

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 the address below (starting in early May):

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.

Voter Information Pamphlet & Sample Ballot

Be A Voter

Tuesday, June 3, 2014

from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m.



Check the back cover for your polling place address.

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



To visit
sfelections.org,
scan this QR code:



請查看封底，以了解您的投票站地址以及郵寄投票申請表。許多投票站地點已經有改動！

重要：如果您已經申請中文版的選舉材料，不久您會收到中文版的《選民資料手冊》。中文版的《選民資料手冊》不包含選票樣本。請保留這份英文版的《選民資料手冊》，以便參閱其中的選票樣本。如果要索取本手冊的中文版或需要其他協助，請致電(415) 554-4367。

Consulte la contraportada para averiguar la dirección de su lugar de votación y encontrar una solicitud de voto por correo. ¡Muchos lugares de votación han cambiado!

IMPORTANTE: Si usted ha solicitado materiales electorales en español, pronto se le enviará un Folleto de Información para los Electores por correo. El folleto en español no contiene la muestra de la boleta. **Guarde este folleto en inglés** para consultar la muestra de su boleta. Para solicitar una copia del folleto en español o recibir algún otro tipo de asistencia, por favor llame al (415) 554-4366.

Important Dates

First day of early voting at City Hall,
approximate mailing date for vote-by-mail ballots

Monday, May 5

Deadline to register to vote in the June election

Monday, May 19

First weekend of early voting at City Hall

Saturday and Sunday, May 24–25

Deadline for the Department of Elections
to receive a request for a vote-by-mail ballot

Tuesday, May 27, 5 p.m.

Last weekend of early voting at City Hall

Saturday and Sunday, May 31–June 1

Ballot Drop-off Stations are open at the Goodlett
and Grove Street entrances to City Hall

Saturday, May 31–Tuesday, June 3


Deadline for new citizens naturalized after
May 19 to register and vote (only at City Hall)

Tuesday, June 3, 8 p.m.

Election Day voting hours
(all polling places and City Hall)

Tuesday, June 3, 7 a.m. to 8 p.m.

Visit sfelections.org/toolkit to:



- ★ Check your voter registration status, including party preference
- ★ Register to vote or update your registration
- ★ 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

Contact the Department of Elections

Email: use the email form at sfelections.org/sfvote


English: (415) 554-4375 中文: (415) 554-4367

Español: (415) 554-4366 TTY: (415) 554-4386

Office hours are Mondays through Fridays (except Memorial Day, May 26) from 8 a.m. until 5 p.m.



DEPARTMENT OF ELECTIONS
City and County of San Francisco
sfelections.org



JOHN ARNTZ
Director

Dear San Francisco Voter:

March 21, 2014

The June 3, 2014, Consolidated Statewide Direct Primary Election is the second primary election in which Californians will use the “open primary” system that voters approved under Proposition 14 in June 2010.

What does this mean? Below is a description of how the open primary system affects your voting opportunities for this election:

- Voters and candidates no longer are considered to be “affiliated” with political parties. Now, voters and candidates have “party preferences” and the candidates must list their party preferences on the ballot.
- Most state and federal offices are now considered to be “voter nominated” rather than “partisan.”
- All voters will receive ballots that list all candidates running for the voter-nominated contests, regardless of the voters’ or candidates’ party preferences.
- For the voter-nominated contests, the two candidates who receive the highest number of votes will move on to the general election in November, regardless of their party preferences. Thus, you may see two candidates from the same party on your November ballot.

For information about the upcoming election, I recommend that you visit sfelections.org. The website provides materials regarding the new primary process, as well as your registration status, your polling place location, and whether the Department has mailed or received your vote-by-mail ballot. The “**Voting Toolkit**,” accessible from the home page, provides a convenient starting point for most election-related information.

For mobile devices, use sfelections.org/m:



Below is more information that might be helpful for this election:

- Beginning May 5, early voting is available in City Hall to all registered voters:
 - Weekdays from 8 a.m. until 5 p.m. (except Memorial Day, May 26)
 - Weekends: May 24–25 and May 31–June 1, from 10 a.m. until 4 p.m. (enter City Hall from Grove Street)
- Election Day voting begins on Tuesday, June 3, at 7 a.m. at all San Francisco polling places, including the voting station located in City Hall. Polls close at 8 p.m.

Respectfully,
 John Arntz, Director



Purpose of the Voter Information Pamphlet

Before each election, the Department of Elections prepares the Voter Information Pamphlet, which is mailed to every registered voter as required by law.

In this Voter Information Pamphlet, you will find:

- information about when, where, and how to vote,
- your sample ballot,
- candidates' statements of their qualifications for office,
- information about each local ballot measure, including:
 - an impartial summary of the measure, prepared by San Francisco's Ballot Simplification Committee,
 - a financial analysis, prepared by San Francisco's Controller,

- an explanation of how it qualified for the ballot,
- arguments supporting and opposing the measure, and
- the legal text of the measure.

You may bring this pamphlet with you to your polling place. In addition, every precinct is supplied with a copy. Please ask a poll worker if you would like to see it.

In addition to the San Francisco Voter Information Pamphlet, there is an Official Voter Information Guide, produced by the California Secretary of State, with information on candidates for state and federal office and state ballot measures. You may access it at sos.ca.gov.



GO GREEN!

To stop receiving this paper pamphlet in the future, see page 58.

The 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, and they volunteer their time to prepare these informational materials for voters.

The Committee members are:

Betty Packard, *Chair*

Nominated by:

the Northern California Broadcasters Association

June Fraps

Nominated by:

the National Academy of Television Arts and Sciences

Ann Jorgensen

Nominated by:

the San Francisco Unified School District

Adele Fasick

Nominated by:

the League of Women Voters

Christine Unruh

Nominated by:

the Pacific Media Workers Guild

Joshua White, *ex officio*

Deputy City Attorney



Check the Back Cover to Confirm Your Polling Place Location

Many polling places have changed for the upcoming election!

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

- **Your polling place address.** Please make a note of it. If you have a vote-by-mail ballot, you may turn in your voted ballot at your polling place on Election Day.
- **Your precinct number.**
- An indication of whether your polling place is **accessible for people with disabilities.**
- A **physical description** of your polling place entryway, such as slope or ramped access.

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

If your polling place is not functionally accessible, visit the above website or call (415) 554-4551 prior to Election Day to find the nearest accessible polling place within your district. For accessible polling place information on Election Day, call (415) 554-4375.

Some Precincts Do Not Have a Polling Place

Voting precincts with fewer than 250 registered voters are designated "Mail Ballot Precincts." An official ballot, instructions, and a postage-paid return envelope will be mailed automatically to all voters in those precincts approximately four weeks before every election.

For voters in those precincts who would prefer to drop off their ballot at a polling place, the addresses of the two polling places nearest to their precinct are provided in the instructions.

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. An average of 13% of polling place locations change each election because site owners no longer make their space available. Polling places may also change as a cost-savings measure. For some elections, two neighboring precincts are consolidated to share a single polling place.

If you own a recreation room, lobby, or other 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. For any voters who are unaware of the polling place change, the Department of Elections posts "Change of Polling Place" signs at the address of the old location on Election Day. Voters may take a copy of the new polling place address from a pad attached to the sign.

Be A Voter

sfelections.org

Multilingual Voter Services

多種語言選民服務

Servicios multilingües para los electores

In compliance with federal law and local ordinance, the Department of Elections provides services to voters and official election materials in Chinese and Spanish, in addition to English. Multilingual voter services include:

- Voter information in English, Chinese, and Spanish at sfelections.org.
- Translated election materials: ballots, voter registration forms, voter notices, vote-by-mail ballot applications and instructions, and Voter Information Pamphlets.
- Instructional signs in English, Chinese, and Spanish at all polling places on Election Day.
- Chinese and Spanish bilingual poll worker assistance at designated polling places on Election Day.
- Telephone assistance in English, Chinese, and Spanish, available Monday through Friday, 8 a.m. to 5 p.m., and from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m. on Election Day.
 - English: (415) 554-4375
 - Chinese: (415) 554-4367
 - Spanish: (415) 554-4366

中文選民服務

依照聯邦法律和地方法令，選務處提供選民中文服務和官方選舉資料。中文服務包括：

- 網上提供的中文選舉資料: sfelections.org。
- 已翻譯的選舉資料：選票、「選民登記表」、選舉預告、「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。
- 於星期一至星期五的上午8時至下午5時及選舉日上午7時正至晚上8時正提供的中文電話協助：(415) 554-4367。

中文版的《選民資料手冊》

除了英文版《選民資料手冊》之外，選務處還提供中文版的《選民資料手冊》。如果您想要選務處郵寄給您一本中文版的《選民資料手冊》，請致電：(415) 554-4367。

Asistencia en español para los electores

Conforme a la ley federal y al reglamento municipal, el Departamento de Elecciones proporciona materiales electorales y asistencia en español para los electores. Los servicios en español incluyen:

- Información electoral en español en sfelections.org.
- Materiales electorales traducidos: la boleta electoral, el formulario 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.
- Asistencia telefónica en español disponible de lunes a viernes de 8 a.m. a 5 p.m. y el Día de las Elecciones de 7 a.m. a 8 p.m. llamando al (415) 554-4366.

El Folleto de Información para los Electores en español

Además del Folleto de Información para los Electores en inglés, el Departamento de Elecciones provee un Folleto de Información para los Electores en español a los electores que lo soliciten. Si quiere recibir un Folleto de Información para los Electores en español, por favor llame al (415) 554-4366.



Voting: When, Where, and How

Vote at City Hall

Any San Francisco voter may vote on or before Election Day at City Hall, Room 48:

- Monday through Friday, May 5–June 2 (except Memorial Day, May 26), 8 a.m. to 5 p.m.
- Saturday and Sunday, May 24–25 and May 31–June 1, 10 a.m. to 4 p.m. (enter on Grove Street)
- Election Day, Tuesday, June 3, 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 are a permanent vote-by-mail voter, your ballot will be mailed on or shortly after May 5. To check when your ballot was mailed or received by the Department of Elections, go to sfelections.org/vbmstatus or call (415) 554-4375. If you have not received your ballot by May 19, please call.
- When you receive your ballot, carefully read and follow the Vote-by-Mail Instructions enclosed with it.
- Return your voted ballot by mail, drop it off at City Hall, or drop it off at any San Francisco polling place on Election Day. Find details in the Vote-by-Mail Instructions enclosed with your ballot, or go to sfelections.org/vbminsert.
- Beginning July 2, you can confirm that your vote-by-mail ballot was counted. If your ballot could not be counted, you will be advised of the reason. Go to sfelections.org/vbmstatus or call (866) 325-9163 toll free.

How to Request to Vote by Mail

If you want to vote by mail for the June 3 election, the Department of Elections must receive your request before 5 p.m. on May 27. There are several ways to request to vote by mail:

- Complete and submit the application found on the back cover of this pamphlet.
- Go to sfelections.org/toolkit.
 - Click on “Voting: when, where, and how,”

- Click on “Voting by mail,”
- Click on one of these options and follow the instructions:
 - “Apply online to vote by mail for this election,” or
 - “Download request to vote by mail for all elections.”
- Call (415) 554-4375, or visit the Department of Elections in City Hall, Room 48.
- Mail or fax a request to the Department of Elections with your name, your birth date, your 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 on your application or when you call that you wish to become a permanent vote-by-mail voter.

Vote at Your Polling Place on Election Day

- To receive the ballot with the correct contests and candidates for your precinct, vote at your assigned polling place.
- Many polling places have changed! 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, June 3, from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m.

How to Vote

Choose Your Ballot Format

- You will receive a paper ballot unless you request to use an accessible voting machine at City Hall or your polling place (for more information, see page 8).
- If you use the accessible voting machine, the machine will provide instructions.

Mark Your Paper Ballot

- Read the instructions printed on each ballot card, and review both sides of each card for contests.
- Check the number of candidates you may select for each contest, which is printed above the list of candidate names. If you mark more than the allowed number of candidates, 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 each contest and measure, as shown in picture ①
- If you don’t want to vote for a certain contest or measure, leave that contest or measure blank. Your votes for the other contests and measures will still count.

How to Vote for a Qualified Write-In Candidate


- In addition to the candidates listed on the ballot, there may be other people running as qualified write-in candidates. Qualified write-in candidates have submitted the appropriate documentation 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 within two weeks prior to Election Day, or ask a poll worker.
- Before casting a write-in vote, make sure:
 - the candidate is **not listed on the ballot**.
 - the candidate is a **qualified write-in candidate**.
 - 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 ②

How to Correct a Mistake

- If you make a mistake on your vote-by-mail ballot, follow the Vote-by-Mail Instructions that were enclosed with your ballot, or call (415) 554-4375.
- If you make a mistake on the ballot provided at your polling place, ask a poll worker for a replacement.
- Voters may replace up to two sets of ballot cards.


①

How to mark your choice:



②

How to vote for a qualified write-in candidate:



How to Find More Information

For more information about voting, visit sfelections.org/toolkit.



Accessible Voting and Services for Voters with Disabilities

Accessible Formats of the Voter Information Pamphlet:

The Voter Information Pamphlet is posted online in a format that can be used with a screen reader and in MP3 format; visit sfelections.org/toolkit and click on “Election information and education.” It is also available in audiocassette, audio CD, and large-print formats. To request a copy of this pamphlet in an accessible format, go to sfelections.org or call (415) 554-4375.

Audio copies of the Voter Information Pamphlet are also available from the San Francisco Library for the Blind and Print Disabled at 100 Larkin Street, or call (415) 557-4253.

Voting by Mail: Prior to each election, vote-by-mail voters are mailed an official ballot with a postage-paid return envelope. Any voter may request to vote by mail in any election. Find a Vote-by-Mail Application on the back cover of this pamphlet or at sfelections.org/toolkit, or call (415) 554-4375. For more information, see page 6.

Early Voting in City Hall: Beginning 29 days prior to each election, any voter may vote at the Department of Elections on the ground floor of City Hall. City Hall is accessible from any of its four entrances. The polling place at City Hall has all of the assistance tools provided at polling places on Election Day. For more information, see page 6.

Access to the Polling Place: A “YES” or “NO” printed below the accessibility symbol on the back cover of this pamphlet indicates whether or not your polling place entrance and voting area are functionally accessible. If your polling place is not accessible and you would like the location of the nearest accessible polling place within your district, please go to sfelections.org/pollsite or call (415) 554-4375.

