

# Jonah Mann's November 2024 voting recommendations

Please reach out to me by email at [jonah@jonahmann.com](mailto:jonah@jonahmann.com) or by text at 610-348-5581 if

- you disagree with anything in this document; I'm happy to change my mind and republish.
- you found this document useful; it'll motivate me to write another one for the next election.
- you'd like more context, clarification, or reasoning; I'll add it to this document and republish it.
- you have suggestions for how to improve this document or the ones I write for subsequent elections; I'll take them seriously.

## Cheat sheet

President & Vice President. <b>Kamala Harris &amp; Tim Walz</b>	CA Prop 2. <b>Yes</b>
United States Senator. <b>Adam B. Schiff</b> (twice)	CA Prop 3. <b>Yes</b>
United States Representative. <b>Nancy Pelosi</b>	CA Prop 4. <b>Yes</b>
State Senator. <b>Scott Wiener</b>	CA Prop 5. <b>Yes</b>
State Assembly Member, District 17. <b>Matt Haney</b>	CA Prop 6. <b>Yes</b>
State Assembly Member, District 19. <b>Catherine Stefani</b>	CA Prop 32. <b>Yes</b>
Member, Board of Education. <b>Gupta, Huling, Jersin, Ray</b>	CA Prop 33. <b>No</b>
Trustee, Community College Board. <b>Chisti, Ferguson, McCarty, Zamora</b>	CA Prop 34. <b>Yes</b>
BART Board of Directors, District 7. <b>Victor Flores</b>	CA Prop 35. <b>Yes</b>
BART Board of Directors, District 9. <b>Joe Sangirardi</b>	CA Prop 36. <b>Yes</b>
Mayor. <b>London Breed 1<sup>st</sup></b> , Mark Farrell 2 <sup>nd</sup> , Daniel Lurie 3 <sup>rd</sup>	SF Prop A. <b>Yes</b>
Supervisor, District 1. <b>Marjan Philhour</b>	SF Prop B. <b>Yes</b>
Supervisor, District 3. <b>Danny Sauter</b>	SF Prop C. <b>No</b>
Supervisor, District 5. <b>Bilal Mahmood 1<sup>st</sup></b> , Autumn Looijen 2 <sup>nd</sup> , Scotty Jacobs 3 <sup>rd</sup>	SF Prop D. <b>Yes</b>
Supervisor, District 7. <b>Myrna Melgar 1<sup>st</sup></b> , Matthew Boschetto 2 <sup>nd</sup>	SF Prop E. <b>No</b>
Supervisor, District 9. <b>Trevor Chandler</b>	SF Prop F. <b>Yes</b>
Supervisor, District 11. <b>Michael Lai 1<sup>st</sup></b> , Earnest EJ Jones 2 <sup>nd</sup>	SF Prop G. <b>Yes</b>
City Attorney. <b>David Chiu</b>	SF Prop H. <b>Yes</b>
District Attorney. <b>Brooke Jenkins</b>	SF Prop I. <b>Yes</b>
Sheriff. <b>Paul Miyamoto</b>	SF Prop J. <b>Yes</b>
Treasurer. <b>José Cisneros</b>	SF Prop K. <b>Yes</b>
	SF Prop L. <b>Yes</b>
	SF Prop M. <b>Yes</b>
	SF Prop N. <b>Yes</b>
	SF Prop O. <b>Yes</b>

## Preface

### Political philosophy

I view a vote as a mandate. I want candidates to propose bold visions. When they win, I want them to interpret their win as a mandate to enact their vision. I don't want my elected representatives to take the median position of their constituents on every issue.

I don't support direct democracy. Crafting good public policy requires both attention and expertise. Voters are attention-constrained and expertise-constrained, and so cannot consistently make good decisions. I want to vote for representatives whose full-time job is to study the issues and consult with experts to craft policies that will produce outcomes in line with their vision. A great example of this is the Federal Reserve Board, a group of experts in their field whom elected officials have presented with a vision, namely [price stability and full employment](#), and who are entrusted with the power to enact policies that will achieve that vision without interference.

Unfortunately California's political system is far from this ideal: On this ballot we'll be voting on 25 different propositions and a dozen different offices that I hardly have the attention to research. That said, I'm not an ideological purist; I believe that outcomes matter. I'm not going to, as an example, vote *No* on all the propositions simply to protest their appearance on the ballot.

## My vision

I suppose having said the above, I owe it to you to articulate the vision I want my policymakers to enact. Well I'm not going to do that. But I'll at least articulate my takes on the issues I care about the most. These inform my recommendations below.

1. Housing. I believe that SF suffers from a severe shortage of housing, and I believe that the housing shortage is at the root of most of the problems we face. I want there to be more housing in SF. When a private actor wants to use their private capital to build housing on land that they privately own, I think we should not prevent them from doing so, as long as they follow safety standards. I believe that increasing the supply of housing will reduce its price. I listen to and believe economists who study the effects of various policies. I believe that rent stability is important, and I'm okay with rent control when I'm confident it won't discourage construction or maintenance. I think the best form of rent control is a credible threat to move to a cheaper equivalent unit down the block. I am a renter and think more people should be too. I don't view homeownership itself as a virtue. I want more density: Proximity is an amenity, and density is proximity to many things simultaneously. Dense places also have the lowest per-capita CO<sub>2</sub> emissions, so in order to combat climate change I believe we have an obligation to accommodate more people in urban spaces.
2. Homelessness. I believe that homelessness is largely a housing issue. If you could [rent a room for \\$500/month](#), a lot fewer people would be homeless. It wouldn't be nice but it would beat living on the sidewalk. That said, I want the city to build enough shelters to house our entire homeless population, and I believe the city should compel people living on the sidewalk to use them. I believe that being homeless deteriorates one's mental health.
3. Law enforcement. I want laws to be enforced. I want the police department to be fully staffed. I am aware that systemic bias exists in enforcement, and when possible I favor automatic enforcement mechanisms like red-light cameras that enforce the law for everyone equally, and that raise the probability of getting caught to 100%. I want drug dealers to be arrested, and users to be compelled into treatment.
4. Getting around the city. I want more protected bike lanes and more dedicated bus lanes. I love the bus. I want more frequent Muni service, even if it means higher fares. I want more express buses and more bus routes generally. I want the bus to be more pleasant to take, which I think might be accomplished with stricter fare enforcement. I want the city to have more car-free spaces. I think ebikes and scooters are a good replacement for many car trips. I like autonomous cars because they are safer than human drivers and they always obey traffic laws. I believe that cars ruin cities. To the extent that the city must

have cars, I want them to be autonomous. I believe that parking is a bad use of urban space.

