

San Francisco Voter Information Pamphlet

Special Election
June 2, 1987
Sample Ballot
Page 4

DOCUMENTS DEPT.

JUN 5 1987

SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

SF
R45

1

6/2/87

56

Jay Patterson
Registrar of Voters

Voter Information Pamphlet

GENERAL INFORMATION

	Page
Voting Instructions	3
Sample Ballot	4
Your rights as a voter	6
Words you need to know	7
Handicapped information	7, 40
Absentee Ballot Application	39
Location of your Polling Place	40

PROPOSITIONS

PROPOSITION A

Would change the zoning classification of the site of the former Polytechnic High School.

Analysis	9
Arguments	10-18
Legal Text	34

PROPOSITION B

Would change the zoning classification of the site of the Balboa Reservoir.

Analysis	19
Arguments	20-28
Legal Text	34

PROPOSITION C

Would permit office and housing construction in the development known as Executive Park.

Analysis	29
Arguments	30-32
Legal Text	34

CREDITS


The analyses of the ballot measures which appear in this publication were prepared by the San Francisco Ballot Simplification Committee, a nonpartisan group appointed by the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors. The members of the Committee are Mary Ann Aronson (Chair), Bernard O. Beck, Herb Levy, Beverly Ornstein, Dick Robertson and Mary Martin. They were assisted by Tom Owen of the City Attorney's Office.

The 5th Congressional District

Voters in the 5th Congressional District (larger area, map, right) will be choosing a representative in congress as well as voting on Propositions A, B, and C.

Voters in the 6th Congressional District (Northwest portion of the City) will vote only on Propositions A, B, and C.

RACE FOR THE 5TH DISTRICT



Examiner

HOW TO VOTE ON THE VOTOMATIC VOTE RECORDER

SPECIAL NOTE:

**IF YOU MAKE A MISTAKE, RETURN
YOUR CARD AND GET ANOTHER.**

如何用自動投票機

A 請特別注意

如有錯誤，請向助理員換取新選票。

STEP

1

Nota: Si hace algún error, devuelva su tarjeta de votar y obtenga otra.


USING BOTH HANDS

INSERT THE BALLOT CARD ALL THE WAY INTO THE VOTOMATIC.

Usando las dos manos, meta la tarjeta de votar completamente dentro del "Votomatic."

B 第一步

請雙手持票向自動機將整張選票插入。



STEP


2

BE SURE THE TWO SLOTS IN THE
STUB OF YOUR CARD FIT DOWN
OVER THE TWO RED PINS.

Paso 2. Asegúrese de que los dos orificios que hay al final de la tarjeta coinciden con las dos cabecitas rojas.

C 第二步

請切記將選票插入時，票尾之二孔，接合於二紅點之上。



STEP


3

HOLD PUNCH VERTICAL (STRAIGHT UP). PUNCH STRAIGHT DOWN THROUGH THE BALLOT CARD TO INDICATE YOUR CHOICE. DO NOT USE PEN OR PENCIL.

Para votar, sostenga el instrumento de votar y perfore con él la tarjeta de votar en el lugar de los candidatos de su preferencia. No use pluma ni lápiz.

D 第三步

請把帶鍊之選舉針，由小孔內垂直插入
打孔投票。



STEP

4

AFTER VOTING, WITHDRAW THE BALLOT CARD AND PLACE IT INSIDE THE ENVELOPE POCKET, WITH THE STUB SHOWING.

Despues de votar, saque la tarjeta del "Votomatic" y póngala bajo el cierre del sobre.

第四步

投票選舉之後，把選票取出，放入空封袋內，票尾凸出在外。

在封袋上，有空白格預備為投票人應用。

特別選舉 一九八七年六月二日 (ELECCION ESPECIAL) (2 DE JUNIO DE 1987) CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO SPECIAL ELECTION JUNE 2, 1987	UNITED STATES REPRESENTATIVE	美國眾議員 (Unexpired term ending January 3, 1989) (REPRESENTANTE DE LOS ESTADOS UNIDOS) United States Representative	請選一名 Vote por Uno Vote for One
	SAM GROVE, Libertarian Electronics Technician (Técnico en Electrónica) 電子技術員 290 →	KAREN EDWARDS, Independent Editor (Editora) 編輯 291 →	HARRIET ROSS, Republican Deputy Public Defender (Diputada Defensora Publico) 副公案辯護人 292 →
		CATHY SEDWICK, Independent Auto Worker (Trabajadora de Auto) 汽車修理工 294 →	NANCY PELOSI, Democratic Businesswoman (Mujer de Negocios) 商人 295 →
		(WRITE-IN:) To vote for a candidate whose name does <u>not</u> appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated. 296 →	
MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS	A	Shall the ordinance re-zoning the site of the former Polytechnic High School at 701 Frederick Street from P (Public) to RH-3 (House, Three-Family) be adopted?	YES 298 → NO 299 →
	B	Shall the ordinance re-zoning the Balboa Reservoir South site at Ocean and Phelan Avenues from P (Public) to RH-1 (House, One-Family) be adopted?	YES 302 → NO 303 →
	C	Shall the City exempt certain office developments including 500 or more housing units from the annual limit on new office construction if the project was approved before November 1986?	YES 306 → NO 307 →
	END OF BALLOT		

(Proposition D was removed from the ballot just before press time. Please disregard any references to it that occur elsewhere in this pamphlet.)

PROPOSICIONES A SER SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES

提交選民表決的提案－市和縣提案

←	298 SI	贊成	¿ Debería de adoptarse la ordenanza para rezonar el lugar de la antigua Escuela Secundaria Politécnica situada en el 701 de la Calle Frederick de P (Pública) a RH-3 (Casa, Familia-Tres)?	應否通過法令，把位於 701 Frederick 街的原工藝中學舊址，從 P (公共) 區域重劃為 RH-3 (住屋，三單元家庭) 區域？	A
←	299 NO	反對			

←	302 SI	贊成	¿ Debería de adoptarse la ordenanza para rezonar el lugar de la Represa Balboa Sur situada entre las Avenidas Ocean y Phelan de P (Pública) a RH-1 (Casa, Familia-Uno)?	應否通過法令，把位於 Ocean 和 Phelan Avenue 的巴保亞蓄水池南區從 P (公共) 區域重劃為 RH-1 (住屋，一單元家庭) 區域？	B
←	303 NO	反對			

←	306 SI	贊成	¿ Debería la ciudad exonerar ciertos proyectos de oficinas que incluyan 500 ó más unidades de viviendas del límite anual de oficinas nuevas en construcción si el proyecto fué aprobado antes de Noviembre de 1986?	本市某些辦公樓建築，包括五百以上單元住屋的建築，如果這些建築於一九八六年十一月之前已獲批准，它們應否獲豁免於每年新辦公樓建築的限額之外？	C
←	307 NO	反對			

FINAL DE LA BALOTA

選票到此為止

YOUR RIGHTS AS A VOTER

by Ballot Simplification Committee

Q—Who can vote?

A—You can vote at this election only if you registered to vote by May 4, 1987.

Q—Who can register to vote?

A—You can register to vote if you:

- are a U.S. Citizen,
- are at least 18 years of age on election day,
- are a resident of California, and
- are not imprisoned or on parole for the conviction of a felony.

Q—How do I register?

A—Phone the Registrar of Voters at 554-4399. You will be sent a form.

Q—Do I have to belong to a political party?

A—Only if you want to. If you don't want to tell what political party you consider yours you can check the box on the form saying that you "Decline to State." At this election it doesn't matter what party you belong to.

Q—If I have picked a party, can I vote for candidates of another political party?

A—At an election such as this one you can vote for any candidate whose name appears on your ballot.

Q—Once I have signed up, do I have to do it again?

A—Only if you have moved.

Q—If I have been convicted of a felony, can I sign up to vote?

A—Yes, if you have served your sentence and parole.

Q—What candidates will voters be choosing at this election?

A—Voters in the 5th Congressional District *only* will be choosing a Congressional Representative. Voters not residing in the 5th District will vote only on the propositions described in this book.

Q—Where do I go to vote?

A—Your polling place is printed above your name and address sent with this Voters' Pamphlet (back cover).

Q—If I don't know what to do when I get to my polling place, is there someone there to help me?

A—Yes, the workers at the polling place will help you. If they can't help you, call 554-4380.

Q—When do I vote?

A—The election will be Tuesday, June 2, 1987. Your polling place is open from 7 A.M. to 8 P.M. that day.

Q—What do I do if my voting place is not open?

A—Call 554-4380.

Q—Can I take my sample ballot into the voting booth even if I've written on it?

A—Yes. Writing on your sample ballot will aid you in voting and will eliminate long lines at the polls.

Q—Can I vote for someone whose name is not on the ballot?

A—Yes. This is called a "write-in". If you want to and don't know how, ask one of the workers to help you. The poll workers will have a list of eligible write-ins.

Q—What do I do if I cannot work the voting machine?

A—Ask the workers and they will help you.

Q—Can a worker at the voting place ask me to take any test?

A—No.

Q—Is it true that I can take time off from my job to go vote on election day?

A—No, that law only applies to statewide elections. This is not a statewide election.

Q—Is there any way to vote besides going to the polls on election day?

A—Yes. You can vote early by:

- Going to the Registrar of Voters office in City Hall and voting there, or
- mailing in the application sent with this voters' handbook (application is printed on the inside back cover).

Q—What can I do if I do not have an application form?

A—An application form is not necessary. You can send a letter or postcard asking for an absentee ballot. This letter or postcard should be sent to the Registrar of Voters, City Hall, San Francisco 94102.

Q—What do I say when I ask for an absentee ballot?

A—You must write:

- your home address,
- the address where you want the ballot mailed,
- then sign your name, and also clearly print your name underneath.

Q—When do I mail my absentee ballot back to the Registrar of Voters?

A—You should mail your absentee ballot back to the Registrar of Voters as soon as possible. You must be sure your absentee ballot gets to the Registrar of Voters by 8 P.M. on election day, June 2, 1987.

IF YOU HAVE OTHER QUESTIONS CONCERNING VOTING CALL THE REGISTRAR OF VOTERS.

RIGHTS OF THE HANDICAPPED VOTER

1. Persons unable to mark their ballot may bring one or two persons with them into the voting booth to assist them.

2. If architectural barriers prevent a handicapped voter from entering the polling place then the voter will be allowed to vote a ballot on the sidewalk in front of the polling place (Section 14234, Elections Code).

3. A recent law allows the handicapped to apply as "Permanent Absentee Voters". A permanent absentee voter will receive a ballot in the mail at all future elections. When you apply for an absentee ballot you will receive an application for permanent absentee voter status.

WORDS YOU NEED TO KNOW

by Ballot Simplification Committee

Here are a few of the words that you will need to know:

BALLOT—An official list of candidates and propositions.

ABSENTEE BALLOT—If you wish to vote by mail you can get a special ballot to fill out. This ballot is called an absentee ballot. You can get this ballot by writing to the Registrar of Voters at City Hall. Please refer to the insert card in the pamphlet.

VOTE BY MAIL—See Absentee Ballot, above.

POLLING PLACE—The place where you go to vote.

PROPOSITION—This means any issue that you vote on. If it deals with City & County government it will have a letter, such as Proposition A. If it deals with State government it will have a number, such as Proposition 1.

MEASURE—Another name for proposition.

CHALLENGE—Officers at the polls can challenge a voter for various reasons, such as living in a different precinct from the one in which he or she is voting.

SUPERVISORS—Elected members of the governing legislative body for the City and County of San Francisco.

CHARTER AMENDMENT—The charter is the basic set of laws for the city government. A charter amendment changes one of those basic laws. It takes a vote of the people to change the charter. It cannot be changed again without another vote of the people.

ORDINANCE—A law of the city and county, which is passed by the Board of Supervisors or approved by the voters.

DECLARATION OF POLICY—A declaration of policy asks a question: Do you agree or disagree with a certain idea? If a majority of the voters approve of a declaration of policy, the supervisors must carry out the policy, to the extent legally possible.

INITIATIVE—This is a way for voters to put a proposition on the ballot for people to vote on. An initiative is put on the ballot by getting a certain number of voters to sign a petition. Each initiative ordinance needs signatures from 7,332 qualified voters. An ordinance passed by the people cannot be changed again without another vote of the people, unless the initiative expressly gives the Board of Supervisors the power to change it. An initiative Charter amendment needs 22,834 signatures.

PETITION—A list of signatures of voters who agree that a certain idea or question should be on the ballot.

REFERENDUM—If a legislative body passes a law you don't agree with you can put that law on the ballot for people to vote on if you get enough signatures on a petition asking that this be done. This is called a referendum. A referendum petition needs 14,664 signatures.

PERMIT (noun)—A document issued by the City which allows one to do a particular act, such as construct a building.

ZONING, RE-ZONING—All land in the City is classified according to what type of building or other land-use is permitted there. Property zoned "P" may only be used for public uses; Property zoned "RH-1" (house, one family) or "RH-3" (house, three family) may be used only for residential use. Re-zoning is a change in the type of land use that is permitted on a particular property.


NEXT TIME YOU MOVE...

DON'T LEAVE YOUR VOTE BEHIND!

You must re-register to vote whenever you move.

