



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 address of your polling place, at the address below:

<http://gispubweb.sfgov.org/website/pollingplace/>

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.



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



QR code

JOHN ARNTZ
Director

Dear San Francisco Voter:

April 11, 2012

The June 5, 2012, Consolidated Presidential Primary Election is the first time California will use its new “open primary” system that voters approved under Proposition 14 in June 2010.

Below is a description of how the open primary affects your voting opportunities:

- ➡ 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 primary ballot.
- ➡ Other than the contest for President, offices are now considered to be “voter nominated” rather than “partisan.”
- ➡ Other than the contest for President and for seats on the county central committees, voters will receive ballots that list all candidates running for the remaining contests, regardless of voters’ or candidates’ party preferences.
- ➡ For the contest for President, you may still vote only for the candidates that appear on the ballot of your preferred political party. However, the Democratic and the American Independent parties are allowing voters who registered to vote without a preference for a political party to “cross over” and vote for those parties’ candidates for President.
- ➡ To vote for central committee candidates, none of the parties allow “cross-over” voting, so you can vote for these seats only according to your party preference. If you have no party preference, or if your party does not have a central committee contest on the ballot for this election, then your ballot will not include candidates for the county central committee seats.
- ➡ 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.

To obtain information regarding the upcoming primary, I recommend that you visit the Department’s website – www.sfelections.org. The website provides materials regarding the new primary process, as well as polling place locations, your registration status, and whether the Department has mailed or received your vote-by-mail ballot. A relatively new feature on our website is the “**Voting Toolkit**,” which provides a convenient starting point for most election-related information. For mobile devices, use www.sfelections.org/m.

QUICK RESPONSE (QR) CODE: You will now see **QR Codes** on our materials, including this letter. After downloading an application for your smart phone, scan these QR Codes and quickly access our Voting Toolkit using your mobile device.

VOTING AT CITY HALL: Beginning May 7, early voting is available in City Hall to all registered voters on weekdays (except Memorial Day) from 8 a.m. until 5 p.m. On Election Day, City Hall is open for voting from 7 a.m. until 8 p.m.

- ➡ Early voting in City Hall begins 8 a.m., May 7
- ➡ Weekend Voting May 26 and 27; June 2 and 3, 10 a.m. through 4 p.m. For weekend voting, enter City Hall from Grove Street
- ➡ Polls open on Election Day, June 5, at 7 a.m. and close at 8 p.m.

Respectfully,
 John Arntz, Director

Voice (415) 554-4375
 Fax (415) 554-7344

1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 48
 San Francisco, CA 94102-4634

Vote-by-Mail Fax (415) 554-4372
 TTY (415) 554-4386



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. The pamphlet provides voters with information about local candidates and ballot measures, as well as how, when and where to vote.

In this pamphlet, you will find:

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

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

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


Mollie Lee, *ex officio*
Deputy City Attorney

Andrew Shen, *ex officio*
Deputy City Attorney

Important Dates for this Election

First day of early voting at City Hall	Monday, May 7
Deadline to register to vote	Monday, May 21
Deadline to notify the Department of Elections of an address change	Monday, May 21
First weekend of early voting at City Hall	Saturday and Sunday, May 26–27
Deadline for the Department of Elections to receive a request for a vote-by-mail ballot	Tuesday, May 29, 5 p.m.
Deadline for new citizens naturalized after May 21 to register and vote	Tuesday, June 5, 8 p.m.
Last weekend of early voting at City Hall	Saturday and Sunday, June 2–3
Election Day voting hours (all polling places and City Hall)	Tuesday, June 5, 7 a.m. to 8 p.m.

Visit www.sfelections.org/toolkit to:



- ★ Check your voter registration status, including party affiliation
- ★ Download a voter registration form
- ★ Request a vote-by-mail ballot
- ★ Confirm that your vote-by-mail ballot was mailed or received
- ★ Look up your polling place location
- ★ View your sample ballot
- ★ Check election results


Contact the Department of Elections

E-mail: use the e-mail form at www.sfelections.org/sfvote

English: 415-554-4375 中文電話協助: 415-554-4367

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

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



Always Confirm the Location of Your Polling Place

**Many polling places have changed for the upcoming election!
Check the back cover of this pamphlet for your polling place address.**

On the back cover, you will find:

- **Your polling place address.** Please make a note of it. If you request 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 the Department of Elections website:
www.sfelections.org/toolkit.

If your polling place is not functionally accessible, you may 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 and 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 with the ballot.

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.



vote!

For more election information, visit
www.sfelections.org/toolkit



Early Voting in Person or by Mail

Voting in Person

You can vote on or before Election Day at City Hall, Room 48. Office hours for early voting are as follows:

- May 7–June 4, Monday through Friday (except holidays), 8 a.m. to 5 p.m.;
- May 26–27 and June 2–3, Saturday and Sunday, 10 a.m. to 4 p.m. (enter on Grove Street); and
- Election Day, Tuesday, June 5, 7 a.m. to 8 p.m.

Voting by Mail for This Election Only

Any voter may request a vote-by-mail ballot, in the following ways:

- Apply online at www.sfelections.org/toolkit.
- Complete the application on the back cover of this pamphlet, and mail it to the Department of Elections. You may also send a written request to the Department of Elections. Remember to include your home address, the address to which you want the ballot mailed, your birth date, your name and your signature. Mail your request to the address on the back cover of this pamphlet, or fax it to 415-554-4372. **All mailed or faxed requests must include your signature!**

The Department of Elections must receive your request before 5 p.m. on May 29. Your ballot will be mailed as soon as possible after your application has been processed.

When you receive your ballot, carefully read and follow the instructions provided with it. You may mail your voted ballot to the Department of Elections or drop it off at any San Francisco polling place on Election Day; remember to **sign and seal** the envelope. The Department of Elections **must** receive your ballot by 8 p.m. on Election Day, Tuesday, June 5.



Check the Status of Your Vote-by-Mail Ballot

You can check when your ballot was mailed or received by the Department of Elections. Visit our website, www.sfelections.org/toolkit, or call the Department of Elections at 415-554-4375.

Voting by Mail for All Elections

Any voter may request to be a permanent vote-by-mail voter. Once you become a permanent vote-by-mail voter, the Department of Elections will mail you a ballot automatically for every election.

To become a permanent vote-by-mail voter, complete the Vote-by-Mail Application on the back cover of this pamphlet, print an application from www.sfelections.org/toolkit, or call for an application at 415-554-4375. Before you return your completed application, **check the box that says “Permanent Vote-by-Mail Voter” and sign the application.**



Ballots will be mailed to permanent vote-by-mail voters starting May 7.

To find out if you are registered as a permanent vote-by-mail voter, check the back cover to see if “PERM” is printed on the Vote-by-Mail Application, use the Voter Registration Status Lookup tool on www.sfelections.org/toolkit, or call the Department of Elections at 415-554-4375. If you have not received your ballot by May 21, please call.

If you do not vote in four consecutive statewide general elections, you will no longer be a permanent vote-by-mail voter. However, you will remain on the voter roll unless the Department of Elections has been informed that you no longer live at the address at which you are registered. To regain your permanent vote-by-mail status, re-apply as described above.



Accessible Voting and Services for Voters with Disabilities

Accessible Formats of the Voter Information Pamphlet:

The Department of Elections offers the Voter Information Pamphlet in audio-cassette, audio CD and large-print formats. It is also available on our website in a format that can be used with a screen reader. To request a copy of this pamphlet in an accessible format, contact us through www.sfelections.org or call 415-554-4375.

Audiocassette 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. A Vote-by-Mail Application can be found on the back cover of this pamphlet, or completed online at www.sfelections.org/toolkit. For more information, see page 5.

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 5.

Access to the Polling Place: A “YES” or “NO” printed below the accessibility symbol on the back cover of this pamphlet indicates whether your polling place is 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 contact us through www.sfelections.org 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. 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 pollworker which 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 Hand-held Keypad: For audio voting, the accessible voting machine is equipped with headphones and a Braille-embossed hand-held keypad with keys coded by color and shape. The voting machine provides audio instructions to guide you through the ballot. The keypad is used 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 contact us through www.sfelections.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 pollworkers, into the voting booth for assistance in marking his or her ballot.

Curbside Voting: If a voter is unable to enter a polling place, pollworkers 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.



Instructions for Voting at Your Polling Place

Marking Your Ballot

Mark your paper ballot with the pen provided by the pollworkers. Connect the head and tail of the arrow pointing to your choice for each contest, as shown in the picture. The ballot may be printed on both sides of the page—be sure to review both sides.

Beware of the Overvote

The number of candidates you may select for each contest or choice will be printed above the list of candidate names for each contest. If you overvote by marking more than the allowed number of candidates for any choice, or by marking both “YES” and “NO” in a measure contest, your vote for that choice or contest cannot be counted.

Qualified Write-In Candidates

In addition to the candidates listed on the ballot, there may be other people running as qualified write-in candidates. For a list of qualified write-in candidates, please ask a pollworker. The list is posted on the Department of Elections website, www.sfelections.org, within two weeks prior to Election Day. Write-in votes can be counted only if they are for qualified candidates; “qualified” means that the person has submitted the appropriate documentation to run as a candidate for the office. For more information, see “Words You Need to Know.”

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 name in the space at the end of the candidate list and **complete the arrow** that points to the space.


If You Make a Mistake

Ask a pollworker for another ballot. Voters may request up to two replacement ballots.


To Record Your Vote

Insert your ballot, one card at a time, into the slot in the front of the “Insight” optical-scan voting machine. The ballot can be inserted into the voting machine in any direction. The voting machine counts the votes electronically as the ballot is inserted and then deposits the ballot in a locked compartment under the machine.

How to mark your choice:



How to vote for a qualified write-in candidate:





Voter Information Pamphlet and Sample Ballot – Opt Out/Opt In Form

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

Complete this form 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.



It is recommended to 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 and Sample Ballot

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

OPT IN: Restart mail delivery of the Voter Information 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.

PRINTED FULL NAME

RESIDENTIAL ADDRESS (NUMBER, STREET, APT/UNIT, ZIP CODE)

E-MAIL ADDRESS (NAME@DOMAIN.END) This e-mail 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, Room 48, San Francisco, CA 94102.



California's New "Top Two" or "Open" Primary Election System

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 offices, state 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 elections for county central committees are conducted.

What does this mean for voters?

All candidates running in a primary election for voter-nominated offices, regardless of their party preference, will appear on a single primary election ballot, and voters can vote for any candidate for:

- United States Senator
- United States Representative
- State Senator
- Member of the State Assembly

The two candidates who receive the most votes for each contest will move on to the general election in November.

Voters may vote for a qualified write-in candidate who is not listed on the ballot in the primary election. To advance to the general election for a voter-nominated office, a qualified write-in candidate must be one of the two candidates who receive the most votes in the primary election.

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 has a preference for a qualified political party, the party will be 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" will be 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 52 of this pamphlet.

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

Look at the back cover of this pamphlet. The party preference, or affiliation, that you chose when you registered to vote is printed near the center of the page. If you did not disclose a political party preference on your most recent voter registration, or if you selected a party that is not qualified to participate in this primary election, "*No Party Preference*" will be printed.

I am registered with a political party. What ballot will I receive?

You will receive a two-card ballot.

The first ballot card will list your party's candidates for President and county central committee (if applicable), and state and local ballot measures.

The second ballot card will list all candidates from all parties for the voter-nominated offices of United States Senator, United States Representative, State Senator, and Member of the State Assembly.

Your sample ballot may be found on the following pages:

- Voters registered with the American Independent Party: pages 12 and 48
- Voters registered with the Democratic Party: pages 16 and 48
- Voters registered with the Green Party: pages 20 and 48
- Voters registered with the Libertarian Party: pages 24 and 48
- Voters registered with the Peace and Freedom Party: pages 28 and 48
- Voters registered with the Republican Party: pages 32 and 48



Exception: The Americans Elect Party is not participating in the June 5, 2012, Presidential Primary Election. If you are registered with the Americans Elect Party, your ballot will not have candidates for President or your party's county central committee. Your sample ballot may be found on pages 44 and 48.

I am not registered with a political party. What ballot will I receive?

You will receive a two-card ballot.

For the first ballot card, you may choose one of three options. For the June 5, 2012, election, two parties allow voters with no party preference to participate in their Presidential primary. You may request to vote in one of these party primaries, or receive a ballot with no presidential contest:

- Option 1: the American Independent Party Presidential primary, and state and local ballot measures;
- Option 2: the Democratic Party Presidential primary, and state and local ballot measures; or,
- Option 3: the state and local ballot measures only.

If you vote on Election Day, you may request the ballot of your choice from a pollworker when you sign the roster. If you vote by mail, you may indicate your choice on the Vote-by-Mail Application on the back cover of this pamphlet. The Department of Elections must receive this application no later than 5 p.m. on May 29. If you do not request a specific party ballot, you will receive a ballot with state and local ballot measures and contests for voter-nominated offices only.

The second ballot card will list all candidates from all parties for the voter-nominated offices of United States Senator, United States Representative, State Senator, and Member of the State Assembly.

Your sample ballot choices may be found on the following pages:

- American Independent Party ballot: pages 36 and 48
- Democratic Party ballot: pages 40 and 48
- State and local ballot measures and voter-nominated offices only: pages 44 and 48

How can I change my party preference?

To change your registration in time for this election, you must complete and submit a voter registration card by May 21. You may download a registration card online at the California Secretary of State's website, www.sos.ca.gov. To request that a voter registration card be mailed to you, contact the Department of Elections through our website, www.sfelections.org, or call 415-554-4375. You may also fill out a voter registration card in person at the Department of Elections in City Hall.

Where can I find more information about the primary election?

For more information about the primary election, visit www.sfelections.org or the "Upcoming Elections" page on the California Secretary of State's website, www.sos.ca.gov.



Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs)

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 21, 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 www.sfelections.org/toolkit 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 or complete one online at www.sfelections.org/toolkit. 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 29, or
- **Vote in person** at the Department of Elections in City Hall, Room 48, during early voting hours (see inside back cover for dates and times).

Q: If I don't use an application, 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 29.

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: 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:

- Have completed your prison term for a felony, including any period of parole or supervised release.
- Are on federal or state probation.
- Are incarcerated in county jail as a condition of felony probation or as a result of a misdemeanor sentence.

Additionally, if you have been convicted of a misdemeanor, you can register and vote even while on probation, supervised release, or incarcerated in county jail.

After completing your prison term for a felony conviction, including any period of parole or supervised release, you

must complete and return a voter registration form to restore your right to vote. No other documentation is required.

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 21), 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 by the close of polls 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 on the Department of Elections website (www.sfelections.org/toolkit), 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. The application can be downloaded from www.fvap.gov or obtained from embassies, consulates or military voting assistance officers. Non-military U.S. citizens living abroad indefinitely can vote only in federal elections.

