



C

Expenditure Lobbyists

Shall the City regulate expenditure lobbyists by requiring them to register with the Ethics Commission, pay a \$500 registration fee, and file monthly disclosures regarding their lobbying activities?

YES ←  
NO ←  

Digest by the Ballot Simplification Committee

The Way It Is Now: Individuals who are paid to directly contact City officers to influence their legislative or administrative actions are called lobbyists. Their activities are regulated by the City’s Lobbyist Ordinance. The Ordinance does not address indirect lobbying, also known as “expenditure lobbying,” where persons solicit or urge others to directly contact City officers.

The Proposal: Proposition C would define an expenditure lobbyist as any person or business who pays \$2,500 or more in a calendar month to solicit, request, or urge others to directly lobby City officers. The types of activities that would apply to the \$2,500 threshold include:

- public relations, media relations, and advertising,
- public outreach,
- research, investigation, reports, analyses, and studies.

The following types of payments would not count toward the \$2,500 threshold:

- payments made to a registered lobbyist who directly contacts City officers;
- payments made to an organization for membership dues;
- payments made by an organization to distribute communications to its members;
- payments made by a news media organization to develop and distribute its publications; and
- payments made by a client to a representative to appear on the client’s behalf in a legal proceeding before a City agency or department.

Proposition C would require expenditure lobbyists to register with the Ethics Commission, pay a \$500 registration fee, and file monthly disclosures regarding

their lobbying activities. Employees of nonprofit organizations would not be subject to the \$500 registration fee.

Proposition C would also allow the City to change these requirements without further voter approval if the change would further the purposes of the ordinance. The Ethics Commission would be required to approve the changes by a four-fifths vote, and the Board of Supervisors would be required to approve them by a two-thirds vote. Voters would retain the right to amend the ordinance.

A “YES” Vote Means: If you vote “yes,” you want the City to regulate expenditure lobbyists by requiring them to register with the Ethics Commission, pay a \$500 registration fee, and file monthly disclosures regarding their lobbying activities.

A “NO” Vote Means: If you vote “no,” you do not want to make these changes.

Controller’s Statement on “C”

City Controller Ben Rosenfield has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition C:

Should the proposed ordinance be approved by the voters, in my opinion, the cost to government would increase by a moderate amount in order to administer expanded lobbyist registration and tracking requirements.

Currently San Francisco requires persons who directly contact City officials in order to influence legislative or administrative action to register as lobbyists and report on their activities. The ordinance would expand the law and define as an “expenditure lobbyist” any person who spends \$2,500 or more in a month for the purpose of influencing City legislative or administrative action. According to current Ethics Commission data, 64 registered lobbying firms and 94 lobbyists were active in 2014. The number of expenditure lobby-

This measure requires 50%+1 affirmative votes to pass.

The above statement is an impartial analysis of this measure. Arguments for and against this measure immediately follow. The full text begins on page 156. Some of the words used in the ballot digest are explained starting on page 41.

ists who would be required to register and report is difficult to estimate, but is likely to be somewhat less than the number of contact lobbyists currently registered.

The measure specifies a one-time budget amount of \$560,000 in fiscal year 2015–16 proposed by the Ethics Commission. This amount includes \$500,000 to expand, develop and maintain for 10 years the software for lobbyist tracking and reporting requirements. The remaining \$60,000 includes the cost of temporary and replacement staff for the initial startup and an estimated ongoing cost of supervision at \$15,000 annually. The ordinance specifies that following depletion of the \$560,000 appropriation, the City would budget \$15,000 annually for this program. Lobbyists subject to the ordinance are required to pay registration fees of \$500 per year which would offset a small portion of the cost of administration and enforcement of the ordinance. Note that an ordinance cannot bind future Mayors and Boards of Supervisors to provide funding for this or any other purpose and therefore future costs will ultimately depend on decisions that the Mayor and Board of Supervisors make through the budget process.

The ordinance can be amended without voter approval, subject to super-majority approval by both the Ethics Commission and the Board of Supervisors.