Site Locations of Propositions A, B & C

(Circles are larger than the property sites)



Site of Former
"Poly" High
(PROPOSITION A)

Site of
Balboa Reservoir
South Basin
(PROPOSITION B)

Site of
Executive Park
Proposed Expansion
(PROPOSITION C)

"Poly" ReZoning Referendum

A

PROPOSITION A

Shall the ordinance re-zoning the site of the former Polytechnic High School at 701 Frederick Street from P (Public) to RH-3 (House, Three-Family) be adopted?

YES 298 ➡

NO 299 ➡

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Zoning laws regulate what types of buildings or activities are allowed in a particular area. The site of the former Polytechnic High School at 701 Frederick Street is zoned P (Public). Property which is zoned P (Public) may be used for government buildings. With the permission of the City Planning Commission, it may also be used for schools, community centers, parks and other similar uses.

The Board of Supervisors passed and the Mayor signed Ordinance No. 410-86, which re-zones the former Polytechnic High School site from P (Public) to RH-3 (House, Three-Family).

Most ordinances do not become law until 30 days after they are adopted. Before this ordinance became law, a referendum petition was filed. A referendum petition, when signed

by enough qualified voters, requires that the ordinance named in the petition be submitted to the voters. The ordinance does not go into effect unless and until a majority of the voters vote in favor of it.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition A is an ordinance which re-zones the former Polytechnic High School site at 701 Frederick Street from P (Public) to RH-3 (House, Three-Family). Property which is zoned RH-3 (House, Three-Family) may be used for three-unit houses.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the former Polytechnic High School site to be zoned RH-3 (House, Three-Family).

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the former Polytechnic High School site to be zoned P (Public).

How "A" Got on the Ballot

Proposition A is a referendum petition that was filed with the Registrar of Voters on November 9, 1986. The petition contained 26,092 signatures.

On December 26 the Registrar certified that the petition had 19,900 valid signatures of registered voters. This is more than the 14,664 valid signatures that the City Charter requires for a referendum to be placed on the ballot.

**THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION A
APPEARS ON PAGE 34.**

Controller's Statement on "A"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition A:

"Should this ordinance be approved, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a product of its possible future application, there could be an increase in the assessment roll and cost of government. The potential property tax revenues and costs, if any, being dependent upon an anticipated development's assessed valuation and other factors, cannot be determined at this time."

A

"Poly" ReZoning Referendum

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

If there is one issue that unites the City, it is the need for more housing and that is what Proposition "A" is all about.

Your "YES" vote will ensure the construction of 114 single family, two, three and four bedroom affordable homes on the site of the long vacant and blighted Polytechnic High School across from Kezar Stadium.

These single family homes, with ample garage space, will sell from \$92,000 to \$137,000—well below the price of comparable new housing.

Only first time home buyers will be eligible and mortgages will be at 7½% fixed rate, 30 years, for most units. The maximum mortgage will be 9½%.

The homes are designed and ready to go. Financing has been secured and a Community Advisory Committee has participated in all decisions every step of the way.

Your "YES" vote will let the City get on with the business of building these urgently needed family homes.

Let's not let disgruntled interests stop one of the most important single family housing opportunities of the decade. The Polytechnic

site is ideal. The old high school, with its broken windows and blighted appearance, has been declared surplus by the San Francisco Unified School District and is currently undergoing demolition.

Please vote "YES" on Proposition A and enable a family to buy a spanking new three bedroom, two bath home with garage right in the very heart of our City. Your "YES" vote will make it so.

The housing must be built and sold by November, 1989, in order to retain the low fixed rate, 30-year mortgages. Otherwise, we lose the opportunity for working men and women and their families to buy homes they can afford.

This plan has the support of the Council of Community Housing Organizations, the Old Saint Mary's Housing Association, the Chamber of Commerce, labor and other citywide groups as well as dozens of Haight-Ashbury representatives who have worked so hard on this project.

Please vote "Yes" for 114 affordable single family homes.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

A yes vote on Proposition A means more affordable housing for San Franciscans and their families.

The plans to build 114 affordable housing units at the site of the former Polytechnic High School are the result of years of policy decisions aimed at providing more affordable housing in our City and increasing homeownership opportunities for San Franciscans.

The former Polytechnic High School building, a vacant and dilapidated structure for the past 15 years, has been declared "surplus city property" and identified as an appropriate location for a housing development project. A year and a half ago, the School District issued a 75-year lease to the City at a cost of \$2.5 million dollars; the City promptly initiated an extensive public review process and held numerous neighborhood and public meetings.

This public process resulted in a well-designed project which will contain 114 affordable housing units at the site of the former Polytechnic High School site.

The final step in allowing new housing to be built on this site is the passage of an ordinance approved by the Board of Supervisors and signed by the Mayor which rezoned the former Polytechnic

High School site from P (Public) to RH-3 (Medium Density Residential). A Yes vote on Proposition A will affirm this rezoning ordinance.

San Francisco has the most expensive housing in the nation, with average home prices of over \$165,000. The homes to be built at the Poly High site would be sold to first-time homebuyers at prices ranging from \$90,000 to \$135,000. The economic viability of the City is greatly dependent upon providing these opportunities for low to moderate income San Franciscans and their families. In addition, special low-cost financing for first-time homebuyers will be lost unless this rezoning proceeds now.

Everybody from the Chamber of Commerce to neighborhood activists are behind this proposal. The only opposition comes from the efforts of a few selfish out-of-town individuals who want to threaten the project for their own personal gain.

We urge a yes vote on Proposition A.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

As members of the San Francisco Unified School District Board of Education we devoted months to working out the lease to the City for Poly High School.

Affordable family housing and a multi-purpose community center at Poly make good sense for our city, the neighborhood and schools.

Join us in voting YES on A.

*Ben Tom
JoAnne Miller
Sodonia Wilson
Libby Denebeim*

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

"Poly" ReZoning Referendum



ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

One of our City's most serious problems is the lack of housing working families and individuals can afford to purchase. A yes vote for Proposition A will permit the long delayed construction of 114 units of urgently needed housing on the site of the former Polytechnic High School.

These homes were the product of several years of very hard work by committed residents of the Haight-Ashbury and Inner Sunset neighborhoods and the City. Building these homes will carry out the expressed will of the voters of San Francisco to utilize unused, vacant city-owned land such as the Polytechnic High School site for

the construction of badly needed housing.

This housing will make available the dream of home ownership for many San Franciscans, who could not otherwise hope to buy their own homes and remain in the City where they want to live.

A strong yes vote on Proposition A will send a clear message to those selfish out-of-town interests opposing this development that San Franciscans need housing, and want housing built. . . NOW!

I urge you to vote yes on Proposition "A".

Art Agnos, Assemblyman

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

The Polytechnic High School Site, declared surplus by the School District, has been leased by the City for \$2.5 million derived from the City's Housing Affordability Fund.

The rezoning to residential has already been approved by the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors. The plans for 114 single family homes are the result of several years of planning by neighborhood leaders and the City.

The first objective of the Housing Element of the City's Comprehensive Plan is "to provide new housing for all income groups" in appropriate residential locations. To meet this goal, development of housing is to be aggressively pursued and encouraged on surplus,

underused and vacant public land.

The site of the former Polytechnic High School is large enough to accommodate a substantial number of new homes.

If you want more affordable housing in San Francisco vote yes on Proposition "A".

Toby Rosenblatt, President, City Planning Commission

Richard B. Allen, City Planning Commissioner

Bernice M. Hemphill, City Planning Commissioner

Sue Bierman, City Planning Commissioner

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

For nearly ten years the Haight Ashbury Neighborhood Council has worked with other neighborhood and community organizations to transform an abandoned school site, Poly, into a useful development meeting the needs of residents of two neighborhoods—the Haight-Ashbury and the Inner Sunset. Now that near decade of voluntary effort is threatened.

We urge all San Franciscan voters to vote YES on Proposition A.

If passed, the work of scores of neighborhood residents will be realized with the development of 114 critically needed affordable housing units, the majority being 3 and 4 bedrooms and a multi-purpose community center located in the historic gyms along Frederick Street.

Proposition A is on the ballot because a wealthy Marin county doctor wants to build a hotel across the the street from Poly. He has been turned down by the neighborhood, the City, and in 1982 the voters of San Francisco, in his attempts to rezone a residential neighborhood to allow for his hotel. Now he is holding the Poly site

hostage to his demands.

Say Yes to neighborhood planning, say Yes to affordable family housing and say Yes to the attempts of people trying to make their neighborhood better for themselves and others.

Vote Yes on A.

Paula Land, President

Joel Ventresca, Vice President

Greg Gaar, Recycling Director

Richard Carell, Treasurer

Calvin Welch, Secretary

Board Members:

Sarge Holtzman

Gary Aaronson


Jon Mulholland

Martha Hoffman

Edward Dunn

**NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED.
PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.**

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.



"Poly" ReZoning Referendum

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

A yes vote on proposition "A" means more affordable housing for San Franciscans. The plans to build 114 affordable homes at the site of the former Polytechnic High School are the result of years of neighborhood meetings, public hearings and of policy decisions aimed at increasing homeownership opportunities. This is why the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor signed an Ordinance which re-

zones the former Polytechnic High School site from Public to Residential. More affordable housing is good for public health.

I urge a yes vote on Proposition "A".

David Werdegarr, M.D.

Director, Dept. of Public Health, S.F.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

A "YES" vote on Measure "A" supports San Francisco's commitment to providing homeownership opportunities for those who live and work in the City.

Faced with the loss of Federal and State support for housing, San Francisco's Mayor and Supervisors unanimously adopted a creative and resourceful policy which returns surplus public lands to the tax rolls, and at the same time builds attractive and safe neighborhoods. In order to preserve jobs and businesses, and to maintain San Francisco as a healthy city and a healthy economy, new housing opportunities must be created for those families who are being driven out of the city by the highest home prices in the nation. A "YES" vote on Measure A helps build that needed housing, and keeps San Francisco a good place to work and live.

*Peter E. Haas,
Levi Strauss and Co.
Arnold Townsend
Robert Thompson
Kevin Starr
Mary Noel Pepys
John Burton
Gene Slater
Gerson Bakar
Alan L. Stein
Stephen Goldman
Lesley Hand*

*John H. Jacobs,
S.F. Chamber of Commerce
Richard B. Morten,
S.F. Chamber of Commerce
Angelo J. Siracusa,
Bay Area Council
William K. Coblentz
Robert Marquis
John Sanger
Zane Gresham
Marsha Thomas*

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

We members of the MAYOR'S ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON POLY urge you to VOTE YES ON "A" to protect the interests of San Franciscans seeking affordable housing. A "No" on "A" may sabotage 114 affordable ownership units to be built at the derelict Polytechnic High School site across from Kezar.

10 Community organizations pooled their interests and resources in 1983 to preserve the historic Poly gyms for a multi-purpose community center and to produce affordable housing.

The project was planned in co-ordination with the Golden Gate Park Master Plan. 10,000 hours of volunteer community energy have gone into the proposal.

The Poly proposal was adopted by Mayor Feinstein and the City. A non-profit developer has joined with a for-profit firm to form the development team. They work closely with the Mayor's Advisory Committee on Poly, representatives of the community groups which created the project.

THE PROPOSAL IS A MODEL OF ENVIRONMENTALLY SOUND AND SOCIALLY RESPONSIBLE USE OF SURPLUS PUBLIC LAND FOR THE DIRECT BENEFIT OF OUR CITIZENS SEEKING TO OWN AND LIVE IN THE CITY.

The Poly proposal has undergone exhaustive environmental examination. Its density is less than permitted by the Planning Code. Provided parking is 1.53 times that required, and more is being sought. Open space and specific children's play areas are integrated in the design.

The extensive affordability will permit families whose household income is in the low \$20,000's to buy a 3-4 bedroom unit. The majority of the units are family-sized.

When the total project is complete, there will be a 60 child care center in the east gym. Above that a theatre, and the west gym will house a fitness/recreation center & music rooms. Public transit is out the front and back doors of the site.

WE URGE YOU TO VOTE "YES" FOR AFFORDABLE HOUSING. YOUR VOTE WILL HELP BURY THE CYNICAL GREED OF A WEALTHY MARIN PHYSICIAN, AND WILL AFFIRM THE VOLUNTEER COMMUNITY ENERGY WHICH PRODUCED THIS ENVIRONMENTALLY SOUND AFFORDABLE HOUSING ON SURPLUS PUBLIC LAND.

*Sue Bierman
Kathleen Connolly
Dale Carlson
Marcia Rosen
John De St. Nicolas
Calvin Welch
Steve Taber
Denis Mosgofian
Beatrice Laws
Jack Morrison*

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

"Poly" ReZoning Referendum

A

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

As San Franciscans interested in the future of our City, we are angered at the misuse of a referendum by a single individual seeking his own personal gain. We support the development of affordable housing and a multi-purpose community center on the former Poly High School site. San Franciscans must not be denied this critically needed development.

