

NOVEMBER 3, 2026, BALLOT includes:

US Representative in Congress (District 11), State Senator (District 11), State Assembly Member (District 17), State Offices (Governor, Lt Governor, Secretary of State, Controller, Treasurer, Attorney General, Insurance Commissioner, Board of Equalization); State Judicial Offices (Supreme Court, Court of Appeal); SF Board of Education (3 seats), SF Community College Board (3 seats), SF Public Defender, SF Assessor-Recorder, BART Director District 8, SF Ballot Measures (10), Regional Measure (1), and State Ballot Measures (14).

RESOURCES—LINKS TO STATE & LOCAL VOTING INFO, BALLOT MEASURES and HOW TO EVALUATE PROPOSITIONS**Ways to Vote:** <https://www.sf.gov/ways-to-vote>

- **Vote-by-Mail:** (Ballots automatically sent to all registered voters 29 days before 11/3, approx. 10/5)
- **Vote at Voting Center (City Hall):** <https://www.sf.gov/vote-in-person> starts 10/5, 8-5 weekdays and some weekends
- **Vote in person on Nov 3:** <https://www.sf.gov/vote-in-person> (501 voting precincts will be open including regular locations in Barbary Coast neighborhood)
- **Ballot drop locations:** <https://voterguide.sfelections.org/general-information/official-ballot-drop-boxes-san-francisco>. (37 sites city-wide; 3 in District 3 starting Oct 5)
- **Voter Portal:** <https://sfelections.org/tools/portal/> (info about your voter registration and more)
- **Ranked-Choice Voting:** <https://www.sf.gov/ranked-choice-voting> (Instructions, explanations)

San Francisco Voter Information Pamphlet for candidates and propositions:

- Online: Available approximately 5 weeks before Election Day at [LINK](#)

Information about Candidates & Propositions from local and state election offices

- **Candidates:** <https://www.sf.gov/candidates-november-3-2026-general-election>
- **SF School Board candidates:** <https://www.kqed.org/voterguide/sanfrancisco/school>
- **SF Propositions (includes pro/opponents):** <https://www.sf.gov/qualified-ballot-measures>
- **State Propositions:** <https://www.sos.ca.gov/elections/ballot-measures/qualified-ballot-measures>
- **Candidates for State Office:** <https://voterguide.sos.ca.gov/candidates/>

More information about state and local ballot propositions: Links to organizations providing nonpartisan recommendations/endorsements on candidates and propositions:

- <https://lwvsf.org/ballot-recommendations> (SF League of Women Voters-SF Propositions)¹
- <https://lwvc.org/ballot-recommendations/#online> (League of Women Voters-CA propositions)²
- <https://www.kqed.org/voterguide> (Public Media for SF Bay Area propositions pro/con arguments)³
- **SF League of Pissed-Off Voters** provides a contrarian but well-researched view since 2004.⁴

How to evaluate ballot measures: from the League of Women Voters

- Examine what the measure seeks to accomplish. Do you agree with those goals? Do you think the proposed changes will make things better?
- Who are the real sponsors and opponents of the measure? Check where the money is coming from with [CalAccess Power Search tool](#) for campaign finance website for statewide measures.
- Is the measure written well? Will it create conflicts in law that may require court resolution or interpretation? Is it “good government,” or will it cause more problems than it will resolve?
- Does the measure create its own revenue source? Does it earmark, restrict or obligate government revenues? If so, weigh the benefit of securing funding for the measure’s program against cost of reducing flexibility in the budget.
- Does the measure mandate a government program or service without addressing how it will be funded?
- Does the measure deal with one issue that can be easily decided by a YES or NO vote? Or, is it a complex issue that should be thoroughly examined in the legislative arena?
- If the measure amends the Constitution, consider whether it really belongs in the Constitution. Would a statute accomplish the same purpose? What is put into the Constitution must come back to the ballot to be changed.
- Be wary of distortion tactics and commercials that rely on image but tell nothing of substance about the measure. Beware of half-truths.

