

Selby, Matthew (REG)

From: Selby, Matthew (REG)
Sent: Friday, August 23, 2024 2:09 PM
To: Arntz, John (REG)
Subject: FW: Challenge to Paid Yes on Prop K arguments

[We have received the below challenge](#)

From: Richie Greenberg Press Office [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, August 23, 2024 2:00 PM
To: SFVote, (REG) <sfvote@sfgov.org>; info <info@votenoont.com>
Cc: Selby, Matthew (REG) <matthew.selby@sfgov.org>; Ramos, Michael (REG) <michael.ramos@sfgov.org>
Subject: Challenge to Paid Yes on Prop K arguments

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

Richie Greenberg
San Francisco

[REDACTED]

John Arntz, Director
San Francisco Dept of Elections
City Hall, San Francisco
sfvote@sfgov.org

Friday, August 23, 2024

Challenge to Prop K Paid Yes Arguments

Dear Director Arntz, et al,

I write regarding the thirteen submitted paid ballot arguments in support of Prop K, those as posted on the department's website. I file this challenge within the allotted and specified time period per San Francisco Election Code.

On July 25, 2024, a concerned voter submitted a challenge to Prop K's initial title, asserting that title was inappropriately named, did not reflect the immediate purpose and end result of the ballot measure, should it pass. In other words, the initial title was deceptive. You responded to this serious issue July 29th, in agreement with the challenge, and therefore modified the measure's title. This is because voters must be adequately informed regarding what they will be voting for.

Now comes before us thirteen very deceptive paid ballot arguments in support of Prop K. Each contains within them misleading words and terms, which if they should be allowed to appear in the upcoming voter guide, will deceptively influence voters.

As has been established, Prop K intent is "*Permanently Closing the Upper Great Highway to Private Vehicles...*" Yet in each one of the thirteen Paid Yes K arguments, the phrase "Ocean Beach Park" is prominently incorporated within their paid argument. Examination shows such deceptive statements as "we need Ocean Beach Park", "Proposition K creates an oceanfront park", "demand for a new coastal park," "Ocean Beach Park will address climate change", "Let's keep Ocean Beach Park," "a new oceanfront promenade," "converting the Great Highway into an oceanfront park", "an iconic new oceanfront park."

In fact, as an aside and anecdotal evidence, the major funding paying for those paid yes arguments is via a political committee named "Ocean Beach Park For All", deceptive in its own right, though their name is not actionable through your department, and can be addressed separately.

As has been determined, Prop K has no purpose, intent nor end result to create a park, nor an oceanfront park, nor a promenade, nor to convert the existing roadway to a promenade. These are misleading, deceptive phrases. Moreover, each of these yes paid arguments were submitted to your office weeks after you had already determined the Prop K title was deceptive (as described above), and you changed the measure title. The Yes Paid authors should have known by your title-change example that voters need adequate ballot measure information, and yet authors ignored your title change example and the precedent you set - and they submitted their misleading arguments anyway.

For these reasons, to prevent voter confusion and misinformation, I respectfully request you take action to strike the phrases "Ocean Beach Park", "Ocean Front Park", "Great Highway Park", "oceanfront promenade", and "convert", from each of the thirteen arguments. San Francisco's voters *deserve the best, accurate information possible* to make an informed decision come November.

Respectfully,

Richie Greenberg