imposing the Cannabis Business Tax shall be exempt from the Cannabis Business Tax.

SEC. 3006. RETURNS; COMBINED RETURNS.

(a) Persons subject to the Cannabis Business Tax shall file returns at the same time and in the same manner as returns filed for the gross receipts tax (Article 12-A-1), including the rules for combined returns under Section 956.3, as amended from time to time.

(b) If a person is subject to the Cannabis Business Tax but is not required to file a gross receipts tax return, such person or combined group's Cannabis Business Tax return shall be filed at the same time and in the same manner as if such person or combined group were required to file a gross receipts tax return.

(c) For purposes of this Article 30, a lessor of residential real estate is treated as a separate person with respect to each individual building in which it leases residential real estate units, notwithstanding Section 6.2-15 of Article 6, as amended from time to time, or subsection (a) of this Section 3006. This subsection (c) applies only to leasing residential real estate units within a building, and not to any business activity related to other space, either within the same building or other buildings, which is not residential real estate. The Tax Collector is authorized to determine what constitutes a separate building and the number of units in a building.

SEC. 3007. TAX COLLECTOR AUTHORIZED TO DETERMINE GROSS RECEIPTS.

The Tax Collector may, in the Tax Collector's reasonable discretion, independently establish a person or combined group's gross receipts attributable to the City from Cannabis Business Activities and establish or reallocate gross receipts among related entities so as to fairly reflect the gross receipts attributable to the City from Cannabis Business Activities of all persons and combined groups.

SEC. 3008. CONSTRUCTION AND SCOPE OF THE CANNABIS BUSINESS TAX ORDINANCE.

(a) This Article 30 is intended to authorize application of the Cannabis Business Tax in the broadest manner consistent with its provisions and with the California Constitution, the United States Constitution, and any other applicable provision of federal or state law.

(b) The Cannabis Business Tax imposed by this Article 30 is in addition to all other City taxes, including the gross receipts tax imposed by Article 12-A-1, as amended from time to time. Accordingly, by way of example and not limitation, persons subject to both the Cannabis Business Tax and the gross receipts tax shall pay both taxes. Persons exempt from either the gross receipts tax or the Cannabis Business Tax, but not both, shall pay the tax from which they are not exempt.

SEC. 3009. ADMINISTRATION OF THE CANNABIS BUSINESS TAX ORDINANCE.

Except as otherwise provided under this Article 30, the Cannabis Business Tax Ordinance shall be administered pursuant to Article 6 of the Business and Tax Regulations Code, as amended from time to time.

SEC. 3010. EXPENDITURE OF PROCEEDS.

Proceeds from the Cannabis Business Tax shall be deposited in the City's General Fund and may be spent for unrestricted general revenue purposes of the City.

SEC. 3011. AMENDMENT OF ORDINANCE.

Except as limited in Section 3003(b)(4) and as limited by Article XIII C of the California Constitution, the Board of Supervisors may amend or repeal this Article 30 by ordinance without a vote of the people.

SEC. 3012. EFFECT OF STATE AND FEDERAL AUTHORIZATION.

To the extent that the City's authorization to impose or collect any tax imposed under this Article 30 is expanded or limited as a result of changes in state or federal statutes, regulations, or other laws, or judicial interpretations of those laws, no amendment or modification of this Article shall be required to conform the taxes to those changes, and the taxes are hereby imposed in conformity with those changes and the Tax Collector shall collect them to the full extent of the City's authorization up to the full amount and rate of the taxes imposed under this Article.

SEC. 3013. SEVERABILITY.

(a) Except as provided in Section 3013(b), if any section, subsection, sentence, clause, phrase, or word of this Article 30, or the application thereof to any person or circumstance, is for any reason held to be invalid or unconstitutional by a decision of any court of competent jurisdiction, such decision shall not affect the validity of the remaining portions of this Article, including the application of such portions to other persons or circumstances. The People of the City and County of San Francisco hereby declare that, except as provided in Section 3013(b), they would have adopted each section, subsection, sentence, clause, phrase, and word of this Article not declared invalid or unconstitutional without regard to whether any other portion of this Article would be subsequently declared invalid or unconstitutional.

(b) If the imposition of the Cannabis Business Tax in Section 3003 is held in its entirety to be facially invalid or unconstitutional in a final court determination, the remainder of this Article 30 shall be void and of no force and effect, and the City Attorney shall cause it to be removed from the Business and Tax Regulations Code.