Accessible Voting Machine: Voters have the option to use an accessible voting machine, available at every polling place. This machine allows voters with sight or mobility impairments or other specific needs to vote independently and privately. Voters may vote using a touchscreen or audio ballot. The machine will provide visual or audio instructions, including an indication of whether a contest uses ranked-choice voting. For ranked-choice voting contests, the machine presents one list of all candidates, from which voters may select up to three candidates in order of preference. After each selection, there will be a visual or audio confirmation of the candidate’s ranking. In accordance with Secretary of State requirements, votes from the accessible voting machine will be transferred onto paper ballots, which will



be tallied at City Hall after Election Day. If you would like to use the accessible voting machine, please tell a poll worker the mode you prefer:

Touchscreen Ballot: Voters may make ballot selections using a touchscreen and review their selections on a paper record before casting their vote. Large-print text is provided on the screen, and voters can further increase text size.

Audio Ballot and Handheld Keypad: For audio voting, the accessible voting machine is equipped with headphones and a Braille-embossed handheld keypad with keys coded by color and shape. The voting machine provides audio instructions to guide you through the ballot. Use the keypad to move through the ballot and make selections.

The machine has a feature for voters to connect a personal assistive device such as a sip/puff device. The Department of Elections can also provide multi-user sip/puff switches or headpointers at the polling place in City Hall, or dispatch them to a polling place for Election Day. To request that one of these devices be sent to your polling place, please go to selections.org or call (415) 554-4375, preferably 72 hours prior to Election Day to help ensure availability and assist in scheduling.

Other Forms of Assistance at the Polling Place:

Personal Assistance: A voter may bring up to two people, including poll workers, into the voting booth for assistance in marking his or her ballot.

Curbside Voting: If a voter is unable to enter a polling place, poll workers can bring voting materials to the voter 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. The accessible voting machine provides large-print text on the screen, and voters can further increase text size.

Seated Voting: Every polling place has at least one voting booth that allows voting while seated.

Voting Tools: Every polling place has two easy-grip pens for signing the roster and marking the ballot.

TTY (Teletypewriter Device): To reach the Department of Elections via TTY, call (415) 554-4386.



Primary Elections in California

On June 8, 2010, California voters approved Proposition 14, which created a “top two” or “open” primary election system. The passage of this proposition changed how the primary 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.

The change to an open primary election system does not affect how the primary elections for U.S. President or the elections for political party county central committees are conducted. However, some timing has changed: county central committee elections now coincide with presidential primary elections.

What does this mean for voters in the June 2014 primary election?

All candidates running for voter-nominated offices appear on the same ballot, regardless of the candidates’ party preferences. Any voter may vote for any candidate for these offices, regardless of the voter’s party preference. All voters in a jurisdiction will receive the same ballot; there will not be party-specific ballots.

The voter-nominated offices on the June ballot are:

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

The two candidates who receive the most votes in each of these contests advance to the general election in November. These two candidates can be from the same political party. Even if one candidate receives a majority of the votes cast in the primary election, the top two candidates will both advance to the general election.

The Superintendent of Public Instruction contest also appears on the June ballot. This is a nonpartisan office. Voters can vote for any candidate for nonpartisan offices.

County central committee contests do not appear on the ballot for the June 2014 election. Voters will elect members of the county central committees at the next presidential primary in June 2016.

What does “party preference” mean?

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

Under the open primary election system, 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. 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; any party endorsements received by the Department of Elections by the submission deadline are listed on page 21 of this pamphlet.

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

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

- Go to sfelections.org/toolkit, click on “Voter registration” and “Check your registration,” or
- Call (415) 554-4375.

What ballot will I receive?

Because there are no party-specific ballots for this primary election, you and all voters in your voting precinct will receive the same ballot. Your sample ballot may be found on page 12.

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 the primary election?

For more information about the primary election, go to sfelections.org or the “Upcoming Elections” page on the California Secretary of State’s website, sos.ca.gov.



Keep Your Registration Up-to-Date

Many Life Changes Require a Voter Registration Update

Have you moved or changed your name? Do you want to change your political party preference? Do you need to make other changes to your voter record, such as changing your mailing address, email address, or vote-by-mail status?

To update your registration, go to sfelections.org/update and find the following options:

- **Check your current voter registration record**

You can confirm that you are registered to vote, verify your party preference, and check whether you are a permanent vote-by-mail voter. You'll also have the option to look up your polling place address and view your sample ballot.

- **Register to vote, or change your name, residential address, or party preference**

You may now go online to register to vote or to make any changes to your registration, such as your name, residential address, or political party preference.

- **Update or correct your voter registration information (other than changing your name, residential address, or party preference)**

Do you need to change or remove your telephone number or your email address, add a mailing address, correct the spelling of your name, or update your language preference? These changes are easy to make and do not require a new registration.

- **Cancel your voter registration**

Only you can request that your voter registration be cancelled. Cancel your registration if you have moved out of San Francisco or no longer want to vote. Complete the form at sfelections.org/update, then print it and return it to the Department of Elections. State law requires that your original signature appear on a request to cancel your registration.

- **Notify us of voters no longer living at your address**

Sometimes voters do not notify the Department of Elections of a change in their address. If you receive election materials for someone who is not living at your address, please let us know by returning the materials to us or by completing the form at sfelections.org/update.

- **Notify us of a deceased voter**

In the unfortunate event of a person's death, you may notify our office so that we can remove the person's name from the voter list. Your notification will assist us in maintaining an up-to-date voter list.

Go to sfelections.org/update to make any registration updates.



Remember to check the back cover for your polling place address.



Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs)

Answered by the Ballot Simplification Committee

Q: Who can vote?

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

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

A: The registration deadline is May 19, fifteen days prior to Election Day.

Q: When and where can I vote on Election Day?

A: You may vote at your polling place or at the Department of Elections 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 Department of Elections is located in City Hall, Room 48.

Q: Is there any way to vote before Election Day?

A: 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/toolkit, 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 no later than 5 p.m. on May 27, or
- **Vote in person** at the Department of Elections in City Hall, Room 48, beginning May 5 (see inside back cover for dates and times).

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

A: 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** no later than 5 p.m. on May 27.

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

A: If you have been convicted of a crime, California law allows you to register and vote if:

- you were convicted of a misdemeanor (even if you are currently in county jail, on probation, or on supervised release for that misdemeanor),
- your sentence for a felony conviction is suspended,
- you are on federal or state probation for a felony conviction, or
- you have **completed** your felony sentence, including any period of parole, post-release community supervision, mandatory supervision, or supervised release for a felony conviction. In this case, you must complete and return a voter registration form to restore your right to vote. No other documentation is required.

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

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

A: 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.

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

A: Yes.

- If you became a U.S. citizen on or before the registration deadline (May 19), 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 Department of Elections in City Hall before 8 p.m. on Election Day with proof of citizenship.

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

A: Yes. You have the following options:

- Come to the Department of Elections in City Hall, Room 48, on or before Election Day, complete a new voter registration form **and** vote at the Department of Elections; 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.

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

A: 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.

Q: What do I do if my polling place is not open on Election Day?

A: Call the Department of Elections immediately at (415) 554-4375 for assistance.

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

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

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

A: 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.

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

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



Voter Bill of Rights

- 1. You have the right to cast a ballot if you are a valid registered voter.**
A valid registered voter means a United States citizen who is a resident in this state, who is at least 18 years of age and not in prison or on parole for conviction of a felony, and who is registered to vote at his or her current residence address.
- 2. You have the right to cast a provisional ballot if your name is not listed on the voting rolls.**
- 3. You have the right to cast a ballot if you are present and in line at the polling place prior to the close of the polls.**
- 4. You have the right to cast a secret ballot free from intimidation.**
- 5. You have the right to receive a new ballot if, prior to casting your ballot, you believe you made a mistake.**
If, at any time before you finally cast your ballot, you feel you have made a mistake, you have the right to exchange the spoiled ballot for a new ballot. Vote-by-mail voters may also request and receive a new ballot if they return their spoiled ballot to an election official prior to the closing of the polls on Election Day.
- 6. You have the right to receive assistance in casting your ballot, if you are unable to vote without assistance.**
- 7. You have the right to return a completed vote-by-mail ballot to any precinct in the county.**
- 8. You have the right to election materials in another language, if there are sufficient residents in your precinct to warrant production.**
- 9. You have the right to ask questions about election procedures and observe the election process.**
You have the right to ask questions of the precinct board and election officials regarding election procedures and to receive an answer or be directed to the appropriate official for an answer. However, if persistent questioning disrupts the execution of their duties, the board or election officials may discontinue responding to questions.
- 10. You have the right to report any illegal or fraudulent activity to a local election official or to the Secretary of State's office.**



If you believe you have been denied any of these rights, or you are aware of any election fraud or misconduct, please call the Secretary of State's confidential toll-free **Voter Hotline at 1 (800) 345-VOTE (8683)**.

Confidentiality and Voter Records

Permissible Uses of Voter Registration Information

Information on your voter registration form will be 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. Voter information may be provided to a candidate for office, a ballot measure committee, or other person for election, scholarly, journalistic, political, or governmental purposes, as determined by the Secretary of State. Driver's license, state identification, and Social Security numbers, or your signature as shown on your voter registration form, cannot be released for these purposes. 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: 1 (800) 345-VOTE (8683).

Safe at Home Program

Certain voters facing life-threatening situations may qualify for confidential voter status. For more information, please contact the Secretary of State's Safe at Home program toll-free at 1 (877) 322-5227, or visit the Secretary of State's website at 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.



You Can Stop Receiving this Paper Pamphlet

You have a choice of how to receive your Voter Information Pamphlet and Sample Ballot. State and municipal laws now allow voters to “go green” and stop receiving a Voter Information Pamphlet and Sample Ballot by mail and read it online instead.

To request that mail delivery of your Voter Information Pamphlet and Sample Ballot be stopped, OR to resume mail delivery if you previously had it stopped:

- Complete and mail this form, or
- Fill out the form at sfelections.org/gogreen.



Submit this form at least 50 days before an election in order for the change to take effect for that election and onward. If the request is received after this deadline, the change will likely take effect for the next election.

OPT OUT: Stop mail delivery of the Voter Information Pamphlet and Sample Ballot

Approximately 40 days prior to an election, your Voter Information Pamphlet and Sample Ballot will be available at sfelections.org/toolkit. At that time, the Department will email a notification to the address you have provided on this form. (If the email address is invalid, we must resume sending you the information by mail.)

OPT IN: Restart mail delivery of the Voter Information Pamphlet and Sample Ballot

If you previously opted out of receiving your Voter Information Pamphlet and Sample Ballot by mail, you can restart mail delivery by submitting this form at least 50 days prior to an election.

 OPT OUT

I no longer want to receive my Voter Information Pamphlet and Sample Ballot by mail. I'll use the online version instead.

 OPT IN

I previously opted out of receiving my Voter Information Pamphlet and Sample Ballot by mail, but I would like to start receiving it by mail again.

ALL FIELDS ARE REQUIRED.

Printed Full Name

Date of Birth (MM/DD/YYYY)

Residential Address (Number, Street, Apt./Unit, ZIP Code)

Email Address (name@domain.end) This email address will be kept confidential pursuant to California Government Code § 6254.4 and Elections Code § 2194, and legally may be provided to a candidate for office, a ballot measure committee, or other person for election, scholarly, journalistic, political, or governmental purposes, as determined by the Secretary of State.

Signature

Date

Mail this form to:

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





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.

OFFICES

VOTER-NOMINATED OFFICES

Governor	
Lieutenant Governor	
Secretary of State	
Controller	
Treasurer	
Attorney General	
Insurance Commissioner	
Member, State Board of Equalization	
United States Representative	
Member of the State Assembly	

NONPARTISAN OFFICES

Superintendent of Public Instruction	
Judge of the Superior Court, Office No. 20	

PROPOSITIONS

TITLE:	YES	NO
41: Veterans Housing and Homeless Prevention Bond Act of 2014.		
42: Public Records. Open Meetings. State Reimbursement to Local Agencies. Legislative Constitutional Amendment.		
A: Earthquake Safety and Emergency Response Bond		
B: Voter Approval for Waterfront Development Height Increases		

NOTES:





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 12 of this pamphlet.

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



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 June 3, 2014, Consolidated Statewide Direct Primary Election are:

Member of the State Assembly, District 17

David Campos
David Chiu
David Carlos Salaverry

Member of the State Assembly, District 19

Rene Pineda
PhilTing

Party Endorsements

State law now 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: Tim Donnelly
Green Party: Luis J. Rodriguez
Democratic Party: Edmund G. "Jerry" Brown
Peace and Freedom Party: Cindy L. Sheehan

Lieutenant Governor

Green Party: Jena F. Goodman
Democratic Party: Gavin Newsom
Peace and Freedom Party: Amos Johnson

Secretary of State

American Independent Party: Pete Peterson
Green Party: David Curtis

Controller

American Independent Party: David Evans
Green Party: Laura Wells
Peace and Freedom Party: Laura Wells

Treasurer

Green Party: Ellen H. Brown
Democratic Party: John Chiang
Peace and Freedom Party: Ellen H. Brown

Attorney General

American Independent Party: Ronald Gold
Democratic Party: Kamala D. Harris

Insurance Commissioner

American Independent Party: Ted Gaines
Democratic Party: Dave Jones
Peace and Freedom Party: Nathalie Hrizi

Member of the State Board of Equalization

Democratic Party: Fiona Ma

United States Representative, District 12

Democratic Party: Nancy Pelosi
Peace and Freedom Party: Frank Lara

United States Representative, District 14

Democratic Party: Jackie Speier

Member of the State Assembly, District 19

Democratic Party: PhilTing



Candidates for United States Representative, District 12

JOHN DENNIS

My occupation is Independent Businessman.

My qualifications are:

I grew up in an era of opportunity and optimism.

I'm the son of a longshoreman and a city hall clerk.

Our home was in a public housing project.

Through education, perseverance and a culture that encouraged initiative, I achieved the American dream.

I founded several successful businesses and became a proud husband and father.

Today I am concerned that the opportunities available to me no longer exist for other Americans. Our spirit of optimism has faded.

While San Francisco's economy has improved, the expansion of Washington's power has taken its toll on the rest of America, threatening what was once a guarantee of a better life for each successive generation.

What has self-serving Washington given us?