Dick Grossboll, Chair, Proposition M Executive Committee*

Regina Sneed, President, San Francisco Tomorrow*

Geraldine Johnson, Coalition of Black Trade Unionists*

John Holtzclaw, San Francisco Sierra Club*

Sue Hestor, San Franciscans for Reasonable Growth

The Affordable Housing Alliance

Members, Democratic County Central Committee*

Carol Migden

Linda Post

Agar Jaicks

Terence Hallinan

Sue Bierman

Tony Kilroy

Louise Minnick

Becky Evans

Connie O'Connor

Jeff Henne

Ron Huberman

Ralph Nieder-Westerman

Alicia Wang

Joe Lacey

Cleve Jones

Norman Rolfe

Jim Wachob

Miriam Blaustein

Suzanne Taylor

Dennis and Marjorie Antenore

Jean Kortum

Adrea Garabedian

Alan Rasnick

Bette Landis

Patrick Flanagan

Buck Bagot

Saul Bloom

Sara Wilcox

Richard Hauptman

Margaret O'Driscoll

Jim Morales

Michael Lighty

Michael Wong

Marie Cleasby

Pauline Layer

Dick Pabich

Mitchell Omerberg

Don Hesse,

St. Vincent de Paul Housing*

David Brigode

Ricardo Hernandez,

Director, Rent Board*

Rai Okamoto

David Prowler

Enid Ng Lim

Daryl Higashi

Doreen Der-McLeod

Herbert Hernandez

Ann Halsted

Eva Paterson

Carol Stevenson

Wes Winter

Polly Marshall

Roger Clay

Edwin Lee

Milo Nadler,

Old St. Mary's Housing

Committee*

Ina Dearman

Howard Gong

Sandra Gartzman

Jane Winslow

*For identification only

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

As directors of community based non-profit housing development corporations we favor the development of housing on public land. Public land is the last remaining subsidy able to be offered by the City to affordable housing producers. The Poly and Balboa housing proposals represent a major addition to our City's affordable housing stock, especially critically-needed larger units which both developments include.

We urge a YES vote on A and B.

Al Borvice, Neighborhood Preservation and

Housing Development Corporation*

Rene Cazenave, Haight Ashbury Community

Development Corporation*

Gordon Chin, Chinese Community Housing Corporation*

John Elberling, Tenants and Owners Development Corporation*

Ben Martinez, Mission Housing Development Corporation*

Bill Rumpf, Catholic Social Services*

Charles Turner, Community Design Center*

James Queen, Potrero Hill Community

Development Corporation*

Randy Shaw, Tenderloin Housing Clinic*

*For identification purposes only

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Additional family housing is undeniably San Francisco's most acute social need.

When some vacant surplus City land (3.2 acres) finally becomes available for 114 additional new private homes there will always be some selfish individuals who are in favor of new housing "just so long as it is not built across the street from me!"


This unused, vacant former Polytechnic High School property hasn't generated a dime of taxes for over thirty years! Let's add 114 NEW homeowner taxpayers to the City's rolls as quickly as possible.

Stop these self-serving obstructionists! Please vote YES!

W.F. O'Keeffe, Sr., President

San Francisco Taxpayers Association

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.



"Poly" ReZoning Referendum

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

The need for affordable housing in San Francisco is great. Poly High is no longer needed as a school.

San Franciscans for Reasonable Growth supports the rezoning.

WE URGE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

SFRG

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

As residents of the Haight-Ashbury and Inner Sunset neighborhood we support the affordable housing and multi-purpose community center proposal for the Poly high site and urge you to vote Yes on A.

Tom Schlegel
Sharon Johnson
Diana Jaicks
Ed Dunn
David Jenkins
Cathern Joseph
Peter and Ellen Huppert
Robert Laws
Judith Harrington

Martha Goodavish
Bruce Sampson
Ann Worth
Pablo Heising
Jim Rhoads
Nina Lathrop
Anne Koelbel
Karl Cohen
Deborah Runkey

Ron Viel
Patti Palen
Betty Ihle
Eugene Bartlett
Rev. Larry Morkert
Barbara T. Smith
Beverly Eschenburg
Elizabeth Coronata
Melanie DeLuca
Seth Mosgofian
Louise Jarmilowice
Bruce Cannon
Allan and Linda Chalmers
Hon-Man Tse

Daniel Eichler
Kathryn Rolfe
Robert and Elisabeth
Hardman Rix
Stephen Leeds
Rita Hurault
Bradley Reed
Al Rosen
Robert Rubin
Patricia Siegel
David Kroot
Mary Alice Fry
Cabala Windle

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

We, as Presidents of neighborhood organizations close to the POLY site, urge a Yes Vote on A. The Poly development will meet our neighborhoods' needs and provide needed affordable housing opportunities for new residents.

Paula Land, Haight Ashbury Neighborhood Council
Edgar McEachron, Edgewood Neighborhood Association
Molley Lowry, Woodland Avenue Association
Dale Carlson, Stanyan Fulton Neighborhood Association
John Hooper, Secretary, Buena Vista Neighborhood Association

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Our community benefited from high quality affordable housing development on surplus school land. We support the same for Poly High School and the Haight Ashbury/Inner Sunset neighborhoods.
Vote Yes on A.

Lonnie Adams, OMICA
Grady Farley, OMICA
Paul Nelson, OMICA
Larry Chew, OMI
Community Center

Homer Gordon, OMICA
Lonnie Lawson, Jr., HCDC
Henry Jefferson, OMICA
Rev. Lewis Allen

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

DON'T BE MISLED—SUPPORT WEALTHY OUT-OF-TOWN DEVELOPERS AGAINST THE TAXPAYERS.

This is one of those ballot propositions where "YES" means "NO" and "NO" means "YES".

If you want the City to give away public property for a project by a greedy Marin County developer and his friends, vote "YES" on Proposition A.

If you actually want to stop great land give-aways to hungry developers at the expense of the public, be sure to vote "NO" on Proposition A. Also vote "NO" on Proposition B and "YES" on Proposition D.

Tom Spinosa

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

"Poly" ReZoning Referendum



ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

SUPPORT GREEDY OUT-OF-TOWN DEVELOPERS AGAINST THE PEOPLE OF SAN FRANCISCO.

The expected public votes AGAINST Proposition A and AGAINST Proposition B are UNFAIR to multi-millionaire developers. Those out-of-town developers have "PAID THEIR DUES" at City Hall—by spreading around loads of campaign donations and currying the political favor of our City officials.

These developers have made substantial investments in paying campaign consultants and public relations people to promote the massive developments that they are planning to build.

Under the circumstances, isn't it fair that the Marin County developer of the Poly High Housing Project be given a 75-year lease of City land for free??? If your answer is "NO", then vote "NO" on Proposition A.

And why shouldn't the Balboa Reservoir developer be sold 12.3 acres of city land (worth millions of dollars) for \$36,900??? Doesn't \$36,900 sound like a fair price for millions of dollars worth of real

estate??? If your answer is "NO", then vote "NO" on Proposition B.

And doesn't logic dictate that BOTH of these out-of-town developer special interests be allowed to make millions of dollars building projects that will compound the traffic and parking problems that already plague our San Francisco neighborhoods???

After all, shouldn't the main purpose of the San Francisco City Government be to enrich the friends and campaign contributors of our politicians at the public expense???

If you favor out-of-town developers making millions of dollars at public expense, vote "YES" on Propositions A and B.

If you're a "spoil-sport" who wants to end City land give-aways at public expense, vote "NO" on Proposition A and Proposition B. Also vote "YES" on Proposition D, if you want to outlaw such land give-aways.

Tom Spinosa

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

STOP THE MARIN MULTI-MILLIONAIRE DEVELOPER.

It's a good marketing strategy to claim widespread neighborhood support for a development project. Marin multi-millionaire developer Thomas Callanan and his partner are making such claims about their proposed development at Poly High School. The truth is that there is overwhelming neighborhood opposition to the Poly project. This proposed development will destroy Golden Gate Park's skyline and environment.

The neighbors are concerned about the failure of the developers to conduct the legally required Environmental Impact Report, the increased parking and traffic congestion problems and the failure of the developer to be responsive to neighborhood concerns, such

as asbestos exposure during the demolition of Poly High and the fact that the development includes plans for a theater and newspaper plant.

Also, the neighbors are outraged that this valuable property at Poly High School is being given at no cost to this wealthy Marin developer. Stop this land give away and say "No" to the greedy Marin developer Thomas Callanan.

Vote "NO" on Proposition "A".

Bob McCormick, Poly High Neighbors

Mary Frick

Tom Foster

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

SAN FRANCISCO REPUBLICAN PARTY OPPOSES PROPOSITIONS A AND B AND SUPPORTS PROPOSITION D.

On March 5th, 1987, the San Francisco Republican County Central Committee passed a resolution to OPPOSE Proposition A (the Poly High School Land Giveaway), to OPPOSE Proposition B (Balboa Reservoir Land Giveaway), and to SUPPORT Proposition D (the proposed ban on giveaways of major pieces of City-owned real estate).

In recent years there have been a series of controversial transfers and sales of land owned by the City for political reasons.

Propositions A and B are supported by a pack of ravenous City Hall politicians. Their only real goal in life is to raise ever more money—in the form of political campaign contributions from narrow developer special interests—for themselves and their friends.

Proposition D is even more bitterly opposed by those same self-seeking City Hall politicians. Proposition D requires that at least 90% of the fair market value of major pieces of City-owned real estate be paid in any sale, lease, or other transfer of such property. Proposition D is a badly needed reform measure.

Vote NO on Propositions A and B. Vote YES on Proposition D.

Terence Faulkner, County Chairman,

San Francisco Republican Party

Tom Spinosa, Secretary,

Republican County Central Committee of San Francisco

Robert Silvestri, Republican County Committeeman

Martin Eng, Vice-Chairman, County Central Committee

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

A

"Poly" ReZoning Referendum

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

SAY "NO" TO POLITICAL THUGGERY!!!

In Soviet Russia and South Africa, people who disagree with government policies are subjected to political thuggery. Concerted actions are taken to interfere with the dissenters' rights to petition their government for redress of grievances.

The wealthy out-of-town developers who support Propositions A and B have imported political thuggery to San Francisco.

Political thuggery may be a way of life in Soviet Russia and South Africa. But it has no place in San Francisco.

Vote "NO" on Political Thuggery. Vote "NO" on A and B.

Bob Geary, San Francisco Democratic County

Central Committeeman

Lake Merced Republican Club

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

IS THIS "AFFORDABLE HOUSING"??

To qualify to buy most of these condos and townhouses, you would probably need a **minimum** annual income of \$30,000 to \$50,000+ (the same is true of the Balboa development).

That's not "affordable"!!

City Hall wants to finance not-really-affordable housing for a few, by taking away from public education for the many. A better source of financing would be to implement the Tax-the-

Corporations initiative which the city passed in 1980.

Poly High should be renovated and re-opened. Allowing the badly-overcrowded public school system to expand would benefit many more people — people in much greater need.

Save affordable education: Vote No! on Propositions A and B!!

Dr. William Steinsmith, S.F. Peace and Freedom Party

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

The politicians at City Hall and their wealthy developer friends would like you to believe that a couple of selfish individuals qualified the Balboa Reservoir and Poly High School referendum petitions.

The truth is that more than 2,000 citizens of San Francisco on a volunteer basis circulated the Balboa and Poly petitions and over 50,000 signatures were gathered. The petition campaigns were funded by contributions from over 300 hundred individuals and 100% of the contributions came from people residing or working in the neighborhoods directly affected by these projects. Also, unlike most campaigns, there was no paid staff.

In contrast, the developers of Balboa and Poly projects to date have spent in excess of \$400,000 campaigning for their projects. This money has come from out of town special interest groups and

from those who would benefit financially from the projects. They have engaged in unethical campaign activities, use City offices and resources for campaign purposes and City employees' time for campaign management and fund raising.

The outpouring of support for the citizen petition campaigns shows that neighbors working together can protect the neighborhoods from greedy developers.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION "A" AND "B" AND YES ON "D".

STOP THE LAND GIVEAWAY AND PROTECT THE NEIGHBORHOODS.

Cesar Ascarrunz

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

SCANDAL!!! SCANDAL!!! SCANDAL!!! SCANDAL!!! SCANDAL!!! SCANDAL!!! SCANDAL!!!

Scandal is the best and only word to describe the selling of over 15 acres of City property, worth more than 30 million dollars, to wealthy developers for only **\$36,900**.

It's hard to believe but it is true!

Bernard Hagen, a multi-millionaire developer, plans to purchase 12 acres of public property at Balboa Reservoir for only \$36,900.

Thomas Callanan, a wealthy Marin developer and his partner, plan to lease for 75 years at no cost, 3 acres of public property at Poly High School.

Stop this giveaway of City property.

Vote NO on Propositions "A" and "B" and YES on "D".

Fabio de La Torres

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

"Poly" ReZoning Referendum



ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

BELIEVE IT OR NOT

The City of San Francisco is planning to give 15 acres of valuable land to greedy, money hungry developers.

As a result of this land giveaway, millions of dollars of profit will be made by the developers. However, if the City sold the property at Balboa Reservoir and Poly High School at fair market value, they would receive more than 30 million dollars—money which could

be spent in educating our youth, providing needed services for senior citizens and the homeless, and for helping in the fight against AIDS.

STOP this RIP-OFF of the TAXPAYERS!!!

Vote NO on Proposition "A" and "B" and YES on "D"

Mike Garza

Terence Faulkner

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

WARNING TO VOTERS:

Millions of dollars are at stake in this election.

If Propositions A and B pass, out-of-town developers will get control of 15 acres of public land for less than \$37,000.

