

Patrick Hannan
1714 Stockton Street, Suite 400
San Francisco, CA 94133
415/837-5403
patrick@letskidsplay.org

August 4, 2014

Via E-Mail to publications@sfgov.org
and Facsimile to 415/554-7829

Ballot Simplification Committee – Request for Reconsideration
c/o Barbara Carr
Department of Elections
City Hall, Room 48
1 Dr. Carlton B Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102

Re: Request for Reconsideration of “Renovations of Playground, Walking Trails,
and Athletic Fields” Digest

Dear Members of the Ballot Simplification Committee:

Thank you for taking the time to review this request for reconsideration regarding the “Renovations of Playground, Walking Trails, and Athletic Fields” measure digest that was prepared on Friday, August 1, 2014.

First, I request that the following language be amended:

“Proposition __ would amend the Park Code to allow the City to renovate any children’s playground, walking trail or athletic field if the renovation satisfies the following conditions:

- The Recreation and Park Department has determined that the renovation would double the public’s use; and
- an environmental impact report has been certified if required by law.”

The alternate language I recommend is:

“Proposition __ would amend the Park Code to allow the City to renovate any children’s playground, walking trail or athletic field if the renovation satisfies the following conditions:

Ballot Simplification Committee – Request for Reconsideration

August 4, 2014

Page 2

- The Recreation and Park Department has determined, and an environmental impact report has documented, that the renovation would double the public's use; and
- when required, an environmental impact report for the renovation has been certified."

I believe this edit is necessary to ensure that the digest accurately reflects the measure's legal requirements. As currently drafted, the digest does not include one important condition: that an environmental impact report (in addition to the Recreation and Park Department) document that the renovation would double the public's use. By mirroring the measure's operative language, this requirement is best conveyed to the voters. I also believe that the modest amendment to the second "bullet point" ensures that the measure and the digest are better understood by the voters.

Secondly, I request that the language following "A "NO" VOTE MEANS" mirror the language following "A "YES" VOTE MEANS."

This section currently reads:

"A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote "no," you do not want to amend the Park Code."

I request that the section read:

"A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote "no," you do not want to amend the Park Code to allow the City to renovate children's playground, walking trails and athletic fields if such renovation would double their anticipated usage and if an environment impact report has been certified."

This change ensures that voters will have a full understanding of the consequences of a "no" vote, and not be confused by the lack of consistency with the "yes" vote section. This is especially appropriate given the approach to the similar sections in the competing "Golden Gate Park Athletic Fields" measure.

Thank you very much for your consideration of these important issues.

Sincerely,



Patrick Hannan