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. Pollworkers at the polling place will help you, or you may visit www.sfelections.org/toolkit or call the Department of Elections at 415-554-4375 for assistance on or before Election Day. (See page 8 for information about voting at your polling place.)

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.

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:

- Translated election materials: ballots, voter registration forms, voter notices, vote-by-mail ballot applications and instructions, and Voter Information Pamphlets.
- 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
- Instructional signs in English, Chinese and Spanish at all polling places on Election Day.
- Chinese and Spanish bilingual pollworker assistance at designated polling places on Election Day.
- Voter information in English, Chinese and Spanish on our website: www.sfelections.org/toolkit.

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：

- 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。
- 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。
- 在選務處網站(www.sfelections.org/toolkit_ch)提供中文選舉資料。

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 para los Electores en Español

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

- Materiales electorales traducidos incluyendo: 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.
- 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.
- Rótulos con instrucciones en español en los lugares de votación el Día de las Elecciones.
- Trabajadores electorales bilingües en los lugares de votación designados el Día de las Elecciones.
- Información electoral en nuestro sitio web en español: www.sfelections.org/toolkit_sp.

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 desea recibir un Folleto de Información para los Electores en español, por favor llame al 415-554-4366.



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)**.

California Secretary of State **Debra Bowen**

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.

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).

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 www.sos.ca.gov.



Pollworkers Are Needed for June 5, 2012, Election!

The Department of Elections is currently seeking pollworkers for the upcoming June 5, 2012, election.

It takes more than 2,000 pollworkers to conduct an election. Although the Department has already recruited many pollworkers, the Department is seeking to expand its pool of available workers for the 2012 election cycle.

Pollworkers operate polling places on Election Day, and assist voters in every part of the voting process. They must attend a training class prior to the election in which all duties are explained in detail. Lead pollworkers must also pick up materials before Election Day and transport them to their assigned polling place on the morning of the election.

Applicants must be United States citizens, age 18 or older, and registered to vote in California. **All positions are one-day assignments and pay between \$125 and \$170.**

Individuals interested in serving as pollworkers may complete the online application at www.sfelections.org/pw.

We look forward to having you join our pollworker team!



Ballot Worksheet

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

Not all voters will be eligible to vote on all party contests. Your sample ballot includes the contests for which you are eligible to vote. For more information see your sample ballot.

OFFICES

PARTY-NOMINATED OFFICES: ▼ *Vote for one*

President of the United States _____

VOTER-NOMINATED OFFICES: ▼ *Vote for one*

United States Senator _____

United States Representative _____

State Senator _____

Member, State Assembly _____

Members, County Central Committee ▼

The spaces below allow for the maximum number of County Central Committee candidates for which any voter may vote. Please refer to your sample ballot for the number of candidates for which you may vote.

_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

PROPOSITIONS

TITLE:	YES	NO
28: Limits on Legislators' Terms in Office. Initiative Constitutional Amendment.		
29: Imposes Additional Tax on Cigarettes for Cancer Research. Initiative Statute.		
A: Garbage Collection and Disposal		
B: Coit Tower Policy		





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 ballots in this pamphlet. To find your sample ballot, please see the table of contents.

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 5, 2012, Consolidated Presidential Primary Election are:

State Senator, District 11

Harmeet K. Dhillon
Mark Leno

Member, State Assembly, District 17

Tom Ammiano
Jason P. Clark

Member, State Assembly, District 19

Michael Breyer
Matthew Del Carlo
James Pan
Phil Ting

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:

United States Senator

American Independent Party: Robert Lauten
Democratic Party: Dianne Feinstein
Libertarian Party: Gail K. Lightfoot
Peace and Freedom Party: Marsha Feinland
Republican Party: Elizabeth Emken

United States Representative, District 12

American Independent Party: John Dennis
Democratic Party: Nancy Pelosi
Green Party: Barry Hermanson
Republican Party: John Dennis

United States Representative, District 14

Democratic Party: Jackie Speier
Republican Party: Deborah "Debbie" Bacigalupi

State Senator, District 11

Democratic Party: Mark Leno
Republican Party: Harmeet K. Dhillon

Member of the State Assembly, District 17

Democratic Party: Tom Ammiano
Republican Party: Jason P. Clark

Member of the State Assembly, District 19

Democratic Party: Phil Ting



Candidates for United States Representative, District 12

JOHN DENNIS

My occupation is Independent Businessman.

My qualifications are:

San Franciscans, and all Americans, face an unprecedented combination of threats to their lives, livelihoods and liberties. The source of these threats is Washington, D.C.

Washington has become our national nightmare. It initiates wars without the consent of the people, crushes our economy with staggering debt, violates civil liberties, and creates inflation for the benefit of connected insiders, at the expense of the middle class, the elderly, and the poor.

Our current representatives are responsible for the mess we face. Their votes and "leadership" have created the debt, the wars, and the inflation. And they are eroding our civil liberties.

This year Congress passed the National Defense Authorization Act, which allows the military to arrest American citizens, on American soil, and detain them, indefinitely. This bill undermines the Posse Comitatus Act, the Fifth Amendment and the foundation of our legal system, habeas corpus.

Government's role is to protect and preserve your liberty, not destroy it. As your representative, I will fight for your rights, for your freedom, and against those who use government to enrich themselves and their supporters. I will work for an America whose government respects the individual.

Your choice is simple: reinforce the indefensible status quo, or support me, and, together, build a freer, more prosperous, fairer society for ourselves, our children and future generations of grateful Americans.

John Dennis

BARRY HERMANSON

My occupation is Community Organizer.

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, we need a real debate in 2012.

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.

My top issues:

1. **Military spending:** Our military budget is nearly equal to the amount spent by all of the other countries of the world combined. Why?
2. **Health Care:** We need Medicare for All. Everyone must be covered – no one left out.
3. **Jobs:** We need a new federal jobs program like Franklin Roosevelt's Works Progress Administration (WPA). Putting people back to work will build our economy.

What are your top 3?

A brief bio:

Current:

- Board Chair, 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

www.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:

For 25 years, I have been privileged to serve San Francisco in Congress. Job creation continues to be my top priority: working most recently to secure key investments to create jobs and invest in infrastructure projects such as the Central Subway, Doyle Drive, the Transbay Terminal, and high-speed rail.

Coming to Congress to fight HIV/AIDS, I worked tirelessly to pass and increase funding for the Ryan White CARE Act, expand access to Medicaid, and enact other initiatives assisting people living with HIV/AIDS.

Throughout my career, my efforts have led to the redevelopment and creation of affordable housing in neighborhoods from Visitacion Valley to North Beach, as well as provided supportive housing for people with HIV/AIDS, veterans and those transitioning from homelessness.

Together, we have made progress for all Americans. First among our achievements is historic health reform, insuring 32 million more Americans. We passed historic investments in education – from early childhood to college aid to lifetime learning – as well as clean energy and innovation, and initiatives to help small businesses, support veterans, and protect consumers. I will continue to fight all efforts to end collective bargaining.

Honoring the ideal of equality, we passed the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act to fight pay discrimination, and a fully-inclusive hate crimes bill, and ended the “Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell” policy. And now, we are working to pass ENDA and repeal the Defense of Marriage Act.

Thank you for the privilege of representing you in Congress. Today, I ask for your vote.

Nancy Pelosi

DAVID PETERSON

My occupation is Technology Professional.

My qualifications are:

America needs stronger Democratic leadership! I’ll sponsor legislation that brings positive change to our community. We can’t send incumbents back to Washington D.C., if we want to fix what’s wrong with government. We need to rebuild the reputation of Congressional Democrats and stop collusion with Republican corrupt policies. I’ll support President Obama’s end to Republican crony contracts.

Wall Street conducted the largest financial fraud since the 1920’s, but no one’s been prosecuted. Elect David Peterson, MBA to congress and let’s get the money back from the crooks! Financial schemes are the greatest threat to our economy and future. I’ll champion legislation to diversify the financial industry and protect our homes.

The endless campaign for war is a symptom of War Profiteers, who spend billions on bribes, and lobbyist. I’ll reduce such government contractors. The greatest threat to national security -> War Profiteers.

My career has been building Accountability systems for Fortune 500 companies, improving performance by billions. Applied to Congress, we can save trillions. We need sustainable growth not bubble-and-bust crony policies.

We need new leadership to halt the war on women. Yesterday’s congress made bad laws. \$450 million spent for Abstinence; result 70,000 unwanted pregnancies. I’ll spend on contraceptives and education.

I’ll reverse DOMA & enable religious freedom. Our liberty demands government pass no law prohibiting free exercise of marriage.

Wind, Solar and Hydrogen Electric are the future. We need Greener leadership for better energy policy, to reverse laws which limit green energy & build incentives for green production.

David Peterson



Candidates for United States Representative, District 12

SUMMER JUSTICE SHIELDS

My occupation is Political Activist.

My qualifications are:

My policy is almost as short and sweet as President Abraham Lincoln's "old lady's dance." I favor the immediate removal of Obama from office and his replacement with a real democratic presidential alternative, the implementation of the Glass-Steagall separation of commercial from investment banking, and the conversion of the privately owned Federal Reserve system into a publicly controlled, Hamiltonian third national bank of the United States, which would issue federal funds for both immediate financial relief to our bankrupt states and for the vast long term industrial development and employment of this nation (i.e. construction of the North American Water and Power Alliance).

War, insofar as it has existed previously, is no longer necessary nor feasible. Rather, we require a Franklin Roosevelt "good neighbor" policy for the nations that inhabit this planet. One billion people go hungry in this world every day. The moral test for this nation will be lifting the lowest people to a remarkably higher standard of living. Therefore, we need a real mission for mankind: I favor a manned space program in the tradition of John F. Kennedy and am calling for cooperation with Russia and China to explore the Solar System and beyond--only by pushing the frontiers of knowledge can we solve the problems facing us today. I am committed to making San Francisco the "Pacific Gateway," stretching out its hand across the ocean to our neighbors in Asia and leading the world in real, long-term economic cooperation.

summer@summershields.com
summershields.com

Summer Justice Shields

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Statements are printed as submitted. Spelling and grammatical errors have not been corrected.



Candidates for United States Representative, District 14

JACKIE SPEIER

My occupation is Congresswoman.

My qualifications are:

It is a privilege to serve you in Congress. I mean it. We've had some tough years but we are tougher. My first priority is getting people back to work and righting the economy. Through my Job Hunters Boot Camps, more than 2,000 constituents have received assistance. Our children must not be strangled by a national debt that we were gutless in bringing under control. As a member of the Armed Services Committee, I will work to accelerate our withdrawal from Afghanistan. I will also demand that our defense department is stripped of fat and sacred cows. I will continue to protect Social Security and Medicare and prevent any efforts to voucher the Medicare system. Whether it is holding PG&E accountable for the tragedy in San Bruno or the Defense Department in properly handling military rape cases, I will not flinch from my responsibility to do what's right. Safeguarding victims of mortgage abuse, ensuring everyone's access to healthcare despite pre-existing conditions, and ensuring the access of veterans to services are also priorities. I respectfully request your vote for a renewed chance to move America further along the path of shared prosperity. Please visit www.jackieforcongress.com.

Jackie Speier

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency. Statements are printed as submitted. Spelling and grammatical errors have not been corrected.



Candidates for State Assembly, District 17

TOM AMMIANO

My occupation is Member, California State Assembly.

My qualifications are:

It's been an honor to serve in the State Assembly and fight for Californians during the worst economic crisis in decades. My priority has been to save funding for schools, healthcare, child care, and local services.

As Public Safety Chair, the landmark Seth's Anti-Bullying Law was signed into law. I also championed sensible drug policy and held the first public hearing on legalizing marijuana.

I am proud to receive a 100% score from the Consumer Federation of California and the California League of Conservation Voters.

Next term, I will work for passage of the Domestic Workers Bill of Rights, giving basic labor protections to domestic workers; passage of legislation permitting local jurisdictions to opt out of the Secure Communities Program, a program leading us in the opposite direction of a workable solution for our broken immigration system; close Proposition 13 corporate loopholes; and passage of legislation for tenant eviction protections.

Please join my supporters:

Sierra Club
United Educators of San Francisco
California Nurses Association
California Teachers Association
San Francisco Firefighters
California Professional Firefighters
California Association of Professional Scientists
Harvey Milk LGBT Democratic Club
Attorney General Kamala Harris
State Senator Mark Leno
Assemblymember Fiona Ma
Board of Equalization Member Betty Yee
City Attorney Dennis Herrera
Assessor Phil Ting
Treasurer Jose Cisneros
School Board Member Sandra Lee Fewer
School Board Member Kim-Shree Maufas
John Burton, Chair, California Democratic Party
Aaron Peskin, President, San Francisco Democratic Party
Tim Paulson, Executive Director, San Francisco Labor Council
Conny Ford, VP Political Activities, San Francisco Labor Council

www.tomammiano.com

Tom Ammiano

JASON P. CLARK

My occupation is General Counsel.

My qualifications are:

My name is Jason P. Clark and I want to be your next Assemblyman.

As a native Californian, Cal graduate, practicing attorney, and resident of Cole Valley I am asking for your support and your vote this June.

I am running to give voice to tens of thousands of San Franciscans who feel that their needs and concerns are being ignored in Sacramento.

I will work closely with our diverse communities and unique neighborhoods to be the voice for homeowners in the Portola and West of Twin Peaks; small businesses and start up companies throughout the district; the vibrant immigrant communities in Chinatown, the Tenderloin and South of Market, the Inner Mission, and the Excelsior, the Black communities in Bayview Hunters Point and the Western Addition, and the LGBT community of which I am a proud member.

I will work within my Party to help create an urban agenda and will reach across the aisle to find common ground so we can move California forward.

My priorities are to create hundreds of thousands of private sector jobs for Californians, provide relief for homeowners and first time home buyers, put California's fiscal house in order, and reform how the State does business so that taxpayers get the biggest bang for their bucks.

It is time for new ideas, new energy, and new leadership to break the gridlock in Sacramento. Please visit my website at www.jasonclark2012.com to learn more about my qualifications and goals.

Sincerely,

Jason P. Clark



Candidates for State Assembly, District 19

MICHAEL BREYER

My occupation is Small Businessperson / Entrepreneur.

My qualifications are:

Sacramento is a mess. Democrats and Republicans lock horns – neither side willing to give an inch. Career politicians either don't understand how to get things done – or they're afraid of the consequences of compromise.

I'm committed to finding innovative solutions to make government work better for all of us. I'll bring an outsider's perspective and proven business experience to reform Sacramento. I'll focus on improving funding for our schools, cutting red tape to allow businesses to expand, and protecting our environment here in San Mateo County.