- stagnant job markets
- a broken healthcare system
- endless foreign wars
- unfettered spying on Americans

It is time to rein in Washington, change its culture of entitlement and replace career politicians who serve special interests instead of the Constitution.

We can reduce the size of Washington, expand personal freedom, restore a sense of optimism and vastly improve the quality of our lives, and the lives of future generations.

Liberty is the key. Let markets work to create jobs and a strong economy, allowing San Francisco families to plan for the future.

Those are my goals and this is my pledge:

I won't be Washington's representative in San Francisco; I'll be San Francisco's representative in Washington.

I ask for your vote on June 3rd.

For more information visit
www.johndennisforcongress.com.

John Dennis

BARRY HERMANSON

My occupation is Equity Investor.

My qualifications are:

When was the last time all candidates for this office participated in a candidate debate or forum? 1987? With so many concerns about the direction of this country, there must be a debate in 2014.

The top two candidates in this election will be on the ballot in November, regardless of party affiliation. With your vote, I can be one of them.

I am an advocate for:

Global Living Wages

Improved Medicare for All

No tuition for California public colleges & universities

Interest-free student loans

GMO food labeling

Taxing carbon emissions

Ridding politics of big money

A path to citizenship for anyone who is undocumented

Bringing our troops home

Eliminating homelessness in America

A free Palestine

I oppose:

Drone warfare

Government's mass surveillance

Importing dirty oil from Canada

Fracking

Trade agreements where workers and the environment suffer

Indefinite solitary confinement for any prisoner

A brief bio:

Current:

- Treasurer, San Francisco Network Ministries Housing Corporation, providing low income housing
- Organizer, Single Payer Now (Medicare for All)

Past:

- Co-author, San Francisco's minimum wage initiative that improved wages for 54,000 people.
- Co-chair, San Francisco Living Wage Coalition, which passed legislation increasing wages for 20,000 workers.
- President, Merchants of Upper Market and Castro - one of the largest and most vibrant merchant associations in San Francisco
- Owner/operator of Hermanson's Employment Services
- Co-chair, California Green Party Coordinating Committee

barryhermanson.org 415-664-7754

Barry Hermanson



Candidates for United States Representative, District 12

NANCY PELOSI

My occupation is Member of Congress.

My qualifications are:

Since coming to Congress, it has been my privilege to represent San Francisco. Each year, the lessons learned from our city inspire my work in our nation's capital.

San Francisco and California are prime examples of progress, always leading the charge to build an economy that works for everyone. Our recent efforts include job-creating investments in the Central Subway, Transbay Terminal, Doyle Drive, and high-speed rail. Our actions, along with others, have brought the Presidio to self-sufficiency, supported institutions like City College, and addressed the need for affordable housing.

Since day one, the local, national, and global fight against HIV/AIDS has been my priority. With Covered California, hundreds of thousands of people are gaining coverage under the Affordable Care Act. With student loan reforms, our youth have a chance to attend college. With Proposition 8 and the heart of DOMA overturned, every family in our state can know the blessings of equality under the law.

There's still much more to do. For our economy, we must adopt Democrats' agenda – "When Women Succeed, America Succeeds" – to ensure fair pay, paid sick leave, and affordable child care. For our safety, we must enact comprehensive gun safety legislation. For our values, we must pass comprehensive immigration reform and make ENDA the law of the land. For our democracy, we must reduce the role of money in politics.

This is the work we must pursue together. This is why I'm asking for your vote.

Thank you for the honor of serving in Congress.

Nancy Pelosi

DAVID PETERSON

My occupation is Accountability System Developer.

My qualifications are:

As a candidate for congress, I believe we, as Citizen Voters, can change the world.

Elected officials should be selected the same as any other professional, based on the work they will do. For congress members, it's the Legislation they will Champion and Deliver.

We can't settle for false promises or popularity. Candidates talk about problems, but don't share Legislative solutions. At best, traditional candidates claim they will FIGHT FOR something they never create Legislation for at all.

These are the Legislative priorities we need to fix with our government.

1. Take the Profit out of WarProfiteering. — Give Peace a Chance.
2. Defund Domestic Spying. — Let's spend our tax-dollars wisely.
3. Prevent Wall Street Financial Schemes. — Dramatically grow our economy instead of bubble/bust Schemes.
4. Legalize Whistleblowing of Government Crimes.
5. Equality Nationwide.
 1. End the War on Women.
 2. Healthcare for All.
 3. 1994 Employment Non-Discrimination Act.
 4. Recognize LGBT marriages nationwide.
6. Fund Rehabilitation and Mental Health Services. — reducing futile/costly Incarceration costs.
7. Save Social Security, Save Medicare from Republican Pilfering and Pocketizing.
8. Cut the Red-Tape slowing Green Energy Transition; Strong Green Action.
 1. \$2.1 billion for San Francisco Wind Turbines.
 2. Clean-up our Toxic Waste.
 3. GMO Labeling.
 4. Wind and Solar the Keystone pipelines.
9. Support Labor, Investors and Pensioners 'together' vs. "Fraud and Corruption".
10. Require 100% public access to all lobbyist requests of congress, via the internet.

No one currently in Congress is Championing these Positive Legislative Changes.

Vote For David Peterson June 3rd, 2014; to bring these real Legislative Improvements to Washington D.C.

David Peterson



Candidates for United States Representative, District 12

MICHAEL STEGER

My occupation is Political Organizer.

My qualifications are:

I have organized with Lyndon LaRouche for twelve years, resisting the fascist dictatorship policies of both Bush and Cheney, and Obama.

Under Obama, we have killed American citizens without due process, cut medical services to the elderly and poor, cut NASA to the bone, given over \$11 trillion to Wall St. criminals through bailouts, supported Al-Qaeda in Libya and Syria, ignored the role of the Saudi Kingdom in 9-11, and threatened the world with nuclear war with Russia and China, including the Nazi-coup in Ukraine.

Obama must be impeached! I have called for his impeachment for 5 years. He must be replaced with a Presidency inspired by FDR and JFK.

The Wall St. criminals must be imprisoned, and Glass-Steagall reinstated!

I have organized for Glass-Steagall for 7 years and there are 4 bills in Congress now.

This will bankrupt Wall St., then we can fund the projects that will end the drought and rebuild our nation.

Our scientific leadership is critical for mankind, and we must fund NASA, space exploration, fusion energy, and asteroid defence, and end this green anti-science agenda!

Shall we inspire the next generations with a culture of passion and creativity - Beethoven and Mozart must be taught in school!

We need a new global economic system and community of sovereign nations as John Quincy Adams intended, and open an immediate dialogue with Russia and China on collaboration.

First, we must impeach Obama.

Michael Steger



Candidate for United States Representative, District 14

JACKIE SPEIER

My occupation is Congresswoman.

My qualifications are:

Serving you for six years in Congress has been an enormous privilege. I continue to focus on our important needs: Jobs, deficit reduction, income inequality, economic and community security.

We must cancel wasteful weapons systems, end our involvement in Afghanistan, and reduce our deficit. I support a constitutional amendment to deny Congress members their paychecks when the budget doesn't pass on time. Many jobs come directly from government research that leads to companies being founded in our district. I support funding research to ensure that the Bay Area leads the globe in science and skilled jobs. My Job Hunters Boot Camps have helped nearly 3,000 constituents hone their skills and find jobs. Our extraordinary community colleges and universities must be defended and supported through federal policy. Each day, tens of thousands take Caltrain's Baby Bullet trains that I helped create. We need more infrastructure investments that grow our economy. I will continue to hold PG&E accountable for safety, fight against sexual assault in the military, vote to end employment and marriage discrimination, and defend a woman's right to choose. My office has recovered over \$3 million for disabled veterans. Delays in benefits are shrinking in part because we have demanded reforms in the VA. We must never voucher Medicare or privatize Social Security. Sea level rise is an urgent threat and government must act to reduce its impact. I respectfully request your vote for an America that delivers opportunity for all. Please visit www.jackieforcongress.com.

Jackie Speier

Candidates for State Assembly, District 17

DAVID CAMPOS

My occupation is San Francisco Supervisor.

My qualifications are:

We came from Guatemala when I was fourteen and unable to speak English. We settled in one of Los Angeles' toughest neighborhoods. I learned quickly how to stand up for myself and fight for my beliefs.

With inspiration from my parents, support from teachers, and my own hard work, I graduated at the top of my high school class and earned scholarships to Stanford and Harvard Law School.

While at Harvard I found myself, my politics, and my life partner (now my husband) Phil. We decided to live our values and moved to San Francisco where I have served as a Deputy City Attorney, General Counsel to the School District, and progressive Police Commissioner. I was elected to the Board of Supervisors in 2008, and reelected in 2012.

As a Supervisor, I've stood up for those who don't have big corporate lobbyists speaking for them – working people, immigrants, seniors, tenants, children, small business owners.

I'm proud to say that my record of fighting for regular people, while working to achieve solutions to tough problems, has earned these endorsements, among others:

United Educators of San Francisco
 Equality California
 Sierra Club
 California Nurses Association
 Harvey Milk LGBT Democratic Club
 San Francisco Latino Democratic Club
 San Francisco Young Democrats
 Unite Here Local 2
 Assemblymember Tom Ammiano
 Assemblymember Phil Ting
 Former Mayor Art Agnos
 Former State Senator Carole Migden
 Supervisor Jane Kim
 Former Supervisor Bevan Dufty
 Kim-Shree Maufas, Board of Education Commissioner

Thank you for your consideration. I'd be honored to have your vote.

David Campos

DAVID CHIU

My occupation is President of the Board of Supervisors.

My qualifications are:

When I came to City Hall in 2008, after serving as a civil rights attorney, criminal prosecutor, small business founder and neighborhood leader, I promised to make government more functional by bringing people together to solve problems.

As President of the Board of Supervisors, I have a long record of building consensus and delivering results:

- Created tens of thousands of jobs by slashing red tape and awarding more city contracts to grow small businesses.
- Made San Francisco more family friendly by securing funding for schools, afterschool programs, child care and seniors, allowing parents with strollers to board Muni buses, and giving parents and caregivers the right to request flexible working arrangements with employers.
- Built affordable housing for seniors and homeless veterans, helped Ellis Act victims find subsidized housing, and fought to protect tenants and legalize thousands of in-law units to increase housing.
- Balanced major budget deficits, championed public safety and public transit, crafted first-in-country environmental policies and established ethics standards.

Our California State Assembly needs bold and effective leadership. San Francisco currently faces an affordability crisis with rents and home ownership out of reach for residents. It's not enough to grandstand about our challenges. San Franciscans need a practical problem solver with a record of delivering results to fight for us in Sacramento.

Join Senator Dianne Feinstein, Lieutenant Governor Gavin Newsom, Attorney General Kamala Harris, California School Employees Association, League of Conservation Voters, Democratic Women in Action, Supervisors Malia Cohen, Jane Kim, Scott Wiener and others supporting our campaign.

VoteDavidChiu.com

David Chiu



Candidates for State Assembly, District 17

DAVID CARLOS SALAVERRY

My occupation is Independent Contractor.

My qualifications are:

In San Francisco, there is always a “progressive” choice, a champion of the downtrodden against Downtown. In San Francisco there is usually a liberal choice, a split-the-difference political mechanic. In San Francisco there is sometimes a fringe candidate, from the extreme left or extreme right.

I am none-of-the-above. I’m a centrist and problem solver.

Are you an Independent? A centrist Democrat? A Libertarian or a fiscal or social moderate? Have you voted the lesser of evils over and over? Or are you so tired of bad choices you find it hard to vote at all?

As a native San Franciscan, educated in public schools, I am the parent of two UC students and a lifelong renter. For 35 years I’ve met payrolls, working with my hands as a cabinetmaker-contractor. I understand the day-to-day challenges and dreams of San Franciscans. I live them.

I am not a politician. I am an activist citizen, opposed to elitism, partisanship and ideological excess. Our politics are diverse, but we must be San Franciscans first to restore our special City and our Golden State.

I am an active listener who works hard, does his homework and will offer creative, honest, practical solutions for all San Franciscans.

Please do your homework: Visit www.davidcarlos2014.com and take a good look around.

You have an alternative in San Francisco.

David Carlos Salaverry



Candidate for State Assembly, District 19

PHIL TING

My occupation is Assemblymember.

My qualifications are:

Step by step we're getting California back on the right track. I'm proud to be:

Working with the Governor to pass an on-time budget for the third year in a row and fighting to create a rainy day fund.

Increasing funding for our public schools, colleges and universities while working every day to keep City College open and funded.

Fighting to reduce the cost of higher education by making sure more low-income students have equal access to financial aid.

Protecting our environment and lowering water use with historic legislation that will increase the supply of food grown locally and sustainably.

Getting more Californians back to work by promoting local business partnerships and strengthening trade ties with other nations.

Protecting the health of Californians by signing up residents to Covered California and sponsoring the bill that will reduce the spread of HIV, Hepatitis and other preventable diseases by increasing the supply of clean syringes.

We're making progress. But there is still important work ahead. That's why I'm fighting to:

Protect tenants by bringing back the renters credit and reforming state laws that allow wholesale evictions.

Promoting greater adoption of electric vehicles and working to solidify the Bay Area's role as the capital of EV production.

And fighting to make government more responsive and transparent by increasing opportunities for all residents to participate.

I'm proud to have the support of teachers, firefighters, nurses, and many others. I hope you will join us.

www.PhilTing.com

Phil Ting

Candidates for Judge of The Superior Court, Office No. 20

DANIEL FLORES

My occupation is Civil Rights Attorney.

My qualifications are:

San Francisco's strength lies in its sense of equality, compassion, and diversity. I am running for Superior Court judge because I believe the judiciary should reflect these values.

In my career, I have had the privilege of representing low-income tenants and businesses alike, handling hundreds of civil and criminal matters in Superior Court. In 2013, I was awarded the Super Lawyer distinction in recognition of my legal work.

Judges must be impartial and competent, with a connection to the communities they serve. I am a proud native San Franciscan and the son of Salvadoran immigrants. They taught me the value of hard work and impressed upon me the importance of treating everyone fairly, and with dignity.

