CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
DEPARTMENT OF ELECTIONS
John Arntz, Director

Ballot Argument Control Sheet A

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

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

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

Office Use Only
FILED
2022 MAR 17 PM 12:07
DEPARTMENT OF ELECTIONS
Time/Date Stamp

Label

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

Section 1: Argument Information

Proposition F

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

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

Section 2: Author Information

Declaration Related to Proponent and Opponent Arguments

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

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

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

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

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

Individual (or principal officer of Organization) ☑

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

San Francisco Address (Where you are Registered [redacted]

Signature [redacted] Email

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

Name of Organization (Print)

Who should be listed as an Author for your Organization?

Only the Organization ☐ Both the Officer and the Organization ☐

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

Signature Email

Section 3: Submitter Information

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

Full Name (Print) David Pilpel Phone

Mailing Address [redacted]

Signature [redacted] Email

Section 4: Information for Paid Arguments

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

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

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

Yes ☐ No ☐

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

1.
2.
3.

Section 5: Argument Text

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

Format B, *I*, ***BI***	← Keep Text Within the Vertical Lines →	# of words per line
	Please vote NO on Proposition F. Garbage rate-setting is one of the most obscure and yet important functions of City government. There is a complicated and yet elegant process approved by the voters in 1932 that still serves us well. I respectfully suggest that Proposition F is not a solution that we need at this time. Recology is often in the news, and not always for good reasons. A recent scandal involving the former Director of Public Works and a recent rate miscalculation have been widely reported. What does not get much coverage is day-to-day collection, processing, and disposal of compostables, recycling, and garbage, including San Francisco's leading position as a City that minimizes waste, separates and processes it, minimizes sending it to landfills, minimizes environmental impacts, supports local hiring and cleanup programs, and does so at a reasonable cost to ratepayers. Proposition F has already caused great uncertainty in a system that needs more stability, not less. As someone who follows this issue closely, I have attended garbage rate hearings for years and brought objections to the Refuse Rate Board. The rate-setting system works fine in my opinion, and this proposal would change powers and duties here in ways that are not helpful to garbage collection, the environment, or ratepayers. It would create more bureaucracy with no meaningful public benefit. This proposal was also developed in secret, with limited participation from selected interests and no substantial public involvement. Businesses and residents would be affected, bills might go up, services might go down, and new oversight mechanisms are not clear. We don't need new City Departments, unnecessary spending, or other gimmicks during a pandemic or at any other time. We should be using existing resources and oversight mechanisms more effectively. Please vote NO on Proposition F. Thank you. David Pilpel	
	If handwritten information or a revision is unclear, Department staff will interpret the handwritten information to the best of their abilities; this interpretation is final.	
	Total Word Count	292

Office Use Only

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