

Mayor

1. Breed
2. Lurie
3. Farrell (up to you if you want to rank 3rd. Details below)

We think you should vote for London Breed because she's the best embodiment of the issue most important to us: housing. She is the only candidate that openly says that SF needs to build more housing **everywhere!** Breed has been mayor for 6 years - 3 of which were during the pandemic, which was a hard transition period for SF. She supports using state workarounds to build as much housing as possible in SF. Breed is also good on bikes and transit: she has added over 20 miles of new protected bike lanes, expanded slow streets, and has supported speed cameras. She has solid initiatives for bringing businesses back to downtown, like zoning changes and Vacant to Vibrant. We can't deny some of her criticism: she has shown cruelty with encampment sweeps and she has had a long tenure as mayor with not enough to show for it, but we still believe she's the best candidate for mayor.

There's no good way to say this: Daniel Lurie is a nepo baby who bought his way into the election. That being said, he has decent ideas on paper, and is a strong supporter of sustainable homelessness solutions, like shelters. He's similarly strong on bike/transit as Breed. He also rides a bike, which notably endears him to us.

We're not fans of Aaron Peskin. He calls himself the progressive in this race, but it's in name only. He's continuously blocked housing in District 3, down-zoning the entire northern waterfront. He's [delayed repurposing a hotel](#) in his district to be converted into shelters, and blocked the [7000+ unit apartments](#) being built in Treasure Island. He continuously blocked a duplex from merging, only to then buy the said duplex and [perform the merge himself](#). He voted against converting the [Nordstrom parking lot](#) into 495 units. Peskin supporters will mention that he has approved housing but that's only in majority minority districts such as Mission, Dogpatch, and Bayview while continuously blocking development in own district or skyline. He's shown [time](#) and [time](#) again to be a [bully at City Hall](#) fostering SF's toxic city politics.

Peskin will also claim support for transit and walkability but will [kill bike lane projects](#), oppose [caltrain funding](#), and doesn't support Ocean Beach Park (Prop K).

Openly - The reason we have Farrell on our ballot is because we want to prevent Aaron Peskin from becoming mayor. We are not huge fans of Mark Farrell - he uses a lot of crime scare-mongering in his campaign, is the biggest supporter in the election of the police, and doesn't support bus lanes. We're not people that think that crime doesn't exist in SF -- between us, we have had 3 bikes stolen -- but we believe that policing needs to be more effective in SF, alongside staffing increases. At the moment, the rate at which property crimes are solved is consistently low, regardless of headcount, and similarly, the arrest rate [has not gone hand-in-hand with the number of officers](#). This leads us to feel unsatisfied with Farrell's

campaign's claims. Despite this, he still remains more pro-housing, pro-shelter, and pro-transit than the other candidates. It's up to you whether you want to put Farrell or not.

If you want SF to be more affordable, we need Breed on housing -- both Lurie and Farrell only support housing in selective areas.

✓ Prop 2 - Public Facilities

\$10 billion bond for public schools

✓ Prop 3 - Right to Marry

Yay! Just says marriage is everyone's right

✓ Prop 4 - Climate Preparedness

\$10 billion bond for clean water, droughts, and clean air

✓ Prop 5 - Lower bond requirement for housing public infrastructure

To pass a bond for housing and local infrastructure you need 67% approval from voters. This lowers the requirement to 55%. The reason we have to vote on propositions for random taxes is because it's way harder to pass bonds in SF.

67% is way too high an approval for raising funds, and 55% is far more democratic to raise critical funds for public infrastructure.

✓ Prop 6 - End Slavery in Prisons

This ends involuntary labor in prisons, and the Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation would not be allowed to discipline a prisoner for turning down a work assignment.

✓ Prop 32 - Minimum Wage

Raises to \$18 - basically everyone in the san francisco bay has an \$18 or more minimum wage. Moreover, health and fast food workers have \$25 and \$20 respectively. Minimum wage will also increase by the Consumer Price Index thereafter.

✗ Prop 33 - Rent Control

This prop wants to repeal Costa-Hawkins. That's a state law that says that housing built after 1995, as well as single family homes, and condos, can't be regulated by local rent control. It also says when a unit becomes vacant, landlords can set the rent back to market rate.

The problem is that 1) allowing cities to apply rent control to newer buildings and 2) putting limits on the rent landlords could charge new tenants, would mean that no new housing gets built. A [2017 study](#) found that rent control caused San Francisco's overall rents (including units not covered by rent control) to go up because landlords, when faced with the financial limitations of rent control, chose to convert rental units to condos or other owner-occupied housing.

Bougie places like Marin and Malibu are going to make really onerous rent control laws to prevent any new housing there, raising the prices everywhere else. If we let this pass, it is just going to be CEQA part 2 -- a weapon that NIMBYs use in order to prevent housing under a progressive facade.

✓ Prop 34 - No (Aids Healthcare Foundation) In My Backyard

This codifies a recent Newsom law that requires California to negotiate drug prices as a single entity and requires some California healthcare providers to spend 98% of funding on direct patient care.

There's also this dude (Michael Weinstein) who runs the AIDS healthcare foundation (AHF), who sponsors his own pet project legislation every couple of years. He's recently tried to get condoms into porn, and pass excessive rent control. The AHF uses state and federal funds to push these ballot initiatives, and this measure basically targets the AHF by limiting state funding on ballots.

✓ Prop 35 - Medi-Cal funding

✗ Prop 36 - Increases penalties for non-violent offenses

✓ Prop A - School Bonds

\$790 million bond to fix public school buildings in SF.

