Ballot Argument Control Sheet A


Control Sheet A must be submitted for every ballot argument, with required signatures and author information. If your argument has more than one author, you must also submit Control Sheet B with required signatures and information for all additional authors.

For an argument submitted on behalf of an organization, the "Individual" section must also be completed by a principal officer of the organization who must be a registered San Francisco voter.

Mailing Address

Signature ____

If an argument states that an individual or organization other than the author supports or opposes the ballot measure, or agrees with or endorses the argument, a completed and signed Consent Form is required.



Facilitate typesetting, and reduce the p 24 hours after submission to the Depa	cossibility of transcription error by sen- rtment at publications@sfgov.org.	ding an electronic copy of your ballot argument text within
Section 1: Argument Inform	ation	
Proposition <u>F</u>	errore to substitut i berno e	
Proponent Argument	Rebuttal to Proponent Argument	Paid Argument in Favor
Opponent Argument	Rebuttal to Opponent Argument	Paid Argument Against
Section 2: Author Information		
Declaration Related to Proponent ar		
am not a Non-supporter of this measur	e. A Non-supporter is defined as a pe	
 Has received or been promise that committee; or 	ed any compensation or thing of value	plans to make expenditures in opposition to the measure; from such a committee to perform consulting services for ture or in advertising that advocates for the defeat of the
measure.		
I attest under the penalty of perjury that not a Supporter of this measure. A Sup		gument for Proposition F being submitted and that I am h respect to a measure:
 Has received or been promise that committee; or Has authorized their name or 	d any compensation or thing of value	plans to make expenditures in support of the measure; from such a committee to perform consulting services for ture or in advertising that advocates for the adoption of the
measure. Complete the following to indicate wi	nether the Author is an individual o	er an organization.
Individual (or principal officer of O		all organization.
		Disters 9 Title (If Applicable) Supervisor
Full Name (Print) Hill ary	Zonen	Title (If Applicable) Supervisor
San Francisco Address (Where you a	re Registered)	
Signature		Email
Organization (Entity)		or section and the Organization Section)
Name of Organization (Print)		
Who should be listed as an Author for	your Organization?	
Only the Organization	oth the Officer and the Organization	
* Check if the title or identifying informatifyou are signing as an individual and	ation is for identification purposes only not of behalf of an organization.	/,
Signature		Email
Section 3: Submitter Informat	tion	
The submitter is the person who delivers a submission, the Department will conta	s the argument and supporting materia ct the submitter.	als to the Department. If there is a question or issue with
Full Name (Print) Karima		Phone