How “C” Got on the Ballot

On June 29, 2015, the Ethics Commission voted 5 to 0 to place Proposition C on the ballot.

This measure requires 50%+1 affirmative votes to pass.

The above statement is an impartial analysis of this measure. Arguments for and against this measure immediately follow. The full text begins on page 156. Some of the words used in the ballot digest are explained starting on page 41.



Proponent's Argument in Favor of Proposition C

The City has a long-standing, compelling interest in furthering public disclosure of the identities of lobbyists and of their efforts to influence decision-making regarding local legislative and administrative matters. This ballot measure seeks to protect public confidence in the responsiveness and representative nature of government officials and institutions.

The City currently requires lobbyists who directly contact City officials, referred to as “contact lobbyists,” to register with the Ethics Commission and disclose their lobbying activities. But individuals, businesses, non-profit organizations, labor unions, and trade associations also attempt to indirectly influence City officials by urging others to directly lobby those officials. These indirect lobbyists, referred to as “expenditure lobbyists,” make payments in an attempt to encourage others to directly lobby City officials by urging them to attend legislative hearings to speak on their behalf, by providing them with transportation to public meetings, by using advertising outlets to ask others to call or contact City officials’ offices to make their arguments, or by making donations in exchange for their direct lobbying efforts. Given these efforts, it is often difficult for City officials to know whether the individuals directly approaching them are truly voicing their own

opinions or are doing so at the behest of expenditure lobbyists.

Prior to 2009, expenditure lobbyists were required to register; this ballot measure reinstates that requirement and makes San Francisco’s reporting requirements consistent with those of Los Angeles, Sacramento, San Diego, San Jose and the State of California.

This ballot measure imposes reasonable, narrowly tailored registration and disclosure requirements on expenditure lobbyists, obligating them to reveal information about their efforts to influence decision-making. Since expenditure lobbyists and direct, contact lobbyists both attempt to influence the City’s legislative process, this ordinance imposes the same sorts of registration and disclosure requirements on both types of lobbyists.

San Francisco Ethics Commission

Rebuttal to Proponent's Argument in Favor of Proposition C

WHY SHOULD LOBBYISTS WORKING FOR NON-PROFIT ORGANIZATIONS NOT PAY LOBBYING FEES???

George Orwell (1903–1950) was born in Bengele, British India, educated at Eton, served in Burma’s Indian Imperial Police, saw the abuses of English colonialism, returned to Europe, fought with anti-Francoists in the Spanish Civil War, and became an author opposing totalitarianism with many of his novels, including *1984* and *Animal Farm*.

In *Animal Farm*, England’s Manor Farm is taken over in a barnyard revolution in the name of animal freedom and equality. Soon the pigs take power, their motto becoming: “**ALL ANIMALS ARE EQUAL BUT SOME ANIMALS ARE MORE EQUAL THAN OTHERS**”

San Francisco’s Ethics Commission, composed of a flock of appointees of City Hall officeholders, seem to have similar ideas about lobbyists.

Most local lobbyists are required to pay large registration fees, but employees of non-profit organizations unjustly ride for free.

Such abuses are to be expected when the Ethics Commission is not composed of independent citizens—like a civil or criminal grand jury.

The Ethics Commission, with a San Francisco City Charter amendment, needs to be isolated from direct City Hall control.

During a recent dispute involving the Sheriff’s Office, the Ethics Commission openly allowed itself to become a City Hall rubber stamp.

The findings of the Ethics Commission on this occasion were overturned by a vote of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors.

Vote “**NO!**” on Proposition C.

Dr. Terence Faulkner, J.D.

*Past Member of Regional Citizens Forum Board of Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG)**

*For identification purposes only; author is signing as an individual and not on behalf of an organization.

Opponent's Argument Against Proposition C

THIS LOBBYIST BALLOT MEASURE NEEDS TO BE REDRAFTED. THE ETHICS COMMISSION SHOULD NOT HAVE THE POWER TO WAIVE THE LOBBYIST FEES OF EMPLOYEES OF TAX-EXEMPT ORGANIZATIONS COVERED BY 26 U.S.C. SECTION 501(c)(3) OR 501(c)(4).