That's why it's important for all good citizens to be aware of Elections Code Section 29610, which provides: "Any person who commits or attempts to commit fraud and any person who aids or abets fraud in connection with any vote cast or to be cast, or attempted to be cast, is guilty of a felony, punishable by imprisonment for 16 months or two or three years."

Report all instances of possible fraud or illegal campaign tactics to District Attorney Arlo Smith (553-1752) or Registrar of Voters

Jay Patterson (554-4399).

VOTE "NO" ON A AND B!

Tom Spinosa, Secretary,

Republican County Central Committee of San Francisco

Terence Faulkner, County Chairman,

San Francisco Republican Party

Robert Silvestri, Republican County Committeeman

Bob Geary, San Francisco Democratic

County Central Committeeman

Martin Eng, Vice-Chairman, Chinese Real Estate Association

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

DON'T BE DUPED!!!

Disregard all of the lengthy ballot arguments and slick brochures that urge a "Yes" vote on Propositions A and B.

These materials are being bankrolled by a few greedy out-of-town developers who want to feed at the public trough.

Unless Propositions A and B are defeated, these developers will get control of over 15 acres of public land for less than \$37,000 for their multi-million dollar development projects.

You, the taxpayer, will foot the bill to make these rich developers richer.

Caught with their hands in the proverbial "cookie jar", these developers can be expected to engage in personal attacks and smear

campaigns against opponents of Propositions A and B. Disregard the developers' propaganda. Their intent is to deceive in order to enrich themselves.

Vote "NO" on A and B.

Terence Faulkner, County Chairman,

San Francisco Republican Party

Robert Silvestri, Republican County Committeeman

Tom Spinosa, Secretary,

Republican County Central Committee of San Francisco

Martin Eng, Real Estate Consultant

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

STOP THE PERSONALITY ATTACKS—LET'S DEAL WITH THE ISSUES!

The sole issue being voted on here, is whether to re-zone the Poly High School campus to allow its demolition and replacement with a housing development.

Some supporters of this project have argued that the opposition includes some rich landlords. But there are rich landlords among the supporters, too. Such as the Mayor.

Personalities are not the issue.

The personality attacks are a distraction from the real issue—whether to allow Poly High to be replaced with condos and townhouses.

Vote No on Propositions A and B if you think our kids should be free from school overcrowding, and that there's got to be a better way to finance housing.

Election Action

A

"Poly" ReZoning Referendum

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

JUST SAY "NO"!!!

Stop give-aways of public land to wealthy out-of-town developers. Don't be impressed by prominent names and groups supporting Propositions A and B.

Most of these groups and many of these people, in one way or another, have their fingers in the big pie at City Hall.

Millions of dollars of spoils and hundreds of patronage jobs are at stake.

They cannot afford to shake up the machine.

JUST SAY "NO" TO A AND B!

Tom Spinoso, Secretary, Republican County Central Committee of San Francisco

Robert Silvestri, Republican County Committeeman

Mike Garza, Republican County Committeeman

Terence Faulkner, County Chairman,

San Francisco Republican Party

Martin Eng, Vice-Chairman, County Central Committee

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

WOULD YOU DO BUSINESS WITH THESE PEOPLE???

The City has agreed to sell 12.3 acres of public land (worth millions of dollars) to Balboa Reservoir developer Bernard Hagan for \$36,900.

Callanan stands to gain millions of dollars by being given a 75-year lease of public property for free unless you vote "NO" on Proposition A.

If you agree that the City shouldn't be giving away public land to enrich Bernard Hagan, Thomas Callanan and their like, vote "NO" on Propositions A and B.

Bob Geary, San Francisco Democratic

County Central Committeeman

Lake Merced Republican Club

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

SHOULD DEVELOPERS WHO EVICT SENIOR CITIZENS BE ALLOWED TO ENRICH THEMSELVES AT PUBLIC EXPENSE?

This is what the *San Mateo Times* has said about developer Bernard Hagan:

"City staff members are scheduled to meet today to work out a plan for protecting residents from eviction at a low income senior citizens' housing project.

"City attorney Bob Rogers said Monday that the government has not been able to work out an agreement so far with Bernard Hagan, the developer of the 75-unit senior complex at 416 Alida Way.

"... Hagan has begun leasing 29 of the apartments to non seniors at market rate levels. Under the federal program (through which Hagan got his construction loan) the rent charges were restricted and only seniors were eligible.

"The Legal Aid Society filed a lawsuit in Superior Court on behalf of several tenants in order to stop the seniors from losing their apartments." (August 28, 1984, D1)

Hagan is one of the wealthy out-of-town developers who will be given use of 15 acres of public property for less than \$37,000 to build multi-million dollar developments unless you VOTE "NO" ON PROPOSITIONS A AND B.

Terence Faulkner, County Chairman,

San Francisco Republican Party

Bob Geary, San Francisco Democratic

County Central Committeeman

Tom Spinoso, Secretary, Republican County

Central Committee of San Francisco

Robert Silvestri, Republican County Committeeman

Martin Eng, Real Estate Investor, C.P.A.

Polls are open from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m.

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Balboa ReZoning Referendum

B

PROPOSITION B

Shall the ordinance re-zoning the Balboa Reservoir South site at Ocean and Phelan Avenues from P (Public) to RH-1 (House, One-Family) be adopted?

YES 302 ➡
NO 303 ➡

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Zoning laws regulate what types of buildings or activities are allowed in a particular area. The Balboa Reservoir South site at Ocean and Phelan Avenues is zoned P (Public). Property which is zoned P (Public) may be used for government buildings. With the permission of the City Planning Commission, it may also be used for schools, community centers, parks and other similar uses.

The Board of Supervisors passed and the Mayor signed Ordinance No. 429-86, which re-zones the Balboa Reservoir South site from P (Public) to RH-1 (House, One-Family).

Most ordinances do not become law until 30 days after they are adopted. Before this ordinance became law, a referendum petition was filed. A referendum petition, when signed by

enough qualified voters, requires that the ordinance named in the petition be submitted to the voters. The ordinance does not go into effect unless and until a majority of the voters vote in favor of it.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition B is an ordinance which re-zones the Balboa Reservoir South site at Ocean and Phelan Avenues from P (Public) to RH-1 (House, One-Family). Property which is zoned RH-1 (House, One-Family) may be used for single-unit houses.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Balboa Reservoir South site to be zoned RH-1 (House, One-Family).

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the Balboa Reservoir South site to be zoned P (Public).

How "B" Got on the Ballot

Proposition B is a referendum petition that was filed with the Registrar of Voters on December 5, 1986. The petition contained 24,808 signatures.


On December 26 the Registrar certified that the petition had 18,320 valid signatures of registered voters. This is more than the 14,664 valid signatures that the City Charter requires for a referendum to be placed on the ballot.

**THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION B
APPEARS ON PAGE 34.**

Controller's Statement on "B"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition B:

"Should this ordinance be approved, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a product of its possible future application, there could be an increase in the assessment roll and cost of government. The potential property tax revenues and costs, if any, being dependent upon an anticipated development's assessed valuation and other factors, cannot be determined at this time."



Balboa ReZoning Referendum

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

A yes vote on Proposition B means more affordable housing for San Franciscans on property that has never been used as a reservoir and was formally declared surplus in 1984.

The plans to build 203 affordable single family homes at the site of this surplus Water Department property are the result of years of policy decisions aimed at increasing homeownership opportunities. These plans are also the result of extensive public review of neighborhood meetings, and they were approved more than a year ago by the City Planning Commission. This is why the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor signed an Ordinance which rezones the surplus Balboa Reservoir site from public use (P) to low-density residential use (RH-1).

San Francisco has the most expensive housing in the nation with average home prices at over \$165,000 according to recent surveys. The homes to be built at the surplus South Balboa Reservoir site

would be sold to first-time homebuyers at prices ranging from \$83,000 to \$145,000. The economic viability of the City is greatly dependent upon providing these opportunities for low to moderate income San Franciscans and their families. In addition, special low-cost financing for first-time homebuyers will be lost unless this rezoning proceeds now.

Just last year this same project was put on the ballot and almost 60% of the voters wanted this housing built. Everybody is united from the Chamber of Commerce to neighborhood activists behind this proposal. Delay tactics and opposition are backed by the same out-of-town individuals who are set on threatening all affordable housing for their own personal gain.

We urge a yes vote on Proposition B.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Like Proposition "A", this Proposition also will give the green light to the construction of AFFORDABLE, single-family housing. Your "YES" vote on Proposition "B" will provide for the construction of 203 homes, most with three bedrooms and two baths, on the South Balboa Reservoir site which is off Ocean Avenue and has been empty for 30 years.

Actually, the construction of these vitally-needed homes was approved by 60% of San Francisco voters in an earlier initiative, but it's back on the ballot because of the same selfish real-estate interests that are trying to block the construction of affordable housing on the Polytechnic High School site.

This group is opposed to the City's effort to take idle public property that's vacant or an eye-sore and convert it to housing.

Your "YES" vote will say the City needs affordable housing and should get on with the job of getting it built.

The proposed 203 units would be sold to first-time homebuyers at prices ranging from \$82,000 to \$143,000 — far lower than market

rate. Mortgages would be kept low, within the means of working men and women — 7½% percent, 30-year fixed-rate, arranged through a City Bond issue. But the housing must be built and sold by November, 1989 in order to take advantage of these low, favorable rates.

The reservoir presently is a barren expanse, serving no useful purpose. It has been decades since it was a part of the city's water supply, and neighboring City College has neither the plans nor the money to convert it to any campus use.

The site offers the perfect opportunity to build family housing.

Reaffirm what San Francisco voters already have approved — the construction of attractive, AFFORDABLE housing on the Balboa Reservoir site.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION "B".

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

The South Balboa Reservoir site, empty for 30 years, is now available for 203 single-family homes. The proposal, including 2 acres of open space and play area for children is the result of several years of planning by neighborhood leaders and the City.

The housing plans and rezoning have been approved by the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors. The proposal was approved by 60% of the San Francisco voters in an initiative last June.

The first objective of the Housing Element of the City's Comprehensive Plan is "to provide new housing for all income groups" in appropriate residential locations. To meet this goal, development of

housing is to be aggressively pursued and encouraged on surplus, underused and vacant public land.

The surplus Balboa site is one of the few sites large enough to accommodate a substantial number of new homes.

If you want more affordable housing in San Francisco vote yes on Proposition "B".

Toby Rosenblatt, President, City Planning Commission

Richard B. Allen, City Planning Commissioner

Bernice M. Hemphill, City Planning Commissioner

Sue Bierman, City Planning Commissioner

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Balboa ReZoning Referendum



ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Proposition B will bring about construction of affordable housing at Balboa Reservoir site. This surplus public property empty for 30 years was declared surplus by the City in 1984. The proposal for 203 single family homes with sales prices as low as \$80,000, 2 acres of open space and a play area for children is the result of several years of planning and hard work on the part of the City and neighborhood leaders. The housing is desperately needed. San Francisco

cans need affordable housing.

Proposition B will bring about construction of affordable housing at the South Balboa Reservoir site. We need more housing in San Francisco, not less. Please join me in voting "YES" on Proposition B.

Doris M. Ward, Member, San Francisco Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B!

In 1980 San Franciscans voted overwhelmingly (63% yes to 37% no) to construct 20,000 housing units. Good progress is underway towards achieving the voter goal. A 1986 report by Mayor Dianne Feinstein states, "In the last five years 3,559 new housing units were completed with another 3,000 by 1988 and 20,000 more in 10 to 15 years". Most of this housing will be built in underutilized commercial districts; not in existing residential neighborhoods.

The 203 affordable owner occupied single family units slated for the southern portion of Balboa Reservoir are part of the 1988 total. Our program in addressing the City's housing shortage will be curtailed if this initiative is not approved. SUPPORT OWNERSHIP AND RENTAL HOUSING CONSTRUCTION, VOTE YES ON

PROPOSITION B.

Housing production is essential to check rising prices and to maintain our social, economic, and ethnic population diversity. AS A SAN FRANCISCO VOTER, YOU CAN BE PART OF OUR HOUSING PROGRESS BY VOTING YES ON PROPOSITION B.

Do not be misled. The Community College Governing Board does support this initiative. The district does not have any future building plans for this housing site.

WE ENCOURAGE YOU TO SUPPORT THE CONSTRUCTION OF FAMILY HOUSING BY VOTING YES ON PROPOSITION B.

John H. Jacobs, Exec. Director of Chamber of Commerce

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

A yes vote on Proposition "B" means more affordable housing for San Franciscans. The plans to build 203 affordable homes at the site of the surplus South Balboa Reservoir are the result of years of neighborhood meetings, public hearings and policy decisions aimed at increasing homeownership opportunities. This is why the Planning Commission, the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor

have approved rezoning the site from Public to Residential. More affordable housing is good for public health.

I urge a yes vote on Proposition "B".

David Werdegarr, M.D.,

Director, Department of Public Health, S.F.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Additional single family housing is undeniably San Francisco's most acute social need.

When some vacant surplus City land (12 acres) finally becomes available for 203 additional new private homes there will always be some selfish individuals who are in favor of new housing "just so long as it is not built across the street from me!"