Section 4: Information for Paid Arguments Paid arguments must include information about the true source of funds for the publication of the argument. It is also required to indicate whether the true source of funds is a recipient committee. This information will be printed below the argument and the author information in the Voter Information Pamphlet. The true source of funds for the printing fee of this argument: Is the true source of funds a recipient committee, as defined by CA Gov. Code §82013? Yes No No In the source of funds a recipient committee, list the three largest contributors below: 1. 2. 3. Section 5: Argument Text The text of your argument will be printed exactly as submitted. Ensure that your argument meets the legal word limit. You may request that specific argument text be printed in bold, italic, or bold italic type. Type your argument with the desired formatting, or underline the argument text to be formatted and in the left column, mark "B" for bold, "If for italics, or "Bi" for bold italics. Other special formatting is not permitted. Include author information in argument text. Format Format Say NO TO PROP F: Wasteful, ineffective, and unfair. Proposition F is a clip-hall insider re-do-of a policy that's already been tried and was a massive failure. Voting Yes on Favouid be a vote for an extremely expensive program that San Franciscans cannot affect, that went loves us safer. • WASTEFUL: Proposition F would force taxpayers to pay some individual efficers up to HALF A MILLION COLLARS by allowing them to double dip into salidres and banked pension payments. It won't add a single effector the race of SPD designed the videly known safing schotcape. Paying relining efficient broke—Including those who safing schotcape the videly known afting schotcape to resent to turn back the clock and return to an expensive, inefficients and supposition F provides no reason to turn back the clock and return to an expensive, inefficients is as expensibly at a time when we have a schotcapes. Vith S			
Paid arguments must include information about the true source of funds for the publication of the argument. It is also required to indicate whether the use source of funds a recipient committee. This information will be printed below the argument and the author information in the Voter Information Pamphiet. The true source of funds for the printing fee of this argument: Is the true source of funds a recipient committee, as defined by CA Gov. Code §82013? Yes \[\] No \[\] If the true source of funds a recipient committee, isst the three largest contributors below: 1. 2. 3. Section S: Angument Text The text of your argument will be printed exactly as submitted. Ensure that your argument meets the legal word limit. You may request that specific argument text be printed in bold, italic, or bold faile type. Type your argument with the destred formatiting, or underline the argument text to be formatided and in the left column, mark 'B' for bold, 'T for failes, or 'Br' for bold italies. Other special formating is not permitted. Include author information in argument text. Format Kaep Text Within the Vertical Lines \$of words per line \$of	Section 4	: Information for Paid Arguments	Victoria Manager
is the true source of funds a recipient committee, as defined by CA Gov. Code §82013? Yes	Paid argument indicate whether	nts must include information about the true source of funds for the publication of the argument. It is also no ther the true source of funds is a recipient committee. This information will be printed below the argument	equired to and the author
Yes No Section 5: Argument Text The text of your argument will be printed exactly as submitted. Ensure that your argument meets the legal word limit. You may request that specific argument text be formatted and in the left column, mark "B" for bold, "I" for italics, or "BI" for bold italics. Other special formatting, or underline the argument text be formatted and in the left column, mark "B" for bold, "I" for italics, or "BI" for bold italics. Other special formatting is not permitted. Include author information in argument text. Format B, I, BI SAY NO TO PROP F: Wasteful, ineffective, and unfair. Proposition F is a city-hall insider re-do of a policy that's already been tried and was a massive failure. Voting Yes on F would be a vote for an extremely expensive program that San Franciscans cannot afford, that won't keep us safer. • WASTEFUL: Proposition F would force taxpayers to pay some individual officers up to HALF A MILLION DOLLARS by allowing them to double dip into salaries and banked pension payments. It won't add a single officer to the ranks of SPPO desplet the widely known staffing shortage. Paying retiring officers twice—including those who retire while under investigation for misconduct—will not compensate for the hundreds more officers approaching retirement every year. • INEFFECTIVE: San Francisco tried this program in 2008 and rightfully abandoned it in 2011 because there was no evidence that it helped the city to retain or recruit officers. Proposition F provides no reason to turn back the other of 17% of their salaries this year and 20% by 2008. • UNFAIR: None of San Francisco's other public safety workers – Firefighters, social workers, 911 dispatchers – receive such large-scale retention benefits even when their workplaces are facing major staffing shortages. With San Francisco facing a major budget deficit, every dollar we waste on Proposition F is a dollar we can't use to address actual public safety concerns. Vote NO on Proposition F. American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) of Nor	The true so	urce of funds for the printing fee of this argument:	
If the true source(s) of funds is a recipient committee, list the three largest contributors below: 1. 2. 3. Section 5: Argument Text The text of your argument will be printed exactly as submitted. Ensure that your argument with the desired formatting, or underline the argument text be printed in bold, italic, or bold italic type. Type your argument with the desired formatting, or underline the argument text be formatted and in the left column, mark "B" for bold, "I" for italics, or "BI" for bold italics. Other special formatting is not permitted. Include author information in argument text. Format B, I, BI SAY NO TO PROP F: Wasteful, ineffective, and unfair. Proposition F is a city-hall insider re-do of a policy that's aiready been tried and was a massive failure. Voting Yes on F would be a vote for an extremely expensive program that San Franciscans cannot afford, that won't keep us safer. • WASTEFUL: Proposition F would force taxpayers to pay some individual officers up to HALF A MILLION DOLLARS by allowing them to double dip into salaries and banked pension payments. It won't add a single officer to the ranks of SFPD despite the widey known staffing shortage. Paying retiring officers twice—including those who retire while under investigation for misconduct—will not compensate for the undereds more officers approaching retirement every paying retiring officers twice—including those who retire while under investigation for misconduct—will not compensate for the undereds more officers approaching retirement every paying retiring officers twice—including those who retire while under investigation for misconduct—will not compensate for the undereds more officers approaching retirement every paying retiring officers propagate in to turn back the olock and return to an expensive this year and 20% by 2026. • INFEFECTIVE: San Francisco's other public safety workers – Firefighters, social workers, 911 dispatchers – receive such large-scale retention benefits even when their workplaces are facing major staffing	Is the true s	ource of funds a recipient committee, as defined by CA Gov. Code §82013?	
1. 2. 3. Section 5: Argument Text The text of your argument will be printed exactly as submitted. Ensure that your argument meets the legal word limit. You may request that specific argument text be printed in bold, italic, or bold italic type. Type your argument with the desired formatting, or underline the argument text to be formatted and in the left column, mark 'B' for bold, 'I' for failets, or 'Bl' for bold italics. Other special formatting is not permitted. Include author information in argument text. Format B, I, BI SAY NO TO PROP F: Wasteful, ineffective, and unfair. Proposition F is a city-hall insider re-do of a policy that's already been tried and was a massive failure. Voting Yes on F would be a vote for an extremely expensive program that San Franciscans cannot afford, that won't keep us safer. • WASTEFUL: Proposition F would force taxpayers to pay some individual officers up to HALF A MILLION DOLLARS by allowing them to double dip into salaries and banked pension payments. It won't add a single officer to the ranks of SFPD despite the widely known staffing shortage. Paying retring officers when circulating shows who retire while under investigation for misconduct—will not compensate for the hundreds more officers approaching retirement every year. • INEFFECTIVE: San Francisco tried this program in 2008 and rightfully abandoned it in 2011 because there was no evidence that it helped the city to retain or recruit officers. Proposition F provides no reason to turn back the clock and return to an expensive, ineffective idea, especially at a time when we've already approved the biggest retention plan in the City's history and are giving senior officers retention premium pay to the tune of 17% of their salaries this year and 20% by 2026. • UNFAIR: None of San Francisco so other public safety workers – Firefighters, social workers, 811 dispatchers – receive such large-scale retention benefits even when their workplaces are facing major staffing shortages. Work No on Proposition F. American Civ			
Section 5: Argument Text The text of your argument will be printed exactly as submitted. Ensure that your argument meets the legal word limit. You may request that specific argument text be printed in bold, italic, or bold italic type. Type your argument with the desired formatting, or underline the argument text to be formatted and in the left column, mark "9" for bold, "I" for italics, or "BI" for bold italics. Other special formatting is not permitted. Include author information in argument text. **Format** B, I, BI **SAY NO TO PROP F: Wasteful, ineffective, and unfair. Proposition F is a city-hall insider re-do of a policy that's already been tried and was a massive failure. Voting Yes on F would be a vote for an extremely expensive program that San Franciscans cannot afford, that won't keep us safer. **WASTEFUL: Proposition F would force taxpayers to pay some individual officers up to HALF A MILLION DOLLARS by allowing them to double dip into salaries and banked pension payments. It won't add a single officer to the ranks of SFPD despite the widely known staffing shortage. Paying retiring officers vice—including those who retire while under investigation for misconduct—will not compensate for the hundreds more officers approaching retirement every year. **INEFFECTIVE: San Francisco tried this program in 2008 and rightfully abandoned it in 2011 because there was no evidence that it helped the city to retain or recruit officers. Proposition F provides no reason to turn back the clock and return to an expensive, ineffective idea, especially at a time when we've already approved the biggest retention plan in the City's history and are giving senior officers retention premium pay to the turne of 17% of their salaries this year and 20% by 2026. **UNFAIR: None of San Francisco's other public safety workers – Firefighters, social workers, 911 dispatchers – receive such large-scale retention benefits even when their workplaces are facing major staffing shortages. With San Francisco facing a major budget defi	_1.		
Section 5: Argument Text The text of your argument will be printed exactly as submitted. Ensure that your argument meets the legal word limit. You may request that specific argument text be printed in bold, italic, or bold italic yee. Type your argument with the desired formatting, or underline the argument text be printed and in the left column, mark "5" for bold, "1" for italics, or "BI" for bold italics. Other special formatting is not permitted. Include author information in argument text. Format Keep Text Within the Vertical Lines Keep Text Within the Vertical Lines SAY NO TO PROP F: Wasteful, ineffective, and unfair. Proposition F is a city-hall insider re-do of a policy that's already been tried and was a massive failure. Voting Yes on F would be a vote for an extremely expensive program that San Franciscans cannot afford, that won't keep us safer. WASTEFUL: Proposition F would force taxpayers to pay some individual officers up to HALF A MILLION DOLLARS by allowing them to double dip into salaries and banked pension payments, it won't add a single officer to the ranks of SFPD despite the widely known saffing shortage. Paying retiring officers twice—including those who retire while under investigation for misconduct—will not compensate for the hundreds more officers approaching reterment very year. INEFFECTIVE: San Francisco tried this program in 2008 and rightfully abandoned it in 2011 because there was no evidence that it helped the city to retain or recruit officers. Proposition F provides no reason to turn back the clock and return to an expensive, ineffective leads, especially at a time when we've already approved the biggest retention plain in the City's history and are giving senior officers retention premium pay to the tune of 17% of their salaries this year and 20% by 2026. UNFAIR: None of San Francisco's other public safety workers – Firefighters, social workers, 911 dispatchers – rocker such large-scalar retention benefits even when their workplaces are facing major staffing shortages.	2.		
The text of your argument will be printed exactly as submitted. Ensure that your argument meets the legal word limit. You may request that specific argument text be printed in bold, italic, or bold italic type. Type your argument with the desired formatting, or underline the argument text to be formatted and in the left column, mark "8" for bold, "I" for Italics, or "8I" for bold italics. Other special formatting is not permitted. Include author information in argument text. Keep Text Within the Vertical Lines Keep Text Within the Vertical Lines Keep Text Within the Vertical Lines SAY NO TO PROP F: Wasteful, ineffective, and unfair. Proposition F is a city-hall insider re-do of a policy that's already been tried and was a massive failure. Voting Yes on F would be a vote for an extremely expensive program that San Franciscans cannot afford, that won't keep us safer. WASTEFUL: Proposition F would force taxpayers to pay some individual officers up to HALF A MILLION DOLLARS by allowing them to double dip into salaries and banked pension payments. It won't add a single officer to the ranks of SFPD despite the widely known staffing shortage. Paying retiring officers twice—including those who retire while under investigation for misconduct—will not compensate for the hundreds more officers approaching retirement every year. INEFFECTIVE: San Francisco tried this program in 2008 and rightfully abandoned it in 2011 because there was no evidence that it helped the city to retain or recruit officers. Proposition F provides no reason to turn back the clock and return to an expensive, ineffective idea, especially at in when we've already approved the biggest retention plan in the City's history and are piving senior officers retention premium pay to the tune of 17% of their salaries this year and 20% by 2026. UNFAIR: None of San Francisco's other public safety workers — Firefighters, social workers, 911 dispatchers — receive such large-scale retention benefits even when their workplaces are facing major staffing a fl		Argument Text	
SAY NO TO PROP F: Wasteful, ineffective, and unfair. Proposition F is a city-hall insider re-do of a policy that's already been tried and was a massive failure. Voting Yes on F would be a vote for an extremely expensive program that San Franciscans cannot afford, that won't keep us safer. • WASTEFUL: Proposition F would force taxpayers to pay some individual officers up to HALF A MILLION DOLLARS by allowing them to double dip into salaries and banked pension payments. It won't add a single officer to the ranks of SFPD despite the widely known staffing shortage. Paying retiring officers twice—including those who retire while under investigation for misconduct—will not compensate for the hundreds more officers approaching retirement every year. • INEFFECTIVE: San Francisco tried this program in 2008 and rightfully abandoned it in 2011 because there was no evidence that it helped the city to retain or recruit officers. Proposition F provides no reason to turn back the clock and return to an expensive, ineffective idea, especially at a time when we've already approved the biggest retention plan in the City's history and are giving senior officers retention premium pay to the tune of 17% of their salaries this year and 20% by 2026. • UNFAIR: None of San Francisco's other public safety workers – Firefighters, social workers, 911 dispatchers – receive such large-scale retention benefits even when their workplaces are facing major staffing shortages. With San Francisco facing a major budget deficit, every dollar we waste on Proposition F is a dollar we can't use to address actual public safety concerns. Vote NO on Proposition F. **American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) of Northern California Asian Law Caucus Chinese for Affirmative Action District 3 Supervisor Plan Preston District 10 Supervisor Preston District 10 Supervisor Shamann Walton Public Defender **Mano Raju Police Commissioner** Jesus Yáñez Former Police Commissioner** Bill Ong Hing	tnat specific a argument text not permitted.	argument text be printed in bold, italic, or bold italic type. Type your argument with the desired formatting, to be formatted and in the left column, mark "B" for bold, "I" for italics, or "BI" for bold italics. Other speci Include author information in argument text.	or underline the ial formatting is
Proposition F is a city-hall insider re-do of a policy that's already been tried and was a massive failure. Voting Yes on F would be a vote for an extremely expensive program that San Franciscans cannot afford, that won't keep us safer. • WASTEFUL: Proposition F would force taxpayers to pay some individual officers up to HALF A MILLION DOLLARS by allowing them to double dip into salaries and banked pension payments. It won't add a single officer to the ranks of SFPD despite the widely known staffing shortage. Paying retiring officers twice—including those who retire while under investigation for misconduct—will not compensate for the hundreds more officers approaching retirement every year. • INEFFECTIVE: San Francisco tried this program in 2008 and rightfully abandoned it in 2011 because there was no evidence that it helped the city to retain or recruit officers. Proposition F provides no reason to turn back the clock and return to an expensive, infective idea, especially at a time when we've already approved the biggest retention plan in the City's history and are giving senior officers retention premium pay to the tune of 17% of their salaries this year and 20% by 2026. • UNFAIR: None of San Francisco's other public safety workers – Firefighters, social workers, 911 dispatchers – receive such large-scale retention benefits even when their workplaces are facing major staffing shortages. With San Francisco facing a major budget deficit, every dollar we waste on Proposition F is a dollar we can't use to address actual public safety concerns. Vote NO on Proposition F. American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) of Northern California Asian Law Caucus Chinese for Affirmative Action District 9 Supervisor Dean Preston District 10 Supervisor Shamann Walton Public Defender* Mano Reju Police Commissioner* Jesus Yáñez Former Police Commissioner* Sill Ong Hing		Keep Text within the Vertical Lines ————————————————————————————————————	
Proposition F is a city-hall insider re-do of a policy that's already been tried and was a massive failure. Voting Yes on F would be a vote for an extremely expensive program that San Franciscans cannot afford, that won't keep us safer. • WASTEFUL: Proposition F would force taxpayers to pay some individual officers up to HALF A MILLION DOLLARS by allowing them to double dip into salaries and banked pension payments. It won't add a single officer to the ranks of SFPD despite the widely known staffing shortage. Paying retiring officers twice—including those who retire while under investigation for misconduct—will not compensate for the hundreds more officers approaching retirement every year. • INEFFECTIVE: San Francisco tried this program in 2008 and rightfully abandoned it in 2011 because there was no evidence that it helped the city to retain or recruit officers. Proposition F provides no reason to turn back the clock and return to an expensive, ineffective idea, especially at a time when we've already approved the biggest retention plan in the City's history and are giving senior officers retention premium pay to the tune of 17% of their salaries this year and 20% by 2026. • UNFAIR: None of San Francisco's other public safety workers — Firefighters, social workers, 911 dispatchers — receive such large-scale retention benefits even when their workplaces are facing major staffing shortages. With San Francisco facing a major budget deficit, every dollar we waste on Proposition F is a dollar we can't use to address actual public safety concerns. Vote NO on Proposition F. American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) of Northern California Asian Law Caucus Chinese for Affirmative Action District 9 Supervisor Dean Preston District 10 Supervisor Shamann Walton Public Defender Mano Raju Police Commissioner Bill Ong Hing			1.0.00
Yes on F would be a vote for an extremely expensive program that San Franciscans cannot afford, that won't keep us safer. • WASTEFUL: Proposition F would force taxpayers to pay some individual officers up to HALF A MILLION DOLLARS by allowing them to double dip into salaries and banked pension payments. It won't add a single officer to the ranks of SFPD despite the widely known staffing shortage. Paying retiring officers twice—including those who retire while under investigation for misconduct—will not compensate for the hundreds more officers approaching retirement every year. • INEFFECTIVE: San Francisco tried this program in 2008 and rightfully abandoned it in 2011 because there was no evidence that it helped the city to retain or recruit officers. Proposition F provides no reason to turn back the clock and return to an expensive, ineffective idea, especially at a time when we've already approved the biggest retention plan in the City's history and are giving senior officers retention premium pay to the tune of 17% of their salaries this year and 20% by 2026. • UNFAIR: None of San Francisco's other public safety workers — Firefighters, social workers, 911 dispatchers — receive such large-scale retention benefits even when their workplaces are facing major staffing shortages. With San Francisco facing a major budget deficit, every dollar we waste on Proposition F is a dollar we can't use to address actual public safety concerns. Vote NO on Proposition F. American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) of Northern California Asian Law Caucus Chinese for Affirmative Action District 5 Supervisor Dean Preston District 10 Supervisor Pamann Walton Public Defender Mano Reju Police Commissioner* Jesus Yáñez Former Police Commissioner* Bill Ong Hing	40	SAY NO TO PROP F: Wasteful, ineffective, and unfair.	X .
MILLION DOLLARS by allowing them to double dip into salaries and banked pension payments. It won't add a single officer to the ranks of SFPD despite the widely known staffing shortage. Paying retiring officers twice—including those who retire while under investigation for misconduct—will not compensate for the hundreds more officers approaching retirement every year. • INEFFECTIVE: San Francisco tried this program in 2008 and rightfully abandoned it in 2011 because there was no evidence that it helped the city to retain or recruit officers. Proposition F provides no reason to turn back the clock and return to an expensive, ineffective idea, especially at a time when we've already approved the biggest retention plan in the City's history and are giving senior officers retention premium pay to the tune of 17% of their salaries this year and 20% by 2026. • UNFAIR: None of San Francisco's other public safety workers – Firefighters, social workers, 911 dispatchers – receive such large-scale retention benefits even when their workplaces are facing major staffing shortages. With San Francisco facing a major budget deficit, every dollar we waste on Proposition F is a dollar we can't use to address actual public safety concerns. Vote NO on Proposition F. American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) of Northern California Asian Law Caucus Chinese for Affirmative Action District 9 Supervisor Dean Preston District 10 Supervisor Dean Preston District 10 Supervisor Dean Preston District 10 Supervisor Phillary Ronen District 10 Supervisor Phillary Ronen District 10 Supervisor Phamann Walton Public Defender Mano Raju Police Commissioner* Jesus Yáñez Former Police Commissioner* Sill Ong Hing	÷ 1 .	Yes on F would be a vote for an extremely expensive program that San Franciscans cannot afford, that won't	
there was no evidence that it helped the city to retain or recruit officers. Proposition F provides no reason to turn back the clock and return to an expensive, ineffective idea, especially at a time when we've already approved the biggest retention plan in the City's history and are giving senior officers retention premium pay to the tune of 17% of their salaries this year and 20% by 2026. • UNFAIR: None of San Francisco's other public safety workers – Firefighters, social workers, 911 dispatchers – receive such large-scale retention benefits even when their workplaces are facing major staffing shortages. With San Francisco facing a major budget deficit, every dollar we waste on Proposition F is a dollar we can't use to address actual public safety concerns. Vote NO on Proposition F. American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) of Northern California Asian Law Caucus Chinese for Affirmative Action District 9 Supervisor Hillary Ronen District 5 Supervisor Dean Preston District 10 Supervisor Dean Preston District 10 Supervisor Shamann Walton Public Defender* Mano Raju Police Commissioner* Jesus Yáñez Former Police Commissioner* Bill Ong Hing		MILLION DOLLARS by allowing them to double dip into salaries and banked pension payments. It won't add a single officer to the ranks of SFPD despite the widely known staffing shortage. Paying retiring officers twice—including those who retire while under investigation for misconduct—will not	
dispatchers – receive such large-scale retention benefits even when their workplaces are facing major staffing shortages. With San Francisco facing a major budget deficit, every dollar we waste on Proposition F is a dollar we can't use to address actual public safety concerns. Vote NO on Proposition F. American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) of Northern California Asian Law Caucus Chinese for Affirmative Action District 9 Supervisor Hillary Ronen District 5 Supervisor Dean Preston District 10 Supervisor Shamann Walton Public Defender* Mano Raju Police Commissioner* Jesus Yáñez Former Police Commissioner* Bill Ong Hing		there was no evidence that it helped the city to retain or recruit officers. Proposition F provides no reason to turn back the clock and return to an expensive, ineffective idea, especially at a time when we've already approved the biggest retention plan in the City's history and are giving senior officers	7 () E E C ()
use to address actual public safety concerns. Vote NO on Proposition F. American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) of Northern California Asian Law Caucus Chinese for Affirmative Action District 9 Supervisor Hillary Ronen District 5 Supervisor Dean Preston District 10 Supervisor Shamann Walton Public Defender* Mano Raju Police Commissioner* Jesus Yáñez Former Police Commissioner* Bill Ong Hing		dispatchers - receive such large-scale retention benefits even when their workplaces are facing major	
American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) of Northern California Asian Law Caucus Chinese for Affirmative Action District 9 Supervisor Hillary Ronen District 5 Supervisor Dean Preston District 10 Supervisor Shamann Walton Public Defender* Mano Raju Police Commissioner* Jesus Yáñez Former Police Commissioner* Bill Ong Hing			
Asian Law Caucus Chinese for Affirmative Action District 9 Supervisor Hillary Ronen District 5 Supervisor Dean Preston District 10 Supervisor Shamann Walton Public Defender* Mano Raju Police Commissioner* Jesus Yáñez Former Police Commissioner* Bill Ong Hing	12 1	, Vote NO on Proposition F.	S. 12.
Chinese for Affirmative Action District 9 Supervisor Hillary Ronen District 5 Supervisor Dean Preston District 10 Supervisor Shamann Walton Public Defender* Mano Raju Police Commissioner* Jesus Yáñez Former Police Commissioner* Bill Ong Hing			
District 10 Supervisor Shamann Walton Public Defender* Mano Raju Police Commissioner* Jesus Yáñez Former Police Commissioner* Bill Ong Hing		Chinese for Affirmative Action District 9 Supervisor Hillary Ronen	n III de la companya
Police Commissioner* Jesus Yáñez Former Police Commissioner* Bill Ong Hing		District 10 Supervisor Shamann Walton	
	ş -	Police Commissioner* Jesus Yáñez	
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			

