



# SPUR

IDEAS + ACTION FOR A BETTER CITY

a member-supported nonprofit organization

## November 2022 Voter Guide

SPUR analyzed all local and state measures on the California, San Francisco, San José and Oakland ballots for the November 2022 election. Our analysis includes the background behind the measures, equity impacts, pros and cons, and a recommendation on how to vote.

### San Francisco (SF)

<b>PROP</b> Retirement Benefits for City Employees <b>A</b> VOTE YES ✓	<b>PROP</b> Eliminating the Department of Sanitation and Streets <b>B</b> VOTE YES ✓	<b>PROP</b> Homelessness Commission <b>C</b> VOTE YES ✓	<b>PROP</b> Affordable Homes Now <b>D</b> VOTE YES ✓	<b>PROP</b> Affordable Housing Production Act <b>E</b> VOTE NO ✗
<b>PROP</b> Library Preservation <b>F</b> VOTE YES ✓	<b>PROP</b> Student Success Measure <b>G</b> VOTE YES ✓	<b>PROP</b> Changing Election Years <b>H</b> VOTE YES ✓	<b>PROP</b> JFK Drive and Great Highway Car Use <b>I</b> VOTE NO ✗	<b>PROP</b> Preserve JFK Promenade as Recreational Space <b>J</b> VOTE YES ✓
<b>PROP</b> Transportation Tax <b>L</b> VOTE YES ✓	<b>PROP</b> Vacant Homes <b>M</b> VOTE NO ✗	<b>PROP</b> Golden Gate Park Concourse Garage <b>N</b> VOTE YES ✓	<b>PROP</b> City College Parcel Tax <b>O</b> VOTE NO ✗	

### San José (SJ)

<b>MEASURE</b> City Charter Amendments <b>I</b> VOTE YES ✓
--

## Oakland (OAK)

<div>MEASURE</div> <div>Oakland Schools Career Readiness</div> <div>VOTE YES ✓</div>	<div>MEASURE</div> <div>Affordable Housing Authorization</div> <div>VOTE YES ✓</div>	<div>MEASURE</div> <div>Gender-Neutral Language</div> <div>VOTE YES ✓</div>	<div>MEASURE</div> <div>Noncitizen School Board Voting</div> <div>VOTE YES ✓</div>	<div>MEASURE</div> <div>Progressive Business Tax</div> <div>VOTE YES ✓</div>
<div>MEASURE</div> <div>Affordable Housing and Infrastructure Bond</div> <div>VOTE YES ✓</div>	<div>MEASURE</div> <div>Just Cause Amendment</div> <div>VOTE YES ✓</div>	<div>MEASURE</div> <div>Campaign Reform</div> <div>VOTE YES ✓</div>	<div>MEASURE</div> <div>Governance Reform</div> <div>VOTE YES ✓</div>	<div>MEASURE</div> <div>Oakland Zoo Parcel Tax</div> <div>NO RECOMMENDATION —</div>

## California (CA)

<div>PROP</div> <div>Reproductive Freedom</div> <div>VOTE YES ✓</div>	<div>PROP</div> <div>In-Person Sports Betting</div> <div>VOTE NO ✗</div>	<div>PROP</div> <div>Online Sports Betting</div> <div>VOTE NO ✗</div>	<div>PROP</div> <div>K-12 Arts and Music Education</div> <div>VOTE NO ✗</div>	<div>PROP</div> <div>Dialysis Clinic Requirements</div> <div>VOTE NO ✗</div>
<div>PROP</div> <div>Clean Air California</div> <div>VOTE YES ✓</div>	<div>PROP</div> <div>Flavored Tobacco Ban</div> <div>VOTE YES ✓</div>			

## SF Prop A Retirement Benefits for City Employees

CHARTER AMENDMENT

## Retiree Supplemental Cost of Living Adjustment; Retirement Board Contract With Executive Director

Makes pensioned city employees who retired before November 6, 1996, eligible for a continuous supplemental cost-of-living adjustment to their pension benefits. Allows the city Retirement Board to enter into an individual employment contract with an executive director.

Vote YES



## SPUR's Recommendation

When voters allowed a limit on supplemental cost-of-living adjustments in 2011, it was intended to apply to all retirees and be a check on pension spending in the wake of the 2008 recession. When Protect Our Benefits took this decision to court, the nonprofit sought to restore this benefit equally to all retirees. Instead, these actions created two groups of retirees: one that had limitations on supplemental adjustments and one that did not.

This measure seeks to equalize the supplemental cost-of-living adjustment system and ensure that an employee who retired on November 5, 1996, and an employee who retired on November 6, 1996, are eligible for the same benefits. It would also give the SFERS more power to recruit an effective executive director.