I am honored to have the endorsements of over 20 judges and numerous civic leaders, including:

Civic Leaders

- Mark Leno, State Senator
- Jeff Adachi, Public Defender
- John Avalos, Supervisor
- David Campos, Supervisor
- Eric Mar, Supervisor
- Scott Wiener, Supervisor
- Matt Gonzalez, Former Supervisor
- Tony Hall, Former Supervisor

Judges

- Cruz Reynoso, California Supreme Court (Ret.)
- Maria Rivera, Court of Appeal
- Suzanne Bolanos
- Linda Colfax
- James Collins
- Samuel Feng
- Loretta Giorgi
- Charles Haines
- Kathleen Kelly
- Anne-Christine Massullo
- Donald Mitchell
- Gerardo Sandoval
- Julie Tang
- Richard Ulmer

www.danielfloresforjudge.com

Daniel Flores

CAROL KINGSLEY

My occupation is Mediator / Attorney / Arbitrator.

My qualifications are:

San Francisco deserves a hardworking, impartial and committed judiciary.

My service as attorney, mediator, and community leader includes:

- 30 years practicing law in California.
- 10 years as professional mediator, resolving cases in litigation.
- San Francisco Police Commissioner and Ethics Commissioner, twice as Chair.

My experience with criminal and civil law gives me the skills to resolve disputes and make impartial decisions as Superior Court Judge.

I also understand firsthand the experience of crime victims. In 1993, my husband Jack Berman, along with eight others, was killed in the 101 California shooting. I have served since its early inception on the Law Center to Prevent Gun Violence Board, helping pass 30 state and local laws to reduce the gun death rate.

My community service:

- The Mediation Society, Board of Directors
- Legal Community Against Violence, Board Member
- San Francisco Women Lawyers Alliance, President
- American Jewish Congress, Regional Vice-President

Please join my early supporters:

Judges Charlene Kisselbach and Gail Dekreon, San Francisco Superior Court; Leslie Landau, Contra Costa Superior Court

Police Commissioners Dr. Joseph Marshall, Julius Turman, Angela Chan*

Former City Attorney Louise Renne

Drucilla Stender Ramey, former Executive Director, San Francisco Bar Association

Chief Administrative Law Judge Karen Clopton, California Public Utilities Commission

Respectfully,

Carol Kingsley

www.kingsley4judge.com

*For identification only



Candidates for Judge of The Superior Court, Office No. 20

KIMBERLY TONEY WILLIAMS

My occupation is Assistant District Attorney.

My qualifications are:

Everyone, including the most vulnerable among us, deserves justice administered fairly and with dignity.

I have proudly served the people of San Francisco under four elected District Attorneys. As a veteran trial attorney with more than nineteen years of courtroom experience, I have successfully prosecuted sexual assault of children, abuse of elders and dependent adults, domestic violence, fraud and career criminals. Additionally, I have handled general litigation and misdemeanors.

I led the implementation of San Francisco's community justice courts to help those who commit low-level crimes find a path towards stability and self-sufficiency.

My advanced skills in research, writing, investigation, trial preparation, litigation, policy development and administration would enable me to provide the people of San Francisco with excellent judicial service.

I held prior positions with the Enforcement Division of the Securities and Exchange Commission, the Alameda County District Attorney's Office, and have been a registered securities agent.

A native San Franciscan, Mercy High School alumna, parent and community activist, I have a Bachelor of Science in Public Administration from the University of Southern California and Juris Doctorate from the University of California, Los Angeles.

I am honored to have your support.

kimberlywilliams4judge.com

Kimberly Toney Williams



Local Ballot Measure and Argument Information

Digest and Argument Pages, Legal Text

The Ballot Simplification Committee has prepared a digest for each local ballot measure. A statement by the City Controller about the fiscal impact or cost of each measure and a statement of how the measure qualified to be on the ballot are also included. Arguments for and against each measure follow the digest. The legal text for all local ballot measures begins on page 54.

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 in accordance with criteria in Section 540 of the San Francisco Municipal Elections Code 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, to be printed free of charge. Rebuttal arguments are printed below the corresponding proponent's argument and opponent's argument.

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.



All arguments are strictly the opinions of their authors. Arguments and rebuttals 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.



Words You Need to Know

by the Ballot Simplification Committee

10-Year Capital Plan (Proposition A): The San Francisco Administrative Code requires the City to prepare and adopt a 10-year plan to meet the City's capital infrastructure needs. The plan includes a timeline for issuing new bonds.

Audit (Proposition A): A formal examination of financial or management accounts and information.

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.")

Dedicated (Proposition A): Used for a specific purpose.

Early voting (Frequently Asked Questions): Voting in person at City Hall before Election Day or mailing a vote-by-mail ballot before Election Day. See page 6 for more information.

Emergency Firefighting Water System (Proposition A): A water supply system used specifically to fight fires. It includes a reservoir, pipes, cisterns, pump stations and high-pressure fire hydrants.

Existing height limits (Proposition B): Limits set by the City as to how tall a building or structure may be built.

Facilities (Proposition A): Buildings or structures used for particular purposes.

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.

Initiative (Proposition B): 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.

Medical Examiner (Proposition A): The Office of the Chief Medical Examiner investigates and certifies deaths in San Francisco, and determines whether the cause was from natural causes or foul play; retrieves bodies; operates the City morgue; performs drug and poison analysis for criminal proceedings, stores death records; and provides vital services in responding to mass fatalities resulting from earthquakes and other disasters.

Ordinance (Proposition B): 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.

Planning Commission (Proposition B): The City commission responsible for adopting and maintaining a comprehensive, long-term general plan for future improvement and development.

Port Commission (Proposition B): The City commission responsible for managing and maintaining Port property.

Port property (Proposition B): The City, through its Port Commission, manages approximately 7½ miles of property along the City's east side from Fisherman's Wharf to India Basin. Port lands include former tidelands that were filled to create the port, including the seawall that defines The Embarcadero shoreline, the finger piers, and the major filled areas of the Port's southern waterfront, which include deep-water berths and 145 acres of paved cargo handling facilities at Pier 80 and Piers 94–96. The seawall created additional filled areas, which are separated from the water in many locations by City streets. Port property does not include all of the eastern San Francisco Bay shoreline area. For example, a stretch of non-Port property between 22nd Street and 24th Street includes the former Potrero Power Plant, which is privately owned. There also are significant undeveloped, privately owned sites in Mission Bay adjacent to the Bay shoreline, including a 14-acre site between 3rd Street and Terry Francois Boulevard. Other privately owned parcels are also located along the eastern shoreline.

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

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

Proposition H (Proposition B): In 1990, San Francisco voters adopted Proposition H, an initiative ordinance, banning the development of hotels on Port-owned piers and imposing a moratorium on waterfront development until the City adopted a land use plan for Port properties within a 100-foot zone upland from San Francisco Bay.

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.

Public trust (Proposition B): The public trust is a form of public ownership that limits uses of public land to those that benefit the people of California. The Port of San Francisco lands were transferred from the State by the 1968 Burton Act subject to the terms of the public trust. The State of California maintains oversight of Port activities through the San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission and the California State Lands Commission.

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. See page 7 for more information.

Reservoir (Proposition A): A natural or artificial place where water is collected and stored.

Revenue (Proposition A): Income.

Seismic retrofitting (Proposition A): Improving or renovating a structure to protect it from potential earthquake damage.

Vote-by-mail ballots (Frequently Asked Questions): 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 San Francisco polling place on Election Day. Also known as absentee ballots. See page 6 for more information.

Waterfront Land Use Plan (Proposition B): The policy document governing land use and development on Port property. The Waterfront Land Use Plan was mandated by Proposition H in 1990. It was created through a seven-year community process and adopted by the Port Commission in 1997.

Thank You, Poll Workers!

The Department of Elections wants to thank the **nearly 2,500 people** who serve as poll workers for every election. These volunteers provide a vital civic duty by helping to safeguard the democratic process.



Like us on

Facebook

[Facebook.com/sfelections](https://www.facebook.com/sfelections)



VOTE ON YOUR SCHEDULE

See page 6 for information about voting by mail and early voting at City Hall.



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. 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, schools, libraries, parks, and other city facilities. The City uses bond financing because these buildings will last many years and their large dollar costs 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. The Earthquake Safety and Emergency Response Bond on this ballot is a general obligation bond to be issued by the City. 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 amount borrowed, the interest rate on the debt and the number of years over which the debt will be repaid. Large debt is usually paid off over a period of 10 to 35 years. Assuming an average interest rate of 6% the cost of paying off debt over 20 years is about \$1.73 for each dollar borrowed – \$1 for the dollar borrowed and 73 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 2013–2014 property tax payers in the City will pay approximately \$308 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 property tax rate for the year to provide for debt and special funds debt requirements will be 18.81 cents per \$100 of assessed valuation or \$739 on a home assessed at \$400,000.

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 \$5.2 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 December 31, 2013, there were \$1.9 billion in outstanding general obligation bonds, which is equal to 1.09% of the assessed value of taxable property. There were an additional \$0.75 billion in bonds that are *authorized but unissued*. If all of these bonds were issued and outstanding, the total debt burden would be 1.53% of the assessed value of taxable property. Bonds issued by the School District and Community College 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 issue new general obligation bonds as old ones are retired, keeping the property tax rate from City general obligation bonds approximately the same over time.

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 excludes special assessment bonds, BART and school and community college district bonds, is equal to 1.35% of the assessed value of taxable property. This direct debt ratio is considered 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 to continue to maintain good credit ratings that, in turn, 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 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

Ballot Drop-off Stations at City Hall

Beginning the weekend before the election, you can walk, drive, or pedal to City Hall to drop off your ballot.

Once you've marked your ballot, bring it, in your signed and sealed envelope, to the Drop-off Stations at the Goodlett and Grove Street entrances to City Hall. Drop your envelope in the secure box and get your "I Voted" sticker from the Elections staff.

Saturday, May 31

open 10 a.m. to 4 p.m.

Sunday, June 1

open 10 a.m. to 4 p.m.

Monday, June 2

open 8 a.m. to 5 p.m.

Election Day, Tuesday, June 3

open 7 a.m. to 8 p.m.



A

Earthquake Safety and Emergency Response Bond

SAN FRANCISCO EARTHQUAKE SAFETY AND EMERGENCY RESPONSE BOND, 2014. To improve fire, earthquake and emergency response by: improving and/or replacing deteriorating cisterns, pipes, and tunnels, and related facilities to ensure firefighters a reliable water supply for fires and disasters; improving and/or replacing neighborhood fire and police stations; replacing certain seismically-unsafe police and medical examiner facilities with earthquake-safe buildings and to pay related costs, shall the City and County of San Francisco issue \$400,000,000 in general obligation bonds, subject to citizen oversight and regular audits?

YES ←  
NO ←  

Digest by the Ballot Simplification Committee

The Way It Is Now: The City owns and operates facilities that provide services for public safety and response to emergencies, including earthquakes. These facilities include:

- The Emergency Firefighting Water System, which provides a dedicated water supply system for fighting fires. This includes a reservoir, pipes, cisterns, pump stations and high-pressure fire hydrants;
- Neighborhood police and fire stations;
- The Medical Examiner’s facility; and
- The police motorcycle unit and crime lab.

These facilities do not meet the seismic standards of the current building code and are not expected to remain functional in the event of a major disaster.

The City’s 10-year Capital Plan identifies the repairs and relocation of public safety facilities as a high priority. To pay for large projects such as those included in the Capital Plan, the City borrows money by selling general obligation bonds. The City uses property tax revenues to pay the principal and interest on those bonds.

The spending of bond revenue is overseen by the Citizens’ General Obligation Bond Oversight Committee. This nine-member committee is appointed by the Mayor, the Board of Supervisors, the Controller, and the Civil Grand Jury.

The Proposal: Proposition A is a general obligation bond measure that would authorize the City to sell up to \$400 million in bonds to improve specific public safety and emergency response facilities.

The bond proceeds could only be used to:

- Upgrade, repair and retrofit the Emergency Firefighting Water System and related facilities;
- Improve and retrofit neighborhood police and fire stations;
- Build a seismically secure structure for the Medical Examiner; and
- Build a seismically secure structure for the police motorcycle unit and crime lab.

Proposition A would allow an increase in the property tax to pay for the bonds. It would permit landlords to pass through 50% of the resulting property tax increase to tenants.

Proposition A also would require the independent Citizens’ General Obligation Bond Oversight Committee to oversee the spending of bond funds. One-tenth of one percent (0.1%) of the bond funds would pay for the committee’s audit and oversight functions.

This measure requires the approval of two-thirds of the voters.

A “YES” Vote Means: If you vote “yes,” you want to allow the City to sell up to \$400 million in general obligation bonds to finance the construction, improvement and seismic retrofitting of specific public safety and emergency response facilities.

This measure requires 66⅔% 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 54. Some of the words used in the ballot digest are explained starting on page 30.

A “NO” Vote Means: If you vote “no,” you do not want to allow the City to sell bonds to finance the construction, improvement and seismic retrofitting of specific public safety and emergency response facilities.

Controller’s Statement on “A”

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

Should the proposed \$400 million in bonds be authorized and sold under current assumptions, the approximate costs will be as follows:

- In fiscal year 2015–2016, following issuance of the first series of bonds, and the year with the lowest tax rate, the estimated annual costs of debt service would be \$13 million and result in a property tax rate of \$0.0069 per \$100 (\$6.79 per \$100,000) of assessed valuation.
- In fiscal year 2020–2021, following issuance of the last series of bonds, the estimated annual costs of debt service would be \$33.9 million and result in a property tax rate of \$0.0149 per \$100 (\$14.69 per \$100,000) of assessed valuation.
- The best estimate of the average tax rate for these bonds from fiscal year 2014-2015 through 2039–2040 is \$0.0097 per \$100 (\$9.61 per \$100,000) of assessed valuation.
- 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 \$500,000 would be approximately \$74.53.

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 February 11, 2014, the Board of Supervisors voted 11 to 0 to place Proposition A on the ballot. The Supervisors voted as follows:

Yes: Avalos, Breed, Campos, Chiu, Cohen, Farrell, Kim, Mar, Tang, Wiener, Yee.

No: None.

This measure requires 66²/₃% 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 54. Some of the words used in the ballot digest are explained starting on page 30.



Proponent's Argument in Favor of Proposition A

YES ON A – EARTHQUAKE AND FIRE SAFETY FOR SAN FRANCISCO

Proposition A rebuilds and restores our aging emergency firefighting water system and prepares San Francisco for a major disaster.

After the Great Earthquake and Fire of 1906, San Francisco burned to the ground for the sixth time. To prevent San Francisco from burning again, residents called for the construction of the world's best emergency firefighting water system.