The employees of tax-exempt organizations should be covered by the same general lobbying laws as other organizations, businesses, and corporations taking part in the legislative process.

The policy of granting waivers to employees of non-profit and/or tax-exempt organizations to exempt them from lobbyist registration fees needs to finally be halted in the City and County of San Francisco.

Modern business entities, corporations, and labor organizations should be governed by similar legislative lobbying rules under modern economic and social conditions.

It is time for the San Francisco to adapt its lobbying standards to those of other California cities.

*Dr. Terence Faulkner, J.D.
United States President's Federal Executive Awards
Committeeman (1988)**

*For identification purposes only; author is signing as an individual and not on behalf of an organization.

Rebuttal to Opponent's Argument Against Proposition C

Proposition C was placed on the ballot by a unanimous vote of the members of the San Francisco Ethics Commission. It imposes registration and reporting obligations on any individual and any organization that spends at least \$2,500 in a calendar month to solicit, request, or urge others to directly lobby City officers (i.e., elected City officials, members of City boards and commissions, and City department heads). Other jurisdictions regulate such "expenditure lobbying" and similar activities, although not always in the same manner. Those jurisdictions include Los Angeles, Sacramento, San Diego, San Jose, and the State of California.

Employees of tax-exempt non-profit organizations are not exempted from the lobbying reporting requirements, which apply to all individuals and entities, including the obligation to register and report their activities; only certain of these employees—those working for charities and social welfare organizations—will be exempted from having to pay the \$500.00 registration fee. This exemption reflects the fact that many of these employees may be paid less

than private sector employees. San Francisco law regulating direct lobbyists contains the same exemption.

San Francisco Ethics Commission



Paid Argument IN FAVOR of Proposition C

Lobbyists are using a loophole to spend whatever they want in San Francisco without disclosure.

Make their lobbying public. CLOSE the loophole, Vote for Prop

*Don Ellison**

*Charles Marsteller**

Former Co-Coordinator

San Francisco Common Cause

*For identification purposes only; author is signing as an individual and not on behalf of an organization.

The true source(s) of funds for the printing fee of this argument: Charles Marsteller, Don Ellison.

Paid Argument IN FAVOR of Proposition C

Prop C will restore transparency to the engine behind local lobbying.-- the money spent shaping how the public views issues facing San Francisco.

As former members of San Francisco Civil Grand Juries - charged with examining city government - we have long been interested in encouraging ethics in San Francisco government, in part by making the Ethics Commission more effective. Prop C mirrors a 2014 Civil Grand Jury recommendation to restore reporting on expenditure lobbying, as was required until 2009.

Recent Supreme Court cases have significantly broadened the flow of money into campaigns which necessitates transparency into the money to inform and protect the electorate. Prop C will shine light on deep-pocketed expenditure lobbying in our City.

With public and open debate, the Ethics Commission voted unanimously to place this on the ballot. It deserves our strong support, and we urge a YES vote on Prop C.

Former Civil Grand Jury Members:

*Larry Bush, 2013/14**

*Daniel A Chesir, 2014/15**

*Allegra Fortunati, 2014/15**

*Hulga Garfolo, 2010/11**

*Joseph Kelly, Jr. 2013/14**

*John Mona, 2000/02, 2006/07**

*Maryta Piazza, 2013/14**

*Bob Planthold, 1999/2001, 2006/08**

*Phil Reed, 2014/15**

*Elena Schmid, Foreperson, 2013/14**

*Robert van Ravenswaay, 2013/14**

*For identification purposes only; author is signing as an individual and not on behalf of an organization.

The true source(s) of funds for the printing fee of this argument: Joseph Kelly, Jr., Elena Schmid, Robert van Ravenswaay.

Paid Argument IN FAVOR of Proposition C

As former Ethics Commissioners, we support the Ethics Commission's Prop C. Several years ago, a loophole opened, allowing special interests to spend money on a type of lobbying without reporting it.