Read our complete analysis at [spurvoterguide.org](https://spurvoterguide.org)

## SF Prop B

### Eliminating the Department of Sanitation and Streets

CHARTER AMENDMENT

## Public Works Department and Commission, Sanitation and Streets Department and Commission

Eliminates the almost-formed Department of Sanitation and Streets and returns all its functions to the Department of Public Works while also altering two recently created oversight commissions.

Vote YES



## SPUR's Recommendation

Splitting the Department of Public Works into two agencies, including a Department of Sanitation and Streets, is, [as we argued in opposing Prop. B in 2020](#), a bad idea.

While it is unfortunate that staff time and money have already been spent establishing the new agency, it is better for the city to write off those one-time costs than saddle itself with millions of dollars in new, recurring overhead costs that provide no assurance of a better outcome.

Read our complete analysis at [spurvoterguide.org](https://spurvoterguide.org)

Looking at the bigger picture, the voters of San Francisco should not be asked twice in two years — by the officials they elected to deliberate on their behalf — to opine on the best structure of government to achieve cleaner streets. Ideally supervisors are judicious when choosing what ballot measures to put before voters so that they can get it right the first time, focusing resources and attention on addressing the problem they are seeking to solve.

## SF Prop C

### Homelessness Commission

CHARTER AMENDMENT

## Homelessness Oversight Commission

Creates a new city commission to oversee the Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing.

Vote YES



## SPUR's Recommendation

There is a need for more oversight, transparency and accountability for a department with the eighth-largest operating budget in the city. Right now, there are currently too many committees and boards that hear complaints on homelessness programs and funding, with little coordination between them. Given the importance of this issue to San Franciscans, we believe there are benefits to having a centralized approach for

Read our complete analysis at [spurvoterguide.org](https://spurvoterguide.org)

community engagement on homelessness services and programs. While we think that many of the goals of this measure could have been accomplished legislatively, experience from the past five years shows that the establishment of a commission may be the most expedient way to achieve better transparency and build public trust.

## SF Prop D

# Affordable Homes Now

CHARTER AMENDMENT

## Affordable Housing: Voter Initiative

Amends the San Francisco City Charter to speed up the approvals process for certain types of housing developments. Prevents eligible housing projects from being blocked or delayed for discretionary reasons if they meet the city's code.

Vote YES



## SPUR's Recommendation

Prop. D would fully streamline approvals for affordable housing projects for low-income households. It would facilitate the construction of moderate- and middle-income housing for teachers and other working families. It would require projects to be approved within three to six months, and those projects would have to provide prevailing wages and health benefits for all construction workers. The competing measure, Prop. E, would not

fully streamline 100% affordable housing, leaving projects open to unnecessary lawsuits. Prop. E would also impose additional burdens on mixed-income housing development that would only make it harder to build affordable housing. It is clear that Prop. D is the only streamlining measure on the ballot that would eliminate obstacles to construction and address San Francisco's housing shortage.

Read our complete analysis at [spurvoterguide.org](https://spurvoterguide.org)

## SF Prop E

# Affordable Housing Production Act

CHARTER AMENDMENT

## Affordable Housing: Board of Supervisors

Amends the City Charter to modify the approvals process for certain types of housing developments.

Vote NO



## SPUR's Recommendation

Prop. E is a measure that was designed to block the passage of Prop. D, Affordable Homes Now. It would do nothing to significantly improve the approvals process for housing projects in San Francisco. Unlike Prop. D, Prop. E would maintain the Board of Supervisors' discretionary approval on 100% affordable housing projects that seek city funding or lease city properties. Maintaining discretionary approvals opens the door to nuisance lawsuits from anti-housing groups to block or delay 100% affordable housing proposals.

Because Prop. E would only allow streamlining on affordable housing projects for residents with incomes up to 80% of AMI, it would prevent streamlining of

projects targeted to moderate income first-time homebuyers making up to 140% AMI. Under this measure, mixed-income projects would face onerous requirements that would render most projects infeasible, making it unlikely that Prop. E would produce any additional affordable units.

Finally, the restrictive nature of the workforce requirements on mixed-income and educator housing projects means that contractors would likely have difficulty hiring workers, which would continue to create obstacles for development. San Francisco's housing affordability crisis demands immediate reforms, and this measure would maintain the status quo.

Read our complete analysis at [spurvoterguide.org](https://spurvoterguide.org)

## SF Prop F

### Library Preservation

CHARTER AMENDMENT

## Library Preservation Fund

Renews the Library Preservation Fund for 25 years and requires the library system to increase hours from 1,211 to 1,400 hours per week, an increase of 15%.

Vote YES



## SPUR's Recommendation

San Francisco's libraries provide important free resources for all San Franciscans, including many vulnerable communities such as low-income people, unhoused people, elderly people and people of color. In addition, the library has a proven track record of providing critical services like warming and cooling centers. The branch libraries became hubs for resources during the COVID-19 health emergency.