Office Use Only	MARKET SERVICE DE LA CONTROL D	Residence of the Secretary Secretary	有国际 国际第一种
Total # of words=	X \$2/word =	+ \$200 publication fee =	Staff Initials
# of signatures submitt	ed in lieu of publication fee	Receipt#	
X \$0.50/signature		Check#	ser out ratio
Adjusted Fee Total		Amount Paid	

If handwritten information or a revision is unclear, Department staff will interpret the handwritten information to the best of their abilities; this interpretation is final.

Ballot Argument Control Sheet B

Control Sheet A must be submitted for every ballot argument, with required signatures and author information.

For an argument submitted on behalf of an organization, the "Individual" section must also be completed by a principal officer of the organization who must be a registered San Francisco voter.

If your argument has more than one author, you must also submit Control Sheet B with required signatures

and information for all additional authors Section 1: Argument Information Proposition

Proponent Argument Opponent Argument

Rebuttal to Proponent Argument Rebuttal to Opponent Argument

Office Use Only 2024 AUG 15 AM 8: 2 HENT OF ELECTIONS DEP Ait Time/Date Stamp Label Paid Argument in Favor

Paid Argument Against

Section 2: Additional Author Information

Declaration Related to Proponent and Opponent Arguments

I attest under the penalty of perjury that I am an Author of the Proponent Argument for Proposition _ being submitted and that I am not a Non-supporter of this measure. A Non-supporter is defined as a person who, with respect to a measure:

- Is a treasurer, officer, or member of a committee that has made or plans to make expenditures in opposition to the measure;
- Has received or been promised any compensation or thing of value from such a committee to perform consulting services for that committee; or
- Has authorized their name or likeness to appear on campaign literature or in advertising that advocates for the defeat of the measure.

I attest under the penalty of perjury that I am an Author of the Opponent Argument for Proposition 🔼 being submitted and that I am not a Supporter of this measure. A Supporter is defined as a person who with respect to a measure:

- Is a treasurer, officer, or member of a committee that has made or plans to make expenditures in support of the measure;
- Has received or been promised any compensation or thing of value from such a committee to perform consulting services for that committee; or
- Has authorized their name or likeness to appear on campaign literature or in advertising that advocates for the adoption of the measure.