Prop C requires full reporting, by those spending money to influence city decisions, of what they spend on getting the public to comment favorably or attend a meeting to support their positions on local interests.

Vote YES on C

Paul Melbostad, former Commission Chair

Bob Planthold, former Commission Chair

Bob Dockendorff, former Commissioner

Sharyn Saslafsky, former Commissioner

The true source(s) of funds for the printing fee of this argument: Paul Melbostad, Sharyn Saslafsky, Robert D. Dockendorff, Robert R. Planthold.

Paid Argument IN FAVOR of Proposition C

Vote YES on C – It's Common Sense

Government openness is a fundamental democratic principle.

Prop C provides a critical means for achieving that objective.

Requiring expenditure lobbyists to report – just as I do, as a lawfully registered lobbyist, for any activity I engage in seeking to influence legislative or administrative actions – is elementary and essential to open government.

Prop C will:

- Contribute to better understanding of the money that could influence government decision-making,
- Improve knowledge of government services and transactions and,
- Improve access to government processes and decision-makers for *all* citizens.

Vote YES ON C!

Denise LaPointe

The true source(s) of funds for the printing fee of this argument: Denise M. LaPointe.

Paid Argument IN FAVOR of Proposition C

DEMOCRATS FOR TRUE TRANSPARENCY!

Proposition C was created by the San Francisco Ethics Commission to strengthen the existing lobbying laws to include unions, nonprofits, and other organizations that lobby elected officials at City Hall.

Vote YES to Strengthen the Lobbyist Laws!

San Francisco Democratic Party

The true source(s) of funds for the printing fee of this argument: San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee.

The three largest contributors to the true source recipient committee: 1. TMG Partners, 2. SFPOA, 3. PG&E.

Paid Argument IN FAVOR of Proposition C

Proposition C will bring into the open the hidden influences of special interests on decisions made by city officials about development, taxes, and anything else. Dark money and influence peddling need sunlight!

Yes on C!

San Francisco Tomorrow

The true source(s) of funds for the printing fee of this argument: San Francisco Tomorrow.

Paid Argument IN FAVOR of Proposition C

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C

A problem for San Francisco taxpayers is secret indirect lobbying at City Hall which influences City government decisions that could adversely affect taxpayers.

Various corporate and organizational executives can, and do, covertly lobby City officials and we don't know it.

The San Francisco Ethics Commission voted unanimously in June to ask voters to overturn the Board of Supervisors and close a destructive loophole in public registration requirements for corporations, organizations, and individuals who pay thousands of dollars to unidentified, unregistered lobbyists to tilt governmental decisions to benefit them. That means favors from City Hall, with our money, unbeknownst to us!

In 2010, the Board of Supervisors repealed the law requiring public disclosure of spending by lobbyists to influence City government decisions, directly or *indirectly*. Proposition C restores the requirement that **anyone** who receives money to influence City Hall

decisions must register and reveal publicly the payments from such corporation, entity or individual. Unreported lobbying can be as venal and injurious to taxpayers as is reported, direct lobbying with the Mayor, Board of Supervisors or other City officials.

That's why Sacramento, San Jose, San Diego, Los Angeles and the State of California require public disclosure of indirect lobbying.

San Francisco Taxpayers Association strongly recommends a YES vote for our Ethics Commission's Proposition C.

*San Francisco Taxpayers Association
Judge Quentin L. Kopp (Ret.), President*

The true source(s) of funds for the printing fee of this argument: San Francisco Taxpayers Association.

Paid Argument IN FAVOR of Proposition C

VOTE YES ON PROP C

As current or former elected officials, we urge you to support Proposition C. The Ethics Commission put this on the ballot to restore public disclosure of spending to influence city hall decisions. Currently some forms of lobbying can be done without telling the public. This would require all lobbying be done with public disclosure.