The Library Preservation Fund relies partially on set-asides, and SPUR has been both supportive and critical of the use of set-asides. SPUR advocates for set-asides when they include automatic expiration dates, physical

statements from the Controller's Office, suspension in case of fiscal emergencies and an analysis by the Controller's Office every five years. These guidelines help to ensure that funds are being used responsibly and that governments are acting in good faith.

The Library Preservation Fund does not follow some of these guidelines, and its 25-year horizon is longer than SPUR's recommended 10 years. Nonetheless, due to the equity impact of the services provided, as well as the library's proven track record of fiscal responsibility and transparency (as shown in yearly published reports), we think Prop. F is worthy of support.

Read our complete analysis at [spurvoterguide.org](https://spurvoterguide.org)

## SF Prop G

### Student Success Measure

CHARTER AMENDMENT

## Student Success Fund — Grants to the San Francisco Unified School District

Establishes a fund for 15 years to provide grants to San Francisco Unified School District schools to improve academic achievement and support social and emotional wellness for students.

Vote YES



## SPUR's Recommendation

Prop. G is a carefully constructed effort to reduce the vast disparities in resources among public schools while also minimizing the unintended consequences of set-

asides. Funding public schools, especially those serving the most vulnerable communities, is a great driver of equity, integration and opportunity for all.

Read our complete analysis at [spurvoterguide.org](https://spurvoterguide.org)

## SF Prop H

# Changing Election Years

CHARTER AMENDMENT

## City Elections in Even-Numbered Years

Moves San Francisco local elections to even-numbered years concurrent with presidential elections and adjusts the initiative ordinance signature requirements to 2% of registered voters.

Vote YES



## SPUR's Recommendation

Increasing voter turnout is a complicated issue without a single solution. Research has shown that adjusting local elections to even-numbered years, which often have a higher voter turnout, can be a simple way of ensuring that more voters are able to have their voices heard in local decisions.

Low-income people and people of color in San Francisco could be better represented in even-year elections because historically they have turned out in higher numbers during these elections. Due to the potential for better representation of San Francisco voters and the cost savings, this measure deserves support.

Read our complete analysis at [spurvoterguide.org](https://spurvoterguide.org)

## SF Prop I

# JFK Drive and Great Highway Car Use

ORDINANCE

## Vehicles on JFK Drive in Golden Gate Park and the Great Highway

Eliminates the protected recreational space along JFK Promenade in Golden Gate Park by allowing cars on weekdays, prevents the city from keeping the Great Highway along Ocean Beach open for recreational purposes on weekends and holidays by allowing cars at all times, and prevents the city from moving forward with its sea-level rise adaptation plans on the Great Highway extension by preventing future road closure.

Vote NO



## SPUR's Recommendation

Converting JFK Promenade to open space was one of the most successful interventions the city made during the pandemic. It took streets that were primarily being used by drivers cutting through the park and turned them into the most popular linear recreational route in San Francisco, used by millions of people every year. Not just an amenity for San Franciscans, Golden Gate Park is a regional benefit for people across the Bay Area. Similarly, the city has crafted a proposal to keep the Great Highway open for recreational uses on weekends and holidays, another intervention that has gained widespread popularity and support.

The city also has a thoughtful plan to use the Great Highway Extension for nature-based sea-level rise adaptation, which would protect a sewage treatment plant and its surrounding neighborhood from flooding.

This retrograde measure would end all three programs and roll back progress made in protecting the city from sea-level rise and creating open space that is accessible and free to all San Franciscans.

Read our complete analysis at [spurvoterguide.org](https://spurvoterguide.org)

## SF Prop J

### Preserve JFK Promenade as Recreational Space

ORDINANCE

## Official Title: Recreational Use of JFK Drive in Golden Gate Park

Reauthorizes the city's Golden Gate Park Access and Safety Program, which closed select park roads to car traffic for recreational purposes and made public space improvements to the park.

Vote YES



## SPUR's Recommendation

Converting JFK Promenade to open space was one of the most successful interventions the city made during the pandemic, and the decision to make it permanent was undertaken with considerable community engagement and support. In adopting the Golden Gate Park Access and Safety Program, the city has taken an important step toward providing solutions for equitable

access to the park. By reauthorizing the program and making it permanent, Prop. J would preserve these newly created recreational open spaces and continue the city's progress in solving for equitable access to Golden Gate Park. These spaces should continue to be protected and made more accessible for everyone.

Read our complete analysis at [spurvoterguide.org](https://spurvoterguide.org)

## SF Prop L

### Transportation Tax

TAX ORDINANCE

## Sales Tax for Transportation Projects

Continues the existing half-cent sales tax to fund transportation improvements without increasing the current tax rate.