I know how to break through barriers. I founded a company that launched the world's first public WiFi network in a San Francisco courthouse – and shortly thereafter in San Mateo County. We broadcast trials, increasing accountability in the courts, educating students about the judiciary, and opening up the judicial process to the public – while creating jobs.

My family has a long history of public service. My great-grandfather served on the Board of Supervisors and my grandfather was the lawyer for the San Francisco School Board for 41 years. At the kitchen table, I learned about ethics and integrity from my father who currently serves as a Supreme Court Justice.

I've been active in local politics, founding the "Draft Ed Lee" campaign, working to elect Barack Obama, and serving on the Library Commission, helping rebuild libraries to meet our community's educational needs.

In Sacramento, your voice will be my voice. Together, we'll bring a fresh perspective and fresh ideas to solving problems.

I ask for your vote.

www.ElectMichaelBreyer.com

Michael Breyer

PHIL TING

My occupation is Assessor.

My qualifications are:

We need more than talk to rebuild a strong economy – we need action now.

I have already taken action to balance budgets, create jobs, increase revenue through trade, protect homeowners from fraud and make our government more efficient and responsive. I'm proud to have:

- Created high-wage jobs by co-founding GoSolarSF, the innovative solar incentive program that includes key local hire provisions.
- Expanded the trade program that helps bring high-wage jobs to San Francisco by attracting Pacific Rim companies.
- Commissioned the nation's first real study of mortgage fraud that has spurred action to protect homeowners from wrongful foreclosure.
- Generated nearly \$300 million in new revenue – without raising taxes – by closing loopholes and bringing the important city agency that I took over into the 21st century.
- Founded the citizen action group Reset San Francisco that is fighting for more responsive policies, from greater access to the online economy to parking policies that don't unfairly target hard-working families.

From my private sector work helping large organizations become more responsive to customers to my background in higher education administration and in local government – I have the experience to drive change in Sacramento.

Please join our campaign to create high-wage jobs, improve our public schools and protect access to affordable higher education at www.PhilTing.com.

And please join our growing coalition, including:

Assemblymember Fiona Ma
California Teachers Association
San Francisco Fire Fighters Local 798
San Francisco Police Officers Association
San Francisco Deputy Sheriffs' Association
California Democratic Party

Phil Ting

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency. Statements are printed as submitted. Spelling and grammatical errors have not been corrected.



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 85.

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 in 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

Commercial value (Proposition A): Monetary worth, the ability to be sold for money.

Compostables (Proposition A): Organic matter that will decay over time, such as food scraps, food-soiled paper or plants.

Declaration of policy (Proposition B): A statement or expression of the will of the voters.

Garbage (Proposition A): Trash, recyclables or compostables.

Initiative (Propositions A and B): A proposition placed on the ballot by voters. Any voter may place an initiative on the ballot by gathering the required number of valid signatures on a petition.

Ordinance (Proposition A): A local law passed by the Board of Supervisors or by the voters.

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

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

Qualified write-in candidate (Frequently Asked Questions): 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 the specific ballot instructions. The Department of Elections counts write-in votes only for qualified write-in candidates.

Rate Board (Proposition A): Consists of the Controller, City Administrator and General Manager of Public Utilities Commission and sets the rates for residential garbage collection.

Rate Tables (Proposition A): Prices charged for garbage services. The Rate Board sets the Rate Tables for residential garbage services. There are separate Uniform Commercial Rates.

Recovery and processing (Proposition A): sorting of recyclable materials.

Recyclables (Proposition A): Materials that can be reused or processed to make new items, such as metal, paper, glass and some plastics.

Trash (Proposition A): Refuse or solid waste that cannot be recycled or composted.

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 5 for more information.

WPA-era (Proposition B): A period of time in U.S. history – approximately 1933-1943 – marked by the Great Depression and the government's efforts through the New Deal to combat chronic unemployment. WPA stands for "Works Progress Administration," a New Deal agency which employed millions of Americans to carry out public works projects, including construction of public buildings and roads as well as large arts projects.



A

Garbage Collection and Disposal

Shall the City use a competitive bidding process to award five separate agreements for trash and recycling services; require that garbage processing and transfer facilities be owned by the City and located in San Francisco; require the Board of Supervisors to approve maximum rates for garbage services; and allow the Board of Supervisors to make future amendments that advance the purposes of this ordinance without further voter approval?

YES  
NO  

Digest by the Ballot Simplification Committee

The Way It Is Now: Any company that collects, disposes of or transports garbage (trash, recyclables or compostables without commercial value) in San Francisco must have a City-issued permit. Each permit authorizes collection in a specific area of the City. A single company currently holds all the permits. The City does not use a competitive process to select providers. These providers are required to implement the City's zero-waste goals for recycling and composting.

Rates for collection are set as follows:

- For residential properties, the City's Rate Board sets the rates.
- For commercial properties, under current law, the City does not set the rates. In practice, rates are determined by the provider, generally based on rate tables established by the Rate Board. Services are agreed upon by the owner and the provider.

Currently the City does not own or lease the processing and transfer facilities. These facilities are in San Francisco.

The Proposal: Proposition A would require the City to replace its permit system with a competitive bidding process. Under that process, the City would competitively award five separate agreements for the following services:

- residential collection of trash, recyclables and compostables;
- commercial collection of trash, recyclables and compostables;
- recovery and processing of recyclables and compostables;
- transportation to disposal sites outside the City; and

- disposal of remaining waste.

The measure would require that the City own the processing and transfer facilities used under these agreements and that they be located in San Francisco.

Each agreement would be for a 10-year term and would be citywide. The measure would prohibit a single company from providing both recycling recovery services and garbage disposal services.

Proposition A would require the competitive bidding process for garbage and recycling services to give priority to the following factors: zero-waste goals that maximize recycling; competitive rates; welfare of workers in the industry; and recovery of the City's costs for bidding and administering the program. It would also require the process to give preference to bidders that use small businesses and hire City residents.

Proposition A would require the Board of Supervisors to approve the maximum rates that residential and commercial customers could be charged for trash and recycling services.

Proposition A would authorize the Board of Supervisors to make future amendments to this ordinance, without further voter approval, to advance the purposes and principles of the measure.

A "YES" Vote Means: If you vote "yes," you want to require the City to use a competitive bidding process to award five separate agreements for trash and recycling services, require that processing and transfer facilities be owned by the City and located in San Francisco, require the Board of Supervisors to approve maximum rates for garbage services, and allow the Board of Supervisors to make future amendments that advance the purposes of this ordinance without further voter approval.

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

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

Arguments for and against this measure immediately follow. The full text begins on page 85.
Some of the words used in the ballot digest are explained on page 63.



Controller's Statement on "A"

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

Should the proposed initiative ordinance be adopted, in my opinion, there could be costs and benefits to the City. The impacts would vary depending on how the City implements the ordinance and on the outcome of contracting and rate-setting processes for garbage collection and disposal.

The ordinance makes changes to how the City contracts for and regulates rates for garbage collection, recycling, waste reduction and disposal. These changes include requiring separate competitively bid contracts or franchises for five specified areas of waste services, administering new rate-setting and complaint processes and conducting analysis. These new requirements would significantly increase the City's costs to administer garbage collection, waste reduction and disposal processes. However, the ordinance also generally provides that the City's costs may be recovered through residential and commercial garbage rates and through franchise fees charged to garbage companies. The proposal's intent is that competitive bidding processes will reduce the costs and rates for garbage services. The City currently pays Recology approximately \$5.6 million annually for waste and recycling services in City-owned buildings, parks and public spaces. To the degree that the proposal achieves rate reduction, the City's costs for these services would be lowered.

The proposal's most significant costs would occur under a requirement for publicly-owned garbage collection, processing and transfer facilities within the City limits by December 2018. The initiative specifies that these facilities must be publicly owned and privately operated under public-private partnerships. Until plans are developed, the financing methods, costs or revenues for such facilities cannot be estimated, however, the range would be in the tens of millions of dollars.

Specific costs or savings cannot be determined at this time for other objectives under the ordinance such as increasing competition for garbage services, creating jobs and minimizing environmental impacts. This statement does not address the potential impact of this proposal on the local economy or businesses.

How "A" Got on the Ballot

On August 15, 2011, the Department of Elections certified that the initiative petition calling for Proposition A to be placed on the ballot had a sufficient number of valid signatures to qualify the measure for the ballot.

7,168 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 2007. A review of all signatures submitted by the proponents of the initiative petition prior to the February 6, 2012, 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.

Arguments for and against this measure immediately follow. The full text begins on page 85.
Some of the words used in the ballot digest are explained on page 63.



Proponent's Argument in Favor of Proposition A

Vote YES on Prop A!

Proposition A is not about Recology, it's about competitive bidding: how City Hall does business. This measure addresses a number of issues found in two City-commissioned studies in 2011:

We pay too much for our garbage and recycling services. Our residential rates have gone up 136% in the last 11 years!

San Jose pays less than half of what we do for the same services – with more people and a much larger land area. (San Jose has competitive bidding after catching Recology in a bribery scandal with their mayor in 2006.)

We don't even have a contract for garbage and recycling services.

We are the *only* Bay Area city that doesn't have a franchise agreement or competitive bidding for such services. Commercial rates are *completely* unregulated.

The city does not receive a franchise fee for garbage services, leaving a huge hole in our city budget.

Oakland gets \$24 million each year to support city services and city jobs, from an \$80 million contract. San Franciscans pay \$220 million in services, and we get *nothing* as a franchise fee. That means city services get cut, workers get laid off, taxes and fees are raised –

while Recology makes whatever profits they choose!

Recology's transfer station sits next door to people's homes.

It's in a neighborhood where the average life expectancy is 14 years shorter than on Russian Hill. Proposition A moves the transfer station to vacant public land at the Port, which is better for competitively bid lower rates and safe environmental handling of our refuse.

Two 2011 City government-initiated studies recommend considering competitive bidding for garbage and recycling services. This measure does that; it's the only way to break up the garbage monopoly.

Vote YES on Prop A!

Tony Kelly

Quentin L. Kopp

Rebuttal to Proponent's Argument in Favor of Proposition A

The Proponents of Prop A have made a series of false accusations and factual errors in their argument. We urge a NO vote on Prop A.

The facts:

1. The current system works. San Francisco was recently named the "Greenest City in North America" while maintaining average or below average rates for garbage service in the Bay Area, according to the official 2011 Local Agency Formation Commission report.
2. Voters created the nonpartisan rate board to set garbage rates and have twice rejected similar misguided attempts to dismantle the system that works so well for us.
3. San Francisco's relationship with Recology built our city's recycling and composting system from the ground up -- we have the highest recycling rate of any major city in North America.
4. Today, Recology provides \$31,200,000 in fees and free services. Prop A replaces the existing nonpolitical rate board, creating five separate contracts that the

Controller says "would significantly increase the City's costs."

5. Proposition A does not require moving a transfer station to the Port or guarantee lower garbage or recycling fees.

6. San Jose's rates are almost identical to ours--and a judge dismissed the politically motivated charges.

We stand behind San Francisco based and employee owned Recology, our garbage and recycling service. Recology is on track to achieving Zero Waste by 2020. Why mess with such a successful system?

Vote No on Prop A.

Jim Lazarus

*Vice President, San Francisco Chamber of Commerce**

Tim Paulson

*Executive Director, San Francisco Labor Council**

*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.



Opponent's Argument Against Proposition A

We are Recology. We live here, we work here, we're the employee-owners of Recology -- the garbage and recycling company that has worked to ensure San Francisco is now the "Greenest City in the Country," according to the *International Green City Index*.

You know us. We collect your garbage, we stand on the recycling lines day in, day out. We built San Francisco's recycling system, so today our city boasts the highest recycling rate in the country. Sometimes it's a dirty job, but we are proud of what we do.

That's why we urge you to Vote NO on A. With so many critical issues facing our city, does the way San Francisco collects and recycles garbage need to be changed? Does change really make sense just because some special interests want it?

Think about it. Would breaking up San Francisco's garbage and recycling services into 5 different contracts – allowing bids by the largest, least "green" companies in the nation—make any sense? There'd be new city bureaucracy. Which company would you call with a problem? Recology works hard, keeping up with the latest technologies to ensure San Francisco has the best available service and greenest future. We take the mandate to reach Zero Waste by 2020 seriously and so far we've accomplished what many said was impossible. That's why we are proud to tell you our story.

Please don't let huge multinational garbage companies that pollute elsewhere end the trust we've built and the success we've achieved together.

*Mike Sangiacomo, President, 29 years, Forest Hill**

*Ayanna Banks, Sorter, 12 years, Bayview**

*Ramiro Hurtado, Mechanic, 32 years, Mission**

*Thanh Trang, Sorter, 4 years, Sunset**

*Micah Gibson, Arts Program Coordinator, 3 years, Castro**

*Ryan McKee, Driver, 9 years, Richmond**

*Lana Yu, Customer Service, 10 years, Visitacion Valley**

www.keepSFgreen.com

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

Rebuttal to Opponent's Argument Against Proposition A

You've seen the ads.

There's only one big company in the Proposition A campaign, and that's Recology.

The garbage monopoly is spending millions of dollars — ratepayer dollars! — to protect their profits and their privilege to raise our rates as much as they want.

They're spending millions because they don't want a contract in San Francisco. Recology won competitively bid contracts in 16 Bay Area cities. They pay franchise fees to those cities. Why can't they do that here?

The garbage monopoly is spending millions of dollars to scare you.

They claim that five different contracts for garbage services will mean more trucks on the road, but it won't. Three contracts don't involve local trucking at all. So two companies, at most, will be on the streets of San Francisco. Anyone who remembers Norcal and Sunset Scavenger trucks knows that isn't a problem.

They claim that competitive bidding will raise your rates with a new bureaucracy. But the old bureaucracy has raised our rates 136% in 11 years! It's obvious that

you will never be less protected against rate increases than you are right now.

They claim that another company will steal their business. But if Recology is anything like the company in their advertising, they will easily win every competitive bid they seek.

Every time you see an ad for Recology, think about what they're really buying with all that money.

What are they afraid of?

For Zero Waste in City government, Vote Yes on Proposition A.

www.competitivebiddingsf.com

Tony Kelly



Paid Argument IN FAVOR of Proposition A

Proposition A does NOT take San Francisco's trash and recycling services away from its current vendor.

It DOES prevent the creation of a monopoly that controls both the recycling and disposal of the City's trash - and ensures the selection of the most cost-effective **and** environmentally sound vendor.

Vote Yes on A!

San Francisco Tomorrow

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

Paid Argument IN FAVOR of Proposition A

What's the biggest threat to our City's Zero Waste goals? *Recology's monopoly.*

Think about it. Today, Recology has to pay somebody else for every bit of stuff dumped at the landfill. If they can recycle it somehow, they make more money.