Today, the deteriorating 100 year-old system requires rehabilitation. On March 12, a 5-alarm fire consumed a major Mission Bay project under construction. That fire would have caused greater damage had San Francisco's newer emergency firefighting water supply system not been in place.

Equally troubling, other facilities for first-responders are in seismically unsafe buildings that could fall after a major earthquake.

Proposition A:

- Ensures a steady supply of high-pressure water, giving firefighters a critical tool to fight major fires;
- Replaces deteriorating pipes, improves pump stations, and builds additional new cisterns citywide;

- Improves seismically deficient and substandard neighborhood fire and police stations;
- Constructs a new resilient police motorcycle unit, crime lab and medical examiner facilities.

Proposition A will NOT increase property tax rates. There will be independent citizen oversight of spending and financial audits. Specific legal requirements encourage the hiring of local residents for construction jobs, contributing to the City's economic vitality.

Earthquake scientists say the odds are 2 in 3 that a disastrous earthquake will strike San Francisco before 2040. That's why your support is critical NOW. Please help us improve earthquake and fire safety in our City by voting YES on A.

Mayor Ed Lee
Board of Supervisors President David Chiu
Fire Chief Joanne Hayes-White*
Police Chief Greg Suhr*

*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

"Proposition A would allow an increase in the property tax to pay for the bonds. It would permit landlords to pass through 50% of the resulting property tax to tenants."

That's the language the official Ballot Simplification Committee (tasked to come up with simple, factual descriptions of ballot measures) used to describe this \$400 million spending proposal.

But proponents claim in their ballot argument that ***"Proposition A will NOT increase property tax rates."***

Compare those two statements. Clearly either one or the other is misleading at best!

Which statement do **you** think more accurately reflects what will happen if Prop. A passes?

Ask yourself, *"Should I trust people who try to mislead me? Should I vote the way they want me to vote?"*

Now consider these **two different methods** of financing seismic upgrades:

- (1) **Set a little money aside from your budget each year** to go toward upgrading facilities one by one, prioritizing those most in need.
- (2) **Spend nothing for many years, then go out and borrow a large sum of money** that costs you nearly twice as much as the amount of the loan due to interest and financing costs, to pay for all the upgrade work you've been neglecting (Prop. A).

If someone proposed the second approach to you, would you consider them to be responsible leaders whom you would want to entrust with your resources and safety?

We urge a "NO" vote on Proposition A.

Libertarian Party of San Francisco



Opponent's Argument Against Proposition A

No one would argue against safe buildings and a functioning emergency response system, but is an expensive bond measure the most prudent use of taxpayer money to accomplish these goals? By lumping all these reasonable improvements under one "proposed project," the Board of Supervisors has inflated the cost and declared a bond is necessary. By the time the citizens pay for the interest, legal expenses, bond fees, and oversight committee costs, the \$400 million cost will almost double. With the expected cost overruns that always accompany these bond projects, we can expect to pay a lot more.

Rather than ignoring basic infrastructure for decades and then declaring the costs too great to pay out of current operating funds, there is a better way. With a current budget of \$7.3 billion, surely city officials can bring back the fiscal prudence of major improvement funds, which call for setting aside a small portion annually to upgrade facilities. Then projects can be funded on a priority basis and paid for one at a time, not all at once, without incurring unnecessary debt for the future. No bond measure today should be approved by the taxpayers without a clause establishing major improvement funds.

Vote NO on A. By voting NO, tell the Board of Supervisors to go back to the drawing board and include a clause for establishing major improvement funds and act like the true trust keepers of taxpayer money that they are supposed to be. Demand that our government officials fund the basic services of government, which includes the upkeep of safe government buildings, out of their huge operating budget each year, not with costly bond measures that force our children and grandchildren to pay for debt that we choose to incur.

Libertarian Party of San Francisco

Rebuttal to Opponent's Argument Against Proposition A

STAYING PREPARED FOR AN EMERGENCY

The San Francisco Board of Supervisors voted *unanimously* to place the 2014 Earthquake Safety and Emergency Response bond on the June 2014 ballot because the City's general fund simply cannot pay for these kinds of urgent, extensive infrastructure investments to protect and safeguard our homes, businesses and communities. ESER 2014 will allow for critical upgrades to our first-response facilities **without raising property taxes – a prudent, time-tested policy cemented in our City's 10-Year Capital Plan.**

ESER 2014 continues the work of the Earthquake Safety and Emergency Response general obligation bond program that was overwhelmingly approved by San Francisco voters in 2010. It has helped the City begin a wide range of vital projects, including improvements to neighborhood firehouses and the emergency firefighting water system.

San Francisco is located in earthquake country and, unfortunately, history has shown us the devastation quakes can cause. Being prepared is crucial to limiting damage and speeding our post-disaster recovery. This

\$400 million investment will improve deteriorating and outdated public safety systems relied on by all San Franciscans.

Responding quickly in the event of a major disaster or emergency directly impacts on how well we, as a city, can recover after a major emergency. To learn more, visit sfearthquakesafety.org.

Mayor Ed Lee
Board of Supervisors President David Chiu
Supervisor John Avalos
Supervisor London Breed
Supervisor David Campos
Supervisor Malia Cohen
Supervisor Mark Farrell
Supervisor Jane Kim
Supervisor Eric Mar
Supervisor Katy Tang
Supervisor Scott Wiener
Supervisor Norman Yee



Paid Argument IN FAVOR of Proposition A

Prop A ensures our neighborhood firehouses and police stations remain functional after an earthquake. It continues seismic upgrades started by the voter approved 2010 Earthquake Retrofit Bond. Bond funds will upgrade emergency facilities and repair and expand our Fire Department's water systems. This measure will save lives and enable San Francisco to return to normal quickly after the next big earthquake, all without increasing property taxes.

Help protect San Francisco residents, homes and businesses. Vote YES on A.

San Francisco Chamber of Commerce and our 1,500 local businesses.

The true source(s) of funds for the printing fee of this argument: San Francisco Chamber of Commerce.

End of Paid Arguments IN FAVOR of Proposition A

No Paid Arguments AGAINST Proposition A Were Submitted



B

Voter Approval for Waterfront Development Height Increases

Shall the City be prevented from allowing any development on Port property to exceed the height limits in effect as of January 1, 2014, unless the City's voters have approved a height limit increase?

YES ←

NO ←

Digest by the Ballot Simplification Committee

The Way It Is Now: The City and County of San Francisco, through its Port Commission, administers about 7½ miles of the waterfront and former waterfront along the San Francisco Bay, including most of the property between Fisherman's Wharf and India Basin. The Port's property includes piers, land near the piers, and areas that were filled and are no longer adjacent to the Bay. The City acquired most of this property from the State of California and holds it in trust for the benefit of the people of California. State law restricts the allowable uses of this property.

In 1990 the City's voters adopted Proposition H, which required the City to prepare a Waterfront Land Use Plan with public input. The Port Commission adopted a comprehensive land use plan that governs acceptable waterfront uses consistent with Proposition H and public trust requirements.

The City's zoning laws regulate development on that property, including the maximum allowed height. The existing height limits generally range from 40 feet to 84 feet. Changes in existing height limits usually require neighborhood notification, public hearings, and approval by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors. These changes do not require the voters to approve a ballot measure.

The Proposal: Proposition B would prevent the City from allowing any development on Port property that exceeds the height limits in effect as of January 1, 2014, unless the City's voters have first approved an increase in the height limit for that development. The measure applies to property currently under the control of the Port Commission, as well as any property that the Port may later acquire. Any ballot question to increase height limits on Port property must specify both existing and proposed height limits.

A "YES" Vote Means: If you vote "yes," you want to prevent the City from allowing any development on Port property to exceed the height limits in effect as of January 1, 2014, unless the City's voters have approved a height limit increase.

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

A summary of "Port property" is provided in "Words You Need to Know."

Controller's Statement on "B"

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

Should the proposed measure be approved by the voters, in my opinion, it would in and of itself, have no direct impact on the cost of government.

Approval of the measure would change certain land use processes on Port of San Francisco property. Currently, projects proposed for Port property generally require approval by the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors following required public consideration processes. These approvals can include adoption of increases to existing height limits deemed necessary or desirable to enable a given proposed project. The proposed measure would instead require voter approval for any changes to existing height limits before a project could be permitted. Proposed—but not yet approved—projects affected by the measure include possible development plans for Pier 30–32, Pier 48, and Pier 70.

In a number of cases, given the condition of various Port properties, increases to existing height limits will likely be required to generate sufficient property value to cover required project and infrastructure costs. The proposed measure, if approved, will increase the time, cost, and uncertainty that proposers and the Port can

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 54. Some of the words used in the ballot digest are explained starting on page 30.



expect for future development efforts on certain Port property. To the extent that the proposed voter approval requirement, over time, results in fewer such increases, it will reduce tax and other revenues to both the City's General Fund and to the Port of San Francisco.

How "B" Got on the Ballot

On February 6, 2014, the Department of Elections certified that the initiative petition calling for Proposition B to be placed on the ballot had a sufficient number of valid signatures to qualify the measure for the ballot.

9,702 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 2011. A random check of the signatures submitted by the proponents of the initiative petition prior to the February 3, 2014, 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 54. Some of the words used in the ballot digest are explained starting on page 30.**



Proponent's Argument in Favor of Proposition B

Vote YES on B to Let the Voters Protect San Francisco's Waterfront!

Last November, San Francisco voters from every corner of the city resoundingly rejected the 8 Washington waterfront luxury condo scheme and told developers, lobbyists, and politicians at City Hall: "No Wall on the Waterfront!"

Somebody didn't get the message.

The Port Commission is ignoring the will of the voters and considering grandiose plans for San Francisco's waterfront. They would repeal the existing waterfront height limits to build a wall of luxury condos, high-rise offices and hotels. One proposal would put *380 foot towers* on land currently zoned as public open space!

Prop B gives voters back our voice

Proposition B gives voters back our voice to ensure that the waterfront we love is protected. It simply states that the existing waterfront height limits must be respected and cannot be increased unless the voters approve.

Prop B strengthens our community-based Waterfront Land Use Plan which was created by a voter initiative passed in 1990. The Waterfront Plan affirms that the existing height limits, which range from 40 feet to 84 feet on piers and seawall lots, are critical to preserving and protecting San Francisco's unique and open waterfront.

Prop B takes away the luxury condo developers' blank check

Prop B ensures that future development will protect our quality of life and serve our real needs – for better transportation, more affordable housing, and sensible growth that protects existing neighborhoods.

Prop B takes away the blank check given to developers to build luxury condos and high-rise hotels without regard for traffic, the neighborhoods or the long-term health of our waterfront environment. It gives voters the ability to hold developers accountable for the waterfront we all deserve.

Please vote YES on B.

Sierra Club

*Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods
Affordable Housing Alliance*

Rebuttal to Proponent's Argument in Favor of Proposition B

Vote No on B to Save New Housing, Parks, and Jobs!

Prop B is a Disaster for San Francisco Families.

If Prop B passes, reuse of empty Port property on our eastern shoreline will be jeopardized, no matter the height.

Projects in the pipeline *that residents and city leaders overwhelmingly support after years of thorough public input* will be stalled or killed outright. The only open-space that will be protected is parking lots - 23 acres of new parks will vanish.

If Prop B passes, the only people who will benefit are those who put it on the ballot - wealthy waterfront condo owners protecting their luxury views.

San Francisco's affordability crisis only gets worse if Prop B passes. New housing planned for the eastern waterfront - rental homes for San Francisco families at all income levels - will never be built. School teachers, firefighters, police officers, entry-level workers and seniors will have no hope of staying in the city.

If Prop B passes, critical funding to rebuild our crumbling waterfront piers and shore up our seawalls to ensure we stay safe in a major disaster will disappear.

This measure jeopardizes projects that invest millions of dollars into Port maintenance and upgrades to keep our precious bayfront safe, usable and accessible.

If Prop B passes, thousands of new jobs for local residents will be lost.

Vote NO on B - Keep Families in San Francisco!

Tim Colen
Corinne Woods
Mike Theriault



Opponent's Argument Against Proposition B

Proposition B makes the waterfront inaccessible to San Franciscans. It isn't about preserving the Port, giving voters a voice, protecting the Bay or access to the waterfront. Prop B is bad policy requiring ballot box planning that prevents new waterfront parks and housing.

PROP B KILLS THOUSANDS OF RENTAL AND AFFORDABLE HOMES

The Waterfront Plan identified locations where up to 4,000 mostly rental homes, including hundreds of on-site affordable homes, can be built without displacement. Prop B requires every housing development to go to voters for approval, adding years of delay and cost.

PROP B STOPS CREATION OF 23 ACRES OF PARKS AND OPEN SPACE

Funding for 23 acres of public parks and open space will be lost as will access to water-related recreation. Crumbling piers and dusty parking lots will blight the bayshore.

PROP B PREVENTS RESTORATION OF HISTORIC PIERS 48 AND 70

For years the Port worked to create public-private partnerships to restore historic structures including the Pier 48 shed

and Pier 70 industrial buildings. Prop B puts these mixed use developments at risk.

PROP B BLOCKS FUNDING FOR CAPITAL NEEDS

The Port's Capital Plan identifies a \$1.59 billion need for critical projects, including seawall seismic upgrades, pier substructure and disabled access.

WE HOLD THE PORT IN TRUST FOR THE PEOPLE OF CALIFORNIA. Proposition B is a blatant attempt to strip from State agencies, the Port and Planning Commissions and the Board of Supervisors authority to oversee this great waterfront resource. Prop B wasn't drafted to protect the public good, but for the private benefit of a few.

JOIN US - VOTE NO ON B

Tim Colen, San Francisco Housing Action Coalition*
Mike Theriault, San Francisco Building and Construction Trades Council*
Corinne Woods, Mission Creek Resident

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

Rebuttal to Opponent's Argument Against Proposition B

VOTE YES ON B

Prop B doesn't "kill," "prevent," "block," or "stop" anything. It does one thing: gives voters a voice on the vital issue of increasing waterfront height limits.

We need that voice because the waterfront doesn't belong to the lobbyists and developers. It belongs to all of us. Only we can ensure that the city approves projects that preserve our waterfront, create affordable housing, provide real community benefits, and are planned together with the neighborhoods.

