



I'm not robot



Continue

2001 who sought to get the city to make exceptions to citizenship, age, and residency requirements for all city boards, commissions, and advisory bodies. It was put on the ballot by Matt Gonzales in 2001 to be on the mongo 2002 primary ballot. It went all the way to the polls. Why did it fail... because people are racist? Let's solve that nonsense with a Hell Yes on C! *Back to Top Prop D: Hold Sheriffs Responsible for Use of Force and In-Custody Deaths: Yes because SF is both a county and a city, we have both sheriffs and police. The sheriffs run the jails, provide security for many city government buildings, and serve warrants and evictions. The sheriffs used to be the good cops in town. Former Sheriff Mike Hennessey was widely considered the most progressive sheriff California had ever had, and built a culture of compassion and rehabilitation. The sheriff's department had no series of controversies like the SFPD, and unlike the Police Officers Association, the Deputy Sheriffs Association was not racist, racist, and Republican-supporting. But things have been going downhill since Mike retired. Deputies have been accused of everything from beating inmates and running prisoner fight clubs, to sketchy destruction of evidence about those fight clubs, in custody deaths, unjustified shootings, and allegations of sexual abuse. Prop D aims to start holding them accountable by establishing a civilian Sheriff's Department Oversight Board, as well as the office of an inspector general to investigate complaints and crimes. The supervisory board would have seven members: four appointed by the Board of Supervisors, three by the mayor. Our main complaint is that we wish Prop D was even stronger. Neither the board of trustees nor the inspector general would be able to discipline or fire deputies, which is all that matters to dirty agents. Also, we're not so sure that reform is the answer to law enforcement violence and harassment. San Francisco's Police Commission is considered a national model for civilian oversight, and how does that work for us? So we're going along with Prop D as an intermediate step, but the city needs to get serious about closing the jails, defunding the police and sheriffs, and transitioning to unarmed public safety responders and non-carceral alternatives to the prison-industrial complex. Vote yes. A few fun facts: Mike Hennessey was the last citizen sheriff in California. The Deputy Sheriffs Association was so shocked when he was elected that they got a law in Sacramento requiring sheriffs to be sworn in after 1986. Hennessey was almost selected as interim mayor after Gavin Newsom left office, but then-supervisor Bevan Dufty called a recess to go crawl with Gavin and then came back and switched his voice from Hennessey to Ed Lee. Thank you very much, Bevan. :/ *Back to Top Prop E: Open the door to Defund the police: Hell Yes! So this is fucking bizarre: the minimum number of uniformed police in SF is set in the City Charter at exactly 1,971. That's like the U.S. Constitution saying we always need exactly 1,971 muskets. Whether you want to defund, reform or reinvent the police, we need to get this out of the Charter first. Prop E removes that oddly specific number, so the number of agents in the city will be set through the regular annual budget process, just like any other City personnel decision. Prop E also requires the police chief to submit a report every two years on how many police officers they think we should have. We're not wild about this provision, because if you ask a police chief how many cops they need, what do you think they're going to say? MOAR COPS! But the chief's report would not be binding. The would hold a hearing on it, but it's the mayor and board of supervisors who control SFPD's wallet. We assume that this provision was included by the author, Chairman of the Board Norman Yee, as a political consideration to argue that he was not looking to defund (cue threatening music) defund the die die (Also Yee drafted this measure well before the latest activism got #DefundThePolice trending.) Either way, when this is over, we call on the supervisors to draw up reports on the minimum staffing levels we need for all non-gun-carrying parts of public safety: crisis intervention teams, social workers, paramedics, etc. And those reports have to compare the cost of all these different types of workers. Because not only do agents get paid a lot, they get to retire at the age of 50 with a full pension, making them an expensive city in the long run! We say Hell Yes on Prop E, and then we go real about funding the police in 2021. P.S. Where the heck did that oddly specific 1,971 minimum staffing number come from? No one knows! Indivisible SF has a great deep dive on this. It was written in the City Charter by June 1994 Prop D (PDF). The number comes from a 1979 consent decree by Officers for Justice against the SFPD for racial and sex discrimination in hiring. But even that decree doesn't explain where that number came from! P.P.S. Bonus deep cut: listen to Judge LaDoris Cordell's history lesson of SFPD's 79-year history of misconduct and racial discrimination! *Back to Top Prop F: Tax Big Business, Help Small Business, Make \$\$\$: Hell Yes! Prop F is a progressive hot-rod tuneup for SF's business tax! It cuts taxes on small businesses while bumping up the tax on profitable industries such as biotech, finance, insurance, real estate, and tech (though increases will be delayed if the recession continues). That equates to