

Proposition A: San Francisco General Hospital and Trauma Center Earthquake Safety Bonds, 2008 (special tax on real property; 2/3 vote needed)

The Question: Should San Francisco be authorized to incur bonded indebtedness in the amount of \$887,400,000 to ensure the availability of SFGH & Trauma Center in the event of a natural disaster?

- The Bond would be used for building and/or rebuilding SFGH to improve earthquake safety.
- State law requires that SFGH meet seismic safety standards by 2013 or close its acute care facilities.
- Prop A would be funded by a property tax increase and would permit landlords to pass 50% of the property tax increase to tenants.
- Prop A would require the Citizen's General Obligation Bond Oversight Committee to provide oversight of the spending of bond funds.

Relevant Positions:

LWVSF: *Financing San Francisco Government:*

Support measures that promote effective and equitable methods of paying for city services.

Increase taxes and fees if necessary to retain the current level of services.

LWVCA: *State and Local Finances*

Support measures to ensure revenues both sufficient and flexible enough to meet changing needs for state and local government services.

Promotes equity and fair sharing of the tax burden and promotes a progressive tax structure.

Supports long term debt financing through bonds when it fits within debt management and infrastructure plans and when the bond financing is used for repair and retrofitting existing public facilities and structures.

Recommendation: Support

Proposition B: Establishing Affordable Housing Fund (Charter Amendment)

The Question: Should the Charter be amended to establish the SF Affordable Housing Fund and require the City to set aside money from the annual property taxes for this fund?

- Prop B would require that 2 1/2 cents of every \$100 assessed valuation be set aside for the fund until 2024.
- The Affordable Housing Fund could not be used to replace other City funding for affordable housing.
- The fund could be used to purchase, build, rehabilitate or maintain housing for households earning not more than 80% of the SF median income; support first time buyers; provide rent subsidies and other services to tenants; and help with urgent repairs of public housing properties owned by SFHA.
- Prop B sets limits and priorities for the use of the fund, i.e., the City must spend at least 75% of the Fund to acquire and develop new housing units with at least 1/2 of the units being 2 bedrooms or larger.

Relevant Positions:

LWVUS: *Meeting Basic Human Needs*; criteria for evaluating policies to "provide a decent home and a suitable living environment for every American family" (Impact on Issues, 2004-2006, p.73)

LWVC: *Housing*

Support action at all levels of government for the provision of affordable housing for all Californians.

LWVSF: *Housing*

Support measures that provide for the needs of low, moderate and middle income groups.

LWVC: *State and Local Finances: Flexibility of Revenue*

To ensure flexibility of revenue by:

- each fund or tax earmarked for a specific purpose containing an automatic sunset date and provisions for mandatory government body review and reauthorization;
- adoption of designated earmarked funds and taxes only in those situations where social benefit significantly outweighs the loss of flexibility.

Recommendation: Neutral

Proposition C: Prohibition on City Employees Serving on Charter Boards and Commissions (Charter Amendment)

The Question:

Should the Charter be amended to prohibit current employees from serving on most boards and commissions created by the Charter?

- Currently City employees are not prohibited from serving on boards and commissions.
- Proposition C would prohibit employees from serving, with some exceptions.

Relevant Positions:

LWVSF: *Boards and Commissions*

- Support a system of boards and commissions that effectively serve the public.
- Select commissioners based upon objectivity in working with community problems and proven ability in a field related to the commission.

LWVUS: *Representative Government*

- Facilitate citizen participation in government decision making.

Recommendation: Neutral

Proposition D: Financing Pier 70 Waterfront District Development Plan Approval upon Board of Supervisors' Approval (Charter Amendment)

The Question: Should San Francisco change the Charter to provide City funds to develop Pier 70 if the Board of Supervisors approves a financial and land use plan for Pier 70?

- The Pier 70 Plan would determine the geographic boundaries for development, improvements, and financing.
- San Francisco would calculate the amount of payroll tax revenues collected from Pier 70 Plan area and estimate new hotel and payroll tax revenues the City would collect of the next 20 years if the development occurs.
- If the Board of Supervisors approves the plan, the City would provide funds for historic preservation and the development of infrastructure such as parks and utilities in an amount up to 75% of the projected new Pier 70 hotel and payroll tax revenues.
- The Plan would also authorize long-term Port leases in the area without any further Board approval.
- The Mayor would submit to the Board agreements to facilitate the transfer of funds between City agencies and the Port. If Board approved, the City would be required to provide the funding.
- Would change priorities for expenditure of Port revenues. It would clarify use of revenues to pay for bonds and other indebtedness and allow revenues for reconstruction or replacement of Port property, equipment, and facilities.