Please join our citywide coalition. Protect San Francisco's waterfront and give voters the right to decide. Vote Yes on B!

Environmental Organizations

Sierra Club
San Francisco Tomorrow
Golden Gate Park Preservation Alliance
San Francisco Green Party
San Francisco Ocean Edge
Take Back Our Parks

Neighborhood Groups

Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods
Castro/Eureka Valley Neighborhood Association
Cole Valley Improvement Association
Corbett Heights Neighbors
Eastern Neighborhoods United Front
Liberty Hill Neighborhood Association
North Mission Neighbors
Potrero Boosters Neighborhood Association

Richmond Community Association
Telegraph Hill Dwellers

Affordable Housing Advocates

Affordable Housing Alliance
San Francisco Tenants Union
AIDS Housing Alliance/SF
Tenants Association Coalition PAC

Democratic Clubs

Central City Democratic Club
District 11 Democratic Club
Harvey Milk LGBT Democratic Club
Potrero Hill Democratic Club
South Beach Democratic Club

Elected Leaders

State Senator Mark Leno
State Assemblymember Tom Ammiano
Former Mayor Art Agnos
Judge Quentin Kopp (ret)
Former City Attorney Louise Renne
Supervisor John Avalos
Supervisor David Campos
Supervisor Eric Mar
Former Supervisor Aaron Peskin
Community College Board Member Rafael Mandelman
Community College Board Member John Rizzo*

No Wall on the Waterfront
www.NoWallOnTheWaterfront.com

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

Arguments are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency. Arguments are printed as submitted. Spelling and grammatical errors have not been corrected.



Paid Argument IN FAVOR of Proposition B

San Francisco's waterfront height limits were created to ensure that buildings tapered lower as they neared the shoreline. This fosters a vision of an open waterfront and reinforces the connection between the City and the water.

Unfortunately, special interests have often sought piecemeal exemptions from these well-thought out height limits, and the people have acted to protect them. Proposition B simplifies the process by ensuring that such projects be proactively endorsed or denied by the voters.

Vote Yes on Proposition B!

San Francisco Tomorrow

Jennifer Clary
Denise D'Anne
Mary Anne Miller
Jane Morrison
Glenn Rogers, PLA
Howard Wong

The true source(s) of funds for the printing fee of this argument: San Francisco Tomorrow.

Paid Argument IN FAVOR of Proposition B

PARKS & OPEN SPACE ADVOCATES SAY YES ON B

Help keep San Francisco's beautiful waterfront open to everyone by voting Yes on B.

Yes on B lets voters, not bureaucrats or politicians, decide whether to increase height limits for waterfront development. We need this safeguard because City Hall has lost touch and is prepared to rubber stamp massive developments along the water. Current proposals include massive towers 380 feet tall on land currently zoned as open space! Shouldn't we get a say?

Please join San Francisco's most trusted environmental, park and open space advocates and vote Yes on B.

Sierra Club
San Francisco Tomorrow
Golden Gate Park Preservation Alliance
SF Ocean Edge
SF Green Party

The true source(s) of funds for the printing fee of this argument: No Wall on the Waterfront.

The three largest contributors to the true source recipient committee: 1. Richard Stewart, 2. Barbara Stewart, 3. Maurice Holloway.

Paid Argument IN FAVOR of Proposition B

AFFORDABLE HOUSING & TENANT ADVOCATES SAY YES ON B

No San Franciscan is immune to the rising cost of housing. First-time homebuyers must move out of the city to afford to buy. Tenants face the real possibility of being forced to leave if they are evicted. Enough is enough.

Every big development proposed for the waterfront today demands to increase height limits to build market-rate and ultra-luxury housing that very few San Franciscans can afford. Proposition B will bring the voters' voice back into this process, so that our concerns about affordability and housing for everyone will be heard and respected.

Please vote Yes on B.

Affordable Housing Alliance
San Francisco Tenants Union
AIDS Housing Alliance/SF
Tenants Association Coalition PAC

The true source(s) of funds for the printing fee of this argument: No Wall on the Waterfront.

The three largest contributors to the true source recipient committee: 1. Richard Stewart, 2. Barbara Stewart, 3. Maurice Holloway.

Paid Argument IN FAVOR of Proposition B

FORMER MAYOR AGNOS SAYS YES ON PROP B

Twenty-five years ago after the Loma Prieta Earthquake, San Francisco made a great decision – we tore down the Embarcadero Freeway. That made it possible to transform the waterfront into a magnificent new place for everyone.

Now, special interests, who care more about huge profits than our waterfront, are obtaining political approvals for higher and higher waterfront height limits that will create a new wall on the waterfront. This time it will be a wall made of high-rise luxury condo towers and parking garages like Fontana East and West instead of a freeway.

Today neighborhood groups in every part of the city complain that their ideas are routinely ignored. Everyone in our city has a right to participate in these decisions, not just the super connected power brokers at city hall.

Prop. B does that by empowering the ordinary citizen to have the final word if the existing waterfront height

limits are raised without their approval. Please join me in voting Yes on B.

Art Agnos, former Mayor of San Francisco

The true source(s) of funds for the printing fee of this argument: No Wall on the Waterfront.

The three largest contributors to the true source recipient committee: 1. Richard Stewart, 2. Barbara Stewart, 3. Maurice Holloway.

Paid Argument IN FAVOR of Proposition B

NEIGHBORHOODS UNITED TO PROTECT OUR WATERFRONT – YES on B

The waterfront belongs to all San Franciscans from every corner of our city. Voting Yes on B ensures that every San Franciscan has a voice in making sure it is preserved for all of us.

This is not a debate about an individual neighborhood or area. The waterfront is the heart and soul of our great city. The bureaucrats and developers have demonstrated that they can't be trusted to protect it.

Please vote YES on Proposition B – if the politicians won't do their job to protect the waterfront, the voters will.

Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods, representing 48 neighborhood organizations from across San Francisco

*Castro/Eureka Valley Neighborhood Association
Cole Valley Improvement Association
Corbett Heights Neighbors
Eastern Neighborhoods United Front
Liberty Hill Neighborhood Association
North Mission Neighbors
Potrero Boosters Neighborhood Association
Richmond Community Association
Telegraph Hill Dwellers*

The true source(s) of funds for the printing fee of this argument: No Wall on the Waterfront.

The three largest contributors to the true source recipient committee: 1. Richard Stewart, 2. Barbara Stewart, 3. Maurice Holloway.

Paid Argument IN FAVOR of Proposition B

SAN FRANCISCO DEMOCRATS AGREE: LET THE VOTERS DECIDE. VOTE YES ON B

As Democrats, we value clean air, clean waterfront, and strong environmental protections. We also believe that voters should be empowered to make critical decisions about San Francisco's future.

By passing Proposition B, we can ensure that the reasonable waterfront height limits put in place after years of careful planning remain intact unless there is a good reason to change them.

Let's keep our waterfront open and accessible for future generations rather than blocked by a wall of tall towers.

Join San Francisco Democrats and vote Yes on Prop. B.

*Central City Democrats
District 11 Democratic Club
Harvey Milk LGBT Democratic Club
Potrero Hill Democratic Club
South Beach Democratic Club*

*State Senator Mark Leno
Assemblymember Tom Ammiano
Former Mayor Art Agnos
Former City Attorney Louise Renne
Supervisor John Avalos
Supervisor David Campos
Supervisor Eric Mar
Jane Morrison, Former Chair, SF Democratic Party*
Aaron Peskin, Former Chair, SF Democratic Party*
John Rizzo, Trustee, San Francisco Community College*
Petra DeJesus, Member, SF Democratic County Central Committee*
Kelly Dwyer, Member, SF Democratic County Central Committee*
Hene Kelly, Member, SF Democratic County Central Committee*
Rafael Mandelman, Member, SF Democratic County Central Committee*
Wendy Aragon, Vice President, Richmond District Democratic Club *
Gus Feldman, President, District 8 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: No Wall on the Waterfront.

The three largest contributors to the true source recipient committee: 1. Richard Stewart, 2. Barbara Stewart, 3. Maurice Holloway.

Paid Argument IN FAVOR of Proposition B

Let The Public Vote As It Has In The Past

Several years ago a number of us were involved in the effort to keep the Giants in San Francisco and build a new ballpark for the team. The issue was put before the voters; the voters said yes; and AT&T Park was born.



Why are opponents of Proposition B now afraid of a similar measure that would allow the public to vote on the future of the waterfront? San Franciscans may not be willing to turn San Francisco into Miami Beach but they can be trusted to vote for good projects in keeping with the beauty and uniqueness of the San Francisco waterfront.

Vote Yes on Prop B.

Louise Renne, Former San Francisco City Attorney

The true source(s) of funds for the printing fee of this argument: No Wall on the Waterfront.

The three largest contributors to the true source recipient committee: 1. Richard Stewart, 2. Barbara Stewart, 3. Maurice Holloway.

Paid Argument IN FAVOR of Proposition B

YES ON B – SAFEGUARD OUR WATERFRONT

Proposition B ensures that voters from every part of San Francisco have the right to accept or reject projects which raise the existing waterfront height limits. It makes no sense to allow lobbyists and special interests to dictate the future of the waterfront that belongs to all of us.

We voters are also entitled to the opportunity to be heard.

Vote Yes on B.

Quentin L. Kopp, Retired Superior Court Judge and former State Senator

The true source(s) of funds for the printing fee of this argument: No Wall on the Waterfront.

The three largest contributors to the true source recipient committee: 1. Richard Stewart, 2. Barbara Stewart, 3. Maurice Holloway.

Paid Argument IN FAVOR of Proposition B

OUR WATERFRONT IS WORTH PROTECTING

Can you name another city in this country where steep hills roll down to meet a beautiful bay and produce a spectacular waterfront that is free and open to everyone to enjoy? There is no other place like San Francisco. That's why it's so important to protect our open and accessible waterfront by voting Yes on B.

Prop. B would prevent developers and politicians from raising the existing waterfront height limits without first getting the approval of voters. Some people want to take San Francisco back to the time where there were virtually no height limits in place to keep high-

rises from being built all along our waterfront. Some people say those were the good old days, but I think they're wrong. In fact, something's still here from those days to remind us of what we could lose if we're not careful. It's a pair of 17 story Bay-blocking high-rises just past Fisherman's Wharf called the Fontana Towers.

The Fontana Towers were approved in 1960 as part of a larger scheme to build similar towers along the waterfront. But seeing these giant walls blocking off the public waterfront produced such an outcry from citizens all over San Francisco that Supervisors enacted a 40-foot height limit along most of the rest of the waterfront to prevent such a thing from ever happening again. Now some people want to raise those height limits again so that our waterfront starts to look like Miami Beach.

San Francisco made a mistake once before when we allowed the Fontana Towers to create a wall on the waterfront. Now we have the chance to be sure that never happens again by approving Prop. B. I hope you will join me and vote Yes on B.

Louise Renne, Former San Francisco City Attorney

The true source(s) of funds for the printing fee of this argument: No Wall on the Waterfront.

The three largest contributors to the true source recipient committee: 1. Richard Stewart, 2. Barbara Stewart, 3. Maurice Holloway.

Paid Argument IN FAVOR of Proposition B

It's a trick every pickpocket knows: You distract the mark's attention with your right hand, with your left lift the wallet.

Developers have riveted citizens' eyes on the Warriors Stadium while trying to slip a set of illegitimate high rises onto our waterfront. The voters set height limits to ensure that the public can continue enjoying views of the Bay, the hills and the city skyline. These proposed luxury buildings would dramatically exceed those limits.

Last November voters resoundingly defeated the height-busting 8 Washington condo proposal. Yet now private interests are again reaching for a treasured chunk of our commons, which includes visual access to water and sky.

The sleight-of-hand promoters of this project also hope you won't notice it sets a precedent for spot zoning that violates the city's zoning code. If they win, watch your neighborhood. High rises may be coming



to you. Vote YES on B to save our waterfront for everyone's enjoyment.

Takebackourparks.org

The true source(s) of funds for the printing fee of this argument: Take Back Our Parks.

Paid Argument IN FAVOR of Proposition B

San Francisco's Neighborhoods SUPPORT Prop B!

Prop B requires voter approval for all height increases along the Waterfront; the Board of Supervisors and the Planning Commission have oversight of project details.

It gives voters the tool we need to protect our waterfront.

Vote YES on B to allow ***your vote, your voice*** to be heard – on height increases along the waterfront. Neighborhood organizations from all around the city support Proposition B.

Let's make sure that San Francisco's beautiful and unique waterfront is preserved and protected!

Vote YES on Prop B!

Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods (csfn.net)
Established 1972.
48 neighborhood associations.

The true source(s) of funds for the printing fee of this argument: Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods.

Paid Argument IN FAVOR of Proposition B

Let San Francisco Citizens Vote On The Future Of Our Waterfront

Who ever thought the day would come, when the San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee would vote to "muzzle" the public and not allow a public vote on a matter of City- wide importance. But this is exactly what the Democratic County Central Committee has done in voting to oppose Proposition B.

Proposition B asks a simple question – should the public vote its approval to raise existing height limits along the waterfront? Amazingly, the Democratic County Central Committee has said "no " – "no" to democracy! Adding insult to injury, voters can now anticipate a flood of mailers trying to justify, with misleading arguments, why the public should not have a vote on waterfront issues.

Perhaps time will tell why the SF Democratic County Central Committee has taken such an undemocratic position, but in the meantime, do not be fooled.

Vote Yes on Prop B and allow San Francisco citizens to vote on the future of our waterfront.

*Aaron Peskin, Former Chair, SF 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: Aaron Peskin.

End of Paid Arguments IN FAVOR of Proposition B

Paid Argument AGAINST Proposition B

PROTECT OUR WATERFRONT – VOTE NO ON B

Proposition B kills new affordable housing, parks, preservation projects and thousands of jobs.

It takes away from the Port and Planning Commissions, State agencies, community leaders and our elected officials the ability to approve well thought out and critically important projects to preserve our maritime infrastructure.

San Francisco has the most publicly involved land use process in California – there is no need to add another layer of voter approval to every Port project.

Vote NO on B

San Francisco Chamber of Commerce and our 1,500 local businesses.

The true source(s) of funds for the printing fee of this argument: San Francisco Chamber of Commerce.