Vote YES



## SPUR's Recommendation

SPUR supports taxation for the public good and believes that this measure balances concerns about the regressive revenue source with essential maintenance and improvements to meet the mobility needs of all San Francisco residents, especially people who are most in need and most at risk from traffic deaths, climate impacts and air pollution. Also, Prop. L represents a continuation of a tax, not a new tax.

Even though the City of San Francisco has challenges completing capital projects on time and on budget, most municipalities in this country face similar problems, and that is not enough of a reason to deny funding. Further, the SFCTA and the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency have been proactively and

earnestly addressing these challenges for new projects in order to minimize the risk of cost increases and delays for future capital projects.

Most importantly, this funding is needed to maintain and improve transportation services, especially given lower revenues from fares as the pandemic continues. Without this funding, San Franciscans will experience lasting negative impacts to climate, equity, health and the economy. For instance, deferring maintenance means that sidewalks, streets and transit would be allowed to deteriorate, making it harder for the city to function. Without this tax, Muni, BART, Caltrain and other transit operators that would receive funding from Prop. L could be forced to make service cuts, leading to fewer riders and more congested roads.

Read our complete analysis at [spurvoterguide.org](https://spurvoterguide.org)



## SF Prop M Vacant Homes

ORDINANCE

## Empty Homes Tax

Taxes apartments that have been vacant for longer than six months.

Vote NO



## SPUR's Recommendation

SPUR wrestled with this measure. Our Regional Strategy calls for the creation of a regional vacancy tax as one element of our anti-displacement agenda. Vacant units do contribute to the tightening of the housing market and are undesirable in cities experiencing a housing shortage. The number of vacant units in San Francisco has increased over the past decade, particularly in the “sold, not occupied category,” which suggests that some of these units are being held off the market as investment properties. From a policy perspective, taxing these units in order to encourage them to be put into active use makes good sense, and SPUR admires the program in Vancouver that serves as a model for this measure.

Unfortunately, Measure M has many flaws. SPUR disagrees that taxation on vacant units should be limited to apartments and that single-family homes do not

require taxation. We would have preferred a more fairly applied universal vacancy tax where all vacant units, regardless of building size, are taxed. We are concerned that the new construction exemption might be insufficient to cover the lease-up time for larger buildings, which is particularly problematic because it might discourage new housing at a time when so few new homes are being built in San Francisco. And we believe the measure should exempt below-market-rate units, which can be challenging to rent.

While SPUR does support the concept of a vacancy tax and finds the mechanism for administering this tax to be appropriate, this is not the particular vacant unit tax that we would prefer to see on the ballot.

Read our complete analysis at [spurvoterguide.org](https://spurvoterguide.org)

## SF Prop N

# Golden Gate Park Concourse Garage

ORDINANCE

## Golden Gate Park Underground Parking Facility; Golden Gate Park Concourse Authority

Clarifies that the City and County of San Francisco may use public funds to acquire and/or operate the Golden Gate Park Underground Parking Facility; dissolves the Golden Gate Park Concourse Authority and transfers its responsibilities to the San Francisco Recreation and Parks Department; and repeals the voter-enacted Golden Gate Park Revitalization Act of 1998.

Vote YES



## SPUR's Recommendation

Prop. N would create flexibility for the city to eliminate outdated constraints and use the Concourse Garage as a resource to meet a wide range of city goals.

SPUR does not support policies that encourage people who have access to greener and safer travel options to drive and park in Golden Gate Park. However, for those

who must drive, the Concourse Garage offers an opportunity for more people to park without interfering with other park activities or eliminating protected open space.

Read our complete analysis at [spurvoterguide.org](https://spurvoterguide.org)

## SF Prop O

# City College Parcel Tax

ORDINANCE

## San Francisco Workforce Education and Reinvestment in Community Success Act

Creates a new parcel tax to raise \$45 million per year to support City College of San Francisco.

Vote NO



## SPUR's Recommendation

In the past 10 years, City College has repeatedly failed to align its budget to its available resources, risking insolvency and loss of accreditation. This approach has put the entire institution on unsteady footing. While additional resources from this parcel tax could provide a financial buffer for City College, the existing parcel tax that was renewed in 2016 was intended to provide a similar buffer and has not proven successful in stabilizing the college's finances. This history indicates that the problems facing City College are structural, related to the management of the institution, and will not be solved by additional money alone.

Earlier this year, the Board of Trustees made the difficult decision to slash the number of faculty positions and class offerings in an attempt to right the financial ship.

This comes at a significant cost to both students and staff at City College. We are hopeful that that decision — and the recent appointment of a new, permanent chancellor — will put City College on a path toward long-term stability. However, it's too soon to know whether that's the case. Given that, it's also too soon to dedicate a new parcel tax that would invest more funds into the institution. City College's stability — and reaccreditation — should be more apparent within two years, at which point additional parcel taxes or other funding would be a more sound investment proposal, particularly if it were controlled directly by the community college district and not the Board of Supervisors.