5. Local governance. I love safety regulations and well-designed taxes. Markets are extremely powerful; I want the government to design markets that yield good outcomes for society. I want to reduce bureaucracy when it comes to building housing and transit infrastructure. I think the city shouldn't exert much control over what types of retail businesses operate in commercial areas. I believe that giving the public too many opportunities to weigh in on decisions actually just benefits the sort of people who have the time to show up to meetings.
6. Ideological purity. I believe that outcomes matter. Some progress is better than none. I won't oppose a measure that only makes partial progress towards my goals.

### Sources of information

My recommendations are informed by my personal research and opinions, and draw inspiration from, but sometimes disagree with, the following:

- [SF YIMBY](#), an organization that advocates for increasing the supply of housing. YIMBY stands for *Yes in my back yard* and is a movement that arose to combat the phenomenon of [NIMBYism](#), *Not in my back yard*. SF YIMBY doesn't take positions outside of issues strictly related to housing.
- [SPUR](#), the San Francisco Bay Area Planning and Urban Research Association.
- [GrowSF](#), a generally-YIMBY-aligned organization that extends its ethos to issues beyond just housing.
- [TogetherSF Action](#). They're pretty similar to GrowSF, but are somewhat right-coded, or at least are attracting the support of SF's moderately reactionary elements. I suspect they bothered to make endorsements in the federal races (President, VP, U.S. Senate, and U.S. House) primarily to combat this image and remind everyone that they are indeed Democrats.
- The [San Francisco Democratic Party](#). In [March](#) we elected the committee that makes the official party endorsements. It now tends to be ideologically aligned with the SF "moderates". Before March it was more aligned with the SF "progressives".
- The [San Francisco League of Conservation Voters](#), an environmentalist organization.

I also like to consult with the recommendations of the following organizations. I am usually aligned with them on their core values, but I feel that they prioritize ideological purity above supporting candidates and policies that actually result in progress towards the outcomes they want. When they agree with the organizations above, I can be pretty confident in recommending you to join their consensus. For the most part, I'll focus my constrained attention on where they disagree.

- The [Harvey Milk LGBTQ Democratic Club](#). As an example of their prioritization of ideological purity, they've declined to endorse the sole Democrat in the races for both U.S. Senate and state Senate.
- The [League of Pissed Off Voters](#).
- The [SF Tenants Union](#).

I find it informative to check in with organizations I know I'm not aligned with. Seeing the strongest good-faith argument that the other side has to offer, and not finding it convincing, makes me more confident in my position. And every now and then we actually do agree on something. See:

- The [San Francisco Republican Party](#).
- The [San Francisco Young Republicans](#).
- The vile [Howard Jarvis Taxpayers Association](#).

I think it's also informative to check out [SF Endorsements](#) which maintains a grid of dozens of local organizations' endorsements in each race.

Here we go

### President & Vice President. Kamala Harris & Tim Walz

I really love both Kamala Harris and Tim Walz. I'm moved by how they both treat all people with [respect](#) and [operate with joy](#). [Kamala Harris is a YIMBY](#), and her [aphorisms are apt](#). [Tim Walz is also a YIMBY](#), and I appreciate having a public role model of a [sweet](#) and jolly man. Endorsed by [TogetherSF Action](#), [Harvey Milk LGBTQ Democratic Club](#).

### United States Senator. Adam B. Schiff (twice)

The Democrat. We get to vote for him twice: once to complete the last two months of Dianne Feinstein's term, and once for his own six-year term thereafter. Endorsed by [TogetherSF Action](#).

### United States Representative. Nancy Pelosi

The Democrat. I do really like Nancy Pelosi. At times she has frustrated me, for example I found her to be insufficiently aggressive in holding Trump accountable during his presidency, and I don't like some of her endorsements in local races. But generally I'm a big fan. I'm especially grateful that she encouraged Biden to exit the presidential race. That said, even Moses wasn't allowed to enter the Promised Land; I would like to have space for a new generation of leaders soon. Endorsed by [TogetherSF Action](#), [Harvey Milk LGBTQ Democratic Club](#).

### State Senator. Scott Wiener

The Democrat. Endorsed by SF YIMBY, GrowSF, [TogetherSF Action](#). I'm not aware of any one person who has done more good for California than Scott Wiener. His bills [SB35](#), [SB423](#), and [SB828](#), among others, are good pro-housing reforms *that actually passed* and that have already contributed to thousands of units getting built. Here's what I said when I [endorsed](#) him in the primary election:

He's the best state legislator in the country. He proposes big, visionary solutions to problems like the housing shortage and is willing to compromise to actually get things passed. His solutions are realistic, effective, and guided by science rather than ideological purity or symbolism. He takes an "all of the above" approach rather than letting the perfect be the enemy of the good.

I'm not a fan of Scott Wiener's recent support for Israel's war in Gaza, but fortunately the state senate doesn't really have any influence in foreign policy. I'm also not a fan of his [recent attempt](#) to regulate AI in California because I fear it would drive the software industry out of the state, but fortunately the governor [vetoed](#) it at [the urging of Nancy Pelosi](#) and many others.

### State Assembly Member, District 17. Matt Haney

Endorsed by the [SF Democratic Party](#), SF YIMBY, GrowSF, [TogetherSF Action](#).