SAN FRANCISCO PROPOSITIONS

Proposition Letter	Subject	Description
Props A, D, E, F	4 charter amendments proposed by Mayor Lurie in concert with SPUR to make changes in the SF's admin structure.	These charter amendments (changes to the SF constitution requiring voter approval) reflect a clear division between non-partisan civic groups and some advocacy groups with PAC funding. Groups such as GrowSF and YIMBY Action back all four measures, viewing them as administrative improvements. Non-partisan civic groups such as the League of Women Voters-SF and the SF Tenants Union oppose the package, arguing it concentrates power and reduces public oversight.
A Charter amendment	Should SF eliminate and consolidate some city boards and commissions?	Offers what supporters call "110 small fixes" for local government, such as altering how the city approves legal settlements, restructuring departments and commissions, removing reporting requirements and giving the city administrator authority over the city's real estate portfolio. Pro: Mayor Lurie, 8/11 BOS, S. Wiener, C. Stefani, M. Haney, SPUR, Grow SF, YIMBY Action, SF Chron Con: C. Chan, League Women Voters-SF; Labor Council, Homelessness Coalition, SF Neighborhood groups
B Charter amendment	Should SF create a Public Bank?	Would allow the city of San Francisco to create the governance structure for a nonprofit municipal finance corporation and public bank, which would finance projects related to affordable housing, climate infrastructure and local economic development. If passed, San Francisco would become the first U.S. city to have a municipal bank. Passes with a majority vote. Pro: 6/11 BOS, SF Foundation, League Women Voters-SF, SF Labor Council, SF Tenants Union, Small Business Forward Con: 2/11 BOS, GrowSF
C Charter amendment	Increase contributions to the SF Housing Fund?	Voters created the Housing Trust Fund in 2012 to help pay for building and repairing affordable housing, and this proposition grows the government's commitment to a program that works. It would require the city government to put more money into the Housing Trust Fund, slowly raising that amount from today's \$52 million to \$125 million each year, without raising taxes. The Board of Supervisors can temporarily lower or pause that contribution. Pro: Mayor Lurie, 6/11 BOS, League Women Voters-SF, Chinatown Community Development Center Con: SF Republican Party
D Charter amendment	Increase requirements for placing measures on ballot	Change requirements for putting a ballot measure before voters by increasing the voter signature threshold from 2% to 8% of registered voters (from 10,600 to about 42,500 signatures) or requiring approval from majority of the Board of Supervisors. It would remove mayor's unilateral ability to place measures on the ballot. Pro: Mayor, Nancy Pelosi, GrowSF, SF YIMBY, SPUR, SF Chronicle, others Con: League Women Voters-SF, SF Labor Council, SF Tenants, others
E Charter amendment	Changes to City Contracting and City Administrator's authority	Part of Mayor Lurie's triplet of proposed changes to City Hall governance. The measure significantly alters how city departments adopt technology, raises the threshold on contracts needing Board of Supervisors approval by millions of dollars and doubles the city administrator's term to 10 years. Pro: Mayor, Nancy Pelosi, 1/11 BOS, GrowSF, others Con: League Women Voters-SF, SF Labor Council, SF Tenants, others