Read our complete analysis at [spurvoterguide.org](https://spurvoterguide.org)

## SJ Measure I City Charter Amendments

CHARTER AMENDMENT

### City of San José Charter Amendments

Modifies the San José City Charter in four ways: adds the city's ethics and elections commission (Board of Fair Campaign and Political Practices) to the charter; removes requirements that members of the planning, civil service and salary setting commissions be electors and/or citizens; removes gender-specific language from the charter; and requires the City Council to adopt a statement of values and guidance for decision making within the city that incorporates equity.

Vote YES



## SPUR's Recommendation

Each of the proposed charter amendments was carefully weighed and considered by the city's Charter Review Commission and overwhelmingly approved. The

City Council also voted 10–1 to place the measure on the ballot. Lastly, three of the four proposed amendments will generate positive equity outcomes.

Read our complete analysis at [spurvoterguide.org](https://spurvoterguide.org)

## OAK Measure H Oakland Schools Career Readiness

ORDINANCE

### Oakland Unified School District College and Career Readiness for All Act

Reauthorizes a parcel tax for 14 additional years to continue funding the Oakland Unified School District's college and career readiness program for high school students.

Vote YES



## SPUR's Recommendation

Existing Measure N's funding has clear equity goals and a track record of proven success for all students, especially African American male students. Measure H

would continue this funding without increasing the parcel tax beyond cost-of-living adjustments and would maintain consistent programming for OUSD students.

Read our complete analysis at [spurvoterguide.org](https://spurvoterguide.org)

## OAK Measure Q Affordable Housing Authorization

ORDINANCE

### Article 34 Affordable Housing Authorization

Authorizes the City of Oakland to develop up to 13,000 new units of city-owned affordable housing.

Vote YES



## SPUR's Recommendation

Given the affordability crisis in the city's residential housing market, SPUR recommends that Oakland voters approve this measure to increase the city's capacity to develop additional affordable units. SPUR also

recognizes, however, that in authorizing public entities to build affordable housing, Measure Q would neither provide the funding nor solve the challenges of actually building it.

Read our complete analysis at [spurvoterguide.org](https://spurvoterguide.org)

## OAK Measure R Gender-Neutral Language

CHARTER AMENDMENT

### Charter Amendment Replacing Gender-Specific Language with Gender-Neutral Language

Replaces gender-specific language in Oakland's City Charter with gender-neutral language.

Vote YES



## SPUR's Recommendation

Measure R seeks to replace outdated language and eliminate gender stereotyping of roles. People who don't identify with traditional binary pronouns hold positions in Oakland's government, and the current language in the charter is not inclusive of the diverse

makeup of staff. This measure would ensure that all individuals, regardless of their gender identity, are properly included and acknowledged for their roles.

SPUR supports an equitable Bay Area for all and believes that the language of our laws should reflect this inclusivity.

Read our complete analysis at [spurvoterguide.org](https://spurvoterguide.org)

## OAK Measure S Noncitizen School Board Voting

CHARTER AMENDMENT

## Noncitizen Voting Rights for Oakland School Board of Education

Gives noncitizens who are the parents, legal guardians or legally recognized caregivers of a child attending an Oakland public school the right to vote for candidates for Oakland Unified School District Board of Education.

Vote YES



### SPUR's Recommendation

Providing voting rights for noncitizen voters in local school board elections increases equity for noncitizen parents by allowing them to have a say in who makes the decisions that impact their children. Despite some of

the uncertainties about the implementation of this measure, the pros of giving all OUSD parents a say in school board elections far outweigh the potential cons.

Read our complete analysis at [spurvoterguide.org](https://spurvoterguide.org)

## OAK Measure T Progressive Business Tax

ORDINANCE

## Progressive and Equitable Business Tax

Creates a tiered tax system in Oakland based on businesses' gross receipts and their business sectors.

Vote YES



### SPUR's Recommendation

Simply put, Oakland needs more tax revenue to meet the needs of its residents and to expand and improve city services. This measure promises to build a more progressive tax system in Oakland, raising vital revenue and providing minor tax relief to small businesses. By asking larger and wealthier businesses to pay more, Oakland could rely on revenue from healthier, more established businesses.

Any time taxes are raised on large employers, there is a chance that businesses will move away. In recent years, Oakland has become an appealing location to

headquarter Bay Area businesses, with lower costs than San Francisco, and this measure could change that trend. However, the tax increase for the largest businesses would be relatively small. Even the highest rate for the largest businesses would be just \$5.50 per \$1,000 in gross receipts. Oakland's location, population and culture would remain attractive reasons for opening a headquarters in the city.