As I said when I [recommended](#) him in the primary election, "Matt Haney is similar to AOC in that both started out as NIMBYs, but both genuinely care about studying issues and supporting policies that make the world a better place, and both are now YIMBYs."

### State Assembly Member, District 19. Catherine Stefani

Endorsed by the [SF Democratic Party](#), SF YIMBY, GrowSF, [TogetherSF Action](#).

### Member, Board of Education. Gupta, Huling, Jersin, Ray

Endorsed by GrowSF, [TogetherSF Action](#).

In SF, the axis of debate around public education has "prioritizing excellence" at one end and "prioritizing equity" at the other. (There's also the Republican fringe that just wants to defund public education.) Programs that prioritize excellence include tracked, rigorous academic courses, and academic-merit-based admissions to schools such as [Lowell High School](#).

Examples of prioritizing equity include dismantling all those aforementioned programs, because in practice Black and Latino students have ended up dramatically underrepresented in them.

This set of four candidates has support of the organizations that I trust prioritize excellence in public education. As [GrowSF says](#), "Our public schools must be competitive with private ones."

For example, Supriya Ray was a [leader](#) of the campaign to allow our middle schools to teach algebra and supports academic admissions at Lowell High School.

### Trustee, Community College Board. Chisti, Ferguson, McCarty, Zamora

Endorsed by GrowSF, [TogetherSF Action](#).

I know nothing about this race but am yielding to the endorsements I trust.

### BART Board of Directors, District 7. Victor Flores

Endorsed by SF YIMBY, GrowSF. He wants BART stations to become "[community hubs](#)" that include "housing, retail, office space, active programming, arts, culture, and more" in and around the station. This sounds awesome to me.

### BART Board of Directors, District 9. Joe Sangirardi.

Endorsed by SF YIMBY, GrowSF, [TogetherSF Action](#).

### Mayor. London Breed 1<sup>st</sup>, Mark Farrell 2<sup>nd</sup>, Daniel Lurie 3<sup>rd</sup>

[GrowSF](#) endorses these three in any order. London Breed has the sole endorsement of [SF YIMBY](#), the [San Francisco Police Officers Association](#), and the [SF Democratic Party](#).

[TogetherSF Action](#) wants you to put Farrell 1<sup>st</sup> and then Breed and Lurie in either order as 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup>.

I've gotten to interview the four major mayoral candidates in person for an hour each, one each week throughout October.

London Breed is the only pro-housing candidate. She's been a champion of car-free spaces, bringing us car-free JFK, slow streets, and car-free Market Street, and she supports Prop K. In interviewing her, it was clear that she has a very strong grasp of policy details as well as the real-world barriers to implementation and how to navigate them. The city still has a long way to go on a lot of issues, but London Breed has actually made a lot of progress during her time in office. [The number of tents on sidewalks is down 60% since June 2023 and at its lowest level since 2018](#). I don't blame the mayor for slow progress: A lot of this progress has only even been possible since June when the Supreme Court handed down its decision in [Grants Pass v Johnson](#), which made it legal for the city to enforce anti-camping laws. Property crime is also down, and arrests for it are up, which also wasn't possible until March 2024 when we passed Prop E ([put on the ballot by London Breed](#)) which authorized the police department to use technologies like drones and cameras that they previously were not allowed to use. London Breed projects that the police department will be fully staffed in two and a half years.

Mark Farrell is running as "the public safety candidate", which is mostly a vibes thing. (It's Breed who has the endorsement of the police officers' union.) His was my favorite interview to conduct. He is open to some very limited new housing on the west side of the city, but primarily wants to limit all new housing density to the financial district and SoMa. He's a very nice guy, open to feedback, and I would genuinely be happy with him as mayor. Farrell wants to allow rideshare on Market Street in the belief that doing so would "increase throughput". I pushed back on that in our interview, suggesting (1) that making buses wait for stopped rideshare cars would actually decrease throughput, (2) that it would be unenforceable because it's impossible to distinguish whether an arbitrary car is being used for rideshare, and (3) that it would kill bikers. He committed that he would conduct a study of whether it would increase throughput before implementing it. He was very open to [increasing the price of residential parking permits](#), which made me happy.

Daniel Lurie is a billionaire, the heir to the Levi Strauss fortune. He talks a lot about "getting things done" and "holding people accountable". In interviewing him, I found him incapable of talking in specifics, even when I tried to elicit them with softball questions. Lurie's previous experience is as the head of [Tipping Point](#), a nonprofit he created. One of Tipping Point's biggest achievements is [833 Bryant](#), a supportive housing complex that Lurie frequently touts as having been built on-time and under budget. As I prepared for the interview, I read [this case study](#) from UC Berkeley that compares this project to several similar projects that were undertaken at about the same time, explaining in detail what steps Tipping Point was able to take to keep to their schedule and budget. It impressed me a lot, and made me think much more highly of Lurie and his knowledge of details. But then during the interview when I tried to give him the opportunity to explain what Tipping Point had done, he could barely do it. Lurie wants to allow rideshare vehicles back on Market Street, and in person he took a much more NIMBY stance than is outlined on his campaign website, in some cases even explicitly

contradicting what is written there. He was totally opposed to increasing the price of residential parking permits.

It's important that you rank all three of these candidates, and leave Aaron Peskin off your ballot. Interviewing him was super fun. He knows his details and he's a super nice guy, but ultimately he would be terrible for the city. He's been a supervisor for 15 of the last 24 years. He believes that he can negotiate a bespoke compromise for every decision taken in the city, which is sweet, but it (1) requires that all decisions go through him and (2) slows the rate of progress to the point where very little actually gets accomplished. Here's what [GrowSF](#) says about him:

Perhaps no politician in the modern era is more responsible for the city's housing crisis than Aaron Peskin. Almost every root cause of the housing shortage—including empowerment of neighbors to single-handedly block projects; abuse of environmental laws; extensive bureaucracy, taxation, and fees; the alignment of far-left politicians with housing opponents; and frequent interference with specific projects by the Board of Supervisors—has been created, exacerbated, or encouraged by Peskin throughout his many years in office.