But that changed last year, when the City gave the new landfill contract to Recology. Soon, there will be no financial incentive to avoid sending refuse to the dump. In fact, Recology could just send refuse wherever it makes the most money – either to recycling, or, to the landfill.

That is a serious threat to our Zero Waste goals. And that is why we shouldn't have a monopoly for garbage and recycling services.

Vote Yes on Proposition A to keep our City's Zero Waste goals.

www.competitivebiddingsf.com

Tony Kelly

The true source(s) of funds for the printing fee of this argument: Good Government Alliance Committee.

The submitter states that no contributions were received by the true source recipient committee during the six months immediately preceding submission of this ballot argument.

Paid Argument IN FAVOR of Proposition A

As a resident of both San Francisco and Yuba County, and as a member of YUGAG (Yuba Group Against Garbage), I urge you to vote YES on Proposition A.

Recology plans to dump San Francisco's non-recyclable trash in their landfill in Yuba County, one of the poorest counties in California. Their landfill sits over a high water table and is adjacent to walnut orchards and grain fields.

Closer to San Francisco is the Coast Range, where landfills are located away from high water tables and agricultural land. The landfill near Livermore, where Recology presently dumps our garbage, has space there for years to come, but Recology doesn't own that landfill.

So Recology hopes to transport our garbage twice as far to its own landfill in Yuba County. This landfill will become a mountain of garbage up to 15 stories high, separated from the soil and ground water by liners that are less than the thickness of a 25-cent coin.

It's wrong for a self-proclaimed Zero Waste company to dump our garbage in one of the poorest counties in the state. It's wrong for green San Francisco to have its garbage potentially endanger agricultural land and groundwater. That is what Recology is doing with the power and money granted to it by its monopoly in San Francisco. The residents of Wheatland, the town nearest the dump, and the nearby farmers (including me and my brother), whose groundwater and organic food may be polluted, have been united and vociferous in opposition to Recology's plans.

A competitive bidding process would be fairer to the people of San Francisco, and would safeguard Wheatland's water supply and Yuba County's agricultural land.

Please Vote YES on Prop A.

Irene Creps

Retired San Francisco public school biology teacher and organic farmer

The true source(s) of funds for the printing fee of this argument: Good Government Alliance Committee.

The submitter states that no contributions were received by the true source recipient committee during the six months immediately preceding submission of this ballot argument.

Paid Argument IN FAVOR of Proposition A

Proposition A gives San Franciscans, for the first time, the benefits of competitive bidding for garbage collection and recycling.

Two City-commissioned reports last year revealed that 71 Bay Area cities enjoy the benefits of competitive bidding or franchise agreements. We have neither; we have a monopoly emanating from an outdated 1932 ordinance, passed when 97 garbage collectors operated in different neighborhoods. *(Those 97 collectors have long since been absorbed by the monopoly.)*

Residential rates have soared 136% in the past 11 years, facilitated by an "independent" rate board of

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.

three mayoral appointees. For example: In 2001, the monopoly sought a 58% rate increase, while the City's staff recommended a 20% increase. ***The Director of Public Works at the time, Ed Lee, ignored his staff and gave the monopoly a 44% rate increase!***

We pay more than twice as much for garbage services as San Jose, a city with 1.1 million people.

The current monopoly bids for contracts in dozens of jurisdictions in the Bay Area and California; it can do so here as well for its \$220 million in services. But let's also allow similar businesses to compete, to furnish lower rates and equal or better services under regulations prepared by the Director of Public Works and our incorruptible City Budget Analyst. *(The Board of Supervisors does not set the rates under Prop A, the rates are set by the bid process itself.)*

Let's utilize unused Port land for the City's transfer station, not the beleaguered Visitacion Valley.

Vote YES on Prop A and allow competition to work for ratepayers.

West of Twin Peaks neighbors:

David Bisho

Walter Ferrell

Mara Kopp

Fred Martin

Alexa Vuksich

George Wooding

The true source(s) of funds for the printing fee of this argument: Good Government Alliance Committee.

The submitter states that no contributions were received by the true source recipient committee during the six months immediately preceding submission of this ballot argument.

Paid Argument IN FAVOR of Proposition A

Why should we move the City's transfer station to the Port? Because the City's transfer station – where garbage is processed and sent to the landfill – isn't the City's transfer station, it's Recology's. We pay for it with our ratepayer dollars, but it's on private land, right next door to people's homes in Visitacion Valley and Little Hollywood. Neighbors breathe in fumes from the City's garbage every day. ***And Recology is looking to expand the dump there!***

The transfer station should be on vacant public land at the Port – maybe at Pier 96, where Recology already handles recycling. ***(Recology claims that the Port's land might be seismically unstable, BUT they are there at Pier 96 right now!)***

The Port's land is far away from people's homes, and it creates a level playing field for competitive bidding.

The transfer station services aren't covered under the 1932 garbage ordinance, but they have never gone out to bid; and they never will if the station stays on private land.

Recology claims that it might cost hundreds of millions to move the dump to the port. **But the controller's own analysis in this handbook says the cost of the move would be "in the tens of millions of dollars" – that can be covered by just one or two years of franchise fees.**

Remember, Recology makes 220 million dollars every year from our services. They didn't get rich by covering construction costs themselves. **There is more than enough profit in Recology's income today to get a franchise fee, move to the Port, and still reduce customer rates.** Or, we can keep paying for a monopoly for years to come.

San Francisco's city dump should not be on private land, next door to people's homes. Vote Yes on Proposition A.

www.competitivebiddingsf.com

Tony Kelly

The true source(s) of funds for the printing fee of this argument: Good Government Alliance Committee.

The submitter states that no contributions were received by the true source recipient committee during the six months immediately preceding submission of this ballot argument.

Paid Argument IN FAVOR of Proposition A

San Francisco's Neighborhoods SUPPORT Prop A!

- ***Competitive bidding is the best way to protect our services and rates.***
It's the standard for every other contract at City Hall, so why not this one?
- The days of back room deals are over. Current city finances necessitate the most "bang for our buck!"
- Recology is spending millions against Prop A to protect and maintain its standing as the only game in town.
- Recology claims that the current system is "efficient." Efficient for whom? It efficiently gives Recology as much money as it wants! There is no accountability; Recology easily manipulates the city government.
- ***If Recology really is the best that there is, then it will easily win the competitive bidding.***

Give Recology the chance to prove itself: **Vote YES on Prop A!**



*Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods
Established 1972
48 neighborhood organizations*

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

End of Paid Arguments IN FAVOR of Proposition A

Paid Argument AGAINST Proposition A

CBSF OPPOSES PROPOSITION A

Recology is a home grown, employee-owned garbage, composting and recycling company that has provided dependable service with no interruptions to San Francisco for years.

If passed, Proposition A would move garbage rate setting power from the current non-elected rate board to the Board of Supervisors, empowering them to charge extraordinary additional fees. Additionally, if Proposition A were to pass, according to the City Controller, San Francisco would need to spend tens of millions of dollars to replicate the infrastructure owned by Recology.

The authors of Proposition A are risking the destruction of a historic, well-functioning San Francisco institution and elimination of the amazing accomplishments of one of the City's most successful local businesses.

Vote **NO** on Proposition A.

Citizens for a Better San Francisco (CBSF)

The true source(s) of funds for the printing fee of this argument: Citizens for a Better San Francisco (CBSF).

The three largest contributors to the true source recipient committee: 1. Edward Poole, 2. Michael Antonini, 3. Christine Hughes.

Paid Argument AGAINST Proposition A

The San Francisco Democratic Party asks you to vote NO on A.

Proposition A is bad for the environment and bad for local jobs.

Please join the San Francisco Democratic Party and vote No on A.

San Francisco Democratic Party

The true source(s) of funds for the printing fee of this argument: SF Democratic Party.

The three largest contributors to the true source recipient committee: 1. SEIU 1021, 2. Tom Amianno for Assembly, 3. Avalos for Mayor.

Paid Argument AGAINST Proposition A

Keep San Francisco Moving Towards Zero Waste

Here in San Francisco, we set a goal of achieving Zero Waste by 2020. San Francisco has consistently led the state in this goal. Last year, California raised the legal statewide goal of diverting waste from landfills from 50% to 75% by 2020, but we already reached over 75% in 2010, and are on track to reach our more ambitious goals by 2020.

These are ambitious standards, and from the start we've been told it couldn't be done, especially by a local, employee-owned company. But since we started the program, we've been consistently proving the critics wrong. San Francisco now recovers 78% of discarded material, a goal we met 2 years early. We're well on our way to Zero Waste, and the work done by Recology is a big reason why.

Proponents of Proposition A claim to embrace Zero Waste, but the measure they drafted could put in jeopardy the gains we have made in our successful system. We shouldn't try to fix a system that's far from broken- it's actually a catalyst moving us in the right direction.

Vote NO on Proposition A.

Californians Against Waste

Bob Besso

*Recycling and Waste Reduction Manager, Recology SF**

Ed Dunn

*Executive Director, Haight Ashbury Neighborhood Council Recycling Center**

Margot Lancellotti

*Parent and School Recycling Volunteer Coordinator**

*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: Keep San Francisco Green.

The two contributors to the true source recipient committee: Recology, Californians Against Waste.

Paid Argument AGAINST Proposition A

I came to San Francisco in 1941, and I have lived here ever since.

At the time, what we now call refuse, was called garbage. The people who picked it up every week in old trucks, some even in wagons driven by horses, were called “garbage men.” This was a San Francisco company whose owners and employees were San Franciscans. Seventy years later, the company is now called Recology. It is still a San Francisco company that is home-grown, home-owned, and employee-owned and runs the best recycling program in America.

I have seen first hand the growth of this company from being called Sunset Scavengers to now running America’s best recycling program and creating good jobs for San Francisco. Citizens have had a longstanding relationship with this company, and I am proud that the company has grown as the city has grown. I trust Recology, and I know that they have always provided San Francisco with great service, from the days they collected garbage to now the premier recycling operation.

Proposition A would put San Francisco’s progress at risk and install a confusing bureaucracy, which is a terrible idea. We don’t need our recycling and garbage to be split into five different contracts. If you have a problem, who would you call? Currently, you call Recology, as I have had an occasion to do, and the problem is solved. If I need special pick-ups, a phone call would take care of that. Our current system ensures San Francisco will continue to benefit from the growth of the recycling industry and the green-job sector and will keep our home-owned, home-grown, employee-owned company doing the work. Why would we want to mess with success. I urge a “No” vote on Proposition A.

John Burton
*Chairman, California 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: Keep SF Green.

The two contributors to the true source recipient committee: Recology, Californians Against Waste.

Paid Argument AGAINST Proposition A

Prop A is bad for our communities

From North Beach to the Bayview, from the Sunset District to the Mission and everywhere in between, San Franciscans know they can trust Recology to manage their waste. In fact, over 10,000 San Francisco residents and businesses have given the keys to their homes and businesses to their local garbage truck drivers to have their trash collected.

We can do that because we know that Recology’s drivers are members of our communities, are committed to providing good service, and can be relied upon to keep our trust. We’ve seen impressive levels of participation in Recology’s education, art and community service programs, which increase public engagement and enrich the lives of San Franciscans. Art and garbage may seem like a strange mix, but it’s just one more example of how San Francisco utilizes creativity and makes the most of our resources.

Recology provides great service to the City on the whole. Contrary to what proponents claim, they compensate San Francisco with \$31.2 million in fees and free services. That’s more than neighboring cities are getting, and it’s a good deal for us.

Proposition A tries to solve a problem that doesn’t exist, and won’t benefit the quality of life in our neighborhoods. Let’s say No to Proposition A and keep the system that works so well for our communities.

Vote NO on Proposition A

Steve Adams
*President, Merchants of Upper Market & Castro**

Chris Jackson
*Community College Board Trustee**

Mitchell Salazar
*Workforce Development Director, Mission Neighborhood Centers**

La Shon Walker
*Bayview Neighborhood Leader**

Jim Weixel
*President, Westside 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: Keep San Francisco Green.

The two contributors to the true source recipient committee: Recology, Inc., Californians Against Waste.



Paid Argument AGAINST Proposition A

BAD FOR SAN FRANCISCO

The people behind Proposition A want you to believe that their proposal is good for San Francisco, but that's just not the case.

We know the risk if this measure passes: Recology, an employee-owned and labor-friendly company, could be replaced by a multinational corporation from outside San Francisco. We'd have no commitment from that corporation towards protecting San Francisco's workforce and values. We also know that these corporations frequently underbid the contract, under-serve customers, and under-compensate their workforce.

That would be a disaster for San Francisco's garbage and recycling employees, many of whom could lose their jobs. It would also harm the City, which would be required to spend money to buy or build tens of millions of dollars worth of recycling and transfer facilities that already exist. In a time where we desperately need to protect vital services like education and healthcare from budget cuts, this is just a waste of resources.

Recology currently operates facilities in the City without passing costs on to San Francisco's budget. Recology also maintains some of the best labor and environmental standards in San Francisco, and they've produced some of the best results.

San Francisco should REWARD companies that employ local residents and have invested in San Francisco, not legislate them away at the ballot box.

Vote NO on Proposition A.

Petra DeJesus
*Police Commissioner**

Matt Dorsey
*Member, Democratic County Central Committee**

Gabriel Robert Haaland
*Past President, Harvey Milk LGBT Democratic Club**

Hene Kelly
*Vice President, California Alliance for Retired Americans**

Alix Rosenthal
*Member, Democratic County Central Committee**

*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: Keep SF Green.

The two contributors to the true source recipient committee: Recology, Californians Against Waste.

Paid Argument AGAINST Proposition A

PROPOSITION A INCREASES COSTS TO RATEPAYERS

Proposition A is a bad deal for San Francisco. Everyone from small business owners to homeowners to our largest companies will lose out under Proposition A. The language of the proposal is too loaded with costly clauses that could harm ratepayers, reduce service and backtrack on our recycling successes:

- The measure forces the City to buy or build new processing facilities – a needless expense that could cost the City and ratepayers tens of millions of dollars
- The measure requires new bureaucracy to administer competitive bidding and monitor companies granted contracts.
- The measure establishes five separate contracts for garbage services, which may create less efficient customer service.
- The measure requires collection companies to bid separately for commercial and residential contracts, potentially putting more trucks on the road and increasing operational costs and traffic.
- The measure removes the existing independent rate board that has kept rates low.

Recology charges average rates for commercial trash, but gives very large discounts to businesses that recycle, providing rates that are among the lowest in the Bay Area and encouraging businesses to recycle. Recology also provides the City with over \$30 million annually in fees and free services, so we're getting a fair deal.

It is clear that Proposition A is bad for San Francisco businesses, residents, and our City budget. It is needless attempt to replace a system that has proven to be good for ratepayers. Proposition A should be opposed by anyone who values our success.