Establishing a progressive tax system would improve the city's financial footing and provide minor tax relief to small businesses, helping them operate in Oakland.

Read our complete analysis at [spurvoterguide.org](https://spurvoterguide.org)

## OAK Measure U

### Affordable Housing and Infrastructure Bond

BOND

## New Infrastructure Bond Measure

Authorizes the City of Oakland to issue \$850 million in general obligation bonds to fund various affordable housing, transportation and infrastructure projects.

Vote YES



## SPUR's Recommendation

Much of Oakland's infrastructure continues to suffer from a lack of sustained and significant investment, with inadequate funding for routine street maintenance, repair, replacement and improvements, and a housing shortage at every income level. Without funding from the city, affordable housing, transportation and other city programs will continue to rely on limited and fragmented state, local and grant funding, which will further delay addressing these needs.

Continuing to invest in Oakland's most essential infrastructure, including affordable housing and transportation, protects the quality of life for all Oaklanders and the city's long-term economic vitality. The dollars generated from the bond measure would also help Oakland reach its climate and equity goals by investing in environmental and seismic improvements to city facilities.

As one of the few revenue mechanisms available to cities, a general obligation bond is a common and reliable funding tool.

Read our complete analysis at [spurvoterguide.org](https://spurvoterguide.org)

## OAK Measure V

### Just Cause Amendment

ORDINANCE

## Just Cause Eviction Protections

Amend the Just Cause for Eviction Ordinance to establish new tenant protections.

Vote YES



## SPUR's Recommendation

Housing production and preservation are vital to accommodate Oakland's future growth over the next 50 years and to improve housing affordability in the short and long term. Tenant protections alone cannot improve access to housing; increasing the overall supply of housing is also an important anti-displacement strategy.

However, expanding tenant protections is a critical intervention to improve community stability, prevent displacement, and reduce the risk of homelessness.

Bay Area cities must take steps to set permanent tenant protections amid an acute affordability crisis, especially once the COVID-19 moratorium is lifted. Expanding just cause protections and eliminating certain types of no-fault evictions will help ensure that Oakland residents can remain in their homes.

Read our complete analysis at [spurvoterguide.org](https://spurvoterguide.org)

## OAK Measure W Campaign Reform

ORDINANCE

## Oakland Fair Elections Act

Establishes public financing for city official and Board of Education elections, promotes transparency in campaign contributions and strengthens lobbying restrictions for former city officials and directors.

Vote YES



## SPUR's Recommendation

Oakland's current campaign finance system is imbalanced and inequitable. In recent elections, most campaign contributions have come from wealthy residents or donors who do not live in Oakland, giving these donors a disproportionate amount of control over local elections. All residents, regardless of income, should have opportunities to engage with candidates and provide support during the elections process.

Even though it doesn't create a new revenue source to fund the Democracy Dollars program, overall this measure is a step toward a more equitable democratic system. SPUR supports the measure's goal to equitably involve all Oakland residents in the political process and commends the inclusion of good government provisions. The measure also has a multitude of safeguards designed to prevent abuse of the program and is allowed to adapt as Oakland's economic climate changes.

Read our complete analysis at [spurvoterguide.org](https://spurvoterguide.org)

## OAK Measure X Governance Reform

CHARTER AMENDMENT

## Governance Reform

Amends the City Charter to create term limits for city councilmembers, closes the mayoral tie-breaker loophole, adds to the duties of the city auditor and creates City Council meeting requirements before measures are placed on the ballot.

Vote YES



## SPUR's Recommendation

SPUR's report, *Making Oakland Work*, lays out the numerous challenges that the city faces due to its government structure. While this measure does not address all of those challenges, it does include several important changes to help improve Oakland's

government, many of which SPUR has called for, including term limits and the ability to increase salaries for councilmembers, as well as minimum staffing for the auditor. This measure includes many steps in the right direction and is worthy of support.

Read our complete analysis at [spurvoterguide.org](https://spurvoterguide.org)

## OAK Measure Y Oakland Zoo Parcel Tax

ORDINANCE

## Oakland Zoo Animal Care, Education and Improvement Ordinance

Creates a 20-year parcel tax in the City of Oakland to fund the Oakland Zoo.

No Recommendation



### SPUR's Recommendation

Support from local governments has allowed many other California zoos to expand their capacity significantly through public partnerships and private donations. For example, the San Francisco Zoo has been able to provide substantial discounts to low-income San Francisco residents. However, a \$68 parcel tax represents a significant amount for many

Oaklanders and further increases the zoo's dependency on the government. Recognizing both the educational importance of the zoo and the cost burden of a parcel tax on Oakland property owners, SPUR's Board of Directors was divided and could not reach a 60% majority to either support or oppose this measure.

