

**Freedom Socialist Party Recommendations for
November 3, 2015 San Francisco General Election**

CITY OF SAN FRANCISCO BALLOT MEASURES (grouped by theme)

Number	Topic	Summary	Supporters and Opponents	Recommendation
Prop A Affordable Housing Bond	Bond measure to rehabilitate public housing, help first-time home buyers, and develop affordable new homes	A \$310 million bond for affordable housing, to be repaid by an increase to homeowner property taxes (50% of the increase can be passed along to renters). Would amount to a tax of an estimated \$56.24 per year on a house valued at \$500,000	For: Mayor Lee, Senator Feinstein, entire SF Board of Supervisors Against: San Francisco Libertarians, San Francisco Tax Payers Association	Voter Decide Prop A is weakly worded and has provisions to ensure great profits for private developers. Monies in the city's general fund should pay for priorities like affordable housing instead of a new tax on working people. Still, affordable housing is deeply needed and this measure could provide some.
Prop D Mission Rock	Encourages the development of Mission Rock; raises height limits to accommodate new construction in the area	Would open up development of municipally-owned Mission Rock, a 28-acre waterfront property. Allocates only 33 percent of new housing units to low- and middle-income households. Raises height limits for new construction	For: San Francisco Giants, Mayor Lee and most Supervisors, SF Chamber of Commerce Against: The Sierra Club; Coalition for SF Neighborhoods	Vote NO <i>One hundred percent</i> of city-owned property should be used for affordable housing. No public land should be used for private development (this measure allots 60% of Mission Rock to private projects).

<p>Prop F</p> <p>Short-Term Residential Rentals</p>	<p>Addresses low stock of housing rentals and abuses by online hosting platforms like Airbnb</p>	<p>Tightens requirements on hosting platforms and landlords, requires greater reporting by landlords of short-term rental spaces, limits short term rentals of private homes and apartments to 75 days per year</p>	<p>For: Former Assemblyman Tom Ammiano, San Francisco Labor Council, San Francisco Tenants Union</p> <p>Against: Airbnb, SF Chamber of Commerce</p>	<p>Vote YES In the current housing crisis, this measure will help to preserve the city's small and rapidly diminishing supply of affordable rentals, and bring in more tax revenue from businesses like Airbnb. Still allows individual residents to rent out their units up to 75 days per year.</p>
<p>Prop I</p> <p>Suspension of Market-Rate Development in the Mission District</p>	<p>Suspends market-rate development in the rapidly gentrifying Mission District</p>	<p>Imposes an eighteen-month moratorium on the construction of new housing, except buildings for low- or middle-income tenants. Mandates the development of a neighborhood stabilization plan by 2017</p>	<p>For: Committee to Save the Mission, San Francisco Labor Council, San Francisco Tenants Union</p> <p>Against: Senator Feinstein, Mayor Lee, Residential Building Association</p>	<p>Vote YES Private developers are not the solution to affordable housing. Market-rate development in the Mission district must be halted. This is a reasonable proposal to counter gentrification and displacement in one of the city's most densely populated and diverse neighborhoods.</p>
<p>Prop K</p> <p>Surplus Public Lands</p>	<p>Broadens the acceptable uses of surplus city-owned lands</p>	<p>Allows the use of city-owned surplus lands to build housing for the very poor and homeless, but also for households earning "up to 150% or more of the area's median income"</p>	<p>For: Mayor Lee, San Francisco Democratic Party, Green Party</p> <p>Against: Some Republicans</p>	<p>Voter Decide Prop K would create affordable housing for San Franciscans who need it most, but public lands could now be developed and sold to buyers who earn well above the median income. Supervisors could now choose to use this land for other purposes, including "public safety" -- i.e., for an already overfunded police department.</p>

<p>Prop G</p> <p>Disclosures Regarding Renewable Energy</p>	<p>The future of clean, publicly-owned electricity in San Francisco (Prop G and Prop H are opposing measures)</p>	<p>San Francisco is preparing to launch CleanPowerSF, a green public power alternative. Entirely funded by PG&E, Prop G would narrowly define what renewable energy sources the city would be allowed to sell, ensuring PG&E's dominance.</p>	<p>For: Pacific Gas & Electric</p> <p>Against: Sierra Club, clean energy advocates, IBEW electricians' union</p>	<p>Vote NO Defeat PG&E's continued monopoly on local electricity</p>
<p>Prop H</p> <p>Defining Clean, Green, and Renewable Energy</p>	<p>The future of clean, publicly-owned electricity in San Francisco (Prop G and Prop H are opposing measures)</p>	<p>Prop H opposes Prop G and PG&E's efforts to limit Clean Power SF's eligible electricity sources. Adopts definition of "green energy, clean energy and renewable greenhouse gas-free energy" in accordance with state standards.</p>	<p>For: Clean energy advocates, SF Labor Council, SF Board of Supervisors</p> <p>Against: PG&E</p>	<p>Vote YES Prop H attempts to halt PG&E's efforts to counter <i>public</i> power. It is a small but important step toward a greener public power alternative.</p>
<p>Prop B</p> <p>Paid Parental Leave for City Employees</p>	<p>This measure expands the right to paid parental leave for city employees</p>	<p>Currently, city workers must exhaust their sick leave before paid parental leave is available. Prop B grants twelve weeks of paid parental leave and allows each parent to retain up to 40 hours of sick leave.</p>	<p>For: San Francisco Labor Council; Service Employees International Union Local 1021, Mayor Lee</p> <p>Against: San Francisco Libertarians</p>	<p>Vote YES! All workers should have the right to generous paid parental leave. Parental leave policies in the U.S. are pathetically weak, compared to most of the world, and all workers, in the public and private sectors deserve better.</p>

<p>Prop C</p> <p>Expenditure Lobbyists</p>	<p>This measure regulates the practices of expenditure lobbyists in San Francisco</p>	<p>The intent of this measure is to stop “covert” lobbying by requiring corporate lobbyists to register with the Ethics Commission and file monthly disclosures.</p>	<p>For: SF Democratic Party, Ethics Commission, SF Taxpayers Association</p> <p>Against: San Francisco Human Services Network, Council of Community Housing Organizations</p>	<p>Vote NO</p> <p>The scope of Prop C is far too broad. It fails to distinguish between corporate lobbyists and critically important unions and community organizations mobilizing their members for change.</p>
<p>Prop E</p> <p>Requirements for Public Meetings</p>	<p>Would require live internet broadcasts of public meetings and increase opportunities for public comment</p>	<p>All city boards and committees, as well as the school board and the City College Board of Trustees, would be required to broadcast meetings live by internet and take public comments online.</p>	<p>For: David Lee, political science teacher at SF State and 150 SFSU students; CCSF Trustee Alex Randolph</p> <p>Against: San Francisco Democratic Party, SF Tomorrow</p>	<p>Vote YES</p> <p>This measure would increase public access and participation in meetings where important decisions affecting San Franciscans are made.</p>