Complete the following to indicate whether the Author is an individual or an organization:

Individual (or principal officer of Organization)	
Full Name (Print) Avren D. FREY	Title (If Applicable
San Francisco Address (Where you are Registered)	
Signature Signature	Emai
Organization (Entity) (If selected, complete both the	ne Individual Author section and the Organization Section)
Name of Organization (Print) ACL Northern	Calbornia
Who should be listed as an Author for your Organization?	**
Only the Organization Both the Officer and the	Organization
* Check if the title or identifying information is for identification if you are signing as an individual and not of behalf of an organ	1. 1.0 Mar. 10 Mar. 1
Signature Signature	e a se se Email
Additional Author Information	
Additional Author Information	
Declaration Related to Proponent and Opponent Arguments	5

l attest under the penalty of perjury that I am an Author of the Proponent Argument for Proposition being submitted and that I am not a Non-supporter of this measure. A Non-supporter is defined as a person who, with respect to a measure:

- Is a treasurer, officer, or member of a committee that has made or plans to make expenditures in opposition to the measure;
- Has received or been promised any compensation or thing of value from such a committee to perform consulting services for
- Has authorized their name or likeness to appear on campaign literature or in advertising that advocates for the defeat of the

I attest under the penalty of perjury that I am an Author of the Opponent Argument for Proposition _ being submitted and that I am not a Supporter of this measure. A Supporter is defined as a person who with respect to a measure:

- Has received or been promised any compensation or thing of value from such a committee to perform consulting services for that committee; or
 Has authorized their name or likeness to appear on campaign literature or in advertising that advocates for the adoption of the measure.
 Complete the following to indicate whether the Author is an individual or an organization:

 Individual (or principal officer of Organization)
 Full Name (Print)
- Full Name (Print) San Francisco Address (Where you are Registered) Signature | Email Organization (Entity) (If selected, complete both the Individual Author section and the Organization Section) Name of Organization (Print) Who should be listed as an Author for your Organization? Only the Organization Both the Officer and the Organization * Check if the title or identifying information is for identification purposes only, if you are signing as an individual and not of behalf of an organization. Signature **Email** Section 3: Argument Text The text of your argument will be printed exactly as submitted. Ensure that your argument meets the legal word limit. You may request that specific argument text be printed in bold, italic, or bold italic type. Type your argument with the desired formatting, or underline the argument text to be formatted and in the left column, mark "B" for bold, "I" for italics, or "BI" for bold italics. Other special formatting is not permitted. Include Author information in argument text. **Format** Keep Text Within the Vertical Lines B, I, BI words per line SAY NO TO PROP F: Wasteful, ineffective, and unfair. Proposition F is a city-hall insider re-do of a policy that's already been tried and was a massive failure. Voting Yes on F would be a vote for an extremely expensive program that San Franciscans cannot afford, that won't keep us safer. WASTEFUL: Proposition F would force taxpayers to pay some individual officers up to HALF A MILLION DOLLARS by allowing them to double dip into salaries and banked pension payments. It won't add a single officer to the ranks of SFPD despite the widely known staffing shortage. Paying retiring officers twice—including those who retire while under investigation for misconduct—will not compensate for the hundreds more officers approaching retirement every year. INEFFECTIVE: San Francisco tried this program in 2008 and rightfully abandoned it in 2011 because there was no evidence that it helped the city to retain or recruit officers. Proposition F provides no reason to turn back the clock and return to an expensive, ineffective idea, especially at a time when we've already approved the biggest retention plan in the City's history and are giving senior officers retention premium pay to the tune of 17% of their salaries this year and 20% by 2026. UNFAIR: None of San Francisco's other public safety workers - Firefighters, social workers, 911 dispatchers - receive such large-scale retention benefits even when their workplaces are facing major staffing shortages. With San Francisco facing a major budget deficit, every dollar we waste on Proposition F is a dollar we can't use to address actual public safety concerns. Vote NO on Proposition F. American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) of Northern California Asian Law Caucus Chinese for Affirmative Action District 9 Supervisor Hillary Ronen District 5 Supervisor Dean Preston District 10 Supervisor Shamann Walton Public Defender* Mano Raju Police Commissioner* Jesus Yáñez Former Police Commissioner* Bill Ong Hing *For identification purposes only If handwritten information or a revision is unclear, Department staff will interpret the handwritten information to

Total Word Count

the best of their abilities; this interpretation is final.

Office Use Only Ballot Argument Control Sheet B Control Sheet A must be submitted for every ballot argument, with required signatures and author 2020 AUG 15 AM 8: 2 BEPARTMENT OF ELECTIONS For an argument submitted on behalf of an organization, the "Individual" section must also be completed by a principal officer of the organization who must be a registered San Francisco voter. Time/Date Stamp if your argument has more than one author, you must also submit Control Sheet B with required signatures and information for all additional authors Section 1: Argument Information Proposition Label Proponent Argument Paid Argument in Favor Rebuttal to Proponent Argument Opponent Argument Rebuttal to Opponent Argument Paid Argument Against Section 2: Additional Author Information Declaration Related to Proponent and Opponent Arguments l attest under the penalty of perjury that I am an Author of the Proponent Argument for Proposition _ am not a Non-supporter of this measure. A Non-supporter is defined as a person who, with respect to a measure: Is a treasurer, officer, or member of a committee that has made or plans to make expenditures in opposition to the measure; Has received or been promised any compensation or thing of value from such a committee to perform consulting services for that committee; or Has authorized their name or likeness to appear on campaign literature or in advertising that advocates for the defeat of the measure. l attest under the penalty of perjury that I am an Author of the Opponent Argument for Proposition being submitted and that I am

is a treasurer, officer, or member of a committee that has made or plans to make expenditures in support of the measure;

not a Supporter of this measure. A Supporter is defined as a person who with respect to a measure:

- Has received or been promised any compensation or thing of value from such a committee to perform consulting services for that committee; or
- Has authorized their name or likeness to appear on campaign literature or in advertising that advocates for the adoption of the measure.

Complete the following to indicate whether the Author is an individual or an organization: Individual (or principal officer of Organization) Title (If Applicable) Communications Director Niketa kuman Full Name (Print) San Francisco Address (Where you are Registered) Signature Signature Organization (Entity) (If selected, complete both the Individual Author section and the Organization Section) Name of Organization (Print) Asian Law Caucus Who should be listed as an Author for your Organization? Only the Organization Both the Officer and the Organization * Check if the title or identifying information is for identification purposes only. if you are signing as an individual and not of behalf of an organization. Signature Signature Email Additional Author Information

Declaration Related to Proponent and Opponent Arguments

I attest under the penalty of perjury that I am an Author of the Proponent Argument for Proposition _____ being submitted and that I am not a Non-supporter of this measure. A Non-supporter is defined as a person who, with respect to a measure:

- Is a treasurer, officer, or member of a committee that has made or plans to make expenditures in opposition to the measure;
- Has received or been promised any compensation or thing of value from such a committee to perform consulting services for
- Has authorized their name or likeness to appear on campaign literature or in advertising that advocates for the defeat of the

I attest under the penalty of perjury that I am an Author of the Opponent Argument for Proposition _ not a Supporter of this measure. A Supporter is defined as a person who with respect to a measure:

Has received or been promised any compensation or thing of value from such a committee to perform consulting services for that committee: or Has authorized their name or likeness to appear on campaign literature or in advertising that advocates for the adoption of the Complete the following to indicate whether the Author is an individual or an organization: Individual (or principal officer of Organization) Full Name (Print) Title (If Applicable) San Francisco Address (Where you are Registered) Signature | **Fmail** Organization (Entity) (If selected, complete both the Individual Author section and the Organization Section) Name of Organization (Print) Who should be listed as an Author for your Organization? Only the Organization Both the Officer and the Organization * Check if the title or identifying information is for identification purposes only, if you are signing as an individual and not of behalf of an organization. Signature Email Section 3: Argument Text The text of your argument will be printed exactly as submitted. Ensure that your argument meets the legal word limit. You may request that specific argument text be printed in bold, italic, or bold italic type. Type your argument with the desired formatting, or underline the argument text to be formatted and in the left column, mark "B" for bold, "I" for italics, or "BI" for bold italics. Other special formatting is not permitted. Include Author information in argument text. # of Keep Text Within the Vertical Lines -**Format** B, I, BI words per line SAY NO TO PROP F: Wasteful, ineffective, and unfair. Proposition F is a city-hall insider re-do of a policy that's already been tried and was a massive failure. Voting Yes on F would be a vote for an extremely expensive program that San Franciscans cannot afford, that won't keep us safer. WASTEFUL: Proposition F would force taxpayers to pay some individual officers up to HALF A MILLION DOLLARS by allowing them to double dip into salaries and banked pension payments. It won't add a single officer to the ranks of SFPD despite the widely known staffing shortage. Paying retiring officers twice-including those who retire while under investigation for misconduct-will not compensate for the hundreds more officers approaching retirement every year. INEFFECTIVE: San Francisco tried this program in 2008 and rightfully abandoned it in 2011 because there was no evidence that it helped the city to retain or recruit officers. Proposition F provides no reason to turn back the clock and return to an expensive, ineffective idea, especially at a time when we've already approved the biggest retention plan in the City's history and are giving senior officers retention premium pay to the tune of 17% of their salaries this year and 20% by 2026. UNFAIR: None of San Francisco's other public safety workers - Firefighters, social workers, 911 dispatchers - receive such large-scale retention benefits even when their workplaces are facing major staffing shortages. With San Francisco facing a major budget deficit, every dollar we waste on Proposition F is a dollar we can't use to address actual public safety concerns. Vote NO on Proposition F. American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) of Northern California Asian Law Caucus Chinese for Affirmative Action District 9 Supervisor Hillary Ronen District 5 Supervisor Dean Preston District 10 Supervisor Shamann Walton Public Defender* Mano Raju Police Commissioner* Jesus Yáñez Former Police Commissioner* Bill Ong Hing *For identification purposes only If handwritten information or a revision is unclear, Department staff will interpret the handwritten information to the best of their abilities; this interpretation is final. Total Word Count