This unused, vacant City reservoir land hasn't generated a dime of taxes for over thirty years! Let's add 203 NEW homeowner taxpayers to the City's rolls as quickly as possible.

Stop these self-serving obstructionists! Please vote YES!

W.F. O'Keeffe, Sr., President, San Francisco Taxpayers Association


ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

The Balboa Reservoir site is near BART and Muni. Isn't it better to build housing here than in a suburban wetland, hillside or farmland, where commuters' cars will pollute our air? The Sierra Club

urges you to vote yes on Proposition B.

John Holtzclaw, S.F. Group Conservation Chair

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.



Balboa ReZoning Referendum

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

A yes vote on Proposition "B" is a vote for affordable housing for San Franciscans and a vote for the integrity of our citizen's initiative process.

Last June the people of San Francisco voted 60% to 40% in favor of building 203 units of middle-income housing on the surplus city property located at the unused Balboa Reservoir site.

A tiny group opposed to the development of these homes want to serve their own narrow selfish interests by disregarding the previously expressed vote of the people. Funded by out-of-town real estate speculators, this small group again seeks to stop construction of these critically needed middle income homes.

These homes, to be built through a unique partnership of the neighborhoods and city government, constitute a major increase in our middle income housing stock.

It is vital that action be taken to get this and other housing proposals under construction as quickly as possible to meet our City's critical shortage of middle income homes.

I urge you to once again say yes on "B", the Balboa Reservoir Homes.

Art Agnos, Assemblyman

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Proposition B will bring about construction of much-needed affordable single-family housing at the long-vacant South Balboa Reservoir site. Sales prices are set at \$80,000, \$120,000 and \$142,800 for low, moderate and middle income buyers currently priced out of the market in San Francisco where the average home is selling for over \$160,000. If this initiative does not pass, the 9.8% fixed-rate 30 year bond funds for mortgages would also be lost.

The plan is the result of several years of planning and is strongly supported by representatives from nine nearby neighborhood organizations. It includes family sized houses with 2 and 3 bedrooms plus space for finishing an additional bedroom. Generous parking is provided — 2½ parking spaces for each home. Two acres of open space, a play area for children and individual yards are also included.

City College has no plans to buy the property for their uses and has no money for institutional expansion.

If you want more affordable housing built in San Francisco, then vote "Yes" on Proposition B.

Frank Noto, Greater Ingleside Political Action Club

Mayor's Advisory Committee

Ricardo Hernandez, Executive Director,

SF Residential Rent Stabilization and Arbitration Board

Norma L. Jerry, OMI Community Association

Larry D. Chew, OMI Community Center

Paul Nelson, OMICA

Grady Farley, OMI Pilgrim Comm. Center

Homer D. Gardner, OMICA

Lonnie L. Adams, OMICA Pilgrim Ctr.

Henry Jefferson, OMICA

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Last year when San Francisco voters voted 59% to 41% in favor of affordable housing and against Proposition E, most folks thought that was the end to it. However a few City College teachers who oppose Balboa Affordable housing have struck up an alliance with a rich doctor in Marin County who pays people \$.40 or \$.50 per signature to qualify their sour grapes initiative for the June 2, 1987 ballot.

Again San Francisco voters must look beneath the high flying smoke screen to understand what is being done. There are many selfish individuals who would rather see the south reservoir remain vacant instead of seeing affordable housing built. City College with its declining student body and declining income base is the smoke screen. Everyone from the Chancellor to the College governing board realizes CCSF will not have funds to build new buildings for years to come and if funds were available, they could build a 5 or 6 story building in the area that has their WW II bungalows (in the middle of the campus).

As President of an OMI non-profit community center board of directors and co-chair of a city wide Black political organization named the San Francisco Black United Front, I strongly urge you to vote for Balboa Affordable housing and against all initiatives aimed at blocking this needed housing development which will also spur development in our OMI Community which has the distinction of being the most neglected area of the city.

Many longtime San Francisco and OMI residents cannot buy a house for \$160,000.00 at market rate interest but are very interested in buying their first house for \$84,000.00 to \$124,000.00 at affordable interest rates. Many people in the housing market are looking at Vallejo or outlying areas, further draining San Francisco in general and the OMI community in particular of young adults and families, the heart and future of any population or community.

Larry Ukali Johnson-Redd, OMICA, President
S.F. Black United Front, Co-Chair

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Balboa ReZoning Referendum



ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Proposition B will bring about construction of much-needed affordable single-family housing at the long-vacant South Balboa Reservoir site. Sales prices are set at \$80,000, \$120,000 and \$142,800 for low, moderate and middle-income buyers currently priced out of the market in San Francisco where the average home is selling for over \$160,000.

The plan is the result of several years of planning and is strongly supported by representatives from nine nearby neighborhood organizations. It includes family sized houses with 2 and 3 bedrooms plus space for finishing an additional bedroom. Generous parking is provided—2½ parking spaces for each home. Two acres of open space, a play area for children and individual yards are also included.

The defeat of this initiative would not, as some of its opponents claim, allow for any additional facilities for City College. City College has no plans to buy the property for their uses and has no money for institutional expansion.

If you want more affordable housing built in San Francisco, then vote "Yes" on Proposition B.

Paul G. Theiss, Ingleside District Pastors
Curtis Renshaw, Our Saviors Luthern Church
Boyd Taylor, Temple Methodist Church
William N. Rumpf, Catholic Social Service Archdiocese of S.F.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

The undersigned are representatives of neighborhood and community associations surrounding the surplus South Balboa Reservoir site. We urge your "yes" vote on Proposition B as an endorsement of our three years of work on the Mayor's Advisory Committee which objectively investigated and made recommendations on the use of this site for housing.

During the course of our discussions, we have identified logical reasons to support housing construction. Chief among these reasons are:

1. Meeting the desperate need for affordable housing with low sales prices, low down-payments, and low interest mortgages and allowing first-time homebuyers to enter the housing market.

2. Families are needed in San Francisco to enrich and enliven our City. No City can exist as empty stone buildings.

3. These family units will house San Franciscans to staff and to own businesses needed here.

4. Construction of affordable housing on the unused Balboa Reservoir site will add directly to the economic vitality of the Ocean Avenue district and the City.

We urge a "yes" vote on Proposition B. It's fair! It serves the community! It's good for San Francisco!

Rev. Lewis Allen, O.M.I., S.N.I.G.
Stan Bergman, Greater Ingleside Political Action Club
Ron Hummel, Member of Ingleside Terraces Homes Assoc.
Norma L. Jerry, O.M.I. Community Association
Lonnie Lawson, Jr., Housing Conservation and Development Corporation
Frank Noto, Greater Ingleside Political Action Club

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

SAVE CITY COLLEGE

We feel this land is needed by City College for a library and other college facilities. The only buildings that have ever been on the land have been City College related buildings. This has been true for over five decades. Why take it away now?

City College needs its West Campus. Please do not rezone it for private development. Help City College.
Vote No on B.

John Riordan, Community College Governing Board

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B


Proposition 56 last November provided money for community college buildings and other capital improvements.

But talk about poor planning! Here City Hall is trying to sell the West Campus of the college to a private developer for \$36,900 before the college can build facilities that would help the neighborhood as well as the college.

Vote NO on B. Reject this bad city planning.

Jesse David Wall, Chairman
SNaP (Sensible Neighborhood Planning Committee)

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.



Balboa ReZoning Referendum

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

12.3 acres of public land worth millions is about to be turned over for only \$36,900 to a developer planning to build 122 subsidized and 81 market rate homes across from City College. The school serves 24,000 students with less room per student than any other California community college! The school desperately needs to expand onto this land to keep pace with the educational demands of San Franciscans.

Public land should be used for the greatest public good. We need

affordable housing—but not at the expense of young people training for careers, immigrants improving language skills, and increasing numbers of women returning to education after raising families. Vote NO for an educated San Francisco. VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION B.

Wendy Nelder, Supervisor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

Wouldn't you like the answers to these questions?

WHY is a private developer able to purchase 12.3 acres of public land for \$36,900?

WHY are the 208 units of subsidized housing on the Balboa site considered so important to the Mayor when they represent barely 1% of her identified 20,000 unit housing program?

WHY are we subsidizing housing for people making an annual income from \$30,000 to \$54,450?

WHY is a 208 unit housing development being planned without an environmental impact report?

WHY did the Water Department declare a reservoir to be "surplus" 3 years before completion of its first system-wide assessment study?

WHY did the San Francisco Fire Department announce last June that the Balboa Reservoir should not have been declared surplus?

HOW can the Mayor's Office continue to claim neighborhood support for a Balboa housing development when precinct counts from last June's election show over 80% of the adjacent neighborhoods voted to suspend such a project?

WHY is the city spending \$128,000 of public funds for a special election to displace Proposition B from next November's ballot, where 25,000 registered voters asked it to be placed?

WHY has the city contracted with a developer with a questionable background of:

- evicting senior citizens
- non-compliance with affirmative action hiring requirements
- conflicting official financial statements
- illegal campaign techniques
- multiple lawsuits

AND WHAT ELSE?

KEEP PUBLIC LAND FOR PUBLIC USE!

City College for Responsible Development

Steering Committee

Ken Crizer

Lene Johnson

Madeline Mueller

Julia Scholand

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

While San Francisco needs more affordable housing, it is essential that new housing be sensitively planned and have the support of its neighbors. The Balboa Reservoir project is opposed by local neighborhood organizations and, in a recent election was turned down by most of the precincts around the project. Support good

planning and neighborhood self-determination—vote "No" on Proposition B.

Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

We are politically strong, unafraid of a threat,
We won't back down, for land we should get.
We're mustering our forces, we're ready to fight,
To back up the college, we know we are right.
The college needs space, the reservoir is there,
Vote college facilities, if you honestly care.

Students will benefit, in the years to come,
Benefitting thousands, not only some.
In the year 2000, we'll look back and say,
"NO on the BALBOA REFERENDUM", saved the day.

William Felzer, Retired CCSF Faculty

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Balboa ReZoning Referendum

B

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

Having been responsible for providing leadership at City College from 1947 to 1977, we cannot stand by and see this site forever removed from the college's future. We must speak out. We left the former West Campus reluctantly in 1952 to make way for water storage. If it is no longer required for that purpose, let us return it to City College.

Thousands of San Franciscans—high school graduates, drop-outs, veterans, re-entering women—representing all of the city's diverse ethnic groups, have been prepared for transfer to four-year colleges, profitable careers, and have had their lives enriched at City College of San Francisco. Without City College's open door

and easy access, many would have been deprived of these opportunities.

Its 56 acre campus was originally designed for 3,000 students. Now it serves over 24,000. This campus, compared to other community colleges, can be best described as cramped, inadequate, and second rate. The condition of the campus is to be contrasted with the excellence of its programs—which are recognized among the best in the nation.

Lou Batmale, Chancellor 1970-1977

Louis G. Conlan, President 1947-1970

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

City College is twice as crowded as any community college in California, and growing. It needs an appropriate library, bookstore, auditorium and parking facility, which would also meet the needs of the neighborhood.

The following faculty members and department heads representing many disciplines believe that adjacent reservoir land should be returned to San Francisco's community college for our students' needs rather than being sold to a private developer for \$36,900!

*Terence Alberigi
Darlene Alioto
Mary Allen
Donald Beilke
Diana Bernstein
Betty Biles
John Bischoff
Jim Boyd
Phillip Brown
Barbara Cabral
James Cagnacci
John Callen
Donald Cate
Linda Conley
George Crippen
Donald Cunningham
Kwaku Daddy
Bob Davis
Helen Dilworth
Brad Duggan*

*John Few
April Flowers
Melia Furgis
Ideale Gambera
Peter Gardner
Fred Glosser
Tanako Hagiwara
JoAnn Hahn
David Hardiman
Dan Hayes
Carol Heard
Paul Hewitt
Thomas Hewitt
Kathy Hondius
Judy Hubbell
Charles Hudspeth
Michael Hulbert
Frank Ingersoll
Sieglinde Isham
Abdul Jabbar*

*Elaine Johnson
Rita Jones
Robert Kaar
Jo Kennedy
Martin Kilgariff
Mohamad Kowsar
James Lallas
Margaret Lanphier
Winnie Leong
Chelcie Liu
Steven Lopez
Paula McCullum
Peggy McCurdy
Donald MacIntyre
Marian McManus
Valerie Mathes
Betty Mattea
Margit Michlmayr
Deanne Milan
Elaine Morgan
Kathleen Moriwaki
Sandra Nager
Anna Nelson
David Newton
Eva Ng-Chin
John Palmer
Steven Potter
Alvin Randolph
Annette Rappleyea*

*Anna Reid
John Riordan
Meme Riordan
Ronald Rubin
George Rush
Louise Scourkes
C. James Sparks
David Spears
Robert Stamps
Agnes Szombathy
Mo-Shuet Tam
Helayna Thickpenny
Barbara Thomas
Mary Thurber
Norm Travis
James Truitner
Helene Urwitz
Alexander Valentine
Willem Vanderwerf
Thomas Velasquez
Austin White
Kevin Williams
Joan Wilson
Rosalie Wolf
Susan Woodruff
Anthony Woods
K. Wright
Annie McMillian Young*


ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

VOTE NO ON "B"

A very short-sighted and questionable use of lands intended for public use.

Kevin Wadsworth

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.



