

## A quick look at the results of San Francisco's ballot measures from the 11/06 election

David Latterman  
Fall Line Analytics  
dlatterman@flanalytics.com

The following are precinct maps and Progressive Voter Index (PVI)<sup>1</sup> correlations for the San Francisco ballot measures from the November 7, 2006 election. The data are taken from the preliminary Statement of Vote, which is about 2-3% short of the final turnout total. However, precinct percentages for measure results are assumed to be nearly identical with what will be the certified result.

The first map is turnout, which was good throughout the city, averaging 60%. As usual, Districts 7 and 8 led the way, with the Castro and Diamond Heights leading overall with just over 70%. Districts 10 and 11 had low turnout compared to the rest of the city, with neighborhood turnouts in the 30's and 40's. Districts 4 and 6, which had contentious Supervisorial races, had high 50's/low 60's, and high 40's through low 60's, respectively. This can be considered a decent turnout given the declining trend of recent elections in San Francisco and California.

This election was thought to have swung "to the left", as all but one of the San Francisco measures passed. Many of the measures were thought to have been socially liberal, like approving paid sick leave and offering tenant relocation. This report does not combine candidate results from local or statewide elections to make any generalizations, as voters have different criteria and expectations for voting on measures and for different offices. Certainly, there are ideological platforms upon which many voters see measures and candidates, but there is enough nuance in the electorate to separate issues and candidates in the voters' minds. Candidate results will be considered in a separate report.

Below, I show the results maps and PVI correlations for all the San Francisco measures and Prop 90 from California (Eminent Domain), as that was considered to be one of the more important relevant statewide measures. Omitted are Props J and K, which were only policy declarations. Prop I was too, but it seemed relevant enough to include here as it was discussed at the Board of Supervisors. I comment on some the measures as I interpret the results, but in many ways the results were straightforward: San Francisco, despite our own local political subtleties, is a liberal city and its people, when given the chance, will usually vote for socially and fiscally liberal policies, neighborhood preservation, and tenant protection. The one exception is if it *directly* impacts a person's pocketbook, which was the case for the parking tax, the only measure to fail. Also, many people simply don't like taxes, at least at the local level. It should be noted, however, the State measures for the tobacco tax (86) and oil company tax (87) passed easily in San Francisco, while the parcel tax barely passed (88).

All maps are to the same scale.  $R^2$  values are provided with the PVI correlations. Y-axis for the measures is *percent yes*. Table 1 shows overall results for the measures displayed here.


---

<sup>1</sup> Please see <http://www.sfusualsuspects.com/Latterman-DeLeon%20-%20New%20PVI%2009%2011%2006.pdf> for a description of this index. In short, a precinct with a low number is politically more conservative, while a higher number indicates a more liberal precinct.

Table 1: SF Measure results (as of November 30, 2006)

Measure	Title	Percent Yes
SF Prop A	School bond	73.8
SF Prop B	Teleconferencing	72.2
SF Prop C	Salaries for officials	63.3
SF Prop D	Info disclosure	64.3
SF Prop E	Parking tax	32.8
SF Prop F	Sick leave	60.9
SF Prop G	Chain store limits	58.2
SF Prop H	Relocation assistance	52.9
SF Prop I	Monthly Mayoral meetings	56.3
Cal Prop 90	Eminent domain	29.0

Figure 1: PSOV Turnout for 11/06, about 2-3% less than the final anticipated certified turnout



Props A and B are straightforward victories for the School Bond and Teleconferencing. Both passed with over 70% of the vote, and correlated well to PVI, although the prop A correlation was stronger at  $R^2 = 0.81$ . Voting slightly more highly against these (and even then it was still almost entirely 'yes'), were parts of D4 and D7.

Figure 2: Percent yes for SF Prop A




Figure 3: Correlation of SF Prop A to PVI




Figure 4: Percent yes for SF Prop B





Figure 5: Correlation of SF Prop B to PVI



Props C and D each passed with around 63% of the electorate. Prop C was approved with strong support of the city’s more liberal community, which runs in a notable diagonal line from the Haight to Mid-market to the mission down to Bayview/Hunter’s Pont (BVHP). Only in parts of D7 and D2 did this fail. Although this was sold as a good government measure, some voters saw this as a referendum on the performance of the elected officials.


