



# NOVEMBER 5, 2024 ELECTION

## TAXPAYER RECOMMENDATIONS

Your San Francisco Taxpayers Association, after thorough review of all 15 local and 10 state ballot measures, recommends the following taxpayer-affecting ballot measures:

### Candidates

**Min Chang** - Board of Education

### Local Ballot Measures

**PROP A - NO** - Should we add new taxes of \$3 billion, including interest, which will be paid off in fiscal year 2047-2048 by attaching parcel taxes to existing property taxes when we haven't yet paid off prior bonds or used the bond funds as voters intended? There is also a \$10 billion state Education Bond to Repair Schools (Proposition 2) on the November 2024 ballot. With declining public school enrollment and questionable spending of past bonds, we should ensure we have a fiscally responsible School Board elected before approving more funds. Additionally, the Citizens Bond Oversight Committee needs to be empowered to fulfill its charge. We need full transparency and accountability and not what was discovered during COVID with the Oversight Committee's promises in the prior-approved Bond Measures non-existent. Voters have always been generous to public schools. It's time to vote NO on Prop. A!

**PROP B - NO** - Another bond, this one for homeless SF residents, and entitled "Community Health and Medical Facilities, Street Safety, Public Spaces, and Shelter to Reduce Homelessness Bond" will add more property taxes of \$3.9 million, plus interest of \$3.4 million over 30 years. Vote "no" and compel non-profit recipients to secure tax-deductible charitable contributions, from millionaires and billionaires. Vote NO on Prop. B.

**PROP C - NO** - This would add another City Hall office for an Inspector-General's Department while two other ballot measures ask voters to reduce such entities. We advise a "no" vote and rejection of this budget increase at least \$725,000 annually. Vote NO on Prop. C.

**PROP D & E - YES, NO** - Proposition D sets a limit of 65 city commissions and saves taxpayers' money. Vote "yes," but reject a Board of Supervisors-spawned Prop. E which establishes a committee to study whether we have too many commissions. Vote YES on Prop. D, NO on Prop. E.

**PROP F - NO** - Prop. F exemplifies City Hall's methods for approval to remedying a shortage of police officers. It would allow a cop to draw his or her retirement payments while still acting for five years as a paid police officer. It won't add a single officer, but fosters "double-dipping." Vote NO on Prop. F.

**PROP G - NO** - Our controller points out that Proposition G "would have a significant impact on the cost of government in that it would reallocate funds that would otherwise be available, starting with at least \$4 million in fiscal year 2026-2027 . . . rising to a maximum of approximately \$14 million in fiscal year 2045-2046." The purpose is a so-called Affordable Housing Opportunity Act. Taxpayers are being asked for their money to create yet another "set-aside" in the annual budget until 2047. The controller observes: "This proposed (Charter) amendment is not in compliance with a voter-adopted city policy regarding set-asides." Vote NO on Prop. G.

**PROP H - NO** - Prop. H involves fire-fighters. There is no shortage and we like firefighters. Our controller concludes approval of Prop. H "would increase costs to the City" millions of dollars through fiscal year 2040-2041. We recommend rejection. Vote NO on Prop. H.

**PROP I - NO** - We support Registered Nurses (RNs) and 9-1-1 operators, but Proposition I would exacerbate shortages of RNs and 911 operators. The latter's retirement law would abrogate the 20-year work requirement for a pension and substitute a mere five-year requirement. RNs would be able to retire three years early! Our controller finds that the annual costs of Prop. I would range from approximately \$1.5 million to about \$4.4 million per year and increase taxpayers' contributions accordingly. Regarding 9-1-1 operators, cost will increase to \$2.3 million starting in 2025-2026 and continuing each year as the number of operators retire early at age 50. Vote NO on Prop. I.

**PROP K - NO** - The Great Highway exists because motor vehicle owners and drivers paid gasoline taxes for decades to pay for it. Park visitors didn't finance it. Bicycle riders never were taxed for it. Neither were walkers. Yet, the Board of Supervisors wants to prevent those financing the Great Highway by building a park and prohibiting all motorists, which renders it unavailable to senior citizens and disabled citizens. No money exists in our City's budget for any park project and Golden Gate Park is just steps away from the Great Highway. Closing the Great Highway to motor vehicles from noon on Friday to 6 a.m. on Monday represents a justifiable compromise which already exists. Vote NO on Prop. K.