SEC. 3014. SAVINGS CLAUSE.

No section, clause, part, or provision of this Article 30 shall be construed as requiring the payment of any tax that would be in violation of the Constitution or laws of the United States or of the Constitution or laws of the State of California.

Section 4. In the event that an ordinance is enacted prior to November 6, 2018, amending Section 6.2-12 of Article 6 of the Business and Tax Regulations Code to expand its application to taxes imposed by Article 21 (Early Care and Education Commercial Rents Tax Ordinance) of the Business and Tax Regulations Code, such amendments to Section 6.2-12 of Article 6 shall be null and void in their entirety, and the amendments made to Section 6.2-12 of Article 6 in Section 2 of this ordinance shall take effect in their entirety.

Section 5. Appropriations Limit Increase. Pursuant to California Constitution Article XIII B and applicable laws, for four years from November 6, 2018, the appropriations limit for the City shall be increased by the increase in the sum of the amounts collected by the levy of the taxes imposed under Articles 10, 10B, 12, 12-A, and 12-A-1 of the Business and Tax Regulations Code in the current fiscal year compared with the prior fiscal year, and by the aggregate sum collected by the levy of the tax imposed under Section 3 of this ordinance.

Section 6. Severability. If any section, subsection, sentence, clause, phrase, or word of this ordinance, or any application thereof to any person or circumstance, is held to be invalid or unconstitutional by a decision of a court of competent jurisdiction, such decision shall not affect the validity of the remaining portions or applications of the ordinance. The People of the City and County of San Francisco hereby declare that they would have

passed this ordinance and each and every section, subsection, sentence, clause, phrase, and word not declared invalid or unconstitutional without regard to whether any other portion of this ordinance or application thereof would be subsequently declared invalid or unconstitutional.

Section 7. No Conflict with Federal or State Law. Nothing in this ordinance shall be interpreted or applied so as to create any requirement, power, or duty in conflict with any federal or state law.

Section 8. Scope of Ordinance. In enacting this ordinance, the People of the City and County of San Francisco intend to amend only those words, phrases, paragraphs, subsections, sections, articles, numbers, punctuation marks, charts, diagrams, or any other constituent parts of the Municipal Code that are explicitly shown in this ordinance as additions or deletions, in accordance with the "Note" that appears under the official title of the ordinance.

Section 9. Effective and Operative Dates. The effective date of this ordinance shall be 10 days after the date the official vote count is declared by the Board of Supervisors. This ordinance shall become operative on January 1, 2019, except for Section 3 of this ordinance, which shall become operative on January 1, 2021.

Proposition E

Ordinance amending the Business and Tax Regulations Code and Administrative Code to allocate a portion of hotel tax revenues for arts and cultural purposes and remove obsolete provisions.

NOTE: **Unchanged Code text and uncodified text** are in plain font.

Additions to Codes are in *single-underline italics Times New Roman font*.

Deletions to Codes are in *strikethrough italics Times New Roman font*.

Asterisks (* * * *) indicate the omission of unchanged Code subsections or parts of tables.

Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. Pursuant to Articles XIII A and XIII C of the Constitution of the State of California, this ordinance shall be submitted to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco at the November 6, 2018, consolidated general election.

Section 2. The Business and Tax Regulations Code is hereby amended by revising Section 515.01 and deleting Section 515.2, to read as follows:

SEC. 515.01. HOTEL TAX ALLOCATIONS.

(a) *The portion of all* ~~all~~ monies collected pursuant to the tax imposed by Section 502 of this Article *7 representing a tax of 1.5%, including any penalties, interest, and fees related to such 1.5% tax* ("Allocable Hotel Tax Revenues"), shall be deposited to the credit of ~~a fund to be known as~~ the Hotel Room Tax Fund, *established in Administrative Code Section 10.100-80*, and shall be allocated ~~as for the purposes~~ specified in *subsections* Subsection (b) ~~and in the amounts prescribed in Subsection (c)~~.