### Supervisor, District 1. Marjan Philhour

Marjan is endorsed by the [SF Democratic Party](#), SF YIMBY, [GrowSF](#), [TogetherSF Action](#).

### Supervisor, District 3. Danny Sauter

Endorsed by the [SF Democratic Party](#), SF YIMBY, [GrowSF](#), [TogetherSF Action](#)

### Supervisor, District 5. Bilal Mahmood 1<sup>st</sup>, Autumn Looijen 2<sup>nd</sup>, Scotty Jacobs 3<sup>rd</sup>

Bilal Mahmood has the sole endorsement of SF YIMBY, the [SF Democratic Party](#), and [GrowSF](#). [TogetherSF Action](#) wants you to put Bilal Mahmood 1<sup>st</sup> and Scotty Jacobs 2<sup>nd</sup>.

I got to interview all three of these candidates for an hour each last month.

Bilal is just awesome. He's pro-housing, pro-transit, thoughtful, willing to be bold, and eager to make personal connections with his constituents.

I like Autumn a lot too. When I asked her "What makes housing so expensive in San Francisco?" her reply was "We don't have enough of it!" She led the successful school board recall and supported letting middle schools teach algebra. She is a Democrat and came to my interview wearing a Kamala pin, but [the SF Republican Party decided to endorse her](#). Bilal has better name recognition. His campaign is more formal and better funded, whereas Autumn's campaign is that of a ragtag outsider. One substantial policy difference between Autumn and Bilal is that Autumn takes a more hardline approach to drug dealing. She wants to refer convicted drug dealers who are in this country without documentation to ICE, whereas Bilal doesn't want to set a precedent of attaching caveats to our status as a sanctuary city. This may explain the Republicans' endorsement.

Scotty is nice and friendly with the YIMBY movement, but I found him to be less pro-housing and less pro-transit than I'd like. For example, he asserted that it "didn't make sense" to have tall

multifamily buildings near Ocean Beach, and when I said [it made sense to me](#), he didn't have much of a response. He also said he wants Muni to be "on a path to self-sufficiency", meaning that fares would cover the cost of operation. (Fares currently constitute about [18%](#) of Muni's revenue.) Public transit is a public good with massive positive externalities and I don't want it to be self-sufficient any more than I'd want public schools or public libraries to be self-sufficient. When I followed up on this, he didn't have much of an answer.

The incumbent in this race is Dean Preston. He rejected my request for an interview. It's important that you rank all three of the above candidates, and leave Dean Preston off your ballot. Dean Preston is a NIMBY. His take, generally, is that he opposes all new housing if someone might profit from building it. Here's what [GrowSF](#) says about him:

Preston has routinely blocked, opposed, or delayed new home construction, including both market-rate developments and subsidized units. As a rule of thumb, he supports housing only if it is built by government, controlled by government, and subject to rent control. He will oppose other housing, although his stated reasons for opposition change depending on the project.

The one area where Dean Preston has been good, actually, is his support for car-free spaces. But that doesn't make up for his NIMBYism.

### Supervisor, District 7. **Myrna Melgar 1<sup>st</sup>**, Matthew Boschetto 2<sup>nd</sup>

Unfortunately there are no really inspiring choices in this race, but Myrna Melgar and Matthew Boschetto are the least bad. Myrna Melgar is inconsistently [pro-housing](#), but SF YIMBY endorsed her four years ago anyway, perhaps in hopes that she would become more pro-housing in response to the endorsement, a tactic that seems to have worked with London Breed. With Melgar that hasn't happened; she's [sometimes been a disappointment](#). Nevertheless SF YIMBY endorses her again this cycle, but [GrowSF](#) and [TogetherSF Action](#) endorse Matthew Boschetto. The [SF Democratic Party](#) and the [Harvey Milk LGBTQ Democratic Club](#) both endorse Myrna Melgar.

### Supervisor, District 9. **Trevor Chandler**

Endorsed by SF YIMBY, GrowSF, [TogetherSF Action](#). The [SF Democratic Party](#) endorses Trevor Chandler #1.

### Supervisor, District 11. **Michael Lai 1<sup>st</sup>**, Earnest EJ Jones 2<sup>nd</sup>

SF YIMBY endorses Michael Lai 1<sup>st</sup> and Earnest EJ Jones 2<sup>nd</sup>. GrowSF, the [SF Democratic Party](#), and [TogetherSF Action](#) endorse only Michael Lai.

### City Attorney. **David Chiu**

Endorsed by GrowSF, [TogetherSF Action](#), the [SF Democratic Party](#).

### District Attorney. **Brooke Jenkins**

Endorsed by GrowSF, [TogetherSF Action](#), the [SF Democratic Party](#)

### Sheriff. **Paul Miyamoto**

Endorsed by GrowSF, [TogetherSF Action](#), the [SF Democratic Party](#)



## Treasurer. José Cisneros

Endorsed by GrowSF, [Harvey Milk LGBTQ Democratic Club](#), [TogetherSF Action](#), the [SF Democratic Party](#)

### CA Prop 2. Yes

Money for school facilities. I love well-funded public education.

Yes is endorsed by [SPUR](#), [GrowSF](#), [TogetherSF Action](#), [Harvey Milk LGBTQ Democratic Club](#), and [pretty much everyone](#). No is endorsed by the vile [Howard Jarvis Taxpayers Association](#). The only No endorsement listed on [SF Endorsements](#) is, in a fun example of [the horseshoe model of politics](#), from the [SF Green Party](#).

### CA Prop 3. Yes

From the [state voter guide](#):

Amends California Constitution to recognize fundamental right to marry, regardless of sex or race. Removes language in California Constitution stating that marriage is only between a man and a woman.