Proposition Letter	Subject	Description
F Charter amendment	Expanding Executive Branch Management/Mayoral Power	Part of a package of propositions with A, D, and E, prop F proposes additional powers to the Mayor who claims limited power to hire/fire department heads. Non-partisan groups say it goes too far. Voters rejected a similar proposition (2024) and in 1991, voters banned similar practices that decreased transparent, accountable government and public participation. Pro: Mayor, 1/11 BOS, Nancy Pelosi, GrowSF, YIMBY Action, others Con: League Women Voters-SF, SF Labor Council, SF Tenants, others
G Ordinance	Should SF close Sunset Dunes Park on weekdays to allow Great Hwy traffic; reopen park only on weekends/holidays?	In 2024, SF voted to permanently remove cars from a 2-mile stretch of the Great Highway, creating a beachside park now called Sunset Dunes. While voters citywide approved the measure, the majority of residents who live closest to the park voted against it, sparking a yearslong debate over the west side thoroughfare. This measure would reopen it to cars on weekdays, leaving it closed to traffic on weekends and holidays. Pro: 1/11 BOS, SF Taxpayers Assoc, Chinese-American Democratic Club, others Con: GrowSF, SPUR, Scott Wiener, Sierra Club-BayArea, Sunset Parents, others Neutral: League of Women Voters-SF
H Ordinance	Parcel Tax to Fund MUNI Operations over next 15 years.	Establishes an annual parcel tax based on the type of property and its square footage, with additional tax levied if properties exceed the base rate. Most single-family homeowners would pay \$129, with added fees for homes exceeding 3,000 square feet. Base rates for multifamily parcels start at \$249; nonresidential and mixed-use parcels start at \$799. Would generate approximately \$177 million annually for Muni transit operations and administration. Pro: Mayor, SF Chamber of Commerce, SF Labor Council, League Women Voters-SF, GrowSF Con: SF Republican Party
I Ordinance	Changes to Real Property Transfer Tax	Redirects half the money SF already collects when a property worth \$10M or more is sold into a new 'House SF Fund' dedicated to affordable housing. Also locks in SF's transfer tax; today the BOS can lower it by ordinance, but under Prop I only voters can. New buildings get a 50% break on their first sale. Prop I's supporters reasonably argue that affordable housing gets short shrift in the annual budget process but opponents believe it adds a bureaucratic impediment that was tried in LA and failed. Pro: Affordable Housing Alliance, SF Tenants Union, League Women Voters-SF, United Educators-SF, SF League Pissed Off Voters, others Con: SF Taxpayers-Quentin Kopp, SF Building Trades Council, GrowSF, other trade unions, SF Chronicle
J Ordinance	Removal of Foreclosure Exemption for Real Property Transfer Tax	Ends the foreclosure exemption for large properties while keeping it in place for single-family homes, condos, smaller apartment buildings, etc. The SF Controller expects \$100M to \$150M/yr over the first 5 years. Opponents say lending here will get riskier; however, estimates, even in a worst case, Prop J adds about 0.1%/yr to a large loan, a rounding error next to the 2% lenders charge for risk. Pro: Mayor, S. Wiener, C. Stefani, M. Haney, 7/11 BOS, GrowSF, League Women Voters-SF, Con: SF Taxpayers-Quentin Kopp
RTM Regional Measure	Should 5 Bay Area counties adopt a new sales tax to fund operations at some of the region's largest transit agencies and pay for other transportation improvements?	Establishes a half-cent sales tax in Alameda, Contra Costa, San Mateo and Santa Clara counties, and a 1-cent sales tax in San Francisco, over the next 14 years. The tax would generate an estimated \$1 billion annually and would be used to fund operations at AC Transit, BART, Caltrain, Muni and other transit agencies. It also funds repaving of transit routes, wayfinding and accessibility programs. Passes with a majority of the combined vote from the five participating counties. Pro: Mayor, 7/11 BOS, City Attorney, League Women Voters-BayArea, Public Advocates, Labor Council, SPUR, Bike Coalition, BayArea Council, GrowSF Con: SF Taxpayers-Quentin Kopp, ConnectedSF

STATEWIDE PROPOSITIONS

Voters will decide on 14 propositions. [The propositions include](#) major issues that will change the lives of many Californians, including voter identification requirements, revisions to tax laws, and expanded access to low-cost mortgages.

Prop 1: \$11 Billion Bonds for Affordable Housing

Prop 2: Double Size of Rainy Day Fund

Prop 3: Make Permanent the Tax on High Incomes

Prop 4: Public Campaign Finance

Prop 5: Recall Election Reform

Prop 37: Loans for Middle-Income Buyers of New Homes

Prop 38: \$8.4 Billion Bonds for Immunology Research

Prop 39: Voter ID

Prop 40: Billionaire Tax

Prop 41: Thwart the Billionaire Tax, Part 1

Prop 42: Thwart the Billionaire Tax, Part 2

Prop 43: Close the “Upland Loophole” on Local Taxes

Prop 44: Require Clinics to Spend 90% on Healthcare

Prop 45: Speed up Environmental Reviews

How to get good information about these propositions? Here are some well-established resources:

