

South Beach District 6 Democratic Club
Election November 4, 2014

Candidate Endorsement Questionnaire

Name: Jamie Whitaker

Address: 201 Harrison St. Apt. 229

City, State, Zip: San Francisco, CA 94105

Campaign contact: Jamie Whitaker

Cell phone number: [REDACTED]

Email: Jamie@jami whitaker.com

1. What are the three civic or community accomplishments of which you are most proud? If an incumbent, draw from actions through your current office/position. (Max 300 words)
 - 1) Founding member of the Friends of the Waterfront Playground with Adhamina Rodriguez and Bill Sauro who successfully raised the money, got Supervisor David Chiu's help to clear bureaucratic hurdles, and get a badly needed playground that serves both toddlers and kids up to age 10 at Sue Bierman Park. We started in 2010, and the playground opened in July 2013 – a record for San Francisco playground projects that started with the community initiating the improvement.
 - 2) I'm very proud of the pedestrian safety improvements that the SBRMBNA (Board member) pushed the state and city to get on The Embarcadero/King Street. The speed limit was lowered from 35 MPH to 30MPH between the Ferry Building and highway 280 – matching the 30 MPH speed limit that already existed north of the Ferry Building. We got the SFMTA to increase crosswalk times so that pedestrians had more time to get across what can operate like a 6-8 lane car/train highway depending on the segment your'e crossing.
 - 3) After years of pushing the SFMTA at their TEP meetings and many postings on STREETS BLOG and my own RinconHillsSF.org pointing out the discrimination directed at eastern SoMa neighborhoods, I'm very proud that the SFMTA has begun a Rincon Hill Transit Study to seriously look at the need for a LOCAL bus line to run east of where they currently terminate (2nd Street) to the waterfront to serve the 20,000 residents that will eventually fill the new high-rise towers being built in Rincon Hill. Learn more here: <http://www.sfmta.com/projects-planning/projects/rincon-hill-transit-study>. Please note that Measure A's \$500 million bond does not promise a single thing to District 6 for our \$100 million investment (if it gets approved) – and with parking meters running JUST in District 6 in the evenings while free elsewhere, I'm voting NO despite the good progress.
2. If elected to this office, what will be your top three priorities and your approach for successful implementation? (Max 300 words)
 - 1) We need an effective Supervisor who will raise hell to get our fair share of infrastructure improvements WRITTEN into the GO Bonds we're asked to approve. The 2012 Parks Bond for \$195 million meant District 6, who pays 20% based upon our very high real estate values, will pay \$39 million and only get \$1 million back in the quickly growing SoMa District (for South Park). Why should we give \$39 for every \$1 we get back? That's like going to a Casino – no promises of getting anything back from this City slot machine with such non-committal Measure A Transit Bond language.