Vote NO on Proposition A.

Jim Lazarus
*Vice President, San Francisco Chamber of Commerce**

David Heller
*Richmond Small Business Owner**

Inger Marie Davis
*Bernal Heights resident, Teacher and Ratepayer**

Art Swanson
*President, San Francisco Small Business Network**



*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: Keep SF Green.

The two contributors to the true source recipient committee: Recology, Californians Against Waste.

Paid Argument AGAINST Proposition A

VOTE “NO” ON PROPOSITION A

Proposition A appears to be a costly power grab being inaccurately promoted as a competitive bidding initiative. Please join me in opposing Proposition A.

THE FACTS:

Proposition A would remove a garbage distribution system that has produced America’s highest percentage of recycled and composted material as an amount of total refuse.

Proposition A replaces the present nonpolitical rate setting board, which has kept rates down while insuring very high service levels, *instead giving rate responsibility to the San Francisco Board of Supervisors*. It further allows the Board to establish additional new fees on our garbage service.

Proposition A was placed on the ballot by people with no experience in the disposal industry and is being funded by competing industry interests.

Proposition A requires San Francisco to spend a significant amount of City funds, potentially in the tens of millions of dollars, to build or purchase facilities that duplicate the present existing, successfully functioning, privately owned infrastructure.

Proposition A could replace *Recology – our San Francisco born and based, employee owned garbage, recycling and composting company*, a majority of whose employees reside in San Francisco – with huge national garbage companies who have no connection or commitment to San Francisco. Recology was formed, over the last century, by the cooperative coordination of close to one hundred individual scavengers who combined their efforts.

Proposition A would fractionalize a very efficient, smooth system that provides all phases of the refuse operation, splitting services over as many as five different non coordinated companies that could only produce duplication and raise costs.

Proposition A is a non functional solution searching for a problem.

SAVE MONEY AND LOCAL JOBS – VOTE “NO” ON PROPOSITION A

Michael Antonini

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

The two contributors to the true source recipient committee: Recology, Inc., Californians Against Waste.

Paid Argument AGAINST Proposition A

Prop A is Bad for the Environment

Proposition A could put environmental progress at risk and threaten San Francisco’s reputation as an innovative recycling leader.

San Francisco currently has the best record of any major city in the nation on environmental issues, and recently was named the “Greenest City in North America.” Our city boasts a 78% diversion rate because our policies foster environmental innovation and because Recology, a local employee-owned company, has demonstrated extraordinary innovation managing recycling, compost and garbage services. This is why we are on the path to Zero Waste by 2020.

Proposition A jeopardizes innovation and guts the very system that fosters our progress. Proposition A increases the complexity of waste services, making it more difficult for the City to ensure that important environmental mandates are followed. Today, the Department of the Environment keeps a close watch over a productive relationship with Recology. With the competitive bidding process and divided service areas of Proposition A, the Board of Supervisors will award five contracts to corporations who may have little commitment to recycling and composting and are headquartered in other states.

Proposition A could increase the number of garbage trucks on the road by separating residential and commercial contracts. Currently, Recology goes above and beyond by using “green” trucks. Under Proposition A, traffic could increase, air quality could decline and we could lose a great partner that helps us protect the environment.

We are at a critical point in our efforts to achieve Zero Waste by 2020, and we can’t let this poorly crafted measure get in the way. Proposition A is a step backwards for environmental policy with no identifiable benefits.

Protect the environment. Vote NO on Proposition A.

*Angelo King,
Commissioner, Commission on the Environment**

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.



*Leah Pimentel,
Commissioner, Local Agency Formation Commission**

*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: Keep San Francisco Green.

The two contributors to the true source recipient committee: Recology, Californians Against Waste.

Paid Argument AGAINST Proposition A

We would support Proposition A if it were about competitive bidding, but it isn't. It is a convoluted, difficult-to-administer scheme.

It puts the Board of Supervisors in charge of the rates and gives the Supervisors the power to amend this ordinance without voter approval.

Proposition A requires The City to own the processing and transfer facilities used by the contractors.

Proposition A, for no good reason, requires City Hall to administer five separate contracts rather than one. City Hall could potentially have to monitor the performance of five separate companies. There is no economic benefit to the ratepayers.

Vote NO on Proposition A.

*San Francisco Republican Party
www.sfgop.org*

*Executive Committee
Harmeet K. Dhillon, Chairwoman
Keith Larkin, VC Finance
Rodney Leong, VC Special Events
Alisa Farenzena, VC Volunteer Operations
Howard Epstein, VC Communications
Sarah Vallette, VC Political Affairs
Richard Worner, Treasurer*

*Members
Michael Antonini
Rudy Asercion
William Bowen
Brooke Chappell
Stephanie Jeong
David Robert Kiachko
Joane Leone*

*Alternate(s)
Christopher L. Bowman*

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

The three largest contributors to the true source recipient committee: 1. Charles Munger, 2. Howard Leach, 3. Harmeet Dhillon.

Paid Argument AGAINST Proposition A

PROTECT LOCAL JOBS - VOTE NO ON A

San Francisco has the best waste collection, recycling and composting program in the country and we are on our way to meeting the City's Zero Waste goals. Why? Because of a historical partnership between residents, our local employee owned garbage company and the City's independent rate board.

Let's not replace today's fairly priced, environmentally sound garbage collection system with a hodge-podge of programs operated by up to five separate companies, with a new city bureaucracy, all under the control of the Board of Supervisors.

Keep garbage collection and recycling a service provided by San Franciscans, for San Franciscans. Vote No on A.

*Laborers Local 261
San Francisco Building Owners and Managers Association
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce*

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

Paid Argument AGAINST Proposition A

SAVE LOCAL JOBS: VOTE NO ON PROP A

Make no mistake -- Proposition A is a job killer for the Bayview. We stand united in our opposition to Proposition A.

San Francisco's recycling system has produced the best recycling rate in the nation and, in the process, has put our kids to work with a company that reflects the value of our community. Recology is a local, employee-owned company that was built from the ground up right here in San Francisco, and is a reliable source of green collar local-hire jobs for residents of the Bayview. 100% of the employee-owners working at the recycling center are hired from the community surrounding the facility. Recology demonstrated dedication to local-hire long before anyone even discussed the idea.

Recology has helped San Francisco toward our goal of Zero Waste by 2020. In the process, it created hundreds of new jobs for our community members, setting them on a life path very different from the one they entered on. Moreover, studies have shown that there are nearly 20 times more jobs created from recycling and composting than by sending waste to landfill.

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.

Proposition A jeopardizes all that has been built. It jeopardizes our highly efficient and environmentally friendly service that has made this City the envy of all others. It jeopardizes the jobs of Recology's employee-owners. It jeopardizes all this by opening the door wide open to big, multinational corporations who don't share our values.

Recology's employee-owners live, work and play in our neighborhoods -- we see them at church, serving community non-profits, and shopping in our stores. *Don't let Proposition A put these employees out of work.*

Vote NO on Proposition A.

*Reverend Henry Davis
Reverend Gary Banks
Rudy Asercion, West Bay Pilipino Multi-Service*

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

The two contributors to the true source recipient committee: Recology, Inc., Californians Against Waste.

Paid Argument AGAINST Proposition A

San Francisco has always thrived thanks to our proven record as a center for innovation. As elected leaders of the City, it is our imperative to encourage continued investment and innovation, right here in San Francisco.

That's why we oppose Proposition A, which could end our partnership with Recology and outsource our garbage and recycling services. Over the years, San Francisco and Recology have worked hand-in-hand to develop the programs that recycle the vast majority of our waste, while maintaining rates at the same level as other comparable cities. We've wildly exceeded expectations, and have made San Francisco the greenest city in North America.

These programs worked so well because Recology is locally-owned and operates its facilities in the City, creating jobs and strengthening our communities. We're proud that so many Recology employees are also San Francisco residents, serving the communities in which they and their families live. And we know that's why 10,000 San Francisco residents and businesses have given their Recology collector keys to their property so their waste can be more easily accessed.

We have a lot of work to do towards spurring job growth and improving our neighborhoods, and Proposition A would just be a step in the wrong direction.

Vote NO on Proposition A

*State Senator Mark Leno
Assemblywoman Fiona Ma
Board of Supervisors President David Chiu
Supervisor Eric Mar
Supervisor Scott Wiener
Former Supervisor Leslie Katz*

The true source(s) of funds for the printing fee of this argument: Keep SF Green.

The two contributors to the true source recipient committee: Recology, Californians Against Waste.

Paid Argument AGAINST Proposition A

Prop A is an Attack on San Francisco Jobs

Proposition A is a direct attack on the men and women who collect this city's garbage and recycling. These men and women work long, hard hours at a difficult job and provide a great service to this city.

Recology is a unique, local company that is owned entirely by its employees. As a major job provider in San Francisco, Recology has some of the best Labor practices in San Francisco. They embody San Francisco and Labor values. Their employees benefit from fair wages and benefits that all workers deserve, but many still do not have. From local-hire to employment practices that honor domestic partnerships, Recology has been a leader and a partner in the San Francisco Labor movement for generations and their example advances the cause of workers everywhere.

The programs that have been developed by Recology and the City of San Francisco are the envy of the world. These programs have been and should be applauded, but we must not forget about the men and women who work very hard to make them exceptional.

Proposition A not only abandons the progress that has been made in San Francisco, but it also jeopardizes the commitments made to generations of workers. Proposition A opens the door to multinational corporations who have proven to underbid, underservice and undercompensate its workforce.

Vote NO on Proposition A.

*Mike Casey
President, San Francisco Labor Council**

*Dean Varni,
Teamsters Local 350**

**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: Keep San Francisco Green.

The two contributors to the true source recipient committee: Recology, Californians Against Waste.



Paid Argument AGAINST Proposition A

Here in San Francisco, we've become accustomed to high-quality service in our neighborhoods, all performed at reasonable, predictable rates. These services are currently being provided by a single company, Recology, which has earned the trust of San Francisco residents and set a high standard for efficiency and professionalism.

Instead of fees kept low by the independent rate board, Proposition A could result in higher rates and increased fees. Additionally, this measure could put in jeopardy nearly 900 local, good-paying San Francisco jobs.

Proposition A is fiscally irresponsible and offers nothing but uncertainty to San Francisco.

Vote NO on Proposition A

State Senator Leland Yee
Assemblywoman Fiona Ma
Supervisor Eric Mar

Mary Jung
*Member, Democratic County Central Committee**

Marily Mondejar
*President, Filipina Women's Network**

*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: Keep SF Green.

The two contributors to the true source recipient committee: Recology, Californians Against Waste.

B

Coit Tower Policy

Shall it be City policy to strictly limit commercial activities and private events at Coit Tower, and to use funds from Coit Tower concession operations on the Coit Tower murals, building, and Pioneer Park?

YES
NO

Digest by the Ballot Simplification Committee

The Way It Is Now: Coit Tower is a San Francisco landmark built in 1933. The tower is located in Pioneer Park at the top of Telegraph Hill. It contains historic WPA-era murals.

The City's Recreation and Park Department manages Coit Tower and Pioneer Park. The City's Arts Commission is responsible for maintaining the murals inside Coit Tower but has no dedicated funds for doing so.

Under a long-standing agreement with the City, a private company runs concession operations at Coit Tower that include a food and beverage stand, gift store, the elevator and the right to operate special events. The City may spend the money it receives from this agreement for any City purpose. The City allocates this money each year to the Recreation and Park Department. Recently, the Department has committed to making a \$250,000 contribution to the Arts Commission as well as setting aside one percent of all gross revenues from the tower for mural preservation and restoration.

There is no City policy against renting out Coit Tower for private events.

The Proposal: Proposition B would make it City policy to:

- strictly limit commercial activities and private events at Coit Tower; and
- use funds the City receives from Coit Tower concession operations for preserving the Coit Tower murals, protecting and maintaining the Coit Tower building, and beautifying Pioneer Park around Coit Tower.

A "YES" Vote Means: If you vote "yes," you want it to be City policy to strictly limit commercial activities and private events at Coit Tower, and to use funds from the Coit Tower concession on the Coit Tower murals, building, and Pioneer Park.

A "NO" Vote Means: If you vote "no," you do not want the City to adopt this policy.

Controller's Statement on "B"

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

Should the proposed declaration of policy be approved by the voters, in my opinion, it would not affect the cost of government.

How "B" Got on the Ballot

On February 14, 2012, 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 a declaration of policy 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 6, 2012, 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.

Arguments for and against this measure immediately follow. The full text begins on page 85.
Some of the words used in the ballot digest are explained on page 63.



Proponent's Argument in Favor of Proposition B

Vote YES on Proposition B!

Coit Tower is a special place. It's an iconic symbol of our unique city, known to every San Franciscan and instantly recognized around the world. Inside Coit Tower are 27 powerful WPA murals from the 1930s that vividly depict the reality of life in California during the tumultuous era in which they were painted.

But sadly, Lillie Hitchcock Coit's generous gift to San Francisco is now in serious trouble due to neglect, decay, and lax oversight by the city. Inside Coit Tower, lead paint peels from the ceiling, broken lights go unrepaired, leaking water seeps through and corrodes the murals, chunks have been carelessly carved out of the art, and gashes and chips mar many of the exposed and fragile frescoes.

This has all been allowed to happen despite the fact that Coit Tower already generates more than enough revenue for the city every year to keep it in good shape. According to city records, the city has been receiving \$633,000 annually from Coit Tower concessions and elevator fees but spending just 7% of that – less than \$44,000 a year – on Coit Tower!

Proposition B will put in place a new policy directing city officials to more wisely use some of the **existing resources** generated by Coit Tower to preserve and

protect it, while keeping commercial activities and private events appropriately limited so that **Coit Tower remains a public place**, not a private party venue for sale to the highest bidder.

Coit Tower and its murals are unique and priceless San Francisco treasures. But they aren't being treated that way.

Coit Tower needs our help. Vote Yes on Proposition B. Let's protect Coit Tower.

Vote YES on Prop. B!

Sierra Club

Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods

San Francisco Democratic Party

Protect Coit Tower Committee

Rebuttal to Proponent's Argument in Favor of Proposition B

NO ON B: Treasure ALL parks, not just those that make money.

SF Parks Alliance shares Proposition B's goal to maintain Coit Tower and its beautiful murals. However, it can not be achieved at the expense of other neighborhood parks.

The Recreation and Parks Department (RPD) and SF Arts Commission have already outlined a plan and funding (\$250,000 for restoration and 1% of Coit revenue annually) to maintain the murals. This amount is double that spent on the murals' recent restoration in 1990, revealing far from "lax oversight" by the City.