Paid Argument AGAINST Proposition B

Proposition B Demeans our Neighborhood

Do not vote for Proposition B! This measure damages our neighborhood (Mission Bay), and neighborhoods around us especially Pier 70. Residents and the Port of San Francisco struggle to restore and rehabilitate the historic structures to create lively neighborhoods integrating old with new. One day, Pier 70 will be beautiful with a variety of life styles; light manufacturing, arts, hand crafts and hand-mades, office, housing, including affordable rentals.

Pier 70 and the Giants Project will provide water access, interesting walks, hand powered boat launch-



es, an extension of the Blue Greenway plus 23 acres of new parks. Wow! The Giants initiative, will be a beautifully planned village of retail businesses, offices, a child care center and apartments including affordable units. A few towers make all this economically feasible.

Why is Prop B happening? A few who wish to stop the Warriors, protect views of the precious few and control Port property organized Prop B. They could have just focused Prop B on the Warriors's arena, but instead chose to attack the entire Port from Fisherman's Wharf to Pier 96 and Cargo Way. Any organization, including the Port, wishing to build a project above the current height limit (0 ft. on Giants property) to mostly 40-65 feet, must pony up for a political campaign. Thus depriving City residents of two new waterfront neighborhoods for years to come. This is No way to run a dynamic and ever-changing City!.

Support our Neighborhoods and VOTE NO on PROP B

Toby Levine, Retired Planning Commissioner*
 Jerry Levine*
 Kevin Simons
 Jackson Hill Fahnestock
 Margaret Jepps Fahnestock
 Wayne Patanian*

*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: Marilyn Levine and Gerald Levine.

Paid Argument AGAINST Proposition B

This radical initiative undermines the delivery of many thousands of planned new homes, most of which are apartments, many of them on-site and permanently affordable, on what is now derelict industrial land. This measure only worsens the City's housing shortage and will result in even higher rents and home prices.

Tim Colen*

*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: Tim Colen.

Paid Argument AGAINST Proposition B

IMPROVE OUR WATERFRONT, VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION B.

The initiative undermines efforts to improve the waterfront south of AT&T Park. The waterfront does not need to be preserved as surface parking lots or red-tagged and dilapidated piers and buildings. Proponents advance the argument that it will save the waterfront when it will actually leave the waterfront in a state of disrepair for years to come. Say YES to 23 acres of waterfront parks, preservation of historic piers and to responsible development for our City and say NO to the politics of Proposition B. **Vote NO on Proposition B.**

Corinne Woods
 Bruce Agid
 Jackson Fahnestock
 Margaret Fahnestock
 Alec Bash
 Judith Langley
 Donald Langley

The true source(s) of funds for the printing fee of this argument: Corinne Woods, Bruce Agid, Jackson Fahnestock, Margaret Fahnestock.

Paid Argument AGAINST Proposition B

PROPOSITION B WILL KILL GOOD PAYING

CONSTRUCTION JOBS - VOTE NO. This initiative jeopardizes the economic viability of the Port and its ability to address its failing infrastructure by cutting off funding needed to improve the waterfront, particularly south of AT&T Park where buildings are red-tagged, dilapidated and falling into the Bay. Further, it threatens 29,000 construction jobs and 32,000 permanent jobs as well as up to 3,700 new housing units, many of which are affordable, and millions of dollars in affordable housing revenue. It is simply an ill-advised, politically motivated measure that turns years of thoughtful planning on its head.

Vote NO on Proposition B and Keep Our City Moving Forward.

Operating Engineers Local 3*
LiUNA! Local 261
IBEW Local 6
Sheet Metal Workers Local 104
Iron Workers Local Union 377

*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: Alliance for Jobs and Sustainable Growth.



The three largest contributors to the true source recipient committee: 1. San Francisco Police Officers Association, 2. United Healthcare Workers SEIU, 3. Hotel Council of San Francisco.

Paid Argument AGAINST Proposition B

THE SAN FRANCISCO DEMOCRATIC PARTY urges a “NO” vote on Proposition B.

IRRESPONSIBLE. Proposition B is an irresponsible overreaction to concern about development along the waterfront. The initiative unwisely strips authority from the Board of Supervisors, Planning Commission, Port Commission, Bay Conservation & Development Commission, the State Lands Commission and Citizens’ Advisory Committees and requires all complicated land use decisions be decided by a city-wide election on the basis of 30-second sound bites, instead of a thoughtful deliberative process.

RECKLESS. The possible impacts of Proposition B are far-reaching and unacceptable. The measure risks lost revenues to the City of more than \$8 Billion. It jeopardizes 23 acres of new waterfront parks, almost 3700 new apartment units, rehabilitation of historic resources and piers and the ability of the City to stabilize and reinforce the seawall that protects the City against flooding in the event of an earthquake or sea level rise.

DESTRUCTIVE. This initiative also puts many of our working families at risk. Proposition B takes aim at 29,000 construction jobs and 32,000 permanent jobs. It means higher rents and housing prices. If this initiative passes, we may be suffering the consequences for years and years to come.

SAN FRANCISCO DEMOCRATIC PARTY

The true source(s) of funds for the printing fee of this argument: Alliance for Jobs and Sustainable Growth.

The three largest contributors to the true source recipient committee: 1. San Francisco Police Officers Association, 2. United Healthcare Workers SEIU, 3. Hotel Council of San Francisco.

Paid Argument AGAINST Proposition B

PROPOSITION B IS BAD LEGISLATION AND BAD FOR BUSINESS, LABOR AND THE COMMUNITIES OF SAN FRANCISCO. It is a poorly written initiative which will permanently harm San Francisco’s waterfront. Labor unions, businesses, community organizations, law enforcement, housing advocates and city planning professionals oppose Proposition B because it is really not about imposing height limits and stopping luxury

high rise condominiums. Instead, it places many important construction projects in jeopardy by preempting the public process that housing builders must follow to get projects approved. Only the wealthiest developers would be able to afford expensive elections to get projects approved.

Proposition B’s supporters relied on out of town signature gatherers to qualify this ill advised measure for the ballot. If passed, it will eliminate 23 acres of public open space, reduce or eliminate affordable housing units built near jobs in Mission Bay, and stop the preservation and rehabilitation of three historic facilities (Pier 48 and Buildings 2 and 12 at Pier 70).

Proposition B would not even affect privately owned property on the waterfront; it would only affect property owned by the Port of San Francisco or property that politicians want to acquire. And it will cost San Francisco \$69 million in lost tax revenue, which pays for city services, street repair and public safety. **VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION B - it is bad law and will hurt San Francisco.**

ALLIANCE FOR JOBS AND SUSTAINABLE GROWTH

The true source(s) of funds for the printing fee of this argument: Alliance for Jobs and Sustainable Growth.

The three largest contributors to the true source recipient committee: 1. San Francisco Police Officers Association, 2. United Healthcare Workers SEIU, 3. Hotel Council of San Francisco.

Paid Argument AGAINST Proposition B

ENVIRONMENTALISTS AGAINST PROPOSITION B. The San Francisco chapter of the Sierra Club does not speak for me. I support 23 acres of waterfront parks and historic preservation of dilapidated piers. I support the development of affordable housing on transit corridors in urban locations near places of employment. I support the environmental and community planning process. This chapter of the Sierra Club appears to support suburban sprawl and urban decay and the replacement of a thoughtful planning process with 30-second sound bites. **Real Environmentalists Oppose Proposition B. Vote NO on Proposition B - The Elitist Initiative.**

**Corrine Woods
Patrick C. Valentino
Virginia Stearns**

The true source(s) of funds for the printing fee of this argument: Alliance for Jobs and Sustainable Growth.



The three largest contributors to the true source recipient committee: 1. San Francisco Police Officers Association, 2. United Healthcare Workers SEIU, 3. Hotel Council of San Francisco.

Paid Argument AGAINST Proposition B

FORMER PLANNING STAFF AGAINST PROPOSITION B.

As former Planning Department staff, we oppose Proposition B. The initiative will encourage clever developers to do an end run around environmental review, neighborhood input and appointed/elected officials. The initiative leaves important, complicated planning decisions to be made based on sound bites, slogans and campaign money. That's no way to make complicated land use decisions. If concerns remain about a project after it has been subjected to the established process for public scrutiny and decision, then opponents still have the opportunity to place the matter on the ballot. This is a far better way to get the public involved at all levels and for the public to weigh the merits or shortcomings of a proposed waterfront project.

Dean Macris, Former Director of Planning*
Amit K. Ghosh, PhD, Former Director of Policy Planning*
Lawrence Badiner, Former Assistant Director, Implementation*
Alec Bash, Former Environmental Review Officer*

*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: Alliance for Jobs and Sustainable Growth.

The three largest contributors to the true source recipient committee: 1. San Francisco Police Officers Association, 2. United Healthcare Workers SEIU, 3. Hotel Council of San Francisco.

Paid Argument AGAINST Proposition B

DEMAND A ROLE IN DECISIONS NOT 30-SECOND SOUND BITES - VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION B. If you care about your neighborhood, your parks, MUNI, more jobs, views of the Bay, you can be part of meetings where all these decisions are made. Prop B takes that right away from you - and allows developers and lobbyists to set the rules at the ballot box. Don't settle for less than a full voice in waterfront decisions. **Vote NO on Proposition B - Demand Respect as a San Franciscan.**

Karen Alschuler, professional planner/urban designer, Fellow AICP*

Ron Miguel, former president San Francisco Planning Commission*
Jim Chappell, former president SPUR*
Cheryl Barton, professional landscape architect, Fellow & former president ASLA*
Paul Woolford, professional architect, AIA*
Alec Bash, former waterfront planner-special projects*
Alan Lewis, professional architect, AIA & urban designer*

*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: Alliance for Jobs and Sustainable Growth.

The three largest contributors to the true source recipient committee: 1. San Francisco Police Officers Association, 2. United Healthcare Workers SEIU, 3. Hotel Council of San Francisco.

Paid Argument AGAINST Proposition B

LAW ENFORCEMENT SAYS NO TO PROPOSITION B.

The initiative undercuts an important source of new jobs for our community. Waterfront projects in the pipeline represent 29,000 new construction jobs and 32,000 permanent jobs for our families, particularly families in need. Good jobs curtail crime and help bring people out of poverty and despair to enjoy their lives. That, in turn, promotes the safety of our men and women who risk their lives every day to protect San Francisco. **Vote No on Proposition B.**

Martin Halloran
President*
San Francisco Police Officers 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: Alliance for Jobs and Sustainable Growth.

The three largest contributors to the true source recipient committee: 1. San Francisco Police Officers Association, 2. United Healthcare Workers SEIU, 3. Hotel Council of San Francisco.

Paid Argument AGAINST Proposition B

BUILDING OWNERS & MANAGERS AGAINST PROPOSITION B. The initiative undermines longstanding civic planning efforts to improve the waterfront and seeks to take away the hard fought uniform protections of our Bay and views from the Bay Conservation and Development Commission. The initiative jeopardizes 3,700 housing units, most of which are apartments. We need more housing to accommo-



date demand and to reduce the upward pressure on rents for our workforce. The measure risks shorting the City some \$8 Billion in tax revenues from development of the waterfront and may result in losing the opportunity to create 60,000 new jobs. This is a measure we simply cannot afford. **Vote No on Proposition B - The Irresponsible Initiative.**

Ken Cleaveland
Vice President*, Public Policy
Building Owners and Managers 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: Alliance for Jobs and Sustainable Growth.

The three largest contributors to the true source recipient committee: 1. San Francisco Police Officers Association, 2. United Healthcare Workers SEIU, 3. Hotel Council of San Francisco.

Paid Argument AGAINST Proposition B

PROPOSITION B IS BAD FOR THE BAYVIEW HUNTERS POINT COMMUNITY, VOTE NO. This initiative will eliminate thousands of jobs, funding for ailing piers and hundreds of affordable housing units for our families, three things we need most in the Southeast for future generations and in this City. Say No to bad policy.

SAN FRANCISCO CHAPTER OF A. PHILLIP RANDOLPH INSTITUTE

The true source(s) of funds for the printing fee of this argument: Alliance for Jobs and Sustainable Growth.

The three largest contributors to the true source recipient committee: 1. San Francisco Police Officers Association, 2. United Healthcare Workers SEIU, 3. Hotel Council of San Francisco.

Paid Argument AGAINST Proposition B

SMALL BUSINESSES AGAINST PROPOSITION B. This initiative requires that every single project of substance go on the ballot for a citywide vote, ultimately hurting small businesses. This is a hurdle that no small business can shoulder. This measure is discriminatory and wrong. Vote NO on Proposition B – The Elitist Initiative.

Henry Kamilowicz
President
San Francisco Council of District Merchants Associations

The true source(s) of funds for the printing fee of this argument: Alliance for Jobs and Sustainable Growth.

The three largest contributors to the true source recipient committee: 1. United Healthcare Workers (SEIU), 2. Hotel Council, 3. San Francisco Police Officers Association.

Paid Argument AGAINST Proposition B

STOP THE ELITIST MEASURE, VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION B

When the cost of rent and housing is skyrocketing and middle-class families are forced to leave San Francisco to make ends meet, what do the authors of Proposition B say?

They say **LEAVE** - San Francisco is not for you.

They say **NO** to San Francisco teachers, firefighters and police officers.

The financial backers of Proposition B want rents and real estate prices to continue to escalate. They don't want new housing. This measure is designed to kill or delay 3,700 units of housing, mostly apartment rentals and homes for middle-class families.

They say **NO** to entry-level workers, seniors and non-profits.

They say **NO** to laborers, welders, carpenters and trade unions by putting at risk 29,000 construction jobs.

They say **NO** to new waterfront parks and rehabilitation of piers and historic buildings.

They say **SO WHAT** if Proposition B costs the City \$8 BILLION and destroys a decade-long community planning process.

Say NO to them instead. STOP this Elitist Measure. Vote NO on Proposition B. Support the Working People of San Francisco.

Bob Linscheid
 Jim Lazarus
 DeeDee Workman

The true source(s) of funds for the printing fee of this argument: Alliance for Jobs and Sustainable Growth.

The three largest contributors to the true source recipient committee: 1. San Francisco Police Officers Association, 2. United Healthcare Workers SEIU, 3. Hotel Council of San Francisco.



Paid Argument AGAINST Proposition B

Measures like this are the reason San Francisco is too expensive.

Vote No on Prop B.

Prop. B is ballot box zoning at its worst.

A good planning process involves community input, debate, and compromise. The irony of Prop B is that in the name of “letting the people decide” it actually circumvents any good planning process.