Relevant Positions:

LWVSF Natural Resources and The Environment:

- Support a planning process which balances the need for open space and increase building (open space, social requirements, preservation of historical areas, aesthetics, economic impact)
- Development/redevelopment should be guided by a flexible long-range plan and conform with the SF General Plan
- South of Market area should continue to incorporate a mix of uses.
- Conservation and development of SF Bay and enhancement and preservation of the Bay and its shoreline should be supported.

Recommendation: Neutral

Proposition E: Changing the Number of Signatures Required to Recall City Officials (Charter Amendment)

The Question: Should the Charter be amended to adopt the signature requirements set by state law to recall an official?

- Currently the Charter requires, for the recall of an official holding City-wide office, that at least 10% of registered voters sign the recall petition.
- The state establishes a sliding scale so for a City wide recall petition, 10% of the City's registered voters would have to sign on; for districts with 50,000 or fewer voters 20% would have to sign; and for a district with more than 50,000 voters 15% would have to sign.

- If state law requirements for signatures change, the signature requirements for the City would change.

Relevant Positions:

LWVSF: *San Francisco's Charter*

Support a San Francisco Charter which is an enabling document understandable to the general public.

Recommendation: Oppose

Proposition F: Holding All Scheduled City Elections Only in Even-Numbered Years (Charter Amendment)

The Question: Should all City elections except special elections be held in even-numbered years after the November 2011 election?

Proposition F would shift all City elections except special elections to even-numbered years after the November 2011 election. This would mean shifting elections for Mayor, Sheriff, District Attorney, City Attorney, and Treasurer to even-numbered years. Persons elected to the offices of City Attorney and Treasurer in 2009 would be allowed to serve five-year terms. The next election for these offices would be in 2014, and every four years thereafter.

The persons elected to the offices of Mayor, Sheriff and district Attorney in 2011 would serve five-year terms. The City would next hold an election for these offices in 2016, and thereafter every four years.

Relevant positions:

LWVCA: The LWV believes that efficient and economical government requires competent personnel...We build citizen participation in the democratic process

Recommendation: Neutral

Proposition G: Retirement System Credit for Unpaid Parental Leave (Charter Amendment)

The Question: Should the City Charter be amended to allow City employees to purchase retirement system credits for unpaid parental leave taken before July 1, 2003?

- Before July 1, 2003, the City did not provide paid parental leave to any of its employees.
- After July 1, 2003, a Charter Amendment passed by the voters provided City employees with paid parental leave of up to 16 weeks.
- This Charter amendment would allow employees to purchase service credit for periods of unpaid parental leave taken before July 1, 2003
- This credit would count towards their service time when SFERS calculates their retirement benefits.
- SFERS would determine the cost to purchase service credit for unpaid parental leave so that the amount employees pay for the service credit covers all City costs.

Relevant Positions:

LWVUS “believe that one of the goals of social policy in the US should be to promote self-sufficiency for individuals and families and that the most effective social programs are those designed to prevent or reduce poverty.” This positions allows us to address “basic needs such as...income support.”

Recommendation: Support

Proposition H: San Francisco Clean Energy Act (Charter Amendment)

The Question: Should the City begin now to explore alternatives to deliver Hetch Hetchy electricity to the City after the current contract with PG&E expires in 2015, and should it seek strategies that maximize greenhouse gas reductions from the electricity sector at the minimum cost and also create an Office of the Independent Ratepayer Advocate?