*Jeff Adachi, Public Defender**
*Art Agnos, Former Mayor**
*Tom Ammiano, Former Assemblymember **
*John Avalos, Supervisor**
David Campos, Supervisor
*Scott Wiener, Supervisor**

*For identification purposes only; author is signing as an individual and not on behalf of an organization.

The true source(s) of funds for the printing fee of this argument: Charles Marsteller.

End of Paid Arguments IN FAVOR of Proposition C

Paid Argument AGAINST Proposition C

In San Francisco, community and faith-based nonprofits provide significant portions of health and human services for children, youth and their families, seniors, people with disabilities, homeless families, and people with AIDS, as well as building most of the City's affordable housing. This is known throughout the world as "the San Francisco model."



In a late night amendment, poorly drafted language was inserted into an otherwise commendable measure regulating lobbyists at City Hall. As written, Prop C fails to distinguish between corporate fronts for Airbnb and other lobbyists, and critically important faith and community-based nonprofits. This measure will require scores of City-funded nonprofits to file as “lobbyists,” placing in jeopardy their Federal non-profit status and their continued provision of services to the most vulnerable San Franciscans.

Vote No on C.

*San Francisco Human Services Network
Council of Community Housing Organizations*

The true source(s) of funds for the printing fee of this argument: San Francisco Human Services Network and Council of Community Housing Organizations.



T

Restricting Gifts and Campaign Contributions from Lobbyists

Shall the City prohibit any lobbyist from making campaign contributions to a City elected official or bundling contributions for the official, if the lobbyist was registered to lobby the official's agency; generally prohibit lobbyists from providing gifts of any value to City officials; and require lobbyists to identify the City agencies they plan to lobby?

YES ←  
NO ←  

Digest by the Ballot Simplification Committee

The Way It Is Now: The City's Lobbyist Ordinance requires local lobbyists to register with the City's Ethics Commission. When they register, the City does not require them to identify the City agencies they plan to lobby. Lobbyists must file monthly reports and disclose campaign contributions made or delivered by the lobbyists themselves, their employers or clients.

In general, a person is not allowed to make a campaign contribution of more than \$500 to a City elected official or a candidate for City elective office. Lobbyists are subject to this \$500 campaign contribution limit. The City does not restrict anyone, including lobbyists, from collecting campaign contributions from other persons—a practice known as “bundling”—and delivering those contributions to a City official or candidate for City office.

With some exceptions, lobbyists cannot provide any City official with gifts worth more than \$25. Under current law, lobbyists cannot deliver payments or gifts through third parties in order to avoid this gift limit.

The Proposal: Proposition T would prohibit a lobbyist from making campaign contributions to a City elected official or bundling contributions for the official if the lobbyist is registered to lobby the official's agency. These restrictions also apply to candidates for local offices.

Proposition T also would prohibit a lobbyist from providing gifts of any value to any City officials. Some nonprofits would have a limited exemption. The measure would also clarify that lobbyists cannot use third parties to attempt to avoid these gift limits.

Proposition T would require lobbyists to identify the City agencies they plan to lobby.

A “YES” Vote Means: If you vote “yes,” you want to:

- prohibit any lobbyist from making campaign contributions to a City elected official or bundling contributions for the official if the lobbyist is registered to lobby the official's agency;
- generally prohibit lobbyists from providing gifts of any value to City officials; and
- require lobbyists to identify the City agencies they plan to lobby.

A “NO” Vote Means: If you vote “no,” you do not want to make these changes.

Controller's Statement on “T”

City Controller Ben Rosenfield has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition T:

Should the proposed ordinance be approved by the voters, in my opinion, the cost to government would increase by a minimal amount in order to administer expanded lobbyist tracking requirements.

Lobbyists, both contact lobbyists and expenditure lobbyists, are currently required to register with the Ethics Commission. The proposed ordinance would require lobbyists to identify the agencies they intend to influence ahead of contact and would also prohibit lobbyists from making any gifts, including gift of travel, to any City officer and their family members. Non-profits would be allowed to provide gifts of food or refreshment up to \$25 for all attendees at a public event.