John Arntz, Director Office Use Only Ballot Argument Control Sheet B 2024 AUG 15 AH 8: Control Sheet A must be submitted for every ballot argument, with required signatures and author BEPARTMENT OF ELECTIONS For an argument submitted on behalf of an organization, the "Individual" section must also be completed by a principal officer of the organization who must be a registered San Francisco voter. Time/Date Stamp If your argument has more than one author, you must also submit Control Sheet B with required signatures d information for all additional authors Section 1: Argument Information Proposition Label Proponent Argument Rebuttal to Proponent Argument Paid Argument in Favor Opponent Argument Rebuttal to Opponent Argument Paid Argument Against Section 2: Additional Author Information **Declaration Related to Proponent and Opponent Arguments** I attest under the penalty of perjury that I am an Author of the Proponent Argument for Proposition _ being submitted and that I am not a Non-supporter of this measure. A Non-supporter is defined as a person who, with respect to a measure: Is a treasurer, officer, or member of a committee that has made or plans to make expenditures in opposition to the measure; Has received or been promised any compensation or thing of value from such a committee to perform consulting services for that committee; or Has authorized their name or likeness to appear on campaign literature or in advertising that advocates for the defeat of the measure. I attest under the penalty of perjury that I am an Author of the Opponent Argument for Proposition F being submitted and that I am not a Supporter of this measure. A Supporter is defined as a person who with respect to a measure: Is a treasurer, officer, or member of a committee that has made or plans to make expenditures in support of the measure; Has received or been promised any compensation or thing of value from such a committee to perform consulting services for that committee; or Has authorized their name or likeness to appear on campaign literature or in advertising that advocates for the adoption of the measure. Complete the following to indicate whether the Author is an individual or an organization: Individual (or principal officer of Organization) Title (If Applicable) (0. Expendice) roctor Full Name (Print) San Francisco Address (Where you are Registered) Signature | Email Organization (Entity) (If selected, complete both the Individual Author section and the Organization Section) Name of Organization (Print) Who should be listed as an Author for your Organization?

Additional Author Information

Only the Organization

Signature

Declaration Related to Proponent and Opponent Arguments

* Check if the title or identifying information is for identification purposes only, if you are signing as an individual and not of behalf of an organization.

I attest under the penalty of perjury that I am an Author of the Proponent Argument for Proposition _ _ being submitted and that I am not a Non-supporter of this measure. A Non-supporter is defined as a person who, with respect to a measure:

Both the Officer and the Organization

Is a treasurer, officer, or member of a committee that has made or plans to make expenditures in opposition to the measure;

Email

- Has received or been promised any compensation or thing of value from such a committee to perform consulting services for
- Has authorized their name or likeness to appear on campaign literature or in advertising that advocates for the defeat of the

I attest under the penalty of perjury that I am an Author of the Opponent Argument for Proposition being submitted and that I am not a Supporter of this measure. A Supporter is defined as a person who with respect to a measure:

Has received or been promised any compensation or thing of value from such a committee to perform consulting services for that committee; or
 Has authorized their name or likeness to appear on campaign literature or in advertising that advectes for the adoption of the

•	Has authorized their name or likeness to	appear of	on campaign	literature or i	in advertising	that advocates	for the adoption	of the
	measure.							

ıll Name	(Print) Title (If Applicable)	
	sco Address (Where you are Registered)	
	(Where you are registered)	
gnature	Email	
	tion (Entity) (If selected, complete both the Individual Author section and the Organization Section	1)
	rganization (Print) d be listed as an Author for your Organization?	1
		*
ly the O	rganization Both the Officer and the Organization	
	he title or identifying information is for identification purposes only,	
ou are s	igning as an individual and not of behalf of an organization.	
nature	Email	
tion 3	: Argument Text	
	our argument will be printed exactly as submitted. Ensure that your argument meets the legal word limit. You ma	av requ
specific	argument text be printed in bold, italic, or bold italic type. Type your argument with the desired formatting, or und	derline t
	kt to be formatted and in the left column, mark "B" for bold, "I" for italics, or "BI" for bold italics. Other special form	matting
mat	d. Include Author information in argument text. Keep Text Within the Vertical Lines →	# of
, BI		wor
	SAY NO TO PROP F: Wasteful, ineffective, and unfair.	per
	Proposition F is a city-hall insider re-do of a policy that's already been tried and was a massive failure. Voting	
	Yes on F would be a vote for an extremely expensive program that San Franciscans cannot afford, that won't keep us safer.	
	WASTEFUL: Proposition F would force taxpayers to pay some individual officers up to HALF A	
	MILLION DOLLARS by allowing them to double dip into salaries and banked pension payments. It won't add a single officer to the ranks of SFPD despite the widely known staffing shortage. Paying	
	retiring officers twice—including those who retire while under investigation for misconduct—will not	
je	compensate for the hundreds more officers approaching retirement every year.	
(10)	INEFFECTIVE: San Francisco tried this program in 2008 and rightfully abandoned it in 2011 because there was no evidence that it helped the city to retain or recruit officers. Proposition F provides no	
	reason to turn back the clock and return to an expensive, ineffective idea, especially at a time when we've already approved the biggest retention plan in the City's history and are giving senior officers	
	retention premium pay to the tune of 17% of their salaries this year and 20% by 2026.	
	UNFAIR: None of San Francisco's other public safety workers – Firefighters, social workers, 911	
	dispatchers – receive such large-scale retention benefits even when their workplaces are facing major staffing shortages.	
	With San Francisco facing a major budget deficit, every dollar we waste on Proposition F is a dollar we can't	
	use to address actual public safety concerns.	
	Vote NO on Proposition F.	
	American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) of Northern California	
	Asian Law Caucus	
	Chinese for Affirmative Action District 9 Supervisor Hillary Ronen	
	Chinese for Affirmative Action District 9 Supervisor Hillary Ronen District 5 Supervisor Dean Preston District 10 Supervisor Shamann Walton	
	Chinese for Affirmative Action District 9 Supervisor Hillary Ronen District 5 Supervisor Dean Preston	
	Chinese for Affirmative Action District 9 Supervisor Hillary Ronen District 5 Supervisor Dean Preston District 10 Supervisor Shamann Walton Public Defender* Mano Raju	
	Chinese for Affirmative Action District 9 Supervisor Hillary Ronen District 5 Supervisor Dean Preston District 10 Supervisor Shamann Walton Public Defender* Mano Raju Police Commissioner* Jesus Yáñez	
	Chinese for Affirmative Action District 9 Supervisor Hillary Ronen District 5 Supervisor Dean Preston District 10 Supervisor Shamann Walton Public Defender* Mano Raju Police Commissioner* Jesus Yáñez Former Police Commissioner* Bill Ong Hing	
	Chinese for Affirmative Action District 9 Supervisor Hillary Ronen District 5 Supervisor Dean Preston District 10 Supervisor Shamann Walton Public Defender* Mano Raju Police Commissioner* Jesus Yáñez Former Police Commissioner* Bill Ong Hing	
	Chinese for Affirmative Action District 9 Supervisor Hillary Ronen District 5 Supervisor Dean Preston District 10 Supervisor Shamann Walton Public Defender* Mano Raju Police Commissioner* Jesus Yáñez Former Police Commissioner* Bill Ong Hing	,
	Chinese for Affirmative Action District 9 Supervisor Hillary Ronen District 5 Supervisor Dean Preston District 10 Supervisor Shamann Walton Public Defender* Mano Raju Police Commissioner* Jesus Yáñez Former Police Commissioner* Bill Ong Hing	

DEPARTMENT OF ELECTIONS John Arntz, Director Office Use Only **Ballot Argument Control Sheet B** Control Sheet A must be submitted for every ballot argument, with required signatures and author DEPARTMENT OF ELECTIONS information. For an argument submitted on behalf of an organization, the "Individual" section must also be completed by a principal officer of the organization who must be a registered San Francisco voter. Time/Date Stamp If your argument has more than one author, you must also submit Control Sheet B with required signatures and information for all additional authors Section 1: Argument Information Proposition Label Proponent Argument Rebuttal to Proponent Argument Paid Argument in Favor Opponent Argument Rebuttal to Opponent Argument Paid Argument Against Section 2: Additional Author Information **Declaration Related to Proponent and Opponent Arguments** I attest under the penalty of perjury that I am an Author of the Proponent Argument for Proposition _ being submitted and that I am not a Non-supporter of this measure. A Non-supporter is defined as a person who, with respect to a measure: Is a treasurer, officer, or member of a committee that has made or plans to make expenditures in opposition to the measure; Has received or been promised any compensation or thing of value from such a committee to perform consulting services for that committee: or Has authorized their name or likeness to appear on campaign literature or in advertising that advocates for the defeat of the I attest under the penalty of perjury that I am an Author of the **Opponent Argument** for Proposition F being submitted and that I am not a Supporter of this measure. A Supporter is defined as a person who with respect to a measure:

- Is a treasurer, officer, or member of a committee that has made or plans to make expenditures in support of the measure;
- Has received or been promised any compensation or thing of value from such a committee to perform consulting services for that committee: or
- Has authorized their name or likeness to appear on campaign literature or in advertising that advocates for the adoption of the measure

Complete the following to indicate whether the Author is an individual or an organization:

Individual (or principal officer of Organization)	7:618:64 5
Full Name (Print) Dean Pleston	Title (If Applicable) Supervisor
San Francisco Address	
Signature Signature	Email
Organization (Entity) (If selected, complete both	the Individual Author section and the Organization Section)
Name of Organization (Print) Who should be listed as an Author for your Organization?	
Only the Organization Both the Officer and the	e Organization
* Check if the title or identifying information is for identification if you are signing as an individual and not of behalf of an organization.	
Signature Signature	Email

Additional Author Information

Declaration Related to Proponent and Opponent Arguments

I attest under the penalty of perjury that I am an Author of the **Proponent Argument** for Proposition being submitted and that I am not a Non-supporter of this measure. A Non-supporter is defined as a person who, with respect to a measure:

- Is a treasurer, officer, or member of a committee that has made or plans to make expenditures in opposition to the measure;
- Has received or been promised any compensation or thing of value from such a committee to perform consulting services for that committee; or
- Has authorized their name or likeness to appear on campaign literature or in advertising that advocates for the defeat of the measure.