- Would require the PUC to study various ways of transmitting Hetch Hetchy electric power to the City, the electric power and distribution needs in the city, resources needed to meet demands for electric power, cost-effective options to reduce and offset greenhouse gas emissions, and
- Would also study costs and benefits of making the City the primary provider of electric power in San Francisco.
- Would develop aggressive energy efficiency measures to reduce the city’s electric needs
- The draft study would require multiple public hearings and independent expert review.
- power sources:
 - by 2012, at least 107 megawatts
 - by 2017, at least 51% of the City’s electricity needs
 - by 2030, at least 75% of the City’s electricity needs
 - by 2040, 100%, or the greatest possible amount of the City’s electricity needs
- An Office of the Independent Ratepayer Advocate would be created to make recommendations about utility rates to the City’s PUC. The Ratepayer Advocate would be appointed by the City Administrator, and the appointment or removal subject to the Board of Supervisors
- Would allow the Board of Supervisors to approve the issuance of revenue bonds to pay for any public utility facilities without voter approval.

Relevant positions:

LWVSF none

LWVCA: *State and Local Finances:* Support measures to ensure revenues both sufficient and flexible enough to meet changing needs for state and local government services;...that include long range finance methods that meet current and future needs while taking into account the cumulative impact of public debt.

- Support a process that...makes limited use of direct voting by the republic on revenue measures
- Flexibility of Revenue: public program and funding priorities that give primary consideration to meeting the basic needs of the general population, attaining program

objectives economically, and using procedures that promote flexibility and permit diversity of services

- Long-term Debt Financing: Use of bond financing for: 1. construction of capital projects 2) purchase of facilities for public use
- provision for voter approval of state and local bond measures by a simple majority vote

Energy: Roles of Local Governments: Local governments should promote energy conservation, especially in relation to building codes, transportation, resource recovery, and public information.

LWVUS: Resource management decisions must be based on a thorough assessment of population growth and of current and future needs. The inherent characteristics and carrying capacities of each area's natural resources must be considered in the planning process.....To assure the future availability of essential resources, government policies must promote stewardship of natural resources. Policies that promote resource conservation are a fundamental part of such stewardship. Consumption of nonrenewable resources should be minimized. The League believes that protections and management of natural resources are responsibilities shared by all levels of government.

Energy: The League supports:

- use of a variety of energy sources, with emphasis on conserving energy and using energy-efficient technologies
- predominant reliance on renewable resources
- action by appropriate levels of government to encourage the use of renewable resources and energy conservation through funding for research and development, financial incentives, rate-setting, and mandatory standards
- mandatory energy-conservation measures

Recommendation: Neutral

Proposition I: Creating the Office of an Independent Rate Payer Advocate (Charter Amendment)

The Question: Should San Francisco Change the Charter to create an Office of the Independent Ratepayer to make recommendations about utility rates to the City's PUC?

- Would be funded from PUC's utility revenues, subject to Charter's budgetary and fiscal provisions.
- The City Administrator would have sole authority to appoint or remove the Advocate.
- The Advocate would have authority to: examine PUC rates from viewpoint of PUC customers, review PUC's use of revenues, hold public meetings and provide recommendations to PUC, accept inquiries from PUC customers, provide explanations about PUC rates, and conduct customer outreach activities

Relevant Positions:

LWVUSF Boards and Commissions:

- Effectiveness of a commission should be judged by: providing a range of viewpoints, includes citizens in decision-making, and provides public forums

- Duties of boards and commissions should include: holding public hearings, advising, and acting as an appeals board (?)
- Appointments of commissioners should be by the Mayor

LWVSF Executive Branch:

- The Mayor, with the Board of Supervisors, should have the power to create, eliminate and combine departments, boards and commissions.

Recommendation: Neutral

Proposition J: Creating an Historic Preservation Commission (Charter Amendment)

The Question:

Should the Charter be amended to create an Historic Preservation Commission instead of the current Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board?

- The Advisory Board has no final decision making authority.
- Under Prop J the Commission would have authority to make recommendations directly to the Board of Supervisors; approve permits or certificates of demolition or alteration to historic/landmark buildings & districts; make recommendation about proposed ordinances/resolutions concerning historic preservation.
- The commission would rely on the Planning Department's staff and budget.

Relevant Positions:

LWVSF: *Boards and Commissions*

- Support a system of boards and commissions which effectively serves the public.
- Select commissioners based on a proven ability in a field related to the commission.

Housing

- Support measures that provide for the needs of low, moderate and middle income groups.
- Streamline the building permit process.