(b) *Subject to subsection (c), the* ~~The~~ monies *in the Hotel Room Tax Fund* ~~allocated pursuant to this Section~~ shall be appropriated *to the following departments and used solely for the following purposes* ~~as follows~~:

(1) **Allocation Number 1** *(Grants for the Arts Convention Facilities): \$16,300,000 to the City Administrator to distribute general*



operating and other support to nonprofit cultural organizations in the City, including any administrative costs associated with this grant-making process. To the City Administrator for Base Rental and Additional Rental as provided for and defined in the Project Lease, as amended, between the City and the Successor Agency to the Redevelopment Agency of the City and County of San Francisco, for the acquisition, construction, and financing of a convention center within the Yerba Buena Center Redevelopment Project Area, and for all expenses reasonably related to operation, maintenance, and improvement of the Moscone Convention Center. Any unexpended balance remaining in Allocation Number 1 at the close of any fiscal year shall be deemed to be provided for a specific purpose within the meaning of Section 9.113 of the Charter and shall be carried forward and accumulated in said allocation for the purposes recited herein.

(2) **Allocation Number 2 (Cultural Equity Endowment):** \$6,400,000 to the Arts Commission for programs that move San Francisco arts funding toward cultural equity, including any associated administrative costs. Any unexpended balance remaining in Allocation Number 2 at the close of any fiscal year shall be deemed to be provided for a specific purpose within the meaning of Section 9.113 of the Charter and shall be carried forward and accumulated in said allocation for the purposes recited herein.(Administration): To the Tax Collector for administration of the provisions of this Article.

(3) **Allocation Number 3 (Cultural Centers):** \$3,800,000 to the Arts Commission to support the operation, maintenance, and programming of City-owned community cultural centers to assure that these cultural centers remain open and accessible and remain vital contributors to the cultural life of the City, including any associated administrative costs. Any unexpended balance remaining in Allocation Number 3 at the close of any fiscal year shall be deemed to be provided for a specific purpose within the meaning of Section 9.113 of the Charter and shall be carried forward and accumulated in said allocation for the purposes recited herein.(Refunds): To the Tax Collector for refunds of any overpayment of the tax imposed under this Article.

(4) **Allocation Number 4 (Cultural Districts):** \$3,000,000 to the Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development for Cultural Districts in the City's neighborhoods, including any associated administrative costs. Allocations for Cultural Districts shall be used solely to address the effects of destabilization on residents and businesses in the City's Cultural Districts. For purposes of this Section 515.01, "Cultural District" means a geographic area or location within the City, designated by the Board of Supervisors by ordinance, as an area or location that embodies a unique cultural heritage. Any unexpended balance remaining in Allocation Number 4 at the close of any fiscal year shall be deemed to be provided for a specific purpose within the meaning of Section 9.113 of the Charter and shall be carried forward and accumulated in said allocation for the purposes recited herein.(Publicity/Advertising): To the City Administrator for publicity and advertising purposes pursuant to the provisions of Section 3.104 of the Charter.

(5) **Allocation Number 5 (Arts Impact Endowment):** \$2,500,000 to the Arts Commission to address needs in the arts community, including any associated administrative costs, to be determined by a cultural services allocation plan prepared no later than March 1, 2019, and every five years thereafter, by the Director of Cultural Affairs with community input and approved by the Arts Commission and the City Administrator. Any unexpended balance remaining in Allocation Number 5 at the close of any fiscal year shall be deemed to be provided for a specific purpose within the meaning of Section 9.113 of the Charter and shall be carried forward and accumulated in said allocation for the purposes recited herein.

(6) **Allocation Number 6 (Refunds):** All amounts necessary to the Tax Collector for refunds of any overpayment of the 1.5% portion

of the tax imposed under Section 502, including any related penalties, interest, and fees.

(7) **(Balance to General Fund):** After the specific purpose allocations and accumulations required by this Section 515.01(b), as adjusted under Section 515.01(c), all remaining revenues shall be transferred to the General Fund, to be expended for unrestricted general revenue purposes of the City.

(c) The amounts described in subsections (b)(1) through (b)(5) as Allocation Numbers 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5, shall be subject to the following adjustments:

(1) **Fiscal Year 2018-2019 Adjustment:** For fiscal year 2018-2019, each amount in subsections (b)(1) through (b)(5) shall be half of the amount stated.

(2) **Annual Adjustment:** Commencing in fiscal year 2019-2020, subject to subsection (c)(3), each amount in subsections (b)(1) through (b)(5) shall be adjusted annually by the percentage increase or decrease in Allocable Hotel Tax Revenues collected in the current fiscal year compared with the prior fiscal year; provided, however, that such percentage increase or decrease shall not exceed 10% annually.