I attest under the penalty of perjury that I am an Author of the Opponent Argument for Proposition being submitted and that I am not a Supporter of this measure. A Supporter is defined as a person who with respect to a measure:

- Has received or been promised any compensation or thing of value from such a committee to perform consulting services for that committee; or
- Has authorized their name or likeness to appear on campaign literature or in advertising that advocates for the adoption of the measure.

Complete th	e following to indicate w	whether the Author is an individ	lual or an organization:	
Individual	or principal officer of O	rganization)		
Full Name	(Print)		Title (If Applicable)	
San Francis	sco Address (Where you	are Registered)		
Signature			Email	
Organizat	ion (Entity) (If sele	ected, complete both the Indivi	dual Author section and the Organizati	on Section)
	ganization (Print)			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
Who should	I be listed as an Author fo	r your Organization?		
Only the Or	ganization	Both the Officer and the Organiz	ation	
		mation is for identification purposed not of behalf of an organization.		
Signature			Email	
Section 2	A Mariamont Toyl		Enter	
The text of y that specific argument tex not permitted	argument text be printed i	in bold, italic, or bold italic type. T he left column, mark "B" for bold, ion in argument text.	that your argument meets the legal word li type your argument with the desired forma "I" for italics, or "BI" for bold italics. Other	tting, or underline the special formatting is
Format B, <i>I</i> , <i>BI</i>	4	Keep Text Within th	ne Vertical Lines	# of words
2, 1, 2.)			per line
	SAY NO TO PROP F	: Wasteful, ineffective, and unfair	4	
	Proposition F is a city Yes on F would be a keep us safer.	r-hall insider re-do of a policy that's a vote for an extremely expensive pro	already been tried and was a massive failure. gram that San Franciscans cannot afford, tha	Voting t won't
	MILLION D won't add a retiring offic	OOLLARS by allowing them to double a single officer to the ranks of SFPD	ers to pay some individual officers up to HALF e dip into salaries and banked pension payme despite the widely known staffing shortage. F re while under investigation for misconduct— proaching retirement every year.	ents. It Paying
	there was r reason to to we've alrea	no evidence that it helped the city to urn back the clock and return to an eady approved the biggest retention p	m in 2008 and rightfully abandoned it in 2011 retain or recruit officers. Proposition F provid expensive, ineffective idea, especially at a timplan in the City's history and are giving senior eir salaries this year and 20% by 2026.	es no e when
	l .	s - receive such large-scale retentio	safety workers – Firefighters, social workers, n benefits even when their workplaces are fac	
		acing a major budget deficit, every d I public safety concerns.	lollar we waste on Proposition F is a dollar we	can't
	Vote NO on Proposi	tion F.		
	Asian Law Caucus Chinese for Affirmativ District 9 Supervisor I District 5 Supervisor I District 10 Supervisor Public Defender* Mar Police Commissioner	Hillary Ronen Dean Preston r Shamann Walton no Raju	mia	
	*For identification pur	poses only		
	*			
			ment staff will interpret the handwritten in	formation to
	the best of their abilities	s; this interpretation is final.	Total	Word Count

Ballot Argument Control Sheet B	Office Use Only
Control Sheet A must be submitted for every ballot argument, with required signatures and author information.	DEPARTMENT OF ELECTIONS
For an argument submitted on behalf of an organization, the "Individual" section must also be completed by a principal officer of the organization who must be a registered San Francisco voter.	
If your argument has more than one author, you must also submit Control Sheet B with required signatures and information for all additional authors.	Time/Date Stamp
Section 1: Argument Information	Station williams
Proposition <u>F</u>	Label
Proponent Argument Rebuttal to Proponent Argument	Paid Argument in Favor
Opponent Argument Rebuttal to Opponent Argument	Paid Argument Against
Section 2: Additional Author Information	
Declaration Related to Proponent and Opponent Arguments	
I attest under the penalty of perjury that I am an Author of the Proponent Argument for F am not a Non-supporter of this measure. A Non-supporter is defined as a person who, wi	
 Is a treasurer, officer, or member of a committee that has made or plans to make Has received or been promised any compensation or thing of value from such a that committee; or Has authorized their name or likeness to appear on campaign literature or in adv measure. 	committee to perform consulting services for
I attest under the penalty of perjury that I am an Author of the Opponent Argument for Pronot a Supporter of this measure. A Supporter is defined as a person who with respect to a	
 Is a treasurer, officer, or member of a committee that has made or plans to make Has received or been promised any compensation or thing of value from such a that committee; or Has authorized their name or likeness to appear on campaign literature or in advineasure. 	committee to perform consulting services for
Complete the following to indicate whether the Author is an individual or an organiz	ation:
Individual (or principal officer of Organization)	District 10
Full Name (Print) Shaman Walton	District 10 itle (If Applicable) Supervisor
	ille (II Applicable)
San Francisco Address (Where you are Registered)	_
Signature Signature	Email ~
Organization (Entity) (If selected, complete both the Individual Author section	on and the Organization Section)
Name of Organization (Print)	
Who should be listed as an Author for your Organization?	
Only the Organization Both the Officer and the Organization	
* Check if the title or identifying information is for identification purposes only, if you are signing as an individual and not of behalf of an organization.	
Signature E	mail
Additional Authorities and Company	
Additional Author Information Declaration Related to Proponent and Opponent Arguments	
toluted to i toponent and opponent raguinents	

I attest under the penalty of perjury that I am an Author of the Proponent Argument for Proposition _ being submitted and that I am not a Non-supporter of this measure. A Non-supporter is defined as a person who, with respect to a measure:

- Is a treasurer, officer, or member of a committee that has made or plans to make expenditures in opposition to the measure;
- Has received or been promised any compensation or thing of value from such a committee to perform consulting services for that committee; or
- Has authorized their name or likeness to appear on campaign literature or in advertising that advocates for the defeat of the

I attest under the penalty of perjury that I am an Author of the Opponent Argument for Proposition _ being submitted and that I am not a Supporter of this measure. A Supporter is defined as a person who with respect to a measure:

Has received or been promised any compensation or thing of value from such a committee to perform consulting services for that committee; or
 Has authorized their name or likeness to appear on campaign literature or in advertising that advocates for the adoption of the

measure.

	e following to indicate whether the Author is an individual or an organization:	
	(or principal officer of Organization)	
Full Name (
San Francis	sco Address (Where you are Registered)	
Signature	Email	
Organizat	ion (Entity) (If selected, complete both the Individual Author section and the Organization Section	n)
	ganization (Print)	
Who should	be listed as an Author for your Organization?	
Only the Or	ganization Both the Officer and the Organization	
	ne title or identifying information is for identification purposes only,	
if you are si	gning as an individual and not of behalf of an organization.	
Signature	Email	
Section 3	: Argument Text	
The text of your hat specific a sargument text.	our argument will be printed exactly as submitted. Ensure that your argument meets the legal word limit. You many argument text be printed in bold, italic, or bold italic type. Type your argument with the desired formatting, or under to be formatted and in the left column, mark "B" for bold, "I" for italics, or "BI" for bold italics. Other special for its Include Author information in argument text.	derline the
Format	Keep Text Within the Vertical Lines	# of
B, <i>I</i> , <i>BI</i>	SAY NO TO PROP 5: Westeful ineffective and unfair	words per lin
	SAY NO TO PROP F: Wasteful, ineffective, and unfair.	
1	Proposition F is a city-hall insider re-do of a policy that's already been tried and was a massive failure. Voting Yes on F would be a vote for an extremely expensive program that San Franciscans cannot afford, that won't keep us safer.	
	 WASTEFUL: Proposition F would force taxpayers to pay some individual officers up to HALF A MILLION DOLLARS by allowing them to double dip into salaries and banked pension payments. It won't add a single officer to the ranks of SFPD despite the widely known staffing shortage. Paying retiring officers twice—including those who retire while under investigation for misconduct—will not compensate for the hundreds more officers approaching retirement every year. 	
	 INEFFECTIVE: San Francisco tried this program in 2008 and rightfully abandoned it in 2011 because there was no evidence that it helped the city to retain or recruit officers. Proposition F provides no reason to turn back the clock and return to an expensive, ineffective idea, especially at a time when we've already approved the biggest retention plan in the City's history and are giving senior officers retention premium pay to the tune of 17% of their salaries this year and 20% by 2026. 	
	 UNFAIR: None of San Francisco's other public safety workers – Firefighters, social workers, 911 dispatchers – receive such large-scale retention benefits even when their workplaces are facing major staffing shortages. 	
	With San Francisco facing a major budget deficit, every dollar we waste on Proposition F is a dollar we can't use to address actual public safety concerns.	
	Vote NO on Proposition F.	
	American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) of Northern California Asian Law Caucus Chinese for Affirmative Action District 9 Supervisor Hillary Ronen District 5 Supervisor Dean Preston District 10 Supervisor Shamann Welton Public Defender* Mano Raju Police Commissioner* Jesus Yáñez Former Police Commissioner* Bill Ong Hing	
	*For identification purposes only	
	If handwritten information or a revision is unclear, Department staff will interpret the handwritten information to the best of their abilities; this interpretation is final.)