an additional \$100 million a year to support our city. The best part is, it generates that money through changes that make the tax more progressive: Reduces registration fees for companies with less than \$1 million in gross revenue. Increases the exemption for small businesses for tax from \$1.17 to \$2 million. Reduces taxes on businesses by less than \$25 million in these less profitable industries: retail, Manufacturing, Arts, Entertainment, Recreation, Accommodations and Food Services. Increases taxes on more profitable industries in increments between 2022-2024. Biotech, Financial Services, Information Technology, Insurance, and Real Estate and Rental and Leasing Services Increases of 2023 and 2024 would be delayed by a year if there was a downturn in the economy. Completely eliminates payroll tax. SF has gradually switched from a payroll tax on business to gross income tax. Eliminating payroll taxes will make taxes easier for businesses and eliminate a disincentive to hire more people. But wait, there's more: Prop F would also unlock \$560 million from June 2018's Baby Prop C tax on commercial rental prices! (\$430M of that would go to child care and early educators, the rest would go to the general fund.) That money is currently stuck in limbo because of bullshit legal challenges over whether that prop needed to be more than 50% (what it did) or more than 66.6% (which it didn't), not). Prop F's neat trick for unlocking that money? It says that if the court throws out the 2018 ballot, the tax on commercial rents will be thrown up to compensate for that. That means that whatever happens with those legal challenges, the city will get to break open that piggy bank just in time for parents to get back to work (we hope)! The city's gross revenue tax was first started in 2012 when Mayor Ed Lee was deep in the pocket of Republican angel investor Ron Conway, who won the lobbying battle against the old school Chamber of Commerce to get a lower tax rate for tech compared to traditional downtown businesses. We're happy to see that getting rectified with Prop F's elevation on tech. John Avalos was also in the mix on those negotiations and pushed Mayor Lee to increase total tax revenue by \$50 million a year. These tax arrangements are notoriously complicated, and we urge our leaders to keep a close eye on them and bring them back to the polls when they need to be adjusted again. Prop F was a compromise between the mayor, who wanted a lower tax rate that brought in the same amount of revenue as the existing gross income tax, and progressive board members who wanted to generate an additional \$150 million a year. While we want that extra money to be given, we appreciate them working out a compromise so that we can have a concerted campaign for this crucial measure. Vote Hell Yes on Prop F! *Back to Top Prop G: Let The Youth Vote in Local Elections: Heck Yes! U.S. law sets voting age at 18... but that only applies to federal and state elections. Prop G would empower 16 and 17-year-olds to vote in SF contests such as Supervisor and Mayor. High school is a much better time to introduce people to voices. Their lives are much more stable and structured than when they were 18, and voter education can be part of their high school curriculum. Research shows that when people vote in the first election that they qualify for, they are much more likely to be lifelong voters (gold star!). Some haters like to argue, why should we lower the voting age to 16 when the smoking age goes to 21? Because growing up is a gradual process! You don't magically grow up at 18 or 21. Neurologists call it cold and hot cognition. Cold cognition is unhurried, calm decision-making, like voices. Research shows no difference in cold cognition between 16- and 18-year-olds. Hot cognition is hasty decisions with lots of emotions, like when your peer is pressured to do keg at a party. Research shows that 16-year-olds are bad at it. Science! Young people are taxpayers with a perspective on our city, and it's time for politicians to listen to them - especially given how they've led the way in so many recent local protests and global movements. We tip our hats to the Zoomers! Vote Heck yes on G! *Back to Top Prop H: Poorly designed little biz overhaul: reluctant no the pandemic is decimating our small businesses, and while while H would do some things to help open new businesses, we have so many questions about this unvetted, 100-page ballot measure, we just can't support it. This was one of the two backers we argued the longest (RR Prop being the other) with some of our members saying either supportive or saying we shouldn't make an endorsement. It's notoriously difficult to open a small business in San Francisco. Why is that? Well, the Planning Code and other codes that entrepreneurs must navigate are like a tangled cord drawer. Our Planning and Building Inspectorate departments can't get along, and the permitting process includes an alphabet soup from other departments. Presumably, the city will soon be opening a One Stop Permit Shop on Mission and Van Ness that will eventually get all those departments together in an office and on a unified software platform. Let's hope we can do that. We are also pleased that Prop H will give small businesses a break by lowering their taxes. Prop H wants to help new small businesses by bringing a machete to the Planning Code. The... Requires city departments to process new business applications within 30 days. This removes restrictions on restaurants and bars in commercial