Balboa ReZoning Referendum

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

The following retired City College of San Francisco faculty and administrators ask you to help keep City College one of the best community colleges in the nation!

*Sidney Ancker
Brigitta Bock
John Brady
Barbara Brackett
Robin Crizer
Gloria Dunn*

*Raymond Early
Bill Funke
Mary Golding
George Gould
Victor Graff
Ralph Hillsman*

*Edna (Pope) Hosie
Joseph Jacobsen
Mildred Jensen
Evelyn Kerkof
Edward Larson
Mary Learnard
Jack Madigan
Iole Matteucig
Irene Mensing
Cindy Moody*

*Sheldon Morton
George Muller
William Schrubba
Catherine Shorb
Dorothy Sigler
Marcelline Simini
Donald Snapp
Roy Walker
Warren White*

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

Westwood Park Homes Association voted 118 to 2 to oppose the current plan to develop Balboa Reservoir.

Overwhelming neighborhood opposition was confirmed by the vote count in precincts here last June. The moratorium (Proposition E) won by margins of more than 3 to 1.

We do NOT want the development as proposed. It is destructive to the neighborhood and ignores the needs of our community college.

Please vote NO on B.

*Residents of Westwood Park
Bill Roache, Past President,
Westwood Park Association
Pauline Armstrong
Elaine Buyvoets
Gertrude Denney
Ruth Hanson
James Herlihy
Loretta Herlihy*

*Irene Kettler
Danae Manus
Esma Manus
Ertha Reed
Barbara Roache
Betsy Stone
Clyde Theriot*

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

Our neighborhoods are outraged that the City will give 12.3 acres of prime land to a developer for only \$36,900.

That land should be devoted to mixed uses that will benefit the College as well as the neighborhood. City Hall bureaucrats want to develop the largest piece of open space in the City without compromise or consideration for local needs.

*Miraloma Park Improvement Club
Frank G. Mastro, President
Lakeside Property Owners Association
Thomas J. Thompson, President*

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

Local 2121 of the American Federation of Teachers, AFL-CIO, representing City College faculty, urges a no vote on Proposition B.

While this project provides short-term employment for a few, we are more concerned about the thousands of students who would benefit from planning and development that would better serve the community and the college.

No on B for continued excellence in community college education.

*Anita Martinez, President
San Francisco Community College District
American Federation of Teachers*

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

Our council represents 17 neighborhood organizations in the area near Balboa Reservoir.

Louis Batmale, our member and former chancellor of City College (1970-1977) has convinced us that City College needs the reservoir land. For the good of the college and to prevent harm to the

neighborhoods, we have endorsed a NO vote on Proposition B.

*West of Twin Peaks Central Council
Juanita Raven, President*

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Balboa ReZoning Referendum



ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

Last June 82% of voters in Sunnyside Precinct 1437 rejected the plan to develop Balboa Reservoir. We are nearly unanimous in opposing City Hall's raid on Sunnyside.

That land should be mixed use, to benefit the neighborhood and help the College.

The bureaucrats' uncompromising attitude is to give it ALL to a developer. That's unfair. That's bad city planning. We oppose the plan.

We ask your help to save our neighborhood.
Vote to control the City Hall bureaucrats.
Vote NO on B.

Jesse David Wall, President
Sunnyside Neighborhood Association

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

City College enrollment is now 24,000. The campus is extremely overcrowded. We need the reservoir for a decent parking lot, and adequate library, and a larger bookstore.

PLEASE vote NO on the Balboa Referendum!

William Wierenga, President, CCSF Student Council
Crystal Chan, Vice-President, CCSF Student Council
Basilio Alviar, Student Council Member

Danny Collins, Student Council Member
Rosemarie Paz, Student Council Member
R. Shawn Sandberg, Student Council Member
John Schaefer, Student Council Member
David Chin
Linda Gayle
Gail Johnson
Robert Williams

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

Our family includes two City College students. The quality of education is excellent, but the campus is too small for 24,000 students.

A student body nearly as large as Cal is squeezed onto a campus that is a small fraction of the size.

If the 12.3 acre reservoir were given to the college it would add nearly 25% to the campus size. This would relieve the overcrowding and provide a site for an adequate library.

Vote NO on B to show that you do not approve of the City's short-sighted plan which has totally ignored education.
Thank You.

Sidney Kass
Susie Langdon Kass
Phil Kass
Margaret Kass

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

Vote NO on B—The big giveaway of your land. A no vote stops the sale of almost 13 acres of prime San Francisco vacant land opposite City College by our Mayor and the Board of Supervisors. Would you sell land valued at over \$2 million dollars for \$36,900? Believe it or not, the city wants to do just that—sell it for ten cents on the dollar. Vote no on B.

As a former member of the Board of Supervisors and a Realtor,

I hope you will vote no on B. Isn't it time that the Mayor, the Board of Realtors, Supe Molinari and other supes stop catering to the condo & townhouse developers at our expense. Whew, 13 acres for \$36,900—Would you like to get in on that?

John Barbagelata, Realtor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

The Supervisors spent an unnecessary \$128,000 to call this special election. They want to shorten the time for our grassroots campaign.

We are on the right side of this land use issue, but it takes time for us to get our message out.


A short time frame is to the advantage of the developer's big money, last-minute blitz campaign.

We hope that voters will study the issues and see through City Hall's scheme.

For better city planning, vote NO on B.

Helen Crizer, Treasurer
SNap

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.



Balboa ReZoning Referendum

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

Two statistics clearly show that City College needs and deserves the reservoir land.

1. Enrollment at City College is HUGE and INCREASING. There are now 24,577 students on a campus planned for 4,000 in the

Table 1.

City College is by far the most crowded community college in the Bay Area. With 22,600 students on a 56 acre campus, it is more than twice as crowded as any of the others.

Name of College	Number of students	Campus (acres)	Area/1000 students
City College of SF	24,577	56	2.27
Laney College, Oakland	9,805	59	6.02
Chabot College, Hayward	18,000	147	8.17
Contra Costa College	8,500	83	9.76
College of San Mateo	13,820	153	11.07
College of Marin	6,663	77	11.56

early 1950's. (See Table 1)

2. Enrollment in the San Francisco Unified School District is INCREASING. SFUSD is the main source of City College students, and its enrollment has increased 7% since 1982. (Table 2)

Table 2.

SFUSD Enrollment

School Year	Enrollment in Grades K-12
1982-83	60,245
1983-84	61,124
1984-85	62,542
1985-86	63,900
1986-87	64,712

William Marquardt, Statistician for SNaP

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

POLLS CLOSE AT 8:00 P.M.

Special Notice to Absentee Voters


If you are voting absentee, avoid the following pitfalls that may endanger your right to vote:

- 1) It is no longer legal to have someone else (other than the Post Office) deliver your ballot to the Registrar.
- 2) It is not advisable to give or mail your application for absentee ballot to someone else (such as a political party or campaign). Mail it directly to the Registrar to avoid any delay.
- 3) You must sign your name and address on the declaration

on the back of the return envelope or your ballot will not be counted.

- 4) Never sign your ballot card or make any identifying marks on it. This makes your ballot void.
- 5) An application form is not necessary. A postcard or letter will do just as well.
- 6) Absentee ballots that are received after 8:00 p.m. on election day will not be counted.

Executive Park



PROPOSITION C

Shall the City exempt certain office developments including 500 or more housing units from the annual limit on new office construction if the project was approved before November 1986?

YES 306 →
NO 307 →

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Proposition M, adopted by the voters at the November 4, 1986 election, amended the City Planning Code to limit construction of new office space throughout San Francisco to a total of 950,000 square feet per year.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition C is an ordinance that would exempt certain office developments that include 500 or more housing units from the annual limit on new office construction, if the project was approved by the City before the November 4, 1986 election. There is one project that qualifies for this

exemption.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to exempt certain office developments that include 500 or more housing units from the annual limit on new office construction, if the project was approved by the City before the November 4, 1986 election.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to exempt certain office developments that include 500 or more housing units from the annual limit on new office construction.

How Supervisors Voted on "C"

On March 16 the Board of Supervisors voted 6-0 on the question of placing Proposition C on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

YES: Supervisors Jim Gonzalez, Thomas Hsieh, Willie Kennedy, Bill Maher, Carol Ruth Silver and Nancy Walker.

NO: None of the Supervisors present voted No.

**THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION C
APPEARS ON PAGE 34.**

Controller's Statement on "C"


City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition C:

"Should this ordinance be approved, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a product of its possible future application, there could be an increase in the assessment roll and cost of government. The potential tax revenues and costs, if any, being dependent upon an anticipated development's assessed valuation and other factors, cannot be determined at this time."

NEXT TIME YOU MOVE...

DON'T LEAVE YOUR VOTE BEHIND!

You must re-register to vote whenever you move.



Executive Park

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

For years, one of the great dreams of San Francisco has been to open the doors wide to opportunity for housing, jobs and park land in the southeast part of the City.

Proposition "C" will do just that. It will permit completion of Executive Park, an exciting complex of homes, offices, business, a hotel and a 26-acre park on a hillside overlooking Candlestick Cove, south of Candlestick Park.

The Executive Park Development has been planned, step-by-step, with the participation and blessing of its neighbors in the Bayview community.

The first office buildings in the complex already have been completed, but the remainder of the project was stopped by the passage last November of Proposition "M".

That proposition provides that the voters can give the go-ahead to projects that will create jobs and housing and will be of lasting value to the city, as this development certainly will be.

Your "YES" vote will get this project moving.

A vital feature of the plan is construction of 600 homes, many of which will be affordable for first-time home buyers—priced below comparable new housing in San Francisco. They will be terraced on the eastern slope of Bayview Hill, the top of which will be landscaped as a park.

Additionally, there will be 50,000 square feet of retail space, a 350-room hotel and office space, all of which will provide opportunities for 6400 jobs.

This well-designed development will bring new life and expanded payrolls into the Bayview. I have supported it from the outset, and I hope you will reaffirm this important complex of homes, jobs and park with your "YES" vote on Proposition "C".

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

A vote for Proposition C is a vote for housing in San Francisco.

Proposition C will allow the much-needed Executive Park project to go forward. Executive Park will help revitalize the southeast section of our City by providing critical housing, stimulating business, and creating jobs. The southeast community strongly supports the project and has been working hard for over ten years to see it completed.

This proposition is not a loophole in Proposition M. No one intended Proposition M to affect Executive Park. Proposition C simply corrects a legal technicality in the Planning Code that threatens to hold up the Executive Park project. The Board of Supervisors,

the southeast community and the drafters and supporters of Proposition M have all expressed support for Proposition C.

Proposition C will cost the taxpayers of this City nothing, but will bring important benefits for the southeast community and the City as a whole. We cannot afford to postpone these benefits. By voting "Yes" on this proposition, you can ensure that this valuable project is not delayed.

We urge a yes vote on Proposition C.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

In October 1985, after extensive public hearings, the Planning Commission approved the San Francisco Executive Park project. Again in December 1986, the Commission reaffirmed its support for the project and its office, retail, restaurant, hotel, residential, parking and open space. Executive Park is a well planned development and meets the City's need for new housing and new employment opportunities.

VOTE YES on this proposition.

Toby Rosenblatt, President, City Planning Commission
Richard B. Allen, City Planning Commissioner
Sue Bierman, City Planning Commissioner
Bernice M. Hemphill, City Planning Commissioner

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Executive Park was approved by the City Planning Commission prior to voter approval of Proposition M. In fairness to the project sponsors, it should be allowed to proceed. This project will not increase the amount of office space allowed under Proposition M.

For these reasons, San Franciscans for Reasonable Growth urges a YES vote on this measure.

SFRG

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Executive Park



ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Inasmuch as the City approved the Executive Park project over a year before Proposition M's passage, we do not believe that Proposition M affected that project. Given that earlier approval, the drafters of M did not intend to stop or delay the Executive Park Project. The City Attorney ruled otherwise, however. Accordingly,

San Francisco Tomorrow believes that Proposition C is consistent with Proposition M and urges its passage.

San Francisco Tomorrow

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

We fought Proposition M because we knew it would have real and hidden negative impacts on the creation of jobs and housing throughout the city. We warned the advocates of the initiative that Executive Park, a project critical to the social and economic well-being of the southeast portion of San Francisco, would be trapped by passage of the measure.

Proposition M has created delays and costs to Executive Park that will result in higher housing costs and increased rents for employers. This is one of the ongoing hidden problems created by Proposition M.

We were proven right, and now we encourage the voters to vote yes on Proposition C. A vote in favor of Proposition C will break one of the shackles of Proposition M. The city must advance—Executive Park represents progress for an area of the city that has been economically ignored for decades.

Please vote Yes on Proposition C.

John H. Jacobs, Chamber of Commerce

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

The San Francisco Executive Park Advisory Committee, consisting of residents from Bayview-Hunters Point, Little Hollywood and Visitacion Valley, has spent over twelve years of voluntary time working with the developers of San Francisco Executive Park to see this much needed development become a reality. It is very disturbing to us to learn that all our time and effort could have been for nothing because of a technical error.

Executive Park represents the type of development our community needs and wants. It represents thousands of jobs, affordable housing, restaurants, retail shops and new small business opportunities, a hotel and office development. All this at no cost to the City. Furthermore, the project will bring in millions of dollars in new property tax revenues.