In May 2008, the California state supreme court [ruled](#) that California's statutes banning same-sex marriage violated the state constitution. Same-sex marriages were performed in California starting the following month. In November of that year, voters passed California Proposition 8, which put a ban on same-sex marriage into the state constitution, halting the issuance of new same-sex marriages in the state. Prop 8 received [significant support](#), in terms of both money and volunteer time, from both the LDS (aka [Mormon](#)) Church and [its members](#). The [California Catholic Conference](#) and the [Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations of America](#) were also supportive of Prop 8, which makes sense because [their holy books explicitly condemn homosexuality](#).

Prop 8 was eventually found in violation of the U.S. Constitution, and issuance of same-sex marriages resumed in 2013. Though unenforceable, Prop 8 is still on the books. The fear here is that the Supreme Court will overturn [Obergefell v. Hodges](#), stating that the U.S. Constitution does not protect same-sex marriage, and so Prop 8 will go back into effect. Prop 3 will avoid that.

Endorsed by [Harvey Milk LGBTQ Democratic Club](#),

The vile [Howard Jarvis Taxpayers Association](#) takes no position on this one.

### CA Prop 4. Yes

From the [state voter guide](#):

Authorizes \$10 billion in general obligation bonds for water, wildfire prevention, and protection of communities and lands. Requires annual audits. **Fiscal Impact:** Increased state costs of about \$400 million annually for 40 years to repay the bond. **Supporters:** Clean Water Action; CALFIRE Firefighters; National Wildlife Federation; The Nature Conservancy **Opponents:** Howard Jarvis Taxpayers Association

This one seems like a straightforward yes. [GrowSF](#) encourages Yes, as do [SPUR](#) and [TogetherSF Action](#). The only opponent on [SF Endorsements](#) is the [SF Green Party](#), who seem to oppose it out of ideological purism. No is endorsed by the vile [Howard Jarvis Taxpayers Association](#).

### CA Prop 5. Yes

From [TogetherSF Action](#):

Currently, most local bond proposals need to get two-thirds of votes to pass. [Proposition 5](#) would lower that threshold from two-thirds to 55 percent for housing and infrastructure bonds only. We support Proposition 5 because making it easier to pass bonds would help expedite housing and infrastructure projects the city sorely needs.

I love spending money on public infrastructure projects and want to make it easier to do so. I like property taxes, and bonds are typically repaid via property taxes.

*Yes* is endorsed by [SPUR](#), [SF YIMBY](#), [GrowSF](#), and the [Harvey Milk LGBTQ Democratic Club](#). *No* is endorsed by the vile [Howard Jarvis Taxpayers Association](#).

### [CA Prop 6. Yes](#)

Amends Article 1, Section 6 of the California state constitution from  
Slavery is prohibited. Involuntary servitude is prohibited except to punish crime.

to

- (a) Slavery and involuntary servitude are prohibited.
- (b) The Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation shall not discipline any incarcerated person for refusing a work assignment.
- (c) Nothing in this section shall prohibit the Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation from awarding credits to an incarcerated person who voluntarily accepts a work assignment.
- (d) Amendments made to this section by the measure adding this subdivision shall become operative on January 1, 2025.

*No* is endorsed by the vile [Howard Jarvis Taxpayers Association](#), and among SF-specific organizations, only by the [Chinese American Democratic Club](#) who phrase it as “Discontinue inmate incentives for doing chores in prison”.

### [CA Prop 32. Yes](#)

From the [state voter guide](#):

Raises minimum wage as follows: For employers with 26 or more employees, to \$17 immediately, \$18 on January 1, 2025. For employers with 25 or fewer employees, to \$17 on January 1, 2025, \$18 on January 1, 2026.

This'll have no impact in SF because our minimum wage is [already higher than \\$18](#). I'm going to vote *Yes*. There are legitimate economic reasons to oppose minimum wage increases; if you want to join the vile [Howard Jarvis Taxpayers Association](#) in voting *No*, I understand. [SPUR](#) takes no position. The only *No* endorsement on [SF Endorsements](#) is from the [Chinese American Democratic Club](#). The [Harvey Milk LGBTQ Democratic Club](#), [GrowSF](#), and [TogetherSF Action](#) all endorse *Yes*.

### [CA Prop 33. No](#)

State law currently prohibits municipalities from enacting rent control on housing built after 1995. The intent is to avoid discouraging new construction, as housing only gets built when the builder believes that building will be profitable. (This law was passed in 1995 but the date after which rent control cannot be applied has never been advanced.) State law also prohibits municipalities from enacting *vacancy control*, meaning municipalities have to let the rent reset to

market rate between tenants. The reasoning here is that it gives landlords an incentive to improve their units, do maintenance and repairs and upgrades, between tenants. If they could never raise rents, they'd just let their units deteriorate and become slums.

One other intent of the existing state law is to avoid incentivizing landlords to remove their units from the rental market. If a landlord is faced with a decision of either selling a unit at market rate or renting it out below market rate, they'll be more likely to sell the unit (as a condo or otherwise owner-occupied unit), removing it from the rental housing stock. This would reduce the supply of rental units, further driving up rents.

Prop 33 replaces the above provisions with the following:

The state may not limit the right of any city, county, or city and county to maintain, enact, or expand residential rent control.

While I would support changing the 1995 date to a rolling "15-years-in-the-past" window, Prop 33 goes dangerously too far. Prop 33 will be weaponized by wealthy NIMBY cities to prevent the construction of all new housing. They'll pass extremely stringent rent control laws, for example limiting rent to \$500/month for all new apartments, which will never be profitable to build and so will never be built. [Republicans in Huntington Beach are already excited about it](#). They've already pulled similar shenanigans, like when Woodside [tried to declare the entire city a mountain lion sanctuary](#) to exempt itself from state laws that required it to approve the construction of duplexes.