LWVCA: *Intergovernmental Relationships*

- Support and efficient, effective and equitable balance of responsibility and authority among the levels of government with accountability to the public.
- Support a rational organization of powers and functions based on economic efficiency, administrative effectiveness, political accountability and fiscal equity.
- Support an organization of powers that provides for the consolidation of functions to deal with area wide problems to achieve cost savings and improve the quality of service.

Recommendation: Oppose

Proposition K: Enforcement of Laws Related to Prostitution and Sex Workers (Ordinance placed on ballot by petition)

The Question:

Should San Francisco prohibit the police from providing/ using or applying for resources to investigate and prosecute prostitution or to support the First Offender Prostitution Program?

- In 1994 a Prostitution Task Force was established that released a report in 1996 with a recommendation that the City stop enforcing/prosecuting prostitution crimes; focus resources on neighborhood quality of life complaints; and redirect funds to services and alternatives for those involved in prostitution.
- Prop K would prohibit the use of resources for the investigation and prosecution crimes.
- Prop K would require enforcement of existing criminal laws and prohibit racial profiling to target trafficking victims.

Relevant Positions: *None*

Recommendation: **No position.**

Proposition L: Funding the Community Justice Center (Ordinance)

The Question: The City has established a new Community Justice Center (CJC) that will include a court for handling some criminal misdemeanor and non-violent felony cases, as well as access to health and social services for defendants. The Board of Supervisors has approved funding of \$998 million for 2008-2009—although it retains the authority to change this funding—and has authorized the Department of Public Health to accept a federal grant of \$984 million in additional funds. The BOS has also authorized the Director of Property to enter into a lease, which he has done.

The Proposal: This ordinance would guarantee that the City would provide first-year funding for the CJC, authorize the Director of Property to lease space for the CJC, and define the CJC’s scope and operations.

Relevant Positions:

LWVUS: *Social Policy*

Secure equal rights and equal opportunity for all. Promote social and economic justice and health and safety of all Americans

Recommendation: **Neutral**

Proposition M: Tenant Harassment Policy (Ordinance)

The Question:

Should the City's Residential Rent Ordinance be amended to prohibit harassment of tenant's by landlords?

- Under current state and local laws landlords are required to keep rental units livable and there enforceable penalties for non-compliance.
- Currently the Rent Ordinance requires "good cause" and lists a number of specific reasons that landlords can use to evict tenants.
- Prop M would add a list of actions that could be construed as harassment, i.e., threats of physical harm; failure to provide required housing services, repairs or maintenance; and attempts to intimidate tenants into leaving.
- Prop M would provide for enforceable penalties should harassment be proven.

Relevant Positions:

LWVSF: *Housing*

- Support measures that provide for the needs of low, moderate and middle income groups.

LWVCA: *Housing*

- Support action at all levels of government for the provision of affordable housing for all Californians.
- Protect the rights of both tenants and landlords.

LWVUS: *Housing Supply*

Support policies to provide a decent home and a suitable living environment for every American Family.

Recommendation: Support

Proposition N: Changing Real Property Transfer Tax Rates (Ordinance)

The Question: Should the real estate transfer tax rate be increased on certain properties and lowered on others where certain solar and seismic improvements have been made?

The Proposal: This ordinance would increase the transfer tax rate to 1.5% for the sale of real estate worth \$5 million or more. The BOS could exempt the sale of affordable housing projects from this increase. The tax rate for the sale of real estate worth less than \$5 million would not increase. The transfer tax would be extended to real estate leases of 35 years or more.

Relevant Positions:

LWVSF: *Financing San Francisco Government:*

- Support measures that promote effective and equitable methods of paying for city services.
- Increase taxes and fees if necessary to retain the current level of services

LWV California: *State and Local Finances*

- Support measure to ensure revenues sufficient and flexible to meet changing needs of State and Local government services
- Promotes equity and fair sharing of the tax burden and promotes a **progressive tax structure.**

Recommendation: Support

Proposition O: Replacing the Emergency Response Fee with an Access Line Tax and revising the Telephone Users Tax

The Question: Should the City replace the Emergency Response Fee with the Access Line Tax at the same rates and with the same exemptions, and to revise the Telephone Users Tax?

- Revenue would go the City’s General Fund
- “Telephone communications services” would be redefined to include current and future technologies for telephone communications
- Would include charges for conference calls, voicemail, call waiting, activation, termination, late payments fees, and universal service charges.
- Would continue Telephone Users Tax exemption for residential landline services as well as other certain services.
- Would also state that voters approve the City’s part collection of the Telephone Users Tax and the Emergency Response Fee.