✓ Prop B - Infrastructure Bond

\$390 million bond for fixing hospitals, road repairs, safety improvements

✗ Prop C - Inspector General for Fraud, Waste, and Abuse

This is Aaron Peskin's ballot measure. In 2020, there was an FBI corruption investigation that revealed a big network of city officials accused of bribery/fraud, which caused a lot of justified outrage.

But - there's already 4 city departments that can investigate fraud, waste, and abuse -- ethics commission, DA, city attorney, and city services auditor. They all meet regularly as well. This is a super redundant position that will cost the city time and money.

The first thing this inspector general should do is investigate themselves for waste.

✓ Prop D - Less Commissions

San Francisco commissions are groups of citizens appointed by the government to oversee city departments and provide advice on issues. There are currently 126 commissions in San Francisco. This proposition will bring it down to 65.

San Francisco's Civil Grand Jury released a report earlier this year that determined there is no comprehensive list of these bodies and the functions they serve. It found that many haven't met in months. There are a huge number of vacancies among the city's 1,200 commission seats, and many of them serve the same purpose. [\[source\]](#)

Both SPUR and SF Chronicle said no on D -- the biggest things that gave us pause were that commissioners were no longer paid (might lead to only rich people running them) and that the number 65 seemed to be somewhat arbitrary.

Ultimately, there's a lot of bloat and wasted money on commissions, so we think this was a good idea.

✗ Prop E - Create "Less Commissions" Commission

This competes with prop E; however there's no requirements imposed on the new commission, nor does it give the commission any actual power. It simply creates the commission, and hopes that the commission will put yet another prop on the ballot to restructure the inane commission structure in the city.

✗ Prop F - Police deferred retirement

The argument for this prop is that there's a shortage of police officers in SF, and that it is hard to hire for the job. What this would do: if an SFPD police officer with 25 years or more of experience puts off their retirement for 5 years, they would earn more interest on their retirement benefits. Very small benefit that likely is applicable to a small amount of people.

This would cost the city about ~3 million dollars, which is not much, but this is probably going to have no real consequences, and is a waste-of-time proposition. The prop tries to reduce the number of officers leaving the force, but fails to do anything consequential to actually increase SFPD staffing.

Prop G - Extremely low income housing subsidies

Currently ELI (extremely low income) seniors, and people with disabilities can barely afford the affordable housing that's being built. This is due to most new affordable housing priced based on 30 - 80% AMI (area median income). This is definitely a problem, and it puts a ton of folks on the margins at risk of homelessness.

However, the way this proposition funds this measure, is through something called a set-aside. It sets a pool of money (max of \$8.25 million a year), from the General Fund budget, to be allocated to the ELI housing, that grows at 3% indefinitely.

While set-asides provide a fixed amount of funding for essential city services, like transportation and libraries, once funding is locked up by the voters, city officials have no ability to make adjustments. For comparison to other cities, Los Angeles has two adopted requirements, San Diego has one and San Jose has none. SF also has a non-binding voter-adopted city policy that limits set-asides that reduce the discretionary portion of the General Fund budget.

The Board of Supervisors launched the [Senior Operating Subsidy](#) program in 2019 with \$5 million. In the years since, the board and the mayor have continued to add money to the pot every couple of years. There was also a one-time windfall of \$52.3 million from the state for these efforts.

This proposition helps subsidize rent for ELI folks, who may not be able to afford the currently built affordable housing, and is not expensive for the city. But it is altogether redundant, a really bad way to budget city money, and poor policymaking.

Prop H - Lower fire department pension age

Before January of 2012, if you were hired, you would retire at 55. If you were hired after, you get to retire at 58. It could be a fiscal danger to SF for all these people to retire earlier than expected, all of the firefighters knew of this when hired. At some level, why are voters deciding this?

Prop I - Retirement benefits for nurses and 911

Prop J - Funding Programs Serving Children, Youth, and Families

Prop K - Great Highway

The southern extension of the Great Highway is closing due to erosion. This is now a dead-end road that we spend resources to clear sand off of. There's a parallel street where cars can drive. Let's make it a park!

If K doesn't pass, we will lose the closed Great Highway on weekends too, which is a huge loss for SF.

✓ Prop L - Muni

This taxes Uber, Lyft, and Waymo to raise \$25 million for Muni operations. Currently Muni faces a deficit for the next two years (regional funding will be on the ballot in 2026!), and cuts to Muni are extremely likely.

There are very few ways to raise funds to reduce the deficit, and this will help Muni not fall off a cliff.

While this may feel like an arbitrary tax (that unnecessarily attacks rideshare), rideshare in SF is taxed far less than other major cities (\$0.91 in SF vs. \$4.95 in Manhattan). This only raises the ride tax to \$2.05 - still far less than Chicago (\$3.00) or NYC.

This will only pass with 50% + 1 vote, and more votes than Prop M. If it does receive more votes, it does not invalidate Prop M.

✓ Prop M - Tax Reform

We currently raise certain taxes based on payroll. This incentivizes businesses to hire outside of SF, and has been very volatile since the rise in remote work. This switches to gross receipts, which is more stable.

Prop M was formed out of a commission by Mayor Breed and Aaron Peskin, and has been in development for over a year. It competes with Prop L; however it does not need more votes than Prop L to pass, only 50% + 1 vote.

✓ Prop N - First responder student loan forgiveness program

✓ Prop O - Reproductive Freedom

National and CA Assembly

Dem down ballot