Read our complete analysis at [spurvoterguide.org](https://spurvoterguide.org)

## CA Prop 1 Reproductive Freedom

CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT

## Constitutional Right to Reproductive Freedom

Enshrines reproductive rights in the California constitution.

Vote YES



### SPUR's Recommendation

The reproductive rights currently provided under the state constitution provide significant freedom for Californians. Guaranteeing those rights reduces the potential for misinterpretation of the law and goes one step further to ensure those rights. In the wake of the

Supreme Court overturning *Roe v. Wade*, it is important that the state ensures the strength and clarity of reproductive freedom law. SPUR recommends a "Yes" vote on Prop. 1.

Read our complete analysis at [spurvoterguide.org](https://spurvoterguide.org)



## CA Prop 26 In-Person Sports Betting

INITIATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL  
AMENDMENT AND STATUTE

## Allows In-Person Roulette, Dice Games, Sports Wagering on Tribal Lands

Legalizes the operations of specific games as well as in-person sports betting at American Indian gaming casinos and at privately owned, licensed horse-racing tracks in certain counties in California. Imposes a 10% tax on sports bets made at licensed horse-racing tracks, with tax revenue to be deposited in the California Sports Wagering Fund.

Vote NO



## SPUR's Recommendation

Gambling operations are here to stay in California, and the revenues that they generate benefit California tribes. However, decisions about who gets to participate in a given industry should be made by the state legislature so that it can adapt how services are offered,

and by whom, as conditions change over time. (See our [Prop. 27 recommendation](#) for more on these complexities.) These questions should not be decided on the ballot, where nuances are lost and the flexibility to make future changes is compromised.

Read our complete analysis at [spurvoterguide.org](https://spurvoterguide.org)

## CA Prop 27 Online Sports Betting

INITIATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL  
AMENDMENT AND STATUTE

## Allows Online and Mobile Sports Wagering Outside Tribal Lands

Legalizes online sports betting in California and directs tax revenue earned to the California Solutions to Homelessness and Mental Health Support Account and the Tribal Economic Development Account.

Vote NO



## SPUR's Recommendation

Sports betting is a lucrative industry, and since California has yet to lay down any regulatory rules, it's no surprise that interested parties are taking measures directly to the voters. But given the complexity of this field, the competing interests among potential participants and the intended or unintended consequences on tribal well-being, these decisions should not be made at the ballot box. The only responsible approach is for the

State of California to legislate the rules surrounding who can operate these services, how the services fit into the landscape of existing gaming rules and tribal-state compacts, and whether sports betting should be made legal in California at all, given its potential risks to individual gamblers. The state should also decide how any new revenue from these services will be spent since spending priorities shift over time.

Read our complete analysis at [spurvoterguide.org](https://spurvoterguide.org)

## CA Prop 28 K-12 Arts and Music Education

INITIATIVE STATUTE

## Provides Additional Funding for Arts and Music Education in Public Schools

Allocates continuous state funding for arts and music education in all K-12 public schools.

Vote NO



### SPUR's Recommendation

Many California schools lack the resources to provide students with arts and music education. Due to the competing priorities school districts face, arts education is frequently neglected. All students deserve access to a well-rounded, quality education that includes access to arts and music instruction.

Unfortunately, this measure fails to include provisions that make budget set-asides worthwhile. SPUR is disappointed to be critical of a measure that has good

intentions and highlights the need for increased funding for arts and music education. However, by setting aside ongoing funding from the General Fund, this measure would limit both the state's and schools' ability to adapt to changing priorities and challenges. Prop. 28 also lacks a sunset clause, specific metrics for success and clarity over whether the designated funding amount is appropriate. For these reasons, SPUR recommends a "No" vote on Prop. 28.

Read our complete analysis at [spurvoterguide.org](https://spurvoterguide.org)

## CA Prop 29 Dialysis Clinic Requirements

INITIATIVE STATUTE

## Protect the Lives of Dialysis Patients Act

Requires dialysis clinics to enact extra procedures and restrictions that increase patient oversight, including on-site medical practitioners, data reporting and financial transparency.

Vote NO



### SPUR's Recommendation

This proposition, for the third time, attempts to regulate dialysis clinics. It's not clear that added regulations are necessary or that added oversight would guarantee improved outcomes, and several requirements set forth by Prop. 29 are already in place. Instead, this measure would increase the cost of care to the detriment of

patients. Dialysis care is a highly complex issue and should not be left up to voters to decide. Patient advocates, labor advocates and clinic operators could negotiate these changes through the normal legislative process.

Read our complete analysis at [spurvoterguide.org](https://spurvoterguide.org)

## CA Prop 30

### Clean Air California

INITIATIVE STATUTE

## Clean Cars and Clean Air Act

Levies a tax increase of 1.75% on personal income over \$2 million to invest \$100 billion in zero-emission transportation and in preventing and fighting catastrophic wildfires.