The state Legislative Analyst's Office (the California Legislature's nonpartisan fiscal and policy advisor) [found](#):

The most likely effects are:

- Some renters who live in properties covered by rent control would spend less on rent. Some renters who live in properties not covered by rent control would spend more on rent.
- Some renters would move less often.
- Fewer homes would be available to rent. One reason for this is that some landlords would sell their properties to new owners who would live there instead of renting it out.
- The value of rental housing would decline because potential landlords would not want to pay as much for these properties.

and

- Reduction in local property tax revenues of at least tens of millions of dollars annually due to likely expansion of rent control in some communities.

I am joined in my *No* endorsement by [SPUR](#), [SF YIMBY](#), [GrowSF](#), [TogetherSF Action](#), and, to my horror, the vile [Howard Jarvis Taxpayers Association](#), whose full writeup I'm pasting below. While [I take issue with their use of the word fair](#), I believe their assessment of the effects of this proposition is correct.

Proposition 33 is a rent control measure that would lead to a reduction in the supply of rental housing. It repeals a sensible 1995 law, the Costa-Hawkins Rental Housing Act, which put limits on rent control laws to ensure that housing providers could make a fair return on their investment and stay in business. Repealing Costa-Hawkins would mean cities could enact radical rent control, even on single-family homes and condos, and prevent property owners from resetting the rent to the market rate after a tenant voluntarily moves out. Proposition 33 would lead to a sharp reduction in new apartment construction as lenders evaluate financial risk due to potential rent control laws. That will worsen the housing shortage in California.

## [CA Prop 34. Yes](#)

From the [Legislative Analyst's Office](#) (the California Legislature's nonpartisan fiscal and policy advisor):

Proposition 34 creates new rules about how certain health care entities spend revenue from the federal drug discount program. Specifically, the entities would have to spend at least 98 percent of their net revenue earned in California on health care services provided directly to patients ("direct patient care"). As Figure 1 shows, these rules apply only to entities that meet certain conditions ("affected entities").

Figure 1

### **Restrictions Only Apply if Four Conditions Are Met**

#### **Proposition 34's Restrictions Apply to a Health Care Entity if It:**

- Participates in the federal drug discount program.
- Has (or has ever had) a license in California to operate as a health plan, pharmacy, or clinic, or has had certain contracts with Medi-Cal or Medicare.
- Has a ten-year period where it spent more than \$100 million on purposes other than direct patient care.
- Owns and operates (or has previously owned and operated) multifamily housing units with at least 500 violations with a severity level of "high."

There is exactly one entity in the state that meets these criteria, and it's the AIDS Healthcare Foundation, founded by Michael Weinstein. Bizarrely, this organization has branched out from its original healthcare-focused mission to also (1) become a slumlord (see the fourth condition in Figure 1) and (2) [spend millions of dollars on anti-housing political campaigns](#) (see the third condition in Figure 1). The intent of this proposition is to prevent Michael Weinstein from using AIDS Healthcare Foundation money on more anti-housing crusades.

The official campaign touts [these endorsements](#) on its website. [GrowSF](#) endorses *Yes*, as does [TogetherSF Action](#). Even the vile [Howard Jarvis Taxpayers Association](#) supports it, saying:

Some nonprofit healthcare organizations that receive federal funds to provide health care services have abused the system to spend large amounts of money on political causes. Proposition 34 would end this practice and require that healthcare providers spend most of the money they receive from a federal prescription drug discount program on direct patient care.

## [CA Prop 35. Yes](#)

From the [state voter guide](#):

Makes permanent the existing tax on managed health care insurance plans, which, if approved by the federal government, provides revenues to pay for Medi-Cal health care services. **Fiscal Impact:** Short-term state costs between roughly \$1 billion and \$2 billion annually to increase funding for certain health programs. Total funding increase between roughly \$2 billion to \$5 billion annually. Unknown long-term fiscal effects. **Supporters:** Planned Parenthood Affiliates of CA; American College of Obstetricians & Gynecologists; American Academy of Pediatrics, CA **Opponents:** None submitted

*Yes* is endorsed by [GrowSF](#), [TogetherSF Action](#), and the [Harvey Milk LGBTQ Democratic Club](#).

## CA Prop 36. Yes

From the [Legislative Analyst's Office](#) (the California Legislature's nonpartisan fiscal and policy advisor):

In 2014, Proposition 47 changed some theft and drug crimes from felonies to misdemeanors. For example, shoplifting (stealing items worth \$950 or less from a store) and drug possession generally became misdemeanors.

Proposition 36 increases punishment for some theft and drug crimes in three ways:

- **Turns Some Misdemeanors Into Felonies.** For example, currently, theft of items worth \$950 or less is generally a misdemeanor. Proposition 36 makes this crime a felony if the person has two or more past convictions for certain theft crimes (such as shoplifting, burglary, or carjacking). The sentence would be up to three years in county jail or state prison. These changes undo some of the punishment reductions in Proposition 47.
- **Lengthens Some Felony Sentences.** For example, Proposition 36 allows felony sentences for theft or damage of property to be lengthened by up to three years if three or more people committed the crime together.
- **Requires Some Felonies Be Served in Prison.** For example, as discussed above, sentences for selling certain drugs (such as fentanyl, heroin, cocaine, or methamphetamine) can be lengthened based on the amount sold. Currently, these sentences are served in county jail or state prison depending on the person's criminal history. Proposition 36 generally requires these sentences be served in prison.

[GrowSF](#) and [TogetherSF Action](#) endorse *Yes*. The [Harvey Milk LGBTQ Democratic Club](#) endorses *No*. I don't love the vibes of saying this, but I think anti-societal behavior is actually really bad. Shoplifting, as an example, imposes costs on everyone, far beyond that of the stolen inventory. Living in a society is a massive privilege and it comes with the obligation to not be actively destructive of the trust that makes that society function. I'd rather raise the probability of getting caught than the severity of the punishment, but it's actually their product (the "expected punishment") that matters. With a heavy heart I must join the vile [Howard Jarvis Taxpayers Association](#) in recommending *Yes*.