Lobbyists would be prohibited from making any contribution, including bundled contributions, to a City elective officer, candidate for office, or their candidate-controlled committee if the lobbyist is registered to

This measure requires 50%+1 affirmative votes to pass.

The above statement is an impartial analysis of this measure. Arguments for and against this measure immediately follow. The full text begins on page 302. Some of the words used in the ballot digest are explained starting on page 58.

lobby the agency for which the candidate is seeking election.

The proposed ordinance specifies a one-time budget amount of \$115,000 in fiscal year 2016–17, including \$100,000 for new software requirements and \$15,000 for one-time staff costs. The ordinance specifies that following depletion of the \$115,000 budget the City would budget \$5,000 annually for this program. Note that an ordinance cannot bind future Mayors and Boards of Supervisors to provide funding for this or any other purpose and therefore future costs will ultimately depend on decisions that the Mayor and Board of Supervisors make through the budget process.

The ordinance can be amended without voter approval, subject to super-majority approval by both the Ethics Commission and the Board of Supervisors.

How “T” Got on the Ballot

On July 25, 2016, the Ethics Commission voted 4 to 0 to place Proposition T on the ballot.

This measure requires 50%+1 affirmative votes to pass.

The above statement is an impartial analysis of this measure. Arguments for and against this measure immediately follow. The full text begins on page 302. Some of the words used in the ballot digest are explained starting on page 58.



Proponent's Argument in Favor of Proposition T

Proposition T was placed on the ballot by a unanimous vote of the San Francisco Ethics Commission to eliminate any possible link between lobbyist campaign contributions and gifts and agency decisions which the lobbyist seeks to influence.

Similar to restrictions in place for the State of California and in the City of Los Angeles, Proposition T bans lobbyists from making campaign contributions to elected officials at agencies the lobbyists are registered to lobby and to candidates seeking election to those offices. Proposition T also bans lobbyists from transmitting to those officials and candidates campaign contributions collected from others, a practice commonly known as "bundling." These bans apply to campaign contributions a lobbyist makes or bundles to any local committee a City officer or candidate controls, including a controlled ballot measure committee. The measure applies to all lobbyists that must register with the Ethics Commission. In addition, lobbyists are subject to these bans for 90 days after their registration to lobby any agency ends.

Proposition T also bans lobbyists from giving City officers gifts of any value, including gifts of travel, and it prohibits lobbyists from making those payments through others. City officers will also be prohibited from soliciting and receiving prohibited lobbyist gifts. A limited exception will allow City officers to receive food and beverages worth \$25 or less at a public meeting held by a 501c3 non-profit organization that has qualified as a lobbyist when those refreshments are equally available to all attendees of the public event.

Proposition T will become operational on January 1, 2018. It provides \$115,000 for the Ethics Commission to modify its online lobbyist registration technology to accommodate the changes made by this measure.

San Francisco Ethics Commission

No Rebuttal or Opponent's Argument Against Proposition T Was Submitted

Paid Argument IN FAVOR of Proposition T

Why Prop T?

Last year, a single lobbyist bundled over \$80,000 in contributions for just two San Francisco candidates. And lobbyists today can give major travel gifts to our elected officials.

When lobbyists mix gifts and contributions with requests for specific policy outcomes, there's a major risk of corruption.

Prop T's solution

Written by the San Francisco Ethics Commission, Proposition T will ban gifts, contributions, and bundling from lobbyists to our politicians in a reasonable and tailored manner.

The lobbyist contribution ban is already the law at the California state level, and it was upheld in federal court - but without Prop T, San Francisco lacks this protection.

Who supports Prop T?

Many organizations, elected officials, and individuals, including California Common Cause and the Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods, have endorsed Proposition T. View the full list of endorsements at www.YesOnPropT.org.

Vote YES on Proposition T, the lobbyist gift ban!

Ban Lobbyist Gifts to Politicians, YES on Prop T, Integrity San Francisco, Sponsored by Represent.Us

The true source(s) of funds for the printing fee of this argument: Ban Lobbyist Gifts to Politicians, YES on Prop T, Integrity San Francisco, Sponsored by Represent.Us - FPPC #1388288.