Relevant Positions:

LWVC Position *Flexibility of Revenue:*

- Ensure flexibility of revenue by adoption of designated earmarked funds and taxes only in those situations where social benefit significantly outweighs the loss of flexibility

Recommendation: Support

Proposition P: Changing the Composition of the San Francisco County Transportation Authority Board

The Question: Should the City change the membership of the Transportation Authority and encourage great efficiency and financial reviews?

- Changes the size and composition of the Authority Board from the Board of Supervisors to The Mayor, The President of the Board of Supervisors, the Treasurer, one elected City official selected by the Mayor, one elected City official selected by the President of the Board of Supervisors.
- The Mayor, President of Board, and Treasurer could designate another elected City official to serve as his or her alternate.

- Would allow City agencies and departments to perform staff functions for the Authority Board, would obtain expert financial review before adopting budgets, and would adopt the same ethics and public records laws that apply to City agencies.

Relevant Positions:

LWVSF Executive Branch:

- Support measures to increase effectiveness and accountability of administration. Retain the authority that lies in the Mayor’s position.
- The Mayor, with the Board of Supervisors, should have the power to create, eliminate and combine departments, boards and commissions.

Recommendation: Support

Proposition Q: Modifying the Payroll Expense Tax (Ordinance)

The Question: Should the City amend the Payroll Expense Tax Ordinance by expanding tax liability to include certain entities not previously subject to the tax?

The Proposal: This ordinance would specify that the City’s 1.5% payroll expense tax applies to compensation paid to shareholders of professional corporations, e.g., partners in a law firm, members of limited liability companies, and owners of partnerships for their services.

Relevant Positions:

LWVSF: *Financing San Francisco Government:*

- Support measures that promote effective and equitable methods of paying for city services.
- Increase taxes and fees if necessary to retain the current level of services

LWV California: *State and Local Finances*

- Support measure to ensure revenues sufficient and flexible to meet changing needs of State and Local government services
- Promotes equity and fair sharing of the tax burden and promotes a **progressive tax structure.**

Recommendation: Support

Proposition S: Policy Regarding Budget Set-asides and Identification of Replacement Funds (Ordinance)

The Question: Should it be City policy that voters approve ballot measures authorizing new budget set-asides only if a new source of funding is identified?

The Proposal: This ordinance would make it City policy that voters will only approve measures authorizing new set-asides or spending mandates if the measure also identifies a new source of funding. In addition, Prop S would also make it City policy that voters will not approve a new

set-aside with a cost-of-living adjustment or annual increase of more than 2% or any new or extended set-aside that does not automatically expire 10 years after it goes into effect.

Relevant Positions:

LWVSF: *Budgetary Systems and Procedures:*

- Support a budgetary process that is effective, visible, and responsive to the needs of the community
- Support a budget that provides effective control over expenditures

LWV California: *State and Local Finances*

- Support measures to ensure revenues sufficient and flexible to meet changing needs of State and Local government services
- Ensure flexibility of revenue by: 4.h. each fund or tax earmarked for a specific purpose containing an automatic sunset date and provisions for mandatory government body review and reauthorization

Recommendation: Neutral

Proposition T: Free and Low Cost Substance Abuse Treatment Programs (Ordinance)

The Question: Should the Department of Public Health be required to provide a report assessing demand for substance abuse treatment and develop a plan to meet the need? And, should the City's budget include funding for the plan?

- Prop T would require DPH to maintain an adequate level of free and low cost substance abuse treatment services and residential treatment capacity sufficient to meet existing demand.
- Requires the City to prevent any reduction in funding and staffing for City substance abuse treatment programs.

Relevant Positions:

LWVUS: The LWVUS believes a basic level of quality health care at an affordable cost should be available to all U.S. citizens.

LWVC: *State and Local Finances: Flexibility of Revenue*

To ensure flexibility of revenue by:

- each fund or tax earmarked for a specific purpose containing an automatic sunset date and provisions for mandatory government body review and reauthorization;
- adoption of designated earmarked funds and taxes only in those situations where social benefit significantly outweighs the loss of flexibility.

Recommendation: Neutral