## SF Prop A. Yes

Funding for school facilities paid for by property taxes. I love well-funded public education and I love property taxes, so this is really a win-win. Estimated to raise annual property taxes by \$13 per \$100,000 of assessed property value.

*Yes* endorsed by [SPUR](#), [GrowSF](#), [TogetherSF Action](#), the [Harvey Milk LGBTQ Democratic Club](#)

## SF Prop B. Yes

Money for a variety of things related to healthcare, streets, and shelters.

*Yes* is endorsed by [SPUR](#), [SF YIMBY](#), [GrowSF](#), [TogetherSF Action](#), and the [Harvey Milk LGBTQ Democratic Club](#).

### SF Prop C. No

Creates an office of Inspector General to investigate fraud, waste, and abuse in city government. [GrowSF identifies](#) four other entities within the city government that already have the same mandate and more power, so views this as pointless added bureaucracy and endorses *No*. They are joined in their *No* endorsement by [TogetherSF Action](#). The [Harvey Milk LGBTQ Democratic Club](#) recommends *Yes*. [SPUR](#) has a thoughtful writeup and concludes that they can take no strong position either way.

### SF Prop D. Yes

Many California cities establish *commissions*, which are bodies of non-elected members of the community who provide oversight on various city functions. SF has 130 commissions. Often multiple commissions have overlapping domains, and so a single decision (like whether a building may be built) will need to be approved by several commissions. One effect of the commission system is that it slows down the rate at which decisions are made, and makes building more expensive. Prop D reduces the number of commissions in SF from 130 to 65. For context, Los Angeles has fewer than 50 commissions and is four times SF's population. Cutting the number of commissions in half feels arbitrary and [Tea Party](#)-esque, and so I find [SPUR](#)'s *No* endorsement reasonable. Nevertheless I trust the [SF Democratic Party](#) to have thought through the practical implications of such a reduction, so I am persuaded by their *Yes* endorsement. They are joined by [SF YIMBY](#), [TogetherSF Action](#), and [GrowSF](#).

### SF Prop E. No

Prop E is Aaron Peskin's counter to Prop D. If both pass but E gets more votes than D, then D will not take effect. Prop E would create a "task force" to *study* whether the number of commissions should be reduced, but doesn't actually impose any reduction. *No* is endorsed by [SPUR](#), [SF YIMBY](#), [GrowSF](#), and [TogetherSF Action](#).

### SF Prop F. Yes

Incentivizes police officers to delay retirement by up to five years. Intended to prevent further attrition of the police force while staffing shortages persist, the effects of this proposition expire after five years, unless the Board of Supervisors renews it. Currently once officers hit retirement age, they can boost their income by going to work for a nearby municipality while collecting their SF pension. This measure would basically pay them more to keep them on the SF force for up to five years instead. *Yes* is endorsed by [GrowSF](#) and [TogetherSF Action](#).

### SF Prop G. Yes

From [GrowSF](#):

Proposition G funds additional rental subsidies for low income households. It requires the City spend \$4 million in 2026, \$8.25 million in 2027, and an additional 3% more per year, up to \$14 million per year, even in years with a \$250 million budget deficit.

In effect, Prop G makes the "Senior Operating Subsidy Program" permanently funded at a specific level, rather than being set during the normal budget cycle. It may force the city to over-fund the program in some years, and under-fund it in other years. The

money in this account may only be used for subsidies for certain classes of extremely low income rental expenses.

[SPUR](#), the [SF Democratic Party](#), and the [Harvey Milk LGBTQ Democratic Club](#) recommend *Yes*. [GrowSF](#) and [TogetherSF Action](#) recommend *No*. [SF YIMBY](#) takes no position.

### SF Prop H. Yes

The retirement age for SF firefighters used to be 55. In 2012, when the city faced budget pressure, the retirement age was increased for all future hires to 58, but all existing employees retained the 55 retirement age. Anyone who was hired since 2012 was hired with the understanding that their retirement age was 58.

Prop H would drop the retirement age back down to 55 for all firefighters.

The city doesn't have a shortage of firefighters, so there's no reason other than compassion for firefighters to support this. The firefighters figured that voters would be sympathetic to giving them better benefits and that few organizations would want to cross them, and, well, they're probably right.

The [League of Pissed Off Voters](#) recommends *No*. The [SF Republican Party](#) recommends *No*, saying "Let's stick with fiscal discipline, folks." [GrowSF](#), [TogetherSF Action](#), the [SF Democratic Party](#), and the [Harvey Milk LGBTQ Democratic Club](#) recommend *Yes*.

### SF Prop I. Yes

Similar to H. Increases retirement benefits for nurses and 911 operators. Costs the city money.

There's no reason this had to be decided by ballot, but the nurses and 911 operators figured they'd get more money by appealing to the voters, who place more emphasis on compassion and less on fiscal responsibility. And here I am, proving them right.

The [Harvey Milk LGBTQ Democratic Club](#), [SF Democratic Party](#), and [GrowSF](#) recommend *Yes*, [TogetherSF Action](#) recommends *No*.

### SF Prop J. Yes

From [GrowSF](#):

Proposition J will ensure that the many millions of dollars the city already spends on children and youth services is spent in a coordinated way.

Currently, funds that affect children in San Francisco are managed by a complex network of city departments...

Prop J will centralize that to a single entity who will conduct a single, centralized, needs assessment to remove duplicate spending and ensure all money spent on children is on programs that have been identified in the needs assessment.

[GrowSF](#), [TogetherSF Action](#), the [SF Democratic Party](#), and the [Harvey Milk LGBTQ Democratic Club](#) all endorse *Yes*.

### SF Prop K. Yes

Since 2022, the Upper Great Highway has been closed to private vehicle traffic on weekends between Lincoln and Sloat, making it accessible to bikers and pedestrians. Prop K would close this segment to private vehicles permanently, seven days a week. The city Recreation and Parks Department would be able to use part of its general fund to turn it into a park.

