

D5 Action: Endorsements for 2015

Working for an informed and active electorate in District 5

Proposition	Vote
A — Bond for affordable housing	No endorsement
B — Enhancing paid parental leave for city employees	YES
C — Lobbyists: change requirements for registering to include non-profits and unions	NO
D — Mission Rock development: allow heights up to 240' on the waterfront (current limit is 80')	NO
E — Meetings: change public access requirements (people who don't live here can take part)	NO
F — Short-term rentals: protect renters and impose enforceable restrictions	YES
G — Renewable energy disclosures: PG&E	NO
H — Clean energy: SF Right to Know Act	YES
I — Mission District: temporary moratorium on new luxury housing	YES
J — Preserve long-term neighborhood small businesses	YES
K — Surplus City Property: use it for affordable housing	YES

Housing affordability

Yes, Yes, Yes on F, I, K

No endorsement on A, **No on D**

Everyone knows there is a severe housing crisis in San Francisco, and many of us have seen our friends forced out of the City. D5 Action has thought long and hard about the propositions affecting housing.

We can't endorse Prop A because although more money for housing seems like a good thing, Prop A does not guarantee how funds will be spent or monitored.

We're tempted by Prop D because of the the guarantee that affordable housing will be built on-site, but this guarantee depends on extreme height increases along the waterfront (from 80' to 240'), and details about the placement of the 240' towers are sketchy. Also, the plan for handling the increase in traffic is clearly inadequate. **No on D.**

Yes on F: Stop the loss of rental housing! The City needs to get serious about enforcing limits on short-term rentals to stop landlords from evicting long-term tenants for short-term gain and to keep our neighborhoods from turning into hotel zones.

Yes on I: This proposition temporarily stops the development of market-rate housing in the Mission to provide time to establish a comprehensive planning process for the area.

Prop K strengthens the 2002 legislation that requires City agencies to identify unused properties that can be developed as housing for homeless people and for affordable housing.

Yes on K!

D5 Action: Endorsements for 2015

Working for an informed and active electorate in District 5

Clean power in San Francisco — No on G and Yes on H

Are you confused by the two similar sounding Clean Energy measures on the ballot? So were we until we did our research.

Prop H was put on the ballot by the Board of Supervisors to counter Prop G. Prop H simply allows the City to follow the same set of rules that PG&E follows, so you will be able to compare apples with apples when choosing which energy program you like best. **Vote Yes on H** for clear comparisons.

Prop G was originally put on by the PG&E workers' union (IBEW 1245) who wanted to protect PG&E's energy monopoly. What it does is limit what the city can call "clean," "green," "renewable" and "greenhouse gas-free" under the CleanPowerSF program that is scheduled to launch next year. Prop G allows the City to label only one type of energy as renewable, but allows PG&E to label three types as renewable. For example, if Prop G passes, the City cannot label rooftop solar energy as "renewable" or "greenhouse gas-free." Now, the authors of Prop G have decided to withdraw support for their measure and are telling people to vote No on G. We agree: vote **No on G**.

Good government — Yes on B and J, No on C and E

D5 Action supports Prop B: it simply addresses an inequity in the City's parental leave program. When both parents of a child are City employees, current law provides parental leave for only one employee. Prop B provides parental leave for both employees. **Yes on B!**

Prop C defines and creates registration and reporting requirements for "expenditure lobbyists," people who spend to influence others to contact City officials. Although D5 Action supports transparency in government, we are concerned about Prop C, which was amended at the last minute to adversely affect non-profits and labor unions. Prop C's threshold kicks in when an organization spends \$2,500 in any one month; this is low enough to be a burden to small non-profits, while larger organizations can easily afford the attorneys and accountants that this proposition would require. Vote **No on C** and urge the Ethics Commission to rewrite this legislation. They can do better than this.

D5 Action says **No on E** because it's important to preserve the role of genuine public input into decisions made by the City's policy bodies. Although Prop E appears to increase the accountability of SF commissions and committees, it actually opens public meetings to a deluge of anonymous, live comments from anyone anywhere in the country with access to the Internet. It also lets any powerful interest with 50 supporters dictate the timing and focus of agendas for public meetings. SF needs proper implementation of existing sunshine laws. Adding the SF Gate comments section to every public meeting won't help democracy in City government.

Yes on J: Save local small businesses! We've all seen that many small businesses have been forced out by rising rents, even when they have been part of their neighborhoods for years. Prop J provides "gap" funding for landlords who help preserve established businesses.