The two contributors to the true source recipient committee: Represent.Us, Louis Eisenberg.

Paid Argument IN FAVOR of Proposition T

Prop T will limit lobbyists' current methods of gaining access to San Francisco decision-makers by banning them from making contributions directly and from bundling contributions from others, along with banning their gifts to decision-makers, including gifts of travel.

As former members of San Francisco Civil Grand Juries — charged with recommending improvements to city government — we have long been interested in methods to limit undue influence on decision-makers. Los Angeles and the state restrict lobbyist contributions without problems. We believe this measure will

help to bring some sanity to methods used by lobbyists to gain undue influence and access to decision-makers.

Campaign contributions from lobbyists, whether direct or as bundled contributions from their clients, can appear to be pay-to-play maneuvers, and can lead to voters losing confidence in their government. Gifts of travel can allow lobbyists, and their clients, access to decision-makers without public accountability.

This year, after many public meetings and open debate, the SF Ethics Commission voted unanimously to place this measure on the ballot. It deserves our strong support and we urge a YES vote on Prop T

Supporters include:

Former Civil Grand Jury Members:

Larry Bush, 2013/14

Karen Cancino, 2008/09

Jay Cunningham, Foreperson 2014/15

Allegra Fortunati, 2011/12, 2014/15

Julia Hansen, 2006/07

Mazel Looney, 2013/14

Martha Mangold, Foreperson 2012/13

Maryta Piazza, 2013/14

Bob Planthold, 1999/2001, 2006/08

Barbara Cahrssen Powell, 2013/14

Robert van Ravenswaay, 2013/14

Elena Schmid, Foreperson 2013/14

The true source(s) of funds for the printing fee of this argument: Larry Bush, Karen Cancino, Jay Cunningham, Julia Hansen, Mazel Looney, Martha Mangold, Maryta Piazza, Bob Planthold, Barbara Cahrssen Powell, Elena Schmid, Robert van Ravenswaay, Allegra Fortunati.

Paid Argument IN FAVOR of Proposition T

It's just common sense. Lobbyists shouldn't be allowed to use gifts and donations to influence our politicians. Let's make sure they can't.

Vote Yes on T.

San Francisco Tomorrow

The true source(s) of funds for the printing fee of this argument: San Francisco Tomorrow.

Paid Argument IN FAVOR of Proposition T

The below organizations and individuals endorse Prop T:

San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee (SFDCCC)



*San Francisco Republican Party
San Francisco Green Party*

*Coalition of San Francisco Neighborhoods
Friends of Ethics
League of Pissed Off Voters*

*Supervisor Eric Mar
Supervisor Norman Yee
Supervisor Scott Wiener
Supervisor John Avalos*

*Assemblymember Phil Ting
Art Agnos, Former Mayor
Tom Ammiano, Former Assemblyman and Supervisor
Ban Lobbyist Gifts to Politicians, Yes on Prop T,
Integrity San Francisco, sponsored by Represent.Us*

The true source(s) of funds for the printing fee of this argument: Ban Lobbyist Gifts to Politicians, Yes on Prop T, Integrity San Francisco, Sponsored by Represent.Us.

The two contributors to the true source recipient committee: Represent.Us, Louis Eisenberg.

Paid Argument IN FAVOR of Proposition T

We former Ethics commissioners urge Yes on T!

T aligns SF with its state counterpart.

T makes it easier for lobbyists to understand, report and comply in much the same way as they do at the state level.

*Paul Melbostad
Bob Dockendorff
Bob Planthold
Sharyn Saslafsky*

The true source(s) of funds for the printing fee of this argument: Ban Lobbyist Gifts to Politicians, Yes on Prop T, Integrity San Francisco, Sponsored by Represent.Us.

The two contributors to the true source recipient committee: Represent.Us, Louis Eisenberg.

End of Paid Arguments IN FAVOR of Proposition T

No Paid Arguments AGAINST Proposition T Were Submitted