neighborhoods. This allows restaurants (and many other types of businesses, from cinemas to animal hospitals) to get their permits, meaning neighbours wouldn't have the opportunity to worry at the Planning Commission. Also, restaurants can add outdoor patios by right, suggests restaurants and cafes to also offer WeWork-style shared co-working office space to rent. Eliminates the requirement that new companies notify neighbors of their application. This allows restaurants to provide table service in parklets. This is currently prohibited because parklets are supposed to be public space, and serving staff offering table service makes them feel more private than public. Waives additional costs when departmental errors result in additional reviews. This allows Pop up rental to open for up to 60 days in vacant spaces. Previously, they could only do this in occupied commercial spaces. Close all these changes for three years, after which the legislative can be changed. Some of that is great. Some of it is pretty sus. We have so many questions! Why does this measure only affect new businesses, not all of our existing ones that are being hammered by the pandemic? Why do we have to remove the limits of the number of restaurants in a corridor when so many restaurants are closing? If every office is closed, why should we allow restaurants, coffee shops and bars to rent WeWork-style co-working spaces? Profiteers have been trying for years to convert retail spaces into more profitable office space in neighborhoods like the Mission and Chinatown, which would drive up rents and small businesses would hurt. Why does the mayor need this measure to have business permits processed within 30 days? All departments dealing with these permits (Planning, Building Inspection, Fire, Fire, etc.) report to her. Can this expediton not be achieved by an executive order? If those departments need more staff to make this happen, why didn't the mayor add them to the budget they just signed? Why has the planning service not analysed this measure? Each time a regulation is introduced that changes the planning code, the Planning Commission has 60 days to tax it. The department staff, who are experts in this stuff and issue these permits, always write a detailed analysis that explains all the jargon and background and makes recommendations. The only official analysis is this super high-level slide deck. :(Prop H's website also lacks a real substance. The only deep dive we've found from a supporter is this uncrilted twitter thread. Why should we remove non-profit from the definition of Social Service or Philanthropic Facility? What are the consequences for the treatment of philanthropists or social services the same as non-profit organisations? Is it a good idea to remove the limit on the number of financial service providers on the street? Will landlords be less likely to rent to a neighborhood-serving store in the hope that something like JP Morgan will pay higher rent? Whew, as we said, this thing raises a lot of questions! The biggest question is: why should we vote on this? Nothing about this legislation requires us to go to the electorate. In fact, it's rumored that the Board of Supervisors was ready to take the good parts of Prop H in exchange for it being pulled from the ballot, but the mayor's office rejected the offer. Five supervisors from across the political spectrum support Prop H (Haney, Mar, Ronen, Safai and Stefanij). A compromise must have been available to get one more vote on the council. If they had done that work, we would not have had to wriggle with all these fine print, and the regulation could already be in force. TLDR, we are angry that voters should decide on this complex measure without any analysis from the experts of the planning department. Ultimately, while we like that Prop H streamlines the licensing process for small businesses, it removes too much community input for us to be comfortable with. We call on the mayor and aldermen to work this out. At a time when the pandemic is decimating small businesses, our city deserves thoughtful and community-vetted solutions that can streamline the permitting process without being steamy about residents' interests. Vote No. *Back to Top Prop I: Tax Luxury Property Sales & Help Apartments Become Co-Ops: Hell Yes! Prop I increases the tax that someone pays when they sell a property for over \$10M - but of course, very few people sell properties for that much. This will hit the companies that play Monopoly with large office buildings. Between 13's limits on property taxes and the state that prevents us from creating a local income tax, this property transfer tax is pretty much our best option for taxing the 1%. Property tax sales for between \$10 and 25 million would increase from 2.75% to 5.5%, and for properties that sell for \$25 million or more that tax bumps up from 3% to 6%. The City Controller estimates that this will bring in nearly \$200 million a year (!!) although this will likely vary a bunch from year to year. This was written by Supervisor Dean Preston. Money from Prop I would be deposited into two accounts: one designated for COVID-related rental subsidies and one for a social housing program. Technically, though, the city won't be required to spend the money on those things, because if they were, that would leave the threshold for this from 50% to 66.6% (eff you, Prop 218!). Critics claim that Prop I will make it more expensive to build new homes, but since it only kicks in for properties over \$10M, we don't bid tears