

From: [Marie Hurabiell](#)
To: [REG - BSC Clerk](#)
Subject: Ballot simplification of Great Highway measure
Date: Monday, July 22, 2024 2:35:36 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

July 22 2024

Dear Members of the Ballot Simplification Committee,

First, thank you on behalf of all SF residents for the work you do making the ballot measures legible for voters. Second, I would be grateful if you would consider these small changes to the draft digest of the Great Highway Closure proposal. I have three suggestions that I believe will improve the clarity of the proposition and its effects for residents.

1.

Make the Great Highway Closure Front and Center

I believe the current draft proposal emphasizes the wrong effect of the proposition. Whatever plans the city may have for the future of the Great Highway post-closure, its closure to private vehicles is the central change proposed. There is nothing in the proposal that creates or provides funding to build a park, so any mention of recreational spaces is more hopeful than factual and seems inappropriate for a distillation of the legal text.. The closure should therefore be placed first in the proposal summary. The current draft could be changed to read: “Proposition ___ is an ordinance that would allow the City to permanently close the Upper Great Highway to vehicles seven days a week, with limited exceptions.”

2.

Remove Unnecessary Reference to Emergency Powers

The final two sentences of the proposal draft are currently spent noting emergency exceptions to the proposal, and the circumstances of these potential emergencies. However, the material in the final sentences (The General Manager of the Recreation and Parks Department would have the authority to allow private motor vehicles to use the Upper Great Highway during an emergency as determined by the General Manager) is nowhere to be found in the legal text. This is also confusing because the powers of the Executive Branch are clearly laid out elsewhere, making it unnecessary to repeat them here. I suggest removing the final sentence of the proposal for the sake of clarity for voters.

3.

Clarify the “Yes” Vote’s Effects

As requested in point 1) above, I believe it is vital to emphasize the imminent effects of the Great Highway's closure over and above any plans for recreational renovation that may or may not follow depending on funding. The "A "NO" Vote Means" section's wording is admirably concise regarding the closure. I suggest you consider amending the "Yes" section to better reflect the "No" section's direct language. It could read: "If you vote "yes," you want the City to permanently close the Upper Great Highway seven days a week to cars."

Thank you for your consideration of my views on the matter, I look forward to hearing from you.

Yours,

Marie Hurabiell

██████████