

Selby, Matthew (REG)

From: CON, Controller (CON)
Sent: Tuesday, August 27, 2024 11:14 AM
To: aeboken
Cc: CON, Controller (CON); Lee, Catherine (REG); Selby, Matthew (REG); Arntz, John (REG)
Subject: RE: Prop K Controller's Analysis Challenge

Dear Ms. Boken,

We have received and reviewed your feedback to our costing letter for Proposition K dated August 12, 2024.

In summary, the Controller’s Office issues a costing analysis where our Office:

- Identify the total net increase or decrease in the cost to government.
- Strives to maintain neutrality in simple summaries that explain the range of possible costs to the voters.
- Provides detail and context on the financial impact of proposed measures, as much as it is knowable.
- Summarizes complex City projects and financial impacts to be as clear and concise as possible.
- Reflects our understanding of the proposal as of the date of the letter. At times further information is provided to us which may result in revisions being made to this analysis before the final Controller’s statement appears in the Voter Information Pamphlet.

Best,

Claire



F0dlh#vwrqh#kch|2khp ,
P dqdjhu#i#shfbd\$urnfww# #Nh|#qldwlv
R iifh#i#kch#rqrwrou
[folh1wqhc vijrykuj](#)
vijry2frqwrrou

From: Lee, Catherine (REG) <catherine.lee1@sfgov.org>
Sent: Thursday, August 22, 2024 5:00 PM
To: Levy, Janice (CON) <janice.levy@sfgov.org>
Cc: Arntz, John (REG) <john.arntz@sfgov.org>; Selby, Matthew (REG) <matthew.selby@sfgov.org>
Subject: FW: Prop K Controller's Analysis Challenge

Hello, Janice,

We received a challenge to Controller's analysis of Proposition K as below.

Per Campaign Services, your office may response to this challenge by Monday, August 26.

Thank you!

Catherine Lee, Publications Manager
San Francisco Department of Elections
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 48
San Francisco, CA 94102
Main: (415) 554-4375
Direct: (415) 554-7771
www.sfelections.gov



From: SFVote, (REG) <sfvote@sfgov.org>
Sent: Thursday, August 22, 2024 4:27 PM
To: Doe, Publications (REG) <publications@sfgov.org>
Subject: FW: Prop K Controller's Analysis Challenge

Please forward to Controller's Office.

From: Ausra Eileen Boken [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, August 22, 2024 3:13 PM
To: SFVote, (REG) <sfvote@sfgov.org>
Subject: Prop K Controller's Analysis Challenge

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

August 22, 2024

TO: San Francisco Department of Elections
sfvote@sfgov.org

FROM: Eileen Boken, President
Sunset-Parkside Education and Action Committee (SPEAK) /s/

RE: Controller's analysis of Proposition K - Permanently Closing the Upper Great Highway to Private Vehicles to Establish a Public Open Recreation Space

Position: Challenging Controller's analysis of Proposition K and strongly urging that Proposition K be withdrawn/removed from the November 5, 2024 ballot.

Proposition K is based on BOS File 240706 Initiative Ordinance - Park Code - Parkway at Upper Great Highway.

File 240706 establishes the Standard of Review for all related documents.

In Section 1, Background and Findings, of the initiative ordinance is subsection 5. .

This ordinance establishes the Standard of Review as sand removal is clearly defined in a document obtained by a Public Records Request (PRR).

Based on this PRR, the Standard of Review in this ordinance for sand removal from the roadway is as follows:

- It's based on a specific annual dollar amount defined in terms of an expense rather than cost savings.
- This annual expense is specified for daily sand removal rather than the established DPW procedure of seasonal sand removal.
- The sand removal is for all four lanes of roadway as this is the DPW established procedure.

However, the Controller's analysis for the Board of Supervisors Rules Committee hearing for this ordinance is inconsistent with the Standard of Review established in the ordinance itself. See attached.

The inconsistencies are as follows:

- It fails to refer to the \$1.7 million sand removal cost which is defined in the ordinance.
- The analysis is for a range of costs rather than a specific amount with the range being between approximately \$150,000 to \$500,000 annually.
- The annual cost is expressed as a cost savings rather than as an expense.
- It's undefined if this is for daily sand removal or seasonal sand removal.
- It's defined as a portion of the roadway which is two lanes rather than four lanes.

There is no stated explanation or justification included in the Controller's analysis as to why the methodology used in the BOS analysis was different from the Standard of Review in the ordinance.

The Controller's analysis for the Board of Supervisors is the subject of a Brown Act violation complaint.

In addition to the Controller's analysis for the Board of Supervisors, a separate Controller's analysis was prepared for the Department of Elections.

The Controller's analysis was prepared for Prop K. See attached.

The Controller's Prop K is also inconsistent with the Standard of Review stated in the ordinance.

The inconsistencies are as follows:

- It fails to refer to the \$1.7 million sand removal cost which is defined in the ordinance.
- The analysis is for a range of costs rather than a specific amount with the range being between approximately \$350,000 to \$700,000 annually.
- The cost savings co-mingles sand removal with roadway maintenance and operating costs.
- The annual cost is expressed as a cost savings rather than as an expense.
- It's undefined if this is for daily sand removal, seasonal sand removal or no sand removal at all.
- It's undefined whether the sand removal is two lanes, four lanes or no lanes.

There is no stated explanation or justification included in the Controller's analysis for the Department of Elections as to why the methodology used in the Prop K analysis is different from the Standard of Review in the ordinance.

There is also no stated explanation or justification included in the Controller's analysis for the Department of Elections as to why the methodology used in the Prop K analysis is different from the Controller's analysis prepared for the Board of Supervisors.

SIGNIFICANT OMISSIONS TO CONTROLLER'S ANALYSIS OF PROP K

- The entire length of the Upper Great Highway is part of the DPW Emergency Priority Routes map. These routes have been established for the City to respond to catastrophic events. They could also be used for mutual aid from the Peninsula and major evacuations. This is a public safety issue.

- The Upper Great Highway between Lincoln and Sloat currently only has ADA access at Judah and Taraval. The Controller's analysis for Prop K does not include the significant costs necessary to upgrade the entire length to be ADA compliant.

- The Controller's analysis for Prop K does not refer to the increased sand dune trampling when the roadway is closed to private vehicles even though this has been documented in the San Francisco Estuary Institute report Growing Resilience, Recommendations for Dune Management at North Ocean Beach. There would be significant costs to dune restoration and maintenance that could easily surpass any cost savings noted in the Controller's analysis of Prop K.

In summary, SPEAK asserts that the Controller's analysis for Prop K does not meet the Standard of Review established in initiative ordinance 240706.

Therefore, SPEAK also asserts that these issues warrant Prop K being withdrawn/removed from the November 5, 2024 ballot.

Furthermore, SPEAK is strongly urging that action be taken for Prop K to be withdrawn/removed from the November 5, 2024 ballot.

###

Sent from my Verizon, Samsung Galaxy smartphone

Verizon, Samsung Galaxy smartphone