Ballot Argument Control Sheet B 2012 AUG 15 API 8 Control Sheet A must be submitted for every ballot argument, with required signatures and author DEPARTMENT OF ELECTIONS information. For an argument submitted on behalf of an organization, the "Individual" section must also be completed by a principal officer of the organization who must be a registered San Francisco voter. Time/Date Stamp If your argument has more than one author, you must also submit Control Sheet B with required signatures and information for all additional authors Section 1: Argument Information Proposition Label Proponent Argument Rebuttal to Proponent Argument Paid Argument in Favor Opponent Argument Rebuttal to Opponent Argument Paid Argument Against Section 2: Additional Author Information Declaration Related to Proponent and Opponent Arguments I attest under the penalty of perjury that I am an Author of the Proponent Argument for Proposition _____ being submitted and that I am not a Non-supporter of this measure. A Non-supporter is defined as a person who, with respect to a measure: Is a treasurer, officer, or member of a committee that has made or plans to make expenditures in opposition to the measure; Has received or been promised any compensation or thing of value from such a committee to perform consulting services for that committee; or Has authorized their name or likeness to appear on campaign literature or in advertising that advocates for the defeat of the l'attest under the penalty of perjury that I am an Author of the Opponent Argument for Proposition _____ being submitted and that I am not a Supporter of this measure. A Supporter is defined as a person who with respect to a measure: Is a treasurer, officer, or member of a committee that has made or plans to make expenditures in support of the measure; Has received or been promised any compensation or thing of value from such a committee to perform consulting services for that committee: or Has authorized their name or likeness to appear on campaign literature or in advertising that advocates for the adoption of the measure. Complete the following to indicate whether the Author is an individual or an organization: Individual (or principal officer of Organization) Title (If Applicable) Public Defend AND PATE Full Name (Print) San Francisco Address (Where you are Registered) Signature | Email (If selected, compléte both the Individual Author section and the Organization Section) Organization (Entity) Name of Organization (Print) Who should be listed as an Author for your Organization? Only the Organization Both the Officer and the Organization * Check if the title or identifying information is for identification purposes only if you are signing as an individual and not of behalf of an organization. Signature | Email

Additional Author Information

Declaration Related to Proponent and Opponent Arguments

I attest under the penalty of perjury that I am an Author of the **Proponent Argument** for Proposition _____ being submitted and that I am not a Non-supporter of this measure. A Non-supporter is defined as a person who, with respect to a measure:

- Is a treasurer, officer, or member of a committee that has made or plans to make expenditures in opposition to the measure;
- Has received or been promised any compensation or thing of value from such a committee to perform consulting services for that committee; or
- Has authorized their name or likeness to appear on campaign literature or in advertising that advocates for the defeat of the
 measure.

I attest under the penalty of perjury that I am an Author of the **Opponent Argument** for Proposition _____ being submitted and that I am not a Supporter of this measure. A Supporter is defined as a person who with respect to a measure:

Has received or been promised any compensation or thing of value from such a committee to perform consulting services for that committee: or Has authorized their name or likeness to appear on campaign literature or in advertising that advocates for the adoption of the measure. Complete the following to indicate whether the Author is an individual or an organization: Individual (or principal officer of Organization) Full Name (Print) Title (If Applicable) San Francisco Address (Where you are Registered) Signature | Email Organization (Entity) (If selected, complete both the Individual Author section and the Organization Section) Name of Organization (Print) Who should be listed as an Author for your Organization? Only the Organization Both the Officer and the Organization * Check if the title or identifying information is for identification purposes only if you are signing as an individual and not of behalf of an organization. Signature Signature Email Section 3: Argument Text The text of your argument will be printed exactly as submitted. Ensure that your argument meets the legal word limit. You may request that specific argument text be printed in bold, italic, or bold italic type. Type your argument with the desired formatting, or underline the argument text to be formatted and in the left column, mark "B" for bold, "I" for italics, or "BI" for bold italics. Other special formatting is not permitted. Include Author information in argument text. Keep Text Within the Vertical Lines # of words B, I, BI per line SAY NO TO PROP F: Wasteful, ineffective, and unfair. Proposition F is a city-hall insider re-do of a policy that's already been tried and was a massive failure. Voting Yes on F would be a vote for an extremely expensive program that San Franciscans cannot afford, that won't keep us safer. WASTEFUL: Proposition F would force taxpayers to pay some individual officers up to HALF A MILLION DOLLARS by allowing them to double dip into salaries and banked pension payments. It won't add a single officer to the ranks of SFPD despite the widely known staffing shortage. Paying retiring officers twice—including those who retire while under investigation for misconduct—will not compensate for the hundreds more officers approaching retirement every year. INEFFECTIVE: San Francisco tried this program in 2008 and rightfully abandoned it in 2011 because there was no evidence that it helped the city to retain or recruit officers. Proposition F provides no reason to turn back the clock and return to an expensive, ineffective idea, especially at a time when we've already approved the biggest retention plan in the City's history and are giving senior officers retention premium pay to the tune of 17% of their salaries this year and 20% by 2026. UNFAIR: None of San Francisco's other public safety workers - Firefighters, social workers, 911 dispatchers - receive such large-scale retention benefits even when their workplaces are facing major staffing shortages. With San Francisco facing a major budget deficit, every dollar we waste on Proposition F is a dollar we can't use to address actual public safety concerns. Vote NO on Proposition F. American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) of Northern California Asian Law Caucus Chinese for Affirmative Action District 9 Supervisor Hillary Ronen District 5 Supervisor Dean Preston District 10 Supervisor Shamann Walton Public Defender* Mano Raju Police Commissioner* Jesus Yáñez Former Police Commissioner* Bill Ong Hing *For identification purposes only

If handwritten information or a revision is unclear, Department staff will interpret the handwritten information to the best of their abilities; this interpretation is final.

Total Word Count

Office Use Only

Ballot Argument Control Sheet B

Control Sheet A must be submitted for every ballot argument, with required signatures and author information.

For an argument submitted on behalf of an organization, the "Individual" section must also be completed by a principal officer of the organization who must be a registered San Francisco voter.

If your argument has more than one author, you must also submit Control Sheet B with required signatures and information for all additional authors.

Proponent Argument Rebuttal to Proponent Argument Paid Argument in

Rebuttal to Opponent Argument

Time	/Date Stan	np	
	Label		

Section 2: Additional Author Information

Opponent Argument

Declaration Related to Proponent and Opponent Arguments

I attest under the penalty of perjury that I am an Author of the **Proponent Argument** for Proposition _____ being submitted and that I am not a Non-supporter of this measure. A Non-supporter is defined as a person who, with respect to a measure:

- Is a treasurer, officer, or member of a committee that has made or plans to make expenditures in opposition to the measure;
- Has received or been promised any compensation or thing of value from such a committee to perform consulting services for that committee; or
- Has authorized their name or likeness to appear on campaign literature or in advertising that advocates for the defeat of the measure.

l attest under the penalty of perjury that I am an Author of the Opponent Argument for Proposition ____ being submitted and that I am not a Supporter of this measure. A Supporter is defined as a person who with respect to a measure:

- Is a treasurer, officer, or member of a committee that has made or plans to make expenditures in support of the measure;
- Has received or been promised any compensation or thing of value from such a committee to perform consulting services for that committee; or
- Has authorized their name or likeness to appear on campaign literature or in advertising that advocates for the adoption of the
 measure.

Complete the following to indicate whether the Author is an individual or an organization:

individual (or principal officer of Org	ganization) 🗹	yta <u>frysklad er er en l</u>
Full Name (Print) JESUS C	7. YANEZ Title (If A	Applicable)
San Francisco Address (Where you are	Registere	
Signature	Emai	a
Organization (Entity) (If select	ted, complete both the Individual Author section and	d the Organization Section)
Name of Organization (Print)		
Who should be listed as an Author for yo	our Organization?	N 0 0
Only the Organization Bo	oth the Officer and the Organization	e Tale Aran A
* Check if the title or identifying informat if you are signing as an individual and no	ion is for identification purposes only, ot of behalf of an organization.	
Signature Signature	Email	
	the second of th	

Additional Author Information

Declaration Related to Proponent and Opponent Arguments

I attest under the penalty of perjury that I am an Author of the Proponent Argument for Proposition _____ being submitted and that I am not a Non-supporter of this measure. A Non-supporter is defined as a person who, with respect to a measure:

- Is a treasurer, officer, or member of a committee that has made or plans to make expenditures in opposition to the measure;
- Has received or been promised any compensation or thing of value from such a committee to perform consulting services for that committee: or
- Has authorized their name or likeness to appear on campaign literature or in advertising that advocates for the defeat of the
 measure

l attest under the penalty of perjury that I am an Author of the **Opponent Argument** for Proposition _____ being submitted and that I am not a Supporter of this measure. A Supporter is defined as a person who with respect to a measure:

Has received or been promised any compensation or thing of value from such a committee to perform consulting services for that committee: or. Has authorized their name or likeness to appear on campaign literature or in advertising that advocates for the adoption of the Complete the following to indicate whether the Author is an individual or an organization: Individual (or principal officer of Organization) Full Name (Print) Title (If Applicable) San Francisco Address (Where you are Registered Signature I Email Organization (Entity) (If selected, complete both the Individual Author section and the Organization Section) Name of Organization (Print) Who should be listed as an Author for your Organization? Only the Organization Both the Officer and the Organization * Check if the title or identifying information is for identification purposes only, if you are signing as an individual and not of behalf of an organization. Signature Signature Email Section 3: Argument Text The text of your argument will be printed exactly as submitted. Ensure that your argument meets the legal word limit. You may request that specific argument text be printed in bold, italic, or bold italic type. Type your argument with the desired formatting, or underline the argument text to be formatted and in the left column, mark "B" for bold, "I" for italics, or "BI" for bold italics. Other special formatting is not permitted. Include Author information in argument text. **Format** Keep Text Within the Vertical Lines # of B, I, BI words per line SAY NO TO PROP F: Wasteful, ineffective, and unfair. Proposition F is a city-hall insider re-do of a policy that's already been tried and was a massive failure. Voting Yes on F would be a vote for an extremely expensive program that San Franciscans cannot afford, that won't keep us safer. WASTEFUL: Proposition F would force taxpayers to pay some individual officers up to HALF A MILLION DOLLARS by allowing them to double dip into salaries and banked pension payments. It won't add a single officer to the ranks of SFPD despite the widely known staffing shortage. Paying retiring officers twice—including those who retire while under investigation for misconduct—will not compensate for the hundreds more officers approaching retirement every year. INEFFECTIVE: San Francisco tried this program in 2008 and rightfully abandoned it in 2011 because there was no evidence that it helped the city to retain or recruit officers. Proposition F provides no reason to turn back the clock and return to an expensive, ineffective idea; especially at a time when we've already approved the biggest retention plan in the City's history and are giving senior officers retention premium pay to the tune of 17% of their salaries this year and 20% by 2026. UNFAIR: None of San Francisco's other public safety workers - Firefighters, social workers, 911 dispatchers - receive such large-scale retention benefits even when their workplaces are facing major staffing shortages. With San Francisco facing a major budget deficit, every dollar we waste on Proposition F is a dollar we can't use to address actual public safety concerns. Vote NO on Proposition F. American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) of Northern California Asian Law Caucus Chinese for Affirmative Action District 9 Supervisor Hillary Ronen District 5 Supervisor Dean Preston District 10 Supervisor Shamann Walton Public Defender* Mano Raju Police Commissioner* Jesus Yáñez Former Police Commissioner* Bill Ong Hing *For identification purposes only If handwritten information or a revision is unclear, Department staff will interpret the handwritten information to the best of their abilities; this interpretation is final. **Total Word Count**