The measure would NOT add to the robust preservation plans already in place. **However, the measure WOULD reduce park funding by "strictly limiting" appropriate activities that create revenue— the same revenue needed to maintain Coit Tower and its murals. This is illogical.**

The measure has not identified revenue sources to replace those activities it would limit, so ultimately would remove potentially hundreds of thousands of dollars annually from the park budget. It would also compel what revenue is generated by Coit to be spent there. Since most parks in San Francisco do not generate revenue as Coit does, **this would set a dangerous precedent of parks that "have" and parks that "have not."**

This is not the San Francisco way.

All our neighborhood parks are treasures, and they all need our support. **We can and will protect Coit Tower, but Proposition B is a step backwards by robbing our park system of much needed funding.**

SF Parks Alliance



Opponent's Argument Against Proposition B

SF Parks Alliance (SFPA) urges you to vote NO on this restrictive, vague, and backwards Coit Tower Policy measure. If passed, it would likely take funding away from your neighborhood park.

SFPA agrees that, like every park, Coit Tower and Pioneer Park should be maintained properly. Coit's historic murals need maintenance, and the Recreation and Park Department (RPD) has already pledged \$250,000 for their restoration and 1% of revenues generated by Coit annually for their maintenance. The SF Arts Commission, responsible for maintaining the murals, agrees amounts pledged by RPD will be sufficient. **The SF Arts Commission views the current repair needs of the murals to be "routine", and does not link repair needs to specific activities at the site.**

Coit provides RPD with approximately \$950,000 in revenue annually from concessions and events, and RPD spends approximately \$270,000 on operations and maintenance there annually. Appropriately, RPD uses surplus revenue from Coit to maintain other city park facilities in need. If passed, the measure suggests this surplus would not be available for other neighborhood parks. This measure could set the precedent of determining maintenance standards for parks based on each park's ability to generate revenue. This standard would be incredibly poor park policy, and would overly

restrict RPD's ability to address needs throughout an already under-resourced park system.

Most importantly, if such a precedent is adopted, it could leave other neighborhood parks with repair and safety issues further behind— simply because they do not generate revenue. This is unfair.

Curtailing concessions and events at Coit potentially could reduce by more than \$500,000. Since that revenue in part supports upkeep of Coit Tower and its murals, reducing revenue ultimately **renders the measure illogical, and sabotages its own stated goals.**

VOTE NO - Keep ALL parks safe and beautiful.

SF Parks Alliance

Rebuttal to Opponent's Argument Against Proposition B

Why is a group called "SF Parks Alliance" making wild-eyed threats against our neighborhood parks if we vote to protect Coit Tower? Maybe they're worried their group won't be able to keep benefiting from the late-night private candlelight dinner parties the *San Francisco Chronicle* recently revealed they've been holding right next to the historic murals inside Coit Tower, exposing the endangered art to even more damage.

That's wrong. Coit Tower doesn't belong to them – Coit Tower belongs to *all* of us!

The SF Parks Alliance also makes the outlandish claim that Prop. B "could reduce revenue by more than \$500,000." That's just made-up. The independent analysis of the San Francisco City Controller in this Voter Information Pamphlet states the truth about Prop. B: **"Should the proposed declaration of policy be approved by the voters, in my opinion, it would not affect the cost of government."**

Read the *full text* of Proposition B for yourself: *"It shall be the policy of the People of the City and County of San Francisco to protect Coit Tower and preserve the historic murals inside Coit Tower by strictly limiting commercial activities and private events at Coit Tower and by prioritizing the funds received by the City from any concession operations at Coit Tower for preserving the Coit Tower murals, protecting and maintaining the Coit Tower building, and beautifying Pioneer Park around Coit Tower."*

Coit Tower is a special place that's worth protecting.

Vote YES on Proposition B!

*Jon Golinger, Chair
Protect Coit Tower Committee*



Paid Argument IN FAVOR of Proposition B

PROTECT OUR HISTORIC HERITAGE!

Coit Tower is one of San Francisco's most beloved landmarks, yet it is being exploited instead of being preserved. **We support limiting commercial activities at Coit Tower and the prioritization of funds received from Coit Tower operations for its maintenance.**

The commercialization of Coit Tower is part of a pattern by the Recreation and Park Department -- the indiscriminate use of publicly-owned open space and facilities for generating revenue.

Golden Gate Park is beloved by residents and visitors alike, yet it is also threatened by commercialization.

The Beach Chalet Soccer Complex has been proposed for the western end of the Park. That project will destroy over seven acres of natural grass and replace it with over seven acres of artificial turf - gravel, plastic carpet, and waste tires or other infill. **This project is the environmental equivalent of installing an asphalt parking lot in Golden Gate Park.**

The soccer complex includes 150,000 watts of sports lighting on 60-foot poles. These lights will be lighted from dusk to 10:00p.m., 365 days a year, right next to Ocean Beach. The lights are for adult soccer leagues from all over the Bay Area, who pay fees to Recreation and Park.

Our parks should not be exploited. SPEAK supports youth soccer and renovating the fields with NATURAL GRASS and NO lights. We support using the remaining funds to FIX UP MORE PLAYING FIELDS. LEARN MORE at www.sfoceanedge.org.

ACT NOW!

1. **Vote 'yes' to protect Coit Tower!**
2. **Ask Mayor Lee and the Board of Supervisors to support natural grass and NO 60-foot sports lights in Golden Gate Park!**

Our historic heritage is part of what makes San Francisco a great city.

SPEAK (Sunset-Parkside Education and Action Committee),
Ann Clark*,
George Wooding*

*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: SPEAK, Ann Clark, George Wooding.

Paid Argument IN FAVOR of Proposition B

Coit Tower is a San Francisco icon. Sadly, our Recreation and Parks Department has failed to maintain it and allowed its historic murals to deteriorate. RPD now proposes to extract more revenue from the Tower by renting it out to private parties and increasing commercial uses, threatening further damage.

Since 2010 RPD has followed a policy of converting parks and recreation facilities into commercial real estate, compromising its primary mission to provide free public access to open space and recreational opportunities. For years RPD's share of general fund dollars has been cut, and it has turned to a fee based model, leasing out facilities to private entities and restricting public access. Under this policy the Department erected toll booths at the entrances to the Arboretum and imposed a \$7 fee on non-residents, and an identity check on residents. These have dramatically reduced attendance of both residents and non-residents.

Our parks are vital to our health and well-being and need reliable public tax support. To raise the needed revenue tax reform is required which recognizes that the extremely wealthy are not paying their fair share.

Vote YES on B to protect Coit Tower and send a message to stop commercializing our public treasures and parks.

KEEPARBORETUMFREE.ORG

The true source(s) of funds for the printing fee of this argument: KeepArboretumFree.org members.

Paid Argument IN FAVOR of Proposition B

Coit Tower is a treasured San Francisco landmark, but the Recreation and Park Department has allowed the building and the precious murals to deteriorate. Now RPD is proposing to turn Coit Tower into a cash cow by renting it to private parties and increasing commercial operations with no preservation plan.

To protect Coit Tower and the murals, we believe commercial activities should be limited and that maintenance and preservation should be the highest priorities for Tower revenue funds.

In 2010, after laying off 166 Recreation Directors, our Parks Department hired a sales force with six figure salaries to lease, rent and commercialize our parks and clubhouses.

The mistreatment of COIT Tower is an example of the new policy of converting our public parks and facilities into commercial real estate.

Elsewhere, the Laurel Hill clubhouse was taken from a free City College early child development program of 38 years and turned over to a private entity that pays \$1,500/month rent but charges \$14,000 annual tuition per child. J.P. Murphy clubhouse was remodeled with \$4 Million of tax dollars, closed, and put up for lease. A huge community outcry stopped the lease. J.P. Murphy remains closed. Sunnyside clubhouse was remodeled and then closed except for private rentals.

Vote YES on B to Protect COIT Tower and to send a message to stop commercializing our public treasures and parks.

TakeBackOurParks.org

The true source(s) of funds for the printing fee of this argument: TakeBackOurParks.org members.

Paid Argument IN FAVOR of Proposition B

PROTECT COIT TOWER

Coit Tower, a cherished San Francisco landmark, deserves respect and protection. Yet it has been long neglected, and its historic murals are now damaged. Water leaks, peeling paint, and broken lights abound; Pioneer Park is overgrown and in shameful disrepair.

Last year, Coit Tower brought in over \$541,000.00 in revenue. Sadly, little of that went to maintain or repair the Tower itself.

Now the recreation and Park Department plans to rent the tower for private corporate parties. The over commercialization of this treasured San Francisco icon should not be allowed. Additionally, the revenue generated at the Tower should be used primarily to restore and preserve the Tower and murals.

Join us, a coalition of 20 neighborhood organizations, in supporting this measure to ensure Coit Tower is protected for future generations to enjoy.

Vote YES on Measure B

West of Twin Peaks Central Council

The true source(s) of funds for the printing fee of this argument: West of Twin Peaks Central Council.

Paid Argument IN FAVOR of Proposition B

PROTECT PUBLIC SPACE!

Coit Tower and its murals have been loved by San Franciscans and visitors for almost 80 years. We

support maintaining and preserving Coit Tower and limiting commercial activities and private events.

The Recreation and Parks Commission and Department have been at war with the public. The Commission ignores public comment and rubber-stamps the Department's whims. Commission decisions cannot be appealed to the Board of Supervisors. Consider:

- Arboretum Fees
- Artificial Turf Soccer Fields
- Laying Off Recreation Directors
- Leasing Recreation Centers instead of providing service
- Stow Lake Boathouse Lease
- Development with no plan for staffing or maintenance

RPD still plans to evict Haight Ashbury Neighborhood Council's (HANC's) recycling center, community garden, and native plant nursery and plans to replace them with a community garden even though HANC has already saved the City \$250,000 by developing the community garden at the site. HANC, through its center, has funded the Garden for the Environment, the 2008 Victory Garden at Civic Center Plaza, and the Hayes Valley Farm. HANC's native plant nursery has provided plants to parks and open spaces maintained by RPD. Evicting HANC's center would also mean loss of ten green jobs and loss of a place to get back the fees you pay for cans and bottles. Your vote will not save HANC's Center, but it will show RPD and RPC that you are unhappy with the way they conduct the public's business.

ACT NOW!

- Vote yes on Proposition B to protect Coit Tower!
- Ask Mayor Lee and the Board of Supervisors to keep HANC's Recycling Center

Haight Ashbury Neighborhood Council

The true source(s) of funds for the printing fee of this argument: Haight Ashbury Neighborhood Council.

Paid Argument IN FAVOR of Proposition B

THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY SUPPORTS PROP. B

Coit Tower is worth protecting. Vote YES vote on Proposition B.

San Francisco Democratic Party

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

The three largest contributors to the true source recipient committee: 1. SEIU 1021, 2. Tom Ammiano for Assembly, 3. Avalos for Mayor.



Paid Argument IN FAVOR of Proposition B

The Recreation and Parks Department wants to raise revenue by subletting valuable park resources - like Coit Tower - to private businesses. At the same time, the Department fails to protect or maintain the assets they count on for revenue.

Proposition B merely requires that funds raised at Coit Tower be first used to protect this resource - particularly its 1930s murals. This should be standard policy for all revenue-generating assets

Vote Yes on B!

San Francisco Tomorrow

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

End of Paid Arguments IN FAVOR of Proposition B

Paid Argument AGAINST Proposition B

SAVE NEIGHBORHOOD PARKS- VOTE NO ON B

Proposition B would set a dangerous precedent, requiring money earned at one park facility to only be spent at that facility. Revenue generating parks provide funds to maintain all our parks and operate recreation programs. If implemented, this measure would take \$700,000 out of the city-wide parks budget.

Join business, labor and civic organizations in Voting NO on Proposition B.

Alliance for Jobs and Sustainable Growth

Laborers Local 261

San Francisco Building Owners and Managers Association

San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

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

Proposition A

NOTE: Additions are *single-underline italics Times New Roman*;
deletions are *strike-through italics Times New Roman*.

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

THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO COMPETITIVE BIDDING AND ZERO WASTE ORDINANCE OF 2011

SECTION 1. TITLE.

This Ordinance shall be known and may be cited as “The City and County of San Francisco Competitive Bidding and Zero Waste Ordinance of 2011” (“Ordinance”).

SECTION 2. FINDINGS AND PURPOSES.

The People of the City and County of San Francisco hereby make the following findings and declare that their purposes in enacting this Ordinance are as follows:

(a) Since 1932, when an ordinance established 97 separate permits for garbage collection, one private corporation has consolidated all permits and created an exclusive monopoly for garbage collection throughout the City and County of San Francisco. For 80 years, one of the largest and most important municipal contracts has never been open to competitive bidding. The annual costs charged to San Francisco residential and commercial ratepayers from that monopoly because of the 1932 Ordinance now exceed \$220,000,000 (Two hundred and twenty million dollars) annually.

(b) The 1932 Ordinance gave the power to set residential rates to a Rate Board consisting of the Chief Administrative Officer, the Controller and the Manager of Utilities. Under the 1932 Ordinance the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors (“Board”) have no authority to set residential or commercial garbage rates.

(c) Commercial rates in San Francisco are unregulated by such Rate Board. Consequently, San Francisco’s commercial businesses pay some of the highest garbage collection rates in the country. According to the Board’s Budget and Legislative Analyst, these rates are up to 50 percent higher than the average of the other 37 jurisdictions in the Bay Area which receive equivalent services, including recycling and composting.

(d) The City and County of San Francisco (“City”) is the only jurisdiction in the Bay Area that has neither a franchise agreement nor a long-term contract with its residential and commercial garbage hauler. All other jurisdictions in the Bay Area regulate solid waste collection rates through either franchise agreements or contracts.

(e) This Ordinance amends the 1932 Ordinance and directs the Director (“Director”) of the Department of Public Works (“DPW”) to prepare and submit such legislation as is necessary to implement the purposes and principles of this Ordinance to govern the competitive procurement and franchising of service components for solid waste generated in the City, including discarded recyclable materials, which shall include but not be limited to: (i) residential collection; (ii) commercial collection; (iii) in-City recovery and processing of discarded recyclable materials, including composting; (iv) transfer and transportation of post-processed residual waste; and (v) disposal and/or conversion of post-processed residual waste. In doing so, the Director shall act in conjunction with, and rely upon the data and quantitative analysis generated by the Board’s Budget and Legislative Analyst.

(f) This Ordinance shall assure rates paid by residents and businesses provide the greatest benefit to ratepayers, safeguard the

environment and achieve Zero Waste goals for the City by maximizing recycling, protect the welfare and benefits of refuse and recycling workers, recover City costs of procurement and franchising, and provide for franchise fees that pay all costs of related City services, including repair and maintenance of City streets on which garbage trucks travel.