Vote YES



## SPUR's Recommendation

California has the worst air quality in the country and, given current policy and levels of investment, will fail to meet its critical climate goals. Prop. 30 would invest \$100 billion to significantly reduce climate emissions and air pollution from the two largest sources in the state: transportation and wildfires. The measure would also make funds available to support transit operators purchasing zero-emission buses and trains, as well as small businesses purchasing zero-emission trucks, construction and agricultural equipment. It would require that 50% of these investments benefit low-

income Californians and those living in disadvantaged communities. The wildfire investments alone would prevent hundreds of thousands of acres being burned in catastrophic wildfires every year, generating more than \$11 billion of annual benefits to Californians. The measure raises the funds through a small and progressive tax increase on the 0.2% of Californians who earn more than \$2 million a year, a group that has seen incomes increase significantly in recent years. Considering the urgency of air pollution and climate change in California, Prop. 30 is worthy of support.

Read our complete analysis at [spurvoterguide.org](https://spurvoterguide.org)

## CA Prop 31

### Flavored Tobacco Ban

REFERENDUM

## Referendum on 2020 Law that Would Prohibit Sale of Certain Flavored Tobacco Products

Upholds the flavored tobacco ban.

Vote YES



## SPUR's Recommendation

California has a long-standing history of trying to reduce tobacco consumption because of its negative impact on public health. Flavored tobacco products are particularly harmful because they are designed to encourage greater consumption, and many are specifically marketed to youth and to Black communities. In light of this, the California Legislature made a bipartisan decision to ban the sale of these products.

Overall, the positive public health impacts and equity impacts outweigh the concerns about limiting adults' access to flavored tobacco products or lost revenue for small businesses. For these reasons, SPUR recommends a "Yes" vote on Prop. 31.

Read our complete analysis at [spurvoterguide.org](https://spurvoterguide.org)

# Purpose and Process

The goal of the SPUR Voter Guide is to offer objective analysis and advise voters on which measures will deliver real solutions.

SPUR analyzed all city measures in San Francisco, San José and Oakland, as well as regional and California state measures.

For each city, a subcommittee of the SPUR board (Ballot Analysis Committee or Policy Advisory Board) serves to hear arguments on both sides of the relevant measures, debate the merits of each and provide recommendations to the relevant SPUR city board of directors. For the state measures, the SPUR Executive Board serves the same purpose. Each board must then reach a 60 percent vote to determine the final SPUR recommendation on a given ballot measure. The boards voted on the relevant measures on the following dates:

**Executive Board of Directors:** August 16, 2022

**San Francisco Board of Directors:** August 31 and September 1, 2022

**San José Board of Directors:** August 24, 2022

**Oakland Board of Directors:** August 23 and 30, 2022

## Acknowledgments

**California Ballot Analysis Committee:** SPUR Executive Board members: Lydia Tan, Kristina Raspe, Jean Fraser, Bob Gamble, Jaye Bailey, Ahmed Ali Bob, Daniel Cedeño, Dahlia Chazan, Donald Falk, David Friedman, Candice Gonzalez, Ariane Hogan, Hao Ko, Camille Llanes-Fontanilla, Manan Shah, Joshua Simon, Joaquín Torres

**San Francisco Ballot Analysis Committee:** Sarah Dennis Phillips, Tamsen Drew, Don Falk, Tyra Fennell, Bob Gamble, Ariane Hogan, Aaron Johnson, Roscoe Mapps, Shin-pei Tsay

**San José Ballot Analysis Committee:** Anil Babbar, Melissa Hippard, Barbara Marshman, Kelly Snider, Leah Toeniskoetter, Geri Wong

**Oakland Policy Advisory Board:** Ahmed Ali Bob, Deb Boyer, Gloria Bruce, Morten Jensen, Carolyn Johnson, Lewis Knight, Josh Simon, Ari Takata-Vasquez

**SPUR Staff:** Paloma Sisneros-Lobato, Fred Buzo, Anne Christie, Jacob Denney, Katie Ettman, Laura Feinstein, Sarah Harper, Nick Josefowitz, Sarah Karlinsky, Jonathon Kass, Grecia Marquez-Niebles, Jackson Nutt-Beers, Jessica Peyton, Erika Pinto, Sujata Srivastava, Laura Tolkoff, Augustina Ullman, Eli Zigas

**Editors:** Valerie Sinzdak, Karen Steen, Colleen Valles

**Copy editor:** Sheryl Kaskowitz, Becky Ohlsen

**Paid for by the San Francisco Bay Area Planning and Urban Research Association. Financial disclosures available at [sfethics.org](https://sfethics.org)**