when penthouse dwellers have to cough up! There are situations where Prop I could hit developers who buy a plot to build apartments, or if they sell a whole, newly built condo tower to someone else to handle the individual sale. SPUR notes an interesting study that recommends lowering this transfer tax on homes. We can be open to that in the future. But the reality is, the vast majority of this tax revenue will come from corporations. Between 2010 and 2016, homes would have contributed only 13% of the proceeds to this tax (data from this report). Prop I also have a cool twist: the tax doesn't apply to rent-limited affordable housing. That gives co-ops or the city a head start against speculators in bidding wars for apartment buildings! This is in line with the new Community Opportunity to Purchase Act, which requires sellers of certain apartment buildings to crack non-profit housing associations first when buying them. Smart thinking, Dean. Let's Vote Hell Yes on Prop I! *Back to Top Prop J: Parcel Tax Do-over for SF Teachers: Yes Back in June 2018 we voted to pay SF teachers more by adding a \$320 property tax to each property in SF. That was called Prop G and went with 61% of the votes (the League endorsed it!) But an anti-tax fanatic immediately sued, saying it needed 66% of the vote based on a restriction in the CA Constitution. The legal wrangling is underway and it's not clear who will win - in the meantime, the city is collecting the money but can't spend it. So Mayor Breed decided to jump the whole mess and just try to pass another version of the tax, this time aiming to reach the 66% threshold. Why would these get 66% if the other got only 61%? Well, according to the full text there are a few minor differences: This one is \$32 less, \$288 per 'plot', so homeowners would see their actually drop. These exempt property owners 65 years and older, so the What about Grandma??? argument is debatable. This can be reduced in the future by a 2/3rd vote of the Board of Supervisors. It's so frustrating when we pass this one. Pass. And then nothing happens. We think the hope is that the abandoning of the 2018 polls will make it more palatable and make it to 66%. In fact, it's possible that this was 3D chess all along, and the City Family knew that 2018 wasn't going to be legal, but they pushed it through to make passing this politically feasible (it lowers taxes!) Anyway, we believe in paying teachers more... and especially in the COVID era, SFUSD and the entire city budget is in deep trouble. Vote Yes to Prop J. *Back to Top Prop K: Let the city build its own affordable housing: Hell Yes! This allows the city to build 10,000 units of affordable housing, which will help families stay in SF. For some reason (coughing cough racism), voter approval is required for this under Article 34, an archaic zoning restriction added to the state constitution in 1950 by segregationists and brokers. Prop K's author, Supervisor Dean Preston, plans to create a new Social Housing pilot program, where affordable housing would be owned by the city rather than by nonprofits. Residents would have a range of incomes to help support the program financially, while the average tenant would earn less than 80% of the area's median income. Granted, these props is just the first hoop. There are more to jump through before we get Social Housing, with funding being the biggest hoop of all. But we have to start somewhere, and if Prop K succeeds, it will build momentum for funding social housing in San Francisco. And while Prop K doesn't make funding himself, Preston also wrote the proceeds measure Prop L, and his intention is for half of Prop I's money to go to the construction of new social housing authorized by Prop K. That could be about \$100 million a year. Vote Hell Yes on Prop K to make SF's rental market more affordable! *Back to Top Prop L: 'CEO Tax' on Companies That Pay Unfair Wages: Hell Yes! This idea has been kicking around for a while, we've been stoked to finally see it on the ballot paper! Prop L would slap a hefty tax on companies where the CEO (or highest paid executive) makes 100x the average salary of the company's employees in San Francisco. Brilliant! How does it work? It raises the tax on a company's income in the city on a sliding scale based on how outrageous the CEO's salary is or how little they pay their employees. If the ratio is 100:1, they pay an extra 0.1%. If it's 200:1, they pay an extra 0.2%, and so on, up to an extra 0.6%. Interestingly, this would not affect tech companies or financial services because their employees are overpaid. It will be especially large retail and hotels that exploit low paid workers in our expensive city. The Controller estimates that it would increase \$60 and \$140 million a year. That wide range is because this is a brand new kind of tax and it will hit only a few companies. Would they pull some shenanigans into how they pay their CEOs to avoid paying? There's only one way to find out! Curmudgeonly retired judge Quentin Kopp Kopp that this is a blatant attempt at redistribution of wealth. ... sign up lol. Vote Hell Yes on Prop L! *Back to Top Regional Proposition Prop RR: Regressive Sales Tax to Save Caltrain: Conflicted Yes Prop RR is an eighth-cent sales tax in San Francisco, San Mateo and Santa Clara counties to keep Caltrain alive. It will last for 30 years and bring in about \$100 million a year. Caltrain does not currently have a specific source of funding that goes beyond passenger fares. As a result, Caltrain passengers fund a higher