(g) In developing and implementing regulations, the Director shall apply the following five principles:

(1) In order to benefit ratepayers fully, create local jobs, and eliminate the possibility of a monopoly, there shall occur competitive bidding, in ten year intervals, of five separate and concurrent contracts of ten years in duration, for each of five solid waste components. The five components are: (i) residential collection services; (ii) commercial collection services; (iii) operation of Zero Waste recyclable materials recovery and processing facilities in San Francisco; (iv) operation of a transfer facility in San Francisco and transportation of post-processed residual waste to disposal or conversion sites; and (v) disposal and/or conversion of residual waste;

(2) In order to achieve maximum “green” recycling and Zero Waste goals, and to avoid conflicts between recycling and disposal, the contractor awarded the contract for the operation of in-City Zero Waste materials recovery and processing facilities shall not be the same contractor or affiliated with the contractor awarded the contract for the out-of-City disposal or conversion of residual waste;

(3) To maximize public benefit, minimize environmental impacts, and create local jobs, there shall be a public-private partnership for the public ownership and private operation of solid waste facilities whereby materials recovery, processing and transfer facilities, as well as parking and maintenance facilities for all residential and commercial collection vehicles (collectively “Solid Waste Facilities”) shall be located within the City limits and shall be publicly-owned no later than December 31, 2018 to provide fair competition for competitive bidding of private operations of such Solid Waste Facilities, and to enable ratepayer savings that will defray costs of publicly-owned Solid Waste Facilities. The negotiations for public ownership of existing Solid Waste Facilities, or the development of plans for new publicly-owned Solid Waste Facilities shall be completed no later than December 31, 2013, and competitive bidding for private operation of Solid Waste Facilities shall be completed no later than December 31, 2015. The City and County of San Francisco shall not enter into any new contract or extend any existing contract for the use beyond December 31, 2018 of privately-owned Solid Waste Facilities;

(4) The Director, in conjunction with the Board’s Budget and Legislative Analyst, shall develop and implement regulations consistent with the principles contained in this Ordinance.

(5) The Director shall by January 1, 2013 prescribe a system to govern the competitive bidding, franchising and/or contracting of the following service components for solid waste generated in the City which shall include but not be limited to: (i) residential collection, (ii) commercial collection, (iii) operation of Zero Waste recyclable materials recovery and processing facilities in San Francisco, (iv) operation of a transfer facility in San Francisco and transportation of post-processed residual waste to disposal or conversion sites, and (v) out-of-City disposal and/or conversion of residual waste in a manner that provides the most benefit to the ratepayers, including the collection of franchise fees to support related City services. Competitive bidding for the five service component contracts or franchises shall be completed no later than December 31, 2015. The Director shall act in conjunction with, and rely upon the data and quantitative analysis generated by the Board’s Budget and Legislative Analyst on development and implementation of competitive bidding and all franchising and contracting recommendations for Board approval. To the extent permitted by law, participation of State of California-certified small business enterprises and hiring of local City residents shall receive maximum credit in the competitive bidding process for contracts and franchises for the five solid waste service components.

(h) Competitive bidding is a better alternative than monopoly control of public service contracts worth hundreds of millions of dollars annually. Competitive bidding can reduce rates, stimulate innovation,



provide better service, and raise revenues for relevant City functions. Further, public ownership of heretofore privately-owned Solid Waste Facilities will allow the City to use competition to benefit San Francisco ratepayers in perpetuity.

(i) This Ordinance may only be amended by the voters at a subsequent municipal election, except the Board may amend the Ordinance, but only to further the purposes and principles of the Ordinance.

SECTION 3. MODERNIZATION OF THE 1932 ORDINANCE

Appendix 1 of the San Francisco Administrative Code, the 1932 Refuse Collection and Disposal Ordinance, is hereby amended as follows, with new provisions proposed to be added underlined [underlined] and existing provisions proposed to be deleted in ~~strikeout~~ [strikeout]:

REFUSE COLLECTION AND DISPOSAL ORDINANCE

Providing for the Collection and Disposition of Refuse in the City and County of San Francisco; Providing for the Licensing of Refuse Collectors by the Director of Public Health; Fixing the Maximum Rates or Charges for the Collection of Refuse by Licensed Refuse Collectors from Homes, Apartment Houses, Stores, etc.; Dividing City and County of San Francisco into Collection Routes; Providing Penalties for the Violation of the Provisions of this Ordinance.

SECTION 1. DEFINITION OF SOLID WASTE

The term "refuse" ~~solid waste~~ as used in this ordinance shall be taken to mean all waste and discarded materials from dwelling places, households, apartment houses, stores, office buildings, restaurants, hotels, institutions and all commercial establishments, including waste or discarded food, animal and vegetable matter from all kitchens thereof, waste paper, cans, glass, ashes, and boxes and cuttings from trees, lawns and gardens. Refuse as used herein does not include debris and waste construction materials, including wood, brick, plaster, glass, cement, wire, and other ferrous materials, derived from the construction of or the partial or total demolition of buildings or other structures means all putrescible and nonputrescible solid and semisolid wastes, including garbage, trash, refuse, rubbish, ashes, non-hazardous industrial wastes, abandoned vehicles and parts thereof, discarded home and industrial appliances, manure, vegetable and animal solid and semisolid wastes, and other discarded solid and semisolid wastes. Organics, compostables, paper, plastics, glass and all other recyclable materials with a commercial value that are not discarded shall not be considered solid waste for purposes of this Ordinance.

SECTION 2. CITY FRANCHISE AGREEMENT OR CONTRACT

It shall be unlawful for any person, firm or corporation to collect, process, transfer, or dispose of ~~refusesolid waste as defined in this ordinance~~ except as herein provided, save that the provisions of this ordinance shall not include refuse which may be incinerated by an owner of a building for himself or for his tenants on the premises where produced; provided, however, that such incineration shall be subject to inspection and control by the Director of Public Health and the Fire Department. Failure of any householder producing refuse to subscribe to and pay for refuse collection, unless such householder is a tenant for whom refuse collection service is provided by his landlord, shall be prima facie evidence that such householder is disposing of refuse in violation of this ordinance ~~expressly authorized by a franchise granted by, or contract entered into, with the City.~~

SECTION 3. PRINCIPLES FOR COMPETITIVE BIDDING

Refuse consisting of waste or discarded food, animal and vegetable matter, discarded containers of food, animal and vegetable matter and ashes shall be collected and placed in suitable metal cans of such capacity as the Director of Public Works may prescribe (but not to exceed 32 gallons in the case of a can serving one single family dwelling unit) by the producer or landlord who by reason of contract or lease with an occupant is obligated to care for such refuse, for collection by a refuse collector to be disposed of as herein provided. Waste paper and

~~boxes and other refuse materials not subject to putrefaction or decay, and cuttings from trees, lawns and gardens may be placed in any suitable container and delivered by the producer or landlord, who by reason of contract or lease with the occupant is obligated to care for such refuse and deliver same to a refuse collector, to be disposed of as herein provided; provided, however, that it shall be optional with the producer or landlord to deliver waste paper or other refuse having commercial value to a refuse collector, and the producer or landlord may dispose of the same in any manner he may see fit. Refuse, which under the provisions hereof must be deposited in a metal can of suitable capacity, shall be removed daily from the place where the same is created.~~

Notwithstanding any other provisions of law, the Director shall adopt regulations no later than January 1, 2013 to govern the competitive procurement and franchising of solid waste generated in the City, including discarded recyclable materials, with contracts for each of the following five components: (i) residential collection; (ii) commercial collection; (iii) materials recovery and processing; (iv) operation of transfer facility and transportation to conversion or disposal site; (v) disposal and/or conversion of residual solid waste. In adopting such regulations, to the extent permitted by law the Director shall give priority to: Zero Waste goals which are designed to maximize recycling and safeguard the environment, maintain competitive rates, protect the welfare of workers in the industry, recover City costs of procurement and franchising, and provide funds to defray the cost of related City services.

The regulations adopted by the Director shall meet the specific criteria contained in the following five principles:

(1) There shall be competitive bidding of five separate and concurrent 10-year contracts for each of the five solid waste components. The five components are: (i) residential collection services; (ii) commercial collection services; (iii) operation of Zero Waste recyclable materials recovery and processing facilities in the City; (iv) operation of transfer facility in San Francisco and transportation of post-processed residual waste to disposal or conversion sites out of the City; and (v) disposal and/or conversion of residual waste;

(2) The regulations shall provide that a private contractor or its affiliate shall not be awarded a contract for both (i) the operation of Zero Waste recyclable materials recovery and processing facilities in the City; and (ii) the disposal and/or conversion of residual waste outside of the City;

(3) The regulations shall assure a public-private partnership for the public ownership and private operation of solid waste facilities whereby materials recovery, processing and transfer facilities, as well as parking facilities for all residential and commercial collection vehicles (collectively, "Solid Waste Facilities") shall be located in the City and publicly-owned no later than December 31, 2018 to provide fair competition for competitive bidding of private operations of such Solid Waste Facilities. The negotiations for public ownership of existing Solid Waste Facilities, or development of plans for new publicly-owned Solid Waste Facilities shall be completed no later than December 31, 2013, and competitive bidding for all five services contracts, including private operations of Solid Waste Facilities, shall be completed no later than December 31, 2015. The City shall not enter into any new contract or extend any existing contract for the use beyond December 31, 2018 of privately-owned Solid Waste Facilities;

(4) The regulations shall be developed by the Director in conjunction with the Board's Budget and Legislative Analyst for implementation consistent with the principles contained in this Ordinance.

(5) Such regulations shall by January 1, 2013 prescribe a system to govern the competitive bidding, franchising and contracting of solid waste generated in the City, including discarded recyclable materials, with the following five separate contracts or franchises:

(i) residential collection; (ii) commercial collection; (iii) materials recovery and processing; (iv) transfer and transportation of residual waste; and (v) disposal and/or conversion of residual waste in a manner that provides the greatest benefit to the ratepayers, including the collection of franchise fees. Competitive bidding for the five service component contracts or franchises shall be completed no later than December 31, 2015. The Director shall work in conjunction with and rely upon the

data and quantitative analysis generated by the Board's Budget and Legislative Analyst on development and implementation of the competitive bidding regulations, and all franchising and contracting recommendations to the Board. To the extent permitted by law, bidders with the most participation of State of California-certified small business enterprises and hiring of City residents shall receive maximum credit in the competitive bidding process for contracts and franchises for the five solid waste service components.

SECTION 4. TERMINATION

It shall be unlawful for any person, firm or corporation, other than a refuse collector licensed by the Director of Public Health as in this ordinance provided, to transport through the streets of the City and County of San Francisco any refuse as in this ordinance defined, or to collect or to dispose of the same, except waste paper, or other refuse having a commercial value. It is provided, however, that a license for a refuse collector, as provided in Section 8 hereof, shall be distinguished from a permit to operate, in the City and County of San Francisco on a certain designated route, as hereinafter provided.

Upon the conviction of any person, firm, or corporation for any violation of the provisions of this Ordinance or of the relevant DPW regulations, the permit franchise or contract of with such person, firm or corporation issued under the provisions of this Ordinance shall be forthwith and immediately terminated and canceled as of the date of conviction in conformance with all laws of the City.

The City and County of San Francisco is herewith divided and established into routes for the collection of refuse, as designated on a map of the City and County of San Francisco, attached hereto, each said route to include only the side of the street or streets bounding each route as designated by a number on said map, said routes being numbered one to ninety-seven, inclusive, and said map and said routes are marked Exhibit A, and attached hereto and made a part of this ordinance.

Any person, firm or corporation desiring to transport through the streets of the City and County of San Francisco, any refuse as herein defined, or to collect or dispose of the same, shall make application to the Director of Public Health for permission so to do. Said application for such permit shall contain the name of the person, firm or corporation, any of the particular route or routes, designated in said map of routes, proposed to be served by said person, firm or corporation, and a statement that said person, firm or corporation will abide by all the provisions of this ordinance, and will not charge a greater rate for the collection and disposition of said refuse than that fixed in or pursuant to this ordinance.

The Director of Public Health shall grant a permit to such applicant unless the route proposed is already adequately served by a licensed refuse collector. An application for a permit must be granted, however, by the said Director of Public Health, and it is mandatory on said director to grant the same, when it shall appear to any said application for a route or routes by a person, firm or corporation, that 20 percent or more of the householders, business men, apartment house owners, hotel keepers, institutions or residents in said route or routes, using refuse service, and paying for same, or obligated to do so, have signed a petition or contract in which they have stated that they are inadequately served by any refuse collector who is then collecting refuse on said route, provided that said director finds upon substantial evidence that such statement is correct. That inadequate service is hereby defined as the failure, on the part of any refuse collector to properly collect, handle or transport refuse on said route, or the overcharging for the collection of same, or insolence towards persons whose refuse has been collected, or the collection by any refuse collector whose license has been revoked as provided in Section 9 hereof. Such permit so granted by the Director of Public Health shall not be exclusive, however, and one or more persons, firms or corporations may be given a permit to collect on the same route.



Persons, firms or corporations desiring to transport through the streets of the City and County of San Francisco only waste paper or other refuse materials having a commercial value, and to collect and dispose of same need not obtain a permit therefor under the provisions of this Ordinance or the Director's regulations.

SECTION 5. NOTICE OF TERMINATION

Refuse collected by refuse collectors shall be disposed of by such persons, firms or corporations and in such manner or by such method or methods as from time to time designated by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco.

Until and unless changed in the manner herein provided, the maximum rate or charge for the disposal of refuse to be charged the refuse collector by any person, firm or corporation authorized by the Board of Supervisors to dispose of refuse shall be \$1.50 per ton. Such rate or charge may, from time to time, be adjusted in the same manner, and in accordance with the same procedures, as is provided for the adjustment of rates and charges for the collection of refuse in Section 6(a) of this ordinance.

Any person, firm or corporation currently authorized to provide solid waste collection services in the City shall be afforded the rights provided under California Public Resources Code section 49520. Upon the effective date of this Ordinance, such persons, firms and corporations shall be deemed to have been given mailed notification effective as of 30 days after the effective date of this Ordinance, that exclusive solid waste handling services are to be provided or authorized by the City pursuant to this Ordinance and the regulations adopted thereunder. The Board shall further provide mailed notification to all such persons, firms or corporations pursuant to California Public Resources Code section 49520 within 30 days of the effective date of this Ordinance.

Any person, firm or corporation currently authorized to provide solid waste collection services for solid waste generated in the City may continue to provide such collection services until December 5, 2016 when such rights shall terminate. Between the date this Ordinance becomes effective and December 5, 2016, such rights to continue the collection of solid waste generated in the City shall be subject to such laws and regulations as may hereinafter be adopted by the City, which shall include provisions for the setting of maximum charges and fees that may be charged to solid waste collection customers, and such other provisions consistent with the findings and purposes set forth in Article 2.