- 2) I will push hard until we have a genuine Sustainability Element in the City's General Planning Code. It would require that the CUMULATIVE impacts on air pollution and other community health measures included at SF DPH's www.SustainableCommunitiesIndex.org be studied and findings be provided to the public about commercial projects greater than 10,000 square feet in size and multi-unit residential buildings with a dozen or more dwellings. The Department of the Environment would also be required to provide public information about the cumulative impacts of these proposed projects on the environment. Until there is a Sustainability Element in our law books, our elected legislator is not doing his or her job for District 6 or the City.
 - 3) We need data analysis basis for police staffing at different stations. Because of the surges in daytime and evening population in District 6 from commuters and event attendees, we should have many more police. Because of our proximity to the highway ramps, we should have a much larger share of traffic law enforcement officers actively patrolling our streets from 7am until 3am every day to account for morning commuters and late nightclub travelers who may be drunk.
3. Do you support or oppose the following local measures on the November 2014 ballot? (Yes/No).
- Transportation and Road Improvement Bond **No**, I do not support District 6 investing \$100 million (that's District 6's 20% share of overall San Francisco property values times the \$500 million Measure A bond amount) of our hard earned money into a bond measure via property taxes (renters pay property taxes via their rent, don't forget) that says it "MAY" do absolutely nothing to improve transportation in District 6. Read the bond measure yourself – there are ZERO promises or specifics:
http://sfgov2.org/ftp/uploadedfiles/elections/candidates/Nov2014/Nov2014_TransportRoadImprovement.pdf We should not allow our City to write such amateur, "may use money for this and that" bond propositions and expect us to just fork over tens of millions of dollars for the next 20 years to pay for an unknown benefit (possibly ZERO) coming back to District 6. The City must come back to us in 2015 with a transportation bond containing SPECIFICS if they want District 6 to pick up \$100 million of a \$500 million bond. As worded right now, it asks \$100 million donation from District 6 with no promise of anything coming back to District 6 – I'm not a sucker, and I hope the majority of District 6 voters are not suckers either.
 - Population-Based Adjustment to General Fund Appropriation to Transportation Fund – **NO**, this is an unfunded measure that means other services will be impacted. We have a budget process that legislators should use to collaboratively agree on how the budget will be spent every year.
 - Children and Youth Fund; Public Education Enrichment Fund; Our Children, Our Families Council; Rainy Day Reserves **NO** – because it should not be increased from 3% to 4% when the population of children shrank by 5,000 between the year 2000 and 2010 AND it is for a 25-year period that binds the hands of future City leaders. Set asides are an awful way to budget – especially for any more than 5 years at a time. I would support maintaining the 3% level and renewing for up to 10 years, but not this irrational increase from 3% to 4% that locks leaders hands for 25 years. This is an amateur hour public finance proposition that should be defeated because it is so poorly thought out.
 - Retiree Health Benefits for Former Redevelopment Agency and Successor Agency Employee I will probably vote yes on this measure. If it affects just current staff, there are only 50 employees in OCII these days – half what it was before dissolution. This is a small blip on the City's budget with 28,000 employees.

- Minimum Wage Increase – YES! Of course San Francisco employees should get \$15 per hour considering the costs of living in the City. The big challenge will be making sure our immigrant neighbors get paid the minimum and are not abused by unscrupulous business owners who report on IRS W-2 forms a \$15 per hour pay wage while paying the immigrant employee less than minimum wage under threat of reporting them to the immigration ICE police if they question why they are not paid minimum wage.
 - Tax on Sugar-Sweetened Beverages to Fund Food and Health Programs NO – This is a regressive tax that will not, in my opinion, change the caloric intake of San Francisco residents and may actually spur more car trips on our roads (more air pollution) to grocery shop in San Mateo County where there are fewer Nanny taxes on food. When the World Health Organization tells us over 7 million people die annually from air pollution related cancer, heart disease, respiratory issues like asthma, and so on (compared to about 3.5 million deaths from diabetes annually), shouldn't we be addressing air pollution since no one can decide to NOT breathe?
 - Pier 70 Development Site Height Limit Increase YES – 90 feet works in this area just fine.
 - Requiring Certain Athletic Fields in Golden Gate Park to be Maintained as Natural Grass YES – Why would we plastic wrap our earth, kill off natural plants and wildlife, cut down trees to build parking lots, and otherwise harm the natural surroundings of Golden Gate Park when that is our City's oasis from the concrete, steel, and glass of city life? YES, YES, YES!
 - Park Code - Children's Playgrounds, Walking Trails, Athletic Fields HELL NO – Our Recreation and Parks Department is one of the absolutely worst run City departments, in my opinion. We should not give them more powers to ignore the wishes of their bosses, that is the citizens of San Francisco. No way.
 - Surtax on Transfers of Residential Real Property Within Five Years of a Prior Transfer YES – This may not have a big effect in general because it will just influence investors to hold on to their properties for 5 years to avoid the tax. It could help curb the quick in and quick out speculators, and that's a good thing for the social fabric of San Francisco. We need to do something to slow down the hollowing out of our City by global investors hungry for a safe investment with a yield better than US Treasuries.
 - Affordable Housing Goals – Yes.
 - Policy Regarding Transportation Priorities in San Francisco - HELL NO – so backwards when we see the air pollution and traffic congestion problems that already exist to give up management of our on-street parking.
4. Why is our club endorsement important to you? Because this is my home Democratic Club, it'd be an honor to get an endorsement for at least one of the ranked choice positions. We do have 3 choices when we vote for Supervisor after all. I am the first candidate in awhile whom the east side of SoMa can trust will represent our interests as I have been doing as a resident and member of the SBRMBNA for years.