Office Use Only Ballot Argument Control Sheet B 8: 22 Control Sheet A must be submitted for every ballot argument, with required signatures and author 024 AUG 15 information. DEPARTMENT OF E For an argument submitted on behalf of an organization, the "Individual" section must also be completed by a principal officer of the organization who must be a registered San Francisco voter. Time/Date Stamp If your argument has more than one author, you must also submit Control Sheet B with required signatures and information for all additional authors Section 1: Argument Information Proposition F Label Proponent Argument Rebuttal to Proponent Argument Paid Argument in Favor Opponent Argument Rebuttal to Opponent Argument Paid Argument Against Section 2: Additional Author Information Declaration Related to Proponent and Opponent Arguments I attest under the penalty of perjury that I am an Author of the Proponent Argument for Proposition _ am not a Non-supporter of this measure. A Non-supporter is defined as a person who, with respect to a measure: Is a treasurer, officer, or member of a committee that has made or plans to make expenditures in opposition to the measure; Has received or been promised any compensation or thing of value from such a committee to perform consulting services for Has authorized their name or likeness to appear on campaign literature or in advertising that advocates for the defeat of the l'attest under the penalty of perjury that I am an Author of the Opponent Argument for Proposition E being submitted and that I am not a Supporter of this measure. A Supporter is defined as a person who with respect to a measure: Is a treasurer, officer, or member of a committee that has made or plans to make expenditures in support of the measure; Has received or been promised any compensation or thing of value from such a committee to perform consulting services for that committee; or Has authorized their name or likeness to appear on campaign literature or in advertising that advocates for the adoption of the measure. Complete the following to indicate whether the Author is an individual or an organization: Individual (or principal officer of Organization) Full Name (Print) uc ans Title (If Applicable) San Francisco Address (Where you are Registered) Signature (If selected, complete both the Individual Author section and the Organization Section) Organization (Entity) Name of Organization (Print) Who should be listed as an Author for your Organization? Only the Organization Both the Officer and the Organization * Check if the title or identifying information is for identification purposes only, if you are signing as an individual and not of behalf of an organization.

Additional Author Information

Signature

Declaration Related to Proponent and Opponent Arguments

! attest under the penalty of perjury that I am an Author of the **Proponent Argument** for Proposition _____ being submitted and that ! am not a Non-supporter of this measure. A Non-supporter is defined as a person who, with respect to a measure:

Is a treasurer, officer, or member of a committee that has made or plans to make expenditures in opposition to the measure;

Email

- Has received or been promised any compensation or thing of value from such a committee to perform consulting services for that committee; or
- Has authorized their name or likeness to appear on campaign literature or in advertising that advocates for the defeat of the measure.

I attest under the penalty of perjury that I am an Author of the **Opponent Argument** for Proposition _____ being submitted and that I am not a Supporter of this measure. A Supporter is defined as a person who with respect to a measure:

- Has received or been promised any compensation or thing of value from such a committee to perform consulting services for that committee; or
- Has authorized their name or likeness to appear on campaign literature or in advertising that advocates for the adoption of the measure.

	or principal officer of Organization)	
Full Name (
	sco Address (Where you are Registered)	
Signature		
	ion (Entity) [If selected, complete both the Individual Author section and the Organization Section)	
	ganization (Print)	
Who should	be listed as an Author for your Organization?	
Only the Or	ganization Both the Officer and the Organization	
	ne title or identifying information is for identification purposes only,gning as an individual and not of behalf of an organization.	
Signature	Email	
-	: Argument Text	
that specific a argument tex	our argument will be printed exactly as submitted. Ensure that your argument meets the legal word limit. You may argument text be printed in bold, italic, or bold italic type. Type your argument with the desired formatting, or under to be formatted and in the left column, mark "B" for bold, "I" for italics, or "BI" for bold italics. Other special form Include Author information in argument text.	erline the
Format	Keep Text Within the Vertical Lines	# of words
B, /, <i>BI</i>	SAY NO TO PROP F: Wasteful, ineffective, and unfair.	per line
	Proposition F is a city-hall insider re-do of a policy that's already been tried and was a massive failure. Voting	
	Yes on F would be a vote for an extremely expensive program that San Franciscans cannot afford, that won't keep us safer.	
, sa	 WASTEFUL: Proposition F would force taxpayers to pay some individual officers up to HALF A MILLION DOLLARS by allowing them to double dip into salaries and banked pension payments. It won't add a single officer to the ranks of SFPD despite the widely known staffing shortage. Paying retiring officers twice—including those who retire while under investigation for misconduct—will not compensate for the hundreds more officers approaching retirement every year. 	
	 INEFFECTIVE: San Francisco tried this program in 2008 and rightfully abandoned it in 2011 because there was no evidence that it helped the city to retain or recruit officers. Proposition F provides no reason to turn back the clock and return to an expensive, ineffective idea, especially at a time when we've already approved the biggest retention plan in the City's history and are giving senior officers retention premium pay to the tune of 17% of their salaries this year and 20% by 2026. 	
	 UNFAIR: None of San Francisco's other public safety workers – Firefighters, social workers, 911 dispatchers – receive such large-scale retention benefits even when their workplaces are facing major staffing shortages. 	
	With San Francisco facing a major budget deficit, every dollar we waste on Proposition F is a dollar we can't use to address actual public safety concerns.	
	Vote NO on Proposition F.	
	American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) of Northern California Asian Law Caucus Chinese for Affirmative Action	9 S
	District 9 Supervisor Hillary Ronen	
	District 5 Supervisor Dean Preston District 10 Supervisor Shamann Walton	
	Public Defender* Mano Raju Police Commissioner* Jesus Yáñez	
	Former Police Commissioner* Bill Ong Hing	
	*For identification purposes only	
	If handwritten information or a revision is unclear, Department staff will interpret the handwritten information to	-
	the best of their abilities; this interpretation is final.	

Supporters / Opponents to be listed on Ballot Label

(Must be submitted with Control Sheet A)

All ballot labels concerning measures shall end with a list of Supporters and Opponents taken from the authors of the Official Proponent and Official Opponent arguments regarding the measure. (CAEC §9170)

- The list of Supporters / Opponents shall not exceed 125 characters in length.
 The Department will not publish beyond the 125th character.
- An associate, nonprofit organization, business, or individual shall not be listed unless they have also completed a Control Sheet for the corresponding Ballot Argument.
- A Supporter / Opponent shall not be listed if the Supporter / Opponent is a
 political party or is representing a political party.
- If this form is not submitted, the Department will print "None submitted" for the corresponding Official Ballot Argument.

Facilitate typesetting, and reduce the possibility of transcription error by sending an electronic copy of the list of supporters or opponents within 24 hours after submission to the Department at publications@sfgov.org

Office Use	Only
2024 AUG 15 AM 8	: 21
BEPARTHENT OF ELEC	CTIONS
Time / Date Si	tamp

Section 1: Argument Information

Proposition F

Official Proponent Argument

Official Opponent Argument

•	-	-		~	-
ı	-		1		
ı				ı	

Section 2: Information for Supporters and Opponents

A supporter or opponent shall not be listed unless it is one of the following:

- An association, nonprofit organization, or business that was not originally created as a committee described in Section 82013 of the Government Code and that has been in existence for at least four years.
- ii. A current or former elected official, who may be listed with the official's title (e.g., "State Senator Mary Smith," "Assembly Member Carlos Garcia," or "former Eureka City Council Member Amy Lee"). These titles may be shortened (e.g. "Senator" or "Sen." for "State Senator" or "Asm." for "Assembly Member").
- iii. An individual who is not a current or former elected official may be listed only with the individual's first and last name and an honorific (e.g., "Dr.," "M.D.," "Ph.D.," or "Esquire"), with no other title or designation, unless it is a title representing an association, nonprofit organization, or business that meets the requirements

Section 3: List of Individuals, Associations, Nonprofit Organizations, and / or Businesses

			÷			
8 1 8 3		1. 19	9 - Ag - 1		T 7 H 7	
American Civil Chinese for Affi	Liberties Union irmative Action	(ACLU) of N	Vorthern California	; Asian Law Cau	ICUS;	
American Civil Chinese for Affi	Liberties Union irmative Action	(ACLU) of N	Vorthern California	; Asian Law Cau	ucus;	

Section 4: Submitter Information (Same as Control Sheet A)

The submitter is the person who delivers the argument and supporting materials to the Department. If there is a question or issue with a submission, the Department will contact the submitter.

Full Name (Print):	Karima	Lynch	Phone	
Mailing Address:				-
Signature Signature			Email	