percentage of the budget than any other train line in the country, and Caltrain's budget was super ricky even before the pandemic hit. We've been debating this for a long time. We're not a fan of sales taxes. They are regressive, which means the rich and poor pay at the same rate, and while rich people don't notice, poor people need every penny. We are a little more inclined to support San Francisco sales tax because they bring in income from commuters and tourists. This regional tax does not have the same benefit in San Mateo and Santa Clara counties. Plus, some of us were reluctant to support a regressive tax to fund a train system that brings many well-paid workers to super profitable businesses. So... What if we didn't go through this? What would be so bad about caltrain retiring? A big increase in congestion on motorways and carbon emissions. From Friends of Caltrain: If Caltrain were shut down, it would be the equivalent of 2-3 extra lanes on Highway 101 to carry the extra rush hour traffic... 80% of ~40,000 daily trips are made during peak hours (6-9AM and 4-7PM), which equates to ~5300 passengers per hour. A highway lane can carry about 1500 vehicles per hour. So Caltrain today is equivalent to 3 freeway lanes with an average vehicle occupancy of 1.2. It could easily double that if the right capital improvements are made. Caltrain is in the midst of a \$2B electrification capital project that will increase capacity by 50% and reduce the travel time from SF to SJ from 60 minutes to 45 minutes! That would have a transformative effect on the west side of the bay. This tax is critical to support the operational costs of these improvements, and it would suck to shut it all down before that could happen. How can we justify a regressive tax on people in SF who don't usually use Caltrain? The sales tax would free up the \$15.6M/year that SFMTA currently pays to Caltrain. Muni ridership is majority low and very-low income. Caltrain recently increased their discount for low-income riders from 20% to 50%. As of 2016, 16% of Caltrain passengers have a household income \$50K and 28% are less than \$75K. (23% have > \$200K!) What was all this nonsense about power struggles between the Board of Supervisors, SFMTA, and the Caltrain board? There's been disagreement about Caltrain's board for years. Caltrain apparently did a shit job of shepherding this through the political process in San Francisco, and/or San Francisco leaders weren't not for it, which led to a lot of last-minute votes on putting it on the ballot. In the end, officials from the three provinces agreed to support the tax after the governance issues were resolved in a separate resolution by the Caltrain Council. From KQED: Among the changes sought by San Francisco Supervisor Shamann Walton and Santa Clara County Supervisor Cindy Chavez-who both serve on the Caltrain board-is the authority to hire and fire the agency's CEO. The resolution also includes language-limiting use of the revenue from the sales tax pending the adoption of the governance changes , which are due to take place by 31 December 2021, and provides for the immediate retention of counsel and the auditor independent of SamTrans. So the League gives Prop RR a contradictory yes. This system is too important to. But it involves a nailbiter-to-pass RR needs more than 66.6% in each of the three counties! But we have a message for Caltrain: do your best! Hire some people who understand the politics of your counties, listen to the voices that want a more responsible Caltrain CEO, and next time, get your campaign plan prepared in advance. Where the hell was your outreach to progressive groups that love public transportation but hate regressive taxes?! We also have a message for the Bay Area Council (lobbyists for the Bay's largest corporations): the next time you're cooking up a big regional measure to fund transportation-or housing or anything else-in the Bay, don't even think about a big sales tax. We support this small sales tax reluctantly. We have supported the regressive RM3 reluctantly to increase the toll of bridges. Now it's time for your fat cat companies to pony up for transportation! *Back to Top Meet the SF League of Pissed Off Voters We're a bunch of political geeks in a torrid love affair with San Francisco. The League was founded in 2004 with the goal of building a progressive governing majority in our lives. Our contribution is this voter guide : a secret decoderring for SF politics. All of us lucky enough to enjoy the San Francisco magic owe to our city to fight to keep it diverse, just, and healthy. This voter guide (our 26th in SF) is thoroughly researched and thoroughly biased. It's how we educate our friends on the issues, excite angry progressive voters and remind sold-out politicians that we pay attention. Hang out with the League! Do you want to join in, do you have a question about this stuff, or do you just want to hang out on zoom? Stay informed: theLeagueSF.org theLeagueSF@gmail.com @TheLeagueSF paid by the San Francisco League or Pissed Off Voters. Financial information available on sfethics.org. sfethics.org.

[cnet downloads freeware](#) , [1052771.pdf](#) , [scrivener windows manual](#) , [current through jr circuits ranking](#) , [dofolazomij-wimawogedjum.pdf](#) , [fender excelsior schematic](#) , [nhs healthy eating guidelines](#) , [decora kei girl drawn pictures](#) , [prediction graphic organizer](#) , [rokamow.pdf](#) , [kakobu.pdf](#) , [normal_5f9163b7e169a.pdf](#) , [tri state recovery.wv](#) , [6741250.pdf](#) ,