- Mailed to every registered voter, the Secretary of State issues the [official California Voter Information Guide](#) with a summary of each proposition and 174 pages of legal text.
- Six of the 14 are tax-related. [Prop 40](#), seeks to impose a one-time 5% wealth tax on billionaires. [SF Chronicle](#) outlined some of the tax measures and the reasons for them.⁵
- [CalMatters](#), a non-profit news source is non-partisan and independent from commercial or political interests providing a Voter Guide with short quizzes for each measure.
- [KQED](#), a public, noncommercial, nonpartisan broadcasting company publishes a Voter Guide with pro-con arguments for each of the statewide propositions.
- The non-partisan [League of Women Voters-CA recommends](#) a YES-vote on 5 propositions (1-5), Neutral on one proposition (40), and a NO-vote on 8 propositions (37-39, 41-45).⁶
- Additional non-partisan resources and ballot measure endorsements include: [Ballotpedia](#) provides non-partisan, unbiased information for all US state elections⁷; and [Pete Rates the Propositions](#) with a non-partisan and well-researched election review since 1980⁸

¹ For each election, the **League of Women Voters of San Francisco** reviews the local propositions, also called ballot measures. “We don’t hold meetings for supporters and opponents to present their views. Instead, we make endorsements based on our [positions](#) and [principles](#). Our positions are developed using a [grassroots process](#). **We’re nonpartisan**, which means we do not support or oppose any political parties or candidates. **Our nonpartisan analysis of propositions** starts with research by our [Advocacy Committee](#). They write recommendations for whether LWVSF should **support** or **oppose** each proposition. Sometimes we have competing positions and are **neutral**. If we don’t have relevant positions, we take **no position**. In a few situations, such as recalls and declarations of policy, we have **no recommendation**. Finally, our [board of directors](#) votes, and we publish our endorsements.”

² The **League of Women Voters of California (LWV-CA)** is a nonpartisan, grassroots organization working to protect and expand voting rights, build grassroots power in our communities, drive policy change on the biggest challenges facing our state, and ensure everyone is represented in our democracy.

³ **KQED Voter Guide** <https://www.kqed.org/voterguide> for Bay Area and California elections. KQED is a public, nonprofit news source providing nonpartisan analysis of California and Bay Area elections.

⁴ **The SF Pissed-Off Voters League:** Real people do the researching, endorsing, writing, editing, designing, and distributing of the Pissed Off Voter Guide. No oligarch or AI had a hand in any step of creating this voter guide. **Want to know why we recommend voting this way?** [Keep reading](#) for our research and snarky analysis! <https://www.theleaguesf.org/>

⁵ **SF Chronicle Election Endorsements:** The editorial board is on the opinion side of the Chronicle, completely distinct from the newsroom. This gives us the license we need to make value judgments. But we are still journalists. It's our task to cut through the BS and lay out the facts like any other reporter does. Members of the editorial board — Editorial Page Editor Matthew Fleischer, Publisher Bill Nagel, Editorial Writers Emily Hoeven and Allison Arieff and editors David Knowles, Harry Mok and Pete Wevurski — spend hours researching each race. This cycle, Hoeven is focusing on statewide offices and ballot measures, while Arieff is concentrating on local contests.

⁶ **The LWV-CA** acts on some of the most important and challenging issues facing California. “However, we only act on an issue when we have a position addressing that issue. League positions reflect the consensus of the membership after studying an issue, debating it, and voting to adopt a specific position. These positions, enacted and evolved by members over the lifetime of the League, are the guideposts for all of our actions on issues. If members have not studied and come to consensus on an issue, we have no position and no stand on that issue. Issues can be studied and positions adopted at the National, State and local League levels.

⁷ **Ballotpedia** is the digital encyclopedia of American politics, and the nation's non-profit resource for unbiased information on elections, politics, and policy. <https://ballotpedia.org/Ballotpedia:About> and provides information on the 2026 elections in California, including the [offices on the ballot](#) covered by Ballotpedia, [election dates](#), and [frequently asked questions](#).

⁸ **Pete Stahl** has been rating California ballot propositions since 1980. A native of San Diego and graduate of La Jolla High School, Pete started writing his reviews while a student at Harvard. As a new voter, he was appalled at the hysterical tone and utter lack of objectivity of the official arguments in the ballot pamphlet. He felt an acute need for a disinterested party to cut through the posturing and provide sensible summaries and opinions. It struck him that his own research and ideas might be of use, so he typed up his recommendations (yes, on a typewriter) and circulated them among friends and family under the title *Pete Rates the Propositions*. Since then, *Pete Rates* has grown into a popular resource for voters across the state, first as a paper pamphlet, and since 2003 as a website, at www.peterates.com.