*Yes* is endorsed by [SF YIMBY](#), [GrowSF](#), [SPUR](#), and the [Harvey Milk LGBTQ Democratic](#)

[Club. TogetherSF Action](#) took no position. The [SF Republican Party](#) endorses *No*, saying “Roads are for cars.”

### [SF Prop L. Yes](#)

Increases the city’s tax on rideshare, and gives the money to Muni.

In two years, when federal Covid relief grants expire, Muni will be facing a \$240 million budget deficit, and will have to aggressively cut service unless the state steps in with extra funding.

While I wish this proposition found a way to target all privately owned vehicles, not just rideshares, I am a frequent user of both rideshare and Muni and I will gladly pay more for rideshare to preserve Muni service.

From [SPUR](#):

Currently, for a \$25 ride, San Francisco charges \$0.91 per trip, which would increase to \$2.04 under Prop. L. By comparison, Chicago charges \$3.00 per trip, and New York City charges \$4.97 for trips in Manhattan and \$2.22 for other trips.

[SF YIMBY](#), [SPUR](#), the [Harvey Milk LGBTQ Democratic Club](#), and the [SF Democratic Party](#) all endorse *Yes*.

[TogetherSF Action](#) and [GrowSF](#) puzzlingly endorse *No*, on the grounds that “[a]t best, it lets Muni avoid cuts and layoffs by two years”. Two more years of functioning transit is a good thing worth voting for! And it buys time for the state government to step in with emergency funding. I suspect these organizations have a donor with very close ties to Uber or Lyft.

If both Prop L and Prop M get a majority of the vote, but Prop M gets more votes than Prop L, Prop L will not take effect.

### [SF Prop M. Yes](#)

Restructures the city’s business taxes.

In the long run, Prop M doesn’t change the amount of tax collected, it just shifts which businesses pay how much.

Prop M would exempt all businesses from paying gross receipts taxes on their first \$5 million in revenue each year. Nearly all restaurants therefore would pay no gross receipts tax. My understanding is that reducing the administrative burden for small businesses here is just as important as reducing the financial burden.

As for the bigger businesses: Currently SF draws much of its business tax revenue from just a handful of very large businesses, which makes for a precarious revenue source for the city. Furthermore, the structure of the current tax encourages large businesses to [shift](#) their operations outside the city’s boundaries. Prop M would reduce the amount paid by the largest businesses and increase the amount paid by the medium-large businesses, diversifying the tax burden over a broader base and stabilizing the revenue.

If both Prop L and Prop M get a majority of the vote, but Prop M gets more votes than Prop L, Prop L will not take effect.

[SPUR](#), [GrowSF](#), [TogetherSF Action](#), and the [SF Democratic Party](#) endorse *Yes*. The [Harvey Milk LGBTQ Democratic Club](#) takes no position. The [League of Pissed Off Voters](#) wants it to pass but takes no official position in the hopes it’ll get fewer votes than Prop L.

### [SF Prop N. Yes](#)



Creates a fund that could be used in the future to pay off the student loans of “members of the Police, Fire and Sheriff’s departments, paramedics, Registered Nurses and 911 dispatchers”. Prop N doesn’t actually put any money into the fund, or make any payments out of it. But future city budgets *could* put money into it or make payments out of it. Furthermore, philanthropists could donate to the fund if they wanted to.

[GrowSF](#) recommends *Yes*, saying:

San Francisco has a critical shortage of first responders so we have to come up with innovative solutions to boost recruitment. Prop N is an idea worth trying.

It lets donors and philanthropists contribute to a City fund that will help new first responder recruits, like EMTs, police, and 911 dispatchers, to pay off up to \$25,000 in student loans or job training costs.

We don’t know if it will work, but since it doesn’t cost the taxpayers anything, we might as well find out!

There are three retirement-related measures on the ballot aimed at addressing the recruitment and retention crisis among first responders, but those measures primarily focus on retaining existing personnel rather than attracting new recruits. Proposition N is the only measure that could actually impact recruitment.

The [Harvey Milk LGBTQ Democratic Club](#) and the [SF Democratic Party](#) also recommend *Yes*. The [League of Pissed Off Voters](#) recommends *No*, saying “Aaron Peskin summed it up pretty perfectly during a rules committee meeting on the measure, ‘We could pass it tomorrow at the Board of Supervisors; it does not need to be an appendage to the ballot. We could just do our jobs right here.’ Vote no.” [TogetherSF Action](#) recommends *No*.

## [SF Prop O](#). **Yes**

Prop O makes it official city policy to “serve as a safe place for people seeking reproductive care, including abortions”.

Prop O would:

- Require the Department of Public Health to maintain a public website that maintains two lists:
  - List 1: Pregnancy centers that either offer abortions themselves or refer patients to abortion providers, and
  - List 2: “Limited-service pregnancy centers”, meaning facilities that don’t offer abortions and don’t refer patients to abortion providers. Limited-service pregnancy centers are often religiously affiliated.
- Authorize the Department of Public Health to post signs outside limited-service pregnancy centers, informing the public that the centers neither offer abortions nor refer patients to abortion providers, and pointing to list #1.
- Prohibit City officials from providing information to law enforcement agencies of other states or the federal government concerning a person’s use or possession of contraception, use of in vitro fertilization, pregnancy status or choice to get an abortion.
- Modify the City’s zoning law so that reproductive health clinics may operate in more areas of San Francisco, including all floors in nonresidential districts and corner lots in residential districts.

The [Harvey Milk LGBTQ Democratic Club](#), [GrowSF](#), [TogetherSF Action](#), and the [SF Democratic Party](#) recommend *Yes*.

This is sort of the pro-abortion counter to anti-abortion crusaders' decades-long regulatory harassment of abortion providers, and I'm all for it.

If for no other reason, vote *Yes* to set a precedent for zoning liberalization; next let's let cafés operate on corner lots in residential districts too!