Support us in making our City a better place to live. **VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C.**

San Francisco Executive Park Advisory Committee:

Shirley Jones, Chairperson, Bayview-Hunters Point

Inez Johnson, Secretary, Little Hollywood

Don Bartone, Little Hollywood

Ethel Garlington, Bayview-Hunters Point

Mary Lou Lindsey, Bayview-Hunters Point

Jackie Hameister, Vice Chairperson, Little Hollywood

Espanola Jackson, Chairperson, Planning Subcommittee
Bayview-Hunters Point

Frank Norrell, Little Hollywood

Henry Schindel, Visitacion Valley

Pat Christensen, Visitacion Valley Merchant's Association

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C


The developers of San Francisco Executive Park have for several years worked with our community to make sure that the plan for Executive Park is reflective of our needs. The plan has specific provisions in it to make sure that the traffic will have minimum impact on our area and to make sure that our community will benefit by the thousands of jobs which will be generated by the project. The project will not cost tax payers anything.

The members of our community look forward to enjoying the open space areas and hillside trails to be provided at SFEP, to making use of the services to be provided in the development, and to

shopping the stores and eating in the restaurants at SFEP. The development will provide a much needed boost to our area, help to change its image, and enhance our feeling of pride in our area of the City.

We support Proposition C wholeheartedly and urge you to **VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C.**

Don Bartone, President, Little Hollywood
Improvement Association



Executive Park

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

The Proposition M Executive Committee, the Committee which had day-to-day responsibility for the Proposition M Campaign, supports this Proposition. It ensures that the Executive Park Project (located near Candlestick) will be completed.

As the drafters of Proposition M, we never intended nor do we believe that M stopped Executive Park inasmuch as the Project had already been approved by the Planning Commission. However, the City Attorney has ruled, on technical grounds, that Proposition M does cover Executive Park. This Proposition, which is consistent with Proposition M's intent, is thus necessary to insure that this community-supported project goes ahead.

Accordingly, we urge passage of Proposition C.

PROPOSITION M EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Dennis Antenore

Jack Morrison

Dick Grosboll

Jim Queen

Jim Handler

Alan Raznick

Geraldine Johnson

Susan Weisberg

Michael Lighty

Calvin Welch

Esther Marks

Chantale Wong

Jim Morales

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

VOTE YES ON "C"

My neighborhood, the Bayview-Hunters Point, wants and needs these jobs. This is a good investment in San Francisco and in our

future.

Kevin Wadsworth

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

The development of the San Francisco Executive Park project will be good for the small businesses in the Southeast Section and the City of San Francisco. By bringing thousands of employees and visitors into the Southeast section, it will improve existing businesses and create new business opportunities at no cost to the City. For a long time the merchants of Bayview-Hunters Point and Visitacion Valley have wanted something like Executive Park to generate positive economic revitalization in the area.

Join the merchants of Bayview-Hunters Point and Visitacion Valley in promoting small business opportunities. **VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C.**

Wayland Fuller, Vice President, Bayview Merchant's Association
Fawzi Kaddura, President, Visitacion Valley
Merchant's Association

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Our community is tired of being viewed as dumping site for sewage treatment plants, auto wrecking yards, warehouses and public housing. We want clean industries and commercial businesses which will provide jobs and new business opportunities. Executive Park represents that type of opportunity. It will not cost the City

anything but will generate millions of dollars of new property tax revenues. Do not let a technicality stymie the progress and change our community wants. **VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C.**

New Bayview Committee

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

The members of the Visitacion Valley Improvement Association have repeatedly supported the San Francisco Executive Park (SFEP) project. Our association is happy the office park complex is being developed here in the Southeast Section rather than downtown. Projects like SFEP provide much needed job opportunities for our community and improve business for the merchants on Leland Avenue.

Our area has an extremely high unemployment rate and SFEP will bring sorely needed jobs to the Southeast Section. We have al-

ready benefited by the project's employment program and we look forward to the many additional jobs that Executive Park will provide for us.

Let's make sure this project is continued. **VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C.**

Henry Schindel, President, Visitacion Valley
Improvement Association

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION C

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

POLL WORKERS NEEDED

Earn \$49 to \$58 (plus bonuses)!

Meet Your Neighbors!

Serve Your Community!

There is a shortage of poll workers in most San Francisco neighborhoods. Voters who are interested in this important work are encouraged to apply as soon as possible at the Registrar's Office at City Hall. If you apply while there still is a large selection of vacancies, it is probable that you will be assigned to a poll in your own neighborhood.

The Registrar is trying to build a permanent corps of polling officials, therefore housewives and retired people, as well as others who are interested in community service are particularly urged to apply.

The higher-paying and more responsible positions will be reserved for persons who apply in person. Others may mail in the application form provided below:

(The workday is from 6:45 a.m. to about 8:30 p.m., with breaks for lunch and dinner.)

APPLICATION TO SERVE AS ELECTION OFFICIAL

I want to work at the polls on Tuesday, Election Day. Please assign me to a polling place.

Name _____

Address _____ Apt. # _____

Telephone No. (required) _____

Do you have an automobile? yes ☐ no ☐

Availability:

I want to work in the following area(s): _____

Second choice locations (if any) _____

Signature _____

TEXT OF PROPOSED ORDINANCE PROPOSITION A

(Zoning Change, 85.649EZ)

ADOPTING CHANGES IN PROPERTY USE CLASSIFICATION AS AN AMENDMENT TO THE ZONING MAP OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO OF PROPERTY LOCATED AT 701 FREDERICK STREET, LOT 34 IN BLOCK 1265 FROM A P (PUBLIC) TO A RH-3 (HOUSE, THREE FAMILY) DISTRICT.

Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. Pursuant to resolution of the Board of Supervisors, adopting the final negative declaration as its own, and pursuant to Section 302 (c)

of the City Planning Code, Part II, Chapter II of the San Francisco Municipal Code, the following change in property use classification, duly approved by resolution of the City Planning Commission, is hereby adopted as an amendment to the Zoning Map of the City and County of San Francisco.

Use District
to be
Superseded
P
(Public)

Use District
Hereby
Approved
RH-3
(House, Three-Family)

Description of Property

Beginning at a point on the northerly line of Carl Street, distant thereon 151.6 feet easterly from the easterly line of Arguello Boulevard; thence at a right angle northerly 275 feet; thence at a right angle easterly along the southerly line of Frederick Street 540.833 feet; thence at a right angle southerly 137.6 feet; thence at a right angle westerly 49.4 feet; thence at an angle of approximately 82 degrees southerly 139.25 feet; thence at an angle of approximately 98 degrees westerly along the northerly line of Carl Street to the point of beginning; being all of Lot 34 in Assessor's Block 1265. □

TEXT OF PROPOSED ORDINANCE PROPOSITION B

(Zoning Change, 84.220Z)

ADOPTING CHANGES IN PROPERTY USE CLASSIFICATION AS AN AMENDMENT TO THE ZONING MAP OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO OF PROPERTY LOCATED AT BALBOA RESERVOIR SOUTHERN BASIN NEAR THE NORTHWESTERN CORNER OF THE INTERSECTION OF OCEAN AND PHELAN AVENUES, A PORTION OF LOT 1 IN ASSESSOR'S BLOCK 3180 FROM A P (PUBLIC USE) DISTRICT TO A RH-1 (HOUSE, ONE-FAMILY) DISTRICT.

Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. Pursuant to resolution of the Board of Supervisors, adopting the final negative declaration as its own, and pursuant to Section 302(c) of the City Planning Code, Part II, Chapter II of the San Francisco Municipal Code, the following

change in property use classification, duly approved by resolution of the City Planning Commission is hereby adopted as an amendment to the Zoning Map of the City and County of San Francisco.

Use District
to be
Superseded
P
(Public Use)

Use District
Hereby
Approved
RH-1
(House, One-Family)

Description of Property

COMMENCING at the point of intersection of the northeasterly line of Ocean Avenue with the easterly line of that portion of Plymouth Avenue which lies south of Ocean Avenue, if said easterly line be extended northerly along its present course; thence proceeding northerly along said northerly extension of said easterly line of Plymouth Avenue, a distance of 155.316 feet to the TRUE POINT OF BEGINNING of this de-

scription: Thence proceeding easterly and along a line parallel with and distant 150 feet northerly from the northeasterly line of Ocean Avenue, a distance of 1065.206 feet, to the westerly line of Phelan Avenue; thence proceeding northerly and along said westerly line of Phelan Avenue, a distance of 700.000 feet; thence deflecting 92°10'12" to the left from the preceding course, and proceeding westerly a distance of 916.218 feet; thence deflecting 90° to the right from the preceding course, and proceeding westerly a distance 110.00 feet to the northerly extension of the easterly line of Plymouth Avenue, produced as described hereinabove; thence proceeding southerly and along said northerly extension of said easterly line of Plymouth Avenue, a distance of 280.000 feet the TRUE POINT OF BEGINNING; being a portion of Lot 1 in Assessor's Block 3180; and adjacent street areas to their centerline. □

TEXT OF PROPOSED ORDINANCE PROPOSITION C

AMENDING PART II, CHAPTER II OF THE SAN FRANCISCO MUNICIPAL CODE (CITY PLANNING CODE) BY AMENDING SECTION 320 TO PROVIDE AN EXEMPTION FROM THE CITY WIDE OFFICE LIMITATION PROVISIONS FOR CERTAIN PROJECTS THAT WOULD PROVIDE HOUSING PURSUANT TO A PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT AUTHORIZATION

NOTE: Additions are underlined; deletions are indicated by ((double parentheses)).

Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco that Part II, Chapter II of the San Francisco Municipal Code (City Planning Code) is hereby amended by amending Section 320 to read as follows:

SEC. 320. OFFICE DEVELOPMENT: DEFINITIONS. When used in Sections 320, 321, 322 and 323, the following terms shall each have the meaning indicated.

(a) "Additional office space" shall mean the

number of square feet of gross floor area of office space created by an office development, reduced, in the case of a modification or conversion, by the number of square feet of gross floor area of preexisting office space which is lost.

(b) "Approval period" shall mean the twelve-month period beginning on October 17, 1985 and each subsequent twelve month period.

(c) "Approve" shall mean to approve issuance of a project authorization and shall include actions of the City Planning Commission, Board of Permit Appeals and Board of Supervisors.

(d) "Completion" shall mean the first issuance of a temporary certificate of occupancy or a Certificate of Final Completion and Occupancy as defined in San Francisco Building Code Section 307.

(e) "Disapprove" shall mean for an appellate administrative agency or court, on review of an office development, to direct that construction shall not proceed, in whole or in part.

(f) "Office space" shall mean space within a structure intended or primarily suitable for occupancy by persons or entities which perform for their own benefit or provide to others services at that location, including but not limited to professional, banking, insurance, management, consulting, technical, sales and design, or the office functions of manufacturing and warehousing businesses, but shall exclude the following: Retail use; repair; any business characterized by the physical transfer of tangible goods to customers on the premises; wholesale shipping, receiving and storage; any facility, other than physicians' or other individuals' offices and uses accessory thereto, customarily used for furnishing medical services, and design showcases or any other space intended and primarily suitable for display of goods. This definition shall include all uses encompassed within Section 219 of this Code.

(g) "Office development" shall mean construction, modification or conversion of any

structure or structures or portion of any structure or structures, with the effect of creating additional office space, excepting only:

(1) Development which will result in less than 25,000 square feet of additional office space.

(2) Development either:

(i) Authorized under San Francisco Redevelopment Agency disposition or owner participation agreements which have been approved by Agency resolution prior to the effective date of this Section, or

(ii) Authorized prior to the effective date of this Section by Agency resolution in anticipation of such agreements with particular developers identified in the same or a subsequent agency resolution;

(3) Any development which is governed by prior law under Section 175.1(b) of this Code, unless modified after the effective date specified in Section 175.1(b) to add more than 15,000 square feet of additional office space. Any addition of office space up to 15,000 square feet shall count against the maximum for the approval period, pursuant to Section 321(a)(2)(B);

(4) Any development including conversion of 50,000 square feet or more of manufacturing space to office space where the manufacturing uses previously located in such space are relocated to another site within the City and County of San Francisco and the acquisition or renovation of the new manufacturing site is funded in whole or part by an Urban Development Action Grant approved by the Board of Supervisors;

(5) Any mixed-residential-commercial development which will be assisted by Community Development Block Grant funds approved by the Board of Supervisors in which all of the housing units shall be affordable to low-income households for a minimum of 40 years and for which an environmental review application and site permit application have been filed prior to the effective date of this ordinance which enacted the provisions of this Section.

(6) Any development authorized pursuant to a Planned Unit Development, as provided for by City Planning Code Section 304, providing for a total of five hundred (500) or more additional units of housing, provided such development first received a Planned Unit Development authorization prior to November 4, 1986. Such Planned Unit Development may be amended from time to time by the Planning Commission, but in no event shall any such amendment increase the amount of office space allowed for the development beyond the amount approved by the Planning Commission prior to November 4, 1986.

(h) "Project authorization" shall mean the authorization issued by the Department of City Planning pursuant to Sections 321 and 322 of this Code.


(i) "Replacement office space" shall mean, with respect to a development exempted by Subsection (g)(6) of this Section, that portion of the additional office space which does not represent a net addition to the amount of office space used by the occupant's employees in San Francisco.