The real effect of Prop B is going to be making it much more difficult for anything to happen on our city’s waterfront.

By forcing every project to gamble with a ballot contest, Prop B will have a chilling effect on efforts to improve access, supply housing and reunite the city with its waterfront.

Prop. B would not reduce the price of housing in San Francisco. In fact it will make it worse.

If Prop B passes, we are looking at the potential loss of 1,990 - 3,690 housing units and tens of millions of dollars for affordable housing. And that’s just the big projects we know about right now.

Prop B is a step in the wrong direction.

Read the SPUR voter guide at www.spur.org

SPUR*

*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: SPUR.



Proposition A

Ordinance calling and providing for a special election to be held in the City and County of San Francisco on Tuesday, June 3, 2014, for the purpose of submitting to San Francisco voters a proposition to incur the following bonded debt of the City and County: \$400,000,000 to finance the construction, acquisition, improvement, and seismic retrofitting of Neighborhood Fire and Police Stations, the Emergency Firefighting Water System, seismically secure facilities for the Medical Examiner, the Police Department’s Traffic Company, and the Police Department’s Forensic Services Division, and other critical infrastructure and facilities for earthquake safety 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 Chapter 37 of the Administrative Code; 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; finding that a portion of the proposed bond is not a project under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and adopting findings under CEQA for the remaining portion of the proposed bond; finding that the proposed bond is in conformity with the eight priority policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1(b), and is consistent 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 Section 53410 of the California Government Code; incorporating the provisions of the Administrative Code, Section 5.30-5.36; and waiving the time requirements specified in Administrative Code, Section 2.34.

Note: Additions are *single-underline italics Times New Roman*; deletions are *strikethrough italics Times New Roman*.

Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. Findings.

A. This Board of Supervisors (this “Board”) recognizes the need to safeguard and enhance the City’s earthquake and emergency response and recovery by rehabilitating critical facilities that support the City’s first responders.

B. The Earthquake Safety and Emergency Response Bond (the “Bond”) will provide funding to construct, improve and rehabilitate earthquake safety and emergency responsiveness facilities and infrastructure (as described below in Section 3).

C. 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 earthquake safety and response needs as described below.

Section 2. A special election is called and ordered to be held in the City on Tuesday, the 3rd day of June, 2014, 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 EARTHQUAKE SAFETY AND EMERGENCY RESPONSE BOND, 2014. \$400,000,000 of bonded indebtedness to improve fire, earthquake and emergency response by: improving and/or replacing deteriorating cisterns, pipes, and tunnels, and related facilities to ensure firefighters a reliable water supply for

fires and disasters; improving and/or replacing neighborhood fire and police stations; replacing certain seismically-unsafe police and medical examiner facilities with earthquake-safe buildings; and to pay related costs, subject to independent citizen oversight and regular audits; and authorizing landlords to pass-through to residential tenants in units subject to Chapter 37 of the Administrative Code (the “Residential Stabilization and Arbitration Ordinance”) 50% of the increase in the real property taxes attributable to the cost of the repayment of the bonds.”

The special election called and ordered shall be referred to in this ordinance as the “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 also 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. The proposed program can be summarized as follows:

A. EMERGENCY FIREFIGHTING WATER SYSTEM. A portion of the Bond shall be allocated to the renovation and seismic upgrading of the emergency firefighting water system (the “EFWS”) and related facilities, including but not limited to cisterns, pipes and tunnels, and related facilities (collectively, the “EFWS Project”).

B. CRITICAL FIREFIGHTING FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE. A portion of the Bond shall be allocated to the construction, acquisition, improvement, retrofitting and completion of critical firefighting facilities and infrastructure for earthquake safety and emergency response not otherwise specifically enumerated in this ordinance, including without limitation, neighborhood fire stations and related facilities (collectively, the “Critical Firefighting Facilities and Infrastructure”).

C. POLICE FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE. A portion of the Bond shall be allocated to the construction, acquisition, improvement, retrofitting and completion of police facilities and infrastructure for earthquake safety and emergency response not otherwise specifically enumerated in this ordinance, including without limitation, neighborhood police stations and related facilities (collectively, the “Police Facilities and Infrastructure”).

D. MEDICAL EXAMINER FACILITY. A portion of the Bond shall be allocated to design and construct a seismically secure structure for the Medical Examiner to enhance the chief medical examiner’s Citywide earthquake safety and emergency response capabilities (the “Medical Examiner Facility”).

E. POLICE TRAFFIC COMPANY AND POLICE FORENSICS SERVICES DIVISION FACILITIES. A portion of the Bond shall be allocated to design and construct a seismically secure structure to house both the Police Department’s Traffic Company and the Police Department’s Forensic Services Division to enhance the police department’s Citywide earthquake safety and emergency response capabilities (the “Traffic Company and Forensic Services Division Facility”).

F. CITIZEN’S OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE. A portion of the Bond shall be used to perform audits of the Bond, as further described in Section 15.

The proposed uses and amounts described in this Section 3 are estimates only and, with the exception of Section 3F above, are subject, without limitation, to review and revision by the Mayor and the Board.

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 Citizen's 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 periodic public hearings and reviews on the bond program and its implementation before the Capital Planning Committee, the Police and Fire Commissions, and the Citizen's 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 the following resolution and in the amount specified below:

Resolution No. 131189, \$400,000,000.

Such resolution was passed by two-thirds or more of the Board and approved by the Mayor of the City (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 the laws of the State of California (the "State") and the Charter of the City (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, June 3, 2014. The voting precincts, polling places and officers of election for the June 3, 2014 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 June 3, 2014 General Election by the Director of Elections to be published in the official newspaper of the City on the date required under the laws of the State of California.

Section 8. The ballots to be used at the Bond Special Election shall be the ballots to be used at the June 3, 2014 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 EARTHQUAKE SAFETY AND EMERGENCY RESPONSE BOND, 2014. To improve fire, earthquake and emergency response by: improving and/or replacing deteriorating cisterns, pipes, and tunnels, and related facilities to ensure firefighters a reliable water supply for fires and disasters; improving and/or replacing neighborhood fire and police stations; replacing certain seismically-unsafe police and medical examiner facilities with earthquake-safe buildings and to pay related costs, shall the City and County of San Francisco issue \$400,000,000 in general obligation bonds, subject to 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 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.

The votes cast for and against the proposition shall be counted separately and when two-thirds of the qualified electors, voting on the proposition, vote in favor, the proposition shall be deemed adopted.

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 said City, or other account held on behalf of the Treasurer of said 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 ("CEQA"), California Public Resources Code Sections 21000 et seq., the CEQA Guidelines, 14 California Code of Regulations Sections 15000 et seq., ("CEQA Guidelines"), and Administrative Code Chapter 31 ("Chapter 31"):

(i) **Emergency Firefighting Water System (EFWS) Project.** For the reasons set forth in the letter from the Environmental Review Officer of the Planning Department, dated November 25, 2013, a copy of which is on file with the Clerk of the Board in File No. 131190 and incorporated by reference, the Board finds that the bond proposal as it relates to funds for the EFWS Project is not subject to CEQA because as the establishment of a government financing mechanism that does not involve any commitment to specific projects to be constructed with the funds, it is not a project as defined by CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines. The use of bond proceeds to finance any project or portion of any project with funds for the EFWS Project portion of the Bond will be subject to approval of the Board upon completion of planning and any further required environmental review under CEQA for the individual EFWS projects.

(ii) **Critical Firefighting Facilities and Infrastructure.** For the reasons set forth in the letter from the Environmental Review Officer of the Planning Department, dated November 25, 2013, a copy of which is on file with the Clerk of the Board in File No. 131190 and incorporated by reference, the Board finds that the bond proposal as it relates to funds for Critical Firefighting Facilities and Infrastructure is not subject to CEQA because as the establishment of a government financing mechanism that does not involve any commitment to specific projects to be constructed with the funds, it is not a project as defined by CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines. The use of bond proceeds to finance any project or portion of any project with funds for the Critical Firefighting Facilities and Infrastructure portion of the Bond will be subject to approval of the Board upon completion of planning and any further required environmental review under CEQA for the individual Critical Firefighting Facilities and Infrastructure projects.

(iii) **Police Facilities and Infrastructure.** For the reasons set forth in the letter from the Environmental Review Officer of the Planning Department, dated November 25, 2013, a copy of which is on file with the Clerk of the Board in File No. 131190 and incorporated by reference, the Board finds that the bond proposal as it relates to funds for Police Facilities and Infrastructure is not subject to CEQA because as the establishment of a government financing mechanism that does not involve any commitment to specific projects to be constructed with



the funds, it is not a project as defined by CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines. The use of bond proceeds to finance any project or portion of any project with funds for the Police Facilities and Infrastructure portion of the Bond will be subject to approval of the Board upon completion of planning and any further required environmental review under CEQA for the individual Police Facilities and Infrastructure projects.

(iv) Medical Examiner Facility. The Environmental Review Officer in the Planning Department determined that the Medical Examiner Facility project is exempt from environmental review as a Class 32 Categorical Exemption, infill development, in a written determination dated May 30, 2013 and contained in Planning Department File No. 2012.1172E and this Board's File No. 131190.

(v) Traffic Company and Forensic Services Division Facility. On November 18, 2013, the Planning Department issued a Final Mitigated Negative Declaration ("FMND") for the Traffic Company and Forensic Services Division Facility project, San Francisco Planning Department Case No. 2013.0342E, which is on file with the Clerk of the Board in File No. 131190 and which is incorporated into this ordinance by this reference. In issuing the FMND the Planning Department determined that the Traffic Company and Forensic Services Division Facility project could not have a significant effect on the environment.

(a) The Board hereby adopts as its own the CEQA findings for the Traffic Company and Forensic Services Division Facility project made by the Planning Department in the FMND.

(b) The Board has reviewed and considered the information contained in the FMND and all other documents referenced in this Ordinance as being on file with the Clerk of the Board in File No. 131190.

(c) The Traffic Company and Forensic Services Division Facility project as reflected in this ordinance is consistent with the project described in the FMND and would not result in any significant impacts not identified in the FMND nor cause significant effects identified in the FMND to be substantially more severe.

(d) In accordance with CEQA, the Board has considered the mitigation measures described in the FMND and hereby requires the mitigation measures and the mitigation monitoring and reporting program ("MMRP") denoted as Exhibit A to this ordinance and on file with the Clerk of the Board in File No. 131190 to be imposed as conditions on the implementation of the Traffic Company and Forensic Services Division Facility project approved by this ordinance.

(e) With the implementation of the mitigation measures required in Exhibit A to this ordinance, the environmental impacts resulting from the Traffic Company and Forensic Services Division Facility project on subsurface cultural resources, air quality emissions, construction hours and operational traffic would be reduced to a less than significant level as described in the FMND.

(f) Based upon the whole record for the FMND, including all written materials and any oral testimony received by the Board, the Board hereby finds that the FMND reflects the independent judgment and analysis of the Planning Department and the Board, is adequate and complete and there is no substantial evidence that the proposed Traffic Company and Forensic Services Division Facility project, given the implementation of the mitigation measures as stated in the FMND and the adoption of the MMRP, could have a significant effect on the environment as shown in the analysis of the FMND. The Board hereby adopts the FMND and the MMRP on file with the Clerk of the Board as Exhibit A to this ordinance.

Section 13. The Board finds and declares that the proposed Bond is (i) in conformity with the priority policies of Section 101.1(b) of the Planning Code, (ii) in accordance with Section 4.105 of the Charter and Section 2A.53(f) of the Administrative Code, and (iii) 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 November 26, 2013, a copy of which is on file with the Clerk of the Board in File No. 131190 and incorporates such findings by reference.

Section 14. Under Section 53410 of the California Government Code, the bonds shall be for the specific purpose authorized in this ordinance and the proceeds of such bonds will be applied only for such specific purpose. 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 of the Citizens' General Obligation Bond Oversight Committee, 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 such 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. 131190, which is hereby declared to be a part of this ordinance as if set forth fully herein.

Proposition B

Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

SECTION 1. Title

This measure shall be known and may be cited as the "Waterfront Height Limit Right To Vote Act"

SECTION 2. Findings and Declarations

The People of the City and County of San Francisco declare their findings and purposes in enacting this Initiative to be as follows:

Whereas, the San Francisco waterfront is an irreplaceable public resource of the highest value;

Whereas, San Francisco holds the waterfront in trust for the People of California;

Whereas, it is in the interest of San Francisco to preserve a unique and vibrant vital waterfront with adequate public views of, and access to, the City and San Francisco Bay;

Whereas reasonable building height limits on the San Francisco waterfront have been instrumental in preventing the historic waterfront from becoming blocked and walled off by luxury high-rises and tall private buildings as has happened on many waterfronts around the country;

Therefore the people of San Francisco declare that it is the policy of the City and County of San Francisco that:

The existing maximum building height limits on the San Francisco waterfront shall be preserved and shall not be increased unless a height limit increase is approved by San Francisco voters.

SECTION 3. Waterfront Height Limit Right To Vote Requirement

Section 61.5.1 is added to the San Francisco Administrative Code as follows:

- (a) No city agency or officer may take, or permit to be taken, any action to permit development located in whole or in part on the waterfront to exceed at any point the building and structure height limits in effect as of January 1, 2014, which are set forth in San Francisco Planning Code Article



2.5, unless a height limit increase for the development has been approved by a vote of the electors of the City and County of San Francisco.

- (b) Any ballot measure placed before the electors to approve increased height limits for development on the waterfront must specify both the existing and proposed height limits in the ballot question. The failure to specify both the existing and proposed height limits in the ballot question shall render such an increase in height limits void.
- (c) For the purposes of this Section, the term “waterfront” means land transferred to the City and County of San Francisco pursuant to Chapter 1333 of the Statutes of 1968, as well as any other property which is owned by or under the control of the Port Commission of San Francisco as of January 1, 2014 or acquired thereafter.

SECTION 4. Effective Date

In accordance with the provisions of California Elections Code section 9217, if a majority of the voters vote in favor of the Initiative, the Initiative shall go into effect 10 days after the vote is declared by the Board of Supervisors.

SECTION 5. Severability

If any provision of this Initiative or any application thereof to any person or circumstance is held invalid, such invalidity shall not affect any provision or application of this Initiative that can be given effect without the invalid provision or application. To this end, the provisions of this Initiative are severable.