(3) **Grants for the Arts and Cultural Equity Endowment:** For fiscal years 2019-2020 and 2020-2021, one-half of the amount of the adjustment to Allocation Number 1 (Grants for the Arts) under subsection (c)(2) due to any increase in Allocable Hotel Tax Revenues shall be allocated instead to Allocation Number 2 (Cultural Equity Endowment).

(d) Commencing with a report filed no later than February 15, 2020, covering the fiscal year ending on June 30, 2019, the Controller shall file annually with the Board of Supervisors, by February 15 of each year, a report containing the amount of monies collected in and expended from the Hotel Room Tax Fund during the prior fiscal year, the status of any project required or authorized to be funded by this Section 515.01, and such other information as the Controller, in the Controller's sole discretion, shall deem relevant to the operation of this Section 515.01.

Each allocation for a purpose described in Subsection (b) shall be in the amount prescribed in the table below:

Allocation No.	Amount
1. Moscone Convention Center	50%
2. Administration	Up to .6%
3. Refunds of Overpayments	As required
4. Publicity & Advertising	As appropriated
5. To General Fund	Remainder

Percentages shall be calculated based on the total amount collected pursuant to the tax imposed by Section 502 of this Article.

SEC. 515.2. CALCULATION OF PERCENTAGE ALLOCATIONS UNDER SECTION 515.01.

(a) Notwithstanding Section 515.01 of this Article, the total amount to be allocated under Section 515.01 for each fiscal year shall be reduced by the amount of principal and interest (exclusive of any bond reserve payments) due and payable for that fiscal year on any outstanding agency bonds, as defined in Section 502.8(c) hereof.

(b) This Section 515.2 shall remain in effect so long as Section 502.8 of this Article remains in effect.

Section 3. The Administrative Code is hereby amended by adding Section 10.100-80, to read as follows:

SEC. 10.100-80. HOTEL ROOM TAX FUND.

(a) Establishment of Fund. The Hotel Room Tax Fund ("Fund") is established as a category four fund as defined in Section 10.100-1 of the Administrative Code, and shall receive all taxes, penalties, interest, and fees described in Section 515.01(a) of Article 7 of the Business and Tax Regulations Code.



(b) Use of Fund. Subject to the budgetary and fiscal provisions of the Charter, monies in the Fund shall be used exclusively for the purposes described in Section 515.01(b) of Article 7 of the Business and Tax Regulations Code.

(c) Administration of Fund. As stated in Section 515.01(d) of Article 7 of the Business and Tax Regulations Code, commencing with a report filed no later than February 15, 2020, covering the fiscal year ending June 30, 2019, the Controller shall file annually with the Board of Supervisors, by February 15 of each year, a report containing the amount of monies collected in and expended from the Fund during the prior fiscal year, the status of any project required or authorized to be funded by Section 515.01, and such other information as the Controller, in the Controller's sole discretion, shall deem relevant to the operation of Section 515.01.

Section 4. Scope of Ordinance. In enacting this ordinance, the People of the City and County of San Francisco intend to amend only those words, phrases, paragraphs, subsections, sections, articles, numbers, punctuation marks, charts, diagrams, or any other constituent parts of the Municipal Code that are explicitly shown in this ordinance as additions or deletions, in accordance with the "Note" that appears under the official title of the ordinance.

Section 5. Severability. If any section, subsection, sentence, clause, phrase, or word of this ordinance, or any application thereof to any person or circumstance, is held to be invalid or unconstitutional by a decision of a court of competent jurisdiction, such decision shall not affect the validity of the remaining portions or applications of the ordinance. The People of the City and County of San Francisco hereby declare that they would have passed this ordinance and each and every section, subsection, sentence, clause, phrase, and word not declared invalid or unconstitutional without regard to whether any other portion of this ordinance or application thereof would be subsequently declared invalid or unconstitutional.

Section 6. Effective and Operative Dates. The effective date of this ordinance shall be ten days after the date the official vote count is declared by the Board of Supervisors. This ordinance shall become operative on January 1, 2019. The 50% adjustment for fiscal year 2018-2019 provided in Section 515.01(c)(1) of the Business and Tax Regulations Code takes into account the mid-fiscal year operative date of this ordinance.