**PROP L - NO** - In 2022, San Francisco voters approved a hike in sales tax to fund Municipal Railway's related projects. By voting for that measure, we approved over \$100 million dollars per year for the next 30 years for Muni. This proposition taxes Lyft, Uber and Waymo, and is just another money-grab for a failed Muni. It hasn't been two years since the 2022 ballot measure, and they are back in our wallets again. The Muni is worse than ever. Fare-dodgers, disruptive passengers, as well as other negative aspects of riding Muni have caused the numbers of passengers to tumble. Empty buses and streetcars abound; yet here we are facing another attempt to pump taxpayer money down this transit rat hole. All city businesses continue to suffer post pandemic. "For Lease" signs on commercial properties abound throughout the City. And now they want struggling businesses and the general public to pay another tax for Muni. Vote NO on Prop. L.

**PROP M - NO** - The mayor and the Board of Supervisors already have the taxpayers of San Francisco paying over one billion dollars per year for homeless related programs via the City budget. Now, they want to increase the taxes on already struggling businesses so they can spend even more on the homeless issue which has been a complete failure with the one billion dollars we have given them every year. Throwing more money at their failed program will only endorse bad management. The taxpayers deserve successful results on the money that continues to be spent yearly on the homeless before additional taxes burden the taxpayers. Send that message, Vote NO on Prop. M.

**PROP N - NO** - The SF Taxpayers Association fully supports first responders, Sheriff deputies, paramedics, nurses and 9-1-1 operators. This proposition, however, gives money to them for education and will further strain our deficit-ridden local budget. Additionally, there are many other worthy city employees and other departments excluded from such handouts. Favoring one sector of public employees would not be equal treatment for all. Vote NO on Prop. N.

---

### State Ballot Measures

---

**PROP 2 - NO** - As the Howard Jarvis Taxpayers Association reminds taxpayers: A bond works like a government credit card (because) paying off that credit card requires borrowers to spend more of your tax dollars. For example, State Proposition 2 authorizes \$10 billion in general obligation (G.O.) bonds for repair, construction and improving conditions of K-12 public schools (including charter schools), community colleges and career technical education programs. This taxpayer loan will, however, also cost taxpayers interest of about \$500 million each year for 35 years (!) to repay this loan or \$1.125 billion in total. Our children will be paying this for decades in a state with a government deficit of \$77 million without Prop. 2 and other statewide bonds. Vote NO on Prop. 2.

**PROP 4 - NO** - The state is already leveraged and in deficit. Additional borrowing should not be allowed. Water and wildfire mitigation expenses should be spent from the state budget and not interest-costing bonds. Vote NO on Prop. 4.

**PROP 5 - NO** - Being saddled with a statewide deficit doesn't stop legislators who would inflict local taxpayers with debt for "affordable housing and infrastructure based on increased property taxes." Shifty legislators now ask us to lower the required voter approval for such expenditures from two-thirds to only 55%, another cute trick to burden local taxpayers. Vote NO on Prop. 5.

**PROP 33 - NO** - One of the last vestiges of small property ownership rights in California is to be able to rent your single-family property without excessive interference from state or local government. The present law protects the small property owner and makes it possible to pay for the upkeep, repair and mortgages on small rentals. Prop. 33 will further hinder rental construction because of the draconian measures written into Prop 33. Protect the rights of small property owners. Vote NO on Prop. 33.

**PROP 35 - YES** - This ballot measure provides that the existing tax on managed health care insurance, which will otherwise expire in 2026, shall be permanent, if thereafter approved by the federal government. The tax provides money for medical treatment for low-income families with children, senior citizens, disabled people and other Medi-Cal recipients. It means increased money for Medi-Cal of \$2 million to \$5 billion annually and higher state costs of \$1-2 billion each year for implementation. 99% of revenue must be used for patient care. There's no argument against Prop. 35 in the Voter Information Guide. Vote YES on Prop. 35.

**PROP 36 - YES** - This voter-sponsored initiative in effect restores Penal Code prison and jail provisions which had encouraged "smash and grab" crimes, burglaries, (including auto thefts) and thefts in general. It's not only law enforcement and the courts which have been frustrated by the 2014 change in law to reduce penalties for thieves, but law-abiding citizens and California visitors who support Prop. 36. So do taxpayers. Convicted thieves will have an option to enter rehabilitation. Protect taxpayers and others. Vote YES on Prop. 36.

Paid for by the San Francisco Taxpayer Association • Judge Quentin L. Kopp (ret.), Pres., Peter Fatooh, Vice Pres, Gina Tse-Louie, secretary-treasurer