(j) "Retail use" shall mean supply of commodities on the premises including, but not limited to, stores, shops, restaurants, bars, eating and drinking businesses, and the uses defined in Planning Code Sections 218 and 220 through 225.

(k) "Preexisting office space" shall mean office space used primarily and continuously for office use and not accessory to any use other than office use for five (5) years prior to Planning Commission approval of an office development project which office use was fully legal under the terms of San Francisco law. ☐

**You must
re-register
to vote
whenever
you move.**

NEXT TIME YOU MOVE



PHONE US
we'll mail you the forms
to register to vote

J. Harske






MAIN LIBRARY
Larkin & McAllister Sts.
558-3191
M, F, S, 10-6
T, W, Th, 10-9
Su, 1-5

BUSINESS LIBRARY
530 Kearny St.
558-3946
M-F, 9-6

BRANCH LOCATIONS



AGENCY	ADDRESS	PHONE			
			NORTH BEACH	2000 Mason St. 94133	391-9473
			M, T, Th, 10-6; W, 1-9; F, 1-6		
ANZA	550-37th Ave. 94121	752-1960	OCEAN VIEW	111 Broad St. 94112	586-4193
T, S, 10-6; W, 1-9; Th, F, 1-6			M, W, Th, F, 1-6		
BERNAL	500 Cortland Ave. 94110	285-1744	ORTEGA	3223 Ortega St. 94122	681-1848
T, 10-12, 1-6; W, 1-9; Th, F, S, 1-6			T, Th, S, 10-6; W, 1-9; F, 1-6		
CHINATOWN	1135 Powell St. 94108	989-6770	PARK	1633 Page St. 94117	752-4620
M, S, 10-6; T, W, 10-9; Th, 1-9; F, 1-6; Su, 1-5			M, T, 10-6; W, 1-9; Th, F, 1-6		
Children's Room			PARKSIDE	1200 Taraval St. 94116	566-4647
M, Th, F, 2-6; T, S, 10-6; W, 2-8; Su, 1-5			M, T, Th, 10-6; W, 1-9; F, 1-6		
EUREKA VALLEY- HARVEY MILK MEMORIAL	3555-16th St. 94114	626-1132	PORTOLA	2334 San Bruno Ave. 94134	468-2232
M, T, 10-6; W, 1-9; Th, F, 1-6			M, T, W, Th, 12-5		
EXCELSIOR	4400 Mission St. 94112	586-4075	POTRERO	1616-20th St. 94107	285-3022
M, S, 10-6; T, W, 10-9; Th, 1-9; F, 1-6; Su, 1-5			T, 10-12, 1-6; W, 1-9; Th, F, S, 1-6		
GLEN PARK	653 Chenery St. 94131	595-4144	PRESIDIO	3150 Sacramento St. 94115	921-5003
M, Th, F, 1-6; T, 10-12, 1-6; W, 1-9			T, 10-6; W, 1-9; Th, F, S, 1-6		
GOLDEN GATE VALLEY	1801 Green St. 94123	346-9273	RICHMOND	351-9th Ave. 94118	752-1240
M, T, 10-6; W, 1-9; Th, F, 1-6			M, S, 10-6; T, W, 10-9; Th, 1-9; F, 1-6, Su, 1-5		
INGLESIDE	387 Ashton Ave. 94112	586-4156	Children's Room		
T, W, Th, F, 1-6			M, Th, F, 2-6; T, S, 10-6; W, 2-8; Su, 1-5		
LIBRARY FOR THE BLIND	3150 Sacramento St. 94115	558-5035	SUNSET	1305-18th Ave. 94122	566-4552
T, 10-6; W, Th, F, Sat, 1-6			M, S, 10-6; T, W, 10-9; Th, 1-9; F, 1-6; Su, 1-5		
MARINA	1890 Chestnut St. 94123	346-9336	Children's Room		
M, S, 10-6; T, W, 10-9; Th, 1-9; F, 1-6; Su, 1-5			M, Th, F, 2-6; T, S, 10-6; W, 2-8; Su, 1-5		
MERCED	155 Winston Dr. 94132	586-4246	VISITACION VALLEY	45 Leland Ave. 94134	239-5270
M, T, Th, S, 10-6; W, 1-9; F, 1-6			M, T, W, F, 1-6		
MISSION	3359-24th St. 94110	824-2810	ANNA E. WADEN	5075-3rd St. 94124	468-1323
M, S, 10-6; T, W, 10-9; Th, 1-9; F, 1-6; Su, 1-5			M, Th, F, 1-6; T, 10-6; W, 1-9		
Children's Room			WEST PORTAL	190 Lenox Way 94127	566-4584
M, T, S, 10-6; W, 10-9; Th, F, 1-6; Su, 1-5			M, S, 10-6; T, W, 10-9; Th, 1-9; F, 1-6; Su, 1-5		
NOE VALLEY	451 Jersey St. 94114	285-2788	WESTERN ADDITION	1550 Scott St. 94115	346-9531
T, 10-12, 1-6; W, 1-9; Th, F, S, 1-6			T, S, 10-6; W, 1-9; Th, F, 1-6		

Hang this up.  Follow these tips.

27 things to help you survive an earthquake

Californians are constantly aware of the potential of an earthquake creating damage and creating dangerous conditions. So if we don't properly prepare, the next quake may cause greater personal damage than necessary. Each item listed below won't stop the next earthquake but it may help you survive in a better way.

4 basics to do during an earthquake

1. STAY CALM
2. Inside: Stand in a doorway, or crouch under a desk or table, away from windows or glass dividers.
3. Outside: Stand away from buildings, trees, telephone and electric lines.
4. On the road: Drive away from underpasses/overpasses; stop in safe area; stay in vehicle.

6 basics to do after an earthquake

1. Check for injuries—provide first aid.
2. Check for safety—check for gas, water, sewage breaks; check for downed electric lines and shorts; turn off appropriate utilities; check for building damage and potential safety problems during after shocks such as cracks around chimney and foundation.
3. Clean up dangerous spills.
4. Wear shoes.
5. Turn on radio and listen for instructions from public safety agencies.
6. Don't use the telephone except for emergency use.

14 survival items to keep on hand

1. Portable radio with extra batteries

2. Flashlight with extra batteries
3. First Aid Kit—including specific medicines needed for members of your household.
4. First Aid book
5. Fire extinguisher
6. Adjustable wrench for turning off gas and water.
7. Smoke detector properly installed
8. Portable fire escape ladder for homes/apartments with multiple floors.
9. Bottled water—sufficient for the number of members in your household.
10. Canned and dried foods sufficient for a week for each member of your household. Note: Both water and food should be rotated into normal meals of household so as to keep freshness. Canned goods have a normal shelf-life of one year for maximum freshness.
11. Non-electric can opener.
12. Portable stove such as butane or charcoal. Note: Use of such stoves should not take place until it is determined that there is no gas leak in the area. Charcoal should be burned only out of doors. Use of charcoal indoors will lead to carbon monoxide poisoning.
13. Matches
14. Telephone numbers of police, fire and doctor

3 things you need to know

1. How to turn off gas, water and electricity
2. First Aid
3. Plan for reuniting your family

The best survival is a prepared survival

City and County of San Francisco Office of Emergency Services

1111 Market Street - Second Floor
San Francisco, California 94103-3085
(415) 558-2984

Important Facts About Absentee Voting

At some recent elections as many as one-third of the votes are cast by absentee ballots. This is up from about 10% only a few years ago. There has been considerable confusion about the rules and procedures governing absentee ballots and some people have wound up accidentally disenfranchising themselves by not following proper procedures. Anyone considering the use of the absentee ballot should familiarize themselves with the rules below:

Any voter can get an absentee ballot. You no longer have to be sick or out of town to get an absentee ballot. Any voter can request an absentee ballot for any reason, or for no reason other than that it is a convenient way to vote.

Permanent Absentee Voters: The disabled can apply to become permanent absentee voters. A permanent absentee voter will automatically receive a ballot for each election without having to apply for it separately each election time. If the voter moves or re-registers he or she must re-apply for permanent status. The application to become a *permanent* absentee voter must state the nature of the disability or declare under penalty of perjury that the voter is actually disabled. Frequent travelers are not eligible for permanent status and must apply each time.

Third Party Delivery of Ballots: Recent court decisions have held that it is no longer legal for anyone other than the voter (himself/herself) or the Post Office to deliver an absentee ballot to the Registrar or his agents. Any ballots delivered by friends, relatives or campaign workers cannot be counted. An exception is made for ballots issued under emergency conditions during the last few days before election day; these ballots are issued in specially marked envelopes.

Third Party Delivery of Applications: This is still legal but is not advisable unless you know and trust the person who is delivering your application for absentee ballot. Many voters give or mail their applications to political campaigns, rather than mailing them directly to the Registrar. The political campaigners then use your application to compile a

mailing list for themselves before they finally turn the form over to the Registrar; delays of as much as three weeks are not uncommon. If a campaign mails you an application, it is advisable to mail it directly to the Registrar of Voters, City Hall, San Francisco 94102 and not to mail it back to the campaign headquarters (usually in Southern California).

An application form is NOT necessary. Voters who wait for the application forms that are included in voter pamphlets and campaign mailings often find that they have waited too long. The best thing to do is to apply early by letter or postcard; all you need to say is "Please send me an absentee ballot," then sign your name and address (also, please print your name clearly).

You must sign your name and address on the ballot return envelope. The reverse side of the envelope contains a declaration under penalty of perjury which establishes your right to have the enclosed ballot counted. If you fail to sign your *name* and your *address* to this declaration we cannot open or count your ballot.

Never make any identifying marks on your ballot card: Some absentee voters are confused about the above requirement and sign their names on the ballot card. You should *never* make any identifying marks on your ballot card; any such marks or signatures on the ballot card make your entire ballot *void*.

Cleaning your ballot card: After punching out the holes corresponding to your choices, you will notice that there are many little paper chips hanging from the back of the card. These hanging paper chips must be removed from the back of the card or they will fall back into their holes and the computer won't be able to "see" that you have punched the hole; if the computer can't see it, it can't count it.

(Since this page would have normally been blank, the space was used to provide this information.)

ABSENT VOTER BALLOT APPLICATIONMAIL COMPLETED
FORM TO:

OFFICIAL USE ONLY

Election Date June 2, 1987**Registrar of Voters**PLEASE PRINT
REGISTERED NAMERoom 155 City Hall
San Francisco, CA 94102

FIRST NAME MIDDLE NAME LAST NAME DATE OF BIRTH

RESIDENCE ADDRESS (DO NOT USE P.O. BOX NUMBER)

NUMBER AND STREET — DESIGNATE N. S. E. W. CITY ZIP

X
SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT (DO NOT PRINT) DATE (AREA CODE) DAYTIME TELEPHONEI have not and will not apply for an absentee
ballot by any other means.

(AREA CODE) RESIDENCE TELEPHONE

Application must be received by the county
registrar of voters no later thanMay 26, 1987Voters with specified disabilities may
qualify as PERMANENT ABSENTEE
VOTERS. Contact your local registrar
of voters for further information.**THIS APPLICATION WILL NOT BE ACCEPTED WITHOUT PROPER SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT**

MAILING ADDRESS FOR BALLOT (IF DIFFERENT FROM ABOVE)

STREET OR BOX

CITY STATE ZIP

The format used on this application
must be used by all individuals, organi-
zations, and groups who distribute ab-
sentee ballot applications.
CA Electronics Code 1006.1THIS FORM WAS PROVIDED BY **THE SAN FRANCISCO REGISTRAR OF VOTERS**

Voter Pamphlets for the Visually Impaired

Tape recordings (Talking Books) of the San Francisco Voter Information Pamphlet are available from the San Francisco Public Library's branch for the blind at 3150 Sacramento Street. Copies of the tapes are free to voters who are visually impaired or otherwise unable to read printed material. Please inform any friends or family members who might benefit from this service.

JAY PATTERSON
REGISTRAR OF VOTERS
155 CITY HALL
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-4691
554-4399

BULK RATE
U.S. POSTAGE
PAID
San Francisco
Calif.
Permit No. 4

Third Class

ADDRESS CORRECTION REQUESTED
RETURN POSTAGE GUARANTEED

DO NOT FORWARD

LOCATION OF YOUR
POLLING PLACE

MAILING
ADDRESS

ACCESSIBLE
TO HANDICAPPED
YES OR NO

BALLOT TYPE

56

SPECIAL ELECTION
5th Congressional District
(16th Assembly District)

PRECINCTS
APPLICABLE:
1000's, 2000's

Application for Absentee Ballot
is printed at the top of the previous page.

If the person to whom this pamphlet is addressed no longer resides at this address, please draw a diagonal slash (/) through the address label and drop the pamphlet in the mailbox.

POLLS ARE OPEN FROM 7 AM to 8 PM

POLL WORKERS NEEDED

Election day workers are needed at the polls in most San Francisco Neighborhoods, Bilingual citizens are particularly encouraged to apply.

WHEELCHAIR ACCESSIBILITY:



The "yes" or "no" on the top line of your address label indicates whether or not your polling place is wheelchair accessible.

This evaluation takes into account architectural barriers only. Geographical barriers you may encounter enroute to the polls have not been considered.