Prop D passed pretty well, but the electoral trends diverge from the usual left-right divide. Most strongly supporting this was BVHP, Vis valley, and OMI, all with higher African-American proportions. Interestingly, Prop D did well in both the tenderloin and Mission Bay. Clearly, this measure struck a chord with the black community. Yet, the Inner and Outer Mission has similar values to the rest of the city, indicating the Latino community did not feel quite as strongly. In fact, the Pearson R correlation of the black precinct percentage to Yes on D was a strongly significant 0.474. The correlation with the Latino percentage was 0.142.<sup>2</sup>

Parts of D7 and D2 voted against Prop D, but not that strongly. Prop D was mostly sold as privacy protection for citizens, but there were some reservation about the clarity of the measure, and whether it would interfere with the Sunshine Act. It is likely, however, most voters saw “privacy” in the ballot title and voted on that.

As discussed earlier, prop E (the parking tax) was the one measure to be defeated, and rather soundly at that. It should be noted that this was the only measure to receive significant funding to defeat it, mostly from the downtown business community. I do think, however, this may have lost on its own.

Prop E had a strong PVI correlation, meaning only the more liberal communities voted for the tax. This correlated pretty well with the sales tax measure in 2004 (Prop J) (Figure 6), but D10 voted more strongly for the parking tax and the sales tax. It should be noted, though, that ‘support’ in this case was still in the 40’s and 50’s. It should be clear by now that taxes don’t pass easily in San Francisco.

Figure 6: Correlation of the parking tax to the 2004 sales tax measure.



<sup>2</sup> Still significant at the 99% level.

Figure 7: Percent yes for SF Prop C




Figure 8: Correlation of SF Prop C to PVI




Figure 9: Percent yes for SF Prop D




Figure 10: Correlation of SF Prop D to PVI




Figure 11: Percent yes for SF Prop E





Figure 12: Correlation of SF Prop E to PVI



Props F, G, and H were three polarizing issues that generally fell upon the left-right ideological divide in San Francisco. Prop F, paid sick leave, was seen as fairness to workers versus an anti-business mentality in San Francisco. This had the highest yes total of these three measures with around 60%. The PVI correlation was decent but not as strong as others we've seen, with an  $R^2$  of 0.55. To me, this shows some variation within the standard divisions with which we are familiar. Also, notice that while D2 and D7 not surprisingly felt strongly against this, D4 generally supported Prop F. In addition, D8 did not support Prop F as strongly as would normally be assumed from its high PVI scores.

Prop G correlated well to PVI, which surprised me a little because I would have thought we'd see more neighborhood cohesion irrespective of political leanings. But generally, people voted somewhat ideologically on this. Note that D10 and D11, which are currently discussing bringing more business to its neighborhoods, voted pretty strongly **for** this.

Prop H ended up being pretty close, passing with around 53% of the vote. This matches the eviction disclosure measure from June 2006 (Prop B), showing that tenant's rights measures are receiving a consistent 52-53% of the vote. This is notable because the percentage of renters in San Francisco is around 64-66%. Thus, there is a bloc of renters not supporting these measures.<sup>3</sup> Looking at the PVI correlation of Prop H, and a correlation of Prop H to June's Prop B (Figure 19), we see that the PVI anomalies are in D6 and D3, which voted disproportionately high for Prop H. By looking at the map, we see the neighborhoods in question are the Tenderloin and Tendernob areas. The Tenderloin has resisted gentrification pressure for a century, while some of the large building evictions are in D3 and along the Van Ness corridor. These election results may be a pushback from that.

Also, Prop H did well in BVHP and Western Addition, African-American communities with gentrification pressures of their own. These communities are already seeing a population decline, and this result seems to acknowledge the housing pressures that will be continued to place upon these communities.

Figure 20 shows a correlation of owned housing units, by precinct, to Prop H. The areas of San Francisco that voted lower on Prop H relative to being high renter districts are in D2 (not a surprise) and D1 (a bit more surprising).

---

<sup>3</sup> Although it is clear that homeowners vote more frequently than renters, so this effect may be mitigated.

Figure 13: Percent yes for SF Prop F




Figure 14: Correlation of SF Prop F to PVI




Figure 15: Percent yes for SF Prop G




Figure 16: Correlation of SF Prop G to PVI




Figure 17: Percent yes for SF Prop H




Figure 18: Correlation of SF Prop H to PVI




Figure 19: Correlation of Prop H with the eviction disclosure ordinance of June, 2006.




Figure 20: Correlation of Prop H with precinct homeowner percentage.




Figure 21: Percent yes for SF Prop I




Figure 22: Correlation of SF Prop I to PVI




Figure 23: Percent yes for Cal Prop 90




Figure 24: Correlation of Cal Prop 90 to PVI