SECTION 6. BOARD AUTHORITY FOR DISPOSAL

- (a) *Until and unless changed in the manner hereinafter set forth, the maximum rates or charges for the collection and disposition of refuse as herein defined, by refuse collectors, from residences, flats and apartment houses of not more than 600 rooms, and the regulations relating to such rates or charges, shall be as follows:*

Rate Schedules

Monthly rates from residences and flats for one container of not exceeding 32 gallons. Made from the ground floor:

No. Rooms	Collections Per Week			
	1.	2.	3.	4.
1 to 4	\$.80	\$1.20	\$1.35	\$1.50
5	.85	1.25	1.40	1.55
6	.85	1.25	1.40	1.55
7	.95	1.35	1.50	1.70
8	1.00	1.50	1.70	1.80
9	1.00	1.50	1.70	1.80
10	1.00	1.50	1.70	1.80
11	1.00	1.50	1.70	1.80
12	1.00	1.50	1.70	1.80

Monthly rates from residences and flats for one container of not exceeding 32 gallons. Made from second floor, one stairway above ground floor or basement:

No. Rooms	Collections Per Week			
	1.	2.	3.	4.
1 to 4	\$.85	\$1.25	\$1.40	\$1.55
5	.95	1.35	1.45	1.60
6	.95	1.35	1.45	1.60
7	1.00	1.40	1.55	1.75
8	1.10	1.60	1.80	1.90
9	1.10	1.60	1.80	1.90
10	1.10	1.60	1.80	1.90
11	1.10	1.60	1.80	1.90
12	1.10	1.60	1.80	1.90

Monthly rates from residences and flats for one container of not exceeding 32 gallons. Made from third floor, two stairways above ground floor or basement:

No. Rooms	Collections Per Week			
	1.	2.	3.	4.
1 to 4	\$.90	\$1.30	\$1.45	\$1.60
5	.95	1.35	1.50	1.65
6	.95	1.35	1.50	1.65
7	1.10	1.55	1.70	1.80
8	1.15	1.70	1.90	2.00
9	1.25	1.75	1.95	2.10
10	1.25	1.75	1.95	2.10
11	1.25	1.75	1.95	2.10
12	1.25	1.75	1.95	2.10

Monthly rates from residences and flats for one container of not exceeding 32 gallons. Made from fourth floor, three stairways above ground floor or basement:

No. Rooms	Collections Per Week			
	1.	2.	3.	4.
1 to 4	\$1.00	\$1.40	\$1.55	\$1.70
5	1.10	1.50	1.65	1.80
6	1.10	1.50	1.65	1.80
7	1.20	1.60	1.75	1.90
8	1.20	1.70	1.90	2.05
9	1.25	1.75	1.95	2.10
10	1.25	2.00	2.20	2.40
11	1.25	2.00	2.20	2.40
12	1.25	2.00	2.20	2.40

Monthly rates from apartment houses:

No. Rooms	Collections Per Week				
	6.	4.	3.	2.	1.
10	\$3.00	\$2.40	\$2.20	\$1.90	\$1.80
20	5.70	4.90	4.40	3.90	3.70
30	7.90	6.40	5.90	5.20	
40	9.80	8.70	7.40		
50	11.30	10.20	8.70		
60	12.50	11.50			
70	13.80	12.90			
80	15.00	14.00			
90	16.30	15.20			
100	17.50	16.20			
110	19.00				
120	20.40				
130	21.80				
140	23.20				
150	24.50				
160	25.90				
170	27.30				
180	28.70				
190	30.00				
200	31.40				
210	32.50				
220	33.80				
230	35.00				
240	36.30				
250	37.50				
260	38.80				
270	40.00				
280	41.30				
290	43.80				
300	45.00				
310	46.30				
320	47.50				
330	48.80				
340	50.00				
350	51.30				
360	52.50				
370	53.80				
380	56.30				
390	57.50				
400	58.80				
410	59.00				
420	60.40				
430	61.80				
440	63.20				
450	64.50				
460	65.90				
470	67.30				
480	68.70				
490	70.00				
500	71.40				
510	72.80				
520	74.20				
530	75.50				
540	76.90				
550	78.30				
560	79.70				
570	82.30				
580	82.40				
590	83.80				
600	85.00				

Rate Regulations

Rates for residences and flats shall be increased for more than one container of a maximum of 32 gallons by 10 cents per additional container per collection.

Any charge made by a refuse collector for removal of waste material not required to be placed in metal cans and which is delivered to him



in other suitable containers as provided by Section 3 hereof, shall not exceed the rates fixed herein for collection and disposal of equivalent volumes of refuse in metal cans.

In determining the number of rooms of any household, building or apartment in order to ascertain the rate for the collection and disposition of refuse therefrom, halls, alcoves, storerooms, bathrooms, closets and toilets shall not be considered as rooms, nor shall basements or attics be considered as rooms unless the same be occupied as living quarters.

Any collection and disposition charges not specifically set forth herein shall be subject to agreement between the producer and a duly licensed refuse collector.

Procedure for Adjustment

There is hereby created a Rate Board consisting of the Chief Administrative Officer, who shall act as chairman, the Controller, and the Manager of Utilities. The Board shall convene upon call of the Chairman or the other two members and two members shall constitute a quorum. The Board shall act by majority vote. Any member of the Board may from time to time designate a subordinate from his own department to act in his place and stead as a member of the Board.

Any person, firm or corporation (including any holder of a permit to collect and dispose of refuse) affected by the above schedules of rates, or by revised schedule of rates hereafter placed in effect, and desiring an increase, decrease, or other adjustment or change in, or addition to, such rates or schedules or the regulations appertaining, shall file an application therefor with the Chairman of the Rate Board, who shall thereupon refer the same to the Director of Public Works for hearing, report and recommendation as hereinafter provided, unless the Rate Board shall determine that the application lies beyond its powers or presents no substantial question as to the justice or reasonableness of the rates, schedules of rates or regulations then in effect or is otherwise frivolous, in any of which events the Rate Board shall deny the application without further proceedings thereon.

Within 30 days thereafter, the Director of Public Works shall commence a public hearing upon the application and shall, not less than 20 days in advance of such hearing, cause to be published at least once in the official newspaper notice of the time and place thereof. The Director of Public Works shall be empowered to make or cause to be made such studies and investigations as he may deem pertinent to the application, to continue the hearing from time to time for that purpose, and to introduce the results of such studies and investigations in evidence. The applicant, and any person, firm or corporation affected by the application, shall be entitled to appear at the hearing and be heard. Any such person, firm or corporation desiring notice of further proceedings or action upon the application may file with the Chairman of the Rate Board a written request for such notice, setting forth his name and mailing address.

Upon the conclusion of the hearing and within 90 days after referral to him of the application, the Director of Public Works shall make and file with the Chairman of the Rate Board a Report setting forth the facts as found by him from the evidence taken and record made at the hearing, and a Recommended Order. The Recommended Order, if it provides for any change in the rates, schedules of rates, or regulations then in effect, shall set forth the date upon which the change is to take effect, which date shall be not less than 15 days from the date of filing of the Recommended Order with the Chairman of the Rate Board. The Chairman of the Rate Board shall publish the Recommended Order, together with notice of filing thereof, in the official newspaper, and shall mail notice of the filing of the Report and Recommended Order to the applicant and to any others who shall have filed written requests for notice as hereinabove provided.

At any time, within 15 days after filing of the Director of Public Works' Report and Recommended Order with the Chairman of the Rate Board, the applicant or any person, firm or corporation affected by the application, may file with the Chairman of the Rate Board any objections that he may have to the Recommended Order. If no such objections be filed, then the Recommended Order shall be deemed the Order of the Rate Board and shall take effect according to its terms without other or further action by the Rate Board. If any such objections be filed, then the Rate Board, upon not less than 10 days notice by mail to the applicant and to others who shall have filed written requests for notice as hereinabove provided, shall hear the objections and, upon the basis of the evidence taken and record made upon the hearing before the Director of Public

Works, shall grant or deny the application in whole or in part and shall make such order, to take effect at such time, as may be just and reasonable. In the event of inability or failure of the Rate Board to render a decision within 60 days of the date of filing with it of the Director of Public Works' Report and Recommended Order, then the said Recommended Order shall be deemed the order of the Board and shall take effect upon expiration of said 60-day period.

Any revised rates, schedules of rates or regulations placed in effect pursuant hereto shall be just and reasonable.

An application filed pursuant to this section and denied in whole or in part may not be renewed for a period of one year from the date of filing in the absence of an intervening change in conditions.

(b) Any collection and disposition of rates or charges for establishments other than residences, flats and apartment houses of not more than 600 rooms, shall be subject to contract between the producer and a duly licensed refuse collector.

Any person, firm or corporation authorized by the Board to hold a franchise or contract to collect solid waste generated in the City shall transport and deliver all such solid waste to a facility designated by the City. No person, firm or corporation authorized by the Board to hold a franchise or contract to collect solid waste generated in the City shall dispose of solid waste in a landfill except as expressly authorized by the City.

SECTION 7. MAXIMUM RATES SET BY BOARD

It shall be unlawful for any refuse disposer or refuse collector to charge a greater rate for the disposal of refuse or for the collection and disposition of refuse than that fixed in, or pursuant to, Sections 5 and 6(a) of this ordinance.

Nothing herein contained shall be taken or construed as preventing a refuse disposer or a refuse collector from charging a lesser rate or charge for the disposal of refuse or for the collection and disposition of refuse than that fixed in, or pursuant to, Sections 5 and 6(a) of this ordinance.

In conformity with results of the competitive bidding process the Board shall establish the maximum charges and fees that may be charged to customers for solid waste handling services provided by any person, firm or corporation authorized by the Board to collect, process or dispose of solid waste generated in the City.

SECTION 8.

Each licensed refuse collector shall be assigned a number by the Director of Public Health. The Director of Public Health shall furnish each collector a metal badge on which is marked the number assigned the collector, who at all times while collecting refuse shall wear said badge in plain view. The Director of Public Health shall collect from each collector for the expense of providing said badge and the issuance of said license the sum of \$5. Each vehicle or wagon in which refuse is transported through the streets shall be assigned a number by the Director of Public Health and the number thereof shall be plainly marked thereon.

SECTION 9.

The license, as distinguished from a permit herein, of any refuse collector, may be revoked by the Director of Public Health for failure on the part of the refuse collector to properly collect refuse, or for overcharging for the collection of same, or for insolence towards persons whose refuse he is collecting, and it shall be unlawful for any person whose license is so revoked to collect refuse in the City and County of San Francisco.

No license of a refuse collector shall be revoked except upon a hearing of which the refuse collector has been given a notice of at least three days.

SECTION 10.

Upon the payment of the rate fixed in or pursuant to Section 6(a) of this ordinance for the collection and removal of refuse, the person paying the same shall be entitled to, and there shall be delivered to him, a receipt on which shall be shown the amount paid, the premises for which



~~it is paid, the name and number of the collector, the number of the vehicle or wagon, and, in clearly legible print, the schedule of rates applicable to his classification of establishment. On the face of said receipt there shall be printed the following words: "The rates for the collection of refuse are fixed pursuant to initiative ordinance and are printed on the back of this receipt. Complaints as to service should be made to the Department of Public Health."~~

~~Upon the payment of a rate fixed by contract pursuant to Section 6(b) hereof, the person paying the same shall be given a receipt which shall show the amount paid, the period for which paid, the premises for which paid, the name and number of the collector and the date of payment, and shall bear the notation that the rate charged is subject to private contract.~~

SECTION 11:

~~Disputes over charges made by collectors or as to the character of the service performed shall be decided by the Director of Public Health. Any charges made in excess of rates fixed pursuant to this ordinance, when determined by the Director of Public Health, shall be refunded to the person or persons who paid the excess charge.~~

SECTION 12:

~~A refuse collector shall be entitled to payment for the collection of refuse at the end of each month from each householder or landlord served by him and from whom the payment is due.~~

SECTION 13:

~~The initiative ordinance passed by the People of the City and County of San Francisco on June 14, 1927, providing for the collection and disposition of refuse in the City and County of San Francisco; providing for the licensing of refuse collectors by the Board of Health; fixing the maximum rates or charges for the collection of refuse by licensed refuse collectors from homes and apartment houses; dividing City and County of San Francisco into collection routes; and providing penalties for the violation of the provisions of this ordinance, and all other ordinances in conflict therewith, are herewith repealed.~~

SECTION 14:

~~Any person, firm or corporation who shall violate any of the provisions of this ordinance shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction thereof shall be punished by a fine not to exceed \$500, or by imprisonment in the County Jail for not more than six months, or by both such fine and imprisonment.~~

SECTION 15:

~~This ordinance shall take effect ten days after the declaration of the official count of the votes cast therefor; provided, however, that for the purpose of issuing licenses to refuse collectors, application may be filed and the licenses issued during the period between the final approval of this ordinance and the date of its taking effect.~~

SECTION 16:

~~The Controller shall furnish the Director of Public Health with such financial data, including data as to the cost of refuse collections, as may be required by the Director to enable him to perform his functions under this ordinance. The Controller shall likewise make available at any hearing before the Director of Public Works upon an application filed pursuant to Section 6 hereof such financial data, including data as to the cost of refuse collections, as the Director of Public Works may deem pertinent to the issues raised by the application. Each collector holding a permit shall keep such records and render such reports as may be required by the Controller to enable him to develop the above-mentioned data, and the Controller shall have access to such records.~~

SECTION 17:

~~If any section, subsection, sentence, clause or phrase of this act is for any reason held to be unconstitutional, such decision shall not affect the validity of the remaining portions of this act. It is hereby declared that this act, and each section, subsection, sentence, clause and phrase thereof, would have been passed irrespective of the fact that any one or~~

~~more other sections, subsections, sentences, clauses or phrases had been declared unconstitutional.~~

SECTION 4. AMENDMENTS.

This Ordinance may only be amended by the voters at a subsequent municipal election, except the Board may amend the Ordinance, but only to further the purposes and principles of the Ordinance.

SECTION 5. SEVERABILITY.

If any provision of this Ordinance or the application thereof to any person or circumstances is held invalid or unconstitutional, such invalidity or unconstitutionality shall not affect other provisions or applications of this Ordinance, and to this end the provisions of this Ordinance are severable.

Proposition B

NOTE: Additions are single-underline italics Times New Roman; deletions are ~~strike-through italics Times New Roman~~.

It shall be the policy of the People of the City and County of San Francisco to protect Coit Tower and preserve the historic murals inside Coit Tower by strictly limiting commercial activities and private events at Coit Tower and by prioritizing the funds received by the City from any concession operations at Coit Tower for preserving the Coit Tower murals, protecting and maintaining the Coit Tower building, and beautifying Pioneer Park around Coit Tower.